Hidden in Plain Sight

POLITICS AND DESIGN IN STATE-SUBSIDIZED RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECTURE

Editors
RUI JORGE GARCIA RAMOS
VIRGÍLIO BORGES PEREIRA
MARTA ROCHA MOREIRA
SÉRGIO DIAS SILVA

Photo Essay by
TIAGO CASANOVA

PARK BOOKS

TITLE

Hidden in Plain Sight: Politics and Design in State-Subsidized Residential Architecture

EDITORS

Rui Jorge Garcia Ramos
Virgílio Borges Pereira
Marta Rocha Moreira
Sergio Dias Silva

COPY-EDITING AND PROOFREADING

David Tucker

PUBLISHER

Park Books

GRAPHIC DESIGN AND PAGINATION

Cristina Amil
Sergio Dias Silva

COVER IMAGE

Affordable Houses Estate of Agualva-Cacém
(Archs. Alberto Pessoa and João Abel Manta, Landscape Arch. Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles, Sintra, 1965–1976)
© Tiago Casanova / University of Porto, Faculty of Architecture

The [MdH XXX] code refers to the record numbers in the Mapping Public Housing Database, available at
http://mappingpublichousing.up.pt/en/database/

FCT
Fundação
para a Ciência
e a Tecnologia

UNIVERSIDADE
DO PORTO
FACULDADE
DE ARQUITECTURA

U.PORTO

CENTRO
DE ESTUDOS
DE ARQUITECTURA
E URBANISMO
CEAU

Hidden in Plain Sight
POLITICS AND DESIGN IN STATE-SUBSIDIZED RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECTURE

Editors
RUI JORGE GARCIA RAMOS
VIRGÍLIO BORGES PEREIRA
MARTA ROCHA MOREIRA
SÉRGIO DIAS SILVA

Photo Essay by
TIAGO CASANOVA

PARK BOOKS

Table of Contents

Housing Programmes and the Construction of the Portuguese City: the Realization of Modernity in the First Half of the Twentieth Century

TERESA CALIX

University of Porto, Faculty of Architecture, Centre for Studies in Architecture and Urbanism

ABSTRACT

The 1950s, in Portugal, are the years of the reunion with modernism. This late fulfilment of the Modern Movement reduced its capacity for urban achievement and assigned the mission of contributing to the expansion of the existing city to interventions. The construction of the Portuguese city that had taken place until this decade was achieved by adding "fragments" as a continuum, expanding the existing urban areas and contradicting the more comprehensive rationales of understanding and actions with greater autonomy and capacity for transformation that the Modern Movement projected.

Taking the housing programmes promoted by the state in the first half of the twentieth century as the central topic of this article, we will try to establish a relation between their evolution and accomplishment and Portuguese urban development. By placing the instruments of formal urbanism and the housing programmes in confrontation, the two practices that intersect and transform the territory, we will try to show how the principles of modern urban development have been systematically reversed: the housing areas promoted were often responsible for the implementation of new urban axes or grids and new districts of urban growth; while the plans drawn up in this period, although quite numerous and connected to the political view and promoting the image of the regime, sometimes fell short of effective realization, despite what might have been expected.

BIOGRAPHY

Teresa Calix graduated in architecture (1998), has a master's in urban planning and design (2002) and a PhD in architecture (2013), with a PhD thesis that focused on the morphologies of the contemporary city. Currently she is assistant professor at FAUP, where she is the coordinator of the study profile Dynamics and Urban Forms of the PhD Programme in Architecture and she is the head of the course Projecto 5–urban design studio–of the Integrated Master's in Architecture. She also collaborates in the course Urban Project Studio of the Master's in Spatial Planning and Urban Project (from FAUP and Faculty of Engineering of the University of Porto). Her teaching activity, particularly that related to practical exercises in the scope of the courses, workshops, and summer schools referred to, is used as an opportunity to deepen the relations with the municipalities of Porto Metropolitan Area and with experts of several areas of knowledge, bridging the gap between university/students and professionals. She is also the coordinator of the research group Morphologies and Dynamics of the Territory of the Centre for Studies in Architecture and Urbanism (MDT-CEAU-FAUP) and has participated in several research and consultancy projects.

With the aim of contributing to the debate on the production of the modern city, this article will try to establish a relationship between the evolution and the diffusion of the housing programmes promoted by the state in the twentieth century and Portuguese urban development, culminating in the processes underlying the modern city of the 1950s.

The *Centro de Estudos de Urbanismo e Habitação Engenheiro Duarte Pacheco*, a Centre for Studies in Urbanism and Housing of the Ministry of Public Works,[1] was responsible for a publication in 1963 focusing on the housing policy of the period mentioned, in which it was acknowledged that *"as the real knowledge of the country's housing needs became more acute, the government was able to face a more important intervention within an indispensable range of priorities, conditioned by the economic viability of its budgets."*[2] This document also established that the years preceding it (1955–1962) *"are characterized by a marked evolution in the housing and spatial planning sectors (which in turn will be reflected in the future) and is a positive indication of a strong government orientation."*[3]

This publication, a disclosure document from the government at the time and stating the efforts in housing, allows not only an understanding of the actions developed in the years prior to its date of release, but also the sequence of facts that it describes, which shows an overlap between different deliberations and the dependence between effects and spaces of decision in which the list of legislation produced stands out. Similarly, it is considered that the different times of production, implementation, and reformulation of the diverse measures and the evolution of the political, economic, and social circumstances directly influencing the 1950s cannot be understood without going back in time. Thus, taking the housing programmes as central to the reflection and accepting as relevant a reading bearing in mind the chain of procedures in time, the proposal that is presented assumes two cross-perspectives: one is that attending to the instruments of formal urbanism tries to show the models that influenced the elaboration of plans and the corresponding understanding about the city that these disseminate; and another that accepts that *"the identification between modern city and residential proposals of the modern architecture is valid, since these constitute the background fabric on which the idea of the city elaborated by the architectural culture of the first half of the twentieth century rests."*[4] This assumption, valid for any context, is particularly interesting for the Portuguese circumstances since, in many situations, certain elements considered structural in the scope of the urban space development have been, or are, ensured by interventions that meet the scale of architectural resolution and not by means of the direct implementation of previously produced planning instruments.

[1] Decree-Law 44,948, 29 March 1963, creates and defines the attributions of the *Centro de Estudos de Urbanismo e Habitação Engenheiro Duarte Pacheco* operating close to the cabinet of the Minister of Public Works. It recognizes "the advantage of promoting and disseminating the study on the problems of urban planning and housing in all aspects related to modern technical processes and systems of action in the field of national, regional, and local planning."

[2] Alves de Sousa (dir), *A Habitação em Portugal* (Lisboa: Ministério das Obras Públicas, Centro de Estudos de Urbanismo e Habitação Engenheiro Duarte Pacheco, 1963), 13.

[3] Sousa, *A Habitação em Portugal*, 13.

[4] Carlos Martí Arís, "Las formas de la residencia en la ciudad moderna," in *Las Formas de la Residencia en la Ciudad Moderna: Vivienda y Ciudad en la Europa de Entreguerras*, ed. Carlos Martí Arís (Barcelona: Edicions UPC, 2000), 3.

Teresa Calix

By placing in confrontation the two practices that overlap in the territory but do not always converge—which even allows us to show the relevance of this point of view in contemporary Portuguese territory—we will try to show how the principles of modern urban development have been systematically reversed. In fact, the new housing programmes were often responsible for the implementation of new urban axes or grids and new areas of urban growth, and also imposed the new conditions of its design, considering the influences of the international framework and the modern standards of hygiene and comfort of the dwellings.

These contributed, or not, to the accomplishment of the proposals contained in the plans that preceded them. In this context, the modern international housing proposals that are presented as alternatives *"to the speculative city generated by the nineteenth century industrial development, in which many of the features that defined the traditional city had disappeared,"*[5] will serve as references to the solutions realized in the twentieth century in Portugal. However, they will occur later in time, with specificities (and inconsistencies, associated with the political influence of the dictatorial regime of Oliveira Salazar[6]), and, above all, will reveal a scale of expansion of existing urban settlements that is much less dramatic when compared to that of the great European cities.

Indeed, while in the international context the Modern Movement evolved from the 1920s to the years after World War II, the 1950s in Portugal were the decade of reunion with modernism, following a movement of strong politicization succeeding the I *Congresso Nacional dos Arquitectos*, the first national congress of architects, in 1948. The principles of the Athens Charter were then assumed as those that must guide a response to the structural problem of housing that had dragged on and increased since the beginning of the twentieth century.

Nevertheless, the complete but late fulfilment of the Modern Movement in Portugal is reduced in its capacity of urban achievement by two orders of reasons: firstly, it was delayed in its realization due to the diffusion of the political image of fascist nationalism of the late 1930s and especially of the 1940s, which matches the apogee of its national discussion and dissemination with the beginning of its international critique; secondly, the neutrality of Portugal and its non-participation in World War I deprived it of the European reconstruction dimension, assigning the mission of contributing to the expansion of the existing city and as a continuum from it to the interventions.

5 Martí Arís, "Las formas de la residência en la ciudad moderna," 4.

6 Oliveira Salazar (1889–1970) was the promoter of Estado Novo (1933–1974) and its political organization; he directed the destiny of Portugal as dictatorial president of the Ministry between 1932 and 1933 and as President of the Council of Ministers between 1933 and 1968.

In this period can be recognized, on the one hand, an evolution resulting from the "affirmation of urbanism as a generalized social practice [. . .] as a result of the voluntarist action of Duarte Pacheco"[7] from the 1930s. However, on the other hand, while many influences of European urbanism and architecture did reach Portugal, the exaltation of the principles of the Athens Charter and the claim of a modernist city from 1948 onwards is not unrelated to the contradictions that arose alongside the undisputed weight of traditionalist ruralism, and the devices created for the exaltation and reproduction of nationalism. The latter was particularly celebrated in the 1940s, *"inflicting with a monumental and historicist flavour the 'ephemeral' modernism that at first interested to Estado Novo,"*[8] the authoritarian regime installed in Portugal.

Thus, considering that urbanism and architecture are recognized as inseparable parts of the project of modernization of cities, the specificity of the modern project of the Portuguese city requires recognition of the different moments of its evolution in the period of industrialization, despite its relatively moderate size. It also implies understanding the machine of capitalism that, in order to respond to the increase in the demanding consumption-production dichotomy, led to a significant increase in urban population and subsequent deterioration of housing conditions in the city.

For this reason, starting with a significantly synthesized historical overview, this article begins at the turn of the 20th century and focuses on the promotion of housing in the development of urban territories. It is organized in three parts, after which the final considerations follow:

- Ephemeral hygienist modernism;
- The influence of the formal model of the Garden City;
- The integration of the canons of the Modern Movement.

[7] Margarida Souza Lôbo, *Planos de Urbanização: A Época de Duarte Pacheco* (Porto: DGOTDU, FAUP Publicações, 1995), 13. Duarte Pacheco (1900–1943) was the Minister of Public Works, responsible for planning, transports, and all kinds of public intervention; he imposed urbanism as a generalized social practice by passing a law that created urbanization plans and gave full powers to the municipalities to take over the transformation of their territory.

[8] Ana Tostões, *A Idade Maior: Cultura e Tecnologia na Arquitectura Moderna Portuguesa* (Porto: FAUP Publicações, 2015), 377.

Teresa Calix

1. EPHEMERAL HYGIENIST MODERNISM

The Improvement Plans—*Planos Gerais de Melhoramentos*—resulting from the imposition of the Decree-Law of 19 January 1865, instated modern urbanistic concerns[9] for the first time in formal urbanism, although limited to a "regulatory pre-urbanism."[10] However, "without a great critical sense or a particular view of the shape of the city that goes beyond the effect of 'beautification' in imitation of European cities,"[11] the plans drawn up were particularly directed at controlling the relationship between private investment and public space so as "to meet the indispensable conditions of light, ventilation, water supply and drainage of sewage."[12] Thus, the shape of the city remained of secondary importance. Only in Lisbon and Porto did the plans aim a little further on the definition of the models for growth. Thus, the effort and the urgency of drawing up the plans resulting from the legislation, dragging through the first decades of the twentieth century, shows that *"Portuguese industrialization was late and mainly concentrated in Lisbon and Oporto. The effects of industrialization in these two cities were felt more intensely from the second half of the nineteenth century and constitute a catalogue of problems familiar to urban historians and common to other eighteenth-century cities: growth of the urban population and increase in housing density, development of precarious housing solutions and overcrowding of residential areas, degraded urban areas and poor sanitary conditions."[13] The *vilas* and *pátios* of Lisbon and the *ilhas* of Porto, examples of this precariousness, increased greatly in this period.

During this period, a number of relevant urban renewal proposals were devised, although they were confined to particular urban sectors,[14] as well as some modern views of broader urban development, even though they did not materialize.[15] The political and economic difficulties of the 1920s—associated with participation in World War I and intensified by the Great Depression of 1929—and the internal migratory flows—stemming from the industrialization process of a hitherto essentially agricultural country—not only failed to provide reliable solutions as they further exacerbated *"the housing needs of a growing population, with a clear trend towards concentration among large population centres and the difficulty of most of the population in meeting the rental costs required for housing built under a free-trade regime (without direct or indirect aid of the State)."[16]* In fact, the imbalance between housing demand and supply would not diminish with the promulgation of the "Decree-Laws 4,137 of 25 April 1918, 4,163 of 29 April 1918, and 5,443 of 26 April 1919, which had the objective of encouraging the construction of good quality private housing for workers."[17]

[9] José Fernando Gonçalves, "Edifícios modernos de habitação colectiva, 1948–61: desenho e standard na arquitectura portuguesa" (Phd Diss., Department de Proyectos d'Arquitectura–UPC, 2007), 43.

[10] Lôbo, *Planos de Urbanização: A Época de Duarte Pacheco*, 16.

[11] Gonçalves, "Edifícios modernos de habitação colectiva, 1948–61," 43.

[12] Lôbo, *Planos de Urbanização: A Época de Duarte Pacheco*, 17.

[13] Manuel C. Teixeira, "A história urbana em Portugal. Desenvolvimentos recentes," *Análise Social*, vol. xxviii (121), (1993–2.°): 381.

[14] Like *avenidas novas,* the new avenues proposed by Ressano de Garcia, in Lisbon, or the future civic centre of Barry Parker, in Porto.

[15] Like the three garden cities proposed by Forestier, in Lisbon, or the prologue to the plan of the city—*Prólogo ao Plano da Cidade do Porto*—by Ezequiel de Campos, in Porto.

[16] Sousa, *A habitação em Portugal*, 9.

[17] Fátima Loureiro de Matos, "Da implantação da República à primeira Guerra: As primeiras tentativas de Resolução do problema habitacional das classes operárias," in *A Grande Guerra (1914–1918): Problemáticas e Representações*, ed. Gaspar Martins Pereira et. al (Porto: CITCEM–Centro de Investigação Transdisciplinar «Cultura, Espaço e Memória," 2015), 370.

Decree 4,137 of 25 April 1918, is actually "the first real intervention of the state in the housing sector,"[18] "establishing various measures to promote the construction of economical houses" in a particularly difficult period of the First Republic.[19] Although it gave rise to concrete interventions,[20] it can be stated that the results were limited to the construction of some working quarters entirely at the expense of the state, which limited unconditionally the volume of achievements required as a consequence of the total absorption of the financial resources available.[21] In 1918, under Decree 4,137, three neighbourhoods had been started: Ursulinas [MdH DB a685], in Viana do Castelo, Ajuda/Boa Hora [MdH DB a215], in Lisbon, and Arrábida [MdH DB a20], in Porto.

While acknowledging the low level of implementation of the aforementioned Decree, it is important to highlight at the same time its pioneering role in the interventions that would mark the decades that would follow. In the long preamble that opens the diploma, describing foreign experiences in the promotion of affordable housing, one notices that *"Of all the models, the interest in the English model stands out in the pioneering role of the construction of 'cheap houses' by cooperative societies or by the local administration and by the regime of 'rent-to-own property' that would inspire legislation and political practice in Portugal, by taking into account the symbolic value of access to property as a 'factor of regeneration' of the working classes."*[22]

After the Military Coup of 28 May 1926—which ended the First Portuguese Republic, and led to the formal establishment of the Estado Novo dictatorship through a new Constitution in 1933— Decree 23,052, of 23 September, was enacted, establishing the "Affordable Houses Programme." Pointing to a model of occupancy and housing based on the single family dwelling, it was *"the first diploma truly aimed at effectively combating the housing crisis; specially oriented for the development of economic housing for the middle and working classes, provided for the realization of houses in a rent-to-own property scheme, which would be redeemable in 20 or 25 years and included insurance for fire, disability, death, sickness and unemployment."*[23] This was followed in 1934 by the Decree 24,802, of 21 December, which *"forces the municipal councils of the continent and adjacent islands to carry out the survey of topographic plants and the drawing up of general urbanization plans"—Planos Gerais de Urbanização*—thus establishing the criteria that would determine the image of future urbanization works.

[18] Sousa, *A Habitação em Portugal*, 10.

[19] According to Maria da Conceição Tiago, "Bairros Sociais da I República: projectos e realizações," *Revista Ler História,* no. 59–*Repúblicas: Culturas e Práticas* (2010), "in that year of 1918, instability was general: there was a serious agricultural crisis, a shortage of basic necessities, a serious financial situation with high inflation, compounded by the devastating effects of the typhoid outbreak in 1917 and the pneumonic flu in 1918, which mainly affected the less salubrious neighbourhoods. At the same time, the rural exodus to the cities was increasing, particularly in Lisbon and Porto. The precarious conditions of housing for the poorer classes became more visible as a result of epidemics, enforcing the urgent need under these circumstances for intervention by the public authorities."

[20] "The construction of these neighbourhoods initiates a process of implementation of some measures of state protection, timid, small, paternalistic in their genesis and configuration" (Matos, "Da implantação da República à primeira Guerra," 370.)

[21] Sousa, *A Habitação em Portugal*, 10.

[22] Tiago, "Bairros Sociais da I República: projectos e realizações."

[23] Sousa, *A Habitação em Portugal*, 11.

2. THE INFLUENCE OF THE FORMAL MODEL OF THE GARDEN CITY

If the problem of housing and the corresponding disorder of urban settlements was recognized. *"With the rise to power of Salazar, at the end of the 1920s, the urban problem linked to the growth of the city came to definitively be included in the concerns of the state. After 1933 [. . .] a new methodology of action began, organized around the State Public Works—a policy that guided the three times of man: past (restoration of monuments); present (public facilities); future (urbanization plans)."*[24] With Duarte Pacheco at the head of the Ministry of Public Works from 1932, *"the necessary legislative measures for the acquisition and expropriation of land for the construction of economic dwellings"*[25] were promulgated, but also *"the development of large infra-structures, such as the construction of roads, bridges, dams and the spatial planning of towns and cities, with the realization of plans and an extensive programme of urban improvements."*[26] In order to promote "an urban image with which the regime identified,"[27] the housing programmes and the city promoted by the state in the 1930s and 1940s corresponded to a process of conception and urban renewal strongly marked by the influence of the morpho-typological solutions advocated by the Garden City movement.

Indeed, while these were widely diffused, the complex *Garden City model* proposed by Ebenezer Howard in *To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform* (1898)—an entity capable of responding to the social nature of the most pressing urban issues and meet the demands of the economy—would barely be considered. Howard's proposal, recognizing the advantages and disadvantages of the countryside and the city of the late nineteenth century, gave as a third alternative the town-country or, as it would later be called, the *garden city*. This model was based on three fundamental principles: the value of land should be shared fairly by the community, owners, and promoters, ensuring profit for all; the political leadership should be strong and present a clear vision; and the organization should take responsibility for the long-term management of community assets. The *social city*, a polycentric cluster of garden cities, clearly delimited and linked together by a network of infrastructures, would allow "all the economic and social opportunities of the giant city"[28] to be reached. While Howard's modern incremental model of the Garden City presupposed converting profits into collective gains, based on a socialist political ideology that simultaneously responded to the intents of industrial and human development, its proposal was often misinterpreted, reducing it to physical issues and scales of higher resolution and lower achievement, confusing Howard's Garden City with the morphological principles applicable to Raymond Unwin's garden suburb.

[24] Gonçalves, "Edifícios modernos de habitação colectiva, 1948–61," 44.

[25] Sousa, *A Habitação em Portugal*, 11.

[26] Lôbo, *Planos de Urbanização: A Época de Duarte Pacheco*, 36.

[27] Lôbo, *Planos de Urbanização: A Época de Duarte Pacheco*, 36.

[28] Peter Hall, *Cities of Tomorrow* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1996 [1988]), 93.

Unwin, a disciple of Camillo Sitte, was involved in the physical realization of the first experiences of the Garden City. By publishing, first, *Town Planning in Practice. An Introduction to the Art of designing Cities and Suburbs* (1909)—where he advocated an innovative understanding of the past, maintaining and elevating the traditional values of the community to future generations through a discipline based on design rather than purely technical—and then *Nothing Gained by Overcrowding* (1912)—where he claimed, above all, a less dense form of occupation—he may have contributed to the dissemination of housing areas with single-family houses, usually detached or semi-detached, as major principles and results of the Garden City. This type of occupation fostered areas with low density and where prolonged contact with nature would be compatible with a high degree of cohesion of the urban form.

Fitting into this neo-traditionalist reformist trend, where the German *Siedlungen* are also included, the usually peripheric housing units that make up the "Affordable Houses Programme" in Portugal in this period, determined relatively small and cohesive groups. However, the choice of their location defined directions for growth and promoted the consolidation of urban expansion from certain bordering territories—which later will be associated with other public programmes, as well as privately promoted housing—which influenced the development and future form of urban settlements.

Along this process of growth focused on the small scale of intervention and not on the plan—which does not mean that it occurred only in its absence but also did not guarantee its materialization—the process of elaborating the general urbanization plans was developed, obligatory for all "localities with more than 2,500 inhabitants who, between two consecutive official censuses, evidence a population increase of more than 10 per cent."[29]

In spite of some previous experiences, the influence of the Garden City movement also arrived, albeit belatedly, to Portuguese urbanism. This happened especially through the influence of the architect Etienne de Gröer,[30] who would be responsible for a significant number of general urbanization plans since the late 1930s, a period in which Portuguese urban planners with specific training were relatively scarce. Although De Gröer was visibly acquainted with Ebenezer Howard's polycentric vision, at least in what it means from the point of view of his physical conception—a network of pre-set medium-size cities[31] linked with each other—he was equally familiar with the principles of Raymond Unwin's *Town Planning in Practice.*

[29] Decree 24,802, of December 21, 1934, article 2(a).

[30] Etienne de Gröer was educated in Paris, although he was born in Warsaw, son of a Polish mother and a Russian father.

[31] Lôbo, *Planos de Urbanização: A Época de Duarte Pacheco*, 77.

De Gröer also addressed the land issue by advocating long-term lease of land in a regime similar to the surface right, which came to be enshrined in Portuguese land law.[32] He integrated some solutions of decentralization, through the proposal of satellite settlements with alternative locations to the growth of the city, although, given the distance proposed for the urban nuclei and their size, they do not present themselves as real alternatives, but rather as poles dependent on the existing urban centre.[33] He also developed design solutions with clear didactic objectives (and his work at this level is especially striking). The limit established in the cities for four-storey buildings shows especially his preference for single-family housing, based on a right-wing ideological discourse in which it is argued that "the large house is an open field to communism."[34]

Thus, the formulas of urbanism were established that the regime recognized as appropriate and which would dominate the production of instruments of territorial management, the urban renewal and the construction of new areas of expansion in the 1940s—the single-family housing and the monumental city. However, the absence of modernist proposals that gave continuity to some experiences of the Portuguese avant-garde of the 1930s showed *"the progressive hegemony in the state apparatus, of traditionalist values [. . .], a breeding ground to precipitate the crisis of the modernist architects that had already manifested itself before, [. . .], when there were apparently no univocal official guidelines to impose a national style."*[35]

"The heyday of urban planning in Portugal lies between 1944 and 1954," however, in the many studies and plans or pre-plans drawn up "we can distinguish a first period, from 1944 to 1948, in which an initial eclecticism gives rise to a specific synthesis," and a second period, since "in 1948 there was a turn marked by the first national congress of architects," when they brought into question the city and lodging instead of the traditional questions of architectural language."[36]

32 Lôbo, *Planos de Urbanização: A Época de Duarte Pacheco*, 77.

33 Lôbo, *Planos de Urbanização: A Época de Duarte Pacheco*, 79.

34 Lôbo, *Planos de Urbanização: A Época de Duarte Pacheco*, 81.

35 Nuno Portas, "Arquitectura e Urbanística na Década de 40,"in *Arquitectura(s) História e Crítica, Ensino e Profissão* (Porto: FAUP Publicações, 2005 [1982]), 291.

36 Gonçalves, "Edifícios modernos de habitação colectiva, 1948–61," 338.

3. THE INTEGRATION OF THE CANONS OF THE MODERN MOVEMENT

With the end of World War II, Europe made a great effort to rise from its agony. Dictatorships gave way to democracies and one of the emergent phenomena in Portugal after the first national congress of architects in 1948 was the politicisation of urban issues *"to reaffirm not only the legitimacy of the creative act free of bureaucratic and censorship obstacles (being modern is not anti-Portuguese) but above all the affirmation of the need for housing policies, facilities and urban renewal that sought to push the regime against the ropes also as regards social investment."*[37] The truth is that if the detached or semi-detached house and the neighbourhood-(suburbia)-garden is that which best adapts to the preferences of the regime[38] and of the bourgeoisie that supports it, this form of space occupation and housing promotion, which involves mostly small interventions, is a political tool for normalizing society by "strengthening the institution of the family"[39] and by inserting itself *"in a wider perspective of social repression, both in the selection of beneficiaries as in the social control through the 'habitat'"*[40].

In addition, the housing shortages were not catered for by the few projects carried out and by the small size of the operations, which were generally of very low density; and if this were not the case, if the assumptions of the dominant form of intervention were maintained, the new areas to be occupied in order to meet the needs would greatly extend the existing urban agglomerations. The conclusions of the Congress thus defended the impracticability of single-family housing programmes and advocated the intensification of collective housing. As such, the adoption of architectural solutions that consider the verticalisation of buildings was proposed—the functional architecture of the massive and high forms that should be implemented considering the solar orientation on ground more available to green areas—referring to the "bases of modern urbanism,"[41] as Corbusier called it, and to the doctrinal principles defined in the Athens Charter.

It would be within the framework of the "Affordable Rent Houses" programme, enacted through Law 2007 of 7 May 1945, that the system of rent in buildings of greater heights is accepted for the first time: *"it establishes collective housing, with no more than 3 floors [or 4, as recommended by De Groer for the plans], and, pour cause, puts an end to the pretension of generalizing access to residential property by its occupants, thus legitimizing the lease."*[42] It opened *"the road to transforming the understanding of the housing problem as a matter centred on a conservative ideology, based on the assumption of the 'merit of the aligned', by the concept of the 'right to housing' and the pursuit in terms of 'objective needs', deriving from a 'technicist' and more universally legitimized ideology"*[43].

[37] Portas, "Arquitectura e Urbanística na Década de 40," 294.

[38] According to the Constitution, it is the responsibility of the state and the local authorities "to promote the establishment of independent residences in sanitary conditions, as well as the institution of the 'homestead', with the purpose, of course, of defending the family 'basic institution of society'. The same is to say that the type of social 'habitat' will necessarily have to be the single-family house, giving access to the property, since the discourse on the virtues of the duality of single-family house/private property has never been so flourishing." Marielle Christine Gros, *O Alojamento Social sob o Fascismo* (Porto: Edições Afrontamento, 1982), 117.

[39] Gros, *O Alojamento Social sob o Fascismo*, 122.

[40] Gros, *O Alojamento Social sob o Fascismo*, 122. Apart from the houses being distributed to heads of households according to their social categories, the elements to be considered in the order of preference are regularity of employment, moral and professional behaviour, age, family composition, and family wages.

[41] Le Corbusier, *Urbanisme* (Paris: Les Éditions Arthaud, 1980 [1925]), i.

[42] Sandra Marques Pereira, *Casa e Mudança Social: Uma Leitura das Transformações da Sociedade Portuguesa a Partir da Casa* (Casal de Cambra: Caleidoscópio, 2012), 73.

[43] Ibid.

The Bairro de Alvalade [MdH DB a89], in Lisbon, exemplifies the process of modernization through the promotion of the "Affordable Rent Houses" programme. It *"materializes in the adoption of the modern paradigm in its strictly technical and economical dimension, clearly ignoring its ideological dimension: modern housing is programmed, but the foundation of this programmatic inflection is exclusively referred to for reasons of efficiency, functionality, rationality, and economy, and never for purposes of democratization. Indeed, in this immediate post-war period, the first motivation was to expand in a planned way, economising, and if possible capitalising."*[44]

In 1955, *"the concept of 'horizontal property' or by storeys was established, whereby the extension of the regime of rental of houses of limited income was promoted to the regime of access to the property in economic conditions accessible to a wider section of the population."*[45] On this followed the possibility of granting loans for the construction and purchase of housing by households. Exemptions from property taxes, with a view to reducing burdens that would promote private initiative in fostering and accessing housing, thereby reducing State burdens, were also promulgated. Indeed, while the recognition of the right to housing was further reinforced by the "progressive" contestation, strengthened since the early 1950s, the state's inability to take on a coherent policy of housing promotion becomes even more evident: *"the decrees and declarations of intention are multiplied; and if that leads to a real complexification of the legal-administrative building, the practical reach of such a policy is far from being evident"*[46] or effective to respond to the increasing population numbers in a situation of real housing shortage increasingly forced into clandestine solutions.

The architectural and urbanistic experiences closest to the canons assumed in the European reconstruction operations succeeded. However, *"the modern city vocabulary would never be taken as a refusal of the existing city, but rather as a new possibility of dialogue that 'extends' the traditional city—the modern plans for growth in Portugal coincide in the critique of the nineteenth century city, but they are more like tests of integration than of rupture."*[47] Thus, *"the 'collectivist' city of modern architects would only appear with the Plano de Ramalde[MdH DB a22] (or the drawings for Campo Alegre), by Fernando Távora [in Porto] and, above all, with the Plano dos Olivais Norte [MdH DB a186] [in Lisbon]— the only large-scale urban intervention, where the 'Athens Charter' was tried without any ties to the traditional city."*[48] In the 1960s, Chelas [MdH DB a194] and Olivais Sul [MdH DB a193] in Lisbon promised a new panorama, stressing not only the scale of the interventions but also the explicit affirmation of the new principles of modern urbanism: although the density is increased in one perspective, it would be reduced in the other.

[44] Pereira, *Casa e Mudança Social*, 75.

[45] Sousa, *A Habitação em Portugal*, 17.

[46] Gros, *O Alojamento Social sob o Fascismo*, 139. Seeking to highlight what he designates as a "fragmented policy," Marielle Gros points out the fifteen main possible formulas of economic housing solutions in 1962.

[47] Gonçalves, "Edifícios modernos de habitação colectiva, 1948–61," 338.

[48] Gonçalves, "Edifícios modernos de habitação colectiva, 1948–61," 339.

The solution considered massive and high-built forms, which should release more green areas, ensuring a relatively low occupation density. In Porto, beginning in 1956, the implementation of the improvement plan—*Plano de Melhoramentos*—enacted by Decree-Law 42,454 of 18 August 1959, which implies a need to sanitize the many existing *ilhas*, the expansion of the municipal housing stock goes from a thousand dwellings in 1955 to more than seven thousand in 1966.[49] Corresponding to a strategy of relocation in peripheral areas, it was carried out through housing neighbourhoods that followed the principles of implementation of the Athens Charter, although considering relatively restrained areas when compared to European experiments.

However, the late entry of the Modern Movement overlapped with its internal crisis, assumed at the 1956 CIAM, International Congress of Modern Architecture, in Dubrovnik, although already announced in the 1951 CIAM when the rationalist functionalist model began to lose its strength, according to the recognition of the relationship between the social and the physical structures of the city. Therefore, although Le Corbusier remained as a reference for the formal imaginary of Portuguese architects, the *"universal recognition of the architect as a mentor of spatial forms, in which a historical-social conscience becomes objective, implies a rigorous requirement in the study of phenomena that the work will define."*[50]

The recognition of this condition implied the disclosure of critical positions, still in the late 1950s, which rejected the exclusive adoption of "certain types considered as a universal panacea."[51] This view defended, first of all, *"as outdated the essentially theoretical position of the rationalist period, which conceived an urban fabric as a standardized mesh of standard units [...] and led to the search for "ideal forms of grouping,"* which is why it challenged *"the indiscriminate claim by the Portuguese architects [in 1948] for large collective properties, taken as the only type of units suitable for social housing"*[52]; and secondly, it denounced the contradictions of the "single family house, inevitably depreciated with the economical and intensive character to which it was now subjected," a reality that could only be understood *"in the context of an ignorance of the urban problems that led to identify with injustice and simplicity, nationalism and certain forms."*[53] Thus, one can affirm that the pro-modernist radicalism of the beginning of the decade was confronted in its final years with the foundational contradictions of the Modern Movement. As regards formal urban planning and according to the Athens Charter, the plans drawn up adopted functional zonings and emphasized the circulation system, segregating the different modes where possible.

[49] Queirós, João, "O 'Plano de Melhoramentos para a Cidade do Porto' de 1956: enquadramento político-social e elenco de realizações," in Pereira, Virgílio Borges (coord.), *A Habitação Social na Transformação da Cidade: Sobre a Génese e Efeitos do Plano de Melhoramentos para a Cidade do Porto" de 1956*, ed. Virgílio Borges Pereira (Porto: Edições Afrontamento, 2016), 58.

[50] Nuno Portas, *A Habitação Social: Proposta para a Metodologia da sua Arquitectura* (Porto: FAUP Publicações, 2004 [1959]), 79.

[51] Portas, *A Habitação Social*, 82.

[52] Portas, *A Habitação Social*, 83.

[53] Ibid.

Moreover, the acknowledged *"inefficiency of the blueprint plan [of the 1930s and 1940s] stemming from its rigidity led to its replacement by the management plan which was more flexible and adaptable during implementation,"*[54] at the same time showing the Portuguese inability to carry out planning and even its discredit, which, despite some intervals of "enthusiasm,"[55] remains to the present day.

This process of adapting territorial management instruments, starting in the mid-1950s, in fact allowed an *"ideal of renewal 'in continuity' that did not call into question any ideological content, justified the crossing of the traditional city with the "conservative" innovation of the garden city and the growth centred on the small scale of the land division operations and not in the plan. The modern social and aesthetic assumptions could only appear in fragments, centred on the architectural object,"*[56] simplified in their ideology by reduction to a particularly formal approximation, that the housing programmes of the following decade continued to materialize. Assuming localized interventions in certain fragments of the territory, the implementation of modernist city corresponded to "units materialized through compositions of isolated blocks where collective housing predominated" that *"resulted from a unitary project, realized through operations of land division or public interventions of significant surface dimension, and, as such, presented the limits of the plot as initial reference for their configuration."*[57]

4. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The models that conveyed the architectural and urban production of the first half of the Portuguese 20th century, as devices for the design and production of the built space, were promoted essentially from the divulgation of a physical form, considered as paradigm of a certain set of values that it was important to advance. In fact, the underlying ideological issues in the origin of their formulation did not always determine, nor were even considered, to the appropriation of the foundations underlying the model that refers to them; it was reduced only to the principles that advocated a particular morphology or typology. Indeed, in many instances the ideology of the regime overlapped, establishing the discourse that determines the formal appropriation in the planning and implementation processes of the programmes, particularly those related to housing, which we have focused on here. However, it is important to highlight a process of resistance that would culminate in the late 1940s at the first national congress of architects, and which determined a significant turning point in the construction of the modern Portuguese city.

[54] Lôbo, *Planos de Urbanização: A Época de Duarte Pacheco*, 219.

[55] In 1994, PROSIURB (programme for consolidation of the national urban system and support for the execution of municipal master plans) was created; in the 1990s translated into the coverage of the national territory by territorial management instruments.

[56] Gonçalves, "Edifícios modernos de habitação colectiva, 1948–61," 350.

[57] Teresa Calix, "As morfologias da cidade contemporânea: uma matriz imperativa da forma urbana. O sistema urbano do Porto." (Phd Diss., Faculdade de Arquitectura da Universidade do Porto, 2013), 542.

Indeed, *"if modernity corresponds, on the one hand, to a permanent process of transformation—'a permanent revolution'—which inevitably translates into the successive metamorphosis of the physical and technological components of the urban space,"*[58] *"the end of the war, with the awakening of democracies and an opposition reinvigorated by the defeat of fascism in Europe, drew a time of cultural unrest that made the end of the 1940s particularly significant for the reflection on modern architecture in Portugal."*[59]

The perhaps debatable[60] maturity of the late 1950s coupled with the critical review of the possible (re)integration of modernist values in architecture and urban planning was not, however, strange to the intensification of the housing needs of a growing number of cities; it resulted from the process of migration associated with industrialization, determining conditions for the project of modernity (and capitalism). In this scenario, the implementation of urgent housing programmes to meet the needs was, in fact, the condition of occupation of new urban areas and promotion and dissemination of the modernist model. The Portuguese city developed in this period, hostage to possible interventions and its viability, was built by adding many fragments, contradicting the more comprehensive rationales of understanding and actions with greater capacity for transformation of the territory.

In its inaugural formulation, and under the umbrella of capitalism, the architectural interventions of modernism would have the ambition to determine and dominate the future, aiming at the action of the present and also the definition of the future. Architectural design was therefore understood as the heart of the modernization process, and through it, in the modernist period, the two disciplinary dimensions that determine urban reality—architecture and urban planning—actually tend to overlap. However, while urban planning seen as "a large-scale architecture" persisted until the 1960s in Europe, in Portugal it was the small scale of the various buildings or housing complexes that ensured the implementation, on a hybrid urban setting, of fragments of the modernist city, thus conveying some intentions of expansion previously established in plans which the Portuguese state could never fully realize.

[58] Berman (1982) apud Calix, "As morfologias da cidade contemporânea," 18.

[59] Ana Tostões. *Os Verdes Anos na Arquitectura Portuguesa dos Anos 50* (Porto: FAUP Publicações, 1997), 21.

[60] França (2013) in Tostões, *A Idade Maior: Cultura e Tecnologia na Arquitectura Moderna Portuguesa*, ii.

Teresa Calix

NOTE

The author is responsible for all the translations into English of the original texts in Portuguese.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Calix, Teresa. "As morfologias da cidade contemporânea: uma matriz imperativa da forma urbana. O *sistema urbano do Porto*." Faculdade de Arquitectura da Universidade do Porto, 2013.

Gonçalves, José Fernando. "Edifícios modernos de habitação colectiva, 1948–61: desenho e standard na arquitectura portuguesa." PhD Dissertation, Department de Proyectos d'Arquitectura UPC Barcelona, 2007.

Gros, Marielle Christine. *O Alojamento Social sob o Fascismo.* Porto: Edições Afrontamento, 1982.

Hall, Peter. *Cities of Tomorrow.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1996 (1988).

Le Corbusier. *Urbanisme.* Paris: Les Éditions Arthaud, 1980 (1925).

Lôbo, Margarida Souza. *Planos de Urbanização: A Época de Duarte Pacheco.* Porto: DGOTDU, FAUP Publicações, 1995.

Martí Arís, Carlos. "Las formas de la residencia en la ciudad moderna." In *Las Formas de la Residencia en la Ciudad Moderna: Vivienda y Ciudad en la Europa de Entreguerras*, edited by Carlos Martí Arís. Barcelona: Edicions UPC, 2000.

Matos, Fátima Loureiro de, "Da implantação da República à primeira Guerra: As primeiras tentativas de Resolução do problema habitacional das classes operárias." In *A Grande Guerra (1914–1918): Problemáticas e Representações*, edited by Gaspar Martins Pereira et al, 369–381. Porto: CITCEM–Centro de Investigação Transdisciplinar «Cultura, Espaço e Memória," 2015.

Pereira, Sandra Marques. *Casa e Mudança Social: Uma leitura das transformações da sociedade portuguesa a partir da casa.* Casal de Cambra: Caleidoscópio, 2012.

Portas, Nuno. *A Habitação Social: Proposta para a Metodologia da sua Arquitectura.* Porto: FAUP Publicações, 2004 (1959).

Portas, Nuno. "Arquitectura e Urbanística na Década de 40." In *Arquitectura(s) História e Crítica, Ensino e Profissão.* Porto: FAUP Publicações, 2005 (1982).

Queirós, João. "O "Plano de Melhoramentos para a Cidade do Porto" de 1956: enquadramento político-social e elenco de realizações." In *A Habitação Social na Transformação da Cidade: Sobre a Génese e Efeitos do Plano de Melhoramentos para a Cidade do Porto" de 1956*, edited by Virgílio Borges Pereira. Porto: Edições Afrontamento, 2016.

Sousa, Alves de (dir). *A Habitação em Portugal.* Lisboa: Ministério das Obras Públicas, Centro de Estudos de Urbanismo e Habitação Engenheiro Duarte Pacheco, 1963.

Teixeira, Manuel C.. "A história urbana em Portugal. Desenvolvimentos recentes." *Análise Social*, vol. Xxviii, no. 121 (1993 [2.º]): 371–390.

Tiago, Maria da Conceição, "Bairros Sociais da I República: projectos e realizações." *Revista Ler História*, no. 59–"Repúblicas: culturas e práticas"(2010).

Tostões, Ana. *Os Verdes Anos na Arquitectura Portuguesa dos Anos 50.* Porto: FAUP Publicações, 1997.

Tostões, Ana. *A Idade Maior: Cultura e Tecnologia na Arquitectura Moderna Portuguesa.* Porto: FAUP Publicações, 2015.