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Introduction

“Latin America” is an imaginary country of vastly varied geographies, climates, resources, and histories. But because nineteen of its countries share the Spanish language and Spanish colonial heritage, and because the Portuguese heritage of the twentieth and largest country, Brazil, is closely parallel, Latin American intellectuals have tended to imagine themselves as part of a single community, with common foes and destiny. This is one reason we find similar approaches to teaching architectural history throughout the region. Another is that architects in most of these countries face similar challenges. One of them is the client base. Everywhere but in socialist Cuba, the gulf between the urban middle classes and the rural poor in terms of opportunities and resources remains extreme, and mass migration to the cities has done less to urbanize the poor than to ruralize enormous areas of the cities. The skewed distribution of resources means there is little privately sponsored development of modest homes or public buildings, such as clinics, hospitals, or schools, of the sort that support many architectural practices in the United States and other countries. The architect’s potential clients tend to be either the very rich, or foreign corporations, or—for the exceptional large public project—the national or provincial government.

Another challenge is the legacy of the past. From Santo Domingo to Santiago, settlement patterns established in Spanish colonial times continue to demand acknowledgment from contemporary planners and architects, whether because chunks of the old street grid remain in use or simply as an appeal to national identity.

The following essay is organized in two parts. The first contextualizes the teaching of architectural history by providing an overview of the institutional frameworks and their history. The second, longer portion deals specifically with the teaching of architectural history. Its introduction—a description of methodologies and resources—is followed by two sections, the first on the teaching of the historical survey and the second on the teaching and researching of the history of Latin American architecture. In the conclusion, I speculate about the role of information technology in the fulfillment of a long-deferred project to construct a unifying cultural discourse about architecture and its historic legacy in the region. Specific references to countries and schools are made within a context of informed generalizations.

Institutional Contexts

The teaching of architectural design and history in Latin America during the nineteenth century and more than the first half of the twentieth reproduced the schism between the methodologies of the French École des Beaux-Arts and the École Polytechnique that had existed since the late eighteenth century. The first school of architecture in Latin America was the Real Academia de San Carlos de la Nueva España, established in Mexico City in 1781. It was modeled on the Academia de San Fernando in Madrid, which had been created in 1742 based on the Parisian Académie Royale d’Architecture and programs established by François Blondel and Claude Perrault. According to the French system, architecture, painting, and sculpture required a shared foundation: drawing. The explosive growth of Mexico’s silver-mining towns, where money was plentiful and the demand for luxury objects, ornamental paraphernalia, churches, and other civic and private buildings was very high, supported the training of local architects and artists. The Real Academia de San Carlos and other schools founded on the same model continued until the mid-twentieth century to follow the pedagogy of the École des Beaux-Arts, as it was developed and codified by Julien Guadet. Similarly, in Brazil, the first architecture course was established in 1826, based on the program at the Academia Imperial de Belas Artes.

In the decades after they obtained independence from Spain, the new republican governments founded other schools that were influenced more by the positivist ideals of the École Polytechnique. These included the Mexican Escuela de Arquitectura e Ingeniería Civil (opened in 1856), the School of Engineering and Architecture (1900) at the Universidad de La Habana, and the school affiliated with the Argentinean national Facultad de Ciencias Exactas in Buenos Aires (1901). Their programs introduced a technological orientation and the rigorous structural and typo-
Although the majority of students attend the state-sponsored schools. Among the private universities, schools of architecture reside primarily in those established by the Catholic Church, whose involvement in education and the construction of political and cultural discourse in the region dates to the seventeenth century. In some countries, Catholic universities include religious studies within the professional curriculum; these take various forms, from required courses in Christianity or Christian ethics in professional practice, to elective pilgrimages in which students share faith-affirming rituals with local populations.

The number of architecture schools varies greatly from country to country. Smaller, poorer nations in Central America—Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, and Salvador—may have a single program in the national university. By contrast, the Dominican Republic has ten programs, reflecting the recent prosperity and urban growth based on cash remittances from Dominicans in the United States. Mexico, with half the population of the U.S., has approximately as many architecture schools as the U.S. and Canada combined. Enrollment also varies. Typically, the figure for each school is in the hundreds. However, enrollments in programs in public universities in the region’s most populous cities are huge: the oldest and largest Mexican school, based in the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM) in Mexico City, has approximately 5,000 students, and the architecture program at the Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA) in Argentina has 8,700. In such places, all courses are taught by teams led by the profesor titular, who is in charge of lecturing, and by a group of assistant instructors coordinated by a head of practical and theoretical assignments.

In the majority of Latin American schools, architecture programs leading to a professional degree are five years long (ten semesters) and follow twelve or thirteen years of primary and secondary education. Most countries require students to take an exam in several scientific and humanist subjects to gain admission to any university program. In addition, architecture programs may have their own admissions exam, emphasizing freehand drawing and graphic representation. The Argentinean UBA program has open admissions, with a Basic Cycle of courses as the test of students’ resolve to pursue an architecture degree. In some universities, the duration of studies is a year longer than ten semesters because a thesis or final project is also required for a degree. In Mexico, students must serve a six-month “social service” internship with a government organization.

Program accreditation across the region is usually part of the general process of university accreditation, which is governed by the national Ministry of Education or its equivalent.

Figure 1 The Real Academia de San Carlos de la Nueva España in Mexico City was the first school of architecture in the Americas, founded in 1781.
Teaching the History of Architecture

Throughout the region, architects, not art historians with doctorates and specializations in architectural history, teach the history of architecture. Some countries, like Argentina, are beginning to require an advanced degree in architectural history or historic preservation as a condition of employment. Consequently, several programs are offering degrees with summer-only or flexible schedules to accommodate professors of long standing who are also required to comply with the new rules. The fact that the architectural history faculty is made up of architects, not art historians, results in few assignments for research papers and an instrumental emphasis on theory in relation to design. Most common are student assignments consisting of 2-D and 3-D analytical and typological exercises and brief design projects, in which they must demonstrate in a synthetic form their command of compositional principles and elements of style in different historical periods. Assignments are typically supplemented by quizzes and exams.

The programs distinguish between the discourses and purposes of history, theory, and criticism. Theory is generally found in the curriculum as a required introductory course about the ideas that have informed Western architecture, or as elective courses about architectural treatises or twentieth-century and contemporary texts and manifestos. In general, theory is taught within a historical framework, and it remains confined to architectural texts; forays into theoretical intertextuality are few and far between. The occasional exception may be the inclusion of anthropological and philosophical texts in those courses where issues of cultural identity or social habitation cannot be adequately addressed by the architectural discipline alone. Few schools have formal programs where students experience criticism as an ongoing cultural activity; one successful example is the public program “Architecture up to Date,” which has been run by a Chilean school for the past decade. In it, recent buildings are presented and discussed twice a month by their architects and an invited critic, with audience participation, including academics and professionals.

In addition to the usual slide-illustrated lectures, some schools—notably in Chile and Uruguay—encourage site visits and more extended study travel. The school of architecture of the Universidad de la República in Montevideo, Uruguay, has a unique tradition of a year-long worldwide study trip for the entire graduating class, financed by a raffle where the prizes are houses designed by the students.

Teaching the Historical Survey

There are between five and seven required one-semester architectural history and theory courses in Latin American architecture schools, with most schools offering additional electives in both areas. The backbone is the chronological survey, which extends across three semesters. In some places, it starts with European prehistory and in others with the establishment of the first known cities, and continues up to the present. An exception is the New School of Architecture at the Universidad Politécnica in Puerto Rico, where the entire survey is taught in a single course as a history of spatial types.

The survey’s point of view remains Western and Eurocentric, not global. This is to be expected given the region’s history of colonization by Spain and Portugal for almost three centuries; its attachment to the urban cultures of Paris, London, and New York since the nineteenth century; and the influence of the European and American schools where its architects complete postgraduate studies. Most schools try to follow more or less sequentially the canon of European and American styles, buildings, and architects, even if sometimes this means departing from the chronological approach. Asian civilizations, if studied at all, are placed before the study of ancient Greece and Rome, together with pre-Columbian civilizations, the better to establish an unbroken European narrative through the twentieth century; Africa and Australia are excluded, with the exception of ancient Egypt and North African Roman sites; and the U.S. appears first through the work of Frank Lloyd Wright, who is considered a precursor of European modern architecture rather than an American architect engaged in a search for a national cultural identity, similar to those undertaken by Latin American artists and writers who were Wright’s contemporaries.

This is not to say that the survey is taught uncritically. In some schools, it is preceded by an introductory course
on critical analysis and methodology, in others by a course on historiography, and in still others it is intermingled with abundant local and Latin American examples, following a methodology that tends to emphasize the processes of mestizaje, which undermines the survey’s Eurocentric inherited ideology (see n. 26). In the schools that include programs in graphic, industrial, and clothing design in addition to architecture and urban planning, it is more common to find a survey that deals with the range of environmental design practices, and the faculty tends to focus it on the history of human habitation, rather than on the history of specific design practices. While the result is a lack of specificity with regard to the disciplines—because each is seen as operating on a different level of environmental design—the inclusion of all environmental phenomena allows for a comparison of scales, methodologies, and typologies not possible in a conventional architectural history course. There is a very unusual school at the Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile, that includes no architectural history courses in its curriculum. Since 1964, the school’s program has been based on the continuing design and construction of Ameredica, also known as The Open City. “Culture of the Body,” a sequence of seven courses, develops the students’ physical and mental ability to build their own designs.21 An extreme relativization of the survey’s master narrative is taking place in the unique institutional practice of the UBA, with a vertical structure of nine parallel series of history courses, much like the vertical design studios that students can select to follow throughout their course of studies. However, the nine approaches are subsumed within two broad trends: one emphasizes European architecture, landmarks, and buildings as objects; the other includes regional and local architectures, unique and vernacular buildings, and a typological approach within the urban context. Although some schools continue to use textbooks by Bannister Fletcher, John Summerson, Nikolaus Pevsner, Leonardo Benevolo, Bruno Zevi, and Manfredo Tafuri, the present trend is toward the compilation of readers with essays that present critical perspectives on the historical materials.22 The Cuban schools rely on textbooks written by their architectural history instructors for a different viewpoint based on the analysis of buildings as manifestations of social and economic relationships. No other school of architecture faculty in Latin America has invested as much effort in rewriting the historical survey.23

Teaching and Researching the History of Latin American Architecture

The importance of the historical survey in the architectural history curriculum is counterbalanced by the inclusion of courses on the history of local and Latin American architecture. Most schools require at least one course on one of these subjects and have postgraduate programs preparing competent faculty to teach them.24 In the 1920s, during a cycle of interest in preservation, the need to teach the local and regional histories in architecture schools was recognized. But many of the courses on the history of Latin American architecture were not established until the 1970s,
when interest in the preservation of cultural patrimony resurfaced in the architecture schools. The issue was initially discussed in the first Pan-American Congress of Architects in 1924, and it was officially identified as an urgent regional concern in the proceedings of the Fourth Congress, convened in Rio de Janeiro six years later. Nationalist identity issues inspired the Congress’s recommendations on this topic. They had taken shape in relation to the 1929 International Fair in Seville, with its underlying theme of national identities emerging from a shared colonial heritage. Claiming that “there is no incompatibility between regionalism and the modern spirit,” the Congress called for the creation of courses in the history of each country’s art and in the decorative arts, focusing on indigenous flora and fauna, in order to better inform the design of pavilions for projected worlds fairs. These recommendations were not immediately implemented, but the meeting of Latin American architectural historians and architects—the Mexican Manuel Toussaint and the Argentineans Mario J. Buschiazzo and Martín Noel—with the Spaniard Diego Angulo Iñiguez, author of the first history of Hispanic colonial art and the first compilation of Hispanic American city plans in Seville’s Archives of the Indies, resulted in the foundation of university-based research institutes in the mid-1930s in Mexico City and Buenos Aires, which sparked the establishment of similar institutions in other countries and created the context for investigations of Iberian American art and architecture, particularly of the colonial heritage.

How, when, and where were research and pedagogy first connected? Establishing with precision the dates when courses on local and regional architecture were first taught in each country is beyond the scope of this essay. However, the renewed interest in introducing local history into the architecture curriculum that began in the mid-1970s was directly related to the desire to preserve the historical patrimony, as landmark buildings and sites were being identified by national and international entities. In Argentina and Colombia, among other countries, preservation activists, including architecture scholars, faculty, and students, were politically active in fighting the destruction of landmark buildings in the historic city centers and their planned replacement by hotels, office buildings, and shopping centers built by international conglomerates to generic designs and specifications.

Throughout the 1980s, there was a considerable increase in research on and in the number of congresses about architectural and urban patrimony in the region, and in the establishment of links between national identity and historic preservation through publications and exhibitions, many of which were the result of collaborative investigations. Several countries created national landmark and monument commissions, and a few universities implemented new courses and postgraduate programs on historic preservation and Latin American architectural history. Some countries also sponsored new archives for the preservation and study of original documents relating to local architecture. Among them are the Centro de Documentación de la Arquitectura Latinoamericana (CEDO-DAL) in Buenos Aires, the most important of its kind, notable for the breadth and depth of its Latin American collections; the Archivos de Arquitectura y Construcción de la Universidad de Puerto Rico (AACUPR), important for the quantity and quality of its scholarly publications; and the Centro de Información y Documentación de la Arquitectura Latinoamericana de la Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, whose singular dedication to tracking and acquiring relevant archives worldwide and to participating in international exhibitions has been outstanding. Many of these initiatives were funded or sponsored by the Spanish government as part of the quincentennial celebration of Columbus’s discovery of Spain’s future colonies. The most active countries were Argentina, Ecuador, Mexico, and Peru. Through its periodical, Documentos de Arquitectura Nacional y Americana (DANA), the Instituto Argentino de Historia de la Arquitectura y el Urbanismo (IAHU) in Resistencia, Argentina, dramatized the issues by bestowing its ironic Atílau (as in Atíllau the Hun) award to “those who have made a conspicuous contribution to the promotion of our cultural heritage, even if they have done so by destroying [one of its material manifestations], an original method for calling attention to its existence.”

The importance given to architectural history in the curriculum during the 1980s may also be seen as a corrective measure to its retrenchment in the 1960s and early ’70s, when modern architecture had been codified in the design studios in the form of Le Corbusier’s Five Principles, leaving architectural history to become a general course on culture. During this period of political turmoil in much of the region, Argentinean schools suffered budget cutbacks, resulting in the closing of research institutes and the establishment of “integrated” or “total” design studios, in which all theoretical, historical, technical, and structural subject matter was selected to fit the requirements of the specific project being taught. In Cuba, the emphasis during the first period of the revolution was almost exclusively on building technology as the means for implementing social programs in housing, health, and education, with design and history/theory in a subordinate, instrumental role.

The architecture of certain periods—notably the nineteenth century—simply disappeared from the architectural
history curriculum as a casualty of design approaches dominated by reductive modernism and the huge influence of Nikolaus Pevsner’s *Pioneers of Modern Design*, whose first Spanish edition was published in 1958. With it, the origins of Latin American modernization in the late nineteenth century as part of the process of independent nation building also disappeared. The reliance on texts by Europeans such as Pevsner and Zevi and the American Henry-Russell Hitchcock similarly obscured the origins of modern architecture in Latin America, for the region was either not included in their books or isolated examples were presented as locally flavored versions of the International Style. For many students, the suppression of history in the studio often led them to vigorously pursue its teachings. As an architecture student in Argentina during this period, I witnessed this backlash: the absence of analytical questioning in the dogmatic emulation of Le Corbusier’s or Mies van der Rohe’s work made us crave the connections between ideas, buildings, sites, and society that we learned about in the architectural history classes.

Today, schools’ positions on courses on Latin American and local architectural histories vary a great deal: a few teach local history before the Western historical survey and others teach it after; some make regional history a requirement while others offer it as an elective. Many faculty, in agreement with the influential Brazilian educator Paulo Freire’s pedagogy of “conscientización,” or “making aware,” consider that the students’ experience of their own lives and contexts constitutes the best point of departure for their understanding of the world. Hence, delving into local architectural history is seen as a critique of the universalizing tendency represented by the Western survey. The objective is to dismantle the exclusionary historical frameworks and to refashion them with new information. While the survey may be taught according to an eclectic methodology, with buildings described in terms of style, typology, or the authority of the designer, depending on the historical period, local and regional history is generally structured in terms of urban history.

Marina Waisman (1920–1997), a greatly admired Argentine architectural historian, was one of the most important advocates of teaching the history of buildings as part of the history of cities. She devised the analytical framework of typological series to engage that relationship. This methodology helped students develop criteria for the assessment of a building’s value through the identification of the best examples within each series, in addition to considering social, political, cultural, and technological information. For example, a building viewed as innovative in the structural typological series may have lesser importance in the functional or aesthetic series, or vice versa. Waisman, who was also a prolific writer and editor as well as a protagonist of memorable debates at regional and international conferences, formed a cadre of disciples who perpetuate this approach.

Among the many organizations and gatherings that emerged with the renewed interest in architectural history and preservation during the 1970s and ‘80s, none has been more influential than the Seminarios de Arquitectura Latinoamericana (SAL). Originating at a gathering of Latin American architects and theoreticians on the occasion of the first Bienal de Arquitectura in Buenos Aires in 1983, the seminars have continued to be held every two years, in locations that alternate between North/Central and South America. One of the SAL’s signature characteristics is the inclusion of historians, theoreticians, critics, and designers in the construction of a Latin American architectural discourse that has been focused, since the early gatherings, on issues of cultural identity. The SAL is not a formal organi-
zation. It has no officers, staff, or dues-paying members. Its core group of organizers comprises some of the most active, prolific, and distinguished Latin American historians, critics, and practitioners and their former students.17

The last meeting, organized with the cooperation of the Colegio de Arquitectos and the two schools of architecture in Puerto Rico in 2001, brought the SAL into its closest contact with the U.S.; indeed, one of the topics for the free-ranging “reflective meetings” was the cultural and technological tulelage of the U.S. in the Americas.18 The conference included several exhibitions—among them the Bienal de Arquitectura in Puerto Rico and a major retrospective of Eladio Dieste’s work—and the publication of the first catalogue of all the architecture journals published in Latin American countries since 1900 by the New School of Architecture at the Universidad Politécnica de Puerto Rico. The school’s library has recently acquired the most extensive collection of such periodicals to have been amassed in North and Central America, thus turning it into a major research destination for scholars of Latin American architecture.

SAL participants have theorized abundantly about modernity in Latin America for the past twenty years, and these theories have generally coalesced around the concept of a “modernidad apropiada,” meaning a modernity that is at once appropriate to the Latin American social and economic contexts, and culturally appropriated through regionally based construction and typologies. Adherents briefly engaged critical regionalism in their debates during the early 1990s, but came to reject the concept as prescriptive of passively resistive and marginal design practices.39 Because the SAL does not have an ongoing journal, the work emerging from or discussed at the gatherings is found in various publications.40 Some contributors have focused on theoretical issues and others on monographs of architects whose practices and buildings are representative of an appropriated modernity. Deliberately or not, these publications have created a kind of Latin American modern canon of the late twentieth century, formed by the work of architects such as the Argentineans Claudio Caveri and Togo Díaz, the Chilean Cristian Groote, the Colombian Rogelio Salmona, the Mexican Carlos Mijares, the Peruvian Juvenal Baracco, and the Uruguays Dieste and Mariano Arana, among others.41 These architects, most of whom are now in their early seventies, do not constitute a group, nor do their oeuvres define a style. Nonetheless, their projects—although in a modernist idiom—show a shared understanding of the city as a historical continuity and are built in readily available materials such as reinforced concrete and exposed brick.

Expectations that these works and ideas could perme-

ate the teaching of architectural design in the region were not fulfilled. This outcome was due to a combination of factors: the students’ greater familiarity with the work of American, European, and Japanese design, which is due to the fact that school libraries subscribe to the international magazines but not the regional ones; the increased coverage of American and European projects by local Internet journals; the influence of younger faculty with postgraduate degrees from American and European universities that teach theory and design; and study tours that continue to be focused on Europe and the U.S., rather than Latin America, a phenomenon which contributes to the lack of first-hand familiarity with architecture in the region. The exception is the work of architects like Luis Barragán and Oscar Niemeyer, which is included in international journals. Not surprisingly, the contributions of women and present-day indigenous peoples to the built environment and to the history of modernity remain to be documented and inscribed within the cultural discourse.

Figure 4 An example of modernidad apropiada: Togo Díaz, Calicanto apartment building, Córdoba, Argentina, 1984
Conclusion

Hitchcock noted in his introductory essay to *Latin American Architecture since 1945* that Latin American countries were better connected to Europe and the U.S. than to each other, and speculated that inter-American communication could finally be achieved in the era of air transportation. However, air travel has not been accessible and affordable enough to create fluid exchanges between architects and architectural historians, theoreticians and critics, that would increase the flow of information within the region that now occurs thanks to the biannual SAL meetings.

Ramón Gutiérrez, author of the landmark *Arquitectura y urbanismo en Iberoamérica*, the first and so far only comprehensive history of Latin American architecture, thinks that in Latin America today, the discourses of design and theory are not sufficiently connected. Using the center/periphery model, which remains a frame of reference for Latin American architects, most design practices are center-tropic, whereas SAL-affiliated theoreticians and historians (and a few designers) think of their practices as defiantly “peripheral.” Information technology plays a large role in the schism, because on the Web, to paraphrase a famous *New Yorker* cartoon, “nobody knows you are Latin American,” and designers can create virtual architectures regardless of locale. For many architects, the lack of opportunities to design and build in their own countries is a further incentive to produce for the global Internet environment. Theorists and historians, instead, continue to promote a discourse interested in questions of cultural identity defined by local and regional specificities and in projects that exemplify these conditions. During the past two decades, historical research on Latin American architecture of all periods has reached a critical mass, and it is now awaiting wider dissemination. Internet-based and -linked sites may offer the best possibility for bringing Latin American architecture to a worldwide audience; for expanding the frames of reference for a region that remains insufficiently connected to cities and areas around the globe with similar experiences of urban development and cultural colonization; and for providing the connective tissue between historical documentation, theoretical work, and design that the region needs to make its built environment intelligible.

Appendix

I thank my Latin American colleagues listed below; I could not have written this essay without their collaboration.

The countries covered in this study are Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Puerto Rico, and Uruguay.

Respondents
Argentina
Prof. Laura Amarilla, Facultad de Arquitectura, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba
Freddy Guidi, President, Argentinean Committee, ICOMOS, Córdoba
Ramón Gutiérrez, Director, CEDODAL, Buenos Aires
Prof. Rafael Iglesias, Director, postgraduate program in architectural history, Facultad de Arquitectura y Diseño Urbano, Universidad de Buenos Aires
Prof. Emeritus Alberto Nicolini, Facultad de Arquitectura y Urbanismo, Universidad Nacional de Tucumán
Prof. Jorge Ramos, Facultad de Arquitectura y Urbanismo, Universidad de Buenos Aires, and Facultad de Arquitectura y Urbanismo, Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata
Prof. Adriana Trecco, Facultad de Arquitectura, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba
Dr. Graciela Viñuales, Director, Centro Barro, Buenos Aires, Deputy Director, CEDODAL, Buenos Aires, and Professor, Facultad de Arquitectura y Urbanismo, Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata

Brazil
Prof. Gustavo Peixoto, Faculdade de Arquitetura e Urbanismo, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro
Prof. Roberto Segre, Coordinator, urban design program (PROURB), Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro

Chile
Prof. Horacio Torrent, Escuela de Arquitectura, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago

Cuba
Prof. Eliana Cárdenas, Facultad de Arquitectura de La Habana, Instituto Superior Politécnico José Antonio Echeverría (ISPJAE)

Dominican Republic
José Luis Delmonte, Dean, Facultad de Arquitectura y Artes, Universidad Nacional Pedro Henríquez Ureña, Santo Domingo
Prof. Risorís Silvestre, Facultad de Arquitectura, Universidad Iberoamericana, Santo Domingo

Mexico
Dr. Louise Noelle, Researcher, Colegio de Investigadores, Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City
Dr. Luis Porter Galetar, División de Artes y Ciencias, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Xochimilco, Mexico City

Puerto Rico
Jorge Rigau, Dean, Nueva Escuela de Arquitectura, Universidad Politécnica de Puerto Rico, San Juan

Uruguay
Prof. Juan Pedro Cravotto, Facultad de Arquitectura, Universidad de la República, Montevideo
Notes
1. In addition to bibliographic research and information provided by the colleagues mentioned in the Appendix, I have consulted numerous Web sites for Latin American schools of architecture. Two good sites with links to Latin American schools are www.architectos.org.mx/vinculos/schools.htm and www.unam.mx/udual/UDUAL/historia/historico.htm.
2. Ramón Gutiérrez, Arquitectura y urbanismo en Iberoamérica (Madrid, 1983), 237. The Real Academia de San Carlos was founded on 4 Nov. 1781, the saint day of King Charles III, under whose patronage the school was established. The Academia de San Carlos de Valencia was another precedent. See also Roberto Segre, “EAU 1960–1975: Los ‘años de fuego’ de la cultura arquitectónica cubana,” unpublished paper, 1.
3. For a detailed history of Mexican architecture schools, see Ernesto Alva Martínez, “La enseñanza de la arquitectura en México en el siglo XX,” La práctica de la arquitectura y su enseñanza en México 26–27, Cuadernos de Arquitectura y Conservación del Patrimonio Artístico (Mexico, 1983), 47–112.
5. Some countries adhered tenaciously to the Beaux-Arts curriculum, such as Chile, where the first architecture course was established in the Universidad de Chile in 1851 following that model.
6. Unlike schools in the U.S., these programs are not called Product and Fashion Design, indicating a lesser identification with the training of designers for work in commercial industries.
7. Private universities in Latin America also flourished during the repose of political resistance to conservative governments that began in the late 1960s. In Argentina, for example, public universities were considered foci of political subversion by the military governments, and new Catholic universities were established to provide a “subversion-free,” selective educational environment for those who could afford the tuition. To undermine the intellectual prestige of the public universities, military interventores conducted faculty purges and hired new professors whose ideology was not suspect; many professors were restored to their positions with the return of a democratic government in 1983.
8. I have been unable to obtain precise statistical data as of the date of this essay, but reliable sources indicate that at least in Mexico, the proportion of architecture students attending public universities to those enrolled in private universities is approximately 70 to 30.
9. In Chile, the oldest school of architecture within a Catholic university has existed since 1894. There are many private universities that are not sponsored by the Catholic Church, such as American University in Nicaragua, or those founded by wealthy families throughout the region.
10. A sampling of schools of architecture that feature religious content in their courses includes the Ecuadorian Universidad Católica Santiago de Guayaquil and the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Ecuador, whose offerings range from “Theology I” to “Sacred Architecture [of the Catholic Church].” In South America, the School of Architecture of the Universidad Católica de Valparaíso has a theology professor in charge of training students who voluntarily participate in a religious “mission,” which consists of a yearly pilgrimage to a rural community, where they partake of religious rituals and offer a collectively designed gift.
11. I obtained this data from a questionnaire I sent to Latin American colleagues listed in the Appendix. Other responses included architecture school enrollments of 732 students in the Pontificia Universidad de Chile; 316 in the Universidad de La Habana, Cuba; and 300 students in the Universidad Nacional Pedro Henríquez Ureña, Dominican Republic.
12. Schools in the Caribbean tend to follow a system based on trimesters rather than semesters.
13. These schools claim that European accreditation enables their students to qualify as future global practitioners and facilitates practical training in Europe.
14. An intensive master’s degree in Iberian American architectural history has recently been established at the Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Seville, Spain, under the direction of Ramón Gutiérrez. See www.upo.es for the curriculum.
15. Hosting universities in the consortium are those of Sint-Lucas Brussel-Gent, Belgium; Eindhoven, the Netherlands; Seville, Spain; and Strathclyde, Scotland; participating Latin American universities are the Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and the Universidad de Belgrano, Argentina. One objective of the consortium is to organize shared “global” curricula for a M.Arch. degree.
16. At the New School of Architecture of the Universidad Politécnica de Puerto Rico, the main assignment in the sophomore-level course “History of Caribbean Architecture” consists of formulating a substantial research question, which may be “eight to ten pages long” and subsequently inform the development of the student’s design thesis. See “Clio in the Caribbean: History as Embraced and Challenged within a New Architecture Curriculum,” unpublished paper by Jorge Rigau, Dean, New School of Architecture, Universidad Politécnica de Puerto Rico. The paper may be obtained by e-mailing jrigau@pupr.edu.
17. This is a program of the School of Architecture of the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile.
18. The study travel program and the raffle that finances it are national events. They have grown to involve more than two hundred students and have been imitated by other professional schools in Uruguay.
20. This approach is due to the lingering influence of the Spanish edition of Bruno Zevi’s Saper vedere l’architettura (Rome, 1948), in which he develops an opposition between “organic” and “rationalist” architectures, favoring Wright’s approach.
21. Following is my translation of the course description for “Culture of the Body,” published on the school’s Web site, www.arquitecturavuc.cl/ page/abie/abie_cuer_01.html: “When does art occur? When there is an artist. Art still appears to many through the hand, eye, and soul of whomever takes the risk to make the work pass from not being into being. In order to do this, one must be present, with a body that is ready, willing, and able to engage what the project’s vision may require. Every time the body must be built, and cultivated, without evasions.”
22. The trend was initiated in 1968 by Marina Waisman, whose series of readerlike booklets, Cuadernos Summa Nueva Visión, disseminated cutting-edge ideas within a critical framework. Each cuaderno was devoted to a single topic, such as Archigram, the Metabolists, architectural education, or low-cost housing, and included, in addition to Waisman’s critical introduction, two to four translations of essays already published in internationally distributed magazines, and specially commissioned commentary by Latin American critics. This collection was Waisman’s attempt to promote broad dissemination of important contemporary ideas in Spanish and to counteract the uncritical consumption of visual images by students who could not read the magazines in their original languages.
23. The textbooks have been written and compiled by a handful of authors, including Eliana Cárdenas, Mario Coyula, Fernando Salinas, and Roberto Segre. In the 1970s, Segre, who is currently based at the Universidad Federal do Rio de Janeiro, was the first to propose a frankly Marxist analysis of the built environment in Latin America, which informed his work through the early 1990s. He also pioneered the introduction of Latin American sub-
jects in the architectural history curriculum in Cuba, establishing a line of research continued by Cárdenas in her recent writing on architecture and cultural identity.

24. Possibly the first degree program of this kind was the Masters in Historic Preservation established by Marina Waisman at the Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina, in 1978, with a focus on the history of Latin American architecture and urbanism.

25. In 1978, for instance, the Instituto de Investigación de la Historia de la Arquitectura y el Urbanismo was established at a congress of architectural historians convened in Mar del Plata, Argentina, whose mission included the “systematic documentation of the architectural and urbanistic national patrimony” and the study of vernacular architecture, according to a brochure published by the institute and provided by its first president, Prof. Alberto Nicolini.


28. The institutes founded by Toussaint and Buschiazzo were, respectively, the Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas de la Universidad Nacional de México (Mexico City, 1936) and the Instituto de Arte Americano (Buenos Aires, 1937, now called Instituto de Arte Americano e Investigaciones Estéticas “Mario J. Buschiazzo”). Other institutes followed in Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela. For a detailed discussion of the historiography of architecture in Latin America, see Gutiérrez, “La historiografía,” 40–59.

29. In addition to the influence of the historic preservation movement, some historians also credit the impact of Aldo Rossi and the circle of critics and historians around Manfredo Tafuri in the renewal of interest in viewing architecture in the context of urban history during the early 1980s.

30. An important example of collaborative research is Marina Waisman, ed. Documentos para una historia de la arquitectura argentina (Buenos Aires, 1980).

31. The Centro de Documentación de la Arquitectura Latinoamericana (CEDODAL) was established in Buenos Aires in 1995 by Ramón Gutiérrez, the center’s director, and Graciela Vítuales, its deputy director. Among its collections, which include books, maps, photographs, postcards, and special archives devoted to the work of individual architects, is the most important extant collection of journals on architecture and urbanism in Latin America. The center may be contacted at cedodal@interserver.com.ar.

32. In particular, the Junta de Andalucía, or autonomous regional government of Andalusia, was the most active sponsor of publications and exhibitions on Latin American architecture during this period.

33. The AIA awards were given to those who destroyed historic patrimony throughout Latin America; the first recipients were announced in 1977 in DAnA 11. The first Honor Award was bestowed upon the Paraguayan architects, engineer, and Catholic monsignor who were responsible for the demolition of the historic church of Caacupé, Paraguay, in order to complete and expand a church started in the 1930s. Local newspapers missed the irony of the award, and it became front-page news that Paraguayan architects had been honored by an Argentinean publication. In the same issue, another award was given to the Uruguayan minister of education for de-landmarking fifty-seven educational buildings that had previously been designated as belonging to the historic patrimony.


36. See Marina Waisman, La estructura histórica del entorno (Buenos Aires, 1985).

37. The SAL’s key organizers and participants have included Mariano Arana, Silvia Arango, Enrique Browne, Humberto Elías, Cristián Fernández Cox, Ramón Gutiérrez, Antonio Toca, Graciela Vítuales, and Marina Waisman.

38. The conference “Hispanic Traditions in American Architecture,” which I organized at Columbia University in 1986, was the first to bring together SAL-affiliated scholars and their colleagues in the U.S. The English-Spanish traveling exhibition of the same name, documenting the architecture and urbanism of the American borderland regions, is archived at Avery Library, Columbia University, and CEDODAL.


40. See the reference to Colección SomoSur in n. 41. Other publishing venues for the debate have included the Cuadernos Escala series (Bogotá) edited by Marina Waisman, and Design Book Review’s “Other Americas” special issue, edited by John Loomis (spring–summer 1994).

41. The work of these and other architects is documented in a series of monographs published in Spanish as Colección SomoSur by the Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia, and University of Miami, Fla. The first volume, Eladio Dieste. La estructura cerámica, appeared in 1987.


43. According to Gutiérrez (conversation with the author, Apr. 2002), the lack of connection between theory and design in Latin American architecture is promoted by inadequately stocked libraries in the architecture schools in private universities, which may subscribe to a handful of international magazines but do not offer substantial bibliographical resources, particularly regarding local and regional architectural history.
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