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Abstract

The discourse on planned and unplanned urbanisms has recently generated much critique. The discourse has been criticized for being unclear, too dichotomist and having derogative and romanticizing connotations. In addition, the discourse has been questioned because the urban theories it has brought forward have mainly been the product of Western thought, while the contrast between planned and unplanned urban form is mainly visible in the cities of the Global South. Departing from these critiques, this thesis set out to gain insight into the relations between that general discourse and the discourse that developed in Mexico City, where the contrast between planned and unplanned urban form is prevalent.

The thesis starts with a literature study that brings together the body of urban theory that has been the subject of critique. The literature study demonstrates how Western urban theory came from the idea that cities develop into physically and socially organized forms. This shows from the Chicago School sociologists who interpreted slums as a temporary symptom of the transitional phase in which rural-urban migrants adapt to urban life. It also shows in the architectural discourse in which critics such as Rapoport and CIAM architects have portrayed Modern architecture as the urban form of the future and vernacular or primitive architecture as backwards. The literature study shows that both sociological and architectural thought has become more critical. In sociology, the urban poor have started to be understood as marginalized instead of marginal through the work of Castells and Perlman in the 1970’s. In architecture vernacular forms have come under the attention of architects as Team Ten members starting in the late 1950’s started to study vernacular form and to question the position of architects. Although the architect’s attention to unplanned urban forms started in that era, only recently have architects started to work in these unplanned environments. This change in architectural interest and practice, together with developments in sociological and post-colonial theory, has influenced the present discourse. Unplanned urbanism is now understood as a form of resistance or as a survival strategy that can be supported with architecture and urban design. This recent development in its turn poses the risk of a romantic image, as the unplanned and its inhabitants start to be praised for their courageous resistance and creative urban solutions. This discourse is put in perspective with the Mexican urban discourse and the development two neighbourhoods in Mexico City.

The Mexican case studies include two neighbourhoods that started to developed in the late 1940’s. The neighbourhood Unidad Modelo was planned by architects and Sector Popular developed in an
unplanned way. The case study also includes the current housing situation in Mexico City in which the contrasts sharpens as unplanned development continues and housing has been left to the private market. The cases have been studied on the basis of Mexican architectural journals that have also commented on foreign urban theory. This made it possible to make connections between the general discourse, the Mexican discourse and the development of the two neighbourhoods.

The Mexican discourse has been influenced by a range of ideas and actors such as European architects and North American ideas on community planning. At the same time architects were also working to adapt these influences to the Mexican situation. The thesis therefore arrives at the conclusions that the general discourse has had influence on the Mexican discourse, but that it hasn’t determined the Mexican discourse; and that the relations between urban discourse and practice are reciprocal as changing urban contexts force architects to change their ideals.
Contents:

Foreword i
Abstract iii

1. Introduction 1
   1.1 Motive 1
   1.2 Problem statement 2
   1.2 Research goals and questions 4
   1.3 Approach 4
   1.4 Readers’ guide 5

2. Literature review 7
   2.1 Introduction 7
   2.2 The beginning of the discourse 8
      2.2.1 The city as an evolving organism 8
      2.2.2 The Modern planning ideal 10
      2.2.3 Consequences of a negative image 13
   2.3 Towards a critical attitude 21
      2.3.1 Critiques against Modern urban planning 21
      2.3.2 Changing architectural and urban practice 28
      2.3.3 Critique against the one-sided approach of architectural historians 33
      2.3.4 Sociological critiques against stigmatization and exclusion of the poor 37
      2.3.5 Local terms 41
   2.4 The introduction of an economical perspective 42
      2.4.1 Informality from an economical point of view 42
      2.4.2 The translation of the economic terminology to urbanism 45
      2.4.3 Unplanned urbanism as a housing solution 47
   2.5 The current discourse 51
      2.5.1 The architect’s entry into the discourse 51
      2.5.2 Informality from an architectural point of view 55
      2.5.3 The unplanned interpreted as flexible and rebellious 59
      2.5.4 Current derogatory rhetoric and its critique 63
   2.6 Conclusion 66

3. Methodology 68
   3.1 Introduction 68
   3.2 Case study 68
   3.3 The case study Mexico City 69
   3.4 Written sources 71
      3.4.1 Primary sources 71
         3.4.1.1 Estudios 71
         3.4.1.2 Arquitectura México 72
1 Introduction

1.1 Motive

This thesis came from a research project that I undertook in 2009 in Bogotá and Medellín, Colombia. This was related to the urban renewal plans of Antanas Mockus, who was the mayor of Bogotá from 1995 until 1997 and from 2001 until 2003, in which he tried to integrate the unplanned parts of that city into the urban fabric. In that research project I analyzed how urban projects both physically and socially stimulate the integration of unplanned neighbourhoods into the planned city. One of the conclusions of that research project was that the distinction between planned and unplanned neighbourhoods is questionable. When can an urban plan that sets out to integrate the unplanned into the planned be evaluated as successful? Can an unplanned neighbourhood turn into a planned one? And with what criteria could that distinction be made?

That project also made me aware of terminology like ‘slum’ and ‘favela’ and the negative images that it provokes. The unplanned neighbourhoods that were part of the project in Medellín and in Bogotá didn’t correspond with such an image of the unplanned city. They were well developed urban areas, equipped with electricity, water, drainage and public transport. The residents had TV’s, mobile phones and a business or a job to pay for them. The neighbourhoods that were part of that research project provoked questions about the vocabulary that is being used in the urban discourse to address the differences between planned and unplanned urban forms. Subsequently, I undertook a research project as a research intern at the International New Town Institute in which I set out to analyze the terminology that is used in the urban discourse to differentiate between the planned and the unplanned city. That research answered much questions about how the discourse evolved, how certain terms entered the discourse and how that has influenced how those terms have been used and understood. It became clear during that internship that my criticism towards the discourse on the unplanned city is a current theme in architecture and in urban studies. The negative connotations of the discourse have for example extensively been discussed by Alan Gilbert (Gilbert, 2007) and critiques against dichotomist approaches by Ann Varley (Varley, 2002; 2010), José Castillo (Castillo, 2000) and Ananya Roy (Roy, 2011), who have also criticized the Western production of urban thought and its projection on non-Western urban landscapes. At the same time as these critiques have been expressed by theorists they have also reached architects and critics who concentrate on the built environment. In these works the descriptions and analyses of urban projects have been accompanied by comments about the shortcomings of the vocabulary and
terminology that the current discourse handles (e.g. Brillembourg et.al., 2005; Hernández et. al., 2010). The current criticism against the discourse can thus be found in theoretic work or as comments in works that discuss urban situations and projects. An analysis of the relations between Western terminology and the non-western urban forms that they relate to, hasn’t been undertaken. Such an analysis could possibly back the criticism of theorists like Gilbert and Varley up and could bring more clarity to the urban debate. That’s why this thesis sets out to get a more complete image of how that discourse relates to an unplanned urban environment and how the friction between Western produced urban models and non-Western urban landscapes is demonstrated in that relation.

1.2 Problem statement
This thesis focuses on the discourses that have been developed to address the differences between planned and unplanned, urban development; and how these discourses are related to urban realities. The thesis will demonstrate that the established discourse poses a number of problems because it produces a false representation of the contrast between planned and unplanned urban form. Drawing from recent critiques towards the debate about planned and unplanned urbanism (e.g. Roy and AlSayyad, 2004; Gilbert, 2007; Hernández et.al., 2010), the current discourse has three main deficiencies. First, the discourse is unclear because scholars use terminologies interchangeably, often neglecting to state a definition. As many academic fields have shown interest in this phenomenon, many disciplines have developed terminologies to address urban conditions. The terminologies have different backgrounds and have been used with different underlying criteria to classify urban forms. Of these disciplines the most influential have been architecture, planning, sociology, economy and anthropology. This wide range of scholarly production has led to many ways of describing and defining urban forms and because urbanism is a multidisciplinary theme, the academic fields have taken over each others’ vocabularies. While the cross-fertilization of the vocabulary could have stimulated the accuracy of the debate, this hasn’t been the case in the field of urban studies and planning. Inaccuracy has developed as a result of authors using the same terms for different urban forms. Second, the discourse is inaccurate because of its incapability to include the gradations between planned and unplanned urban form. This situation is the product of the dichotomies that have often been used, such as formal/informal, planned/unplanned, legal/illega, regular/irregular, and that have resulted in a too abstract and dichotomist model to grasp the complexities of urban forms. Although scholars have developed new concepts to replace
the dichotomist approaches, many still depart from the same dualities, stating that the planned and unplanned should be understood as intersecting or reciprocal phenomena (Roy and AlSayyad, 2004). Third, the discourse has produced false representations because it is charged with romanticism, assumptions, stereotypes and prejudice. This is partly due to the fact that many terminologies and criteria have already been in use for a long time and have been used in different fields of interest. Another reason for the distortion in the discourse is that urban theory has largely been produced by Western thought and hasn’t consequently been connected with urban realities. As urban landscapes changed, the meanings of terms that are used to refer to them have changed. The word ‘slum’ for example was once used to describe housing in alleys, then to describe deteriorated neighbourhoods and now the word carries a stigmatizing connotation of poverty, crime and disease (e.g. Vaux, 1812 In: Davis, 2004; Park, 1925; Gilbert, 2007). So when the word is used now, like the UN who uses this word to campaign for shelter (Gilbert, 2007), or when Mike Davis uses it to illustrate the living conditions of the world’s urban poor (Davis, 2006), these negative connotations produce the risk of stigmatization.

The unclarity, inaccuracy and hidden meanings of the discourse have made it difficult to start a debate about unplanned forms of urban development. This for example becomes clear when scholars start their treatises with a discussion of the shortcomings of the existing vocabulary to settle for the least controversial terminology, but acknowledging that it carries many disadvantages (e.g. Castillo, 2001; Roy and AlSayyad, 2004; Brillembourg et.al., 2005). The problem also becomes clear when scholars safeguard themselves from critique towards the terms they chose to use by placing terms in brackets, by stating that the terminology is flawed, or by using phrases like ‘what might be called’ (e.g. resp. Roy, 2009; Castillo, 2000; UN Habitat cited in Gilbert, 2007). The caveat is justified because terminology is important, but it does pose a problem when debates at conferences where urban studies are presented fall into discussions about what terms the presenting scholar uses or should have used for the addressed issues.¹ The dichotomy ‘planned versus unplanned’ for example is said not to be used because neighbourhoods are never unplanned. They might be planned by agents other than planners and architects. This whole situation has made it difficult to address urban issues without being silenced for the terms due to the terms scholars choose to use.

¹ Personal conversations with A.M Martin and S. Rots
1.3 Research goal and questions

The goal of this research is to produce a critical overview of the discourse on planned versus unplanned urban forms and to compare the discourse with the referred urban forms. The subsequent goal is to arrive at a better understanding of how this discourse has been related to urban practice and to create a nuance in the ways urban differences have so far been addressed. These goals have been translated into the following research questions:

Main research question:
How have discourses on planned versus unplanned urban development evolved and how have they been related to urban realities?

Sub questions:
- What are the differences and similarities between the development of the general discourse and the place specific Mexican discourse on planned versus unplanned urban form?
  - How do the two discourses differ in their classifications of urban forms with distinctive economical, morphological and social contexts?
  - To what extent and how do the two discourses take the development of urban forms through time into account?
- To what extent and how has the general discourse affected the Mexican discourse?
  - To what extent and how has the Mexican discourse taken over the stereotypes, assumptions and romantic images of urban form that the general discourse has produced?
  - Does the Mexican discourse show the same ideological preferences for planned urban form that have been produced by the general discourse and if not, how do they differ?
- To what extent and how have the general discourse and the place specific Mexican discourse had influence on Mexican urban policy and practice?

1.4 Approach

The approach to answering the research questions is twofold. The first part is the literature study in which the historiography of terminologies will be analyzed. This part of the study provided insight into the strengths and weaknesses of the terminologies that are being used in the general
discourse. Also, it sheds light on the criteria that are being used to categorize urban forms. The second part of the research is a comparative case-study in which these terminologies and criteria were projected on a planned and an unplanned Mexican neighbourhood. The Mexican context was chosen for the case studies because when urban models and theories from the general discourse arrived there in the 1950’s and architects adapted those models to the Mexican context, Mexico City started to grow rapidly and mainly in unplanned ways. The Mexican case offers the possibility to illustrate the contrasts between the planned and the unplanned, both in urban reality and in discourse. In addition, Mexican architects have frequently had the opportunity to publish their ideas in architectural journals and this made it possible to trace back the development of the Mexican discourse and its relations with Western urban theory. From the Mexican context, the case Unidad Modelo was chosen to illustrate planned urban development based on the North American Neighborhood Unit concept and the mainly European Modern urban principles. The case Sector Popular was chosen to illustrate unplanned urban development and the regularization and consolidation of such an urban area. These two cases will be used to illustrate the theoretical discourse with urban realities and to analyze their relations. Additionally the thesis will shed light on the dynamics of present day social housing and unplanned urbanization in Mexico City and the debate that these practices have spurred among Mexican architect that work in the capital city today.

1.5 Readers’ guide
The first comment to the reader of this thesis should be that the disadvantages of the present discourse also formed a challenge when writing it. To avoid the pitfall of getting lost in the many terminologies that could be chosen from, I made the decision to use the terms ‘planned’ and ‘unplanned’ urbanism for the time being. With ‘planned’ I mean professionally planned, thus urban forms that are the product of a trained and licensed architect, engineer or planner, and with unplanned I refer to urban forms that were not the product of a trained and licensed architect, engineer or planner. Furthermore, I chose to refer to the urban theories and models that have been produced in Europe and in North America as ‘the general discourse’, to distinguish it from the Mexican discourse that will be illustrated with case studies.

Chapter two contains the literature review in which the genesis, the criteria, the strengths and the weaknesses of existing terminology are discussed. The literature study functions as the starting
point for the fieldwork because it distinguishes the criteria and the focus points that are used in the general discourse and that will be used to analyze the case studies. Chapter three will discuss the approach that was chosen for the fieldwork. The sources that were used are presented in this chapter along with the possibilities and restrictions that they posed. Chapter four will introduce the context of Mexico City and the two case-studies that were selected from this area. The analysis of the fieldwork and the synthesis between the literature study and the collected data will be brought about in chapter five, which leaves chapter six for final conclusions.
2 Literature review

2.1 Introduction
In order to understand the relations between unplanned and planned urbanisms and the many aspects to these forms of urban development, it is necessary to know and to be critical towards the ways in which other scholars have described or typified the differences. Knowledge about the criteria and terms demonstrate the strengths and weaknesses of the current debate and should be used to sharpen the debate about the spatial consequences and opportunities of unplanned and planned urbanisms. This chapter concentrates on the development of the Western discourse, in contrast with the non-Western Mexican discourse that will be introduced in chapter four. A preliminary overview of the literature showed that the discourse can roughly be divided in four sometimes overlapping, periods.\footnote{This division came forth out of the unpublished research into unplanned versus planned terminologies undertaken between December 2010 and March 2011 at the International New Town Institute.} The discourse started when cities started to grow quickly at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. This is the period in which the planned and the unplanned were regarded as two isolated entities. In this part of the discourse the planned was regarded as modern, healthy and efficient, and the unplanned as unhealthy, dangerous and primitive. This part of the discourse is the subject of the first paragraph. The paragraph devotes much attention to architectural and urban Modern, because the urban models and critiques of people like Le Corbusier, José Luis Sert and other CIAM architects have had great influence on the development of non-Western architectural and urban thought. The second part of the discourse that will be discussed is the period in which critiques against a one-sided perspective started to be expressed. This period includes research into vernacular architecture, self-help planning projects and economic and sociological research projects that have demonstrated that the planned and the unplanned city are related. In this part of the discourse, scholars also started to be more critical of the terms to describe built forms. The third paragraph will discuss the influence from the field of economics on the urban discourse. The paragraph primarily focuses on dichotomist terms like ‘formal’ and ‘informal’ and how they have influenced the urban debate. The fourth paragraph discusses the most recent developments in the discourse, in which scholars have made an effort to show the dynamics of the planned and the unplanned city. This paragraph discusses recent ideas on how urban forms are expressions of power relations in the urban landscape, mechanisms of offer
and demand and the availability of space and building materials. This paragraph also illustrates the recent interest that architects have shown in unplanned urban forms. The fifth paragraph analyzes and summarizes the different characteristics of urban form that are taken into account by the users of the discussed terms. This concluding analysis will be taken as a starting point for the fieldwork.

2.2 The beginning of the discourse
The discourse on the planned and the unplanned city started simultaneously with the beginning of industrial and postcolonial urbanization processes at the beginning of the twentieth century. In this period the ideal of the planned, Modern city started to prevail and with it the tension between the planned and the unplanned, the formal and the informal city started to develop as well. This led to a situation in which the planned city was idealized and advocated as the city of the future, and the unplanned city was being referred to with derogatory terms like ‘slum’. The work of the Chicago School’s urban sociologists started this ideal before the Modern architectural project began (Roy and AlSayyad, 2004).

2.2.1 The city as an evolving organism
A historiography of the discourse on planned and unplanned urbanism should begin with the work of the urban sociologists of the University of Chicago, better known as the Chicago School. The historiography should begin here because these scholars were the first to develop urban sociology into an academic field of research, a project that began with the foundation of the School in 1892. In addition, the Chicago School scholars developed and published the majority of their urban sociological theories in the period between 1915 and 1930, the period in which urbanization processes speeded up and became an established topic of academic debate. The theories of the scholars of the Chicago School became highly influential as their ideas reoccurred in the later development of the discourse on urban development and as their concepts are experiencing an academic revival in the present day (Small, et.al. 2010). The Chicago School scholars developed the academic field of urban sociology by regarding the city as an organism in which processes of competition and selection determine its development into an ever more complex system of organization, like competition and selection were believed to determine the development of species at that time. They argued that as a city grows the social organization of its urban community strengthens and that this would stimulate the improvement of the urban environment (Wirth, 1938). The scholars were using Chicago as their urban laboratory. Chicago experienced rapid
growth in the first decades of the twentieth century as this industrial centre attracted, mainly black, immigrants that were coming to Chicago from the south of the United States. These new immigrants inhabited the parts of the city centre that the Chicago School referred to as slums.\footnote{Mike Davis traced the word ‘slum’ back to 1812 when its definition was first published in Vaux’s the Vocabulary of the Flash Language. Back then it was British and Australian slang for an organized crime or a criminal trade. According to Davis it was the 1830s-1840s cholera epidemic that added health and housing conditions to the meaning of the word (Davis, 2006). Dennis argues that when the word started to carry the meaning of a specific built form, it meant ‘a single room – a place for slumber’ (Dennis, 2004; In: Gilbert, 2007). Nowadays institutions like the World Bank and the United Nations use the word to refer to ‘lower-quality or informal housing’ (e.g. UN Habitat, 2003), and categorize urban areas by the means of criteria like ‘inadequate access to safe water, inadequate access to sanitation and other infrastructure, poor structural quality of housing, overcrowding, and insecure residential status’ (UN Habitat, 2003:12) or by means of what they lack: ‘Slums do not have: basic municipal services – water, sanitation, waste collection, storm drainage, street lighting, paved footpaths, roads for emergencies; schools and clinics within easy reach. Safe areas for children to play; places for the community to meet and socialize’ (Cities Alliance, 2000).} To illustrate the point of view that Chicago School had towards these areas, Robert Park, one of the pioneering scholars of the Chicago School, in The City described them as:

‘submerged regions of poverty, degradation, and disease, and their underworlds of crime and vice’ (Park and Burgess, 1925: 55).

The Chicago School scholars expected these immigrants to adjust to city life and that they would become part of social graphs and that as of a result they would be able to improve their living standards and housing conditions (Park and Burgess, 1925). The slums were believed to gradually disappear through this process. New immigrants would create new slums which would emerge further towards the periphery. These would eventually be upgraded, once the new-comers had adapted and integrated to urban life (for the Chicago School’s scheme for urban growth see ill. 1).

The theoretical point of view of the Chicago School scholars resulted in the interpretation of slums as urban areas with residents who still needed to adapt and to develop social relations. The degraded inner city areas that they were living in were a temporal phenomenon that would disappear as its residents got involved in the social organization of Chicago’s urban community.
The theory of the Chicago School has been adopted by other scholars. Oscar Lewis for example developed the theory of 'the culture of poverty' based on the urban theories of the Chicago School. In accordance with the ideas of the Chicago School, he theorized that the urban poor form a separate subculture that isn’t capable of adapting to modern city life. In his most renowned work *Five families: Mexican case studies in the culture of poverty* (Lewis, 1959), he argued that poor people behave in an underdeveloped way that is culturally determined and that that type of behaviour confines them to poverty. When it turned out that slums are not a temporary phenomenon in the transition to a modern society, but a permanent aspect of urban form, the idea that slums are a weak link in the evolution of cities and societies already dominated. Since the image of the slum didn't only include the quality of the physical urban environment, but also the characteristics of its residents, slum dwellers got portrayed as rural people who were incapable of adjusting to modern, urban life. These ideas of the Chicago School scholars and their followers like Lewis, continued to appear in later urban studies. In 1962, for example, Charles Stokes commented that:

> *The slum is the home of the poor and the stranger [...] these are the classes not (as yet) integrated into the life of the city*.  
> (Stokes, 1962: 188)

And in 1970 Morris Juppenlatz added a notion of fatalism to the already negative discourse by referring to slums as ‘urban cancer’ (Juppenlatz, 1970). Although the Chicago School scholars have had great influence on the development of urban theories, the image of slums did not solely come into being because of their theory. The negative image of the slum also developed because the Modern city, a planned, ordered and efficient city started to be presented as the city of the future. This image was constructed and advocated by the avant-garde of Modern architecture and urbanism in the period between 1915 and 1960. Their envisioned city of the future was rigidly planned and organized and because of that it formed a direct contrast with the unplanned ways in which cities in the developing world were at the same time starting to grow rapidly.

2.2.2 The Modern planning ideal

At the same time as the negative image of slums and the urban poor was developed, urban critics and architects came up with an alternative to the organically growing industrial city. Instead of
1. Scheme of urban growth according to the Chicago School urban sociologists. In this scheme, the ghetto and the slum are located in the centre of the city and the residential areas of higher quality towards and in the periphery.

2. Plan Voisin, the plan that Le Corbusier developed for Paris in 1925 to substitute the small scale historic urban fabric. The plan shows the cross-shaped high-rise flats that would allow high density population, public green space and maximum sunlight and ventilation.
believing in the ability of people to adjust to city life, they believed that the environment should be adjusted to stimulate people and to bring out the best in them. As an alternative to the industrialist metropolis, critics like Ebenezer Howard and Patrick Geddes in England developed urban schemes that combined the qualities of city life with those of rural life (e.g. Howard, 1898). Their ideas resulted in spacious garden cities like Letchworth, North of London in 1903. In North America the same ideal led to urban schemes that were aimed at the stimulation of community life. The Neighborhood Unit concept by Perry Stein for example resulted in the realization of the planned community Radburn, in New Jersey in 1929. These new towns also fitted in a philanthropic trend that started to become stronger from the beginning of the twentieth century that advocated better quality of life for the working class. In the architectural discourse this trend became visible in the discussions of the platform for Modern urbanism and architecture ‘Congrès International d'Architecture Moderne’ (CIAM) about the Existenzminimum at their second conference that was held in 1929 in Frankfurt. The concept of spacious living and the conviction that the world’s working class deserved a dwelling that would meet certain minimum standards was adopted by the avant-garde of architecture and urbanism in the 1920’s and 1930’s as a symbol of modernity. CIAM architects advocated the planned, organized city via the concept of the radiant, or the functional city. This new form of building was to provide an alternative to the old-fashioned and malfunctioning cities of the pre-war period. Le Corbusier, one of the CIAM founders and the publicist of the movement’s manifest Athens’s Charter, described how he saw the problem that was posed by the cities of that time in his 1933 The Radiant City (see ill. 3):

‘The street becomes appalling, noisy, dusty, dangerous; automobiles can scarcely do more than crawl along it; the pedestrians, herded together on the sidewalks, get in each other’s way, bump into each other, zigzag from side to side; the whole scene is like a glimpse of purgatory. [...] Elsewhere, the buildings are residential; but how is it possible to breathe properly in those torrid canyons of summer heat; how can anyone risk bringing up children in that air tainted with dust and soot, in those streets so full of mortal peril? How can anyone achieve the serenity indispensable to life, how can anyone relax, or ever give a cry of joy, or laugh, or breathe, or feel drunk with sunlight? How can anyone live! [...] The world is sick. A readjustment has become necessary. Readjustment? No, that is too tame. It is the possibility of a great adventure
Just like the Chicago School had described negative influences to urban areas, so did Le Corbusier by portraying the built environment having tainted air and being full of moral peril. Le Corbusier formulated the remedy against the sickness of the world in his model for the modern city which he called ‘the radiant city’. The radiant city is the city of space and light. Le Corbusier wanted to reach these urban qualities by the use of cross-shaped skyscrapers (see ill. 2). Because of their shape, these buildings would have the maximum façade surface and they would thus allow the maximum of light possible to enter the offices and homes. Another advantage of the vertical concentration according to Le Corbusier was that it resulted in an efficient city because commuter distances would be shorter. The buildings were to be connected by elevated highways in order to keep the surface free for parks and other forms of recreational areas. Le Corbusier’s unrealized 1925 Plan Voisin for Paris, in which he planned to erase the historical fabric of the city and to project a gigantic leap in scale on the resulting tabula rasa, could be interpreted as an experiment with the principles that he later published in *The Radiant City* (see ill. 2 and 3). This radiant city was thought to be more suitable for the modern society because people would have the basic necessities to live a healthy and productive life. Probably because of this focus on efficiency and hygiene, the orderly functionalist city became a symbol of modernity and the unplanned became regarded as old-fashioned or undeveloped. After the Second World War, European cities needed to be reconstructed and former colonies in Africa, Asia and South America started to urbanize rapidly. Because of this, the Modern architects of the CIAM platform and their followers had many opportunities to plan their Modern cities of the future.

2.2.3 Consequences of a negative image

Before this section can start with a discussion of the effects of the negative image of slums and of the Modern planning ideal, it is necessary to clarify how this term ‘slum’ has been used in the literature. This term poses the difficulty that it was initially used to refer to degraded inner city areas and later also to refer to auto-constructed residential areas in the fringes of the cities of the developing world. As a result of this double use the term has become a non-specific word that is used to refer to a variety of lower income communities’ residential areas. Another difficulty, as
3. The front cover of Le Corbusier’s *La Ville Radieuse*, 1935. The image shows his points of departure for the cities of the future, sun, space and green areas.
Gilbert has argued, is that the negative connotations with the term ‘slum’ is because of the work of scholars like Robert Park and Oscar Lewis who continued to use it when the term started to refer to peripheral urban areas (Gilbert, 2007). Gilbert illustrated this development of the term using Mike Davis’ 2006 *Planet of Slums*, in which Davis discussed the structural economical and social problems that cause the development of slums and in which he described that development as ‘urban involution’ (Davis, 2006). Gilbert also pointed at the recent publication of *The Challenge of the Slums*, by UN Habitat and pointed at the continuing risks of stigmatization that the use of the term ‘slum’ poses (Gilbert, 2007). Gilbert concluded that it would be better not to use the term at all. As the term reappears throughout the urban discourse, its use can’t be completely avoided in this thesis. This label will only be used in the context of publications that have used it. Where possible, the types of housing that where referred to will be included in the discussion. This won’t be possible in all instances because authors haven’t always been clear about the exact types of urban forms that they referred to.

The Chicago School sociologists had produced a negative image of slums and their inhabitants that had been adopted by other theorists like Oscar Lewis. At the same time the architects and urban planners of the Modern Movement had produced a counterexample to that old-fashioned urban fabric. This counterexample made the contrast between the planned and the unplanned sharper and it made inner city slums to be regarded as inappropriate and counterfactual to:

‘[...] modernist ideals of social and physical order, morality, health, spaciousness and urban quality’.

(Flood in Gilbert, 2007)

The Chicago School scholars and the Modern ideals thus created a contrast that rendered the organically developed city unsuitable for the modern era. This development of the urban discourse has had and effect on urban plans and policies. The idea that inner city slums are an inferior urban form that would cease to exist once cities would become more developed and better organized, continued to prevail when after World War II peripheral slums were starting to be ever more noticeable in the cities of the developing world. The city governments that had peripheral slum development were embarrassed about these urban areas because they symbolized the incapability of their city to modernize (Castillo, 2010). It has also been argued that urban areas that are referred
to as slums impose fear on governments because of their continuing association with crime and disease (Gilbert, 2007). The peripheral slums in the developing world have also been regarded as a political threat because they are densely populated with unsatisfied people who are being made promises that are hardly ever met (Turnham, 1990). Governments have been afraid that the residents of these densely populated would organize and that they would start riots to enforce change (Turnham, 1990). Because of fear for riots and because of the embarrassment which slums pose, local and national government throughout the 1950's and 1960's chose to eradicate slums through evicting residents and bulldozing the sites. Another urban development strategy of such governments was to import the urban symbol of modernity by contracting a Modernist architects to restructure the urban fabric, whether for an urban renewal or an urban expansion plan. The Modernist architects of CIAM were frequently consulted to design solutions for these cities, especially in Latin American countries. European protagonists of the Modern Movement for example made plans for Colombian cities. Le Corbusier projected the demolition of the historic centre of Bogotá (see ill. 4) and José Luis Sert planned the demolition of the slums on the hills of Medellín and to substitute them with high-rise social housing (see ill. 5). The Swiss architect Hannes Meyer, who was one of the founders of CIAM and who was director of the Modernist Bauhaus school in Dessau from 1928 until 1930, migrated to Mexico City in 1939 after being invited by President Lázaro Cárdenas del Río to become the director of the city's recently founded Institute of Urbanism (Leidenberger, 2010). Meyer was greeted with open arms in Mexico. Although the institute was abolished after one and a half years, he succeeded in promoting his ideas on urbanism because he was being invited to speak on conferences of the Sociedad de Arquitectos Mexicanos. Also, he got in contact with the editor of the Modern architectural journal Arquitectura México, Mario Pani, who enabled him to publish three articles in that journal (Leidenberg, 2010). The European Modern discourse arrived in Latin America in diverse ways. Apart from the Modern architects’ direct involvement in overseas slum clearing projects, many architects who were

---

4 Slum clearing projects were more common in the 1950’s and 1960’s as the attitude towards unplanned development started to change from the 1960’s onwards. However, these projects didn’t stop, they continue until the present day. Examples of such initiatives are the 1975 Bangladesh slum clearing where the 500,000 squatters of the Dhaka slum were evicted and their homes bulldozed because of a city ‘clean-up’ project (Choguill, 1996); Nigeria, where in 1990 the Maroko slum in Lagos was bulldozed because it was an eyesore to the better-off, neighboring community (Davis, 2006), and for more recent examples one could turn to the demolition of slums in Chinese cities, to prepare for the 2008 Olympic Games.
4. Plan Director that Le Corbusier developed for Bogotá in 1951. The plan included the demolition of the city's historical colonial centre ‘La Candelaria’ that would be substituted with high-rise commercial buildings and projected the functional separation of housing (yellow), working (red) and leisure (green) in zones.

5. Plano Piloto that Wiener and Sert developed for Medellín in 1950. The plan shows the projection of a gridiron structure in the north-eastern hill slopes. Those hills is where the unplanned development of Medellín took place in the 1950’s
working outside of Europe followed the Modern trend. The Venezuelan architect Carlos Raúl de Villanueva in 1957 for example planned the Modern suburb 23 de Enero, a project for which a part of Caracas’ peripheral slums had to be eradicated and demolished (see ill. 6). The Mexican architect Mario Pani in 1988 created the plan ‘Ciudad Concertada’ for the centre of Mexico City. He envisioned demolishing of Mexico City’s historic centre and its ill narrow streets and constructing of high-rise buildings in superblocks, in order to give the area a higher density (Noelle, 2000: 24-28). Other examples of Latin American followers of the European Modern planning ideal are the Brazilian architects Oscar Niemeyer and Luis Costa who planned and designed the new capital of Brazil, Brasilia, according to the Modern principles of the functionalist city.

 Apart from the conceptual contrast that the Modern Movement created through advocating the planned city, they also sharpened the contrast by the ways in which they planned and realized their Modern projects. In the case of Brasilia for example, a provisional neighbourhood was built to temporarily house the construction workers that built this new city. That neighbourhood however continued to exist as the Modern city was not capable to offer affordable houses to the construction workers. In other cases Modern projects experienced much unplanned development after their completion. In these cases, like in Villanueva’s 23 de Enero in Caracas that started to be squatted almost right after its completion (see ill. 7), the Modern city turned out not to respond to the budgets of the lowest income brackets. As the projects of the Modern Movement turned out not to be designed for all classes of society, these sharpened the contrast between planned and unplanned development.

Although the Modernist’s inability to house the lowest classes can’t be denied, it must be noted that the Modern Movement initially intended to develop an urban and architectural form that could be used for all social classes globally. The idea for standardized housing produced by Le Corbusier, the 1914 plan Le Maison Domino, shows that Modern architects were working to develop a low-cost, standardized form for all urban dwellers (see ill. 8). This project also shows that Le Corbusier was at the beginning of his career thinking about housing systems that would leave room for the unplanned. This is why some writers on the Modern Movement, emphasize that the Modern project was not just meant for the new urban elite, but that it was seen as the ultimate urban fabric that
6. The housing project 23 de Enero designed by Carlos Raúl de Villanueva in Caracas in the 1950’s. The illustration shows the large high-rise slabs in a free landscape conforming with the Modern model.

7. Carlos Raúl de Villanueva’s 23 de Enero in Caracas with in the foreground unplanned housing development in the projects public space
8. Maison Domino as presented by Le Corbusier in 1915. Le Corbusier developed this model during the first World War and he proposed that it would enable the fast reconstruction of Europe after that war. The concrete skeleton is all the architect would provide, the frame could be filled in later according to the future residents’ needs.
could realize entirely new societies and modern citizens (von Osten, 2009). As unplanned urban development continued and as the Modern Movement didn’t turn out to be capable to keep pace with urban growth, the criticism against the Modernist ideal in architecture, against the urban projects that it produced and against the stigmatization of slums, whether inner city or peripheral, and its residents started to grow. These criticisms will be further discussed in the next paragraph.

2.3 Towards a critical attitude
The practices of eradication and the stigmatization of poor urban dwellers led to criticism of the ways the urban poor and their living conditions had been described. As well in the field of urban sociology as in the field of architecture and planning, scholars started to evaluate their perspectives and to become more critical of their research. In architecture the theoretical and practical focus on the planned built environment was started to be criticized, resulting in studies on vernacular architecture and the realization of design projects that left more room for residents’ use of space. In urban sociology and anthropology, established stereotypes like the supposed marginality of the urban poor were being re-evaluated, taking broader socio-economic circumstances into account.

2.3.1 Critiques against Modern urban planning
In architecture and planning, the beginning of a critical attitude could be noticed in theory as well as practice from the late 1950’s onwards. In the field of architectural theory the critiques came from various directions; younger architects started to take on a critical attitude towards the discourse and the ideals that their forerunners had created and the Modern projects that turned out not to function as planned or that turned out not to be able to provide housing for the lowest income groups generated much critique.

The inability of designers of projects like Brasilia and 23 de Enero to provide housing for the poorest social classes generated much criticism. Some critics say that the provisional neighbourhoods for the construction workers never disappeared because the Modern city wasn’t concerned with the working class, but with the middle- and upper classes (e.g. Rosler, 2010). These critics also point to the habit of architects who worked in the Modern project to locate the working class residence far away from the city centre, and far away from means of production and job opportunities which stimulated spatial segregation among income groups (Rosler, 2010). Apart from the Modern Movement being blamed for elitism, critics also blamed it for being paternalistic,
as it imposes urban forms on people. Lisa Peattie, an anthropologist who cooperated in the planning of Ciudad Guyana in Venezuela, for example described the distance between urban realities and urban plans in her critiques of that Modern project (Peattie, 1987). Ciudad Guayana actually consists of two cities, San Felíx, a town that was already there, and Puerto Ordaz, the part of the city that was planned by MIT and Harvard engineers in the early 1960’s. San Felíx has continued to be the unplanned counterpart of Puerto Ordaz, and it is home to the poorer inhabitants of Ciudad Guayana. In this case the Modern planning practice also failed to plan for the working class or to equip the urban fabric with a flexibility that would allow the residents of the city to follow their daily routines. Peattie described how the tension between the planned and the unplanned city came about as people started using the new city and started occupying vacant spaces while the city was still under construction (Peattie, 1987). 5 In the construction of the new part of the city, these inhabitants who were already there weren’t taken into account. The construction of a planned city caused tension with its unplanned counterpart.

Apart from the critique against Modern projects, the Modern Movement also started to receive criticism on account of its theoretical principles mostly from the younger members of the CIAM group and from a number of older CIAM members, like José Luis Sert. The beginning of the friction within CIAM became visible during the eighth CIAM meeting that took place in Hoddesdon, England in 1951. During the preparation for this meeting a discussion started about the subject of that meeting. Whereas Le Corbusier suggested that the meeting should be aimed at developing a Charte d’Habitat, José Luis Sert proposed that the meeting should be concentrated on urban ‘cores’ or ‘civic centres’ (Mumford and Frampton, 2002). Sert was at the time working in the United States and Gropius urged Sert to invite American planners, sociologists and planners to the CIAM meeting like Louis Kahn, Lewis Mumford, Clarence Stein and the Chicago School sociologist Louis Wirth (Mumford and Frampton, 2002). Although few American architects and planners attended the eighth meeting, the interest of CIAM members in North American planning concepts influenced the theoretical focus of CIAM and the projects that CIAM architects developed, most notably Clarence Perry’s Neighborhood Unit concept. This concept for urban planning that started to be developed in

5 She used the term ‘the Platonic city’ to refer to the city that is planned with a top-down strategy, without taking the daily reality of the people who live there in account; and ‘the Aristotelian city’ to refer to a planning practice that leaves room for the initiatives of the people who are already there (Peattie, 1987).
the 1920’s, came from the idea that in the industrial urban era in which cities would become larger and the automobile would dominate urban life, the social coherence of society had to be stimulated. According to Perry, this coherence would start in the neighbourhood and departing from a strong neighbourhood community people would be able to relate with the greater urban community (Brody, 2009). In order to construct a strong community in the neighbourhood, planners who worked with the Neighborhood Unit concept departed from the central position of the school in the neighbourhood and the positioning of larger arterial roads on the neighbourhood’s perimeter so that children would be able to walk to school. The school would be provided with playgrounds and other community leisure functions so that the lay-out of the neighbourhood would be directed at the community’s shared social functions. The concept has been highly dispersed in American planning and later planning concepts like Clarence Stein’s Radburn model followed the idea of community planning (Brody, 2009). In the Radburn model the inward concentration of the neighbourhood was further elaborated as this model departed from a green heart that contained the community’s shared functions and subsequently positioned the houses with their front sides directed to the community’s open space and their back entrances towards the streets (Lee and Stabin-Nesmith, 2001). These American planning concepts were discussed and adopted by the CIAM architects. The eighth meeting was eventually concentrated on the theme ‘The Heart of the City’. This CIAM meeting was focused more on the urban community and less on the functional planning ideals. At the meeting, Sert and Wiener presented their plan for Chimbote in Peru. In that projected they departed from the central position of a civic centre in the neighbourhood that would stimulate social contacts in a neighbourhood and they distanced themselves from the Modern principles of high-rise and isolation of urban functions, introducing the new urban form ‘the urban carpet’ that consisted of a low-rise urban fabric with patio-houses that were based on vernacular forms (Mumford and Frampton, 2002). The urban carpet departed from the idea that the rural-urban migrants who would inhabit that neighbourhood would bring their life style and would require a place near their home to keep their stock. It should be noted here that this planning concept had developed under the influence of the Chicago School’s ideas on the social organization of the city. From the 1960’s onwards it started to generate the same type of criticism as the ideas of the Chicago School had received. This criticism was aimed against segregation and exclusion that inward neighbourhood planning turned out to cause, especially towards the black populations in the United States (Brody, 2009). These critiques have for example been expressed by community activist Jane Jacobs who also rallied against the functionalism of Modernism and the distorting
effects of functional zonification and urban highways in America cities and (Jacobs, 1961). Although the American planning principles also departed from a rigid planning ideal, they did change the focus of attention from the physical architectural task towards an urbanism that was focussed on the community. This would be further elaborated in later CIAM meetings.

The differences of opinion between the older and the younger members of CIAM became sharper at the ninth CIAM meeting that was organized around the theme of the human habitat in 1953 in Aix-en-Provence. The core of the dispute was that the younger architects of CIAM like Aldo van Eyck, Giancarlo de Carlo and Peter and Alison Smithsons interpreted architecture and urbanism from a situationist instead of the established functionalist point of view. This meant that the younger generation interpreted the theme of the habitat as people’s living environment in its broader socio-economic context, including people’s interaction with that space. The older generation interpreted habitat as the physical living environment. These two points of perspective also caused disagreement about the ways in which habitat should be studied and the role of the architect in the realization of human habitat.

The ninth CIAM meeting included studies on habitat that caused uproar among the functionalists in the group because they were focused on vernacular building structures. Two groups within CIAM presented such studies. First, the Moroccan CIAM group presented two studies about the bidonville Carrieres Centrales in Casablanca Pierre Mas and Michel Écochard presented the ‘Moroccan Housing Grid’ and George Candilis presented the ‘Habitat for the Greatest Number Grid’ (see ill. 9). The grids were composed of sketches and photographs that showed the living conditions in Carrieres Centrales and suggested housing systems based on the patio-system found in the bidonville (Lejeune, 2008). Secondly, the Algerian CIAM group presented the study the ‘Mahieddine Grid’ that was prepared by Roland Simounet and showed the living conditions in the bidonville Mahieddine on the outskirts of the city Algiers and design solutions that were to replace the bidonville (Lejeune, 2008:253). Alison Smithsons has remarked that these grids caused upheaval because they weren’t studies on the aesthetics of architectural or urban forms, but rather on:

‘the messy everyday urban environment, the bidonville, that emerges from poverty and necessity’

(Lejeune, 2008: 253)
9. The habitat for the Greatest Number Grid as presented by the Moroccan CIAM group under the leadership of George Candilis at the ninth CIAM meeting that took place in Aix-en-Provence in 1953. This part of Candilis’ study shows the living conditions in the bidonville Carriere Central in Casablanca where people used to have the habit to construct their homes in repeating sequences around patios.

10. The 'Urban Re-Identification' Grid as presented by Alison and Peter Smithsons at the tenth CIAM meeting that turned out to be the first Team Ten meeting in Dubrovnik, 1956. The study demonstrated the various ways in which people use streets and this particular plate showed children’s play. The two bottom left squares show the translation of the Smithsons thoughts into the proposal for the Golden Lane project.
It was also a more general critique against the functionalist doctrine that caused friction between CIAM members. This critique focused on the rigid separation of functions that according to the younger members had caused people not to be able to identify with the urban environment anymore. At the ninth CIAM meeting Alison and Peter Smithsons presented their ‘Urban Re-Identification Grid’ (see ill. 10). In this study the Smithsons focused on the relations between people and their surroundings. They conceptualized the identification between people and different scales of the urban environment, the house, the street, the neighbourhood and the city, and analyzed how people interact with these scales. They for example illustrated that a street is not only a place for circulation but people on a sunny day could also take their garden furniture out on the streets and use it as a place for leisure. These studies led the Team Ten architects to conclude that the separation of functions that the older CIAM members kept holding on to didn’t conform with the ways people interact with urban space. After the ninth meeting the situationist architects continued their studies on everyday environments and the interaction between people and space. In 1954 a number of Team Ten architects came together in Doorn, The Netherlands, to reflect on the ninth meeting and to further develop the ideas that emerged from that meeting. After that meeting these architects issued a statement on Habitat that officially rejected the Athens Charter stating:

‘Urbanism considered and developed in the terms of the Charte d’Athenes tends to produce ‘towns’ in which vital human associations are inadequately expressed. To comprehend these human associations we must consider every community as a particular total complex’

(Mumford and Frampton, 2002: 239-240)

These younger architects organized the tenth CIAM meeting that led to the formation of the platform Team Ten, as the older CIAM members stopped attending. The tenth meeting concentrated on ‘human association’. At this meeting Aldo van Eyck presented his ‘Lost Identity Grid’ (see ill. 11). With this study Van Eyck underscored the importance of creativity, play and the element of surprise in the urban fabric. He argued that one can only relate to his environment by discovering it and by using it creative ways like children do when they play. The Team Ten architects continued their studies on habitat and human association after the tenth meeting and published their analyses of the internal structure of auto-constructed areas like Kasbahs and the connections between spaces with different functions in international architectural journals like the Dutch journal Forum.
11. The ‘Lost Identity’ Grid as presented by Aldo van Eyck at the tenth CIAM meeting that turned out to be the first Team Ten meeting, in Dubrovnik, 1956. The grid demonstrated how children discover their own identity through interaction with their environment.

12. Study of the structures in North-African Kasbah’s as presented in Forum under direction of Aldo van Eyck, 1959. Aldo van Eyck introduced the in-between spaces that he encountered in these Kasbah’s in his housing designs.
(see ill. 12) and the Italian *Spazio e Società*. The editor of *Forum* magazine Aldo van Eyck for example used that magazine to discuss his ideas on reciprocity that he illustrated with images of broad thresholds in front of Kasbah houses (see ill. 13). He illustrated the impossibility to categorize an urban place like such a threshold because it has many uses and characteristics. It is both a place of circulation and dwelling as it is a porch and a port at the same time. It is both open and closed as it can be used to permit and deny access. It is both public and private as it is simultaneously part of the house and part of the street (Ligtelijn and Strauven, 2008). In these magazines architects like the Smithsons, Van Eyck, Candilis and Woods also presented the projects that came forth out of their new conceptual perspectives on urbanism.

2.3.2 Changing architectural and urban practice

The re-conceptualisation of urbanism that the Team Ten members produced led to a re-conceptualisation of the Modern paradigm (Mumford and Frampton, 2002). They translated their studies of everyday urban life and their studies of the North African bidonvilles and Kasbah’s into a new form of urban planning that tried to reintroduce human scale in large housing projects. Alison and Peter Smithsons presented their proposal for the Golden Lane project as an illustration of their Urban Re-Identification Grid and their critique against the functionalist approach. The proposed project consisted of low-rise, zigzag-shaped, gallery accessed flats that were described by the Smithsons as ‘streets in the air’ because of their width (see ill. 14). A project of the Smithsons in the same vein that got realized is their infamous Robin Hood Garden project in London. The project was received with much criticism because of its grim and prisonlike appearance (see ill. 15). The project has generated the same type of critique that the large scale Modern projects of CIAM members had received on account of their massive scale and rigidity. Aldo van Eyck worked more directly with the lessons that he distilled from the vernacular forms that the grids from the Moroccan and the Algerian CIAM groups had presented at the ninth CIAM meeting and from his studies on in between spaces in these vernacular constructions. Aldo van Eyck for example incorporated the forms that he had studied in his ‘casbah organisée’ project into the Burgerweeshuis project that he realized in Amsterdam in 1960 (see ill. 16). In that project he adopted the ‘in-between’ spaces, like thresholds and patios, and the internal structure of sequenced spaces that he encountered in self-built environments (see ill. 17). This way Van Eyck tried to give his project a labyrinth quality that would encourage the dweller to interact with space and to identify with the environment through discovery. Another example is the project that Georges Candilis and Shadrach Woods developed
13. One of the Kasbah thresholds that Aldo van Eyck included in his 1959 study of in-between spaces. The size and use of these thresholds made Van Eyck question dualities like public versus private and led him to interpret them as reciprocal instead of mutually exclusive characteristics.

14. The proposal for the Golden Lane housing project by Alison and Peter Smithsons. The sketch shows the wide ‘streets in the air’ that the Smithsons developed in order for residents to be able to use these public spaces.

15. Robin Hood Gardens housing project in London by Alison and Peter Smithsons, 1969. This project was a materialisation of the critiques of these two architects against the functional doctrine. The illustration shows the ‘streets in the air’ that the architects had developed in their proposal for the Golden Lane project.
in 1952 in Casablanca, where they incorporated the building type of the 'hut settlements' that they had studied in the shantytowns of Casablanca into Modern projects (von Osten, 2009). They translated the patios of the informal settlements into a vertical city with balconies (see ill. 18). This endeavour deviated from the Modern approach because it adapted to climatic and cultural specifics instead of developing a universal building form like the Modern project was trying to do. A similarity with the Modern approach in architecture was that they still used the knowledge form auto-constructed housing in large-scale housing solutions in which the imposed an urban order from above. They have been criticized for being colonialist and elitist because they worked in colonies like Morocco in projects that spatially segregated the working class and also because they regarded the:

‘hut settlements and bidonvilles [as a] spatial expression of a rural or culturally specific tradition of unplanned self-organization, a natural consequence of the disorganized structure of the new suburban situation that demanded their intervention and ordering principles’

(von Osten, 2009: 15).

These projects generated the same type of criticisms that Modern projects like 23 de Enero received because Candilis and Woods’s project also informalized as the residents occupied spaces for example by closing off balconies (see ill. 19). Although the Team Ten architects first continued designing housing in the rigid manner that the Modern architects had done, their interpretation of the position and the task of architects changed. Team Ten members, Giancarlo de Carlo, Shadrach Woods and Aldo van Eyck example started to question the role of the architect in society. De Carlo criticized the accomplishments of Modern architecture for the lower classes. Woods in 1968 assisted students in the removal of his work from the Milan Triennale and questioned what the role of the architect should be in a society that has created ever more brutish housing and ever more sophisticated weaponry. Van Eyck started to include future residents of his projects in his design methods by letting them participate (Sadler, 1998: 32). The situationist point of view of these architects and their scepticism about the future role of architects also showed in their support of projects like Constant Nieuwenhuys’ New Babylon project, in which that artist projected a flexible urban form that would facilitate people’s interaction with space in a way that accepted and stimulated the adaptation of that space. In this new interpretation of architecture, the architect’s
16. The Burgerweeshuis in Amsterdam by Aldo van Eyck, 1960. The aerial photo shows the structure of repetitive cells around patios that are similar to the study of Candilis in Casablanca and the Kasbah’s that appeared in *Forum*.

17. The thresholds that form the transitions between the compartments inside Aldo van Eyck’s Burgerweeshuis.
18. Housing project Cité Verticale by Georges Candilis and Shadrach Woods in Casablanca, 1952. In this project the architects translated the horizontal patio structure of the bidonville into a vertical city with balconies.

19. Cité Verticale in Casablanca in 2008. The project by Candilis and Woods has been appropriated by the residents who have closed off the patio balconies in order to make them part of their appartments.
position was ever more being interpreted as an initiator or a stimulator of a process in which people form their own environments through their creative interaction with that environment.

2.3.3 Critique against the one-sided approach of architectural historians

Another branch of critiques that started to be expressed from the mid 1960’s was directed against architectural historians. The core of the critique was that architectural history had only been concerned with Western elitist buildings and not with the buildings that constitute the majority of built forms in the world:

‘the houses of lesser people’.

(Rudofsky, 1964:2)

The first criticism against the one sided focus in architectural history was the Museum of Modern Art’s 1964 exhibition on vernacular architecture ‘Architecture without Architects’. Bernard Rudofsky’s catalogue had the same title as the exhibition and presented series of photographs of vernacular buildings from all over the world. The photographic study was introduced with a critique on the narrow perspective that architectural historians have postulated. Rudofsky commented that historians are arbitrary because they only discuss ‘a full-dress pageant of “formal” architecture’, and that:

‘[Architectural history as we know it] amounts to little more than a who’s who of architects who commemorated power and wealth; an anthology of buildings of, by and for the privileged – the houses of true and false gods, of merchant princes and princes of the blood – with never a word about the houses of lesser people.’

(Rudofsky, 1964: 2)

As the exhibition and the accompanying publication were the first works to discuss the subject of ‘the houses of lesser people’ there was not yet a vocabulary. In the introduction to the catalogue Rudofsky therefore stated that:
‘Architecture Without Architects attempts to break down our narrow concepts of the art of building by introducing the unfamiliar world of nonpedigreed architecture. It is so little known that we don’t even have a name for it. For want of a general label, we shall call it vernacular, anonymous, spontaneous, indigenous, rural, as the case may be.’

(Rudofsky, 1964: 2)

Later in his introduction, Rudofsky would also use the term ‘primitive’ to refer to the built forms in his research that are not the product of an architect’s hand. With this collection of terms, Rudofsky started a vocabulary for unplanned urban development in the field of architectural history. The body of work that Rudofsky demonstrated was a collection of photographs with very short geographical and typological descriptions. The definitions and implications of the vocabulary that he offered for this new focus in architectural history stayed unclear. Although terms like nonpedigreed and primitive come across as negative, the tone of Rudofsky’s work is romantic as he stated that:

‘[…] vernacular architecture […] is nearly immutable, indeed, unimprovable as it serves its purpose to perfection’.

(Rudofsky, 1964: 1)

Five years after the exploratory work of the MoMA and Rudofsky, Amos Rapoport published his influential book *House, form and culture* (Rapoport, 1969). Rapoport went further than the first exploration that *Architecture without Architects* was. The aim of Rapoport was to analyze the lives of people from other cultures and to see how built forms are the results of cultural habits, climate conditions, available material and technical expertise. He interpreted the undesigned built environment as a source of information on others cultures’ ways of living:

‘We may say that monuments – buildings of the grand design tradition – are built to impress either the populace with the power of the patron, or the peer group of designers and cognoscenti with the cleverness of the designer and the good taste of the patron. [...] The folk tradition is much more closely related to the culture of the
Apart from the analytical aim, the work is also more thorough in its introductory explanation of what is meant with the terms vernacular, folk, popular or primitive architecture. Rapoport explained that grand design, primitive architecture and vernacular architecture are three different types of built forms and he summarizes these types as follows:

1. **Primitive.** *Very few building types, a model with few individual variations, built by all.*
2. **Preindustrial vernacular.** *A greater, though still limited, number of building types, more individual variation in the model, built by tradesmen.*
3. **High-style and modern.** *Many specialized building types, each building being an original creation (although this may be changing), designed and built by teams of specialists.*

(Rapoport, 1969: 8)

Rapoport used this approach to analyze the construction and the use of housing solutions of African, Asian and South American indigenous populations (see ill. 20). The research of Rudofsky and MoMA, although highly visual and little analytic, comprised an ample field of vernacular forms. The publication included Mediterranean towns that are constructed with fabricated materials like baked stones, and that have uniform arcades or neatly aligned streets, as well as African huts that are produced entirely out of clay and wood (see ill. 21). His research on vernacular architecture was more in depth because he analyzed the context and the use of the dwellings. At the same time it was also narrower than the initial exploration of Rudofsky because Rapoport included a select group of dwelling types in his research. The most notable shortcoming of this publication was that Rapoport depicted the analyzed dwellings and the cultures that they are from as primitive. He interpreted the dwellings and its inhabitants as under or lesser developed. As Rapoport applied the
20. A Peruvian indigenous hut as discussed by Rapoport in his *House, Form and Culture*, 1969. This hut is illustrative for the kind of vernacular constructions that Rapoport included in his analysis as it only included non-Western housing types.

21. A Mediterranean town with regular building- and street patterns as presented by Rudofsky in his *Architecture without Architects*, 1965. Rudofsky discussed an ample range of vernacular architectural form both from the developed and the developing world. He also presented vernacular forms with uniform shapes like the repetitive pattern demonstrated in this illustration.
theoretical sequence of primitive, preindustrial vernacular, and Modern architecture, he is now being criticized for depicting the Modern as the built form that is worth pursuing and a cultural characteristic that all should aspire to, and the primitive as an inferior architectural and cultural form (Arboleda, 2006). In this regard, Rapoport’s architectural research fits into a linear historical tradition that tries to discover patterns that accumulate to, and justify (then) present date practices, just like Marc-Antoine Abbé Laugier’s 1753 argument for neo-classicism that was based on tracing back the high design temple architecture of the ancient Greeks on a primitive hut (Laugier, 1753) and Alfred Loos’ argument that:

‘The evolution of culture marches with the elimination of ornament from useful objects’
(Loos, 1908)

Loos even went as far as to compare ornament in architecture with body ornamentation in the form of tattoos, stating that when Papuan indigenous decorate themselves it is a sign of their primitivity, whereas when modern men do that it means that they are criminal or degenerate (Loos, 1908). This approach to vernacular architecture hasn’t done justice to the housing solutions offered and has subjectively continued to support the Modern project in architecture. In addition, because vernacular architecture has been understood as a form of cultural expression, the inhabitants of vernacular architecture, of dwellings not produced by architects, have been portrayed as underdeveloped and backwards. These first ventures of architectural historians and critics into the field of the unplanned built environments resulted in an equally derogatory theory as the Chicago School had produced with their concept of the organically growing and evolving city. When these ideas were starting to be produced in the field of architecture, sociologists were starting to question the image of the marginalization of the urban poor that their theoretical perspectives had produced.

2.3.4   Sociological critiques against stigmatization and exclusion of the poor
In the field of sociology, Manuel Castells and Janice Perlman expressed the critique that the marginal positions of the urban poor as these had been described by Oscar Lewis, were not the expression of disorganization or of peasant culture, but rather of the opposing power of the urban elite. They argued independently that urban conditions should be understood in their greater economic and social contexts. In The Urban Question Manuel Castells pointed out that the Chicago
School’s urban theory is flawed because it assumes that the growth of the physical city positively correlates with the level of organization in the relations between people in that city, which by that time had already been proven not to be true (Castells, 1976). The social relations between people that the Chicago School called ‘urban culture’, were according to Castells actually relations typical for the:

‘[...] social organization linked to capitalist industrialization; in particular in its competitive phase.’
(Castells, 1976: 81)

On the basis of these arguments, Castells expressed the Marxist critique that urban problems such as slums and economical inequality were being explained as a natural, evolutionary outcome, while in fact it should be understood as a way of oppressing and marginalizing the poor. In a similar way, Janice Perlman argued in The Myth of Marginality that the urban poor aren’t marginal and aren’t peasants incapable of adapting to modern city life (Perlman, 1976) (see ill. 22 and 23). On the basis of her fieldwork in Brazilian favelas, Perlman concluded that:

‘[...] socially, the residents of favelas are well organized and cohesive; culturally, they share middle-class norms and values; economically, they are productive; and politically, they are neither apathetic nor radical’
(Perlman, 1976).

Perlman argued, much like Castells, that the urban poor are stigmatized as marginal by the elite in order to maintain the status quo. Perlman for example recognized how this stigmatization works as she noted that residents of the working class neighbourhoods were finding it harder to find jobs when they stated their ‘favela’ zipcode on their resume (2006: 161). Perlman thus showed that strong prejudices existed against favelas and their inhabitants and that these function to maintain the status quo. Although the change in perspective that Perlman demonstrated in her early work has been groundbreaking and highly influential (Roy and AlSayyad, 2004), it should be noted that she also reproduced the assumptions that she challenged. This happened for example when she used the word favela and addresses its planned counterpart with a ‘good neighbourhood’ (Perlman,
Pages from Janice Perlman’s *The Myth of Marginality*, 1976. The pages show images from the neighbourhood Praia do Pinto; on the left when the area was burnt in 1969 and on the right the same in area in 1973 where the government of Brazil realized subsidized housing for military personal after the eradication. Perlman used the images on these pages to illustrate the phenomenon in which the unplanned communities in Rio de Janeiro’s favelas were evicted from their homes in order for investors to plan housing there that didn’t fit in the long-term budget of the former residents of these areas.
23. Another page taken from Perlman's *The Myth of Marginality*, 1976. This page shows photos from the Paciencia neighbourhood in Rio de Janeiro. Perlman used these images to show how the houses that residents constructed themselves so that they could be adapted to their changing circumstances, and how the new houses that were erected after the original neighbourhood was demolished didn't offer the possibility to add extra rooms or storeys.
By referring to the planned city as ‘good’ the unplanned city automatically gets labelled ‘bad’, and this strengthens the stigmatization of unplanned urban areas and its inhabitants. The term ‘favela’ that Perlman used does this too, because it has become to mean the same as slum. Local terms like ‘favela’ are used frequently in the urban discourse to refer to unplanned urbanisms. That’s why this historiography will continue with the discussion of the use of local terms before it will illustrate the effects of the criticisms.

2.3.5 Local terms

The local terms that scholars use like Perlman used ‘favela’ and ‘ciudad asfalto’ and Team Ten architects used ‘bidonville’ and ‘kasbah’, usually refer to a local characteristic such as the genesis of the urban settlement or the material that was used in its construction. The main advantage of these local terms is that they per definition refer to political, social and economic place specific contexts. These terms thus automatically eliminate the difficulty that a non-specific term like ‘slum’ poses. Some local terms that refer to an urban form with a specific genesis have however come to refer to low quality housing in general. In Brazil for example the term ‘favela’ was originally used to refer to squatted urban areas where the residents don’t own the land they occupy and have no permission from the owner. The term ‘loteamento’ was used to refer to an unauthorized land division (Lara, 2010). The greatest difference between the spatial manifestation of a favela and a loteamento is that the first doesn’t have a planned street and plot pattern since people claimed land as they arrived. The loteamento usually does have a gridiron layout because the owner or the unlawful entrepreneur who divided the land would have wanted to do it as efficiently and economically as possible. As a result, the planning and design challenges for a favela or a loteamento are distinct. Notwithstanding the differences between favelas and loteamentos, ‘favela’ has come to be used in the same way as the term slum, referring to all sorts of lower quality housing whether people own the plots or not. Like the term ‘slum’, ‘favela’ has also adopted the assumptions and connotations. This for example becomes clear with Mike Davis’ *Planet of Slums*, translated into Portuguese as *Planeta Favela* (Gilbert, 2007). The risk that is produced by this use of the word favela is not just that it becomes unclear what sort of urban area is being discussed, the word also stigmatizes the area and all the people who live in it. As Gilbert notes:
'So often slums and all the people who live there are tarred with the same brush. [...] Slumdwellers are not just people living in poor housing; they are considered by others to be people with personal defects. In Brazil, a favelado is not just someone who lives in a favela, he or she is thought to be someone who deserves to live there.’ (Gilbert, 2007: 703).

So, although local terms can have the benefit of referring to a place specific context, with time their meanings change and with the meaning the image it produces of neighbourhoods and its residents. The same happens with local terms that refer to materials. The term ‘bidonville’ that was used in the CIAM Grids of 1953, initially referred to tin, which the North African suburbs were constructed with by their residents. As these neighbourhoods consolidated, their materials changed. With the material transformation of the neighbourhood, the term ‘bidonville’ is still used, but now not to refer to their building materials but to their general lower living standard. Other local terms have instantly produced a negative image, like the Argentinean ‘villa misera’, or the Colombian ‘urbanismos piratas’, because they refer to miserable living conditions or their illegal history. Another type of imagery that local terminology can produce occurs when terms are used to euphemize the living conditions. There are several terminologies that do this, for example the term ‘pueblos jovenes’, meaning ‘young towns’ that is used in Peru or the Colombian and Venezuelan ‘barrio popular’, meaning working class neighbourhood. So although local terms can refer to place specific contexts, the strength of certain local terms also depends on the way authors use them.

2.4 The introduction of an economical perspective
As sociologists, planners and architectural critics were opening their eyes for the connections between planned and unplanned urban form, the urban discourse started to be influenced by the field of economics. The terminology and the perspective to unplanned initiatives that the economist Keith Hart presented in his 1973 publication ‘Informal income opportunities and urban employment in Ghana’ have had great influence on the architectural and urban discourse. That’s why this work will be discussed here (Hart, 1973).

2.4.1 Informality from an economical point of view
The economist Keith Hart coined the term ‘informality’ in his 1973 publication ‘Informal income opportunities and urban employment in Ghana’ (Hart, 1973). In this article he tried to analyze the
advantages that the informal sector provides for the Ghanaian economy instead of departing from the preference for a modern and completely planned economy. In his analysis of the economic situation in Ghana, he used a number of terminologies that would later be adopted in urban studies. The dichotomist character of these terms and the image of urban development that they have produced have resulted in much criticism.

Of the terms that Hart used to present his research, ‘informal’ would become the most frequently used in urban contexts. Hart used it to refer to the form of labour that isn’t:

‘[...] recruited on a permanent and regular basis for fixed rewards’ or enterprises that do not ‘run with some measure of bureaucracy [that are] amenable to enumeration by surveys’

(Hart, 1973: 68).

Hart thus characterized formality by standardization and measurability. Apart from the formal versus informal divide, Hart introduced a variety of other terms that would later make their appearance in planning. He used the dichotomies ‘organized versus unorganized’, ‘wage-earning versus self-employment’, ‘regular versus irregular’, ‘legitimate’ versus ‘illegitimate’ and ‘legal’ versus ‘illegal’ to refer to characteristics of the formal and informal sector. Hart often mentioned the divide between organized and unorganized work without explicitly stating the criteria he used to distinguish them with. From Hart’s article it seems that he distinguished the two with the criteria of there being rules that arrange how many hours a person works and against what rates or not.

6 Hart tried to analyze the advantages that the informal sector provided in the Ghanaian context, instead of departing from the preference for a modern, planned economy. Hart’s work should be understood as placed between the modern and the postmodern academic episteme. Until the early 1970s the modern paradigm, apart form architecture and urbanism, also prevailed in economics, preferring the planned economy over the unplanned, the formal over the informal. The economist Turnham pointed out that, as in planning, in the field economy the ‘evolution line of thought’ also prevailed (Turnham, 1990). Turnham noted that up until the early 1970s the main goal of developing countries was to industrialize their economies and to reduce the size of the informal sector, even though it was the only means by which the unemployed could survive: ‘despite the interest shown from the outset in small-scale enterprises and their potential, the prevailing idea was that this sector needed to be reduced gradually in size’ (Turnham, 1990).
Another dichotomy that Hart frequently used is his article is ‘regular versus irregular’. He used this to refer both to continuity in time and continuity of activities and gains. Finally, Hart used the dichotomies ‘legal versus illegal’ and ‘legitimate versus illegitimate’ to explain respectively the legal and moral contexts which informal work occurs in. Hart used these terms to point out that what is regarded as an illegal activity by law may not be regarded as a crime or a felony by ‘certain subcultures’, so trying to understand and valorise them in their place- and cultural specific context. Hart speaks of legitimate informal labour, (such as street vending) and illegitimate informal labour (such as smuggling, gambling and theft), not dependt on the law, but on the norms that are prevalent in a group.

The main point that Hart made was that the informal sector is providing opportunities for the ones who experience the shortcomings of the formal sector. Hart argued that formal jobs in Ghana often do not pay enough to sustain a single person let alone a family. Those jobs often aren’t flexible enough to allow a worker to take on several jobs as work in the informal sector often does. Hart offered several examples of informal workers, from the hardworking housewife running a bar from her home, to the prostitute; from the worker who took on multiple formal and informal jobs, to the illegal bookie, to sketch a complete image of the many types of informal work. Also, Hart elaborated on the cases of labour and income that he encountered in his research that were more difficult to place under either one of the two labels. For example in the case of the worker with multiple jobs, or when people have a temporary job in the informal sector when they are in between formal jobs. Although Hart described his case-study with dichotomies, he used them to describe the complexity of the informal sector, with all its different motives, causes, and forms; the differing degrees of legitimacy and regularity of informal work; and how both sides of the economy intertwine.

Still, the work of Hart has, apart from the innovative idea that the formal and informal are connected, also reaffirmed stereotypes that prevailed at the time. First, he described the people he studied as slum dwellers connecting the informal sector with slum living and the connotations that this term carries. Then, he connected the informal workers of Accra to United States slum dwellers and those living in ‘the culture of poverty’. Third, he illustrated how:
‘[...] many urban dwellers purchase, rent, or occupy plots of land to farm on as a sideline’ and that ‘access to these income sources is limited primarily by the availability of space’.

(Hart, 1973:70).

This way he connected informal labour with squatting. Next, he stated that:

‘The informal sector may be identified for heuristic purposes with the sub-proletariat of the slum – a reasonable assumption despite the participation of many in the wage economy and of a few members of higher income groups in certain lucrative informal activities’.

(Hart, 1973:86)

In summary, Hart developed a vocabulary with a number of dichotomies that he didn’t use to convey a dual image, but to illustrate the complexity of the relations, the overlaps and the gaps, between the two sectors. Apart from that, he also reproduced the marginal, rural and underdeveloped image that scholars like Perlman and Castells were trying to break down. When the terms got translated to urbanism, their dichotomist character got stronger, as they have been used in other ways than Hart did.

2.4.2 The translation of the economic terminology to urbanism

Hart’s economical terms were adopted by the urban discourse in various ways. The formal and the informal, typified by Hart with the characteristics of standardization and measurability, found their way to the urban discussion through studies on housing markets. ‘Informal urbanism’ was first used in 1989 by Juan Pablo Pérez Sáinz to describe the informal urban economy of Latin American countries (Roy and AlSayyad, 2004; Hernández et.al. 2010). Pérez used the term in the same fashion as Hart, concentrating on the statistically invisible, and thus immeasurable, economic processes that are at play in developing countries’ cities. After this connection between informality and urbanism was made, it was used to describe informal land tenure and housing markets (e.g. AlSayyad, 1993).
As the terms 'formal' and 'informal' were adopted to study housing markets, so were the other dichotomies that Hart had used to address aspects of informality. Hart for example elaborated extensively on the legitimateness of the different types of informal work, and the terms that he used to make legal distinctions made their way to the urban discourse. In urban studies they often refer to property rights and building permissions. Terms such as 'legal', 'legitimate' and 'good' are used to refer to the planned city; terms as 'illegal', 'illegitimate' and 'unlawful' are used to refer to urban areas that are developed by violating property rights, building codes and land use regulations (e.g. Roy and AlSayyad, 2004), and has even led to the term 'illegal city' (Castillo, 2000: 4). Apart from the legal terms, Hart also elaborated on temporality and the flexibility of labour terms as a characteristic of the informal sector for which he used the dichotomy 'regular versus irregular'. These two terms appear in the urban discourse in various ways. ‘Regularity’ is being used to refer to the regularity of a spatial pattern, addressing the difference between the ordered city plan with a uniform urban morphology and housing typology versus the unordered, organic shaped city plan with dead-end streets, alleys and self-built housing (e.g. Castillo, 2000: 18). In urban studies, regularity has also been used in the sense of temporality. Planners then often speak of degrees of 'consolidation', using building materials, the number of storeys and the presence and quality of facilities as parameters (e.g. Ward, 1976; Wigle, 2009: 422).

The advantage of these technical terms is that they refer to different aspects of urban form. When urban researchers for example use the terms ‘formal’ and ‘informal’ to discuss standardization, and ‘regular’ and ‘irregular’ to discuss the spatial pattern of urban development or the degree of consolidation, these terms together could produce a complete characterization of urban form. The problem with these kind of terms is that they haven’t exclusively been used in this way. They have also been used simultaneously and interchangeably, which caused their original meaning to blur. Castillo for example states that the term ‘informal’ is being used simultaneously with other terms such as ‘irregular’, ‘illegal’, ‘uncontrolled’, ‘self-generated’, ‘unplanned’; and that this interchangeable use of terms has led to an unclear situation (Castillo, 2000:22). Instead of referring to aspects of urban form that could later be brought together to illustrate the complexity of urban forms and the relations between different types of urbanities, the terms are now used to refer to complete urban forms, without stating their characteristics. This situation has led to the critique that dichotomist terms produce a false dual image. As this critique has strengthened, it has become a regular item in the forewords to academic publications dealing with the subject of urban
informality (e.g. Hernández, et.al., 2010; Brillembourg et.al., 2005; Roy and AlSayyad, 2004). These scholars also point at the condemning character that dichotomies have. Castillo for example argued that there first has to be a norm in order for something to deviate from it (Francois and Azuela, 1997 In: Castillo, 2000: 23). The irregular or the informal is then interpreted as abnormal. The use of the term ‘illegal city’ also illustrates this condemning mechanism in the discourse. Because the false images that these terms have produced have created problems, scholars have sought new ways to approach the contrast between planned and unplanned urban form. Scholars have tried to demonstrate the connectedness between the planned and the unplanned and have started to interpret the unplanned as a solution to the shortcomings of the planned city.

2.4.3  Unplanned urbanism as a housing solution

The image that the planned and the unplanned city are two separate phenomena was contested by scholars who were analyzing the connections between them. This new perspective concentrated on the possibility of an unplanned urban area to develop and consolidate. Charles Stokes published a frequently cited article about what he called ‘slums of hope’ and ‘slums of despair’, the former being neighbourhoods that have much possibilities to develop, for example because of strong leadership, and the latter those that don’t (Stokes, 1962). Following the ideas of Stokes, Peter Ward conducted a research in Mexico City in 1976 in which he analysed two different types of working class neighbourhoods in the city and their possibilities to develop and consolidate (Ward, 1976). In the article ‘The Squatter Settlement as Slum or as Housing Solution: evidence from Mexico City’ he discussed the debate that was going on at the time about whether proletariat neighbourhoods constitute a slum universe or form a viable housing solution (Ward, 1976: 330). In this article Ward also pointed at the misconceptions and stereotypes that had developed such as the assumption that unplanned areas are inhabited by rural communities and the use of derogative descriptions like ‘urban cancer’ (Juppenlatz, 1970; Ward, 1976). These misconceptions, and the effects that they have had on public policy, were reason for Ward to analyse the development of these semi-legal settlements. He concluded that the invisible legal settlements that parasitize the urban fabric have fewer opportunities to develop, but that many older squatter settlements have consolidated and that these developments form a solution to the housing problem that can be encountered in many developing countries. Also, he suggested that the planning profession could support these developments by providing solutions such as public services and standardized construction elements. The perspective of research projects such as those of Ward and Stokes, the perspective
that analyzes the opportunities that informal settlements offer to the working class is a more pragmatic aspect of the urban discourse. Although the scholarly work of these researchers offered an alternative to the static dualism of the unplanned and the planned city, their vocabulary still repeated the derogatory rhetoric. Stokes referred to both developing and static proletariat neighbourhoods as ‘slums’ and Ward also kept referring to the stagnating neighbourhoods as ‘slums’. Although the discourse started to become more conscious about the differences between distinctive types of unplanned urban development and about the disadvantages of the derogatory discourse, the ways in which Stokes and Ward used terminology has caused confusion about what ‘slums’ are and the differences between ‘slums’, ‘proletariat neighbourhoods’ and ‘unplanned neighbourhoods’.

The idea that an unplanned neighbourhood can develop into a full-fledged part of the urban fabric could also be noted in urban development policies. A change in attitude happened in thinking about how future urban development in the developing countries could be directed and in how to deal with the unplanned urban areas that had already developed. Until the 1970’s the main strategy against unplanned urban development was demolition and substitution with social housing projects (e.g. Castillo, 2000). International institutions like the UN and the United States’ Alliance for Progress were also stimulating the development of rigidly planned social housing complexes, like for example the housing project ‘Ciudad Kennedy’ that was completed in the 1960’s in the Colombian city Bogotá with the financial support of the Alliance for Progress. When these projects and Modern urban projects like 23 de Enero in Caracas turned out not to be able to provide enough housing to counterbalance the growth of cities and were not able to provide housing for the lowest income groups, institutions like the Alliance for Progress and USAID changed their strategies. Instead of planning and financing social housing projects, they started to stimulate and develop sites and services projects. Sites and services is a strategy of urban development that was developed by a group of MIT engineers who in the late 1960’s and 1970’s were working to develop innovative ways to provide shelter for many people against low costs. John Turner promoted the sites and services projects and was particularly successful in lobbying with United Nations policy makers, which led to worldwide realizations of this type of projects. Sites and services is a basic

7 It is a general misconception that Turner invented and developed this idea. The first sites and services projects were undertaken in Puerto Rico in the 1930s by the USA Housing Department as a result of the persuading powers of planner and lobbyist John Crane (Harris, 1998). In the 1930s the general idea about
form of urban development in which only the lots with services like sewage and water are provided, where people construct (with or without supervision) their own homes. Although the idea of sites and services stemmed from the 1930s, it only started to be applied on a greater scale in the late 1960’s and the 1970’s. Castillo for example commented that the Mexican government refused to participate in these projects until the 1970’s because they were afraid that providing services would stimulate further rural-urban migration and as a consequence informal growth. Turner and his colleagues made great progress in changing planning practice from slum demolition and public housing for the few into a practice that provided a minimum amount of services for many (Harris, 2003). This ‘new’ practice could, with the same budget, provide access to urban facilities on a larger scale. It’s remarkable that in these projects planners for the first time combined the planned and the unplanned and thus accepted the advantages and the necessity of unplanned urban forms. In contrast, in architecture and urbanism architects and critics had opened their eyes for self-built environment but they still regarded the unplanned as an inferior stage in the pursuit of the planned Modern city. The conviction that the unplanned city shouldn’t be condemned because it offers structural solutions to the shortcomings of its planned counterparts received support from the field of economics. Economist Hernando de Soto for example has interpreted informality as an opportunity for people who are being excluded from the formal sector (Soto, 1989; 2000). He interpreted informal activity as a form of entrepreneurship that could be the solution to urban poverty. In his thoroughly debated *The other path* and *The Mystery of Capital*, de Soto explained that the problems that are formed by the informal economy and informal urban development (what he doesn’t call informal but extra-legal) could be solved by dismantling bureaucratic procedures that corrupt law enforcement and exclude many people and enterprises from legality (Soto, 1989; 2000; for critiques see Bromley, 1990; 2003; Varley, 2010). In the case of urban informality this meant granting property rights to auto-constructors and occupiers in order to let them be part of the formal city. The theory behind this idea was also that when people own their homes they will be more likely to invest in them and to develop or enforce the development of public facilities. Also, the property would function as a microcredit because when people hold official property titles they can sell them. This would make informal housing construction into an entrepreneurial activity that non-institutional urban development was still drenched with fear and embarrassment, so that in many countries, although the projects in Puerto Rico proved very successful, the sites and services project weren’t executed. (e.g. Castillo, 2000).
could help people in the long run. The neo-liberal point of view of De Soto has received the criticism that it relies too much on market mechanisms to solve a problem that is not solely legal and economic (e.g. AlSayyad and Roy, 2004). The causes for the development of informal housing are more complex than De Soto portrays them to be and as a consequence the solution is more complex than granting property rights. Critics of De Soto’s work support their points of view with the difficulties that experiments with granting property titles have demonstrated. A first problem has turned out to be who gets them. As the titles are put on one person’s name, usually the male head of the family, granting titles could interrupt the social fabric and could benefit some while worsening the situation of others (Perlman, 1976). Another aspect has been that people often end up with higher monthly expenditures because of the mortgage on their homes because of increasing costs of public facilities or the taxes they started to pay. Instead of stimulating the economic situation of these families, the granted property rights could disadvantage their situation. This could results in them adding a new house to their plot or a new floor to their home to rent it out. It could also result in them selling their titles and moving to cheaper, informal residence, usually further away from the city centre and from job opportunities (e.g. Perlman, 1976). Also when the expenditures don’t rise, people rearrange space and add rooms to their homes to fit their needs when the family grows or when it is necessary to sublet a room to gain extra income (Bayat, 2000). This is why Castillo comments that:

‘To assume that areas that originated through one mode of informal development but that have achieved legal land tenure are no longer informal is to fail to recognize that development is not solely a matter of legal status, but rather of the conditions that facilitate urban life’.
(Castillo, 2000: 2)

The theory that people wait with the development and consolidation of their houses and neighbourhoods until they have been granted property rights and the idea that such a development is an investment continues to be contested. The first part of the theory has been challenged because unwritten agreements between subdividers and occupiers have proven to provide enough security for people to develop their homes and to arrange facilities. The second part is being contested because empirical research has shown that auto-constructed houses are hardly ever sold because these unplanned developments occur in places where nobody with enough financial resource to
buy a house would want to live. Also, people who construct their own home are emotionally attached and wouldn’t consider selling it (Varley, 2002). In summary, granting property rights doesn’t guarantee a formal future.

After the introduction of dichotomies to understand urban forms, scholars have developed several ideas about the connections between the planned and the unplanned. At the same time as Stokes and Ward introduced the idea that unplanned urban areas could develop into full-fledged parts of the urban fabric, ideas about urban development policies started to change as well. The UN and the Alliance for Progress started to stimulate semi-planned housing development through sites and services projects. The economist Hernando de Soto introduced the idea of unplanned housing as an investment. These ideas are now being contested as people who construct their homes themselves are not in a position and are not willing to sell their house and move. The current discourse has gotten dispersed as some scholars have continued on existing lines of thought and others developed new conceptualizations. Also, as architects have entered the discourse and have developed an architectural vocabulary and strategy for the unplanned city.

2.5  The current discourse

The discourse on planned and unplanned urbanisms has largely been formed by social scientists as planners and architects have stayed focused on the planned city (Castillo, 2000). When architects started to work, both theoretically and practically, in the field of unplanned urbanisms, they lacked an architectural vocabulary to address these urban forms (Brillembourg et.al., 2005). In search of a vocabulary and an architectural attitude towards unplanned urbanism, architects have turned to the discourse that had already been formed in their absence. They continued the discussions about dual images, marginalization and added notions of physical form and planning strategies. At the same time academics working in the field of sociology, anthropology, economy and habitat also continued their discussions. In that part of the discourse new conceptualizations were developed but old misconceptions continued to be reproduced as well. These recent developments in the discourse will be discussed in this fourth and final section of the literature study.

2.5.1.  The architect’s entry into the discourse

Although architects had started to focus on vernacular architecture in the 1950’s, they did in order to enrich their planned projects. Architects started to work in unplanned urban areas much later,
although there are exceptions like John Turner. A sudden interest from architects in unplanned urbanisms and architectural forms could be noted after the year 2000. A number of projects stand out for the influence that they have had and the approach that they have developed. To begin with, the Urban Age project started in 2004. This project was a joint initiative of the London School of Economics and Political Science and the Alfred Herrhausen Society of the Deutsche Bank in which information from eleven megacities from around the world is interchanged and discussed through publications, conferences and newsletters. This continuing project is focused on the problems that arise now that the majority of the world’s population lives in urban areas and societies continue to urbanize. The project among other themes discusses density, mobility, pollution, social inequality, crime, housing, and water- and energy shortage. Around the same time Alfredo Brillembourg and David Klumpner started their Urban Think Tank project in Caracas, Venezuela in which they started to develop a framework to approach the unplanned urban areas in that city and ways to design for those areas that had been left out of the architect’s field of view. They didn’t try to design complete housing solutions but instead intervened with small scale design solutions to sanitation or mobility problems that the unplanned neighbourhoods of Caracas face (see ill. 24). Projects like Urban Age and the Urban Think Tank became visible to the larger professional public when they presented their works at the tenth Architecture Biennale that was held in Venice in 2006. For the first time the theme of the architecture biennale, ‘Cities, Architecture and Society’, did not solely refer to architecture but extended its field of interest to incorporate the larger field of the city. The Biennale should be understood as a breakthrough in the architectural discourse about the planned and the unplanned city because it contained contributions from cities all over the world including the ones which’s rapid growth is primarily caused by informal urban development. The Biennale included contributions from cities like London, Milan and New York to Mumbai, Bogotá and São Paolo. The exhibition showed a great contrast in living standard between these cities, for example by demonstrating the differences in density in these cities. The exhibition also succeeded in showing the contrasts within cities, as the the favelas in São Paolo and the barrios in Caracas are sometimes located right next to the planned communities of the wealthy (see ill. 25). The exhibition also showed how architecture and design changed these urban environments. It included the work of the Urban Think Tank whose projects are developed and executed with an acceptance of the unplanned environment. The architects try to analyze and value the structure of the unplanned city and within that unplanned order they highlight urban inefficiencies and possible design solutions. Another example of urban intervention that was shown at the Biennale was the upgrading of urban
24. Plan for a vertical gym as they have been realized by the architects of the Urban Think Tank, Alfredo Brillembourg and David Klumpner, in Caracas and São Paolo, 2001-2004. The architects plan small, flexible constructions in which different leisure functions are vertically stacked to make maximum use of the scarcely available space in unplanned neighbourhoods.

25. This aerial photograph was taken in the favela Paraísopolis in São Paolo. The unplanned neighbourhood is located directly next to a planned apartment complex for the city’s richer inhabitants. The photo shows the sharp contrast in density, available public space and facilities between planned and unplanned urban areas.
space in Bogotá, Colombia. This contribution showed how public space was reclaimed from the informal sector, how public space and cycling paths were created in the unplanned and densely populated unplanned areas of the city, how architecture had been used as method to connect planned and unplanned areas and to bridge gaps in Bogotá’s segregated society (Martin, 2007). The presentations at the Biennale coincided with architects and governments starting to develop projects to socially and physically diminish the gap between the planned and the unplanned city. The Plano Urbano Integral (integral urban plan) strategy of the government of Medellín has, for example been successfully used to integrate the unplanned parts into city into the urban fabric. The program does so with participation of the communities they work in. That way the planners and governments succeed in prioritizing the necessities of the communities and to tackle the greatest problems that these communities encounter, usually mobility, dangerous housing situations, education and health and sanitation. Apart from the social inclusion through participation and the physical integration through improvement of the physical environment and mobility, the projects in Medellín have also shown that architecture can contribute to the visual integration of unplanned neighbourhoods and communities. Sergio Fajardo, who was the mayor of Medellín from 2004 until 2008 implemented the policy that the city’s most luxurious architectural projects should be located in the city’s poorest and peripheral areas. This idea of Fajardo led to the construction of new libraries and cultural centres in the formerly isolated parts of the city. The most discussed example from this policy is the library ‘España’ in Santo Domingo Savio neighbourhood that was designed by one of the country’s most famous architects Giancarlo Mazzanti (see ill. 26). The library constructs a visual connection between the city’s planned centre and the unplanned houses on the hills where the building is located. The logistical connection between the hill and the city’s planned urban fabric was made with the construction of a metro cable that is connected with the city’s metro system. These connections do not only ensure that the unplanned neighbourhood and community of Santo Domingo Savio gets connected with the urban fabric of Medellín, it also stimulates the integration of

---

8 This conclusion came forward out of my research project in Colombia in January-May 2009 and the unpublished research report ‘Participatie, burgercultuur en place attachment: geïllustreerd aan de hand van vijf stedelijke projecten in Bogotá en Medellín’ [Participation, civic culture and place attachment: illustrated by means of five urban projects in Bogotá and Medellín] and the research dossier ‘Participatie in stedelijke projecten in Bogotá en Medellín, Colombia’ [Participation in urban projects in Bogotá and Medellín, Colombia].
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Medellín into these neighbourhoods as people from all over the city now need to go to that neighbourhood to visit the library. Projects like the example from Medellín show that architecture and participatory planning and design are useful instruments in improving unplanned urban areas. It’s probably because of these projects and presentations that attention from the field of architecture for the unplanned city continues to grow. Apart from the growing number of architectural initiatives that are undertaken in unplanned urban areas, the arrival of architects to the debate has also given a new dimension to the discourse about planned and unplanned urban forms.

2.5.2 Informality from an architectural point of view

After the Biennale there has been more attention to the unplanned city. Universities and other research institutions have started programs to investigate the current urban situation: The Urban Think Tank Caracas that also introduced Caracas at the Biennale published the catalogue *The informal city: Caracas Case* (Brillembourg et.al., 2005) The International New Town Institute is presenting the integration of the unplanned city in its' research on planned cities in the publication ‘*New Towns for the 21st century: the planned vs. the unplanned city*’ (Provoost, 2010) (see ill. 27). Harvard Design Magazine in 2008 dedicated an issue to the possible roles of design in informal urban settlements (see ill. 28). The journal Architectural Design dedicated its' April 2011 edition to Latin American cities under the theme ‘Latin America at the crossroads’. Another demonstration of the new interest in the unplanned city is the publication *Rethinking the informal city: critical perspectives from Latin America* by Felipe Hernández, Peter Kellett and Lea Allen (2011) (see ill. 29). In all these occasions, architects have discussed the way informality should be addressed in order not to stigmatize, simplify or romanticize the phenomenon. At the same time it should be noted that looking at the front covers of these publications, the informal city is being portrayed as the irregular urban morphologies on hill-slopes (see also ill. 30 and 31). With the production of these images the chaotic image of the unplanned is reproduced and the regular subdivisions that constitute the majority of unplanned urban development is being put out of focus.
26. Biblioteca España by the architect Giancarlo Mazzanti in Medellín, 2006. The photograph shows the neighbourhood Santo Domingo Savio in the foreground that has been connected with the city’s public transport system with the construction of the metrocable. The photo also demonstrates how the library rises above the neighbourhood and forms a visual icon in this unplanned part of the city.

27. The front cover of New Towns for the 21st Century by The International New Town Institute, 2010. The cover shows the contrast between an unordered unplanned area and an ordered planned area.
28. The cover of *Harvard Design Magazine* of August 2008. The cover shows unplanned urban forms on the hills of Caracas where a metro cable was planned to improve the accessibility of these areas.

29. The cover of Felipe Hernández’ *Rethinking the Informal City*, 2010. This cover also shows an unplanned urban hill slope area.
The architectural discussion about unplanned urban form that took place in these presentations and publications was concerned with the practical approach of the architect. It questioned what the architectural profession can contribute to improve the quality of life in unplanned urban areas. The discussion is at the same time held with the awareness that the discourse has had negative influence on urban practice and that it’s important for that reason so construct the architectural discourse consciously. Critics refer to the negative image of unplanned urban form that has been produced (e.g. Brillembourg 2004; Castillo, 2001; Varley, 2010), and to the urban policies of eradicating and bulldozing unplanned settlements caused by this discourse (e.g. Brillembourg, 2006). This has led to recent debates about how to approach unplanned urbanism. The publication that accompanied the contribution from Caracas at the Biennale, *The informal city: Caracas Case* offers an interesting example of the ways in which architects have started to try to unravel the Gordian knot that the debate about unplanned and planned urban form has come to be (Brillembourg et. al. 2005). The writers argued that architecture lacks a vocabulary to address the unplanned city. They also pointed at the same issue that Castillo had highlighted, that the terminology formal versus informal is unnecessarily dichotomist and that it implies a norm. For their project *The Informal City: Caracas case* Brillembourg and Klumpner wanted a term that would both be broad and specific enough and that wouldn’t be derogatory. They eventually chose the term ‘informal city’ for their research, but they presented the term with their own interpretation. They explained ‘informal’ as derived from the words ‘form’, which means shape or structure and ‘formal’, which according to them means ‘pertaining the customary form or conventionality’ (Brillembourg et.al. 2005). The writers stated that as certain forms become norms, they are culturally codified and become standard, accepted rules. These thoughts made the architects chose to work with the definition of ‘informal’ as:

‘*not done or made according to a recognized or prescribed form; not according to order; unofficial, disorderly.*’

(Brillembourg et.al, 2005)

The writers stated that they chose the term ‘informal’, but that they didn’t believe that the informal city lacks form. They argued that the informal city has a form that has yet to be recognized. This point of view has later been adopted by other writers in the field of planning and architecture. Hernández, Kellett and Allan for example adopted the definition of Brillembourg and Klumpner on
formal and informal urbanisms in their collection of essays on urban informality *Rethinking the Informal City: critical perspectives from Latin America* (e.g. Hernández et.al., 2010).

The new interpretation of formality and informality focused on urban and architectural form is only one of many solutions to the dualism in the urban debate. Scholars have come up with several new approaches. Some have argued that the two poles, formal and informal, should be understood as a continuum, which means that the absolute informal or formal doesn’t exist but that they are two imaginary poles between which urban forms move on a gradual scale (Bromley, 1990; 2003). Castillo solved the objections that he had to the dualistic approach by understanding informality in plural, titling his dissertation *Urbanisms of the Informal* (Castillo, 2000). Roy stated that she tried to differentiate within informality, instead of between formality and informality (Roy, 2005). These alternatives will be discussed in the next section.

### 2.5.3 The unplanned interpreted as flexible and rebellious

Architects have developed new terminologies and have adopted concepts from other fields to approach the urban field. The collection of essays that is presented in *Rethinking the Informal City*, offers an overview of the conceptual spectrum that is used in architectural debates (Hernández et.al., 2010). The publication started with a foreword by architect Raul Mehrotra in which he explained his concept of the kinetic versus the static city (Mehrotra, 2010). Mehrotra argued that the divide between formal and informal housing and economies is not clear-cut. According to Mehrotra there is an assumption that people who live in informal houses also have an informal job and that the people with formal jobs live in the formal parts of the city. He argued that this assumption isn’t true because people with a house in the formal city often have a job (or an extra job) in the informal sector, or the other way around. This is the result of the scarcity of job opportunities and the scarcity of urban space and the housing stock. The kinetic city, in the work of Mehrotra, is the city that cushions the effects of the scarcities on peoples’ lives. It can adapt quicker to growing or declining demands and it recycles materials that have lost their use. According to Mehrotra:

> ‘The kinetic city is a fluid and dynamic city that is mobile and temporal and leaves no ruins’

(Mehrotra, 2010: xii).
By taking this perspective Mehrotra (2010) widened the debate by crediting the kinetic city for its possibilities as a problem solver and that way tried to break through stigmas. Mehrotra’s explanation is in this regard similar to the early approach of economist Hart (1973), who used the terms formal and informal and illustrated the relations between these two sectors, as well as the solutions the latter offers for the shortcoming of the former. Also, Mehrotra’s concept includes the possibility for the kinetic city to become static. This happens when houses are upgraded with more permanent materials then the kinetic city can consolidate and become static.

Subsequently, Hernández and Kellett illustrated the importance of the work of post colonialist Homi Bhabha, who coined the terms performative and pedagogical to refer to these two power positions (Hernández et.al 2010). Hernández and Kellett brought these terms in relation with urbanism and architecture because they can be used to illustrate the ambiguity, the plurality and the temporality of urban space (2010). The pedagogical is the combination of forces such as the state and other powerful institutions, that constructs one identity for a nation or a city. The pedagogical homogenizes groups with mixed identities, produces norms, and renders everything outside that norm marginal or misplaced. The performative is the combination of forces that resists the dominating forces by acting outside the norm and that way questions the validity of the norm. In urbanism these notions can be translated to the planned city as the pedagogical control that authorities impose on communities, and the unplanned city as the performative reaction against that norm.

Another perspective that Hernández and Kellett mentioned is the theory of sociologist Henri Lefebvre on how space is produced, how values are attached to spaces and how people can get excluded from spaces (Lefebvre, 2003). For Lefebvre space is a means of production that some have access to and that others are excluded from by their social or economic position in society. In Lefebvre’s theory there are two sorts of spaces; abstract space and social space (Lefebvre, 2003). Abstract space is a dominating spatiality that imposes a norm and that tries to homogenize people in order to control them. Social space is the space in which people live their everyday lives and produce and maintain social relations. Abstract space imposes a norm and values and social space produces its own norms. Hernández and Kellett summarized this invention of Lefebvre as follows:
'Here, Lefebvre contrasts the concept of space as conceived by the elites against actual space produced by the people'.

(Hernández et al., 2010: 8)

Lefebvre didn’t only include planning in his understanding of place. He also included the struggle between the two sorts of space and the unequal situations that dominating articulations of space can produce. These ideas have recently been adopted by urban theorists to illustrate how the permanency of the planned city produces places with fixed values that exclude the inhabitants from the unplanned and more temporary city (Roy, 2009).

A similar concept has been developed by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari who translated Lefebvre’s conceptual framework of social versus abstract space to urbanism, creating the terms striated and smooth place. With these terms they tried to refer to the difference between space where people can freely move through and space that is striated by rules. According to theory of Deleuze and Guattari smooth and striated place are constantly transversed into each other. Smooth place is planned and turned it into striated place; and people in striated place try to liberate themselves by contesting the rules that striate it and in so doing is turned it into smooth space. In their line of thought the absolute smooth and the absolute striated don’t exist. Deleuze and Guattari see informal work and unplanned settlements as a counterattack on the striation of the labour market and the housing market.

All these terms, from performative and pedagogical until striated and smooth, share that they don’t concentrate on the urban form, but on the stakeholders and the power relation that produce urban form. The Spanish colonial town is then understood as the imposition of a spatial order at the disadvantage of the pre-Columbian order that existed prior to the conquest. The Modern city has also been understood as the imposition of a spatial order, as it dictates where people should live, work and recreate; and as a neo-colonial because it’s a Western urban model that has been projected on non-Western cities. In this sense, through the search for less dichotomist terminology, the discourse seems to have experienced a post-colonial turn. Post colonialism is a way of theorizing the world by critically analyzing power relations of domination and resistance. The field encompasses examples of power relations that derive from the colonial era, but has also analyzed patterns that have been produced after the colonial era or that can stand apart from colonial
politics, such as feminist theory. Important founders of post colonialism are Edward Said and Gayatri Spivak who have theorized the position of others and minorities in relation respectably to the self and the majority (Said, 1978; Spivak, 1988). Both scholars have shown how stereotypes of the other and of heterogeneous minority groups come to being and how they get reproduced until they are understood as pre-given facts. Deriving from the work of these protagonist academics, other postcolonial academics have created terms to describe the agency of the dominating and the resisting groups. Said developed the theory of ‘orientalism’, which he has used to explain the mechanisms of ‘othering’ unknown cultures. He argued that people have the psychological habit of filling in information about unknown cultural groups on the basis of the counterparts of their self-image (Said, 1978). Said explained how this on the one hand leads to negative stereotyping and on the other hand to overt romanticization and how these falls images have been used, and are still used to justify European imperialism and colonialism (Said, 1978). Said’s theory has mainly been used to explain the relations between the West and the Arabic world, in which images of disorganization, and chaos even, have shaped the ways in which Arab culture is understood. The arguments of Said against negative stereotyping have in turn caused the critique that it has diverted the attention away from the wrongs that Arab societies actually are confronted with (Makiya, 1993). As mentioned before, the Modern Movement in architecture and their successors, the Team Ten architects, have both been accused of imperialist behaviour as they dictated a spatial order on colonized or recently decolonized working class groups particularly in North Africa and South America. The work of Rudofsky and Rapoport can also be accused of orientalism as they have both, in greater and lesser extent, portrayed vernacular architecture as a primitive form and a first step in the development towards the grand design tradition towards the Modern planning ideal. On the other side, a variation on the critique against Said’s theory of orientalism can also be found in the field of urban studies as the arguments against negative descriptions of unplanned urban forms have led theorists to comment that they divert the attention away from the actual problems that unplanned communities face (e.g. Provoost, 2010). Unplanned urban areas are for example being portrayed as a model for a more ecological city as they are constructed with recycled material, which leads to a romantic image of the unplanned.

In line with the interpretation of patterns in space as expressions of power and exclusion, unplanned urbanism has started to be interpreted as the struggle of the underdog against a status-quo that excludes the poor from the planned urban fabric (Bayat, 2000; Soto, 2000; Brillembourg,
Asef Bayat explained this mechanism of rebellion as ‘the quiet encroachment of the ordinary’ (Bayat, 2000). With this term he referred to the ways in which the socially marginalized and disenfranchised produce a quiet grassroots protest by claiming space as a survival strategy. Bayat argued that collective action against urban injustice and exclusion might not be possible, but that by claiming space and in that way resisting to the order that has been imposed. This action makes it impossible to ignore them. They are on the streets selling their goods and they claim living space in the city which makes in more difficult to view them as a passive group that exists outside of the norms. The idea to interpret the claiming of space as resistance or rebellion has also been adopted by scholars working in the field of unplanned urbanisms (e.g. Brillembourg, 2004; Roy and AlSayyad, 2004). Brillembourg interpreted informal urbanism as a rebellious effort of formerly colonized populations to reclaim urban space in a way that breaks with the gridiron order that had been imposed upon them by their colonizer (Brillembourg, 2004). Apart from raising the critique that unplanned urbanisms often do follow a gridiron pattern, this interpretation of the unplanned has also spurred criticism that it expects too much from unplanned urbanism (Varley, 2010). The interpretation of unplanned urban development as a rebellious deed against a dominating power leans toward heroic romanticism and surpasses the fact that there are few other options for people living in the unplanned city to earn money or to have shelter.

2.5.4 Current derogatory rhetoric and its critique
The discourse has become critical of stigmas and dichotomies, and economical and political circumstances are more often taken into account when urban development is studied. When the terms ‘informal’ and ‘formal’ are used they are defined and discussed thoroughly (e.g. Roy and AlSayyad, 2004; Brillembourg et al., 2005; Hernández et al., 2010). And as Gilbert notes, for decades academics have avoided charged words like ‘slum’ (Gilbert, 2007). Occasionally a term like ‘slum’ is being re-introduced into the discourse, and when that happens it causes much debate. Recently the term has been used again by UN Habitat to draw attention to the UN Summit Millennium Development Goals. The UN did so with a research report called The Challenge of the Slums (UN Habitat, 2003) (see ill. 30) and a campaign called ‘Cities without Slums’ (Cities Alliance, 2000). In these documents UN researchers drew attention to the living conditions of the urban poor, the underlying challenges of economic growth and national governance that underlie these conditions, and prognoses for the future of urban poverty. (UN Habitat, 2003) These efforts of the UN have been widely criticized by scholars working in the field of urban development and housing issues for
30. The cover of the United Nation’s report *The Challenge of the Slums*, 2003. This collage of images shows the hill-slope unplanned forms that have also adorned the covers of publications on the informal city.

31. The cover of Mike Davis’ *Planet of Slums*, 2004. The cover shows an image of an unplanned urban area on a hill slope.
the terms the UN uses and the criteria for improvements they apply. Davis (2004) has criticized both stating that the term ‘slum’ doesn’t have a straightforward meaning but that it entails different things in different places and times. He argues that to measure improvements the term should have an absolute and a relative meaning. Only then can improvements from different locations be compared and can there be an end-goal; a minimum of qualities that housing conditions should meet (Davis, 2004). Despite the critique Davis expressed he has used the term extensively himself in his publication about unplanned urban development, as he titled his work *Planet of Slums* (Davis, 2004; 2006) (see ill. 31). Gilbert argued that the term ‘slum’ is being used only because of the strong image that it provokes. According to Gilbert, the UN this way tried to generate more support for their cause. However, Gilbert argued that by naming the campaign ‘Cities without Slums’ they risked to re-establish the old assumption that slums could eventually disappear, the assumption which has led to slum clearance projects and that have stigmatized and neglected the urban poor (Gilbert, 2007).

The dispute between Gilbert and the UN Habitat campaigners isn’t the only example in which academics have criticized the current use of terms like ‘slum’. More in general, urban theorists have started to question their methods because the vocabulary and the urban models that are being used in the academic world have largely been produced by scholars that live and work in the West (e.g. Varley, 2002; Roy, 2011). Roy has argued that the dichotomies in the urban discourse are a product from the West (Roy, 2011). According to Roy this can be noted in the use of words like ‘megacity’ that is used to represent the large urban centres in the Global South implying the uncontrollability of these centres of growth and the problems and risks that come forth out of their size, and ‘global city’ that is used to refer to urban centres of equal size in the developed world in a way that implies the connectedness of these centres with the world. Roy stated that the word ‘slum’ should also be understood in the way that ‘megacity’ can be understood: as a representation of the developing world’s cities produced by Western thinkers from their external point of view (Roy, 2011). Whereas Roy in her article aimed her critique against Western production of terminologies and images, others have more in general argued that the perspective on unplanned urbanisms is a product of Western thought. Varley for example argued that the dualisms that have become an established part of the urban discourse have been produced by Western thought and that the urban regulation and formalization strategies that attributed much importance to the legalization of tenure come out of the sharp legal versus illegal, and public versus private divide in the West and the importance
that official property titles have shown to have had for the development of cities in the West. Varley contested these aspects of the discourse by showing that these divides aren’t as clear in Mexico City, as formal and informal rules apply at the same time (Varley, 2002). With Varley, more critics have noted that cities in the developing world are still being portrayed as consisting of two identities, a modern, planned one, and a pre-modern, unplanned one (e.g. Biron, 2005). A continuing problem with this way of approaching the difference between the planned and the unplanned city is that it doesn't differentiate between the different forms of informal urbanism. Varley illustrated this by pointing at the continuing use of the term 'favela' in all sorts of urban contexts, even when a neighbourhood is located outside of Brazil, doesn't have a history of squatting and isn't located on a hill (Varley, 2010). This confusion leads to the image that all unplanned development has an irregular street pattern, while many informal cities continue along the pattern of the colonial grid. Carlos Brillembourg illustrated this on the basis of the homogeneity of urban form in Mexico City where about seventy percent of the urban territory developed in unplanned ways but almost always under the leadership of a subdivider who would divide an area into lots following a gridiron pattern (Brillembourg, 2006). The difference between a planned and an unplanned neighbourhood is then difficult to notice. Also, this stereotyping neglects the unplanned settlements of the urban elite; the gated-communities of the rich in developing countries often also have an unplanned history (Brillembourg, 2006; Varley, 2010).

2.6 Conclusion

The development of the discourse on planned and unplanned urbanism started with an evolution theory that foresaw the eventual disappearance of slums from the urban landscape. This idea, developed by the Chicago School's Urban Sociology department, was used by other scholars like Oscar Lewis and has since then continued to have great impact on the development of the urban discourse as it has stigmatised the marginalization on unplanned urban areas and their residents. Although the term ‘slum’ is hardly being used anymore in scholarly circles as it has been replaced for terms like informal, irregular and unplanned. Marginalizing mechanisms continue to be part of the discourse. In order to tackle this aspect of the discourse scholars have developed new concepts to approach the planned and the unplanned city, interpreting unplanned development as a housing solution or as the spatial expression of a social struggle. The latest critique against the marginalizing connotations of the discourse has been that urban models and theories have too much been the product of Western thought. The scholars that have expressed these critiques
suggest that these urban models and theories are the product of a false image that Western scholars have of cities in the developing world. Empirical research in unplanned neighbourhoods has demonstrated that much of the dualism that exist in urban theory do not conform with reality and that the possible solutions to continuing unplanned development therefore don’t work. That’s why in order to arrive at a more realistic approach to planned and unplanned urbanisms, it is crucial to depart from the contrast between planned and unplanned in urban reality.
3 Methodology

3.1 Introduction
This chapter will clarify how the research questions of this thesis were answered. It will explain which data sources were used and how the choice for those sources came forward out of the research goals. Subsequently this chapter will shed light on the advantages and disadvantages of the methodology, and how these were taken into account during the analysis.

3.2 Case study
In order to answer the research question, this thesis has to get insight into the discourse of the planned and unplanned city that was not formed by architects and critics from the West, but instead by the architects who are trained and who work within the contrasts between the planned and the unplanned. This way the body of theory that has been discussed in chapter two and that has been produced by European and North American architects and critics, can be compared with the interpretation that a group of architectural professionals that works in a city with unplanned and planned development has given to that contrast. Case study research allows a researcher to verify or falsify a theory (Stake, 1995). Because of this possibility, case study was chosen as the research method to answer the research questions in this thesis. A case study can generate illustrative support for a theory or counterexamples that will enable the researcher to indicate the weak and strong aspects of a theory and to formulate critiques against that theory. In architectural history this has for example been done by the Museum of Modern Art and Rudofsky's with their publication on vernacular architecture (Rudofsky, 1964). In that publication the dominant historical tradition that concentrated on 'high design' was criticized on the basis of the cases that showed a range of built structures that were thus far left out of written history. As a conclusion to the work, the publication suggested to produce a more complete architectural history by including these architectures without architects. Case studies thus lend themselves for the analysis of a theory and its verification with reality. A disadvantage of the method is that the information that is retrieved form case studies can only lead to interpretations and conclusions with regard to those case studies. To get back to the example of Rudofsky's work, the cases that are used in Architecture without architects to illustrate the types of buildings that didn't yet appear in the work of architectural historians are only valuable as counterexamples to the dominant architectural paradigm. They shouldn't be interpreted, nor are they presented, as a way to understand
vernacular architecture in general. In a same way, the case studies that will be presented here will
be used to illustrate the strengths and weaknesses of the discourse that has been presented in the
previous chapters.

3.3 The case study Mexico City
In order to get insight into a non-Western architectural discourse on the planned and the
unplanned city, Mexico City was chosen as a case study. There were various reasons for this choice.
First, Mexico City hasn’t been left untouched by the Modern ideal. The ideal of modernity was
adopted by politicians after the revolution of 1910 to strengthen their promise of a better future for
the Mexican people. Mexican architects at the same time started to develop a Modern vocabulary
that suited the political climate. These Modern architectural expressions are still visible in the city,
especially in the public housing projects that were executed in the period between 1945 and 1965.
Second, at the same time as the Modern Movement’s ideas arrived in Mexico, the capital city
experienced explosive growth. The Federal District of Mexico City went from 1.65 million
inhabitants in 1940 to 3.24 million in 1950, to 5.18 in 1960 and to 7.33 million in 1970 (Davis,
1998) (see ill. 32). This growth couldn’t be absorbed by the planned housing market, and as a
consequence immigrants started to build their houses next to the idealist social projects that
governmental institutions developed. The planned and the unplanned development of Mexico City
continue until this day and produce ever greater contrasts between the planned and the unplanned
city, serviced and un-serviced urban areas, and the rich population and the poor. These two
simultaneous developments create an interesting contrast that makes it possible to analyze how
both types of urban development were received through time, and how their relation has been
understood. Thirdly, Mexico City is a suitable location to study the relations between the planned
and the unplanned city and their local interpretations and representations because Mexican
architects have produced a number of journals that have documented the development of Mexico
City, and the ideas and projects of Mexican architects. Finally, Mexico City is a suitable case because
its growth continues until today and the contrast between planned and unplanned continues to
sharpen because of that development. This becomes visible as the present growth of the city is
being absorbed by private companies’ social housing projects and by state programs that improve
unplanned housing and provide credit. This situation allows this thesis not only to analyse the
development of the Mexican discourse in the 1940’s and 1950’s when unplanned development
started to accelerate but also to include an illustration of the issues that are at play in the
32. Table showing the demographical development of Mexico City between 1900 and 1990. The table shows number for the Central City, which are the four central urban divisions of the city, the Federal District, which is the state, and the entire Metropolitan area that has passed state borders. The table shows that the growth of the city made a giant leap in the period between 1940 and 1950 and that it has continued in such a pace from then on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central City</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>2,249</td>
<td>2,829</td>
<td>3,003</td>
<td>2,686</td>
<td>1,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal District</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>3,240</td>
<td>5,178</td>
<td>7,327</td>
<td>9,165</td>
<td>8,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan area</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>3,136</td>
<td>5,381</td>
<td>9,211</td>
<td>14,419</td>
<td>15,048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. A page from *Estudios* 5, 1952. The page shows the growth of the urban area of Mexico City between 1900 and 1940. The BNHUOP used these studies to create development plans for the city.
present development of the city and the ways the Mexican urban discourse has responded to these developments. The past and present development of Mexico City and the ways the Mexican discourse's response to these developments has been documented make it possible to analyze how the planned and the unplanned were understood by Mexican architects and critics and to compare this with the development of the general discourse that has been discussed in chapter two.

3.4 Written sources
There are a number of Mexican architectural journals that have documented the urban development of Mexico City and the presence and absence of architects and urban planners. These journals give insight into the Mexican discourse on the planned and unplanned city. Although the writers of the articles that were published in these journals weren't all Mexican, their editors and publishers were. The image that these journals presented of the urban development of Mexico City and the planning and design challenge that this development posed to the architectural profession at the time, are a useful source to gain insight into a Mexican perspective on the planned and the unplanned. Apart from the historical journals there are also later publications on the development of Mexico City. These publications include historical investigations that have recently been executed. Although not all of these publications present a Mexican point of view, they are useful as they present additional information on the growth of the city.

3.4.1 Primary sources
The Mexican journals that have been used to understand the interpretation and the attitude of the Mexican architectural profession towards planned and unplanned urban development will be further commented on in this section. The section will shed light on the motives of the journals, on the editors, and on the type of articles these journals published. These backgrounds are important to understand the images that these journals produced.

3.4.1.1 Estudios
The journal *Estudios: obras y servicios publicos habitaciones populares* was a bimestral journal that was initiated and published by the state's Banco Nacional Hipotecario Urbano y de Obras Públicas (BNHUOP) (National Urban Mortgage and Public Works Bank). That bank was founded in 1933 to stimulate the development of cities and towns in Mexico through loans and investments. In 1952 the Bank commissioned its team of architects under the leadership of Félix Sanchez, to undertake a
study of Mexico City. This study would give the bank insight into the development of Mexico City and would be an important document for the bank’s future policies and programs (see ill. 33). The study was published in six editions between January and December 1952, of which the first one unfortunately wasn’t available for this research. These editions have become interesting historical documents because they include a lot of information about the state Mexico City was in 1952 and they also help to gain insight into the points of view that the architects and directors of this important development bank had. As the bank created urban policy and because this document was meant as a direct adviser for future programs of the bank, this journal illustrates how these points of view became part of urban policies. The journal contained articles about social loans to make housing affordable for the poor, studies on the problems that Mexico City’s soil poses for construction, and discussion about the future height of buildings and the density of the population. Because of the character of the journal, it is a suitable historical source to analyze what the Mexican architectural profession regarded as the challenge that the city was confronted with in 1952 and what they thought the solutions to those challenges could be. The importance of the journal is also noticeable because it is still frequently being referred to by contemporary architectural researchers (e.g. de Anda Alanís, 2008).

3.4.1.2 Arquitectura México

The journal Arquitectura México (see ill. 34) was an initiative of the Mexican architect Mario Pani. Pani studied architecture at the École de Beaux Arts in Paris. He was studying in Paris when in 1931 the first edition of Architecture d’Aujourd’hui was published. Because of this synchronization of events the idea has been developed that Architecture d’Aujourd’hui functioned as an example for Arquitectura México (Noelle, 2008). The Mexican journal was founded with the same motive as the French Architecture d’Aujourd’hui: to stimulate the globalization of Modern architecture. The journal has been published from 1938 until 1978. The editors of Arquitectura México started the first edition with a presentation of the motives of the journal. They stated that the objective was to present the projects in architecture, urbanism and decoration that were the most important, the most characteristic and the most original that they were developing in the world (Editors of Arquitectura México, 1938). They also stated that in the age in which innovations in communication technology were making the world into a smaller place and the different nations of the world were
34. Front cover of the magazine *Arquitectura México*, 30, 1950. The cover shows the Conjunto Urbano Presidente Alemán, one of the projects of Pani in which he put the Modern ideals into practice. That type of projects is characteristic for the project description and discussions that were published in the journal's first years.

35. The front cover of the first edition of *Arquitectura Autogobierno*, 1976. For the first edition the editors choose to put a picture of an unplanned urban area in development on the front cover, which is illustrative of the discussions that were going to take place in the journal.
coming to live closer to each other, the houses of men have become uniform and architecture has become international. This way the writers defended the necessity to be aware of developments in architecture over the world and the necessity of the journal. In line with the editors’ motives behind the journal, the journal was initially mainly focused on European architects and architecture. Among the articles were interviews with architects like Le Corbusier and Auguste Perret, and reports on recently completed architectural designs and urban assembles. When the architectural production of architects who were working in the Modern style in Mexico started to grow, the editions of the journal started to include ever more Mexican projects. In line with this change of focus, the journal also started to include articles about the problems of social housing in Mexico and possible solutions to these problems. Because of the motive it had and the content it produced, *Arquitectura México* is a historical source that helps to gain insight into the opinions that Mexican architects had about the problems that were being posed by Mexico’s rapid urbanization process at the time it started to occur. Due to the journal’s Modern ideals, it was also a suitable source to analyze the attitude of architects towards unplanned development in an age in which the planned urban environment was advocated as ideal.

3.4.1.3  *Arquitectura Autogobierno*

The journal *Arquitectura Autogobierno* (see ill. 35) is a monthly journal that was published by the architecture department of the Mexican University ‘Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México’, starting from October 1976. The initiative to create a new journal came of the context of national political unrest and an international architectural crisis. Mexico experienced political change in the 1970s as the silent dictatorial regime of the political party Partido Revolucionario Institutional (PRI), became visible and ended. Looking back on six decades of PRI reign, the conclusion was that the inequalities that had led to the 1910 revolution had become greater instead of smaller and the Mexican working class was still excluded from political participation. The international crisis in architecture consisted of the criticism against the Modern Movement and the growing awareness among architects of their position in society. This crisis was for example noticeable in the choice of Team Ten architects to let future inhabitants of their projects participate in the design process. These two contexts resulted in a journal that discussed the social responsibilities of architects and the incapability of the architectural profession thus far to meet the housing needs of the Mexican people (Dávila, 1976). This latter theme included the deficiency of housing for the working class but also the incapability of architects to communicate with the future inhabitants of their designs. The
journal included articles that discussed how architecture could support auto-construction, how to make social housing more economical, and the responsibility of the state in housing for the poor. Because of these aims of the journal, it has been a suitable historical source for the study of the attitude of the Mexican architectural profession towards unplanned development, their responsibilities towards these types of development and possible planning and design solutions.

3.4.1.4 The Urban Age project

In 2005 the Deutsche Bank's Alfred Herrhausen Society and the London School of Economics and Political Science started a worldwide research project on cities. The initiative for the project emerged from the awareness that soon half of the world's population would be living in cities and the prognosis that in 2050 that share would have grown to seventy-five percent. The researchers in the project mainly derive their information from the ten cities New York, Shanghai, London, Mexico City, Johannesburg, Berlin, Mumbai, São Paulo, Istanbul, Chicago and Hong Kong. They concentrate on a wide spectrum of urban themes such as urban density, transportation and mobility, land tenure, architecture, planning and urban politics, private and public space, etc. The research results are presented in annual conferences, newsletters and publications. The conferences' attendees travel between the selected cities and each time focus on the issues that are at play in the inviting city. The project has led to the two extensive publications *The Endless City* (Burdett and Sudjic, 2008) and *Living in the Endless City* (Burdett and Sudjic, 2011) in which the findings from several conferences and research projects have been brought together. As Mexico City is one of the case cities, these publications include information on the current state of affairs in this city. In addition, these publications also form primary sources because its contributors are Mexican architects who work in Mexico City. Because of this the contributions on Mexico City in the 'Urban Age' program could be used to shed light on the current Mexican discourse.

3.4.1.5 'Vivienda Social y Autoconstrucción.'

The exhibition 'Vivienda Social y Autoconstrucción' that was organized in 2011 by the 'Museo de Arte Moderno' in Mexico City gave insight into the current debate among architects in Mexico. The exhibition offered an overview of the history of social housing in Mexico including the influence of the Modern Movement in architecture, the later tendency to leave housing to the private market, and an analysis of contemporary solutions to the problems that housing poses. The exhibition included a documentary titled *Vivir Adentro* (Living Inside), in which a number of Mexico's most
renowned architects in the field of social housing contemplated on the glamorous history of social housing in Mexico that lasted until the 1970's and the current public and private mechanisms. An initial idea for this research was to interview architects but as that plan turned out to be difficult to execute because of lack of contact information and time restrictions. This documentary offered a suitable alternative. The exhibition also showed new ways of designing and constructing social housing in Mexico in which the architects have tried to incorporate the flexibility of auto-construction in their designs. The exhibition included construction methods that leave the interiors of houses open to be further determined by the future residents of the houses. Another way the flexibility of the houses is promoted is by enabling the easy addition of extra rooms and floors. Finally, the exhibition also showed projects in which the architects don't participate in the design of a new construction. They only teach people how to change their auto-construction tradition in a way that makes the construction more efficient, more economical, and safer. The exhibition as a whole demonstrated the development of social housing in Mexico; from the first initiatives in the 1930's to the Modern projects in the 1940's and 1950's and from the 'golden age of public housing' in the 1970's to the current trend of privatization of social housing. The documentary offered much factual information about the development of housing in Mexico City and has also been a useful source for gaining insight into Mexican architects' current opinions and ideas, as their interviews were part of the documentaries in the exhibition.

3.4.1.6 The built environment

As this thesis wants to shed light on the relation between the discourse on the planned and the unplanned city and on how discourse relates with urban reality, the built environment of Mexico City was included in the analysis as an unwritten data source. The urban projects and areas of unplanned urban development that are subjects in the discourse under discussion were used to illustrate that discourse. The characteristics of urban areas that have been described in the articles have been verified by an analysis of those same urban areas in the present day. These analyses give more insight into the urban forms that the discourse has been focused on. Apart from that, the built environment of Mexico City is a source that helps to gain insight into the development of planned and unplanned areas through time. Combined with written sources like Arquitectura México, in which these urban developments were discussed, this offers an impression of the changing reception of unplanned development through time.
From the early period of urbanization, the neighbourhood ‘Unidad Modelo’ was selected as an example of a planned area and ‘Sector Popular’ was an example of an unplanned area. Unidad Modelo was planned in 1947 by a team of architects that included Félix Sanchez, the editor of Estudios, and that was led by Mario Pani, the editor of Arquitectura México. For Pani the project was an important opportunity to demonstrate that his ideas of high-rise and high-density could work in Mexico City. As the Modern architect Pani had to work together with Félix Sanchez in this project, Unidad Modelo has become a mix of the Modern ideal and the Neighbourhood Planning Unit strategy that had been developed in the United States starting in the 1920’s by Clarence Perry to offer a housing solution for the poor working class. The case of Unidad Modelo offers many opportunities in this research because it combined two imported urban models and because its architects had the opportunity to publish extensively about this project in the journals Estudios and Arquitectura México. These journals offered insight into the urban concepts and ideals behind the planning of the neighbourhood because they included the urban plans. Unfortunately, the journals didn’t include the plans for all the housing typologies that were realized in Unidad Modelo but they did offer insight into the planning of Unidad Modelo.

Sector Popular was selected to be part of the case-study because the neighbourhood originated in the same period as Unidad Modelo. At the time when Unidad Modelo started to be constructed, directly next to the construction area, Sector Popular started to be developed in an unplanned manner. The area was subdivided and the new residents constructed their houses there without the supervision of an architect. Through time the neighbourhood has consolidated as the area was regularized by the government in 1952 and was serviced, and as people expanded and consolidated their houses bit by bit as they succeeded in saving money to invest in their property. As Sector Popular was developed without a plan for the urban morphology or the housing typologies, and because the houses in Sector Popular are diverse in their typologies, it wasn’t possible to include plans in this part of the case study. The selection of Sector Popular and Unidad Modelo made it possible to analyze how these two neighbourhoods of the same age but with opposite stories have developed through time and how they have been described by the Mexican architectural profession.

The second part of the case-study is an illustration of the contemporary contrast between planned and unplanned urban form. To illustrate how the Mexican architectural profession interprets their responsibility in housing the poor in the present day, their comments on contemporary social
housing policies and on efforts to support auto construction were included in the case study. The social housing policy that is discussed in this thesis has been the result of the decision of the National Mexican government to privatize the housing market. Between 1995 and 2002 the responsibility for the construction of social housing has been completely put with private companies. The Mexican state has limited its activities in the housing sector to providing social loans. This policy has led to the construction of social housing focused on the dynamics of the market. Architects have heavily criticized the practice of companies ‘Casas GEO’ and the passivity of the Mexican government. These projects and the ongoing development of unplanned areas are used to illustrate how the debate on the problems that Mexico City poses in terms of housing for the lower classes is shaped today and how it differs from the opinions that dominated the debate at the beginning of Mexico City’s rapid urbanization process.

3.4.2 Secondary sources
Apart from the primary sources a number of secondary sources has been used as well. This group of texts includes academic publications about the unplanned urban development of Mexico City. These sources haven’t been used to study the discourse on urban development because they weren’t written by Mexican architects or planners. The two most prominent researchers in this group are Peter Ward and Diane Davis who both have been working on the development of Mexico City since the 1990’s. Their publications have provided important background information on the growth of Mexico City particularly on unplanned growth. Topics like unplanned growth, the challenge of housing for the poor and working class, and deterioration of inner city areas were discussed in the primary sources. In the first period that is covered this research, the period between 1940 and 1960, Mexican architects seemed mainly focused on the planning ideals of Modernism. In the journals that were used to cover that period in this thesis, Arquitectura México and Estudios, unplanned development was a secondary topic. To get a more complete picture of the developments that Mexico City was going through at the time, more sources were needed.

3.5 Interpretation
Historical research, as has been argued by postmodernist theorists, never results in a factual account of the past (e.g. Jenkins, 1995). As writing history always requires interpreting historical data, the resulting stories have been argued to say as much about the researcher as about the historical event that is being described (Jenkins, 1995). Continuing this line of thought, it has been
argued that history, even if it would be written with the most reliable and complete historical sources at hand, takes place in the present. History is a contemporary reflection of the researcher’s cultural beliefs and different historians would ascribe different interpretations to the same historical event. This doesn’t mean that historical research is pointless. It does mean that one’s own position in the research should be taken into account. Although this research includes historical sources, these sources were interpreted by a contemporary researcher and her cultural framework will be present in this research. As to the different positions on the timeline it’s important to keep in mind that when Mexican architects were writing about unplanned urban development in the 1950’s they didn’t yet know how that development would continue. They couldn’t foresee the vast scale of present day unplanned urbanism nor the incapacity of planned urbanism to provide housing for the poor. The present day researcher has this information and this influences the ways these historical texts are interpreted. Apart from the changes of perspective through time it should also be taken into account that the perspective of the researcher culturally differs from the studied material. The researcher grew up and was educated in other economical and cultural circumstances than the Mexican and she was made familiar with European and North American concepts and ideals of architecture and urbanism. Although every historical research is one of many possible interpretations and history always includes the background of its writer, this doesn’t make history less important. The interpretation that is presented in this thesis adds to the existing body of research on the planned and the unplanned city and this way it contributes to and refines the prevalent image.

3.6 Strengths and restrictions of chosen methods

As it has been explained in section 3.5, historical research includes a process of interpretation that prevents history from being a pure reflection of the past. In the process of analysis and interpretation the historical sources are revised and parts of the information that they offer are selected. Parts of information inevitably get lost in this process and this causes distortions. Another restriction is caused by the choice of comparative case studies as a research method. This choice has the consequence that the results of the research only offer insight into the selected cases and not into the history of unplanned and planned urbanisms in general.

Apart from these restrictions, the chosen methods also have brought a number of strengths to the research. The case studies were selected from a historical context, in which the contrast between
the planned and the unplanned started to grow and from the present situation, in which that contrast continues to increase. Because of their contexts, these cases can be used to illustrate the theories that were discussed in chapter two. With the help of these cases it can be demonstrated which aspects of those theories are true and which are false. This way the cases can clarify the theory, point at their strengths and weaknesses and spark questions for future research.
4.1 Introduction
This chapter will present the development of various neighbourhoods of Mexico City and the development of the Mexican discourse which will be used to put the literature research that was presented in chapter two in perspective. That will form the basis for the analysis that will follow in chapter five. The selection of neighbourhoods was made on the basis of the two criteria: first, that they had to demonstrate a contrast between planned and unplanned urban form, in order for this study to shed light on the reception of these urban forms; and second, that they have to appear in historical publications. In this chapter the first developments of the selected neighbourhoods are described, their development through time, their current state and their reception. The cases are used to shed light on the relations between the discourse on the planned and unplanned city and the changes the discourse and the city have experienced through time. Before the two selected neighbourhoods from the 1950's and two examples of recent urbanization processes will be presented, this chapter will first offer a short introduction to the development of Mexico City from a node in a mainly rural country in the 1940’s, to an industrial capital and service centre in the 1960’s and form the metropolis it became in the 1990’s to the megalopolis it is today.

4.2 Introduction into Mexico City’s growth
In the 1940’s Mexico City was an urban node of one-and-a-half million inhabitants in a largely agrarian country (Davis, 1998). The fast growth that the city would later experience, which made it into the current megacity with an estimated twenty-four million inhabitants and that continues today, started in that era. There are a number of factors that spurred the city’s growth, such as the economic situation, the transition towards industrialization and resulting changes in land use. These circumstances should all be understood in the context of the Mexican political climate of the 1940’s. The Mexican revolution that took place from 1910 until 1920 had set out to democratize the country and to make an end to the uneven spread of wealth in Mexican society. After twenty years of political unrest that was caused by the post-revolution power vacuum, the political leaders of Mexico started to present themselves as revolutionary reformers. Their supposed goal was to change Mexico into a modern, prosperous country and to distribute the profits more equally than had been the case during the dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz from 1876 until 1911, that had preceded and caused the revolution. The political leaders of Mexico set out to do this by reforming the
agrarian economy into an industrial economy (de Anda Alanís, 2008). This decision has had crucial effects on the urbanization process of Mexico City. As Mexico City was already the most important urban nucleus of the country, the majority of the industrial investments were made in the capital (Winfield Reyes, 2010). Apart from the importance that Mexico City already had, some scholars argue that the investments were purposely being concentrated in Mexico City because the political party that was in power could count on support from that city (e.g. Davis, 1998). This was also possible because Mexico City didn't have an autonomous local government until 1987. Until this date the president of the Mexican state appointed a mayor who would be responsible for Mexico City's local affairs. The population of Mexico City didn't have the possibility to elect a local government with specific political ideas on local affairs. Other major Mexican cities like Monterrey and Guadalajara opposed the national government and their growth would have formed a threat for the status quo (e.g. Davis, 1998). Stimulating the economical and demographical growth of Mexico City can be understood as an electoral strategy. The lack of an autonomous local government during the period of growth of Mexico City explains much of the planning disorder that the city has experienced (Davis, 1998; de Anda Alanís, 2008). The city was not being governed with the goal of improving the quality of her urban conditions but with the goal of maintaining national political power. All these circumstances together with the decreasing job-opportunities in the formerly agricultural countryside caused rapid rural-urban migration that pressured the capital’s land-, job- and housing markets. This process also had the consequence that the agricultural land that still surrounded Mexico City in the 1940's was rapidly sold or traded and changed into urban land. The rapid growth that began in this period was thus a direct result of the change in national political and economical policies.

Due to the fast growth of Mexico City the land prices skyrocketed. High land prices resulted in the expulsion and exclusion of the poorer classes from the city's better areas and it made it profitable for investors to speculate (de Anda Alanís, 2008). Speculation further spurred the growth of the city and drove the prices further up. At the same time as Mexican politicians were industrializing the country and stimulating private investment, they also promised an egalitarian society. The policies of the government were however creating sharper contrast in Mexican society instead. The growth of the city, speculation and the resulting pressure on the land prices drove the working class into the deteriorating city centre and towards the cheaper urban periphery. On top of that there was a lack of social housing. Although housing had been a responsibility of the government since 1917,
the Mexican government had not yet interfered in the housing sector (Zamora, 1952b; Winfield Reyes, 2010). To illustrate this point, between 1933 and 1946 the Mexican state participated in the construction of 700 houses (Zamora, 1952b). This governmental passivity was about to come to an end as political leaders chose urbanization and social housing as instruments for their politics of progress and modernization. The propaganda of the modernization of Mexico on the one hand and the post-revolutionary promise of a minimum living standard for the working class on the other hand were combined in a policy of Modern social housing.

### 4.2.1 Effects on ideas about the city and social housing

Although the size of Mexico City and her continuing growth are nowadays often described as a problem, for example because of the water shortage, pollution, crime and traffic jams (e.g. Davis, 1998; Burdett, 2008), in the 1950’s the growth of Mexico City was also being interpreted as a sign of her progress and a sign of the modernization of the country and Mexican society. Engineer Emilio Alanis Patiño in the July 1952 edition of *Estudios* for example remarked that the greatness of the nations is reflected in their metropolises and that as the modern cities of the world are growing rapidly, so is Mexico City (Alanis Patiño, 1952). Historical researcher and urban critic María Eugenia Negrete Salas commented in her analysis of the population growth and the urban organization of Mexico City that during the presidency of Miguel Alemán from 1946 until 1952, the motto was: ‘to modernize is to urbanize’ by the development of industrial areas or by the construction of housing (cited in de Anda Alanís, 2008: 56). As mentioned before, the growth of Mexico City was causing pressure on the housing market and was forcing the lower classes of society into the centre and the outskirts of the city. Apart from the goal to modernize the country, the post-revolutionary politicians had also promised to improve the living conditions of the lower classes of Mexican society. Although the revolutionaries believed that machinery, technology and modernity would automatically bring progress to the masses (Sánchez Rueda, 2009), the state also started to construct social housing for the working class. Apart from the revolutionary promise that was this way being fulfilled, the government was also answering one of their responsibilities, as from the 1917 constitution housing had been a responsibility of the Mexican state. It’s no surprise that the Modern architectural ideal appealed to these reformers. Where they announced the entrance of Mexico into the modern world, Modern architecture offered a language for the materialization of that announcement. They promised better living standards for Mexico’s workers, Modern architecture dedicated itself to the betterment of housing conditions of all social classes of
modern society. Furthermore, Modern architects were thinking about how to urbanize in an efficient and affordable way. Modern architecture was a way to give expression to the modernization of the country and to improve the living conditions of the working class, or as the Mexican architect and professor in urbanism, Guillermo Sánchez Rueda recently described:

‘The architectural production financed by the government was abundant in this period because the leaders did not only seek to better the conditions in the city, the also wished to present an image of a culturally united country and a society on its way to progress and modernity’.

(Sánchez Rueda, 2009: 144)

Apart from the revolutionaries’ choice for Modern architecture, Mexican architects had also got interested in the CIAM ideas and they believed in the possibility to reform the country and the capital city using Modern architecture as an instrument for the cultural education of society. Mexican architect and critic Mauricio Gómez Mayorga in 1961 for example commented in his essay on contemporary architecture that:

‘[...] it is through the civilizing instrument of architecture that our middle and lower social classes and the new rich of the revolution have learned how to live’.

(Cited in de Anda Alanís, 2008)

The Mexican architectural profession had great admiration for European architects and their Modern buildings. The most influential architect to have introduced the Modern ideals into the Mexican theoretical discussion on architecture and urbanism was Mario Pani. Pani studied at the École des Beaux-Arts where he completed his education in architecture in 1933. As architectural historian Louise Noelle commented, the professional training of Pani and the time that he spent in Paris have had mayor influence on his thoughts on architecture and urbanism (Noelle, 2008). When Pani got back to Mexico he founded the journal *Arquitectura México* which to introduce the Modern ideas on urbanism to Mexico. Being the editor of the journal, Pani maintained correspondence with the editors of *Architecture d’Aujourd’hui* that was being published in Paris and with architects like Le Corbusier, August Perret and Hans Meyer, who all published in this journal. Pani also organized a conference to facilitate the international exchange of architectural ideas and in 1946 he founded the
Colegio National de Arquitectos (The National College of Architects) to further develop a National Modern style in architecture. Although Pani wasn’t a member of CIAM and didn’t attend the CIAM meetings he was a close follower of that European Modern movement and he introduced these ideals through his writing and his works. Pani had the opportunity to realize many of his designs and his influence on the urban landscape of Mexico City remains visible today. One of the reasons that Pani had the possibility to execute many projects was that he had established contact with Dirección General de Pensiones Civiles, an institute that was founded in 1925 to support the rights of government employees and it also initiated and realized housing projects for them. Pani was contracted in 1946 to design the housing complex Conjunto Urbano Presidente Aléman. In this project that would turn out to be highly successful and well received, Pani introduced high-rise apartment buildings equipped with many facilities like sport fields, parks, a swimming pool, a school and a medical post, all located in a open green landscape. With this project Pani convinced the Dirección General de Pensiones Civiles of the necessity of high denisty and high-rise buildings for Mexico City and this successful project enabled Pani to realize more of his ideas. Pani for instance got contracted to design the large urban projects Ciudad Universitaria in 1954, Ciudad Satelitě in 1957 and Conjunto Urbano Nonoalco Tlatelolco in 1965. All these projects on the outskirts of Mexico City were designed as autonomous cities and according the Modern ideas on urbanism.

As mentioned before, Pani used his new journal Arquitectura México to discuss European examples of Modern architecture. The Modern were also notable in other ways. The journal Estudios, although focused on the situation in Mexico and in particular Mexico City lengthily discussed Le Corbusier’s ‘Unité d’Habitation’ to compare it with the ‘multifamiliares’ that had been constructed in Mexico (Sanchez, 1952b). Although European Modern architecture was functioning as a model for Mexican architects, they were also looking for a way to adapt European functionalism to Mexican cultural, climatic, material, social and economic context. As Mexico was a young independent state it was looking for a way to construct and represent a united society with a shared culture. This was done through the concept of ‘total art’ or the ‘integration of the arts’, putting together urban design, architecture, landscaping, painting and sculpture in ways that used

---

9 ‘Multifamiliar’ is the Spanish term for a high-rise housing constructions such as the Unité d’Habitation. As Enrique de Anda Alanís has commented, the term doesn’t have an English equivalent (2008). That’s why the Spanish term will continue to be used here.
the form, function and content of the ‘total works of art’ to construct a national identity (Aldrete-Haas, 2004; Winfield Reyes, 2010). Architecture and the visual arts were combined through integrating mural paintings and mosaics in architectural design. This differentiated the Mexican variation of Modern architecture from the European model which viewed decoration as an impurity and an unnecessary and inefficient addition. The decorations of the buildings in Pani’s Ciudad Universitaria are probably the most notable example of the combination of Modern architectural sobriety with abundant Mexican expression as the concrete block structure have been decorated by artist Juan O’Gorman with Mexican indigenous mythical figures and vegetation like maize and cacti and the national symbol of the eagle and the serpent (see ill. 36) (Aldrete-Haas, 2004; Winfield Reyes, 2010). This type of decorations can also be found adorning the Modern multifamilares’ exterior walls as Mexican architects were working together with the country’s most famous mural and mosaic artists like Diego Rivera, Juan O’Gorman and José Luis Cuevas, to give expression to a new national culture.

Another difference is that European architects such as Le Corbusier, Hannes Meyer and Ludwig Mies van der Rohe were convinced of the necessity of high-rise building and of a dense urban fabric. Mexican architects and urban critics challenged this necessity. To illustrate this point, architect Félix Sanchez commented in the May 1952 edition of Estudios that the Mexican ‘unidad habitacional’ will differ from those of Le Corbusier because they will be less an experiment in Modern architecture and more a social experiment. He commented that the high density in the urban models such as the 700 inhabitants per hectare in the Unité d’Habitation should be understood as a European necessity because of the limited availability of land in that continent, and that they [Europeans] are probably very happy with Le Corbusier’s solution but that it’s actually impossible to live comfortably in an urban area with a higher density than 500 inhabitants per hectare (Sanchez, 1952a).

Although the necessity of high-rise and high density in the urban fabric of Mexico City was being questioned, other aspects of the Modern Movement’s thoughts on urbanism were adopted with vigour. One of the characteristics of the Modern Movement that was adopted was the understanding of urbanism according to its four functions: living, working, recreation and
36. The central library of the National University in Mexico City, 1954. The campus was planned according to Modern principles with concrete blocks on pilotis in a free landscape. The buildings are adorned by mosaics by the Mexican artist Juan O’Gorman.

37. The plan for the inner city neighbourhood ‘La Candelaria’ as presented in Estudios, 1952. The plan shows the small scale historical structure of this neighbourhood in the upper left plan, and the large scale block structure that was presented as its substitute.
circulation. This is can be noted in the concluding edition of Estudios that was published in November 1952 which demonstrated a study of Mexico City according to those four functions. It included the analysis of the city’s growth and the problems the city posed in the areas of housing, industry and service areas, leisure areas and traffic issues. The influence of the Modern ideal has also been visible in the attempts to make plans for Mexico City’s growth. These plans, of which the first took form in 1947 were largely focused on the separation of the four urban functions (de Anda Alanís, 2008). The initial impact of these plans was small because Mexico City didn’t have an autonomous government that was concentrated on local issues. The execution of the plans depended on the mayor that the national government appointed for the capital city. To illustrate this, the mayor from 1952 until 1966 Ernesto Peralta Uruchurtu wanted to improve mobility in Mexico City and succeeded in initiating the first metro lines and realizing many breakthroughs that are now the principal traffic axes of Mexico City (Myers and Dietz, 2002). In 1958 the Instituto Nacional de la Vivienda (INVI) (the national housing institute) published their analysis of the problems of degradation of dwellings surrounding the city centre Herradura de Turgurios: problemas y soluciones10 (Instituto Nacional de la Vivienda, 1958). In the study the degradation of the city centre was presented as a severe problem because it was thought to have negative effects on the morals of the city centre’s inhabitants (Instituto Nacional de la Vivienda, 1958: 9). The solution to these problems was projected according to the Modern Movement’s line of thought. These areas would be demolished and new housing would be built according to the principles of the centralization of functions in the neighbourhoods’ centres, high-rise building and open green spaces for leisure. These projects would gradually replace the tugurios11 or slums, much like the Chicago School had imagined that slums would gradually be pushed towards the periphery and would eventually disappear. Estudios number six of November 1952 also included plans for neighbourhoods in the city centre in which a rescaling was planned by the complete demolition and rebuilding of the neighbourhood (see ill. 37). Finally, another medium that has shown the impact of the modern Movement’s ideas has been the journal Arquitectura México under the supervision of editor and architect Mario Pani. This journal presented similar plans as Estudios had published for

---

10 The title could be translated to English as ‘Horseshoe of Shacks: problems and solutions’

11 Tugurio literally means ‘a shepherd’s hut’ or ‘small and miserable dwelling or establishment’ (Real Academia Española, 2011). Like the English ‘slum’ it also carries the associations of crime, bad morals and lack of hygiene.
the city centre and also included lengthy discussions about the urban Modernization of Mexico City. The twentieth edition for example included homage to Sigfried Gideon’s *Space, Time and Architecture* in which his ideas are described as ‘indispensable for all architects’ and as ‘the light that will guide towards complete truths’ (Mariscal, 1946: 282). The journal also included essays that remind much of the derogatory discourse on unplanned urban forms that was discussed in chapter two. The interview by Mauricio Gomez Mayorga with Mario Pani (see ill. 38) that appeared in the twenty-seventh edition is particularly interesting in this regard as Pani portrayed the unplanned city and the degraded inner centre in much the same way as Le Corbusier had done when he discussed the illnesses of Paris as Pani talked about slums and about the cancerous invasion of low quality housing in Mexico City (Gomez Mayorga, 1948).

Apart from the European Modern model for urban planning and design, the Mexican discourse was also influenced by the planning ideals that were being developed in the United States, most notably by the Neighborhood Unit concept that was developed by Clarence Perry and by the Radburn Model by Clarence Stein and Henry Wright, both starting in the 1920’s. As stated in paragraph 2.2.1, these urban planning concepts came from the neighbourhood’s common areas in order to consolidate the community. The same concentration on the social aspect of urban design and the same terminology can be found in the Mexican discourse (Winfield Reyes, 2010). Although journals like *Arquitectura México* and *Estudios* haven’t made explicit reference to the concept, it can be recognised in the points of view that architects have postulated. This especially becomes visible in *Estudios* when the editors commented that the Mexican housing project should be less an architectural experiment like the Modern Movement proposed and that it should instead be understood as social experiment and a way to build society (Sanchez, 1925a). As the Mexican writers don’t make explicit reference to the North American planning models and because Modern architects like Sert from the early 1950’s started to become interested in American urban models like the Neighborhood Unit concept, it isn’t clear whether these Mexican architects were following the changes that people like Sert and

---

12 The interviewer, Gomez Mayorga was at the time of the interview an employee of Mario Pani. It’s therefore very likely that this interview wasn’t an actual interview, but rather a monologue in which Pani presented himself and his ideas on architecture in a staged manner. The interview only a more interesting source because the reader may assume that Pani chose his words carefully and presented a calculated argumentation.
UNA CONVERSACION CON EL ARQUITECTO MARIO PANI

El arquitecto Pani, Director de esta revista, es autor de un vasto conjunto de ideas y de soluciones para atacar a fondo el grave problema de la habitación en nuestra ciudad. Se trata de un planteo nuevo, y de un tipo de pensamiento tan diferente, que se aleja en forma notable de cuanto se ha intentado antes en México. Además, no se trata de realizar un milagro, ni de redimir de sufrimiento a las clases que constituyen un problema en nuestro medio, sino de llevar a cabo, real y efectivamente, una solución profundamente interesante que está destinada a construirse en seguida, y no a archivarse en los cajones del proyectoista.

A pesar de la dificultad de que el propio arquitecto Pani por su falta de tiempo no vio al mismo en un artículo toda la teoría y contenido de su solución, hemos preferido conversar ampliamente con él y dar esta forma de entrevista a lo tratado para explicar el anteproyecto que presentamos a continuación.

—Antes de entrar en la materia de su solución, arquitecto Pani, diga a usted cómo ve el problema de la habitación en nuestra ciudad.

—En México, como en todas las ciudades del mundo es ése un problema sumamente agudo. Participamos en una buena proporción del déficit mundial de cien millones de habitaciones. En algunos países faltan casas porque fueron destruidas por la guerra; en el nuestro, porque no han sido construidas nunca, o por que lo hecho, insuficiente desde un principio, ha sido abandonado hasta su destrucción.

—Se refiere usted en particular a las habitaciones obreras y a los problemas que hay en todo el país?

—No. El problema de la clase obrera es otra cosa. El obrero no tiene capacidad de ahorro y, por lo tanto, el asunto tiene que tratarse en forma de subsidios, lo que resulta extraordinariamente honroso, conduciendo, además, naturalmente, a que no se cuide ni se conserven habi- tanaciones que han sido obtenidas gratuitamente. Hay que ver lo ocurrido en México con todos los experimentos de casa obrera. Claro está que el problema es más agudo entre las clases populares, pero dentro de ellas cabe distin- guir entre un grupo social de necesidades mínimas y mínimo sentido de responsabilidad, y otro que no solamente necesita habitación, sino que además padece desarrollar un esfuerzo para alcanzarla, por lo que tratará de mantenerla y conservar el resultado de ese esfuerzo. Pero sucede que en nuestro medio, inclusive en el que pertenece a ese grupo social capaz de luchar por una casa y por su conservación, existe por desgracia una falta de relación entre lo que se necesita y los medios de que se dispone para costearlo. La capacidad de ahorro, inexistente en los estratos más bajos de la sociedad, no es todavía suficiente, aún en la clase media, para costearse alojamientos del tipo que requiere. Siempre que se ha pretendido resolverlo de forma común y co- nveniente ese problema económico, arquitectónico y social, a lo que se ha llegado es a unas lamentables edificaciones inhumana- blemente mínimas y de pésima calidad; a esas casas y col- sas mal edificadas, mal servidas, mal proyectadas y mal construidas que conocemos tanto y que han invalidado como cáncer toda la ciudad de México. Esa es la verdad: esa basura es lo único que puede comprarse efectivamente con lo que es posible ahorrar.

—¿Qué propone usted para salvar esa diferencia entre necesidad y capacidad de ahorro?
the younger Team Ten generation were making in Modern architectural theory, or whether the Mexican architectural profession was directly following these North American models.

The plans and theories that were being presented for Mexico City in these journals and research publications were also put into practice. One of these plans, Unidad Modelo, was selected for the case study. In Unidad Modelo Modern urbanism and the Neighborhood Unit concept came together as Mario Pani, who was a follower of European Modernism, was the responsible architect. Félix Sanchez, the editor of Estudios who advocated the importance of the social structure of communities, was the head of the team of architects of the Mortgage Bank that initiated and financed the project.

4.3 Unidad Modelo

Unidad Vecinal 9, Modelo, was projected between 1947 and 1948 as part of the Unidades Vecinales plan of architect Mario Pani. The larger plan projected a series of neighbourhoods in the southern periphery of the city that would be connected with each other by the city's greater avenues (see ill. 39). As Pani commented while being interviewed by Gómez Mayorga, these neighbourhoods were planned to be equipped with all the basic neighbourhood functions and services like shops, schools, medical centres and sports facilities and they were planned to be connected by the city's greater avenues in order not to construct isolated housing solutions but a new urban structure (Gómez Mayorga, 1949). Pani got his first chance to realize a part of this plan when the Departamento de Edificios (department of buildings) of BNHUOP decided to start developing public housing. The site was located in the south east of the city and was surrounded by the Churubusco river in the north west, canal De La Viga in the east and avenue Calzada Ermita Ixtapalapa in the south. In this plot Mario Pani worked together with the architect Félix Sanchez to develop housing for fifteen thousand inhabitants. As Enrique de Anda Alanís has commented, these two Modern architects differed in opinion on some crucial themes (de Anda Alanís, 2008). Mario Pani could be understood as the protagonist of Modern architecture in Mexico because he was a theorist and because he demonstrated the Modern Movement's ideas on architecture in his design projects. Pani showed the same way of talking about the unplanned city and the degraded city as European architects did. Like mentioned before, Pani talked about the 'cancerous spread of low quality housing', about the 'fractionated infection of lucrative urbanism' and about 'the inorganic and absurd growth of the
The plan for a series of neighbourhoods in the south-east periphery of Mexico City by Mario Pani, 1949. The map shows that the neighbourhoods were planned to be connected by the city’s principal traffic avenues, preventing their isolation.
city' (Gomez Mayorga, 1949). It must also be noted that Pani wasn’t solely thinking about urban form and about Modern design principles. He was aware of the inequalities in society that were causing the city to grow by the means of provisional housing as it was the only type of dwelling that the lower classes could afford (Gomez Mayorga, 1949). Pani also advocated a change in the ways housing was financed and to make it possible for workers to save money in order to buy a house. Notwithstanding this consciousness of the roots of the Mexican problems in the field of housing, Pani envisioned a completely planned Mexico City. This is the architect who introduced large scale high-rise housing projects in Mexico such as Nonoalco Tlatelolco in 1964 with almost twelve thousand apartments spread over one-hundred-and-two buildings and at the end of his career he developed the idea to demolish the historic centre of Mexico City and to replace it with high-rise building and in a green landscape to solve the problem of the tugurios (Noelle, 2000). He strongly held on to the principles of density, high-rise buildings with integrated functions, the separation of traffic flows and open green spaces for leisure. These principles can be found in all of his larger housing projects. The other architect of Unidad Modelo, Félix Sanchez, was mainly interested in Mexican society and Mexican housing tradition and secondly in the translation of the Modern architectural vocabulary into solutions for Mexican society. The interest that Sanchez demonstrated emerged from his position as researcher and architect of the BNHUOP. In that role in 1950 Sanchez chaired and reported on the round table discussion about popular housing in Mexico City and in 1952 he directed and edited the urban study of Mexico City in the sixth edition of the journal Estudios. Sanchez for example also questioned the necessity of high-rise and high density in Mexico. He reasoned from the Mexican housing tradition and their wish for a ‘little house, with a garden, a patio and plants’ (cited in de Anda Alanís, 2008). Sanchez preferred the term ‘unidad vecinal’, which means ‘neighbourhood unit’ over Pani’s ‘multifamiliar’, in order to combine a mix of different housing types and to provide housing suitable for different income scales in the same area (de Anda Alanís, 2008: 126). This way the planned neighbourhood would constitute a dynamic community with inhabitants from various classes and a variety of family compositions. The themes that Sanchez introduced thus had more in common with the North American concept of the Neighborhood Unit than with Modern urbanism. In Unidad Modelo the combined perspectives of Pani and of Sanchez can be found.
40. The peripheric site Unidad Vecinal Modelo, was projected on. The photo shows that this part of Mexico City still largely consisted of agrarian land in 1949.

41. Aerial view taken from the south of Unidad Modelo while it was under construction. The photo shows the agrarian land that still surrounded the neighbourhood at the time, and the bottom of the photo shows the contrast with the neighbouring proletariat neighbourhood.
4.3.1 The plan for Unidad Modelo

Unidad Modelo is located in what used to be the south-east periphery of Mexico City. When the neighbourhood was being planned, the area was still largely un-urbanized (see ill. 40 and 41). In the 1949 interview with Gomez Mayorga, Pani described this area of the city as ‘virgin’ and ‘untouched’ (Gomez Mayorga, 1949). He explained that although the area was located outside of the city, this didn’t mean that the area was isolated. The area was close to a number of important transportation axes and this would secure easy access to the city from Unidad Modelo. Because of curves in Rio Churubusco, the river that marks the northern limit of the area, Unidad Modelo was projected on an irregularly shaped plot (see ill. 39 and 40). This plot was structured by a traffic circuit that made the area accessible and that divided the area in five blocks. This fluently shaped circuit has two central roundabouts that assured the smooth flow of traffic through the neighbourhood, to and from the two western, one southern, and two eastern access points. These streets were based on the pre-existing street pattern. The circuit permitted limited access to the five blocks that were created by the dividing circuit roads (see ill. 42). There, the roads were further developed in cul-de-sac patterns that prevented ongoing traffic to enter the residential areas and that granted freedom to pedestrians to move through the neighbourhood without obstruction caused by motorized traffic (see ill. 43). The circuit through the area didn’t form an obstruction for the pedestrians because the blocks were planned to be self-sufficient. The blocks were planned to have their shops, schools and all the services that would be needed on a daily basis. The residents of the blocks wouldn’t have to leave their part of the neighbourhood to do their daily routines. These aspects of the plan for Unidad Modelo correspond to the principles of the Neighborhood Unit concept. Another aspect of that concept is reflected in the large diversity in types of housing that the blocks were planned to have. The plan included free plots where people could construct their homes according their own desires, terraced houses, duplex houses with two floors, low-rise multifamiliaries with three floors and three high-rise multifamiliaries with ten floors (see ill. 44) (de Anda Alanís, 2008:229). These high-rise multifamiliaries also demonstrated a variety of housing types in itself, as it included apartments with a variety of sizes and one-floor and two-floor apartments. These housing types were spread over the five blocks in order to stimulate the dynamics in the communities. The high-rise buildings were largely projected in the open green spaces at the centres of the blocks. In the open green spaces and on the ground floors of these high-rise buildings is where the communal facilities like shops, schools, churches and sports facilities would be created. The variety of housing types and the central position of shared facilities correspond with the Neighborhood Unit concept.
42. The plan for Unidad Modelo by Mario Pani, 1949. The plan shows the division of the neighbourhood into five blocks by the projection of a circulation system. The plan also shows the north east positioning of the buildings and the central position of the common facilities within the five blocks.
because this was thought to stimulate a dynamic and strong community organization. The typology of the high-rise multifamiliares shows that these in turn were largely based on the Modern principles. The multifamiliares were lifted from the ground on pilotis to maximize the mobility of pedestrians and were planned in north-south direction so that the facades would bring maximum morning and evening sun light into the apartments. The floor plans of the multifamiliares were organized in a way that would reduce the costs of construction and that would allow maximum light, privacy and ventilation, and thus, according to the Modern ideal, maximum living quality. These design principles can be noted in the facades, the vertical organization of the building and in the floor plans in a number of ways (see ill. 44, 45, 46 and 47). Félix Sanchez, the architect of the multifamiliares, chose to place the two-level apartments on the first six floors and the smaller one-bedroom apartments on the seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth. This way the upper levels would be less populated according to Sanchez and this would bring greater efficiency to the elevators and stairs (Sanchez, 1952e). The decision to include two-storey apartments also made the building more space efficient because the first, third and fifth floor wouldn’t need a corridor. As Sanchez chose to position the entrances on the bedroom levels of these apartments, the living area of these apartments are bigger as they include the space that on the other levels is reserved for the corridor. Sanchez chose not to organize the ventilation and the illumination of the apartments with exterior corridors or internal patios but to work the facade open with voids. The internal corridors are illuminated and ventilated by the voids that Sanchez used to work the facades of the buildings open. All the apartments in the buildings are connected to the voids in the facades and have their entrances across a void. The single-bedroom apartments on the upper floors were going to be substantially smaller as these apartments were the same size as the smaller upper levels of the two-storey apartments (see ill. 47). The difference in size is the result of the void that functioned as a terrace for the two-storey apartments but that the smaller apartments’ residents would have access to, and of the corridor space that is included into the two-storey apartments and that was needed as corridor space on the building’s upper level. Additionally, because Mexican homes are usually equipped with an exterior washing area, these apartments were planned with small balconies that were connected to the kitchens. All together, the planning and design of the multifamiliares thus departed from the principles of efficiency and maximum sunlight and ventilation; which were also the principles of the Modern ideal.
43. Part of the plan for Unidad Modelo by Mario Pani and associates, 1949. The illustration shows the cul-de-sac structure that was used as a repetitive pattern along the edges of the neighbourhood to prevent ungoing traffic from entering into the neighbourhood and to provide a safe environment for the residents.

44. Maquette of the ten-floor high-rise multifamiliar for Unidad Modelo by Félix Sanchez, 1949. The Maquette shows the building’s piloti base and the voids that were used to ventilate and illuminate the building.
45. The floor plans of the first, second and eighth, ninth and tenth floor of the multifamilaires for Unidad Modelo by Félix Sanchez, 1949. The floor plans show that the first six building layers consisted of two storey apartments. These apartments had a terrace on the first floor of the apartment which continued as a void on the second floor. The architect chose to position the entrances of these apartments on the upper floors with the bedrooms, to save space. Another way in which the duplex apartments allowed the architect to save space was that the first, third and fifth floor didn’t need a hallway. The floor plans also show the changing positions of the voids in the façades so that the apartments and voids are at all times justapositioned, and so that the entrances of all the appartments are in front of a void. These changing positions of the voids also allow more light to enter the hallways.
46. A cross-section of the multifamiliar for Unidad Modelo by Félix Sanchez, 1949. From bottom to top the cross-section shows the building’s pilotis that guaranteed an open landscape. It shows the six first layers with three two-storey apartments. The cross-section shows how the central hallways are placed on the bedroom levels of the apartments on the second, fourth and sixth floor. It also demonstrates how the voids functioned as private terraces on the first, third and fifth floor and as a void on the second, fourth and sixth. The smaller apartments on the seventh until the tenth floor didn’t have access to these open spaces.
47. The top plan shows the floor plan of the first floor of two two-storey apartments. The living and dining room are located in the centre and the kitchen is located next to the void which forms a terrace that the kitchen gives access to. The middle plan shows the upper floor of two two-storey apartments. This plan shows that the entrance was planned to be located at the same levels as the two bedrooms and that the stairs at the entrance would permit a direct connection with the downstairs living area. The bottom floor plan shows the plan of two single-storey apartments. The plan shows that these apartments were equipped with small balconies that were connected to the kitchen. A comparison between the floor plans shows that the one-bedrooms apartments had the same sizes as the bedroom floors of the larger apartments because of the space that is lost by the corridor and the voids.
An aspect of Unidad Modelo that didn’t correspond with the Modern ideal was the relation between the planned neighbourhood and its’ surroundings. The free plots were planned along the edges of Unidad Modelo in order not to cause an environmental shock between the designed neighbourhood and the existing and future urban context. According to de Anda Alanís the self made architecture at the edges of the area would establish links with the unplanned urban environment (de Anda Alanís, 2008). The planned qualities of the neighbourhood would get stronger to the centres of the five blocks and to the centre of the neighbourhood where the three ten floor high-rise multifamiliares were planned. This planning decision is remarkable since Pani presented a future image of Mexico City that would be entirely planned. This is why de Anda Alanís argued that although Pani was the official leading architect of the project, the role of Sanchez has been stronger.

4.3.2 Execution and current state of Unidad Modelo

The realization of Unidad Modelo didn’t precisely follow the plan that is described above. The most notable difference is that the three high-rise buildings weren’t constructed. Four years after the completion of the project architect Félix Sanchez commented at the VIII Pan-American congress of Architects that this was the result of the resistance of the authorities, the companies and the future residents of the neighbourhood (Sanchez, 1952b). The doubts of the authorities and the cooperating companies resulted in economic uncertainties that put the whole project at risk and that forced the architects to deviate from their first plan. The projected density of two-hundred-and-twenty inhabitants per hectare wasn’t reached. The profitability of the project and the goal to stimulate a dynamic and mixed community from various classes of society was reached by a system of ‘save and loan’ for the single family houses and rent control for the apartments (Sánchez Rueda, 2009: 153). Working class people who weren’t able to afford to buy a home were stimulated to save twenty-five percent of the cost of their home and a social bank would then lend them the remaining seventy-five percent. Subsequently, the workers would pay the loan back as if they were paying rent, until the house would be completely theirs. The apartments weren’t given to the market as the deficient of housing would most probably have driven the rent of the apartments up. Although the planned diversity wasn’t accomplished because the ten floor multifamiliares never made it through the planning phase of the project, Félix Sanchez was still pleased with the resulting mix of social classes in the neighbourhood as he commented that they succeeded in getting workers, professionals and entrepreneurs to live together in the same neighbourhood (Sanchez, 1952b).
48. Houses in Unidad Modelo. In the front the photo shows a one-storey dwelling almost in its original state, to the right the photo shows the same housing type but extended with an additional floor, and in the back the photo demonstrates a home extended with two additional floors.

49. Houses in Unidad Modelo. The photo demonstrates how residents have pulled up walls in front of their yards and this way have turned the yards into parking space.
The development of Unidad Modelo continued after the plan of the architects was completed. People bought and occupied the free plots and gave a diverse image to the edges of the neighbourhoods. Also, the people who bought the planned and designed houses adapted their homes to their needs. Owners have added floors to their houses and added extra rooms to their homes, extending the ground floor over the patios (see ill. 48). In addition, owners have also made smaller practical and decorative additions. Many houses now have a wall in front of the house that divides their property from the public sidewalk and residents use this space to safely park their cars (see ill. 49). Since mass car ownership is a relatively new phenomenon in Mexico City (Davis, 1998), the architects had not taken into account that the neighbourhood should provide much parking space. Other, mainly decorative, changes are for example the addition of false wooden buttresses, tiled facades, entry gates at the patio and the change of the windows’ sizes, heights and shapes (see ill. 50). These adaptations have led to an irregular and diverse urban landscape. The changes to the houses are so numerous that it’s difficult to get an image of what the neighbourhood originally used to look like and to distinguish original aspects from later additions.

The urban context of Unidad Modelo has changed a lot. Whereas the neighbourhood was planned outside of the urbanized area of Mexico City in 1947, its location is more central now as Mexico City has grown rapidly and has moved past the Unidad. The urbanization of the surrounding land and land further south has caused pressure on the roads surrounding Unidad Modelo. That’s why the former Rio Churubusco and Canal de la Viga were arched over and are now two important avenues. The name of Canal de la Viga was for this reason changed in Calzada de la Viga. The Unidad is now very well located as it is bordered by these two new avenues and the already existing Calzada Ermita Ixtapalapa on the southern perimeter. Although surrounding traffic flows have changed a lot, the street lay-out within the neighbourhood has stayed the same. Because of the major avenues that surround the neighbourhood, ongoing traffic doesn’t enter. The circuit mostly processes local traffic. The cul-de-sac structures and pedestrian paths are largely intact, although the increase of car ownership has had effect on this aspect of the urban landscape as well. The urban lay-out was planned to deny cars access to the green open spaces and the sports facilities in the centres of the blocks. These spaces are now however also being used by the residents to park their cars (see ill. 51). Another effect of car ownership but also of safety issues in Mexico City is that residents have put fences at the entries of the cul-de-sacs (see ill. 52). With this claiming of public space the residents try to increase security in their street. Although it isn’t allowed, it’s possible for them to
50. Houses in Unidad Modelo. On the left the photo shows a house with an added tiled chimney and a safety wall, and on the right a house with an additional floor, false wooden butresses under the cornice and an added French balcony.

51. Pedestrian path and green zone in Unidad Modelo. The photo shows that these car-free zones are now also being used as parking spaces.

52. Cul-de-sac street in Unidad Modelo. The photo shows how residents have closed off the street with a fence and have made an effort to appropriate and privatize the public street.
do this because the neighbours won’t experience any disadvantages of the measure and won’t complain. The result is that the urban structure has got disturbed. It has got more complicated to find a way through the neighbourhood as mobility is being diminished by the fences. Unidad Modelo is pedestrian friendly in comparison to other neighbourhoods in Mexico City.

4.3.3 After Unidad Modelo

Apart from the absence of high-rise buildings and high density population in the area, the main critique against this early Modern and community planning experiment has been that the pedestrians haven’t been granted complete freedom of movement in the Unidad as the circuit divides the neighbourhood in five blocks and prevents the free movements of pedestrians from one block to the other (Sanchez Rueda, 2009). The architects were aware of these deviations from the ideal but because of the circumstances they weren’t able to put their wishes to practice. After the completion of Unidad Modelo, Mexican State institutions initiated many Modern and Neighborhood Unit based social housing projects. In these later projects the Modern urban planning principles have been applied more strictly. In the Unidad Esperanza project that was completed in 1948, high-rise apartment buildings were created for the first time in Mexico City. Centro Urbano Presidente Alemán was also completed in 1948. This urban centre has almost eleven-hundred apartments of which the vast majority is located in twelve-story flats on pilotis and the rest in three-story multifamiliares (see ill. 53 and 54). High-rise structures resulted in large communal spaces where the residents can use the basket ball fields, swimming pool, parks, shops and the doctor’s clinic. Nowadays, the conjunto is still a popular living area, especially because of its two-storey apartments (Garay, 2002). Centro Urbano Presidente Juárez is another important example of large scale, social, Modern architecture and urbanism in Mexico City. The project was completed in 1951 and contained almost a thousand apartments in six-story high-rise buildings on pilotis and three story buildings (see ill. 55). The example of community planning, Unidad Independencia, in the far south of Mexico City has become a famous example of social housing. It was completed in 1960 and contains over twenty-two-hundred houses and apartments in a green landscape (see ill. 56). The neighbourhood was designed as an autonomous city outside Mexico City. The Mexican social security institute that initiated the project, paid special attention to the cultural and physical education of the workers who were going to live in Unidad Independencia. That’s why the neighbourhood counts with a large central square, a theatre, a cinema, a bowling alley, billiards and a swimming pool (see ill. 57). Nowadays, Unidad Independencia still looks the same; the only small
53. Centro Urbano Presidente Alemán, by Mario Pani, 1949. The aerial photo shows how the multifamiliares were placed in an open landscape with shared facilities.

54. Conjunto Urbano Presidente Alemán in its current state. The photo demonstrates a multifamiliar in the background with an exterior corridor on every third floor to permit access to the two-storey apartments and in the front the communal sport fields.
55. Centro Urbano Presidente Juárez by Mario Pani, 1950. The photo shows the six-storey multifamiliare on pilotis.

56. Unidad Habitacional Independencia by Alejandro Prieto and José María Gutiérrez Trujillo, 1960. The photo shows that the unidad is placed in a forest-like environment and that the buildings are connected with pedestrian paths.

57. A shared swimming pool at Unidad Modelo. The photo shows how the pedestrian paths are shaded with brise soleil. This is a way in which urban planning models were adapted to Mexican climatic circumstances.
alterations being the closed off balconies and the re-sized windows (see ill. 58). After the success of Unidad Independencia the last large scale Modern social housing project that was executed in Mexico City was Conjunto Urbano Nonoalco Tlatelolco. The project was inaugurated in 1964. In this project architect Mario Pani had the possibility to realize his Modern ideal on a large scale. The result is an urban area planned as an independent city with almost twelve-thousand apartments spread over one hundred hectares in one-hundred-and-two high-rise buildings (see ill. 59 and 60). Nonoalco Tlatelolco was planned to have six-hundred-eighty-eight shops, twenty-two schools, six clinics, four theatres and a cinema. When the project was finished, the journal *Arquitectura México* dedicated a double edition to the project. The way in which Pani presented his project is interesting for this thesis because he also demonstrated the urban conditions that the project substituted (see ill. 61). The article shows that Pani was still trying to realize the ideas that he expressed in 1949 when he presented the Unidad Modelo project. Pani developed the theory that the new housing projects would cause people to move out of the tugurios and that these could then be demolished to make room for gardens and parks (Gómez Mayorga, 1949). This prediction of Pani didn’t come true because of the continuing rural-urban migration that caused many people to arrive to Mexico City. Social housing production couldn’t keep pace. The tugurios were still inhabited when Pani realized his Modern plan in Tlatelolco and around seven-thousand residents had to be relocated in order to start construction. This series of social housing projects, from Unidad Modelo to Nonoalco Tlatelolco shows the impact that the Modern planning ideal has had in Mexico. The fact that all these projects have been achieved with the financial support of national housing institutions, banks and labour unions demonstrates the support of the Mexican governing elite for the Modern urban ideal. Recent studies among the residents of these urban projects show that the projects have been successful as the same people continue to live there and state that they are happy with their apartments, houses, the facilities and the public spaces (Garay, 2002; Amato, 2008a; Amato, 2008b). At the same time, the Modern ideal however hasn’t been able to improve the living condition of the poorest segments of Mexican’s working class. Because of this, the planning ideal has also received its’ share of criticism in Mexico, already in the period in which these large scale projects were being executed.

13 It must be noted here that the editor of the journal, Mario Pani, was also the architect of Nonoalco Tlatelolco and that the presentation of the project in *Arquitectura México* and the importance that was given to it must thus be understood as his point of view.
58. Houses at Unidad Modelo in their current state. The photo shows how residents have closed off balconies and this way have expanded their house with an extra or larger room on the second floor.

59. The plan for Conjunto Urbano Nonoalco Tlatelolco by Mario Pani and associates, 1964. The plan shows the isolated roads for ongoing traffic, the secondary roads inside the conjunto, the central park and the north-south directed high-rise multifamilares.
Aerial photo of Conjunto Urbano Nonoalco Tlatelolco. The photo shows the roads that surround the conjunto and that lead ungoing traffic around the residential areas. The photo also offers an image of the scale leap that was made in relation to the surrounding urban fabric. In contrast, in the planning of Unidad Modelo the architects Pani and Sanchez had provided a smooth transition between the planned dense and high-rise urban fabric of the Unidad and the surrounding autoconstructed low-rise and low-density urban fabric.
61. The page in the 94-95 double edition of *Arquitectura México* dedicated to Conjunto Urbano Nonoalco Tlatelolco. The page shows the houses that were demolished to be able to construct the project. The photos that Pani selected to make his argument are concentrated on the low living standard of the tugurios. The photos for example show the small unpaved alleys and the residents washing their clothes or dishes in the streets.
4.4 Unplanned urban development and critiques against the Modern planning ideal

The study on Mexico City that was done by the BNHUOP in 1952 already included many critiques against the Modern planning ideal. The second edition opened with a critique by the general director of the BNHUOP, Adolfo Zamora, who started with the statement:

‘Garden city, linear city, radiant city are all premature dreams of the middle class. They pretend to create a new urban structure without modifying the regimen of production that explains and supports the existing structure’. [...] ‘It’s not possible to think about better housing for the poor when their income doesn’t improve.’

(Zamora, 1952a: 4)

Zamora commented in his articles that the problems of Mexico City aren’t caused by a lack of knowledge on how to make a beautiful, ideal and clean city. The problem according to Zamora, was that tugurios were the only sort of housing that the working class could afford (Zamora, 1952a). In an interview of the same year in Arquitectura México, Zamora repeated his conviction of the necessity of a change in how housing is financed (Zamora, 1952b). In this interview Zamora pointed at the Mexican ‘save and loan’ system that stimulated the working class to money to be able to buy a home. This way, the social housing that the Mexican state was producing could also start to be inhabited. It should be noted that these projects were meant for the Mexican working class, not for the people without a fixed salary. These people wouldn’t have been able to get a loan in the program. Pani has made similar comments about how low quality housing was meeting a demand in Mexico City. He however continued to believe that the Modern project would be able to house all, even when studies that were conducted at the time, like that of the engineer Emilio Alanis Patiño, demonstrated that with the prognoses for Mexico City’s population growth, the deficiency in housing couldn’t be solved within the state’s budget (Alanis Patiño, 1952). Zamora was instead of Modern architecture in favour of a financial solutions and he had faith in the governments’ ‘save and loan’ project. Pani had also expressed his support, but only in order for people to be able to buy an apartment or a house in one of his Modern projects. The financial program that was organized by the Mexican government didn’t persuade people to buy a home in one of the state’s social housing projects. The government was aware of the deficiency in housing and the impossibility to solve that problem in a short period of time. They allowed people to use their credit to build their home with the help of a constructor. So, although the government was supporting the Modern
urban project in Mexico City, it didn't aspire to an entirely planned city as architects like Pani did. With good reason, because at the same time as these discussions and debates among Mexican architects were taking place, Mexico City continued to grow as arriving migrants from the countryside constructed their homes with or without supervision of architects and construction technicians.

4.4.1 The development of Sector Popular

Sector Popular is a working class neighbourhood which was established in 1947 in what then was the periphery of Mexico City. The neighbourhood is located directly east of Unidad Modelo. The area is bordered in the west by the former canal Calzada de la Viga, in the north by the former river Rio Churubusco, in the east by Sur 113A and in the south by Rodolfo Usigli (see ill. 62). The area was invaded by so called ‘paracaidistas’ (parachutists), referring to the speed with which areas were invaded. In this type of urbanization, the arriving families receive land titles but from a sub divider who doesn’t have legal title to the land. This leads to a situation in which the residents perceive themselves as having rights, providing them with a degree of legitimacy, while their status as owner remains questionable and they still have the risk of being evicted (Ward, 1976). As, this type of urbanizations is organized by a sub divider these areas usually have a regular gridiron pattern. This has also been the case in Sector Popular. The area was divided in plots according to a grid structure that projected north to south streets and two broader west to east avenues that manage the traffic flow through the neighbourhood and that lend access to the smaller residential north to south streets. The northern avenue Alfonso Torro has two traffic lanes, one in each direction; and the southern avenue Agustin Yañez has four lanes, two in each direction, which makes the latter the neighbourhood’s main street. Because of the goal of the sub divider to gain the highest possible profit from the land, the neighbourhood has little public space. When the residents arrived they began to construct their homes with the means that they had. This meant that the first structures were provisional; the occupiers pulled up shacks (Ward, 1976). Photos of the houses that were being constructed in this era were published in Estudios. (see ill. 63) Later, as the residents saved up money, they replaced the provisional structures with more permanent materials. According to Ward, this process accelerated from 1952 onwards because the state expropriated the land from the former legal owner which provided the residents with security of tenure (Ward, 1976). This process of consolidation made Ward comment that:
62. Map of Sector Popular. The map demonstrates the regular grid-iron organization of the area, the avenue Alfonso Toro that was partly turned into a public park, and the four-lane traffic avenue Augustin Yañez. The part west of the avenue Eje 2 Oriente is the neighbouring Unidad Modelo.

63. Photo of a house taken in a proletarian neighborhood in the same area as Sector Popular, 1952. The photo demonstrates that people initially used the materials that they found, like the steel plates that were used as a roof in this photo; and that they also made an effort to arrange a garden.
'Viewed from the road, frontages are brick-built, and many houses are of two or more stories, which makes it unlikely that an uninformed observer would recognize the origins of the zone.'
(Ward, 1976: 337)

The regularity of the street pattern and the materials that are used in the houses support this statement. Also, because the Mexican state already in 1952, five years after the first invasion of the area, started to meddle in Sector Popular, facilities like water, drainage and electricity arrived rapidly. This had the result that most of the houses in Sector Popular were fully serviced in 1976 when Ward conducted his research (Ward, 1976). Before Ward’s positive conclusions about the consolidation of the neighbourhood can be affirmed it is useful to analyze the state Sector Popular finds itself in today.

4.4.2 Current state of Sector Popular
Sector Popular hasn’t been planned by an architect or a professional planner and because of that the urban structure shows some inefficiencies. At the same time the urban fabric of Sector Popular also has advantages over the urban fabric of planned entities such as Unidad Modelo. Through an analysis of how Sector Popular looks today and how its spaces are being occupied and used more insight was gained in these advantages and disadvantages. The first aspect that should be discussed here is the development of the road system. As mentioned before the dividers projected two broad avenues in west to east direction through the neighbourhood and more narrow north south residential streets. The northern avenue, Alfonso Torro, is just as broad as the southern, Augustin Yañez, but in the first avenue, the two central lanes were turned in to a public park. Here the residents can walk their dogs in the park and find playgrounds for their children (see ill. 64 and 65). Because of the maximum profit goal that directed the development of the area, this is the only public space to be found in the neighbourhood. Because of this later development, the southern avenue is now the only street that permits the fast flow of traffic. The main avenue prevents the ongoing traffic from entering the north-south streets. This makes these streets into low traffic residential areas. As traffic almost only passes through the southern avenue, that’s where the neighbourhood’s economical activity takes place. On Augustin Yañez the residents find their grocery shops, restaurants, bar, car maintenance services, pharmacies, etc. Again, because of the maximum profit goal, public space is scarce and the sidewalks are narrow. People use the sidewalks
64. Photo of a public area in Sector Popular. The photo shows a public park that was constructed between two traffic lanes at Alfonso Torro, Sector Popular.

65. Photo of a public area in Sector Popular. The photo shows a children’s playground that was constructed between two traffic lanes at Alfonso Torro, Sector Popular.
and parts of the streets for their businesses as they demonstrate their products there or use the space to provide the services that they sell (see ill. 66). Together with Augustin Yañez being the principle traffic axis, this resulted in a hazardous situation.

The development of the road system and the ways residents use space is reflected in the pattern of building constructions in the neighbourhood. As residents were responsible for the construction of their homes, the quality and the sizes of the constructions are the result of the economic situation of the owners. As economic activity is concentrated on the southern avenue, this is where the larger and multiple storey buildings developed (see ill. 67). On the northern avenue, one can also encounter higher and larger buildings. This is probably because the avenue used to have the same importance for on carrying traffic as the southern avenue. Also, because of the creation of public space on the northern avenue, there is still economic activity such as small shops and restaurants. As there’s less traffic and less passerbies in the north-south streets, the majority of the houses there only have one additional storey and houses that consist of a single storey are still quite common (see ill. 68). One occasionally encounters an abandoned and/or deteriorated property here and properties that still have their additional stories under construction (see ill. 69). The development and consolidation of Sector Popular continue today. Because of the hybridity and variety of Sector Popular and because the neighbourhood didn’t develop with an official plan, it isn’t possible to offer a general discussion of the houses’ typologies.

4.5 A comparison between Unidad Modelo and Sector Popular
From a planning perspective, the most notable difference between the development of the two neighbourhoods Unidad Modelo and Sector Popular is that the first departed from a planning ideology that was aimed at the development of a community and the second from the aim of making the largest possible profit. This principle difference can in various ways be found back in the neighbourhoods’ urban morphologies and housing typologies.

The most notable difference between Unidad Modelo and Sector Popular is that the former was directed on the public space and shared facilities in the neighbourhood and that the latter has a lack of public space. Although the high-rise buildings that would result in high-density were never
66. Augustin Yañez avenue in Sector Popular. The photo shows how residents use the street as the owner of a car-repair business has put the shop’s advertisements and merchandise on the streets to attract customers.

67. A building at Augustin Yañez avenue, Sector Popular. The photo shows a building with commercial functions on the ground floor and the housing on the second floor. This building was probably constructed with the supervision of an architect because the building is concentrated around a shared entrance and has a symmetrical and uniform appearance. This sort of larger and more costly constructions are more common on the larger avenues. In the narrower streets the houses were constructed one by one and therefore don’t share entrances or show uniform structures.
68. A house in one of the narrower north-south streets of Sector Popular. In contrast with the houses on the larger avenues in the neighbourhood, these houses often still consist of one storey. In the photo the residents use their roof as a patio, to wash and dry clothes.

69. A house in one of the north-south streets of Sector Popular. In this neighbourhood residents expand their houses when they have saved enough money. This process of consolidation continues until today. The photo shows a house that is being expanded with an additional storey.
built, Unidad Modelo was designed around communal green space. Sector Popular has very few public spaces because it was developed without an urban plan. People constructed their own homes which resulted in a low-rise urban fabric. The urban morphology of Sector Popular is less efficient because of that. This has also become visible in the housing typology. The houses in Sector Popular have been developed individually and because of that, buildings in which several dwellings share their entrances or common facilities are rare. The houses in Unidad Modelo, as seen from the floor plans of the multifamiliares, were designed with the aim of efficiency in space and materials, and maximization of sunlight and ventilation. The differences between Unidad Modelo and Sector Popular also become visible in the road systems. Because Unidad Modelo was designed from the Neighborhood Unit and Modern principles that dictated the separation of modes of transportation and the accessibility of the neighbourhood for pedestrians, the neighbourhood has a road system that promotes a safe and pedestrian friendly environment. Sector Popular in contrast, wasn’t developed with such an urban mandate, resulting in a neighbourhood that’s more difficult to cross for pedestrians. There’s more motorized traffic that crosses the neighbourhood and pedestrians have to cross the roads to make their way to the neighbourhood. The unplanned situation of Sector Popular also brought advantages for its residents in comparison with Unidad Modelo. As Unidad Modelo was planned to keep as much traffic as possible out of the neighbourhood and because it was developed with concentrated service and facility areas separate from the residential areas, the commercial activity in Unidad Modelo is limited to the neighbourhood’s commercial centres. Because more traffic comes through Sector Popular, and because the residents had the flexibility to integrate commercial functions into their dwellings, the economical possibilities that the urban form of Sector Popular offers to its residents are more numerous. Finally, a difference that comes forth out of the difference between the commercial possibilities in the two neighbourhoods is the extent of the physical transformation of the two neighbourhoods. In Sector Popular, that transformation depended on the economic capacity of its residents, resulting in great differences within the neighbourhood. Some owners haven’t developed their homes any further than the first building layer. Many have added extra floors to their home and some have substituted their home with five-storey apartment buildings. In Unidad Modelo the physical transformation has been more modest. The houses haven’t been substituted with apartment buildings and people haven’t opened shops on the ground floor of their house. Another difference in this regard is that the transformations in Sector Popular were and still are, executed one storey at a time, the transformation of Unidad Modelo more frequently took place in the front yard or on the balconies.
where a single room would be added to able to accommodate more people. This difference between the transformation of Sector Popular and Unidad Modelo again emerged from the urban plan for Unidad Modelo and the absence of such a plan in Sector Popular. Because of the spacious organization of Unidad Modelo, the residents have a larger surface to expand their home. In Sector Popular the residents from the beginning occupied their entire plot which only left vertical expansion as a possibility to invest in their homes.

4.6 The present day contrast between planned and unplanned urban development

The cases Unidad Modelo and Sector Popular show that the contrast between planned and unplanned environments was sharp in the 1950’s and that the debate about solutions included a variety of opinions. As time passed the contrasts in the areas that developed in the 1950’s blurred because residents in planned areas modified their houses and because unplanned areas developed further and consolidated. Engineer Emilio Alanis Patiño commented in 1952 that the contrasts would only get sharper as Mexico City would continue to grow (Alanis Patiño, 1952). Ward concluded in 1976 that the invaded areas of Mexico City would consolidate with the precondition that residents were organized and would have security of tenure (Ward, 1976). The youngest invasions would still show deplorable living conditions but the quality of housing and the presence of facilities would continue to improve with time. In order to illustrate to what extent these predictions have come true, this paragraph will shed light on several issues that are at play in the field of housing for the poorer classes of Mexican society today and the opinions that Mexican architects have expressed with regard to the current situation.

The social housing projects that have been described in previous paragraphs were state funded projects, and they came forth out of the Mexican law that considered housing a responsibility of the government. This state approach to housing continued after the Nonoalco Tlatelolco project and in retrospect Mexican architects are commenting that it led to a peak, or a ‘golden age’ even, in state sponsored social housing projects in the 1970’s (Amato, 2008b). At the time the Instituto del Fondo Nacional de la Vivienda de los Trabajadores (INFONAVIT) (the Institute of National Funds of Housing for Workers) was created to bring the funds of institutions such as the BNHUOP together and to be able to work more efficient with the state’s budget on housing (Garza Usabiaga, 2011). The architects that are interviewed for the documentary Vivir Adentro have mostly negative opinions about the social housing projects that have been planned recently in Mexico City (Amato,
This is mainly due to a change in Mexican politics in the field of housing. Between 1988 and 1995 social housing was commercialized and the responsibility to provide social housing was placed with private companies (Garza Usabiaga, 2011). The main task of INFONAVIT has become the distribution of loans that help people to buy or to improve their house. The loans can be used to buy a home in a commercial project as the actual development and planning of housing projected is now regarded as a private responsibility instead of a public one. This structural change has changed the principles that underlie housing projects. Whereas in the 1950's, 1960's and 1970's the Mexican state was working to improve the working class' living conditions, the companies that currently plan housing projects do so with the goal of gaining maximum profit. The projects are therefore being constructed on cheap land and thus in locations far from the city's economical centres and job opportunities. The projects include a minimum of public space and facilities. The houses are small and the building materials and construction techniques are of poor quality (Amato, 2008b). An illustrated example gains insight into the effects of this change of policy.

Casas GEO is a company that realizes social housing projects throughout the country. Their housing projects for the low income segments of the market, that include the people who buy their homes with an INFONAVIT loan, can be found in the peripheries of all major Mexican cities. There, the land is cheaper, and the profits will be greater. To answer the demand, Casas GEO mostly constructs single-family houses in secured areas; gated communities. The houses in these areas are prefabricated, uniform and made of the most economical materials (see ill. 70 and 71). The critique against these projects is extensive. Architect Carlos Gonzales Lobo in an interview in Vivir Adentro for example commented that the houses with their forty to fifty square meters are too small and that the public space and facilities aren't sufficient (Amato, 2008b). These neighbourhoods for example aren't equipped with schools and parks and there're few banks and grocery stores which make the residents depend on the nearby city (Corona, 2010). He also commented that the projects are located too far away from the city and that they force residents to commute to up to four or five hours a day to Mexico City which causes extra expenditure and stress. He continued with the critique that the materials and construction techniques are too cheap resulting in the houses not being sound proof and not solid enough to expand. When people want to extend their home with an extra storey, as is common in Mexico City, the whole construction of the house first has to be strengthened which makes it less attractive for the residents to do this as it would require a higher investment. Gonzales Lobo even commented that the continuing development of unplanned
70. Social housing as is being developed by the private construction company Casas GEO. The picture shows the small houses with an average surface of fifty square meters and that are realized far away from economical urban centres, where land is cheaper.

71. Social housing project by Casas GEO. The photo shows the scale and uniformity of these projects. Together with the fact that they are located up to five hour driving distances from urban centres and are realized with a minimum of public space and facilities, this is why these projects are being criticized for their segregating effect.
auto-construction in Mexico City should be understood as the taking control of the poorer inhabitants of Mexico City against the passivity of officials to improve these conditions (Amato, 2008b).

As the attitude towards social housing in Mexico has changed, so has the attitude against auto-construction and other forms of unplanned urban development. The exhibition *Vivienda Social y Autoconstrucción* for example showed housing projects of a number of architects that are working to adapt their designs to the characteristics of unplanned housing and to the wish of people to be able to extend their homes as they succeed to save money (Garza Usabiaga, 2011). The exhibition for example included Casas Utiles that eSTUDIO vS / Miguel A. Romero Preciado architects developed in the city Guanajuato (see ill. 72 and 73). In this project the architects designed the houses in such a way that they could easily be modified and extended by the future residents. Another project in the exhibition was the project Contruye tu Casa/Construye tu Ciudad by Cano/Vera architects in which the architects worked to help make auto construction more efficient by designing building elements that could be prefabricated economically. Another new attitude towards auto construction can be noted as architects who used to work in the field of social housing in the 1970’s such as José María Guitièrez who was responsible for Unidad Independencia are now working to help residents to improve existing constructions (Amato, 2008b).

The two cases Unidad Modelo and Sector Popular and the present day contrast between planned social housing and unplanned development show that these phenomena can be approached from a range of angles and that their characteristics change over time. These complexities have led to different opinions among Mexican architects and the changes over time have also changes the discourse. These dynamics will be analyzed thematically in the next chapter, and to come to a greater understanding of the relations between the discourses and urban realities, the Mexican discussion will be related to the literature on planned and unplanned urbanism that was discussed in chapter two.
72. Casas Utiles by eSTUDIO vs / Miguel A. Romero Preciado architects in the city Guanajuato, 2007-2010. The photo shows that the houses consist of a ground floor and stairs to a second floor, although there is nothing on that second floor but a door to a roof terrace. That terrace can later be converted into an extra storey if the residents want to extend their home.

73. The floor plans of Casas Utiles. The plans show that all the functions, a multi-use living area, the kitchen, the bathroom and a bedroom are located on the ground floor. The stairs lead up to the second floor where access to the roof is provided. This way, residents can expand their home vertically. The houses don’t occupy the entire lot, so that the residents also have the possibility to extend their home horizontally on the rear side.
5 Analyses

5.1 Introduction
In this chapter the connections between the literature study that was presented in chapter two and the cases that were presented in the fourth chapter. In this chapter the literature study in chapter two that discussed the development of North American and European planning ideals will be referred to as the general discourse and the case studies from chapter four will be referred to as the Mexican discourse. The chapter will shed light on how the themes that came to the forefront in the general discourse are demonstrated in the Mexican discourse and how the Mexican discourse is related to the cases that were presented in chapter four. The chapter will demonstrate parallels between the planning ideals and perspectives towards unplanned development from the general discourse and will add new perspectives to the established debate on the basis of the Mexican case studies. The synthesis between the general discourse and the place specific Mexican discourse and urban practice will permit to reflect on the general discourse and come to a deeper understanding of the relations between discourses and urban reality. The insights that will come forth out of this chapter will be used to answer the research questions in chapter six.

5.2 The Mexican discourse in the 1950's
The first part of chapter two showed that the beginning of the general discourse on the planned and unplanned city as it took form in the 1920's under the influence of the Chicago School and the European Modern planning ideal, came from the idea that as cities grow they would develop higher levels of social organization (Park, 1925; Lewis 1959). In the field of architectural and urban critique this evolutionary thinking also occurred and resulted in expressions of the thought that the urban fabric would become more organized and that architectural form would develop from primitive, rural constructions to Modern and high design throughout the 1950's and 1960's (e.g. Rapoport, 1969). The vocabulary and the assumptions that were used throughout the general discourse also came to the forefront in the development of the Mexican discourse but a comparison between the development of the general and the Mexican discourse also shows differences. To start with, the Mexican discourse has been more accurate in its description of the variety of urban forms.
Chapter two showed that a number of terms like, ‘slum’ in the 1920’s and ‘informal-’ and ‘irregular urbanism’ in the 1970’s, entered the general discourse with a sharp definition and were used to refer to specific urban phenomenon, but that they later blurred and ended up being used to refer to a range of unplanned urbanisms with different characteristics. The terms that occur in the Mexican discourse are used more conscientiously. In the study of Mexico City that Estudios presented in its six publications in 1952, the different housing types that at the time could be encountered in the city were discussed one by one. The study included jacales, tugurios, colonias proletarias and colonias abundantes and decadentes (Sanchez, 1952d) (see ill. 74). A jacal is a house that Mexican peasants used to construct in the countryside (see ill. 75). When rural-urban immigration started to accelerate in the 1940’s and 1950’s, these structures could also be found in the city, as people brought their habits and traditions with them. These jacales have also been mentioned in Oscar Lewis’ 1959 study on the culture of poverty, which was discussed in chapter two, where he interpreted them as a sign of the inability of rural migrants to adapt to urban life (Lewis, 1959). In Estudios the jacales weren’t interpreted as an expression of a certain culture, instead their materials and their facilities were analyzed to come to a conclusion about the housing conditions that they provided for their residents. Because of lack of resources, people added the things that they found, like pots and pans, to the wood and rocks that are the traditional materials for a jacal. Besides the humble materials that were used for these houses, they lacked sanitation which sometimes wasn’t more than a hole in the ground (Sanchez, 1952d). On the basis of this information the living conditions that these jacales provided were described as ‘deplorable’ and as an urgent problem. The next housing type that occurred in the study on Mexico City was the tugurio. ‘Tugurio’ literary means ‘shepherd’s hut’ or ‘little room’ but in the study it’s used to refer to the deteriorated houses in the historical centre of the city. The term shows similarity with the use of the word ‘slum’ in the general discourse, as ‘slum’ at the beginning of the twentieth century also meant ‘single room dwelling’ but started to be used to refer to inner city deteriorated housing as has been illustrated by the work of the Chicago School scholars (Park, 1925). A noticeable similarity with the use of the term ‘slum’ is that ‘tugurio’ has also repeatedly been related with disease, crime and vice (e.g. Instituto Nacional de Vivienda, 1958). Where the association of the term ‘slum’ with negative characteristics has caused slums to be cleared and demolish, the same pattern between discourse and urban policy can be found in the Mexican discourse of the 1950’s and 1960’s. In the study on
74. A page from *Estudios*, 1952 on which the locations of the distinct types of housing in Mexico City were mapped. The map also included data on the population, the surface of the area and the value of the houses in these areas.

75. A jacal. The photo shows an example of this typical rural housing construction for Mexico and the Southern states of the United States. The constructions were usually made out of wood and rocks and when Mexico City started to grow, rural-urban migrants brought this construction technique with them to the city.
tugurios that INVI published in 1958, plans for the neighbourhoods in Mexico City’s centre were presented that projected the complete renewal of the urban fabric. The demolition of the houses of the residents was presented as a necessary intervention because the urban fabric was thought to have negative effects of the residents’ behaviour:

’[…] because the infrahuman conditions of the houses have strong repercussions on the moral degeneration of their inhabitants, causing and stirring up numerable centres of vice, or destructing the stability of families.’

(Instituto Nacional de la Vivienda, 1958)

It should be noted here that the term ‘tugurio’ is only used to refer to the housing conditions in the city centre, as opposed to the English ‘slum’ that was introduced in the 1920’s in the general discourse to refer to city centre deterioration and that later started to be used to refer to a wide range of low quality housing both in city centres as in urban peripheries as for example in Mike Davis’ 2006 Planet of Slums (Davis, 2006) . This is an important difference between the use of ‘tugurio’ and ‘slum’, because the latter has led to confusion in the general discourse and has received a great deal of criticism (e.g. Castillo, 2000; Gilbert, 2007). Subsequently, the 1952 study in Estudios introduced the proletariat neighbourhoods, like Sector Popular that was shown in the case study. This type of neighbourhood was understood as a development that could turn into decent neighbourhoods if it wasn’t for the fact that they lacked services and that they were located among urban areas of lesser quality such as the jacales. To illustrate, the description of the photo of the proletariat neighbourhood that was used in Estudios (see ill. 51) read:

’Note the wish of the owners to organize their garden, greatly improving the look of this humble house. Imagine this house being located in a better environment and provided with the essential urban services. This would be a great house!’

(Sanchez, 1952d)

Finally, the study discussed the colonias decadentes and abundantes. These are the terms that were used to describe the planned houses of the city’s inhabitants with more economical resources. The editors of Estudios hardly commented on these neighbourhoods but illustrated them extensively. Probably because these neighbourhoods didn’t lack services, like the other types that had been
discussed, and the BNHUOP thus didn’t need to develop further plans for them. The terms that are used here, ‘abundant’ and ‘decadent’, are interesting though, as they are illustrative of the contrast that could be found between housing for the rich and for the poor that could be found in Mexico City.

The Mexican discourse as presented by the editors of Estudios in 1952, thus demonstrated a vocabulary that was specific for the types of urbanizations that could be found in Mexico City in the 1950’s. As Ward discussed, the differentiation between the different types of neighbourhoods is important because their circumstances of development, such as their location, their social organization and the legal status of the residents, are preconditions for the possibilities they have to develop (Ward, 1976). The legal status of these residential areas was also earlier included in the Mexican discourse in comparison to the general discourse. In the general discourse architects started to consider the legal and economical contexts of urbanism in the 1980’s (e.g. Pérez Sáinz in Roy and AlSayyad, 2004; Pérez Sáinz in Hernández et.al. 2010). In Mexico they were already part of the study that Estudios presented in 1952. As Ward has mentioned, the legal status of the residents of different types of unplanned areas in Mexico City differed. The squatted inner centre tugurios were described as parasitic whereas the residents of proletariat neighbourhoods were regarded as legit, even though their legal status was questionable. Also, because city centre tugurios, that were started to be identified as a problem in the 1950’s but that continued to be part of Mexico City’s urban fabric until the 1985 earthquake, were less visible and had lower levels of social organization than the unplanned residential areas that developed in the periphery of Mexico City, it was more difficult for the residents of the tugurios to enforce the government to provide services to develop their neighbourhoods (Ward, 1976). The residents of proletariat neighbourhoods like Sector Popular, that started to develop in the late 1940’s and that had been legalized in the 1950’s, had more possibilities because they had titles to their land and this enabled the residents to invest in their houses and in their neighbourhood’s facilities without the threat of eviction. In consequence, the support that these two types of proletariat residential areas needed differed and the Mexican discourse of the 1950’s was better equipped to define these differences as it referred with more accuracy to the different urban forms. This forms a great contrast with the scholars that have described unplanned urbanisms as ‘the illegal’ city and the strong dichotomist descriptions like ‘formal versus informal’ that have from the 1970’s onwards become common in the general
discourse. The accuracy in the Mexican debate when it comes to the different housing types however hasn’t saved that discourse from derogatory rhetoric.

5.2.2 Derogatory rhetoric

In the citation from INVI from the previous section, already shows that the prejudice against low quality housing that from the beginning in the 1920’s has been part of the general discourse was also part of the Mexican discourse, especially in the 1950’s when low quality housing and a general housing deficit started to pose a serious problem (INVI, 1958). Apart from that citation in which the urban fabric was interpreted as causing of moral degeneration, there are more examples and more sources that illustrate that image. Another example in which the urban environment was put in a causal relation with the morals of the people that live there, can be found in the Mexican movie of the 1950’s *Los Olvidados*. In this movie, the social problems of the city have been portrayed against the contrasting backdrop of the construction of Modern high-rise and the city’s unplanned periphery. Although it is not an architectural historic document, it is an important cultural document as it has become to be seen as a classic movie and illustrates the situation Mexico City found herself in in the 1950’s (de Anda Alanís, 2008). The movie starts off with the introductory lines:

‘Behind their magnificent buildings all great modern cities, like New York, Paris or London, hide humble houses full of malnourished and unclean children with no schooling. They are nesting grounds of future criminals. Society tries to correct this disease, but the results of its efforts are very limited. Only in the near future will children’s and teens’ rights be vindicated for them to be useful in society. Mexico, the great modern city, is no exception to this universal rule. That’s why this movie, based on true facts, is not optimistic. It leaves the solution up to society’s progressive forces.’

(Buñuel, 1950)

Another way in which negative associations demonstrated themselves in the Mexican discourse of the 1950’s was not by their proclaimed effects on the morals of the residents but by the portrayal of

---

14 Translated to English as ‘The forgotten ones’ and officially released in English as ‘The young and the damned’
the urban fabric itself as a bad or infected thing. In the fifth edition of *Estudios*, that was published in 1952, the production of Modern housing for Mexico City was for example commented on as follows:

‘What is being done now are only scratches on a big growing tumour’
(Sanchez, 1952c: 71)

These citations are similar to the ones like Juppenlatz’ 1970 description of slums as urban cancer (Juppenlatz, 1970) and the recent discussion by Gilbert on the effects of this part of the general discourse on urban policies of slum clearing (Gilbert, 2007). The citation of INVI is interesting in this regard as it presented urban degradation as having possible contagious effects on the moral standards of residents and used this argument for the substitution of these neighbourhoods with a new urban fabric. The director of the BNHUOP, Adolfo Zamora, also used this rhetoric in his contribution to *Estudios* as he compared the tugurios with Paris’ ‘unhealthy lots’ as Le Corbusier had described the historic centre of that city to find support for his urban renewal plan (Zamora, 1952a). There are more connections between the European and North American discourses of Modernism and derogatory rhetoric that is illustrated by Zamora’s citation. The next section will offer an analysis of the influence of the Modern ideal and the North American Neighborhood Unit concept on the portrayal of urban forms in the Mexican discourse.

5.2.3 The influence of the Modern ideal

The Modern planning ideal, as discussed in chapter two, has been blamed for being paternalistic and neo colonialist because it imposes a spatial order (Rosler, 2010). These critiques have especially been directed against the rigid early version of Modern urbanism that was presented by Le Corbusier in the Athens Charter in 1943 and that started to be criticized in the early 1950’s by the architects of Team Ten and older CIAM member like Sert. Some scholars have more explicitly put the blame for demolishing unplanned residential areas and rendering its inhabitants homeless on the Modern planning ideal (e.g. Castillo, 2000; Gilbert, 2007; Rosler, 2010). The Mexican discourse of the 1950’s shows a number of examples that illustrate this effect of the Modern rhetoric on urban policy as it adopted the rhetoric of infection and disease that has been discussed in the previous chapter to defend their urban ideals.
The most influential Mexican advocate of the Modern architectural and urban ideal, Mario Pani, made a remarkable comment when he was interviewed by Mauricio Gómez Mayorga in 1949. In the interview that was published in his journal Arquitectura México Pani explained why he was developing his housing schemes, of which the case study Unidad Modelo was part, in the periphery of the city:

'We don’t want that our project has anything to do with the fractionating infection of lucrative urbanism. There’s no point in continuing on this topic: you and I and other architects have talked a thousand times about the organic and absurd growth of our city.

In all its directions, incurably plagued by the divisions of fantasy and second class architecture, the city has one direction [...] that, except from one strip of urbanizations of the last category [...] is more or less clean from divisions.’

(Gómez Mayorga, 1949: 71)

In this citation, Pani refered to unplanned urbanism as an infection of the urban fabric and that the city as a result was incurably plagued. He therefore wanted to isolate his housing projects from these infectious urbanisms and planned Unidad Modelo in the periphery of Mexico City. Note that Pani used ‘second class architecture’ to refer to auto construction, much in the way that Rapoport in 1969 distinguished between primitive and vernacular architecture on the on hand and Modern, and high design architecture on the other (Rapoport, 1969). The following citation illustrates how infectious these proletariat areas of Mexico City according to Pani were. It was taken from the article ‘Penicilina para la Ciudad’ in which the editors of Arquitectura México, the journal of which Pani was the principal editor, in 1950 discussed the advantages and disadvantages of publishing photos of Mexico City’s proletariat neighbourhoods (see ill. 76):

‘That plaza with its legends of yesterday and today [...] is also a nest for robbers, drunkards, and for big obese and dirty women. All over that place waste is piling up. And over its paving blows its everlasting dust, charged with mourning causing viruses. Starving gats live there, who employ themselves temporarily in neighbouring households, and when they get fatter and save some money up, whether it is the
product of their work or of their black magic, they relinquish it and turn to the plaza’s
den where they live as they please, scared by rats and jumped on by parasites.’
(Pani, 1950: 311)

In this citation the people who live in the proletarian neighbourhood Roma, were described as
starving cats and the dust that blew over on the streets of the neighbourhood was explained as a
risk to the entire city. Another interesting aspect of this citation is the supposed incapability of the
urban poor to save money, as according to Pani they will eventually relinquish what they build up.
Pani also expressed this opinion in his interview with Gómez Mayorga in which he stated that the
tugurios are the result of the working class’ inability to save money because of their lack of
education (Gómez Mayorga, 1949). These two fragments that demonstrate Pani’s understanding of
the economical roots of Mexico City’s housing problems and the effects of unplanned urbanisms for
the larger city, illustrate the polarizing effect that the Modern ideal has had on the Mexican
discourse on the planned and the unplanned city. Pani’s vision for the future of Mexico City was that
the residents of the tugurios and the fantasy and second class architecture divisions would move
into Modern housing units and that the space that was then occupied by the tugurios could be used
to create urban gardens (Gómez Mayorga, 1949). In 1950, Pani foresaw that unplanned urban
forms would gradually and automatically. In 1960 Pani’s ideology had become fiercer as in order to
realize his housing project Conjunto Urbano Nonoalco Tlatelolco, seven thousand residents of the
tugurios were forced to relocate. Arquitectura México illustrated the project with the before and
after pictures, using the image of the tugurios to illustrate the improvement that Pani had
accomplished. The publication didn’t mention that in order to become a resident of Nonoalco
Tlatelolco one had to be a unionised worker, excluding the informally and partly employed that
mostly inhabited the demolished tugurios. It’s this type of urban development projects that Castillo
in 2000 referred to when he stated that the Modern ideal has caused the eviction of many people to
make place for social housing projects (Castillo, 2000). This image of the Mexican discourse and
urban policies is however one side to the story, as other architects and housing institutions that
were working in Mexico City in the 1950’s looked at that city’s growth from a more realistic
perspective.
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76. Page from the article ‘Panicilina para la Ciudad’ that was published in Arquitectura México 30, 1950. The page shows the kind of pictures of which Pani discussed whether they should or shouldn’t be published in international magazines because of the image of Mexico City they could provoke. The pictures depict the tugurios in the neighbourhoods in the historic centre’s of Mexico City.
5.2.4 A more pragmatic approach

Although the negative image that has been presented in chapter two can be supported the Mexican discourse, the same sources also demonstrate that there's another side to the story. Pani was the most devoted follower of Modern functionalism in Mexico and although his theoretical production has had great influence on other Mexican architects and on urban policy, his points of view shouldn't be understood as a representation of general Mexican urban thought and practice of the time. Whereas Pani was of the opinion that tugurios were the result of the poorer classes’ lack of education, the authors that published in Estudios in 1952 blamed the poor living conditions on the uneven distribution of income in the country (e.g. Zamora, 1952a). The director of the BNHUOP, Adolfo Zamora, lamented on the sharp contrast between rich and poor in the urban fabric and predicted that this contrast would only get sharper as Mexico City grew more. Also, the study of the Mexican engineer Alanis Patiño in Estudios calculated that it wouldn't be possible to plan all housing as the future growth of Mexico City was expected to occur too rapidly for the national budget to be able to keep pace. These two facts made it necessary for architects to include the economical aspects of housing policies in their debates and to adopt a more moderate perspective towards unplanned urban forms. Compared to the Modern planning ideals it is remarkable how early Mexican architects started to discuss the economical foundations of their projects, as the critique against the 1942 urban study of José Luis Sert’s Can Our Cities Survive? He used the principles of the International Congress for Modern Architecture to analyse urban problems and to offer solutions (Sert, 1942), for example was aimed at its lack of economical foundation (e.g. Ascher, 1943; K.D., 1943). In chapter two has been discussed that the economical aspects of housing started to occur in the general discourse after the 1970’s and that it was centred on notions like formality, legality and legitimacy. These terms weren’t used in the Mexican discourse. Instead, the debate was concentrated on how subsidies, social loan programs and mortgages could facilitate housing for the poor. The journals Estudios and Arquitectura México show several opinions about the government’s save and loan program that allowed workers to buy a home once they would have saved twenty-five percent of the house that they wanted to buy. The difference of opinion between Modern architects like Pani and the more pragmatic architects like Sanchez was that Pani was of opinion that people could use the program to buy a house or an apartment in one of the planned projects; whereas architects like Sanchez, who took into account that it wouldn’t be possible for planned housing construction to keep pace, wanted people to be able to use the program to commission and
construct their homes without architects. This difference of opinion can be illustrated by the case study Unidad Modelo.

In the Unidad Modelo project that was planned between 1948 and 1949, Pani worked in a team with the architects from the BNHUOP under the leadership of architect Félix Sanchez. Sanchez interpreted the Modern ideals in a more moderate way than Pani and his ideas had strong effects on the plan. Although Pani stated that he didn't want his plan to have anything to do with the organic growth and the second class architecture that was being realized in the city, Unidad Modelo was eventually executed in a way that took these developments and expected future developments of the same kind into account. The neighbourhood was planned in such a way that its edges would form a smooth transition with the unplanned urbanizations that were already there, like Sector Popular, and the unplanned development that was expected (de Anda Alanís, 2008). These plots at the limits of Unidad Modelo that were reserved for private commissioning are contributed to Félix Sanchez and Pani had to conform to his ideas as Sanchez was the leading architect of the financier. Pani’s vision of spatial isolation was far from urban reality and also differed from the ideas that other Mexican architects and the managers of national housing institutes like the BNHUOP shared at the time. Whereas Pani had the vision that his housing projects would eventually cause the residents of tugurios and lucrative urbanizations to move from their homes into his projects and would permit the demolition of second class architecture, architects like Sanchez already in 1952 expected that Mexico City would continue to grow and that the housing deficit would continue to exist.

Because architects like Pani continued to believe that the future growth of Mexico City could be planned while demographic studies like Alanís Patiño’s showed that this would be impossible (Alanís Patiño, 1952) the Modern planning ideal and its housing projects for Mexico City were described as unrealistic by the more pragmatic Mexican architects. In the sixth edition of Estudios the editors commented that:

“The majority of the discussions that are being held put the [housing] problem in false perspectives and far away from reality”

(Sanchez, 1952d: 260)
It is also useful to recap the comments of Zamora here, in which he portrayed the Modern ideal as ‘a premature dream of the middle class’ (Zamora, 1952a). These comments illustrate that the accusations against the Modern ideal that it only provides housing for the higher classes of society (Rosler, 2010), were also expressed by Mexican critics before the results of the Modern planning ideal became visible. Instead of following the idea of the construction of a new urban fabric that was advocated by Pani, the editors and authors that contributed to the publications for example argued for decentralization by stimulating migration to other cities and by discouraging further construction of housing in Mexico City (Sanchez, 1952c: 72). This other side of the Mexican discourse of the 1950’s shows that unplanned developments were perceived in different ways and were even included in urban plans, and that the conclusions in chapter two about the effect of the Modern planning ideal on place specific discourses like the Mexican discourse need to be nuanced.

5.3 The current Mexican discourse

Chapter two showed that from the 1970’s onwards the general discourse started to be more critical of terms like ‘slum’ and dichotomies like formal versus informal. From that moment onward the architectural debate started to include vernacular forms and architects turned to the unplanned city to learn lessons to apply in their designs. Also, from the 1970’s the unplanned city started to be understood as a solution and later in the 1990’s as a form of resistance against the politics that hadn’t been able to provide for enough housing. The development of the Mexican discourse after the 1970’s shows parallels with the general discourse but the differences are more numerous. In the Mexican discourse one won’t find the term ‘informal’, and the false dichotomist approach that the general urban discourse has been accused of is largely absent in the Mexican discourse, as is the interpretation of unplanned urbanism as a solution or as a form of grass root resistance. This paragraph will shed light on the development of the current Mexican debate on planned and unplanned urbanism after 1970 and its relation with the continuing growth and housing problems of Mexico City.

5.3.1 Reflections on Modernity

In the 1950’s, when Pani and Sanchez were planning Unidad Modelo, when Sector Popular was developing and when the debate about how housing should be financed was taking place, the growth of Mexico City had just started. Urbanization was understood as a part of the country’s transition to modernity and the Modern urban and architectural ideals were embraced as an
instrument to give physical expression to the post revolutionary political ideals. As the city continued to grow, architects started to express critiques against the Modern urban ideals and against the politicians that had spurred urbanization as part of their transition towards modernity propaganda.

In the 1950’s architects like Pani had the vision that the future Mexico City would be planned by architects and that unplanned urbanizations would at some point belong to the past. As the city continued to grow it became clear that this was an unrealistic vision. What less idealistic architects like Sanchez had already relied on, turned out to become true as unplanned urbanizations are still part of Mexico City’s growth. Where modernity and urbanization used to be regarded as the solutions to the country’s economical situation and a solution for Mexico City’s urban problems, from the 1970's onwards these same ideals were started to be regarded as the problem. The Mexican architect Emilio Pradilla Cobos commented in 1977 that he didn’t believe that the situation Mexico City was in was a symptom of transition towards modernity and industrialisation. Instead he stated that he was critical of the theory of marginality:

‘The theory interprets Latin America as being in transition from a preindustrial to an industrial society. It ascribes the housing problems to the temporal stage of transition and makes it look as if poverty isn’t inherent to the capital process.’

(Pradilla Cobos, 1977)

This perspective was also reason for Pradilla to turn against the sites and services program that Turner had developed and that from 1975 started to be seen by institutes like USAID and the Alliance for Progress, as the solution for the housing problems in the developing world. According to Pradilla the sites and services concept was part of the theory of marginalisation, because it was based on the assumption that the Latin American conditions were temporary (Pradilla, 1977). Pradilla interpreted the popularity of sites and services as a way for the government to cover up their shortcomings in housing and in the development of a more egalitarian society. This is an interesting point of view, especially in contrast with Castillo’s assumption that the sites and services were never applied in Mexico City because of the preference of planned urban development over unplanned solutions (Castillo, 2000).
At the same time, the principles of Modern architecture and urbanism were receiving critiques as well. As the projects of the Modern Movement in Mexico had, even with the help of the save and loan program, turned out to be out of reach for the lower working class, the Modern architectural ideal was started to be criticized for being elitist. Architect Pradilla commented in 1977 that design had turned out to be nothing more than a technical practice in service of the ones with money (Pradilla, 1977). In Arquitectura Autogobierno this type of comments was quite common in the 1970’s. The architectural profession was questioning itself and its failure to house the poorer classes of society. In the 1976 article ‘Reaprendiendo a diseñar en arquitectura’ Michael Pyatok and Hanno Weber analyzed architectural education at Bauhaus and concluded that Bauhaus professors like Walter Gropius had taught architects that they could improve the life of humankind by studying geometry and colour, and by the translation of the universal values of form and colour to an architectural and urban form that would suit the machine age (Pyatok and Webber, 1976). According to the authors these principles of the architectural profession put architects on pedestals and this way architects came to be presented as the ones with knowledge that would help out the uneducated. Pyatok and Webber instead proposed that the architectural profession should be more modest and should reconnect with the working classes in order to be of better service to them (Pyatok and Webber, 1976). This argument was also put to practice as Arquitectura Autogobierno for example published the work of Carlos Gonzales Lobo who developed a more efficient and economical way for people to construct their own home using convex armed concrete structures to make the strongest possible constructions with a minimum of material (see ill. 77). This type of criticism against the own profession has also been noted in the general discourse as architects of the Team Ten group started to question the position of the architect in future society and Aldo van Eyck in the 1970’s started to work with the participation of their clients and the future residents of their housing projects (Mumford and Frampton, 2002).

At the same time as the criticism against Modernism started to grow in Mexico, Modern architects continued to present their planning ideal. The editors and writers that contributed to Arquitectura México noted the problematic growth of Mexico City and the incapability of planning to keep up. Although they noticed that their goals weren’t being accomplished, they didn’t reflect on their principles. Arquitectura México number 81 that was published in 1963 for example included an article by Pani about the Mexico’s perpetual housing problem (Pani 1963a) and a summary and review of the exhibition ‘El problema de la Vivienda en México’ that was organized by the Secretary
Here the journal discusses a method developed by architect Carlos Gonzales Lobo to stimulate more efficient auto-construction. The convex armed concrete roofs that he proposed require less material because they make optimal use of the forces. Gonzales Lobo didn’t design the complete houses but rather taught people how to use his construction technique.
of farming and Public Credit, the Bank of Mexico and Pani’s team of architects and that was to be offered to the Alliance for Progress (Pani, 1963b). Both articles stated that the housing problems that Mexico City was faced with weren’t the result of architectural and urban planning but of a lack of financial funding (Pani, 1963a; 1963b). Pani suggested that the government should dedicate a larger part of their budget to housing and that the government would then eventually need their Modern urban studies as an organizing element for the further growth of cities (Pani, 1963a). It should be noted that the financial reforms that Pani proposed were all aimed at housing for organized workers. Pani’s ideas didn’t include housing for people with unsteady jobs or for people that were employed in the informal sectors of the economy. This aspect of the Mexican discourse illustrates the critique against Modern architecture and planning in which it is blamed for being an elitist movement (Rosler, 2010). Even as the housing problem continued to become more serious in the 1960’s, and the loan programs that Pani proposed were implemented, Arquitectura México under Pani’s editorial supervision, didn’t change its planning rhetoric. Instead, from the 1970’s onward the contributors to the magazine started to propose a political change of direction that would stimulate the growth of Mexico’s smaller cities for them to be able to apply their Modern urban ideals there (Pani, 1971; Catalano, 1977). Note that this is what engineer Alanis Patiño had already proposed in Estudios in 1952 (Alanis Patiño, 1952). These two contradicting branches of the Mexican discourse, the Modern and the pragmatic, show that the development of the Mexican discourse and its relations with the development of Mexico City are more complex than the general discourse would make one believe. Whereas one group of architects accepted unplanned development as a solution and incorporated it in their future vision of Mexico City, the other group continued to believe in their task to continue planning for the entire city, even though they didn’t include the larger group of the (partly) unemployed working class in Mexican society. These contradicting opinions among Mexican architects continue in the current Mexican discourse.

5.3.2 Accepted urban form

After terms like ‘formal’ and ‘informal’ had been incorporated in the general discourse in the 1970’s and in the 1990’s started to become more critical of the dichotomist approach to urbanism that these terms had caused, European and American architects and urban theorists started to reflect on this rhetoric. The solution to the problem of vocabulary that the general discourse posed was being solved by Alfredo Brillembourg and David Klumpner by the adaptation of the term ‘informal’ in the meaning of ‘not yet accepted urban form’ (Brillembourg et. al, 2005); a view that would later be
adopted by the editors of *Rethinking the Informal City: critical perspectives from Latin America* (Kellett et al., 2010). The current Mexican discourse offers the opportunity to reflect on the perspective that Brillembourg and Klumpner proposed because what is accepted urban form differs with place and time. As has been concluded in the previous paragraph, some Mexican architects accepted unplanned urbanization already in 1952 as part of Mexico City while others continued to believe in a completely planned and organized urban fabric well into the 1970’s. These characteristics of the Mexican discourse make one question the perspective of Brillembourg and Klumpner. What should be interpreted as accepted urban form in the Mexican context?

Focusing on the development of Mexico City as has been illustrated in the case studies, the unplanned development of the urban fabric and the unplanned adaptations of planned entities aren’t the unaccepted exception but the general rule of Mexico City’s urban development. The houses in Unidad Modelo have almost all been adapted to the necessities of the residents and Sector Popular had already in the 1970’s become an integrated neighbourhood in Mexico City’s fabric, as it has been fully serviced with urban facilities like electricity and water and has been made accessible by public transport (Ward, 1976). Later developments in Mexico City’s housing policies show another perspective. As mentioned before, in the period between 1988 and 1995, the Mexican government pushed the responsibility for housing to the private sector, which resulted in a sharper contrast between planned and unplanned development. The private companies that are now in charge of social housing plan and construct houses with their economical interest in mind. This development has produced a greater contrast in the urban fabric and also in on how Mexican architects think about housing. The 2008 documentary *Vivir Adentro* shows how architects receive the commercial housing projects like Casas GEO that are being constructed around Mexico City (Amato, 2008b). Architect Carlos Gonzales Lobo for example criticized these projects because the houses are too small, the materials of too low quality, they are located too far away from the economic centre and have too few facilities (Amato, 2008b). He criticized the poor quality of the construction of these houses because they don’t allow people to expand their houses. According to Gonzales Lobo planned housing projects should be constructed in such a way that they facilitate the unplanned expansion and adaptation of these houses to the residents’ needs; which is a quality that the planned Modern neighbourhoods like Unidad Modelo did have. He remarked that social housing has lost its soul as it has become a matter of square meters. This point of view has been shared by the architect Teodoro Gonzales de León in his article ‘Perdió Humanidad Vivienda de Interes Social’
that was published in the national newspaper *El Siglo de Torreon* in 2003 on account of the second national architecture congress (Gonzales de León, 2003). This is a type of critique that had also been expressed by architects in the general discourse, for example by Woods, who was wandering why the efforts of Modern architecture to develop housing for the poor, like the Existenzminimum project, had been concentrated on developing the smallest possible dwelling (Sadler, 1998). Gonzales Lobo blamed architects that are focused on design for thinking that architects can solve housing problems through studies in aesthetics, while he thinks that architects should instead understand their challenge as a social one. *Vivir Adentro* on the one hand demonstrated nostalgia for the period between 1945 and 1970 in which government institutions were actively trying to solve the Mexican housing problem with Neighborhood Unit and Modern housing projects. Even though these projects only helped a small part of Mexicans working class, they did provide decent housing with their apartments of eighty square meters in comparison to Casas GEO forty to fifty square meters per house. On the other hand the documentary demonstrated the same critiques that the Modern project has had to endure before; that a focus on aesthetics won’t solve the Mexican housing deficit.

Because Mexican housing policy now completely relies on the country’s commercial sector, more and more architects, of which a few also that used to participate in the Modern projects of the 1950’s, now devote themselves to help people improve their self constructed homes. The documentary *Vivir Adentro* for example showed José María Gutiérrez who was the architect of Unidad Independencia, telling about his projects in which he closely works with auto constructors to improve their homes, accepting them as self trained architects (Amato, 2008b). He stated that he now prefers this way of working over designing social housing ensembles because it is the only way to reach the poorest people in Mexican society. The documentary also backed this personal opinion of Gutiérrez with the fact that with the resources for every social home yet to be designed and built, seven auto constructed houses could be improved (Amato, 2008b). Apart from the initiatives to improve auto constructed homes, in other parts of the country projects are being executed aimed at the complete facilitation of unplanned development. These projects include Contruye tu Casa/Construye tu Ciudad by Cano/Vera that aimed at the development of more effective ways of auto construction and the Casas Utiles by Miguel Angel Romero that tried to provide a flexible structural basis in order for residents to be able to expand their homes. The national policies and the housing production that these policies resulted in also changed the Mexican discourse.
5.3.3 The urban fabric as an expression of power and resistance

A final aspect that was discussed in chapter two and that should be illustrated from the perspective of the Mexican discourse is the interpretation of the contrast between planned and unplanned urban development as reflections of power and resistance that has taken form in the last ten years. Chapter two discussed the work of Bayat who interpreted unplanned urbanism as a protest (Bayat, 2000) and the idea of Brillembourg that unplanned urbanism in Latin America could be understood as a delayed rebellion against the Spanish colonial gridiron (Brillembourg, 2004). The chapter also discussed the remarks of Varley who argued that the interpretation of unplanned urban form as a form of resistance is too optimistic (Varley, 2010).

Focusing on the Mexican discourse, the first thing that comes to mind to illustrate these aspects of the general discourse are the statements that were made in the 1950's and 1960's about the tugurios in Mexico City's centre. Many architects understood the tugurios as the answer to the shortcomings of the housing market (e.g. Gómez Mayorga, 1949; Zamora, 1952a). This interpretation of the tugurios was however always being accompanied by remarks about the inhumanity of the living conditions that the tugurios produced and were understood as the result of the unfortunate position of the working class in Mexican society, not as the physical reflection of their resistance. Chapter two also discussed the idea that governments should be less bureaucratic when it comes to housing. The recent neo-liberal ideas of De Soto in particular have caused much debate (Soto, 1989; 2000). Now that the Mexican housing sector has completely been privatized, apart from the loans that INFONAVIT still provides for organized workers, it serves as an interesting illustration of what de Soto's neo-liberalism can lead to. Theoretically the mechanisms of the free market should lead to a product for all income classes, but projects like Casas GEO don't form a real alternative for many people. The houses are located too far away and force people to spend hours every day with commuting to work and back home again. The housing projects are located so far away from commercial centres because that's where the land is still cheap. Gonzales Lobo in Vivir Adentro commented that the choice of people not to move to these projects but instead to construct their own home should be understood as them taking control in front of the passivity of the government whose choices have led to this situation (Amato, 2008b). This remark of Gonzales Lobo is rare in the current Mexican discourse as it's the only one that corresponds with the part of the general discourse in which scholar like Bayat have interpreted auto construction as a form of resistance. Staying with this idea of resistance, it should be questioned how much this form
of rebellion contributes to the housing conditions of the poor. Whether people would chose to buy a home in one of the commercial projects like Casas GEO or would chose to construct their own home, in both cases they would encounter them far away from the city’s economical centres and job opportunities. Looking back at the Mexican discourse and practice of the 1950’s, one can conclude that the architects who planned Unidad Modelo based on the Neighborhood Unit concept and Modern urban principles were trying to realize a level of social dynamics with the mixed housing typologies of the neighbourhood. The policies and the projects that are handled today don’t have that objective and the social segregation of Mexico City gets sharper as the urban poor are forced to the peripheries of the city. Ironically, this social segregation that the Modern project has been accused of (Rosler, 2010) has only gotten sharper as architects and politicians have departed from the Modern ideals. In contrast, the Modern housing projects like Unidad Modelo, Conjunto Urbano Presidente Aléman and Conjunto Urbano Nonoalco Tlatelolco are now being praised by their residents for their location and their relation to important traffic and public transport routes (Amato, 2008b; personal conversation with resident of Unidad Modelo, 2011).
6 Conclusion

6.1 Introduction
Now that has been illustrated how the general discourse is manifested in the Mexican discourse and how these discourses are related to urban development of Mexico City, these relations can be used to answer the research questions of this thesis. This will be done in section 6.2. The focus and the approach that were chosen for this research have resulted in interesting insights. At the same time these decisions have left certain perspectives out of the analysis. These strengths and restrictions could lead to interesting future research projects. These aspects will be discussed in section 6.3.

6.2 Conclusions
The goal of this thesis was to answer the research question ‘How has the discourse on planned versus unplanned urban development evolved and how has it been related to urban realities?’ Before this main question will be answered, the answers to the sub questions will first be formulated.

What are the differences and similarities in the development of the general discourse and the place specific Mexican discourse on planned versus unplanned urban form?

A comparison between the general discourse and the place specific Mexican discourse demonstrated both similarities and differences. Focussing on the vocabularies of the two discourses the differences outnumber the similarities. Whereas the general discourse started to develop in the 1920’s with non-specific terms like ‘slum’ and after the 1960’s continued this way with the use of terms like ‘informal urbanism’, in the Mexican discourse the different types of urban developments, their differing characteristics, contexts and problems were already taken into account in the 1950’s. The Mexican term ‘tugurio’ that has similar origins as the English ‘slum’ is specifically used for inner centre housing issues, ‘jacales’ for Mexican rural housing types that rural-urban immigrants constructed in the city, and ‘colonias proletarias’ for the unplanned housing development in the fringes of Mexico City. Because the Mexican discourse handles its own place specific terminology, its representation of unplanned urban stays closer to urban reality. The general discourse has presented unplanned urbanism as chaotic and irregular morphologies while Mexico City’s
unplanned neighbourhoods like Sector Popular has mainly developed along a gridiron pattern. The analysis has shown that the more accurate differentiation and classification in the Mexican discourse has also led to more knowledge about the characteristics of the development and the challenges they posed to architects, urban planners and policymakers. Notwithstanding its more refined terminologies and criteria, the Mexican discourse of the 1950’s shows similarities with the general discourse of that period in how it has produced stereotypes about unplanned urban forms and negative assumptions about its residents. The rhetoric with which these stereotypes and assumptions have been formed are strikingly the same as they both apply a medical vocabulary that conveys these parts of the city and/or their residents as ill, contagious and in need of medical help like penicillin in the form of urban renewal. This similarity is illustrative of the influence that the Modern Movement and American thinkers like the Chicago School sociologists have had on the Mexican discourse as it presented itself in the 1950’s. The two discourses show differences in their attitudes towards future development of unplanned urban forms. As noted in the literature study in chapter two, the possibility of hybridity of urban forms weren’t introduced into the general discourse as late as the 1970’s. In the Mexican discourse the development of urban forms has been taken into account from the beginning of Mexico City’s rapid growth in the 1950’s. Unplanned forms were in the 1920’s until the 1950’s interpreted as a temporary symptom of the country’s transition from agriculture to industrialism. From the 1950’s the government started to regularize unplanned neighbourhoods like Sector Popular. As a result Sector Popular became part of the urban fabric and the neighbourhood’s unplanned history isn’t visible anymore for the untrained eye. Later in the 1970’s auto-construction started to be interpreted as a solution and architects started to develop construction techniques to help auto constructers build their homes more efficiently. Now, Mexican architects like Cano/Vera are designing housing solutions that combine the advantages of planned and unplanned form. This poses a contrast with the present architectural discourse that is focused on small improvements in unplanned areas.

To what extend and how has the general discourse affected the Mexican discourse?

Although correspondence between European, North American and Mexican architects and critics hasn’t been included in the thesis, on the basis of the similarities between the two discourses, the known contact between European, North American and Mexican architects and the criticism against the general discourse in the Mexican discourse, a number of conclusions can be drawn
about the influence of the general discourse on the Mexican. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, the similarity between the two discourses in their negative rhetoric about unplanned urban forms is striking. The relations between European and Mexican, and North American and Mexican architects is especially clear for the part of the Mexican discourse that was formed in the journal *Arquitectura México*, as the editor Pani was trained in Paris and as the articles in the journal included reviews of European projects and interviews and essays on European architects. It’s therefore very likely that this part of the Mexican discourse has taken form under the influence of the discourse of the European Modern Movement. This conclusion can however only be drawn with regard to the journal *Arquitectura México*. The editors and authors of *Estudios* were for example more cautious when it came to the reception of the Modern Movements thoughts on architecture and urbanism. To start with their studies on Mexico City’s urban forms were more objective and they were more sceptical about to what extend the Modern Movements ideas would be applicable to the Mexican context. The differences within the Mexican discourse in the 1950’s have resulted in a variety of attitudes towards the future of Mexico City. Whereas the editor of *Arquitectura México* Pani continued to envision the future Mexico City as a functionalist city until the 1980’s, the editor of *Estudios* Félix Sanchez was in 1952 already of the opinion that the Modern ideal was out of reach in the Mexican context and that unplanned urbanism should be accepted as full-fledged part of Mexico City’s urban fabric. Sanchez was more concentrated on the concept of the Neighborhood Unit that had been developed in North America and that had also entered the European Modern discourse through architects like José Luis Sert. As the Mexican discourse developed further in the 1970’s and 1980’s, the criticism against the Modern ideal became stronger as it had proven not to be able to provide housing for all the social classes in Mexican society. Mexican architects and critics also kept showing their scepticism towards the general discourse as the ideas of American aid institutions and Turners sites and services concept where critically received. As for the latest developments of the general discourse in which critics have started to regard unplanned urbanism as a form of resistance it should be included that the Mexican discourse hasn’t adopted that line of thought either. Instead Mexican architects are currently developing a critical attitude towards the passivity of the Mexican government.

To what extend and how have the general discourse and the place specific Mexican discourse had influence on Mexican urban policy and practice?
The general discourse’s influence on Mexican urban practice went as far as Mexican architects adopted the general discourse’s ideas. In addition, the eventual influence of the Mexican discourse on urban plans turned out to depend heavily on the position of individual architect in relation to politicians, financiers and housing institutes in the 1950’s and to have been reduced to a minimum since the social housing market has been privatized between 1988 and 1995. To illustrate the differing influence of architects in the 1950’s, Pani had contacts with the directors of Pensiones Civiles which enabled him to frequently put his ideas to practice. It became easier for Pani to find support for his ideas after the first successful projects for Pensiones Civiles. This enabled him to eventually plan and design the large scale Nonoalco Tlatelolco housing project in 1960, in which he followed the Modern Movements’ ideas. Also because of Pani’s position as the editor of *Arquitectura México*, in the case of Pani the relation between general discourse, Mexican discourse and urban practice are thus strong. The case study showed that the strong influence of Pani on the Mexican discourse and on Mexico City’s urban fabric didn’t always win it from other architects with different ideas. Sanchez was the leading architect of the team of the BNHUOP which gave him greater influence on the development of Mexico City, for example by the stimulating of the acceptance of the national save and loan program. The influences of Pani and Sanchez came together in the planning of Unidad Modelo and in that part of the case study it showed that Sanchez’ more moderate and Neighborhood Unit based interpretation of the Modern Movements’ ideas had greater influence on the planning and realization of that neighbourhood because he was the adviser of the financier. Nowadays, the Mexican architectural and urban discourse has less influence on the development of the city. Since the responsibility for social housing has been put with private companies, the development of the city is being influenced by the fluctuations between offer and demand and costs and benefits. De architectural profession that pleads for active government engagement in the social housing sector aren’t being answered, neither their initiative to improve housing instead of designing new housing entities.

6.2.1 Answer to the main research question

Now that the sub questions have been answered, an answer to the main research question ‘How has the discourse on planned versus unplanned urban development evolved and how has it been related to urban realities?’ can be formulated. To be able to formulate that answer it should first be noted that the literature study on the general discourse in chapter two, the case study that has presented the Mexican discourse, and the answers to the sub question have shown that it isn’t
possible to speak of one general discourse, or one Mexican discourse. The general discourse shows a variety of opinions and perspectives, as does the Mexican discourse. In general one could state that the general discourse and the Mexican discourse both started regarding the unplanned city as a temporary phenomenon and that this thought continued until the 1950’s. When the fact that cities continued to develop in unplanned ways started to become accepted in the two discourses after the 1960’s, the devolvement of perspectives in these discourses started to vary. The general discourse included scholars like Oscar Lewis who interpreted continuing unplanned development as a cultural problem that made people incapable to adjust to city life (Lewis, 1959), a point of view that has also been detected in Pani’s rhetoric (Pani, 1950); and that scholars like Castells interpreted it as a problem inherent to capitalist forces (Castells, 1976), a perspective that was encountered in the Mexican discourse in the work of Pradilla (Pradilla, 1977). These differing points of view have produced different opinion about possible solutions to unplanned development. The thesis has shown that Pani continued to plan according to the Modern Movement’s functionalist principles until the 1980’s while architects like Sanchez were of the opinion that Mexico City’s growth couldn’t be planned for completely in the 1950’s; which is a difference of opinion that continues between Mexican architects until the present day. The Mexican discourse has also shown dissimilarities in relation to the general discourse as it has handles a more precise vocabulary in comparison with the non-specific terminology that the general discourse has been criticised for and as it has shown to have been critical in its receptiveness of the ideas that were produced in the general discourse. Some aspects of the Mexican discourse were the direct result of the place specific context as the demographic study of Alanis Patiño for example turned out to have extensive influence on the Mexican debate (Alanis Patiño, 1952). The thesis has shown that some of ideas from the general discourse can be found in the Mexican discourse and that some of the ideas from the Mexican urban discourse have been put to practice in Mexico City. These however included varying and sometimes contradicting perspectives and have led to a variety of ideas on how Mexico City’s growth should be managed. A comparison between the present day general and Mexican discourses showed that the interpretation of unplanned urbanism as a form of resistance is largely absent in the Mexican discourse. The differing points of view within the two discourses and the differences between the Mexican discourse and the general discourse don’t allow this thesis to conclude that either the general discourse or the Mexican discourse has dictated urban practice and policy. On the contrary, this thesis has shown that both in the case of the general and the Mexican discourse the development of the city has forced architects and critics to reflect on the
discourses they were participating in and to change it. This happened for example when unplanned growth continued after the social housing projects that the government had financed between 1945 and 1970 and when starting in 1988 the Mexican government put the responsibility for social housing with private parties. This thesis therefore arrives at the conclusions that the general discourse hasn’t determined the Mexican and that the relations between discourses and urban practice are reciprocal.

6.3 Discussion
The final section of this thesis will reflect on the conducted research. It will discuss the advantages that the approach of this research has demonstrated to have and will touch on the perspectives that have been left out of the research’s field of view. These reflections could then lead to recommendations for future research projects that could further broaden the knowledge about discourses on planned and unplanned urban forms and their relations with urban planning practice.

The approach that was chosen for this thesis has allowed insight into relations between the general discourse, the Mexican discourse, and urban policy and practice in Mexico City. This method was in particular successful because the case studies and the historical sources that were chosen were closely related: Pani and Sanchez were the editors of Arquitectura México and Estudios and both worked on Unidad Modelo. The selection of the cases and the sources has made it possible to generate a synthesis that has led to an integral illustration in this thesis of developments in discourse and practice. This synthesis then made it possible to make connections between the general and the Mexican discourse and has led to insights that have helped to invalidate some aspects of the general discourse. The method that was chosen has thus allowed the presentation of a discourse that hasn’t fully been the product of Western thought, because it developed grounded in a spatial context that included the planned and the unplanned.

The historical sources that were available for the research didn’t offer all the information that could have been useful for this research, such as the floor plans of the houses in Unidad Modelo and Sector Popular. Furthermore, it’s essential during a research project to choose a focus and to decide to leave perspectives that are of secondary importance out of the project. In this research the decision was made to focus on historical Mexican journals and on the built environment of the
cases. This decision made it possible to get insight into the development of the Mexican discourse but at the same time left the architects’ archives out of the research. The journals have illustrated the opinions of Mexican architects about European and North American planning ideals, but haven't explicitly illustrated the correspondence between Mexican and foreign architects, and Mexican and foreign institutions like USAID and the Alliance for Progress. It is important to mention that here because future research could profit from such sources.

To round up, it would be interesting to keep following the Mexican situation now that the housing market has been privatized. The larger passivity of the Mexican state has led architects to take a critical stance against the social segregation that this new housing policy has caused. The future development of their criticism and the possible result of that criticism in their projects could add more insight into the current dynamics between discourse and practice in the Mexican context. This way research could keep offering counterbalance against the assumptions that have been produced and continue to be produced in the general discourse, with illustrations from a context in which the contrast between planned and unplanned urbanisms continue to be present.
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