Introduction  Patricio del Real

The written history of modern architecture in Latin America remains under construction, being a fairly recent enterprise intimately connected to the consolidation of a particular global imaginary after World War II and the hegemonic rise of North Atlantic cultural centers. The following essays discuss the publications in which the issues, terms, and ideas of modernism have appeared in individual countries, and the way the region’s architecture was incorporated into general histories of modernism produced both locally and abroad. The bibliography itself has been placed online, at www.moma.org/laic_bibliography, where it will continue to grow.

Histories of modernism that incorporate the architecture of Latin America are conditioned by the changing strategies of assembling the region as a whole. The term “Latin America” was created in early-nineteenth-century France to advance a collective “Latin” identity rooted in culture, and ever since, it has been enriched, reinforced, questioned, and challenged by theoretical and practical assemblies that emphasize cultural, political, historical, and economic aspects of the region. Considerations of the nature of architectural modernism started early in the twentieth century, galvanized by ongoing debates on the development of the region. The term “modernism” produced both locally and abroad. The bibliography was effectively the first book to consider the region’s modern architecture as a whole. Latin American works first appeared in this literature in the context of the history of modernism produced within the region. Early modernist developments were not put into a larger historical context, however, until after World War II, eventually coalescing first and foremost into national histories of modernism produced within the region. The historiography of modernism in Latin America oscillates between locally produced national histories—modulated by global overviews produced primarily in Spanish-speaking countries—and fragmentary incorporations of key moments in histories produced by scholars from outside the region. These latter histories have explained the emergence of modernism in Latin America primarily as an offshoot of European formal experiments that, responding to climate and culture, developed local stylistic idiosyncrasies with limited contributions to international discussions and formal explorations. In all, historical examinations from outside the region have been fragmentary, haphazard, and reductive, guided by the overarching aim of explaining the blossoming of modernism in Latin America in the mid-twentieth century.

Few histories of modern architecture produced outside Latin America have incorporated examples from the region, and those that do have treated only select developments in key countries as representative of the region as a whole. Latin American works first appeared in this literature in the context of the postwar polemic between functionalism and organicism, in Bruno Zevi’s Storia dell’architettura moderna (1950), which mobilized examples in Brazil and Mexico to show the extent of the crisis of European rationalism. In An Outline of European Architecture, Nikolaus Pevsner similarly did the same by linking the “structural acrobatics” of Brazilian architecture to the postwar “expressionist” phase of Le Corbusier, signaled by his chapel of Notre Dame du Haut in Ronchamp, France. Zevi and Pevsner together inaugurated the tendency of viewing developments in the region as merely derivative of European movements. Moreover, these historians enabled the view of an exuberant or irrational “Latin American” style that would risk tainting “Western” modernism if it became too influential. In all, these histories argued that Latin American modernism tended toward baroque forms because, guided by Brazilian formal experiments, it was conditioned by a cultural predisposition for excessive formal experimentation, an overarching tropical geography, and an exuberant Latin sociological temperament coupled with a deep colonial heritage. In these views, developments in Mexico, exemplified by the Ciudad Universitaria, fell too easily into folkloric nationalism and offered no positive counterbalance to Brazilian formalism.

In the 1950s ongoing developments were compiled in many surveys that captured the tremendous output of the region’s architects. Two of the most singular were produced in 1955: Yuichi Ino and Shinsuke Kikko’s Latin America volume of the World’s Contemporary Architecture series, published in Japan, and Henry-Russell Hitchcock’s Latin American Architecture since 1945, accompanying the exhibition of the same name at The Museum of Modern Art. These surveys were enthusiastic about the work but had a limited impact on histories that attempted to explain the emergence and development of modern architecture. Three works of 1958—Hitchcock’s Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, Michel Ragon’s Livre de l’architecte moderne, and Jürgen Joedicke’s Geschichte der modernen Architektur—are paradigmatic examples of the integration of the region’s architecture into the overall history of modernism. Unlike Ragon and Joedicke, Hitchcock included no works later than 1955, yet his history remains unparalleled for its unprecedented attempt to weave a complex tapestry of formal relationships that emphasized the rise of a new formal language along Miesian lines, being developed predominantly in Venezuela alongside the remarkable work of Carlos Raúl Villanueva. Although these histories reinforced the idea of the Corbusian origins of Latin American modernism, and helped to canonize the Ministério da Educação e Saúde in Rio de Janeiro as the singular point of modern architecture’s introduction to the whole of South America, they acknowledged the level of independence and maturity reached in the region and thus tacitly rejected Zevi and Pevsner’s initial outlook.

In La arquitectura de las grandes culturas (1957), the Cuban historian Joaquín Weiss emphasized this point and argued that the overall historical, climatic, and social conditions of Latin America favored the organic development of modernism without missionaries from abroad. A decade earlier, the Peruvian Luis Miro Quezada had advanced a similar humanistic and evolutionary thesis in Espacio en el tiempo. By 1958 and the dawn of Brasilia, there was an overwhelming recognition of Brazilian modernism’s contribution to the breaking of the rationalist and strict geometries of early functionalism. Opinions on the consequences of this liberation did not fall far from Pevsner’s early warnings on its irrationalism, however, as most critics agreed that such formal explorations had become capricious. In contrast, Venezuelan developments were celebrated for their rigor and restraint, and for the restoration of a proper abstract universality to Latin American modernism.

Leonardo Benevolo’s Storia dell’architettura moderna (1960) presented the Brazilian experience as an important shift in the geography of modernism. Yet Benevolo reduced the history of the entire region to that of Brazil, focusing on Brasilia as the culminating point of this experience. Benevolo argued that Oscar Niemeyer’s elemental and diagrammatic forms, decontextualized and disarticulated by the scale of the new capital city, had acquired surrealistic tones that cast a shadow on the future of the city and, by implication, on the entire region. In all, as Sigfried Giedion argued in the 1962 fourth edition of Space, Time and Architecture, Brasilia had closed the development of modernism in Latin America, which he summarized as a series of sudden bursts of activity that, although at times brilliant, were limited to regional and timely contributions.

In 1969 Francisco Bullrich met Benevolo and Giedion head-on, revising the story of the region’s architecture after Brasilia. His Arquitectura latinoamericana, 1930–1970 was effectively the first book to consider the region’s modern
architecture as a whole, and it remains the key contribution from Latin America. Bullrich's book, published in both Spanish and English (with important differences, since the English-language edition contains more transnational thematic comparisons), revealed the tension between the necessity of presenting recent developments and the need to offer readers a historical overview. To manage this tension and address the enormous and diverse geography at hand, Bullrich advanced the notion of “common problems,” in vogue in the political and social sciences of the period. Without abandoning “national features” and salient figures such as Villanueva, he accepted the regional frame by presenting a diversified production that rejected any form of authentic local or “Latin American” character. The roots of this overarching regional assembly based on perceived common traits can be found in the writings of the Spanish architectural historian Fernando Chueca Goitia, who inaugurated the idea of a common geocultural Iberian world in the 1940s.

Since the late 1960s, research centers, and journals such as Summa, have made efforts to go beyond Brasilia. These efforts received impetus from the center-periphery model of dependency theory, deployed in works such as Rafael López Rangel’s Arquitectura y subdesarrollo en América Latina (1975) and in collections of diverse voices such as Roberto Segre’s América Latina en su arquitectura (1976) and Damían Bayón’s Panorámica de la arquitectura latinoamericana (1977). These histories presented a tension between journalistic reporting and historical analysis; they also transformed the constraints of an architectural style, as described by Benevolo and Giedion, into the limitations of an overarching regional assembly based on perceived common traits. The apparent impasse set by Brasilia remained active in histories such as Manfredo Tafuri and Francesco Dal Co’s Architettura contemporanea (1976). While the Italian historians did not reduce the entire region to a single country, they saw modern architecture there as unable to surpass its mid-twentieth-century developments, either by falling prey to the corporate modernism of US global hegemony, as in Mexican developments, or by wallowing in its own fashionable success, as in Brazil, where architecture had fallen into a manneristic repetition of scenographic forms. These summary judgments became the main historiographical line, repeated, for example, in William Curtis’s Modern Architecture since 1900 (1982) and Spiro Kostof’s A History of Architecture: Settings and Rituals (1985).

The notion of commonality, first advanced by Bullrich and later reinforced by views on geography, politics, culture, and economy, became a key analytical frame, transforming into the shared problems of third world development, as in the 1982 Spanish edition of Benevolo’s history, which included a chapter by the Catalan critic Josep Maria Montaner, or into the similarities of geography, culture, and identity in Critical Regionalism, as in Kenneth Frampton’s Modern Architecture: A Critical History (1980). In Latin America, Ramón Gutiérrez (1983) and Leopoldo Castedo (1988) emphasized Iberian cultural similarities and colonial backgrounds to highlight the disruptive nature of modernism, and Bayón (1988) brought together architecture and art scholars to highlight the “points of contacts” enabled by modernity. International journals such as the French Techniques et architecture’s 1981 theme issue on Latin America, and the 1993 issue of the Italian Zodiac, gathered scholars and architects from key countries to present a synthesis of the development of modernism alongside the most salient works up until then. The historiographical impasse set by Benevolo and Giedion, however, remained active, as evidenced in Valerie Fraser’s examination of Mexico, Venezuela, and Brazil in Building the New World, which stops in 1960.

The most pertinent architectural history to go beyond Brasilia is Jorge Francisco Liernur’s America Latina: Arquitectura, gli ultimi vent’anni (1990). Liernur assembled the region by bringing together diverse authors, and he developed the notion of common problems within architectural culture beyond stylistic considerations, examining topics such as the city, social housing, technology, and development from different positions. More important, he tackled the impasse set by Benevolo and Giedion by advancing the multiple futures imagined in the architecture produced after Brasilia. In all, Liernur rejected the end of architecture in Latin America as announced by historians outside the region, and he gestured toward the future by examining architectural production in Latin America after 1960 as part of the ongoing history of its modern architecture.

This and other efforts have enabled the incorporation of nineteenth-century developments in Latin America in works such as Silvia Arango’s Ciudad y arquitectura: Seis generaciones que construyeron la América Latina moderna (2012), and in genealogical compendiums of works along thematic, formal, and technological lines such as Luis Carranza and Fernando Lara’s Modern Architecture in Latin America: Art, Technology and Utopia (2015). If the history of modern architecture in Latin America is on its way to being consolidated, a history of modernism as a whole, one that incorporates the region’s development, produced both from outside and from within the region, remains very much in construction. This book offers another stone for that construction.

General References


The foundations of modern Argentine architecture began to be laid in the mid-1920s by specialist magazines such as Revista de arquitectura and Nuestra arquitectura, along with more widely ranging cultural journals such as Martín Fierro and Sur. More particularly the field was shaped by a group of principally young architects, including Alberto Prebisch, Antonio Vilar, and Wladimiro Acosta, whose works and whose aesthetic, technological, and urban ideas functioned to promote the new architecture. A turning point came in 1939 with the manifesto of Grupo Austral, signed by Antonio Bonet, Juan Kurchan, and Jorge Ferrari, which called for a humanistic rethinking of the relationship between urban planning and architecture. Historical research meanwhile supported a universal classicism over any specific national style.

World War II exposed a problem in the construction industry: a dependence on imports in a development-focused economy. But avant-garde magazines began to appear, including Tecne (1942), Nueva visión (1951), Mirador (1957), and Obrador (1963), and these, with the publishing houses NV and Infierno, articulated the challenges of contemporary architecture. Tomás Maldonado, Juan Manuel Borthagaray, Carlos Méndez Mosquera, Jorge Enrique Hardoy, César Janello, and Horacio Baliero were among those who addressed the problems of industrial modernization and changing ways of life.

This was the context in which, in 1963, Francisco Bullrich published Arquitectura argentina contemporánea, a first attempt to establish a canon of Argentine architects and their works. Bullrich initiated a history of a modern Argentine architecture located in a third world demanding drastic changes in the underlying conditions of production. For him the casas blancas (white houses) architectural movement had discovered another possible kind of classicism in the pre-Columbian and colonial world. Strong volumes, white walls, vaulted spaces, and terra-cotta tiles could be combined with concrete to produce organic forms with Corbusian echoes that referenced a generic, atemporal history and signaled the necessity of a link between craft and technology. One approach to this goal looked toward an "industrial humanism" through the lens of the Arte Concreto Invención movement, which had called for good form, technical logic, and an integration of the arts. Another focused on individual creativity (Amancio Williams, Clorindo Testa). Meanwhile the magazine Summa, edited by Méndez Mosquera, first appeared in 1963 and sought to articulate the roots of an integrating common past—now termed Latin American—that might, in turn, construct a future through holistic design.

In the 1970s regionalist patrimonialism was linked to the appreciation for "national and popular" architecture manifested, with some variations, by Rafael Iglesia, Claudio Caveri, Ramón Gutiérrez, and others. From another perspective, Aldo Rossi’s theory of the "analogue city," and the typological investigations of Antonio Díaz, Alberto Varas, and Justo Solsona, based on the tradition of city blocks, introduced a certain neutrality. In Summarios, Marina Waisman initiated an international survey within a structuralist context.

In the late 1970s the modernist line opened by Bullrich began to be revalued, moving out of its position in the margins at the architectural workshop La Escuelita. Beginning in the 1980s the introduction of Frankfurt-inspired cultural history opened a parallel field, in tension with the dominance of Latin American Critical Regionalism. Jorge Francisco Liernur’s critiques based on a "historical construction" of modern architecture in Argentina shifted the focal point; his work, together with that of figures like Ernesto Katzenstein, Roberto Fernández, the writers for the journal Block, and others, intervened in considerations of modern architecture and its foundational place in contemporary production.
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BRAZIL Cláudia Costa Cabral

Philip Goodwin’s exhibition and book Brazil Builds, produced by The Museum of Modern Art in 1943, provided the international launch for a school of modern architecture based in Rio, but it elicited controversy in the country itself: in 1948, the art critic Geraldo Ferraz demanded that Lucio Costa reverse Goodwin’s “misrepresentation of information, which is beginning to determine the historiography of modern architecture in Brazil.” According to Ferraz, Goodwin had ignored earlier modern works in São Paulo. Costa’s response was to assert that the artistic value of Brazilian modern architecture, and its claim on international attention, derived not from the houses built by the Paulista Gregori Warchavchik in the late 1920s but from the original work of the Carioca Oscar Niemeyer, built on a Corbusian foundation.

The debate took another turn in the early 1950s, setting those who understood architecture as art (“construction conceived with plastic intention,” in Costa’s words) against those who understood architecture as service that provided housing for the people. Lina Bo and Pietro Maria Bardi, the founders and editors of the São Paulo–based magazine Habitat, opposed Niemeyer’s “plastic complacencies” to the “severe morality” of João Batista Vilanova Artigas. Artigas himself, a communist like Niemeyer, denounced Le Corbusier’s “reactionary ideology” and “servile formalism” in “Le Corbusier e o imperialismo.” Writing from the southern city of Porto Alegre, Demétrio Ribeiro, another communist, asked for a national interpretation of Socialist Realism to achieve an architecture that the people could understand. Niemeyer launched Modulo magazine in 1955 to promote his ideas and refuted the criticisms of his architecture in “Problemas atuais da arquitetura moderna.”

“To all appearances the modern movement had triumphed in Brazil,” wrote Henrique E. Mindlin in Modern Architecture in Brazil (1956). “Unfortunately,” he went on, “appearances are deceptive.” Faced with the contradictions of the country’s wide range of socioeconomic development, the literature on modern architecture and architects tends to deal with them in terms of responsibility for the future. In these terms, the idea of architecture as art, ratified once again by Niemeyer and Costa through the building of Brasília, represented a threat of degeneration for those who, like Ribeiro, considered formalism and “plastic acrobatics” unacceptable models, as “profligate opulence” was incompatible with Brazil’s persistent underdevelopment. Pietro Maria Bardi’s Profile of the New Brazilian Art (1970) made the opposite argument: Brazil could confront its political and cultural resistance. In her article “Na América do Sul: Após Le Corbusier, o que está acontecendo” of 1967, Bo Bardi made an ironic reply to this latter position, and in particular to the “paternalistic advice” of the US journal Progressive Architecture (1967). South American architects should now seek inspiration in “Indian huts, little shacks and favelas of the poor, as befits underdeveloped architects who operate within an equally underdeveloped continent.”
Yves Bruand’s *Arquitetura contemporânea no Brasil* (1981) and Sylvia Ficher and Marlene Milan Acayaba’s *Arquitetura moderna brasileira* (1982) brought this cycle to a close. Together these works constituted the first comprehensive history of modern Brazilian architecture, Bruand chronicling the eclectic work preceding the modern period and closing with the construction of Brasilia, while Ficher and Acayaba addressed the 1970s and the regional developments of the modern legacy from north to south.

*Le Corbusier e o Brasil* (1987), by Cecília Rodrigues dos Santos, Margareth Campos da Silva Pereira, Romão Veriano da Silva Pereira, and Vasco Caldeira da Silva, inaugurated a new cycle characterized by academic research. This cycle was nurtured by the growth of Brazilian postgraduate studies in architecture and by the establishment of national and international exchange networks (notably SAL—the Seminarios de Arquitetura Latinoamericana—and, since the late 1990s, Docomomo [the International Committee for Documentation and Conservation of Buildings, Sites and Neighborhoods of the Modern Movement]). There has been a considerable expansion of documentary research, through not only general historiographical reviews (by Renato Anelli, Lauro Cavalcanti, Hugo Segawa, and Ruth Verde Zein) but thematic studies and monographs on the protagonists in the development of modern Brazilian architecture. New studies of foundational episodes (by Carlos Eduardo Dias Comas, Carlos Alberto Ferreira Martins, Pereira, Santos, and Zein) have provided the foundation for critical recognition of the modern legacy. Both approaches are rewriting the history of modern Brazilian architecture.


Publications on modern architecture began to appear in Chile at the end of the 1920s. The country’s first debates on both the nature of the new architecture and the local possibilities of modern urban planning took place in the magazines ARQuitectura (1935–36), Urbanismo y arquitectura (1936–40), and others. The 1950s and ’60s saw the development of various lines of theoretical thought—some of Chile’s most original thinking on architectural culture in the twentieth century. Particularly significant was the production of the Escuela de Arquitectura de la Universidad Católica in Valparaíso, where Alberto Cruz and Godofredo Lonmí were central figures. Their ideas tended toward the radically modern, foregrounding the relationship between architecture and poetry and finding expression in a range of different writings—indeed the most important text of this time and place was the collectively written poetry book Amereida (1967). The equally radical theories of Juan Borchers and, to a lesser extent, José Ricardo Morales must also be noted; approaching the subject from very different perspectives, both men tried to create a theoretical foundation for the practice of modern architecture.

Systematic studies of the history of modern architecture in Chile began in the late 1960s, and were later compiled in Manuel Moreno and Humberto Eliash’s book Arquitectura y modernidad en Chile, 1925–1965: Una realidad múltiple (1989). In the last two decades, both subjects and methodologies have diversified, making space for a broad range of approaches. Although philosophical texts still appear, they have largely given way to a proliferation of historical studies, sometimes combining with criticism. Works like Portales del laberinto (2009), by Jorge Francisco Liernur, Fernando Pérez Oyarzún, Pedro Bannen, and
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Federico Deambrosis; Chilean Modern Architecture since 1950 (2011), by Pérez Oyarzún, Rodrigo Pérez de Arce, and Horacio Torrent; and a number of others show a rich perspective on Chilean architecture in the early twenty-first century.

The city of Santiago developed alongside the early debates on modern architecture. Karl Brunner’s book Santiago de Chile: Su estado actual y futura formación (1932), which put forth both a plan for the Chilean capital and a criticism of Le Corbusier’s theories and urban plans in the context of the Congrès Internationaux d’Architecture Moderne, is an early example of a historical approach. Although that approach was rejected by more radical groups, it is nonetheless relevant for both its judgments and its proposals. More thorough historical studies of Santiago developed slowly in the next decades. The planning theories of the 1970s, exemplified in John Friedmann’s work on Santiago, contributed ideas but no historical analysis. In the 1970s and ‘80s, Juan Parrochia and Armando de Ramón, although they used different methodologies, helped to establish a historical view of Chile’s capital.

Alongside the debates on modern architecture and urban planning there appeared studies of the history of so-called colonial Chilean architecture. Following an approach originally developed at the Universidad de Chile, the first fully systematic studies of this kind appeared in the 1930s and ‘40s, in the work of Alfredo Benavides and Manuel Eduardo Secchi. Pursuing this direction in the 1970s and beyond, Gabriel Guarda reasserted the value of history as an intellectual project.
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Colombia

Hugo Mondragón and Ricardo Daza

The story of modern architecture in Colombia begins with Carlos Martínez and Jorge Arango’s book Arquitectura en Colombia: Arquitectura colonial, 1538–1810; Arquitectura contemporánea en cinco años, 1946–1951, published in 1951 by Editorial Proa. The book’s structure resembles that of The Museum of Modern Art’s exhibition catalogue Brazil Builds (1943); a selection of contemporary works preceded by an introduction attempting to link them with Colombian colonial architecture. With some nuances, this was the primary agenda of the magazine Proa during the thirty years that Martínez was its editor (1946–76), and it is also the evident agenda of Arquitectura en Colombia.

In 1981 Anne Berty published Architectures colombiennes: Alternatives aux modèles internationaux, a book that took a radical position against modernist architecture. Rather than seek a synthesis of the national and the international, Berty proposed the local as a project of resistance—resistance of the margin against the center, the local against the global. This ideological turn weighed heavily in the 1980s and ’90s and in some areas still dominates today. Silvia Arango’s essay “La evolución del pensamiento arquitectónico en Colombia, 1934–1984,” published in the Anuario de la arquitectura en Colombia for 1984 and again in the 1989 Historia de la arquitectura en Colombia, follows a similar agenda. These historical narratives were constructed with the goal of homogenizing Rogelio Salmona’s architectural program into a larger program of Colombian architecture.

As a body of critical writing that was particularly influential in its field, the writing of Germán Téllez Castañeda stands out for its distance from the ideological themes of nationalism versus internationalism and for its interest in the discipline of architecture. Recent studies also address concrete examples such as the Bogotá avenue Carrera Décima, Paul Lester Wiener and José Luis Sert’s plans for Colombian cities, and Le Corbusier’s much-studied encounter with Bogotá. Recent texts have recuperated the vision of ecological structure such as the Bogotá avenue Carrera Décima, Paul Lester Wiener and José Luis Sert’s plans for Colombian cities, and Le Corbusier’s much-studied encounter with Bogotá. Recent texts have recuperated the vision of ecological structure seen in Le Corbusier’s plan for the city, as well as the role Bogotá played as an urban laboratory in his development scheme for Chandigarh, India.

Recent years have seen the publication of many monographs on individual architects, as well as case studies of specific cities. Carlos Niño’s, Arquitectura y estado examines the projects of the Ministerio de Obras Públicas. Essays such as Hugo Mondragón and Felipe Lanuza’s “El intrincado juego de la identidad: Para una arqueología de la arquitectura colombiana” (2008) evidence the beginnings of critical reflection on the deliberate and militant practices of the history and critique produced in the 1980s and ’90s.
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Before the 1959 revolution and through the early 1960s, some of the most notable writing on Cuban architecture appeared in the pages of the journal Arquitectura (renamed Arquitectura Cuba in 1959). Starting in the 1930s the magazine’s editors featured modernist works by Cuban practitioners and published widely read essays by critics and architects such as Eugenio Batista and Pedro Martínez Inclán. In 1951 the journal Espacio, produced by the students of the Escuela de Arquitectura in Havana, challenged the hegemony of Arquitectura and advanced the cause of modernism in multiple disciplines. The founding figure of the history of modernism in Cuba was Joaquín Weiss, who produced the first survey of contemporary Cuban architecture, in 1947, and one of Latin America’s first histories of architecture worldwide, in 1957. Weiss’s acute reflections on modernism fell into obscurity, however, overshadowed by his accomplished studies on colonial architecture and by the ideological turn that overtook Cuban scholarship after the revolution. During this period, governmental agencies such as the Ministerio de la Construcción produced good compendiums such as La arquitectura escolar de la revolución cubana (1973) and Arquitectura y desarrollo nacional (1978), which contextualize the building achievements of the revolution in terms of the larger history of social and economic development in Cuba.

Since 1970 two scholars who represent generationally divergent attitudes toward the subject have dominated the literature. Before his death in 2013, the Italian-Argentine architect Roberto Segre was a vigorous proponent of the Cuban Revolution. He went to Cuba in 1963, joined the faculty of the Universidad de La Habana, and was an influential teacher there for thirty years. His seminal 1970 publication Diez años de arquitectura en Cuba revolucionaria valorized the work of the 1960s generation of Cuban architects as crucial to the socialist project while denigrating those who went into exile. Eduardo Luis Rodríguez was a student of Segre’s. In writings beginning in the 1990s, Rodríguez has sought to depoliticize the narrative, to illuminate the work of the island’s early modernists, and to reconnect the architecture of the postrevolution era to its antecedents in Cuban modernism of the 1940s and ‘50s. His 1997 essay “La década incógnita: Los cincuenta; Modernidad, identidad y algo más” was the first work of Cuban scholarship to consider the masters of the 1950s free of guilt by association with the old regime.

Work on Cuban architecture since the revolution remains incomplete. John Loomis’s 1999 Revolution of Forms: Cuba’s Forgotten Art Schools brought international celebrity to the neglected Escuelas Nacionales de Arte buildings of 1959–64 and promoted the campus as a singular embodiment of revolutionary ideals. In 2004 Rodríguez presented the broader scope of the remarkable architecture of the first decade of the revolution in an exhibition at New York’s Storefront for Art and Architecture, Architecture and Revolution in Cuba, 1959–1969, though a publication has yet to emerge from the project. Timothy Hyde’s recent Constitutional Modernism, which examines the process and form of civic architecture in the politically troubled decades before the revolution, is a significant achievement and an example for future scholarship on the longer history of Cuban modernism.
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The Dominican Republic    Gustavo Luis Moré

The Dominican Republic was one of the few Latin American countries missing from MoMA’s famous 1955 exhibition Latin American Architecture since 1945. The country’s modern architects appear nowhere in that show’s remarkable catalogue. This absence may be attributed to two causes: first, the international hostility toward the dictator Rafael Leónidas Trujillo, who governed with an iron fist from 1930 until 1961, when he was assassinated; and second, the fact that many of the country’s most recognized architectural works conformed to the early rationalism of the 1930s and ’40s, making little allusion to the predominant tone of the buildings in the catalogue, with their curtain walls, brise-soleils, and surfaces clad in natural materials. This situation had a corollary in the literature: during that period, only one, almost apocryphal book, La arquitectura dominicana en la era de Trujillo, was published on the architecture of the time, and it was written by the architect most connected to the regime, Henry Gazón Bona.

With the end of the dictatorship, the country moved forward as a democracy. An architects’ union was founded, and later became the Colegio Dominicano de Ingenieros Arquitectos, which produced, at irregular intervals, a magazine that was the only documentary record of the country’s new architecture. In 1979 a group of young architects came together as the Grupo Nueva Arquitectura (GNA), a collective dedicated to the study, circulation, and promotion of the country’s built heritage. Their initiatives inspired parallel developments in other countries in the region, including Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Guadalupe. The GNA published Arquivox, the Dominican Republic’s first genuinely analytic magazine on architecture, and for a number of years contributed a widely influential architecture page to the newspaper El nuevo diario, published every Tuesday and later collected as a set in 100 hojas de arquitectura.

The first wide-ranging study of the Dominican architecture of the period was Rafael Calventi Gaviño’s Arquitectura contemporánea en República Dominicana (1986). Interest in the Greater Caribbean region, with its foundation in the CARICOM/OECA Plan, was strengthened by various studies, including the Manual bibliográfico de la arquitectura y el urbanismo en el Gran Caribe, that opened the way to the appearance of the magazine Archivos de arquitectura antillana (AAA), which began publication in 1996. Issues no. 33 of the Docomomo Journal (2005) and no. 34 of AAA (2009) were devoted to the regional panorama; that issue of AAA was the product of a conference organized by The Museum of Modern Art and the University of Technology, Jamaica, on the theme of modernity in the Greater Caribbean.

Eugenio Pérez Montaís brought together years of study and rigorous scholarship in his monumental volume La ciudad del Ozama (1998), a history of the city of Santo Domingo. Other texts with an urban focus are Antonio Vélez Catrain’s Ideas urbanas para Santo Domingo (2002), Ramón Vargas Mera’s Tendencias urbanísticas en América Latina y el Caribe (2004), José Enrique Delmonte’s Guía de arquitectura de Santo Domingo (2006), and Cristóbal Valdez’s Reflexiones urbanas (2007). Two texts published outside the country situated Dominican architecture in a wider perspective: the Panamanian scholar Eduardo Tejeira Davis’s doctoral thesis “Roots of Modern Latin American Architecture,” written in Heidelberg, on the Hispanic Caribbean, and Roberto Segre’s pivotal Arquitectura antillana del siglo XX (Segre was one of the most widely circulated and influential authors in the region.) My own Historias para la construcción de la arquitectura dominicana, 1492–2008 and Delmonte’s 60 años edificados are two narrative texts on Dominican urban planning and architecture. Both address the country’s recent architecture from historical as well as critical perspectives.

The view today is much more positive than it was three decades ago. Well-established journals such as AAA, AAA/Pro...Files, Arquitecto, Hábitat, and others maintain a variety of complementary perspectives on the national and regional scene, as do books focusing on more specific subjects and architectural projects that enrich our national inventory. A rigorous and updated critical vision is needed, however, the more precisely to situate the difficult and sometimes uncomfortable presence of the Dominican Republic within the diffuse Latin American panorama as seen from these paradoxically marginal shores.


The history of Mexican modern architecture has for the most part been written by two important groups: people from outside Mexico, whose foreign perspective has allowed them to highlight specific characteristics of identity; and the country’s own leading architects, who have written instrumental texts. This second group has tended to view modern architecture as an outgrowth of the Mexican Revolution of 1910—a socially responsible architecture, in other words, not subject to foreign influences.

The first magazine articles (whether published in Mexico or abroad), and Esther Born’s groundbreaking survey of 1937, The New Architecture in Mexico, were clearly of great importance and demonstrated an optimism about the ability of modern architecture to create a better future. In fighting for that architecture, functionalists legitimated it through a schematic historical materialism that identified ornamentation as an instrument of the exploitation of the working classes. Conflicting ideas about modern architecture were evident in Pláticas sobre arquitectura of 1933. In 1937, in his book El arte moderno en México: Breve historia siglos XIX y XX, Justino Fernández for the first time proposed a genealogy of and a historical argument for Mexican modern architecture, launching ideas that would remain current for years about that architecture’s origins, and ancestors, the negative reading of early forms of modern styles, and the condemnation of radical functionalism.

In the 1950s, under the spell of the Ciudad Universitaria, Carlos Obregón Santacilia and José Villagrán reviewed the past and identified the styles of the nineteenth century with the political powers of Mexico as it was before the revolution. They also described the “erroneous but necessary” paths taken to establish Mexican identity and break with academic traditions—the paths in question initially being those of the neocolonial style and, later, that of radical functionalism. They argued for a national consensus around an idea of modern architecture that would incorporate common features of past architectures, both indigenous and Spanish.

With the work of Israel Katzman and Mauricio Gómez Mayorga in the 1960s, architectural history became more professionalized, and architectural discourse was buoyed by optimism, related to an openness to influence from abroad and a view of modern architecture as being moved by industrial and technological development along a linear path of progress. In the 1970s critical historians such as Rafael López Rangel and Ramón Vargas reacted against these discourses, sharing a Marxist ideology and locating themselves in the context of an era of crisis and economic dependence. In a search for responses to this sense of crisis they looked to the past, focusing on the functionalist architecture of the 1930s, which they saw in heroic terms. In the 1980s and ’90s Enrique de Anda, Antonio Toca, and Louise Noelle attempted to address history from a more neutral position and identified a continuity in the synthesis of Mexican identity and modernity achieved at Ciudad Universitaria and elsewhere. These projects led to the heights of architectural language seen in the work of Luis Barragán, whom Emilio Ambasz had introduced to an international audience through an exhibition at MoMA as early as 1976.

General studies have become scarcer in recent decades, making room for deeper study of specific cases. A focus on gathering, distributing, and safeguarding historiographic documents—as in the work of Carlos Ríos Garza—and a renewed interest on the part of North American academics such as Keith Eggener and Luis E. Carranza have allowed for critical reconsiderations that transcend linear discourse and arbitrary categories, bringing to light elements of Mexican modern architecture that had previously gone unnoticed.
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**Perú**

Sharif Kahatt

Theoretical and critical reflections on modern architecture have appeared only fleetingly in Peru; from the postwar period through to the present moment, they have gained no representative presence in the region. The few texts published in the first decades of the twentieth century addressed Neoclassical practices and, later, the establishment of a national style through directions such as the neocolonial, the “neo-Inca,” and the “neo-Peruvian.” Only at the end of the 1930s did the discourse begin to shift toward a form of modernism associated with the principles of architectural and urban functionalism.

These attempts to initiate a new architecture coincided with the publication of the first texts by Luis Miro Quesada and Fernando Belaunder Terry, the former, in essays in the newspaper El comercio, calling for advances in thinking on architecture, the city, and art, and the latter, as founder and editor of the magazine El arquitecto peruano, affirming the social responsibility of architecture. Only in 1945, however, was a book published that can be called a foundational text about modern architecture in Peru, Miró Quesada’s Espacio en el tiempo: La arquitectura moderna como tradición cultural. Miró Quesada took an optimistic view of the modernist avant-garde and tried to interpret it from a Peruvian perspective. His book signaled the beginning of a consolidation of modern architecture at all levels, from academic teaching to actual construction.
By around 1955 the state, the private sector, and most of Peru's urban population had accepted modern architecture as a reality. Attempts to develop architectural discourse remained few, however, and were centered on discussion of the need for mass housing projects. Without critiquing modernist doctrine, Peruvian architects worked on adapting modern architecture to local realities, adjusting their practices to the country's political, social, cultural, environmental, and building conditions, as is evident from the magazine El arquitecto peruano.

In the context of these efforts, some of the most important essays and books relating to these new ideas regarding mass housing and urbanization efforts were published. The most important texts of the 1950s and 1960s—with a central focus on the population's lack of economic resources and the socio-political necessities that arose out of the explosive growth of Peruvian cities—concentrated on problems and solutions regarding affordable housing. Among these, the work of Adolfo Córdova is particularly outstanding.

In the 1970s, the last publication to make a real attempt to rethink architecture in Peru was the Carta de Machu Picchu (1977). Written by an international group of architects, this manifesto-like text—similar in its objectives to Le Corbusier’s Athens Charter, published in 1943—focused on the urban responsibility of architecture, in a context where countries everywhere were experiencing crises around energy, ecology, and social issues. The Carta de Machu Picchu also shares in the worldwide concern with conceiving new forms of urbanism and rethinking the role of architecture in society.

Since the 1980s Peru’s most important architectural writings have been dedicated to recuperating the work of important modern architects—their projects and ideas and their relation to the city. Many of these texts have involved analyses of the construction of modernity in Peru, and particularly of these architects’ contributions to urban and architectural culture. A number of them have reflected on the relationship of modernity to notions of identity and urbanism; depending on the specific discourse, these ideas tend to be presented as contributions and recognitions of the local, the universal, and the interconnections between the two. In the early years of this century, urban culture, housing, the city, and, in particular, modernity continue to be the principal issues with which architectural thinking in Peru is concerned.

Puerto Rico

Enrique Vivoni-Farage

In 1923, in El libro de Puerto Rico/The Book of Puerto Rico, the Bohemian architect Antonin Nechoda took a theoretical view of design in the tropics for the first time in twentieth-century architecture literature on Puerto Rico; in so doing, he coined the term “ultra-modern style,” for one “founded upon the urgent needs of the people who have chosen this tropical island for their abode.” He described the need for use of reinforced concrete walls, leaded colored-glass windows, and deep overhangs to protect from the tropical light so injurious to the white races in the tropics.” He further asserted that the “residents of the island have a tendency towards bright colors” because of the gorgeous and vivid colors of the tropics.

The influence of the tropics on architecture in Puerto Rico was a local issue from that point until 1945, when the work of the Committee for Design of Public Works (a product of the New Deal) was published by Richard Neutra in the March issue of Architectural Forum. For the committee the tropics and the socioeconomic condition of Puerto Rico were paramount, and it is in this context that architectural discussion would develop through the 1970s.

The Bibliography is organized as a catalogue. Theoretical issues are absent from publications until Henry Klumb, in interviews and writings published in journals and books, began to expound on his ideas of living in nature. The work of Klumb's contemporaries, including...
Osvaldo Toro, Miguel Ferrer, Jesús Amaral, Efrer Morales, Thomas Marvel, and Jorge del Río, appeared in various US and international architectural journals starting in 1949, but their work was generally presented as simply buildings in Puerto Rico, without their ideas on what architecture for the island should represent. But Efren Pérez-Charis provided a most vibrant voice, editorializing in his journal, Urbe, on architects and architecture in Puerto Rico. This journal, published from 1962 to 1973, argued in favor of both the Modern Movement and preservation, published architects’ biographies, fought for the establishment of an architecture school, and proposed the URBE awards for architecture it considered deserving.

The first in-depth books about architecture in Puerto Rico were published in the 1990s, starting with Jorge Rigau’s *Puerto Rico 1900* (1992), followed in 1997 by a series of books by the Archivo de Arquitectura y Construcción at the Universidad de Puerto Rico, which included biographies of architects and historical contextualization of their time.

In the 2000s the Colegio de Arquitectos published its first books, in a series called Colección Catálogos de Arquitectos and featuring Thomas Marvel, Jesús Amaral, and Luis Flores. The Amaral book was entirely written by Andrés Miguucci; the other contain essays by various architects and the featured architects themselves in monograph on their works.


**Uruguay** Jorge Nudelman

Uruguayan architectural historiography proper began in 1955 with the publication of Juan Giuria’s four-volume *La arquitectura en el Uruguay*, which described the national architecture from its colonial origins through the year 1900. Only a few years earlier, in 1952, the Facultad de Arquitectura—the architecture school at the Universidad de la República in Montevideo—had changed its curriculum, moving from a Beaux Arts model to a program that emphasized material production and organized theoretical courses of study in accordance with the Athens Charter. The school’s antihistoricist tendency—and that of the authors who followed Giuria, including Aurelio Lucchini and, to a lesser extent, Leopoldo Carlos Artucio—would move the direction of research at the Instituto de Historia de la Arquitectura (earlier called the Instituto de Arqueología Americana) toward a scientific review of issues to do with the origins and evolution of “national” territory. The institute started to publish these studies in 1962 in its *Fascículos de información*, beginning with readings of land use, then later, though not to any great extent, moving on to other types of historiography, such as a debate between the architects Julio Vilamajó and Octavio de los Campos on the 1930 regulatory plan for Montevideo. In general, the writing of this period was oriented more toward cataloguing efforts than toward critique.

A military regime took over the government of Uruguay in 1973, and the following year its intervention in the university interrupted these projects. Lucchini, the director of the Instituto de Historia de la Arquitectura, had been working on a history of Uruguayan architecture; an unfinished version of this book would be published posthumously in 1988, under the title *El concepto de arquitectura y su traducción a formas en el territorio que hoy pertenece a la República Oriental del Uruguay*. The institute’s faculty had constituted the largest concentration of architectural scholars in Uruguay, but a number of them resigned, and over the next decade the publication of architectural writing decreased and showed little innovation. When democracy returned in 1985, revisionist debates on modern architecture had advanced without the institute’s participation. The leading writer of this period was Mariano Arana, and regionalist impulses were at the forefront; some younger writers, including Juan Bastarrea, Mariella Russi, and others, would work with these themes, but the continuity of archival and documentary work had been lost. A critical update seemed urgently necessary, and attempts were made in this direction, but their foundations in research were weak, and they mainly produced a growing number of opinion-based texts published in the 1990s in magazines such as *Elarqa* and by Julio Gaeta’s Dos Puntos press. Today, a generation that grew out of that time—including Laura Alemán, Mary Méndez, Santiago Medero, Emilio...
Nisivocia, and Martín Cobas—has taken up the task of renewing the discourse
with more documentary rigor and in an updated critical context.
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Venezuela Guillermo Barrios

At the very moment when the process of establishing modern architecture
in Venezuela reached its peak, in 1954 and 1955, Gio Ponti published a pair of
articles in Domus, “Coraggio del Venezuela” and “A Caracas,” highlighting the
rapidity and the nature of the transformations in the architectural environment
of Venezuela’s capital city. The phenomenon not only attracted the attention
of the international media but sparked the development of specialized journals
within Venezuela, including, notably, Integral (1955–59). It was only in the 1960s,
however, that the foundations of the country’s architectural literature were
laid. One milestone was the book Caracas a través de su arquitectura (1969),
which balances Graziano Gasparini’s valorization of a built heritage profoundly
affected by new infrastructures against Juan Pedro Posani’s sense of the mul-
tiple expressions, tendencies, and contradictions that came into play as these
processes unfolded. A few years earlier, Carlos Raúl Villanueva had advanced
an analytical approach based on historical comparisons in his book Caracas en tres tiempos (1966), which shows how this master architect’s readings of traditional architecture generated intriguing insights into his own works. Villanueva’s projects lie at the heart of Venezuelan modernity, as Sibyl Moholy-Nagy makes clear in her 1964 book Carlos Raúl Villanueva and the Architecture of Venezuela, which includes an insightful overview of the architectural panorama of the time.

The architectural literature of subsequent years often focused on particular architects working in the national context of Venezuela. This was true, for example, of Silvia Hernández de Lasala’s book Malaussena (1990), a reference work focusing on the prelude to the country’s modernist achievements, and of Alberto Sato’s José Miguel Galia (2002), on the Uruguayan creator of many important examples of Venezuelan modernism. In addition to the tendency of focusing on individual figures, the literature also addressed the development of the modern city through analyses of urban-planning processes, for example in La reurbanización “El Silencio” (1988), by Ricardo De Sola, and El Plan Rotival: La Caracas que no fue, published in 1991 by the Instituto de Urbanismo at the Universidad Central de Venezuela. Other books inventoried notable points on the urban map. The origins of this kind of project include the series of articles “Guía arquitectónica de Caracas,” begun by Manuel López in the magazine Punto in 1979, and Mariano Goldberg’s Guía de edificaciones contemporáneas de Caracas (1982). In the mid-1980s Los signos habitables, organized by William Niño, launched a series of expository projects by Venezuelan museums whose catalogues would become important reference sources both on the works of specific architects and on tendencies and currents in the architecture of the immediately preceding decades. In Venezuela y el problema de su identidad arquitectónica (2006), Azier Calvo tried to smooth out the fragmentariness of the narrative of Venezuelan modernist architecture through both substantive analysis and a minutely detailed cataloguing of references and associations. That narrative remains an ongoing focus of academic research (whose results, however, are seldom published) and sporadic independent book and lecture projects, and has proven a popular subject of exchange on social networks.
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