‘All in one rhythm’ was the slogan of the 2014 FIFA World Cup in Brazil. The tag line was assumed to be the ‘unifying message which represents the unique flavour that Brazil will bring to the FIFA World Cup’.¹ According to the FIFA website, the slogan was chosen because it stressed social cohesion, innovation, the different rhythms of Brazil’s rich culture and nature and a general sense of happiness. The twelve cities that hosted the matches, Belo Horizonte, Brasília, Cuiabá, Curitiba, Fortaleza, Manaus, Natal, Porto Alegre, Recife, Rio de Janeiro, Salvador and São Paulo, have all been adorned with new stadiums that represent the nation’s pride and a unifying love for soccer. Not that apparent from FIFA’s rhetoric, however, is the fact that the list of 2014 World Cup cities also represents centuries of urban living on the Latin American and Caribbean continent. First founded along the coast and later in the Amazon forests, the rhythms of those different urban spaces have come to characterize the diversity of urban life in the region throughout the centuries, thus offering convenient examples to start off this collection of essays about housing, living and belonging. As is well known, during the twentieth century Latin America was urbanized in an incomparably rapid way, resulting in cities of incommensurable sizes and social constellations. Within that context, Brazil offers some of the most problematic and also some of the most successful examples of urban living in Latin America. Brazilian cities have simultaneously become famous and infamous among scholars, policymakers, urban experts and civic organizations inside and outside of the region. Those cities are ‘good to think with’, because they encompass a broad range of human knowledge on the city as a place of residency and belonging.

Brasília’s remarkable design and development has received ample international attention from architects and social scientists alike (Holston 1989; M.E. Kohlsdorf, G. Kohlsdorf and de Holanda 2010). Situated at the crossroads of old trading routes in the vast inland areas, Manaus and Cuiabá exemplify the explosively growing Amazon cities (Browder and Godfrey 1997). Natal, Fortaleza, Recife and Belo Horizonte are renowned for their material and immaterial layers of colonial history, and for the social and racial inequalities that characterize their urban identities today (Delson 1979; cf.
Linger 1992). Curitiba became famous among international urban designers and planners in the last decades of the twentieth century because of Jaime Lerner’s counter-current revitalization plans (Macedo 2004; Irazábal 2010). Porto Alegre is probably the best-known example of municipal participatory budgeting programmes (Baiocchi 2005). Finally, the two largest cities from the FIFA list, Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo, are known as core cases of unbalanced urban development (Caldeira 2000; Kent 2006; Perlman 2010). As a set, those cities represent urban Brazil and the broader gamut of urban Latin America.

In an urban Brazilian context, the ‘one rhythm’ slogan was anything but new. It resembled the slogan that President Juscelino Kubitschek (1902–76; President: 1956–61) launched when he started building Brasília as the new capital city. Even back then, he used the ‘rhythm of Brasília’ slogan to motivate workers:

[T]he “rhythm of Brasília” [was] defined as “36 hours of work a day — 12 during the day, 12 at night, and 12 for enthusiasm”. This rhythm was an expression of the new time consciousness of modernity, one which believed in the possibility of accelerating history, of mobility in society, and of creating discontinuities in the class bound routines of daily life to generate a new human solidarity. (Holston 1989: 215)

The utopian rhythm of modernity resulted in a sense of fellowship during the tough construction years. In the end, however, it did not result in a less class-based spatial organization of the capital city as was hoped.

The enthusiastic optimism phrased in the ‘rhythm of Brasília’ slogan contrasts with the tense atmosphere captured by the anthropologist Linger (1992) in his description of the north-eastern city São Luís. In the ‘rhythms of city life’ he introduces the routes and routines of daily life on weekdays, weekends and during the city’s great festivals. The ‘rhythms’ of those festivals are metaphors for the violent escalations in the city’s public spaces. They express a dystopian view of urban Brazil. In turn, the ‘all in one rhythm’ FIFA slogan follows the optimistic perspective again, emphasizing the socially inclusive character with which Brazilian music, dance and festivals are attributed. ‘All in one rhythm’ suggests a synchronization of experiences along the different spaces, histories, time zones and cultures of the country. The FIFA marketing campaign intended to spread a sense of proud identification and belonging by stressing that ‘all’ Brazilians and visitors would be stirred up in ‘one rhythm’ however unrealistic those expectations may be. Alternative interpretations of Brazil’s urban rhythms express, in a nutshell, the opposed perspectives on the Latin American city in international urban studies. With this volume we aim to contribute to a more balanced analysis
of Latin American urban life. To guide our thoughts, this chapter offers an overview of the literature. Most attention will be paid to the urban transformations of the last two decades and to the dominant perspectives of the Latin American city in urban studies.

**Pendular Paradigms**

Knowledge about Latin American cities and urbanization processes is historically intertwined with knowledge about urban design and planning (Almandoz 2006: 83). Throughout the twentieth century, the Latin American city has proven a valuable ‘laboratory’ for urban analysis and intervention. In the first half of the century, the urbanization of the Latin American region was principally understood in evolutionary/development terms. Based on French-European traditions in the academic discipline of urbanismo, with its emphasis on urban forms and the articulation of monumental spaces, Latin American professionals in city planning emphasized the significance of the urban morphology. A utopian view on the role of the city ruled the academies. Cities were regarded as living organisms that could become the motor of national modernization, progress and pride. In order to become that motor of progress, cities had to be ‘healthy’. If they had ‘ill-functioning’ parts, European (preferably French) experts together with a new generation of locally trained professionals were hired to ‘cure’ the city with their scientific knowledge about development and a profound Beaux-Arts training (Rosenthal 2000; Outtes 2003; Almandoz 2006). When the evolutionary model became obsolete, the functionalist CIAM (Congrès International d’Architecture Moderne, 1928–59) model proved a viable alternative. It enabled a continuation of the modernization agenda under different political regimes: ‘functionalist modernism … was put, like developmentalism and industrialization, at the service of the progressive goals of democracies and dictatorships alike’ (Almandoz 2006: 97). Yet, excessive urban growth from the 1940s onwards and its consequential social problems, especially in the field of housing and employment, formed the onset of a paradigm change in the second half of the century.

After the Second World War the urbanismo approach was set aside for an approach of planificación based on North-American ideas about zoning, master plans and other technocratic instruments (Hardoy 1992; Almandoz 2006). Still, the relatively optimistic conception of urbanization continued, presupposing that the advantages of diversified urban economies would eventually trickle down to the lower social strata and result in higher welfare levels for everyone. This optimistic paradigm ruled until the 1960s. When the growth of inner-city slums and peripheral squatter settlements became
symptomatic for larger social problems that affect urban societies, the shortcomings of the planificación thesis became an outright threat to the development goals. Urban theories at that time started to become much more dystopian in their outlooks (Angotti 1987; Kemper 2002; Kent 2006). Explanations for the failure of the developmentalist agenda were found in over-urbanization and in the cultural dispositions of the new citizens vis-à-vis life in a modern industrialized city (Lewis 1966; Gugler 1982). Social problems were attributed to the maladjusted behaviour of rural migrants and other new urbanites. In social theories, they were categorically separated from the urban middle and upper-middle classes: the model of the ‘dual city’ reigned. Although several scholars shed fresh light on urban duality, for example by negating the ‘marginality’ of the masses (Perlman 1976; Gilbert and Ward 1985) or by highlighting the positive contributions of new urbanites to the city (Mangin 1967; Turner 1968a, 1968b; Lomnitz 1977), the functionalist approaches continued to frame the debate in antagonistic terms. The ‘slums of hope – slums of despair’ debate resulted in opposite yet partial and sometimes disconnected micro-level views of the Latin American city (see Eckstein 1990).

A critical macro-level perspective appeared during the 1970s and 1980s. Neo-Marxists pointed to persistent inequalities in the larger structure of society. They regarded historically grown social and economic inequalities as the causes of hardship for the majority of the urban population in Latin America. Moreover, the crises caused by a staggering model of import substitution industrialization, the international oil crisis of 1973, the debt crisis and the consequences of internal guerrilla wars severely disrupted urban life in the region. At the same time the region’s principle cities had grown at unprecedented rates, establishing a pattern of urban primacy that was said to result in ‘internal colonialism’. After decades of modernization and progress projected onto urban areas, the effects of hyper-urbanization spearheaded a more pessimistic reading of the Latin American city (Gilbert 1994; Pino and Bear 1998; Kemper 2002). At first, social inequality was linked to a continuing monopoly of national and local elites over the principle means of existence. The dichotomy between rural and urban areas and between ‘formal’ and ‘informal’ sectors in the city became a new anchor in the urban development debate (Griffin and Ford 1980; Angotti 1987). Later, the economic and social inequalities were viewed in a broader, global perspective, in which Latin America was regarded as a ‘dependent’ region. If European and North American cities formed the centre of the world’s economy, Latin American cities were situated in the periphery (Castells 1973; Gilbert 1982; see also Almandoz 2006). The lopsided urban hierarchy was repeated on a global scale: hardly any of the Latin American capital cities could claim to be a World-Class City (Roberts 2005; cf. Sassen 1991).
Urban Nostalgia

After two decades of structuralist, neo-Marxist and dependency approaches, the regional economic landscape changed. When the debt crisis of the 1980s was followed by a region-wide adoption of neo-liberal policies guided by Washington-based institutions such as the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF), a wave of conservative sentiments engulfed the region. Nations and cities were reformed by harsh policies. In 1990 over 70 per cent of the population in Latin America lived in cities, several of which had grown into megacities. The liberal reforms and cutbacks that resulted in unemployment were paralleled by an increase in poverty, social insecurity and urban violence (Roberts and Portes 2006). The era of neo-liberalism was paralleled by postmodern trends in urbanism, in which people clung ‘to old “truths” as well as to the reigning power structure, manifest in the call to – re-everything – rehabilitate, revitalize, restore, renew, redevelop, recycle …’ (Ellin 1996: 4). Whereas the Washington consensus enforced economic adjustment plans upon the region’s economies, attention in Latin American urban debates shifted towards the values of the centro histórico, the marketing of urban histories and heritage preservation. The neo-liberal habit to privatize public space combined with a scholarly trend to question dominant North-American and European urban theories, such as those regarding gentrification, resulted in a series of publications about the Latin American inner-city (Ward 1993; Low 2000; Scarpaci 2005; Herzog 2006; Inzulza-Contardo 2012). A gradual ‘return to the centre’ heralded a revival of morphological, spatial and cultural perspectives in Latin American urbanism (Almandoz 2006).

Several historical city centres were by that time designated as United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage Sites. The Quito Carta (an outcome of the Organization of American States (OAS) conference in 1967) sent a message to all nations to preserve the social histories of urban historic districts. Its publication in 1977 contained a formal definition of historic districts (ICOMOS 2005; ICOMOS Chile 2007). However, as Scarpaci (2005: 121) notes, even though heritage sites may be ‘badges of honour’, they rarely attract large sums of money, and less so since neo-liberal policies – with their focus on productive investments – started to dominate the region. Increasingly, the flow of visitors and tourists became a new goal in urban policies. The overall urban landscape changed when the growth rates of the large metropolises diminished and medium-sized cities developed as the new poles of attraction and urban expansion. Aware of these shifting patterns, tourist cities like Havana, Cartagena de Indias, Puebla and Cuzco presented urban regeneration plans to ‘revitalize’ the centre and protect its historical architecture.
The question of which policies were the most adequate formed the input for heated local and international discussion. Several authors have pointed to the challenge of conserving an historical consciousness of the city without causing gentrification or converting the centre into an open-air museum (Ward 1993; Bromley 1998; Scarpaci 2005; Herzog 2006; Crossa 2009).

As examples from Puebla, Quito, Cuzco and Cuenca show, however, a forced displacement of lower-status users did indeed, as a rule, accompany the beautification of the built environment (Hardoy and Dos Santos 1983; Jones and Varley 1994, and 1999; Middleton 2003 and 2009; Swanson 2007; Bromley and Mackie 2009; Crossa 2009; Klaufus 2012a). Revitalization strategies often embraced a race- and class-based notion of visual cleanliness, in which street vendors, indigenous people and beggars were regarded as ‘polluters’ of the cityscape (Swanson 2007). Several authors have argued that gentrification theories therefore need to pay more attention to the moral connotations of seemingly neutral policy terms such as ‘renovation’ and ‘revitalization’, especially in a Latin American context, where the notions of class, race and territory are historically interconnected (Jones and Varley 1994, and 1999; Wade 1997; Colloredo-Mansfeld 1998; Whitten 2003; Wilson 2004). The nostalgia for a visually coherent cityscape that orders society in otherwise chaotic times formed a starting point for the academic and policy-oriented perspectives that have characterized the 1990s. Neo-liberal urban policies had a clear Janus face: ‘Gentrification, historic preservation, and other cultural strategies to enhance the visual appeal of urban spaces developed as major trends … Yet these years were also the watershed in the institutionalization of urban fear’ (Zukin 1995: 39).

**Fragmented Spaces**

While some urban policymakers and international scholars were dedicated to protecting the Latin American urban architectural heritage, others were particularly concerned with demonstrating how the Latin American dual city was developing into a fragmented one. Parallel to an architectural focus on city centres, a whole range of studies appeared about the increase of insecurity, violence and misery in low-income areas, especially in megacities. Most studies that appeared in this range were geographically based in Central America, Colombia, Venezuela and Brazil, where everyday violence reached unprecedented levels (Rolnik 2001; Moser and McIlwaine 2004; Koonings and Kruijt 2007; Jones and Rodgers 2009). The neo-liberal wind that had started to blow throughout the region resulted in a reduction of state institutions and a concomitant privatization of infrastructure, urban facilities and spaces. With a long history of liberal legalism, individual property rights had
always been at the core of Latin American urban development (Fernandes 2007). The revitalization projects such as the famous Puerto Madero in Buenos Aires and the Malecón 2000 in Guayaquil resulted in a visual coherence that appealed to the middle class urban order, but also led to a reduction of publicly accessible spaces (Pírez 2002; Andrade 2007; cf. Zukin 1995). As described above, the aesthetical boost was paired with socially discriminatory policies. Increased levels of policing and private security were needed in the city centre to protect the visual coherence so neatly constructed in architecture and space design. This implied that the users that made the city’s spaces look ‘ugly’ were displaced from the streets. Formal commerce was also displaced from the centre to the new malls (Ford 1996), and in the residential areas gates and guards became the common characteristics of neighbourhood entrances. Both in the centre itself as well as in residential areas, spatial transformations gradually resulted in social segmentation (Borsdorf, Hidalgo and Sánchez 2007).

The neo-liberal austerity and state-reduction measures soon resulted in higher poverty levels. In more than ten countries, minimum wages in 1998 were lower than in 1980. At the same time, economic and cultural globalization made people familiar with modern consumer products, which further increased the gap between aspirations and possibilities: ‘to the more traditional shortcomings of life are now added the desire to acquire the new products associated with the comfortable urban life and to display the outward signs of distinction, transmitted by fashionable brands’ (Briceño-León and Zubillaga 2002: 23). Increased globalization also transformed the drug economy and illicit flows of firearms. At the turn of the twenty-first century, the levels of violence had risen all over the continent. With more than fifty homicides per 100,000 inhabitants, Cali, San Salvador and other Central American and Colombian cities were among the most violent ones on earth (Briceño-León and Zubillaga 2002; Briceño-León, Camardiel and Ávila 2006). Not just violence per se, but also the fear of becoming a victim of violence permeated Latin American cities, which set in motion a downward spiral of insecurity and protective measures. Not only in upper-class areas but also in informal neighbourhoods did residents make efforts to close off the area. The socio-spatial inequalities were reproduced in a geography of security, symbolized by walls and fences (Caldeira 2000; Coy and Pöhler 2002; Borsdorf, Hidalgo and Sánchez 2007; Borsdorf and Hidalgo 2010; Plöger 2010).

One aspect that is mentioned in most geographical and sociological studies is that of the young male inhabitants of poor neighbourhoods, who have become actively involved in crime and violence. Violence and insecurity are immensely difficult to understand, yet several explanations surface in all works: the withdrawal of state and church institutions, which left an authority void; the economic hardships in combination with increased consumer
aspirations, which made alternative, violent ‘careers’ more appealing; and the dominant gender roles in Latin America, which tend to associate male roles with protection and honour codes (Briceño-León and Zubillaga 2002; Moser and McIlwaine 2004; Jones and Rodgers 2009). Case studies show that what started out as ‘street-level politics’, with a solidaristic aim to establish regimes of order and security, unravelled during the 1990s into ‘predatory regimes’ (Rodgers 2009: 40). It became clear to scholars and policymakers alike that the conflation of profound social inequality, recent histories of state versus guerrilla warfare and the neo-liberal restructuring measures resulted in problematic urban societies (Goldstein 2004; Koonings and Kruijt 2007). The informal or marginalized settlements – the favelas and barriadas – were the spaces most affected by this downward spiral:

It is in the neighbourhood public space that the subjective dimension of urban segregation begins to endow it with a cultural dimension. Street culture arises out of the experience and perception of exclusion. In this privatized or appropriated public space, young people construct an environment with norms, values, practices and forms of behaviour that enable them to cope with or avoid the frustration and exclusion represented for them by the outside world. (Saraví 2004: 44)

This in turn reinforced the stigmatization of poor neighbourhoods as no-go areas. Yet in many cities, for example São Paulo and San Salvador, the inner cities had become known as dangerous places, too, leading Rodgers (2004) to conclude that the fortified networks that connected the gated enclaves of the urban middle class to the guarded central areas, such as malls and commercial centres, had come to constitute a characteristic pattern of the Latin American city.

Over the last two decades Latin American cities have become notorious worldwide for their maras (criminal gangs) and for the excessive, almost unexplainable orgies of violence guised as femicide or narco-related slaughtering. The scholarly debate about the social exclusion of the majority has redirected its focus towards the question of citizenship, and to the right-to-the-city as the condition for urban reform. With the ‘right to habitation’ and the ‘right to participation’ as the main constituents of citizenship, the activities and actions of socially excluded groups in urban space can be understood as claims that express their desire to be respected as members of households, neighbourhoods and cities. Yet, the acknowledgement that urban property has a socio-environmental function, too, and that citizenship rights require effective participation in planning, decision-making and management still has to be accepted on a much broader scale in local governance (Fernandes 2007).
Room for Manoeuvre

The picture of the fractured city sketched above is not a rosy one. Yet, not all urban development projects can be described in such defeatist terms. Brazil and Colombia have demonstrated some promising pathways for reforming legal systems for urban development since the mid 1980s. Progress has been made with respect to participatory governance, especially in Brazilian cities where the Constitution of 1998 introduced urban policy changes that cleared the path for the City Statute of 2001 (Caldeira and Holston 2005; Fernandes 2007). Over the last two decades, Brazil also stands out for its massive urban upgrading programmes. The Favela-Bairro programme, which was set up halfway through the 1990s in Rio de Janeiro, is regarded internationally as a successful initiative that has improved the lives of favela residents (Riley, Fiori and Ramirez 2001; Duarte and Magalhães 2010; Handzic 2010). Although it did not effectively lead to more decisive powers on a grassroots level (Riley, Fiori and Ramirez 2001), the emphasis put on the improvement of public spaces was an effective means to tackle the ‘ghetto image’ that had led to the social stigmatization in the first place (Segre 2010). In combination with the Bolsa Família, the country’s conditional cash-transfer programme, poverty-driven problems concerning housing and education have been reduced. The ‘pacification’ operations that have cleared the way for Brazil’s large events, however, seem to impose many contradictory effects on neighbourhoods, as we will see in Menezes’s contribution to this volume.

Bogotá has also experienced a remarkable and unexpected positive transformation. With high murder rates and an almost bankrupt economic system during the first years of the 1990s, a positive turn came after the ratification of the Organic Statute of 1993. Several subsequent administrations, headed by the ‘strong’ mayors Antanas Mockus and Enrique Peñalosa, established a continuity of administration and reduced the levels of corruption and clientelism. They put well-qualified experts in crucial positions, who succeeded in transforming urban public space and citizens’ behaviour in the public sphere, and in increasing tax revenues. The levels of violence decreased, although not for long, and people’s bond with the city grew. The remarkable transformation earned the city some laudable qualifications, such as ‘good governance’ and ‘best practice’ (Gilbert 2006). However, after the first surprising ‘cultural turn’ provoked by Mockus’s mime players, ‘citizen cards’ and ‘vaccination against violence’, appropriate behaviour was later enforced through policing and the appearance of security guards in public spaces. The displacement of ‘unwanted space users’ became the bottom line of public order again, because, as Berney (2011: 22) notes, ‘if one side of the coin in Bogotá’s story is the making of citizens, the flip side is monitoring them’.
What seems to be successful on the large scale of city transformation can appear counterproductive on a micro level: low-income residents were hired as volunteer caretakers to exclude other low-income people, such as street vendors, from the city’s public spaces. All in all, public spaces in Bogotá have been transformed in a successful way, which made the city more attractive, even though its renewed moral order has perhaps exacerbated existing social inequalities (Berney 2011). The positive turn experienced in Bogotá inspired mayors of other cities, for example in Medellín (see the contributions by Samper and Marko and by Martin and Martin in this volume) to start similar programmes.

With such striking yet not widely known examples in mind, more scholarly attention was requested for ‘ordinary cities’ and ‘ordinary citizens’ at the start of the twenty-first century to balance out theories of urban development (Robinson 2006; Lees 2012). This resulted in a general plea for more comprehensive and comparative scholarship in urban studies worldwide (McFarlane 2010; Robinson 2011; Jaffe, Klaufus and Colombijn 2012; Lees 2012). For Latin American urban studies this implies that the paramount attention to megacities should be accompanied by a proportionate attention to smaller or lesser-known cities (Klaufus 2012a). Smaller cities are said to offer a higher quality of life because of their human size (Max-Neef 1992; Scarpaci 2005; Herzog 2006), and urbanization processes in smaller cities tend to be more manageable for city planners (Satterthwaite 2007: 3; Bolay and Rabinovich 2004). However, nearly half the growth of the urban population worldwide until 2025 is expected to derive from the growth of small and intermediate cities (UN 2008: 8). With respect to smaller Latin American cities, it has already been noted that ‘their intermediate size does not, in and of itself, guarantee them a bright future’ (CEPAL 2000: 11).

The alternations between utopian and dystopian perspectives should be succeeded by a more realistic outlook, in which Latin American urban societies are attributed with negative and positive features alike. Rodgers, Beall and Kanbur (2012: 18) state that ‘the current vision of “fractured cities” obscures the fact that cities are social, economic, political and cultural systems that bring different and often contradictory processes together, and unless we focus our attention more on the interrelatedness of these different processes within cities, our analyses – and concomitant policy initiatives – will unavoidably remain inadequate’. A more varied scope needs to be accompanied by a methodology that allows comparisons of case studies based on theoretical inquiries instead of on presupposed outcomes (Robinson 2011). Nuanced insights into the processes of imagination, empowerment and meaning-giving, for example, request anthropological and micro-level accounts of everyday life. Some interesting examples can be found in geogra-
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In our own accounts, Arij Ouweneel and I have explored when and how domestic environments become sites of contestation and opportunity for low-income families in the Andes. Ouweneel challenges the often proclaimed idea that second-generation migrants in Lima still suffer a trauma from the political violence in the 1980s by demonstrating that grassroots films show a more optimistic vision of life (Ouweneel 2012). I claim that in Ecuador, transnational migration and the reverse flows of remittances have offered migrant families some financial and cultural room for manoeuvre to demonstrate upward mobility or claim respect (Klaufus 2006; 2011; 2012b). At the same time, new opportunities for some imply new setbacks for others, as I have also emphasized. As most publications on the neo-liberal Latin American city have set forward a dystopian view, the time has come to develop a more nuanced set of theories about the contemporary Latin American urban imaginary. One attribute in that search is the careful micro-level attention to the spatialization of behaviour, in combination with an historical and a cultural analysis of space: ‘If social class, ethnicity, and power are constructed by interpersonal relations of intimacy in [urban] space, we should look very closely at how people behave. It is useless, however, to look at behaviour without looking at individuals’ locations in society and without
considering the social and historical context of the space itself' (Zukin 1995: 291). This volume attempts to strike a balance between macro-level examples of spatial dynamics and power relations on the one hand, and micro-level examples of creativity, empowerment and room for manoeuvre on the other. Based on case studies from different cities in the region, the sections in this book address the creation of home environments from different perspectives: from the viewpoint of knowledgeable self-builders and middle-class customers to formal planning perspectives and private sector involvement. Without stealing attention from the structural inequalities that continue to characterize Latin American urban life, the chapters explore each in their own ways how contemporary urban residency is constructed around people’s claims to belong to the city.

Taking up Residency

Latin American cities are, first of all, places of residence for the majority of the region’s population. Depending on the theoretical approach taken, housing can be considered a cause or a consequence of social inequality (Hamilton 2010: 158). Regardless of the theoretical explanation of housing insufficiencies, residents have to ‘make a living’ both in an economic and a philosophical way. Making a living refers to the creative process of ‘remixing tomorrow out of the raw materials of today’. Creating a meaningful existence in the city is as much material and financial as it is social and cultural. The shared focus of the chapters of this volume is therefore on the relationship between housing, living and belonging in Latin American urban societies. The verbs ‘housing’, ‘living’ and ‘belonging’ are understood in a broad sense: building housing units, constructing neighbourhoods, finding a (suitable) place to live and making a home. Examples of people’s attempts to feel at home in the city and of urban lifestyles across the generations are discussed within the geographical context of new and consolidated urban areas. Two of the Brazilian cities mentioned in the beginning of this introduction, Belo Horizonte and Rio de Janeiro, will be part of the chapters. Other case studies come from Mexico, Colombia, Peru and Argentina. Methodologically, the authors use a broad range of approaches and techniques from the social sciences and humanities: some chapters are based on empirical data, whereas other chapters are organized around the interpretation of public manifestations of housing and belonging in architecture and film. Social anthropological accounts of citizenship are complemented with geographical accounts of spatial policies and cultural accounts of identification processes. Apart from ethnographic research, urban spatial policies, narratives and non-verbal communications of belonging in urban societies are analysed. Although connections between the
‘dots’ formed by descriptions of different housing types (self-help housing, middle-class apartments and gated communities) might be read as one line structuring the book, the principle storyline concerns residential quality at the various scales of home, neighbourhood and city.

The book is thematically divided into five parts, including a contextual section. The two chapters of Part I ‘descend’ in scale from overviews of urban study paradigms to micro-level reflections on dimensions of belonging. In the next chapter, Roberts gives an overview of Latin American urban development as compared to Chicago School urban theories. He examines possible sources of urban disorder and their impact on social cohesion in two time periods: that of the region’s rapid urbanization (ca. 1950–80) and the current period of low urbanization rates. Concentrating on the intervening factors that mediate the link between urban disorder and social cohesion, he argues that the spatial and demographic sources of disorder seem to have a positive impact on social cohesion in the first period relative to the second period, when the impact is more negative. Martin and Martin analyse the much-celebrated urban reform of Medellín and state that, while the reforms translate into robust evidence of improved quality of life and public service delivery, dwellers of the impacted neighbourhoods produce a more fragmented narrative of the impact of these reforms on their way of life than one might expect. Their chapter can be read as a micro-level story about the social construction of belonging to urban space.

The second part explores the experiences of first-, second- and third-generation inhabitants of informal settlements with consolidation and progress. The authors describe the attempts of urban residents to ‘move on in life’ and, at the same time, to feel at home in the city both in a legal and an emotional sense. Situated in Lima, Hordijk describes why informal settlement residents no longer aspire to collective action. She argues that they put emphasis on individual efforts, on ‘ser profesional’, which implies that they feel less attached to the neighbourhood per se and more attached to the city as a whole. Grajeda analyses the range of legal provisions that structure housing inheritance and succession among low-income families in Mexico, and how these are managed and adjudicated informally by family agreement or formally under the law. She argues that new incidences of informalization have occurred, which create new inequalities in otherwise formalized settlements. Menezes explores how residents of the ‘pacified’ showcase favela of Santa Marta Hill in Rio de Janeiro have organized themselves against removal and the meanings they attach to their residency. These chapters all address the dynamics between empowering activities at a grassroots level and the contradictory effects of policy responses.

The third part assesses attempts of residents, authorities and professionals to improve the overall quality of housing in cities. It reconsiders
the role of neighbourhood reputations, lifestyles and the increase of urban middle classes in Latin American cities. Ostuni and Van Gelder explore the Argentinian paradox that, in spite of huge government expenditure on social housing launched under the Programa Federal, informal settlement in the city of Buenos Aires has increased significantly since 2004. They argue that the programme bypasses the views and needs of its end users and disregards the particularities of the areas in which it intervenes. Dohnke and Hölzlı address the increase of gated apartment buildings up to fifty floors high, equipped with additional services, in Buenos Aires. About 200 complexes of this building type have been constructed since the real-estate boom of the 1990s. They argue that the transformation of the urban morphology results in fragmented senses of belonging. Inclán-Valadez analyses the **conjuntos urbanos** (large-scale housing projects), which have become a formula for ‘good city’ growth and a means of improving the housing condition of millions of Mexican families over the last fifteen years. She claims that a new cultural trend, ‘the GEO trend’, produces new forms of suburban middle class belonging. These three chapters describe the troublesome development of private and public formal housing production for social coherence. Yet they also point to individual creativity in people’s activities to get ahead.

The fourth part discusses non-verbal forms of communication as representations of status and identity through material culture and spatial design. It discusses the linkages between form, cultural meanings and identifications. Lara traces some of the ways in which modernist architectural knowledge was disseminated in middle-class and favela housing in Brazil. He argues that the appropriation of modernist technology and spatiality have been achieved on such a large scale that it has become part of the popular building culture. Kellett addresses the dynamics of housing design and display in Santa Marta, Colombia, and concludes that, as dwellings consolidate, there appears to be an increasing divergence between dwelling forms and domestic practices. Samper and Marko analyse two competing narratives of belonging in the city of Medellín: one is presented by community members of informal settlements, and the other is presented by state actors who act like the ‘saviours’ of these same settlements. They assert that an overlooked value of these competing narratives is found in the synergies between state and community interventions. Together, the three chapters present bottom-up urbanism and non-verbal narratives of belonging as an approach that, according to their views, has to become more influential.

The fifth part offers reflections on the above themes, connecting the parts and addressing the notions of belonging on the scale of homes and neighbourhoods to contemporary urban societies in a theoretical way. Based on research carried out in four different areas of the city of Guadalajara, Mexico,
Varley compares and contrasts the residents’ understandings of the meaning of home. She theorizes the notion of ‘home’ and concludes that critiques of home should take great care not to overlook the role that the material space of home plays in providing support for individual and collective narratives of identity. Ouweneel analyses the films produced by the JADAT (Jovenes Adolescentes Decididos A Triunfar/Young Adolescents Determined to Succeed) youth organization in Lima, whose initiator was a former gang leader. The initiative proved successful, as gang violence ceased to exist in the community and inhabitants could begin recreating neighbourhood life. Ouweneel argues that Andean notions of space and time are used as cultural resources in artistic productions, which reinforce a sense of belonging. His reflection underscores the idea that urban studies are basically neighbourhood studies. All in all, the volume aims to shed fresh light on the meanings of urban residency in the most urbanized region in the world. By describing the various spaces and temporalities of belonging in urban Latin America, the authors claim that if there is such a thing as a ‘rhythm’ that connects Latin American urban residents, it is perhaps the pace of making home that surpasses all others.
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