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The study of the transfer of urban planning into Latin America has been mainly focused on the research about the foreign visitors’ works and urban design proposals from the beginning of the twentieth century. As a way of exploring other variables of this process of transference, the paper aims at searching antecedents and works that help to explain how the fields of urban and planning history emerged and were consolidated in Latin America’s academic milieux between the 1930s and 1980s, approximately.

For that purpose, the paper starts by reviewing the possible influence of the 1930s’ famous visitors, who were linked to the professional practice, as well as the theoretical influence of general and comparative books – not case studies - events and authors related to the emerging fields of urban and planning history. The comprehension of the process of transfer and shaping makes necessary to understand how the local milieux conceived the emerging agenda of town planning in general, since both historiographic and professional processes seem to have been parallel. The paper will also try to pinpoint how, from the 1960s, the Latin American scholars’ exchange with other nuclei in Europe and North America would lead to the constitution of the field. Besides the contribution of pioneers such as the Argentine Jorge E. Hardoy, the epistemological consolidation will be explored through events focusing on Latin America’s urban historiography, especially within the symposia of the Congresses of Americanists, as well as through the ensuing publications. Other approaches by social sciences, such as the School of Dependency, will also be considered. Although the fields of urban and planning history were closely linked by the mid-twentieth century, it will be pursued a different development of planning history in terms of the same variables.

This paper is drawn from my current postdoctoral research about Latin America’s urban historiography, Centro de Estudios Posdoctorales (CIPOST), Universidad Central de Venezuela, Caracas.
Resumen

El estudio de la transferencia urbanística hacia América Latina ha estado principalmente centrado en la investigación sobre la labor de los visitantes foráneos y sus propuestas de diseño urbano y planificación desde comienzos del siglo XX. Tratando de explorar otras variables de ese proceso de transferencia, este trabajo intenta buscar antecedentes y obras que ayuden a explicar cómo el campo de la historia y del urbanismo llegó a emerger y se consolidó en los medios académicos latinoamericanos entre los años 1930 y 19870, aproximadamente.

A tal efecto, se comenzará por revisar la posible influencia de famosas figuras visitantes desde los años 19320, vinculadas más bien a la práctica profesional, así como de la influencia teórica de libros generales y comparativos - no casos de estudio - autores y obras más eventos directamente relacionados con los nacientes campos de la historia de la ciudad y el urbanismo. La comprensión del proceso de transferencia y formación pasa por entender cómo los medios locales concibieron la agenda emergente del urbanismo en general, ya que ambos procesos historiográfico y profesional parecen haber sido paralelos. También se intentará precisar cómo, a partir de los años 1960, la interacción entre los académicos latinoamericanos con otros núcleos historiográficos de Europa y Norteamérica llevó a la cristalización del campo. Además de la labor de líderes como el argentino Jorge E. Hardoy, esta consolidación será explorada a través de eventos especializados sobre historiografía urbana latinoamericana, especialmente en los simposios de los Congresos de Americanistas, así como a través de las publicaciones subsiguientes. También serán consideradas otras aproximaciones científico-sociales, como la de la Escuela de la Dependencia. Aunque los campos de la historia urbana y del urbanismo estaban estrechamente vinculados para mediados del siglo XX, se tratará de seguir un desarrollo diferenciado de la historia urbanística en términos de las mismas variables.

Esta ponencia se deriva de mi actual investigación posdoctoral sobre la historiografía urbana latinoamericana, Centro de Estudios Posdoctorales (CIPOST), Universidad Central de Venezuela, Caracas.
Introduction

La comprensión del proceso de transferencia pasa por entender cómo los pioneros locales del urbanismo – della Paolera en Argentina, Harth-terré en Perú, Villanueva en Venezuela, entre otros – entendieron el tema de la historia urbana y trataron de insertarlo en los medios académicos y profesionales. También se intentará precisar cómo, a partir de los años 1960, la interacción entre los académicos latinoamericanos con otros núcleos historiográficos de Europa y Norteamérica llevó a la cristalización del campo. Además de la labor de líderes como el argentino Jorge E. Hardoy, esta consolidación será explorada a través de eventos especializados sobre historiografía urbana latinoamericana, especialmente en los simposios de los Congresos de Americanistas, así como a través de la publicación de obras pioneras.

From the 1990s, the study of urban transfer into Latin America has been mainly focused on the contribution by foreign visitors and their proposals of urban design from the early twentieth century (Hardoy, 19889; Almandoz, 2002?). Trying to encourage a search for other variables of that transfer process, this paper aims at looking for antecedents and books, authors and events that help to explain how the fields of urban and planning history were shaped in Latin America from the 1930s through the 19870s, approximately. For that purpose, it is necessary to consider, firstly, the theoretical and historical influence of epistemological components – history of art and architecture, geography and urban sociology, among other – that were peculiarly fundamental at the beginning of Latin America’s urban historiography. Secondly, there were the foreign works and authors rather linked to the practice of the emerging discipline, as well as the interpretation of those precepts made by local pioneers of urbanism, all of which were still intertwined with history in academic and professional milieux by the mid-twentieth century. As a third stage, from the 1960s onwards, it will be considered how the interaction between Latin American scholars and other nuclei in Europe and North America led to the consolidation of the historiographic field.

The main thread for tracing this process of transfer and consolidation of urban history is the contribution by the books coming from fields around urban studies. Adopted in the postdoctoral research this paper is drawn from, this bookish approach lies in turn on an epistemological conception, ranging from Hayden White and Michel de Certeau through Paul Ricoeur, according to which history is mainly a “literary artifice” (Ricoeur, 1987, III, p. 287). However, it cannot be dismissed the influence that the changes of the professional practice of urban planning has had in its own historiography, in the way that Sutcliffe (2003), for instance, has recently reconstructed for the British milieu. At the same time, the occurrence of events, the contribution by pioneers and curricular changes in universities are key elements for recreating the origins of Latin America’s urban historiography, as one of its leaders, Roberto Segre, has helped me to frame in a recent interview (Almandoz, 2003).

So, in addition to the appearance of the first specialized books – which remain as the main historiographic variable of this paper’s discourse structure – this consolidation will be complemented with references to events, pioneers and academic changes. As a final consideration, it must be said that, although I am aware that it is difficult to be maintained regarding some books, I stick to the traditional distinction between “urban history” as referring to the city as such and the process of urbanization, and “planning history” as the one dealing with the constitution of the discipline and practical ways of intervening the urban settlement and space.
Urban history: from art history to the School of Dependency

Unlike countries like Britain and the United States, where urban history seems to have derived from economic and social mainstreams (Almandoz, 2003a), history of art seems to have provided a first substratum for Latin America’s urban historiography. Encouraged by the pan-American congresses of architecture, from the late 1920s Argentina’s Martín Noel and Mario Buschiazzo, Peru’s Emilio Harth-terré and Mexico’s Manuel Touissant published a series of works on Hispanic America’s history of art and architecture, which eventually led to urban morphology. Among the periodicals that supported that first group of art historans were the University of Mexico’s Anales del Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas from 1937; followed by the University of Buenos Aires’s Anales del Instituto de Arte Americano e Investigaciones Estéticas from 1948. This Creole generation’s search brought about the first studies about urban plans and forms for Mexico City (1938), Buenos Aires (1940), Montevideo (1944), Lima (1945), Havana (1945-6) and Guatemala City (1948), in all of which the “isolated building and its morphology are no longer the sole concern of the art historian” (Palm, 1968, pp. 22, 26-27).

From the United States, George Kubler, Dan Stanislawski and Robert Ricard worked on the subject of colonial architecture and urbanism in Hispanic America, while Oskar Jürgens and E. Palm did the same from Germany (Kubler, 1968).2 Also Spain made a significant contribution to the historiography of Latin America’s art and architecture. After Seville’s Iberian American Exhibition in 1922, which seems to have prompted the peninsular interest for the artistic expressions of its former colonies, the notebooks on Arte en América y Filipinas appeared from 1935. Published by the Spanish Diego Angulo Iñíguez between 1933 and 1939, the Archivo de Indias collection of colonial plans was followed by the mammoth Historia del arte hispanoamericano (1945-56), edited by Angulo Iñíguez jointly with Enrique Marco Dorta and Mario Buschiazzo, whose volumes referred to colonial layouts of Latin American capitals.3 As Segre has pointed out, these reference works provided an early and stimulant input for young generations to envisage the field of urban historiography in Latin America (Almandoz, 2003).4 In this respect, it is also worth noticing the treatment given to the city in encyclopaedias such as the Histoire générale des civilizations (1953-1961), coordinated by Maurice Crouzet, which was translated into Spanish and Portuguese almost immediately.5 (1)

*The progressive specialization of university curricula is another historiographic variable that promises an interesting approach, though it has just started to be explored from the architectural domain. As early examples of urban studies in academic institutions, it can be mentioned that the professorship chair on urban planning at Rosario’s University of Litoral was promoted from 1929 by the Argentine pioneer Carlos Della Paolera, who came to hold the same position in Buenos Aires from 1933 (Randle, 1977, p. 12); also by the early 1930s, Lúcio Costa’s reform at Rio de Janeiro’s National School of Fine Arts aimed at instituting the teaching of urbanism in Brazil. Also the visits of famous urbanists helped to bolster the specialization of Latin America’s urban studies, as it happened with Karl Brunner in Chile and Colombia. One year after the publication appearance of The Culture of Cities, the Austrian professor published his Manual de urbanismo (1939-40), where not only Mumford was referred to, but also was picked up the latter’s evolutionist idea – inherited from Geddes and Lavedan – regarding the shaping determination of 20th the twentieth century’s urban agenda by the problems of the nineteenth 19th’s problems (Brunner, 1939, I, pp. 13-15). (2)

Gaston Bardet had influence in Brazil, where the famous urbanist gave a course in Belo Horizonte in the 1940s. His ideas about the “domesticurban step” and other variants of the neighbourhood unit were adopted from the beginning of the same decade by the Venezuelan architect Carlos R. Villanueva, for his famous project of urban renewal of El Silencio, in central Caracas (Villanueva, 1967, p. 24).6 By the 1950s, the father Joseph Lebret’s visits to Brazil and
other Latin American countries helped to experience with different levels of collective life, drawn from human economy and from the ideas of the Economy and Humanism Movement, which advocated the incorporation of social variables and interdisciplinary approaches to regional and town planning (Leme, 1999). Even though these examples are not directly related to historiography, it can be said that, on the one hand, they represented the application of notions of Geddes, Poëte and Bardet, who had early shown an interest for linking the urban evolution with professional town planning and civic studies; on the other, they correspond to an epistemological moment in which the practise of the discipline seemed to feed back the urban historiography that was being shaped.

*Coming from the architectural field, the Argentine Jorge Hardoy emerged as pioneer of a more focused urban history of Latin America, especially after his work *Las ciudades precolombinas* (1964). Jointly with the Americans Richard Schaedel and Richard Morse, among others, from the 1960s Hardoy organized symposia about regional urbanization in the context of the Congresses of Americanists: Mar del Plata (1966), Stuttgart (1968), Lima (1970), Rome (1972), Mexico City (1974) and Paris (1976). The early ones dealt with Latin America’s urbanization in general and throughout different historical periods, searching “to facilitate a wide exchange of ideas among archeologists, architects, anthropologists, social and art historians, as well as town planners” (Schaedel and Hardoy, 1975, p. 16); but after Lima, a central issue was set for each event, subject to review from the pre-Columbian to the contemporary times. (3) Also in terms of events, it is noteworthy that an International Seminar about the “Situation of the Historiography of Latin American Architecture” was held in Caracas, organized by Graziano Gasparini at the Central University of Venezuela’s Centre of Historical and Aesthetical Research (CIHE); from its foundation in 1963, the CIHE carried out a continental mission parallel to Hardoy’s Torcuato Di Tella Institute in Buenos Aires. (4)

In addition to the growing importance given by architectural journals to urban history, the all-embracing perspective of colonial and republican periods was consolidated by the 1960s and 1970s in several compilations about Latin America’s urbanization, edited in Spanish by Hardoy, Carlos Tobar and Francisco de Solano, as well as in English by Hardoy himself, Morse and Bryan Roberts. Among the multi-authored books that contributed to the continent’s historiographic delimitation, one of the most successful resulted from the joint effort of experts on Latin American architecture, such as Bullrich, Hardoy and Roberto Segre, among others that had gathered in 1967 in Lima under UNESCO’s patronage, and in Buenos Aires two years later. With chapters addressing diverse urban aspects such as the process of urbanization, the shaping of metropolitan areas and squatter settlements, the transformation of rural and the new towns, the book finally appeared with the not-very-representative title of *América Latina en su arquitectura* (1975), edited by Segre, with successive editions until the early 1980s. (5)

*After the delimitation of the field, the 1970s seemed to allow an internal differentiation of approaches. Patricio Randle’s interesting interpretation of urban historiography in *Evolución urbanística* (1972) evinced the influence of French historians and urbanists such as Lavedan, Poëte and Bardet, combined with the organicism of Geddes and Mumford. Distinguished by the Argentine scholar from Darwin’s evolutionism, his was supposed to be a historiographic category more specific than the urban historical geography or than the town or planning history, since it should “prevent by itself the lack of spatiality that often leads to clashing with other historical approaches”, besides making “an elaboration or processing of historical data with its own method and aim” (Randle, 1972, pp. 13-14). (6)

Following the Marxist interpretation, from the late 1960s through the early 1980s, social sciences were provided by the so-called School of Dependency (SoD) with a historical matrix aimed at understanding Latin America’s backwardness during the colonial and republican eras,
including the economic, political and social dimensions of underdevelopment. The structural problems of the “depending urbanization” throughout the twentieth century were described and analyzed by Manuel Castells in *Imperialismo y urbanización en América Latina* (1973), and by Marta Schteingart in *Urbanización y dependencia en América Latina* (1973); the social and political aspects of the region’s cities as dramatic stages of that urbanization were typified by Marcos Kaplan and Aníbal Quijano, among others. A historical analysis of the continental and national networks of cities was carried out by Alejandro Rofman in *Dependencia, estructura de poder y formación regional en América Latina* (1974) – one of the few attempts to spatialize the historical analysis. This is why I believe that Edward Soja’s (1995) thesis – according to which the Marxist critique reinstated space in critical social theory in the case of geography – is not applicable to the historical and social analyses of Latin America’s SoD.

Besides the lack of spatial and territorial projection, the oblivion of cultural aspects was another weakness of the SoD – though it would be more than compensated by José Luis Romero’s classic *Latinoamérica: las ciudades y las ideas* (1976), which fortunately escaped from the school’s orthodox principles and agenda. Additionally, as it has been pointed out by Francois-Xavier Guerra from a more historiographic perspective, the SoD authors offered in many cases “interpretations” more than “studies grounded on a careful exploration of the sources” (Guerra, 1989, p. 605). Following a reaction “against the too dependency-oriented analyses” that also happened in other fields of Latin America’s economic and social history (Mauro, 1989, p. 641), most of that Marxist rationality would be rejected as a historical explanation throughout the 1980s, though some of the SoD’s urban statements would keep sense in later approaches, reinterpreted from diverse perspectives. This shift can be said to have been international, considering that after economy-oriented explanations based on Marxism; after the geographical emphasis of the *longue durée* inspired on Braudel and the School of Annals; and even after the demographic emphasis of the so-called “Malthusian model” of social change, the “new history” leaders became “increasingly open about explanations” (Burke, 2001, p. 15).

**Planning history: the dialogue with architectural historiography**

Even though this paper is focused on books, pioneers and events – and not on articles of specialized journals – I dare say that the development of Latin America’s planning history seems to have been more dynamic than its urban counterpart. Perhaps this vitality has been prompted by the former’s capacity of dialogue with architecture and design, facilitated by the architectural background of most of the pioneers of urban historiography. So it is convenient to make some general considerations in relation to the teaching of architecture, before going on with the emergence of planning history as a field.

From the 1920s, the Pan-American Congresses of Architecture promoted the teaching of planning in the context of a discipline that was still oriented towards the Prix-de-Rome academicism, combined with Sitte’s artistic legacy. According to Hardoy’s testimony, the contents of the first courses of town planning did not facilitate understanding the structure and dynamics of either the city or the historic centres which rapidly sprawled and crowded. It happened as in the emerging urbanism then in practise: even though there were some interventions inspired on functional modernism, most of Latin America’s urban renewals stuck to partial approaches to traffic, green areas and embellishment, without incorporating the economic, social and environmental dimensions advocated by technical planning (Hardoy, 1991; Almandoz, 2002, pp. 31-32). Especially from the 1940s through the 1960s, the teaching of history was established when architecture schools overcame the nineteenth-century dichotomy
between the artistic principles of the École des Beaux-Arts and the engineer-oriented of the École Polytechnique, which had been reproduced in some Latin American universities from colonial times. As in other parts of the world, the cultural heritage awareness bolstered, from the 1970s, the teaching of architectural history in many universities; later on, it can be said that history framed the teaching of theory and criticism (Torre, 2002, pp. 549-51).13 (10)

In a continent still seduced by Beaux-Arts academicism, from the 1930s the practical orientations of urbanism opened more, though, towards modern and technical influences of famous planners, who helped to the institutional consolidation of this field in Latin American countries. While Le Corbusier’s functionalist proposals for Buenos Aires, Rio de Janeiro and Bogotá continued after his first tour throughout the continent in 1929, Hannes Meyer’s rationalism was introduced in Mexico during the Swiss architect’s visit after an invitation by President Lázaro Cárdenas.14 Besides the Polish Gregori Warchavchik, who stayed in São Paulo, luminaries of the Congrès d’Architecture Moderne (CIAM), such as Walter Gropius, Richard Neutra and Joseph Albers, visited Cuba and Brazil during the 1940s; in the following decade, José Luis Sert designed a plan for Batista’s Havana. Also from the late 1940s, in Pérez Jiménez’s progressive Venezuela, modern planning was advocated by Sert, Francis Violich and the French urbanist Maurice Rotival (Almandoz, 2002, pp. 35-7; Fraser, 2002, pp. 9, 21).

Through books and courses, some foreign figures had an academic influence oriented towards planning history. Besides helping to found the institutional and professional platforms of town planning in Chile and Colombia, let us remember that Brunner published his Manual de urbanismo, where a review of the main solutions that the emerging discipline offered to the functional problems of world metropolises – let us say it again - was innovatively compiled for Latin America’s readers, with many examples of its changing cities. Also from a prospective rather than historical perspective, Violich’s Cities of Latin America. Housing and Planning to the South (1944) offered one of the first comparisons among the republics’ urban milieux the Californian planner was in contact with after a long journey throughout the continent. Invited by his disciple, the Argentine urbanist Carlos Della Paolera, Marcel Poëte’s visit for launching the “Curso Superior de Urbanismo” (Advanced Course of Planning) at the University of Buenos Aires, was to influence the evolutionist orientation of the teaching of history, inspired on the Institut d’Urbanisme the French historian came from. Also Gaston Bardet visited the Argentine capital in 1949, though he was devoted to teaching more instrumental than historical courses (Randle, 1972, pp. 32-4). By that time, as it has already been said, the architect and historian also lectured in Belo Horizonte, where the father Joseph Lebret had been in 1946, promoting his Economy and Humanism Movement. (Leme, 1999, pp. 26, 32). By the mid-1950s, the reform in the teaching of planning, among other disciplines, became an important reference at Argentina’s National University of Rosario, where professionals from Buenos Aires were called upon. Among them were consolidated figures of architectural and urban historiography, such as Francisco Bullrich and Jorge Enrique Hardoy, who on that occasion were approached by a younger generation of scholars, including Roberto Segre.

From the 1960s, Marina Waisman edited the series of Cuadernos Summa Nueva Visión, which aimed at serving as an alternative to the predominance of foreign classics in Latin America’s architectural schools. Her best known book, La estructura histórica del entorno (1972), cannot be considered a work of urbanism, not even of architectural history in the traditional sense. However, in her attempt to establish a new epistemology for the architecture of the industrial era, relying for that purpose on the discursive-formation method similar to the one unfolded in Foucault’s L’archéologie du savoir (1969), the Argentine professor updated and enlarged the concept of “entorno” (environment) as “cultural unity” (Waisman, 1972, p. 47), in such a way that opens and strengthens links with the city and its planning. In this respect, Waisman’s influential interpretation – which had great impact among a generation of
architectural historians and critics in Argentina and Latin America in general – advocated that historical research was supported “rather by structural relationships” among the objects than focusing on the field's objects as such; furthermore, within this sort of vectorial complex that the architecture’s cultural field is, the “relations of the work with the environment” were recognized as one of architecture’s traditional issues of “historical studies” (Waisman, 1972, pp. 43, 59). Even though Waisman’s book does not identify an explicit link with the city and planning, both of them can be said to be encompassed in her notion of entorno, just as the study of the historical relationship with the urban components of that environment is recognized as belonging to the architecture’s epistemology.

Reviews While architecture was to develop its own historiographic agenda, reviews of the origins of urbanism were included in treatises of the discipline published in the 1960s by the Peruvian Emilio Harth-terré and the Argentine Patricio Randle. While the former’s Filosofía en el urbanismo (1961) focused on drawing the epistemology of urbanism from preceding disciplines, what led him to a more philosophical than historical report, the latter’s Qué es el urbanismo (1968) went beyond the review, in order to establish his own historiographic search and typology, both in urban and planning terms. Inspired on Oswald Spengler’s vitalism and on Henri Bergson’s evolutionism, Randle’s “evolución urbanística” (planning evolution) was illustrated through “mentors” such as Geddes, Poëte, Mumford and Bardet, as it was already mentioned (Randle, 1972).

Even though the Argentine Jorge Hardoy can be regarded as the leading figure of Latin America’s urban historiography since the 1960s, when he published the already-mentioned classic Las ciudades precolombinas, his production during this period, I believe, was rather focused on the typology of cities and the process of urbanization. If we look for general histories of the discipline, it was Roberto Segre who undertook the difficult task – the sole attempt in Latin America, as far as I know – of reconstructing the emergence of planning during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, in the context of developed countries. On the basis of the “main interpretative stock of the Modern Movement”, where he grouped planning historians such as Leonardo Benevolo, Paolo Sica and Michel Ragon, and especially in the latter’s way, the Argentine/Cuban architect combined today’s blurred blocs of socialist and capitalist countries, putting them in relation with a well-balanced matrix of architecture and urbanism, though recognizing the primacy given to the former’s “aesthetic and symbolic values”. Another peculiarity of Segre’s approach within Latin American historiography, at least during that period, was the Marxist position that, by contrast to treatises “supposedly ‘neutral’” yet laden with capitalist ideology, led him to adopting a “scientific approach” for studying the “urban structures” of nineteenth and twentieth century modernism, ranging from the architectural to the planning scales (Segre, 1985, pp. 13-17).

In this respect Working from Havana’s University by that time, Segre was one of the few scholars that took the SoD to the domain of planning history, trying to pursue a territorial and spatial analyses that he had already achieved in Las estructuras ambientales de América Latina (1977).

As to the general histories of Latin America’s town planning, besides Hardoy’s chapters in the collective works that he edited, I believe that Segre’s books and Ramón Gutiérrez’s Arquitectura y urbanismo en Iberamérica (1983) stand out as the great treatises produced within the region. In both of them, the incipient historiography of urbanism is alternated with the more-established periodization of architectural history. As in Segre’s above-referred works, completed with the compilation Historia de la arquitectura y el urbanismo: América Latina y Cuba (1986), in Gutiérrez’s mammoth treaty some chapters of urban history were included, which “constituted the essential reference for understanding the architectural phenomenon”; but beyond this sort of complementary role, those chapters conveyed certain entity of Latin America’s planning historiography, according to the book’s chronological and geographical
structure, which was completed by some functional subjects. Even though in the introduction to his work Gutiérrez recognized, like Segre, the existence of a “cultural dependence” that would be at the basis of many artistic, architectural and planning manifestations of Latin America as a traditional periphery of the Western civilization that has become part of the contemporary Third World, the Argentine architect argued that the answers to the former’s necessities would come up, “more than from ideological recipes, from the thorough and specific understanding of its own and unexplored realities” (Gutiérrez, 1984, pp. 11-12).

Treatises produced from Latin America did no not overshadow, though, the importance of significant compilations published in the 1980s in Spain by Bonet Correa (1985), Francisco de Solano (1986) and Gabriel Alomar (1987). There was in fact some complementation between the two fronts: the work of Gutiérrez and Segre can be said to be influenced by the historiographic legacy of Angulo Iñiguez, Chueca Goitia and Bonet Correa, among other Spanish pioneers of Latin America’s art and architecture studies. Arising mainly from the latter, during the 1980s there was a consolidation of the planning history at both sides of the Atlantic, throughout an interaction that is still healthy in terms of courses, events and publications; all of them aimed at looking with self-produced categories at the Latin American agenda, which had been long dismissed by international historiography.

Different types of reasons can be argued for explaining the traditional oblivion of Latin America by international historiography. From the point of view of architectural history, Waisman pointed out that Europe’s architectural historiography has tended to be événementielle and traditional, what has made difficult to incorporate Latin America’s process, which the Argentine critic regarded as closer to a structuralist approach (Waisman, 1990, p. 16). In the domain of urban history, there are also the language and cultural issues: perhaps with the outstanding exception of Mumford, American and British authors have been less influential on Latin America’s urban historiography than their French or Italian colleagues. This is for me another confirmation of a traditional gap, still evident nowadays, between the academic production in English and Spanish. From the perspective of general works, this breach was overcome only by the Hardoy.

En cuanto a las historias generales del urbanismo en América Latina, además de los capítulos de Hardoy en algunos de las obras colectivas por él editadas, creo que los libros de Ramón Gutiérrez y Roberto Segre, en los que se alterna la incipiente historiografía urbanística con la más consolidada periodización establecida a propósito de la arquitectura, permanecen como los grandes tratados producidos desde la región. Ello no desmerece la importancia de monumentales compilaciones editadas en la península, tales como las de Gabriel Alomar y Antonio Bonet Correa. Aunque dar referencia sobre los innumerables estudios urbanísticos centrados en los siglos anteriores al XIX, y mucho menos sobre casos de estudio particulares, excede los límites e intención de esta ponencia, valga mencionar como ejemplos de aproximaciones basadas en el ordenamiento urbanístico: las recientes de Eugenio García Zarza, Francisco de Solano y Allan Brewer-Carías sobre las Leyes de Indias y sus tipologías derivadas; la de Rodríguez Alpuche sobre urbanismo indígena y colonial en México; la de Margolies y Gasparini sobre el urbanismo incaico; la compilación de Gutiérrez sobre los pueblos de indios en la región andina; la de Rojas-Mix sobre la Plaza Mayor, y los artículos de Solano o Zawisza sobre las tipologías del urbanismo colonial en el ámbito continental.

It can be said that Latin America’s planning historiography has been closer to the interpretation, models and categories provided by French, Italian or Spanish historians, what signals a gravitation around continental Europe that, according to the experts, has also happened in other fields of economic and social historiography (Guerra, 1989, p. 617). Besides the fact that works by Leonardo Benevolo, Françoise Choay and Paolo Sica were early translated into Spanish and Portuguese, the attachment to Latin historiography may have to do with
Benevolo’s early and specific recognition of the new Latin American cities as a feature of the architectural and urban culture of the *Cinquecento* (Benevolo, 1968). Also with the inclusion of chapters or special treatments about the Latin American cities in international histories written by Sica (1976-1978) or Chueca (1974, pp. 127-34), what has been done in English only in the last edition of A.E.J. Morris’s classic about the urban form before the Industrial Revolution (Morris, 1984, pp. 292-320).

**Conclusions**

From my research about Latin America’s urban historiography - that is still in progress – there can be drawn conclusions that help to explain some of the main trends considered in this paper. Even though the antecedents of urban historiography in Europe and North America can be traced back to the late nineteenth century, its real consolidation took place from the 1960s, so it can be said that Latin America’s urban historiography did not emerge much later than in those contexts. Initiated by Spain’s art historians and visiting urbanists to the continent’s capitals from the 1930s, the process of transfer and shaping of the field, as a part of town planning’s emerging agenda in national milieux, was almost simultaneous.

Closer to the Italian and Spanish traditions, art and architectural history seemed to have had a more important role in Latin America’s urban historiography than it did in Britain or the United States. Magnetizing a group of international scholars that worked at the Congresses of Americanists, Hardoy emerged as the leader of the continent’s urban history from the 1960s. Evincing a longer and more significant presence of the Marxist apparatus in the region, the SoD later paid great attention to political, social and economic variables of the urbanization process, but did not manage to incorporate the space and territory into the analysis. Mainly drawn from architectural historiography, Segre’s and Gutiérrez’s great treatises, complemented by the compilations produced from Spain, confirm the maturity of Latin America’s planning history by the 1970s and 1980s.
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Latin America has always been shaped by events: wars, rebellions, invasions and more. Explore the top 10 which has proved to be the most important.

The most devastating war ever fought in South America, the War of the Triple Alliance, pitted Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil against Paraguay. When Uruguay was attacked by Brazil and Argentina in late 1864, Paraguay came to its aid and attacked Brazil. Ironically, Uruguay, then under a different president, switched sides and fought against its former ally. In the late nineteenth century the railroads represented the first “big business.” The railroad industry was the largest single employer of labor in the U.S., and helped standardize America economically, socially, and culturally.

Territorial Expansion.

The severest labor conflict in U.S. history occurred during the last third of the nineteenth century. Between 1881 and 1905, 37,000 strikes occurred, involving nearly 7 million workers. An astounding rush of inventions and technological innovations transformed America and its economy in the late nineteenth century. In the entire period up to 1860, the government issued 36,000 patents. But 440,000 were issued in the 30 years between 1860 and 1890. Throughout the history of Latin American geopolitical games of the world have influenced the formation of boundaries and even the emergence of new states. A typical example was the creation in 1828 under the mediation of Great Britain of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay as a “buffer” zone between Argentina and Brazil. To forecast the future borders of the Latin American countries is impossible today. Over a century anything can happen. But even if the South American mainland is separated from North America and drifts to Antarctica, the imaginary national borders of Latin America will remain the same as before. Rate this article. (no votes).