The Latinamericanization of Urban Planning: Public Housing and Contacts with the Global South in Chile, Brazil, and Mexico (1960s–1980s)

Katharina Schembs

ABSTRACTS

While the first half of the twentieth century was characterized by the importation of urban planning models from Europe and the USA to Latin America, the 1960s represent a turning point: In the context of different development theories, local planners first started to emphasize structural similarities of Latin American cities that, according to their view, required more independent approaches to urbanism. Inspired by the Third-World-discourse and Dependency theory, urbanists towards the second half of the decade became increasingly interested in parallels with other countries of the Global South. They conceptualized cities as litmus tests of the developmental stage and as motors of economic progress. Focusing on the case studies of Chile, Brazil, and Mexico, the article analyses the initial planning euphoria in the early 1960s, especially in the field of public housing, the growing references to the "Third World" as well as the withdrawal of the state from urban planning in the 1970s and 1980s.

Während die erste Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts durch den Import städtebaulicher Modelle aus Europa und den USA nach Lateinamerika geprägt war, stellen die 1960er Jahre einen Wendepunkt dar: Im Kontext verschiedener Entwicklungstheorien begannen lokale Planer erstmals, strukturelle Ähnlichkeiten lateinamerikanischer Städte zu betonen, die ihrer Ansicht nach eigenständigere städtebauliche Ansätze erforderten. Angeregt durch den Dritte-Welt-Diskurs und die Dependenztheorie, interessierten sich Urbanisten in der zweiten Hälfte des Jahrzehnts zunehmend für Parallelen zu anderen Ländern des Globalen Südens. Sie konzeptualisierten Städte als Lackmustest für den Entwicklungsstand und als Motor des wirtschaftlichen Fortschritts. Anhand der Fallbeispiele Chile, Brasilien und Mexiko analysiert der Artikel die anfängli-

che Planungseuphorie der frühen 1960er Jahre, insbesondere im Bereich des öffentlichen Wohnungsbaus, die zunehmende Bezugnahme auf die „Dritte Welt" sowie den Rückzug des Staates aus der Stadtplanung in den 1970er und 1980er Jahren.

1. Introduction: The Birth of the Latin American City

Over the course of the 1950s, the number of inhabitants of Latin American cities skyrocketed due to internal migration. Continuing industrialization and upcoming employments in the growing tertiary sector forced millions of people all over the subcontinent to leave their rural homes and seek new opportunities in the metropolis. Since the early 1960s, more than half of the Latin American population has been living in cities.[1] The rising demand for shelter turned public housing (span. *vivienda*, port. *habitação*) into one of the main challenges for governments, urban planners and architects alike. In the intellectual climate of developmentalism (*desarrollismo*) proper state planning appeared to be the key to not only tackling what was perceived as economic backwardness, but also the housing deficit. In fact, as in earlier periods, decent housing of workers was thought to be instrumental to economic progress. While still rooted in modernization theory, which diagnosed linear development as that of the Global North, *desarrollismo*, however, also marked the birth of Latin American social and economic theories that departed from local conditions. This is equally true for urbanism that in part refrained from adhering to European and North American models which had been popular until then in order to turn to solutions for deficiencies deemed specifically Latin American. Local experts including social scientists and urbanists, among other things, hinted at the idiosyncratic temporalities and causalities of the recent urban growth in Latin America. According to them, as opposed to Europe and North America in the nineteenth century, in many places in the subcontinent the rapid urbanization seemed independent from processes of industrialization.[2]

Because of these developments, Argentine historian of architecture Adrián Gorelik has termed the beginning of the 1960s the moment when "the Latin American city" as a category of social theory was first "produced".[3] Beyond this observation on a macrohistorical level and as Gorelik himself laments, the question of how Latin American development theories of the 1960s and 1970s influenced urban planning there has hardly been a research topic until now.[4] Against this backdrop, this article traces the process of Latinamericanization of urban planning at a time of growing self-consciousness of Latin American urban planners in three case studies: Chile, Brazil, and Mexico. It thus contributes to a still rather small body of literature which for countries such as Argentina,

1   United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Dynamics, https://population.un.org/wup/Download/ (WUP2018-F21-Proportion_Urban_Annual.xls) (accessed 29 March 2021).
2   A. Quijano, Dependencia, urbanización y cambio social en Latinoamérica, Lima 1977, pp. 174–175.
3   A. Gorelik, A produção da "cidade latino-americana", in: Tempo social 17 (2005) 1, pp. 111–133.
4   Ibid., p. 115.

Peru and Venezuela have looked at the effects of *desarrollismo* on processes of regional and urban planning on the ground.[5]

Besides shedding light onto the ways in which governments and urbanists dealt with one of the most pressing issues, the provision of housing, this article argues that the planning and construction of physical spaces has always been accompanied by a statement on the belonging to superordinate symbolical spaces. While through previous urbanist interventions planners had tried to express their connection with Europe (until 1945) or North America (post-WWII), the following case studies show that from the late 1950s and early 1960s other spatial identifications came to the fore: Latin America and the "Third World". Because these spaces supposedly bore similar climatic and economic characteristics and thus challenges, contemporary planners were interested in intellectual exchange and hoped to learn from experiences elsewhere.

The first case study, Chile, represents an early example of massive expansion of public housing in a comparatively urbanized and wealthy Latin American country.[6] The Christian Democrat government of Eduardo Frei Montalva (1964–1970) delegated the task to an entirely new ministry, a novelty that greatly appealed to other Latin American countries. Chile thus constitutes one of the first fields of experimentation of public housing that, in contrast to earlier advances on the continent by populist governments, was increasingly backed by social theory.

After an initial flirt with public housing in Brazil – the second case study and a less urbanized country[7] – the military government that came to power in 1964 rather turned to slum clearances as its predominant urbanist strategy towards the end of the decade. In the international arena, Brazilian architecture exerted great influence after the construction of the new capital Brasília. This was especially true for Africa, where Brazilian architects (with more or less conflictive relations with the military regime) had close contacts. Simultaneously, the dictatorship fostered foreign relations with the so-called "Third World" and Brazilian social sciences were at the forefront of coining the concept of Third Worldism (*terceiromundismo*).

As with other Latin American countries, there was also exchange regarding Third Worldism with Mexico,[8] the third case study.[9] There, public housing under the Partido Rev-

5   L. Benmergui, The Alliance for Progress and housing policy in Rio de Janeiro and Buenos Aires in the 1960s, in: Urban History 2 (2009) 36, pp. 303–326; L. Castañeda, Pre-columbian Skins, developmentalist Souls: The Architect as Politician, in: H. Gyger and P. del Real (eds.), Latin American Modern Architectures: Ambiguous Territories, London 2012, pp. 93–114; F. Schulze, In search of El Dorado. US experts and the promise of development in the Guayana region of Venezuela, in: History and Technology 3 (2019) 3, pp. 338–363.

6   The share of the Chilean population living in cities was 67.8 per cent in 1960, it rose to 75.2 per cent in 1970 (United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Dynamics, https://population.un.org/wup/Download/ WUP2018-F02-Proportion_Urban.xls [accessed 15 July 2022]).

7   In 1960, 46.1 per cent of the Brazilian population lived in cities, by 1970, their share had risen to 55.9 per cent (United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Dynamics, https://population.un.org/wup/Download/ WUP2018-F02-Proportion_Urban.xls [accessed 15 July 2022]).

8   F. Alburquerque, Tercer Mundo y tercermundismo en Brasil. Hacia su constitución como sensibilidad hegemónica en el campo cultural brasileño, 1958–1990, in: Estudos Ibero-Americanos 37 (2011), pp. 176–196, at 190–191.

9   The share of the urban population in Mexico was 59 per cent in 1970 (United Nations, Department of Economic

olucionario Institucional (PRI) governments of the 1970s and 1980s experienced a comparatively late bloom: While other Latin American governments increasingly adopted a laissez-faire attitude and left the construction sector to private initiative, in Mexico the numbers of publicly built living space rose at an unprecedented pace. At the same time, the country constituted a haven for numerous exiled scholars and practitioners of urban planning from other Latin American countries that by then had fallen under dictatorial rule.

Apart from constituting snapshots of the discussions on public housing in Latin America from the 1960s to the 1980s, the selected case studies also represent a range of political systems and their respective responses to the challenge of housing deficit: a reform-oriented Christian Democrat government, a civil-military regime (and an early example of a regime type that would abound in Latin America from the 1970s onwards), and a formally democratic, yet authoritarian government. The examples of Chile, Brazil, and Mexico and the interrelations between them as well as with other countries of the Global South demonstrate that the histories of public housing in Latin America in the 1960s–1980s cannot exclusively be written as national histories, but only be understood in their transnational entanglements – an approach this article encourages to apply more.

2. Chile (1964–1970): Ministry of Housing and Planning Euphoria

As the rest of the region, Chile in the 1960s witnessed a sharp increase in migration from rural areas to the cities: Santiago swelled by 800,000 inhabitants, with the overall urban population rising from 4.4 million in 1955 to 7.2 million in 1970.[10] In the framework of his reformist "revolution in liberty" Christian Democrat President Eduardo Frei Montalva (1964–1970) strove to grant the Chilean population access not only to public health care and education, but also to housing, which he declared a "basic necessity" ("bien de primera necesidad").[11] Overall public spending doubled during Frei's term of office until 1970.[12] In order to meet the rising demand, the Frei administration made it their goal to build 60,000 housing units a year, 60 per cent of which had an average space of 50 m^2 and were reserved for lower income strata groups.[13] For this ambitious housing policy,

and Social Affairs, Population Dynamics, https://population.un.org/wup/Download/ WUP2018-F02-Proportion_Urban.xls [accessed 15 July 2022]).

10   S. Collier and W. F. Sater, A History of Chile, 1808–1994, Cambridge 2004, p. 312; United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Dynamics, https://population.un.org/wup/Download/ WUP2018-F03-Urban_Population.xls (accessed 14 September 2022).

11   Collier and Sater, A history of Chile, p. 307; R. Hidalgo Dattwyler, La vivienda social en chile y la construcción del espacio urbano en el Santiago del siglo XX, Santiago 2005, p. 272.

12   Collier and Sater, A History of Chile, p. 315.

13   Hidalgo Dattwyler, La vivienda social, p. 272.

the administration accepted loans from Interamerican institutions like the Interamerican Development Bank, among others.[14]

While creating a separate Ministry of Housing had been discussed in other Latin American countries such as Brazil in 1962,[15] Chile was the first Latin American country to actually establish one: The Ministerio de la Vivienda y Urbanismo (MINVU) was founded in late 1965, uniting all competences for public urban and regional planning as well as for housing. A further mandate was the elaboration of a national plan of urban development that aimed at creating a nationwide balanced system of cities.[16] AUCA (Arquitectura, Urbanismo, Construcción, Arte), one of Chile's main architectural journals, celebrated this step in hopes that it would enable the government to carry out the housing plans in a more streamlined manner and that human resources involved in these tasks would be utilized more efficiently.[17]

While most divisions of the new ministry were without institutional predecessors, it incorporated some previously existing government departments, most importantly the Housing Corporation (Corporación de la Vivienda, CORVI), that had been founded under President Ibáñez del Campo (1952–1958) in 1953. As part of the new ministry, the department covered every step from the planning to the execution of new living spaces: the division of land into plots, the construction and equipment with infrastructure, and the remodelling of entire quarters and villages in urban and rural areas. In short, CORVI was responsible for all residential complexes that were directly financed by the State.[18] An iconic new quarter built by CORVI was Villa Presidente Frei in the quarter of Ñuñoa in Santiago between 1965 and 1968. Built on an area of two hectares, it consisted of around 3,700 housing units of three types (high rises, lower buildings and single-family houses) as well as parks and civic centres.[19]

In cooperation with university architecture departments, another aim of CORVI consisted of elaborating typologies of *vivienda* for specific needs such as varying family sizes, climatic conditions and financial possibilities. Prototypes of houses built by the department later became the object of studies that evaluated, among other things, the materials used and the state of the dwellings a few years after construction. Furthermore, in "Casas experimentales CORVI" (1965), published by a member of the department of architecture of the Universidad Católica de Chile, a certain distancing from external models, in this case the British one, can be detected: The author argues that the norms and standards common for the British case were not applicable in Chile. Requirements of resistance and stability – Chile being a seismic area – as well as thermic insulation were

14   A. Raposo Moyano, Estado, ethos social y política de vivienda. Arquitectura habitacional pública e ideología en el Chile republicano del siglo XX, Santiago de Chile 2008, p. 102.

15   S. de Azevedo and L. A. de Andrade, Habitação e poder. Da Fundação da Casa Popular ao Banco Nacional Habitação, Rio de Janeiro 2011, p. 38.

16   Hidalgo Dattwyler, La vivienda social, p. 280.

17   ¿Qué pasa en el MINVU?, in: AUCA 9 (1967), p. 5.

18   Hidalgo Dattwyler, La vivienda social, p. 283.

19   Raposo Moyano, Estado, ethos social y política de vivienda, p. 111.

simply too diverging. For this reason, a study on local exigencies had been conducted and, according to the author, it revealed many gaps in research on the topic.[20]

Apart from publications by members of architecture departments, scientific studies by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe, CEPAL), with its headquarters in Santiago de Chile, also served as a source of information to the new ministry: In 1964, demographers working for CEPAL tried to calculate the future needs for housing, categorizing Chile as a "less developed" or a "developing country". Symptom of this characterization, which according to the author also fit all other Latin American countries, was the existence of so-called "barriadas marginales" in Peru, "favelas" in Brazil, "callampas" in Chile, and "villas miseria" in Argentina, different terms for shantytowns and slums.[21] In other events organized by the CEPAL, the focus was not on numeric predictions but on cost-efficient construction methods: For example, in a seminar on prefabrication in Copenhagen in 1967, the director of the Chilean Chamber of Construction reported on the role of the private sector in the building process.[22]

Once a unit was finished, the ministry allocated it according to a point system that considered factors like the applicants' age, marital status and family size. Contrary to the existing literature on public housing built under the aegis of the MINVU (which mainly highlights the ministry's accomplishments), petitions and complaints by applicants and dwellers point to various problems: Prices of properties often exceeded the candidates' financial possibilities or accommodations were handed out much later than expected. Residents already in possession of publicly built housing regularly complained of missing infrastructure like sewage systems or surfacing work, or that accommodation originally thought of as emergency shelters had turned into a permanent solution. Another common objection concerned "irregularities in the administration". These complaints have hardly been taken into account by research.

Apart from offering finished housing, Frei's housing policy also relied on distributing land for self-help housing. Originally an emergency measure following a heavy storm in 1965, which left hundreds homeless, self-help housing became an important element of the government's strategy to tackle the housing deficit. From the distribution of mere plots of land to the provision of a minimum of infrastructure, and in some cases even sanitation facilities, the so-called *operaciones sitio* became the main option for the poorest families to acquire property through a publicly financed loan programme. Until 1970, 71,000 plots of land were handed out for that purpose, most of them on the outskirts of Santiago.[23]

20   L. Bravo Heitmann, Casas experimentales CORVI, Santiago 1965, p. 9.
21   J. Morales Vergara, Estimación de las necesidades de viviendas en Chile, 1952–1982, Santiago de Chile 1964, pp. 1–2.
22   H. Calvo Salas, Políticas, programas, construcción y mercado de vivienda en Chile, in: Comisión Económica para América Latina, Seminario latinoamericano sobre prefabricación de viviendas, Copenhague, 13 August to 1 September 1967, pp. 1–26.
23   Hidalgo Dattwyler, La vivienda social, pp. 290–292.

However, even if one includes the amount of self-help housing, the Frei administration did not reach its overall goal of building 360,000 housing units by 1970. Nevertheless, 230,000 accommodations were completed and another 240,000 were under construction.[24] Already in 1967, in a very critical article, AUCA had attributed the fact that the government was falling behind its high aims to several malfunctions inside the MINVU: Housing plans were executed much slower than scheduled, bureaucratic and financial obstacles had increased and the work ethic of the civil servant architects (*arquitectos funcionarios*) was commonly poor because of their low salary.[25]

Despite such strong criticism and what turned out to be fewer finished public housing units as expected, architects and urban planners in other Latin American countries paid close attention to the Chilean example that – in contrast to earlier approaches in the field – was essentially informed by findings from the social sciences.[26] Having been one of the first of its kind on the continent, the MINVU even attracted European visitors who wanted to study a ministry that united competences for housing and regional planning first-hand.[27] Professionals in Chile during the period of 1964–1970 started to concentrate on local necessities, to tentatively reject influential external models like the British one, and to instead frame their spatial belonging differently.

3. Brazil (1964–1985): Slum Evictions and Third Worldism

In March 1962, the São Paulo-based architectural magazine *Habitat* self-confidently declared, that Brazilians were able to solve the housing shortage problem themselves: "[o]ur technical development has reached a level that renders the importation of foreign 'know-how' pointless."[28] According to architect Joaquim Guedes, who is quoted in the article, external aid like the Alliance for Progress of US-American origin should not play a role when elaborating a National Housing Plan. Instead, as in the case of the construction of Brasília (1957–1960),[29] the emphasis should be on the strength of Brazilian development and the potentials as a "new nation" that was "object and subject of its own history and destiny".[30] Foreshadowing arguments popular among dependency theorists towards the end of the 1960s, Guedes further holds that deficits in housing were a direct consequence of Brazil's "underdevelopment" and could not be solved in an isolated manner:

---

24   Ibid., 289.

25   ¿Qué pasa en el MINVU?, p. 5.

26   Exemplary proof of this is the inventory of the Library of the Argentine Sociedad Central de Arquitectos (SCA). Publications authored by the Chilean MINVU, like Ministerio de Vivienda y Urbanismo, Bases del Concurso Internacional Área de Remodelación en el Centro de Santiago, Chile, Santiago de Chile 1972 were purchased shortly after they first came out.

27   Hidalgo Dattwyler, La vivienda social, p. 289.

28   Habitação, subproduto da independência econômica, in: Habitat 67 (1962).

29   While the new capital was inaugurated in April 1960, many buildings such as the Catedral Metropolitana Nossa Senhora Aparecida were only finished afterwards.

30   Habitação, subproduto da independência econômica.

"On the contrary, housing will be a by-product of Brazil's development and economic independence".[31]

While this quote speaks to the pride and self-confidence for having planned and built a new capital from scratch in a relatively short period of time, Brazil did in fact belong to the main recipient countries of external aid from the Alliance for Progress – funds which were partly allocated for the housing sector.[32] While Brasília was celebrated internationally as either an example of "tropical modernism" or Brazil's or Latin America's contribution to international modernism, the city was not especially well-known for its social housing. Its planners were actually later criticized for having ignored that question altogether.[33] Besides representative buildings, the original "plano piloto", which was shaped like an aeroplane, only contained superblocks (*superquadras*) with apartment houses for government employees. As is widely known, the city rapidly exceeded the envisaged size of 500,000 inhabitants.[34] Workers from the northeast involved in the original construction works did not return to their region of origin but settled in the new capital and a few years after its inauguration, the first satellite towns and slums sprawled.[35]

Since 1946, the *Fundação da Casa Popular* (FCP) had been the main federal organ responsible for public housing for the whole of Brazil. Although it was founded during the administration of President Eurico Gaspar Dutra (1946–1951), preparations had already been under way in the last years of Getúlio Vargas' government (1930–1945). From the late 1950s on, the country experienced massive waves of migration to the cities. Newcomers mainly settled in informal urban quarters and favelas that would become the site of multiple tensions during João Goulart's presidency (1961–1964). Reacting to these challenges, the military government that came to power in April 1964 prioritized the "urban question":[36] In August, it created the Banco Nacional da Habitação (BNH) that replaced the Fundação da Casa Popular (FCP) as the central institution for public housing.[37] Furthermore, it instituted a National Housing Plan as well as a Federal Service for Housing and Urbanism (Serviço Federal de Habitação e Urbanismo). Both were to symbolize the beginning of a new housing policy. These new organs meant further centralization: the new housing plan established a single decision-making entity in the form of the BNH that henceforth coordinated the division of labour between public and private actors.[38]

---

31   Ibid.

32   J. F. Taffet, Foreign Aid as Foreign Policy. The Alliance for Progress in Latin America, New York 2007, pp. 95, 119.

33   For Niemeyer's opinion on social housing, see I. Flagge and P. Andreas (eds.), Oscar Niemeyer. A Legend of Modernism, Basel 2013.

34   Brasília already had 546,015 inhabitants as early as 1970; that number had risen to 1,176,935 in 1980 (M. Bursztyn and C. H. Araújo, Da utopia á exclusão. Vivendo nas ruas em Brasília, Rio de Janeiro 1997, p. 27).

35   C. Krohn, Order and Progress: Oscar Niemeyer, Urbanist, in: Flagge and Andreas (eds.), Oscar Niemeyer, pp. 37–44, 42.

36   Azevedo and Andrade, Habitação e poder, p. 41.

37   M. Peters, Apartments for Workers. Social Housing, Segregation, and Stigmatization in Urban Brazil, Baden-Baden 2018, pp. 58–59.

38   Azevedo and Andrade, Habitação e poder, pp. 39–40, 46.

Primarily directed at the urban working class, the construction of housing also served the purpose of making the regime appear sensitive to social problems and granting it consent.[39] Like Getúlio Vargas in the early 1950s, the dictatorship hoped that home ownership among workers would prevent them from adhering to leftist political convictions. A further economic incentive for setting up the BNH was the number of new jobs in the construction industry. The Sistema Financeiro de Habitação (SFH) and the Fundo de Garantia do Tempo de Serviço (FGTS), both of which in turn depended on the BNH, were to secure the funding of the different building projects. The FGTS was financed through employer's contributions.[40] Thus combining forms of compulsory and voluntary saving, this new approach aimed to prevent clientelism and corporatist structures that, in the eyes of the military leaders, earlier institutions such as the FCP, partly based on social security agencies, had been prone to.[41]

Until 1986, the BNH was responsible for the construction of a total of 2.4 million housing units.[42] While the first five years of the regime thus witnessed the institutionalization of public housing, from which, however, mainly the middle class and not the urban poor benefitted, investment in the sector started to rapidly decline starting in 1969.[43] The government then increasingly shut down democratic channels and began evictions of slums in big cities, especially in Rio de Janeiro. "Desfavelamento"[44] as it was called became its main urbanist intervention in the following years.[45] Political authorities perceived uncontrolled growth of favelas as an offense to their notion of "orderly" cities.[46] An emblematic episode was the removal of the favela Ilha das Dragas in the quarter of Lagoa and the resettlement of its dwellers to Cidade de Deus in the western periphery of Rio de Janeiro in 1968, where they were provided with alternative housing which, however, quickly fell into decay. In internal documents by the federal agency Coordenação de Habitação de Interesse Social da Área Metropolitana do Grande Rio (CHISAM, created in 1968), this step was presented as the integration of the ex-*favelados* into society, which reveals the regime's technocratic character.[47] Although the original plan to remove all favelas by 1976 could not be fulfilled, until its dissolution in 1973, the CHISAM was responsible for the eviction of 175,000 favela dwellers from 62 favelas, transferring them to around 35,000 new housing units, the majority of them in the north and west of Rio de Janeiro.[48]

---

39   Ibid., p. 47.
40   Peters, Apartments for Workers, p. 59.
41   Azevedo and Andrade, Habitação e poder, pp. 43, 45.
42   Peters, Apartments for Workers, p. 60.
43   Ibid.
44   M. S. Brum, Ditadura civil-militar e favelas: Estigma e restrições ao debate sobre a cidade (1969–1973), in: Cadernos Metrópole 28 (2012) 14, pp. 357–379, at 362.
45   Peters, Apartments for Workers, p. 61.
46   Brum, Ditadura civil-militar e favelas, p. 359.
47   Ibid., p. 362.
48   Ibid., p. 371.

Despite its alignment with the United States, in its foreign policy the military dictator-ship in practice actually fostered diplomatic and economic relations with the so-called "Third World": While before 1964 the attempt to diversify foreign trade partners had been limited to Latin America and had resulted in the creation of the Associação Lati-no-Americana de Livre-Comércio (ALALC), for example, by 1967, Brazil had signed a series of trade agreements with African countries. In the Brazilian foreign ministry, new geographic divisions for Africa, the Middle East, Asia and Oceania were established and diplomatic missions opened in recently independent countries in these parts of the world.[49] The government furthermore fulfilled a protagonist role in international forums of "Third World" countries, like the Group of 77 that was created at the first United Na-tions Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) in 1964. [50]

Concomitantly in academia, since the late 1950s, Brazilian social sciences had been at the forefront of coining the concept of *terceiromundismo* (Third Worldism); numerous respective thematic research institutions and publications were founded. Third World-ism meant a favourable attitude towards, and a special interest in, Africa and Asia, two continents with which exponents of that intellectual current showed their solidarity.[51] While the Instituto Brasileiro de Estudos Afro-Asiáticos – as part of the public Instituto Superior de Estudos Brasileiros (ISEB) – and the Centro de Estudos Afro-Orientais at the Universidade Federal de Bahia were early creations, the 1964 military coup did not represent a turning point with respect to the institutionalization of Third Worldism in Brazil: In 1965, for example, the Centro de Estudos Africanos (CEA) at the Uni-versidade de São Paulo with its journal África followed.[52] Together with the CEPAL in Chile, Brazilian academia was one of the main centres of Third Worldism in Latin America; and from social sciences, it quickly permeated other disciplines in the country, such as aesthetics and international studies, and notably the Brazilian Catholic Church as well.[53] Third Worldism in Brazil experienced a downswing in the 1970s following the aggravated political situation for intellectuals since 1969; media on the topic from other Latin American countries was nevertheless still published in the country: For example, *Cadernos do Terceiro Mundo*, the Brazilian version of a Mexican journal, was launched in 1980.[54]

Maybe due to this heightened sensitivity of Brazilian intellectuals towards the so-called "Third World" and following the international prominence of Brasília, especially in the Global South, architectural magazines in the country were very attentive to coverage on Brazilian architecture in foreign media. Already in August 1963, the Rio-based journal *Módulo*, edited by Oscar Niemeyer, reported on the growing interest in Brazilian archi-

---

49   S. Khalil and V. C. Alves, Ideias e Política Externa. As Relações do Brasil com o Terceiro Mundo durante o Governo Castelo Branco, in: Contexto Internacional 36 (2014), pp. 683–708, at 683, 692, 696.
50   Khalil, Alves, Ideias e Política Externa, pp. 699–700.
51   Alburquerque, Tercer Mundo, p. 178.
52   Ibid., pp. 177, 182.
53   Ibid., pp. 177, 186.
54   Ibid., pp. 187–188, 190–191.

tecture in Japan as could be seen in the country's most renowned architectural magazine *Kindai Kentiku*. The article very meticulously cites the number of pages (36) and photographs (32) dedicated to the Brazilian pavilion at the V. Feira Internacional de Amostras in Tokio by Manoel K. Corrêa and the Hakone International Congress Palace planned at that time by Brazilian architect Wilson Reis Netto. The author sees proof of the continuing interest of the Japanese in Brazilian architecture in the fact that photographer Yukio Fukagawa was preparing a whole book on the topic, which was to come out the following year.[55]

The Brazilian Foreign Ministry was also very active in organizing exhibitions on Brazilian architecture abroad, for example in Chandigarh, India in 1963. Of course, this location was not chosen by chance but because it was planned from scratch by the Swiss-French architect Le Corbusier as the new capital of the states Punjab and Haryana in the 1950s. The exhibition was held in the library of Punjab University, also designed by Le Corbusier from 1952–1958, together with the iconic court, secretariat and assembly buildings. The Brazilian ambassador to India, upon whose initiative the exhibition took place, in his opening speech explicitly related Chandigarh to Brasília.[56] This parallelization not only speaks of the confidence after the erection of the new Brazilian capital, but also of the identification as a "Third World" country and the conditions, challenges, but also opportunities of planning there.

After the military coup in April 1964, *Módulo* ceased its publication after just a few issues and was relaunched only 11 years later in September 1975. Its editor-in-chief Oscar Niemeyer, a self-declared communist, went into exile in 1965. Yet this step and his political beliefs did not prevent him from accepting commissions by the Brazilian military government.[57] When *Módulo* reappeared, Niemeyer, in a 1976 article "Brazilian architecture in Algeria", looked back on the design of a university campus there eight years earlier, highlighting the belonging of Brazilians and Algerians to the "Third World" as well as the African origins of the former. He further praised the Socialist regime of the second Algerian president after independence, Houari Boumedienne, which he witnessed firsthand during the construction of the campus.[58]

Beyond highlighting being part of the "Third World" as a commonality, in the journal there is a pronounced interest in "young African nations", that – like Brazil until 1822 – had been a Portuguese colony until the more recent past. As other contemporary authors also argued, this colonial dependence on Portugal, and colonial dependence in general for that matter; had effects on the cities and the urban structure of the countries that could still be perceived. One case in point was the existence of one big city, the capital or a port city, from which in colonial times primary goods had been exported while the rest

55   Arquiteitura brasileira no Japão, in: Módulo 34 (1963), pp. 50–51.
56   Arquiteitura brasileira na Índia, in: Módulo 33 (1963), p. 44.
57   N. Maak, The curves of life – an interview with Osar Niemeyer, in: Flagge and Andreas (eds.), Oscar Niemeyer, pp. 21–26, 25.
58   O. Niemeyer, Arquiteitura brasileira na Argélia, in: Módulo 43 (1976), pp. 16–29, at 20.

of the country was predominantly rural.[59] A 1977 article in *Módulo* maintains that the colonial legacy in Maputo could be seen in a very modern city centre and a periphery of spontaneous housing without any planning.[60] The journal even sent its Paris correspondent to Mozambique, which had become independent in 1975, in order for her to report first hand "on the great work that the leaders of Frelimo had realized for their fatherland that is finally free of colonial rule". Apart from the former colonial dependence on Portugal, rural exodus is named as a common problem that afflicted both Mozambique and Brazil. As a solution, it proposes limiting the growth of the capital Maputo to a maximum number of 1.5 million inhabitants (to be reached in 1985) as well as agricultural development and the building of self-sufficient communal villages ("aldeias comunais autosuficientes") as measures to prevent peasants from migrating to the cities.[61] In a subsequent interview with Mozambican Public Works Minister Julio Carillo, when asked about the role of the architect in "Third World"-societies, he declares: "The architect should not only be a technician, but also a militant. […] He should know how to materialize the ideas and aspiration of the people."[62] While this statement was probably in line with Niemeyer's own convictions, it could not have been further from the posture of the military dictatorship in Brazil. Despite the increasingly restrictive political climate, Brazilian urbanists remained interested in an exchange, primarily with African countries, regarding questions of housing – a realm that the Brazilian government had completely abandoned from the late 1960s on.

4. Mexico (1970–1988): Heyday of Public Housing and Haven for Exiled Urban Planners

Whereas authoritarian regimes in Brazil and many other Latin American countries took urban planning and social housing off their agenda in the 1970s, in formally still democratic Mexico it experienced a downright boom.[63] While public housing in the 1960s had mainly been directed at the middle class, such as the famous housing complex Conjunto Urbano Nonoalco-Tlatelolco designed by Mario Pani and finished in 1964, from the 1970s onwards, broader sectors of the population and especially the lower income strata became the principal target group.[64] Until the end of the following decade, the construction of public housing under the continuously governing PRI party reached an unprecedented scale in numeric terms: Between 1973 and 1987, the Mexican govern-

---

59   Quijano, Dependencia, pp. 168, 173–174.
60   M. Rossard, Moçambique, 1977, in: Módulo 47 (1977), pp. 20–31, at 26.
61   Ibid., p. 24.
62   Ibid., p. 28.
63   G. Garza and D. Araceli, Cincuenta años de investigación urbana y regional en México, 1940–1991, Mexico City 1996, p. 78.
64   C. Puebla Cadena, Del intervencionismo estatal a las estrategias facilitadoras. Los cambios en la política de vivienda en México, 1972–1994, Mexico City 2002, p. 40.

ment arranged for 1.5 million housing units to be built.[65] This trend had major effects at the legislative and institutional level: In 1972, Luis Echeverría's government (1970–1976) created the Instituto del Fondo Nacional de la Vivienda para los Trabajadores (INFONAVIT) that granted working-class applicants loans to purchase publicly built living space. These loans were funded through employers' and employees' contributions and tax revenues.[66] For lower income groups residing in Mexico City, the responsibility lay with the Dirección General de Habitaciones Populares del Departamento del Distrito Federal (DGHP-DDF), that in 1981 was replaced by the Fondo Nacional de Habitaciones Populares (FONHAPO). Starting in 1972, civil servants could turn to the Fondo de la Vivienda del Instituto de Seguridad y Servicios Sociales para los Trabajadores del Estado (FOVISSSTE) if they were interested in acquiring property.[67]

In 1976, Echeverría's successor José López Portillo (1976–1982) passed a General Law on Human Settlements (Ley General de Asentamientos Humanos) in reaction to the UN Conference Habitat I in Vancouver, Canada. He furthermore set up a homonymous State Secretariat (Secretaría de Asentamientos Humanos y Obras Públicas, SAHOP). Mexico's leading architectural journal *Arquitectura México* celebrated López Portillo's election: "For the first time in the history of Mexico an expert in urban planning has been elected president of the Republic".[68] Having been part of a commission for urban development before becoming president, he had been in charge of the institutionalization of the land use plans and had initiated a study on the topic – the article goes on to explore the reasons why these were hardly ever followed.

The continued high public expenditure on housing in the second half of the 1970s was possible because, in contrast to other Latin American countries, Mexico had overcome the oil crisis in 1973 rather unharmed due to its own deposits. At the beginning of the 1980s, the nationalization of the bank at the peak of the debt crisis enabled the government to continue allocating public funds for the housing sector, which would receive the most resources until the end of the decade. In spite of the tense economic situation, the construction of public housing became the social policy par excellence for Miguel de la Madrid's government from which he tried to draw legitimacy especially vis-à-vis the powerful labour unions. During his administration (1982-1988), an Understate Secretariat of Housing (Subsecretaría de Vivienda) was founded as part of the newly formed Secretariat of Urban Development and Ecology (Secretaría de Desarrollo Urbano y Ecología*)*. Furthermore, the right to "decent housing" ("vivienda digna") was incorporated into the constitution (Art. 4).[69]

Beyond legislative and institutional reforms, urban development advanced to a central research topic in Mexico and numerous academic institutions concerned with regional and urban planning sprang up. For example, at the prestigious Colegio de México, the

---

65   M. Schteingart, Espacio y vivienda en la ciudad de México, Mexico City 1998, p. 26.
66   Puebla Cadena, Del intervencionismo estatal, p. 47.
67   Ibid., pp. 47, 51–52.
68   M. Pani, El presidente electo y el urbanismo, in: Arquitectura México 111 (1976), p. 2, at 2.
69   Puebla Cadena, Del intervencionismo estatal, pp. 42, 44.

area urban studies (*Estudios Urbanos*) and the master programme urban development (*Desarrollo Urbano*) were initiated in 1976. At the Architecture Department of the UNAM (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México), the country's most important university, a postgraduate programme in urbanism was created. The 1970s also saw a decisive increase in academic publications on urban and regional planning in disciplines as diverse as demography, sociology, geography, history, and economy.[70]

There is reasonable evidence that a great number of planners and researchers from other Latin American countries, especially from the Southern Cone that was under dictatorial rule, who were living in exile in Mexico influenced these developments. To name just a few examples from Argentina, where a military coup d'etat ended democratic rule in March 1976: architect Martha Schteingart, who had worked at the Argentine Centro de Estudios Urbanos y Regionales (CEUR) and the Sociedad Interamericana de Planificación (SIAP) and had spent part of her professional life in Chile (1968–1973), had already left her home country for Mexico in the tumultuous political climate of 1975 to become a professor for urban development at the aforementioned El Colegio de México.[71] Her husband, political scientist Marcos Kaplan, who accompanied her, was one of the central authors who wrote about planning in Mexico in the 1970s.[72]

Another architect was Argentine Eduardo Fernando Catalano, who had studied at the University of Buenos Aires, worked in urban planning in Chile and Peru and as an academic teacher in the US and Venezuela. In Mexico, he not only taught university courses, but also collaborated with the INFONAVIT, the Project of a National Plan of Urban Development, and published in the journal *Arquitectura México.*[73]

Apart from Latin American scholars and practitioners of urban planning who travelled or fled from one place to another, the trend of Latinamericanization can also be traced in contemporary publications on the topic, like *Arquitectura México*. After relaunching the journal in 1976, editor-in-chief and famous architect Mario Pani declared that, apart from Mexico, the coverage on foreign countries would focus on those that were most similar to Mexico ("los países que nos son más afines"), such as the Spanish American ones ("los de América Hispánica"). Therefore, the journal would establish a network of correspondents in Latin American countries.[74] One possible explanation for this re-orientation towards similar countries is given in a quote by President López Portillo in the same issue: according to him, "poor countries" (in contrast to "rich countries"), a category in which he included Mexico, needed more careful planning as they had fewer means at their disposal and therefore could not afford to waste them.[75]

70   Garza and Araceli, Cincuenta años, pp. 78–80.

71   Ibid., pp. 78–79.

72   See e.g. M. Kaplan, Aspectos politicos de la planificación en América Latina, Montevideo 1972; M. Kaplan, La reforma urbana en América Latina, in: Comercio exterior 22 (1972) 7, pp. 635–642.

73   F. Catalano, Hacia un Desarrollo Urbano y Rural Integrado, in: Arquitectura México 113 (1977), pp. 30–37, at 30.

74   M. Pani, De nuevo con ustedes, in: Arquitectura México 111 (1976), pp. 3–4, at 4.

75   Pani, El presidente electo, p. 2.

The categorization of "poor countries" or "the poor" was also extended to countries outside Latin America and appeared in the review section, where in September/October 1976 a book by the Egyptian author Hassan Fathy with the title "Arquitectura para los pobres" ("Architecture for the poor") was critiqued. In contrast to the centralized Mexican approach and more similar to other Latin American countries, that by then had adopted a more laissez-faire attitude, the publication recommended "autoconstrucción" and "the active participation of the users" in the building process. Centralized public bureaucracies were prone to wasting resources and therefore unable to effectively solve the housing problem, the argument goes on.[76]

As part of the new focus on "similar countries", a competition for planning a new quarter in Manila made it to the news section of the November/December edition of *Arquitectura México* in 1976. The challenge consisted of improving the lives of rural immigrants who had settled in the Philippine capital's periphery – a problem that of course also afflicted Latin American countries in general and Mexico in particular.[77] While the winner of the competition was, however, from New Zealand, three Mexican architects who had apparently participated received mention.

As the coverage in architectural journals shows, Mexico of the 1970s not only became a hub of Latin American architects and urban planners, but urbanism as it was practiced there became more oriented towards Latin American and "Third World" countries.

5. Concluding Remarks

From the beginning of the 1960s, urbanism in Latin America experienced a twofold process of Latinamericanization: first, personal exchange intensified among local urbanists who travelled back and forth and visited newly founded research and planning institutions. From the 1970s onwards, however, these movements became increasingly involuntary as they were often due to regime changes in their respective home country that forced professionals into exile. Second, urbanism in its contents became "latinamericanized": experts paid closer attention to what they saw as the specificities of cities on the subcontinent. Rather than solving the housing shortage by importing policies from the Global North, Latin American urbanists opted to look at other societies that seemed to face similar political, economic and planning challenges of the time. Beyond Latin America, the "Third World" provided a common denominator and symbolic space to which they felt appurtenant. Most "Third World" countries were ex-colonies, which had long-lasting impacts on their national economies, and thus the state of their cities. How to provide the growing urban population with housing despite limited financial resources was therefore a common problem.

---

76   Notas bibliográficas, in: Arquitectura México 111 (1976), p. 61.
77   Noticias, in: Arquitectura México 112 (1976), pp. 126–128, at 127.

Initially, and as the Chilean example shows, economists, social scientists, and urbanists in the intellectual climate of *desarrollismo* were convinced that through proper state planning, any "backwardness" could be overcome. For the housing sector, the Frei administration entrusted this task to an entirely new ministry that also benefitted from studies conducted by the CEPAL. This optimism of the early and mid-1960s inspired many foreign planners, and the housing units built by the Chilean MINVU were reported on in architectural journals all over Latin America. However, high inflation rates and an unstable economic situation curbed not only other social reforms, but also led Frei to turn to intermediate housing solutions like the *operaciones sitio* (self-help housing). Contemporary critics towards the end of the decade ascribed this lack of success to the clumsiness of the MINVU and questioned whether a state ministry was the appropriate agent to tackle the housing shortage.

Different from the Chilean experience, the Brazilian military dictatorship that installed itself in 1964 made a bank the central institution of its housing policies: The BNH sought to prevent the clientelism of earlier solutions and to regulate the relationship between the public and private sector, the latter being responsible for the execution. Yet in fact, the lower-income groups' access to housing became even more difficult. Towards the end of the 1960s, when investments in public housing dwindled, it was obvious that the regime's initial commitment had mainly been of a strategic nature. With its authoritarian turn in 1968, the government became less and less dependent on a favourable public opinion. Just as with other later military dictatorships like the one in Chile starting in 1973, the Brazilian military regime's main urbanist interest then was to ban inner-city slums from view.

Although the government at first did not hinder intellectuals' efforts to theorize the concept of the "Third World" (*terceiromundismo*) and itself fostered foreign relations with Africa and Asia, in the Brazilian case it was rather individual urbanists that got in touch with colleagues in the Global South and who benefitted from their prominence after the construction of Brasília.

Mexican planners and architects in the 1970s were equally interested in exchange with other Latin American and "Third World" countries and, as opposed to their Brazilian and Chilean counterparts under military regimes, they continued to receive public commissions. Until the late 1980s, public expenditure in the housing sector remained among the highest on the subcontinent. This construction boom not only brought about several legislative and institutional innovations, but also established urban and regional planning as academic research topics. Institutions like the UNAM and El Colegio de México created new departments and degree programmes, and together with state agencies they hosted Latin American researchers and urbanists that had fled from dictatorships elsewhere.

For the overall aim of a transnational intellectual history of public housing in Latin America from the 1960 to 1980s, the individual careers and biographies of these exiled urban planners (not only in Mexico), however, still need to be reconstructed. Other queries that remain to be investigated in more detail concern the specificity of urban

planning *for* Latin America or the "Third World" that contemporaries strove to coin. And lastly, it would be pertinent to know if and how the supposed Latinamericanization materialized in the results of this planning.