grther in the metamorphosis of the local identity. Ola Udouku, from Ghana, and The Wolff, from South Africa, on the other side, expose the difficulties of appreciating modern architecture in former colonized territories, which is a major situation in African countries. Despite of in many cases, Modern Movement architecture has been developed in deep connection with the local culture, the lack of global awareness concerning this heritage, leads to a long way to be achieved in terms of its protection. Considering global and local questions with different times – the colonial and the post-colonial – the debate on identity is a key and complex issue on this matter.

David Martín López, from Spain, calls our attention to the mass tourism phenomenon taking place at the Canary Islands, where resorts are being designed and built taking the image of vernacular and modern Canarian architecture as a merely stylistic recourse. As in many other places of our contemporary world, mimics is used for the development of a fake traditional built environment sold as authentic. "Heritage distortion", "aesthetic fiction", "typological promiscuity" are expressions that the authors use to criticise an architectural production that, through an ethical disruption of authenticity, is endangering original buildings, deceiving the understanding of history and nature, and misleading people. Within the so called "Disneyfication" process, this seems to be a case where global phenomena may destroy the local habitat. Stéfano Guatuedo, from UK, presents what he calls "a transcultural genealogy of critical regionalism" by going deep in the elements that conditioned Greek architects Suzana & Dimitris Antonakakis understanding of the regional in relation to the modern, that was in the basis of Toonis & Le-favre's and later Frampton's theorizations on critical regionalism. The author argues that in the Antonakakis' work, the regional became the vehicle for a critical approach of the modern, while the modern a critical approach to the regional. Through an interwoven view of both learnings, “they pursued in the ways in which the architectural lessons from the past and the avant-garde vision, for the first time, were appropriately reconciled and responsibly adjusted to the needs of a changing world.”

In the end, it is that what we all within DOCOMOMO, are trying for. With this session, we hope to give few steps further to reach that goal.

NOTES

2 José Luís Sert, Boris Wolkoff: Modern Architecture: Impressions of a Continent, AIA, 1949.
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Until second half of 20th century, the Iberian Peninsula was mostly rural, poor and archaic until very recently, with only a few cities whose inhabitants lived a substantially different reality from the rest of the population. This provides a background of supposed authenticity of the mots of national architectural identity with direct effects on architectural choices. One of the possible examples to understand this process is the experience of inner colonization, so crucial both in Portugal and in Spain, and the actions taken by the authorities in charge. These parallel experiences provide us with an ideal testing ground to gain a thorough understanding of the relationship between architectural identity and the rural world. In both countries, the 1940s and 1950s were characterized by major infrastructural interventions in the territory. The modernization of Portuguese and Spanish countryside included inner colonization schemes, implementing the “agrarian utopia” purported by both Franco and Salazar. Many modern architects and politicians, were involved in this process, which is an important stage to the reform, despite the awareness of its necessity.

In Spain and Portugal, however, land reform was to wait a few decades. During the Iberian totalitarian regimes of Franco and Salazar – which ended in 1975 in Spain and 1974 in Portugal --, the power of large lands were a major obstacle to the reform, despite the awareness of its necessity. Nonetheless, the 1940s and 1950s were characterized by relevant territorial interventions, including major hydraulic works, construction of power stations and road networks which effectively contributed to landscape change in both countries. In Portugal, for example, the Salazar regime promoted a campaign for the creation of 5a thousand agricultural, that was the same happened in Spain, where fast-growing or resinous species were planted in order to exploit the less fertile or easily flooded areas. These projects led to the establishment of several new institutions, as the Hydroelectricity ones. In these Spain also included the Instituto Nacional de Colonización (INC) (Instituto Nacional de Colonización) (1940) which was responsible for the hydraulic works required for agricultural development of land associated to inner colonization. In Portugal, such tasks were shared by the Junta Autónoma das Obras de Habitação Agrícola (Autonomous Board for Agricultural Hydraulic Works) (1931) and the Junta Nacional de Colonização (JCI) (Board for Colonization National) (1936). Even if plans by the Portuguese JCI covered almost the entire region south of river Tejo, it was only the “inner colonies” which were actually implemented, all located on State-owned or common lands (aludins). In the latter case, new settlers sometimes met a strong opposition in the basis of the land, who felt deprived of not only of the common land (granted to the newcomers or used for afforestation) but also of ancestral grazing areas. This was a rejection factor which, in some cases, was aggressively extended to the new settlers. In Spain, INC’s action was undertaken on a much larger scale, as testified by the ca 300 existing pueblos. Undoubtedly, despite the many similarities, these processes had a different evolution in each of the two countries.

MODERNISM AND AGRARIAN UTOPIA

Maria Helena Maia (Portugal)

ABSTRACT

The Iberian Peninsula was mostly rural, poor and archaic until very recently, with only a few cities whose inhabitants lived a substantially different reality from the rest of the population. This provides a background of supposed authenticity of the mots of national architectural identity with direct effects on architectural choices. One of the possible examples to understand this process is the experience of inner colonization, so crucial both in Portugal and in Spain, and the actions taken by the authorities in charge. These parallel experiences provide us with an ideal testing ground to gain a thorough understanding of the relationship between architectural identity and the rural world. In both countries, the 1940s and 1950s were characterized by major infrastructural interventions in the territory. The modernization of Portuguese and Spanish countryside included inner colonization schemes, implementing the “agrarian utopia” purported by both Franco and Salazar. Many modern architects and politicians were involved in this process, which is an important stage to the reform, despite the awareness of its necessity.

In Spain and Portugal, however, land reform was to wait a few decades. During the Iberian totalitarian regimes of Franco and Salazar – which ended in 1975 in Spain and 1974 in Portugal --, the power of large lands were a major obstacle to the reform, despite the awareness of its necessity. Nonetheless, the 1940s and 1950s were characterized by relevant territorial interventions, including major hydraulic works, construction of power stations and road networks which effectively contributed to landscape change in both countries. In Portugal, for example, the Salazar regime promoted a campaign for the creation of 5,000 thousand agricultural, that was the same happened in Spain, where fast-growing or resinous species were planted in order to exploit the less fertile or easily flooded areas. These projects led to the establishment of several new institutions, as the Hydroelectricity ones. In these Spain also included the Instituto Nacional de Colonización (INC) (Instituto Nacional de Colonización) (1940) which was responsible for the hydraulic works required for agricultural development of land associated to inner colonization. In Portugal, such tasks were shared by the Junta Autónoma das Obras de Habitação Agrícola (Autonomous Board for Agricultural Hydraulic Works) (1931) and the Junta Nacional de Colonización (JCI) (Board for Colonization National) (1936). Even if plans by the Portuguese JCI covered almost the entire region south of river Tejo, it was only the “inner colonies” which were actually implemented, all located on State-owned or common lands (aludins). In the latter case, new settlers sometimes met a strong opposition in the basis of the land, who felt deprived of not only of the common land (granted to the newcomers or used for afforestation) but also of ancestral grazing areas. This was a rejection factor which, in some cases, was aggressively extended to the new settlers. In Spain, INC’s action was undertaken on a much larger scale, as testified by the ca 300 existing pueblos. Undoubtedly, despite the many similarities, these processes had a different evolution in each of the two countries.
In Portugal, most of the colonies were planned during the 1940s and received settlers in the first years of the 1950s. Only Boalhosa was built later. Afterwards, new rural settlements came to a halt, as it was preferred to upgrade already existing villages and to support hydraulic works which were to improve agriculture.

In Spain, the 1940s were also characterized by experimental pilot interventions in farms purchased by the State for the purpose; the period from the 1950s until the mid 1960s was characterized by a more pragmatic/technocratic approach, resulting in the construction of new settlements, some of which required expropriation of previous landowners. In the mid 1960s the investment on new settlements tended to be replaced by investment on agricultural improvements, quite similarly to what already happened in Portugal.

The attempt to transform potential proletarians into petty-bourgeois was an issue also in Portugal, where the distribution of land associated with internal colonization implied a "cultivated folklore and an organic view of society as a response to the harmful effects of modernization. However, Salazar’s ‘ruralism’ was imposed via powerful mechanisms of ideological indoctrination within the framework of a nationalist dictatorship.”

In effect, an appropriate profile was required to be settler. In Pygmys, for example, they had to be healthy, sturdy, non-alcoholic and presenting “conditions of moral suitability and integrity”.

In addition, they had to go through a control process on a daily basis, this concerned both their agricultural work and social behaviour. All this bears witness to the ideological pressure on the new settlers and to the institutional interference in the settlers’ life.

Agronomists played a crucial role in inner colonization of the Iberian Peninsula.

In Portugal, most of the colonies were planned during the 1940s and received settlers in the first years of the 1950s. Only Boalhosa was built later. Afterwards, new rural settlements came to a halt, as it was preferred to upgrade existing villages and to support hydraulic works which were to improve agriculture.

In Spain, settlements were surrounded by agricultural fields and featured a concentrated layout following a set of predefined rules and programs. Pueblos and aldeas were always equipped with a centro cívico (civic centre) surrounded by houses with agricultural annexes and costral.

The civic centre was organized around a square, including several buildings with pre-defined functions. In the aldea, these included a mixed school convertible in chapel, a teacher’s house and a small administrative building. In the larger pueblo, these included a church with the priest’s house, the town hall, schools, a syndicate’s building, a playground, a cinema, a lodge, a cafe, houses for professionals, doctors, teachers, town hall secretary and around 10% for artisans and shopkeepers.

Besides, the settlements’ layout was to follow the natural topography, trying to find an appropriate orientation of streets and lots, onto which houses and their annexes would be grafted.
In Portugal, most of the colonies were planned during the 1940s and received villages built in the first years of the 1950s. Only Bairro was built later. Afterwards, new rural settlements came to a halt, as it was preferred to upgrade already existing villages and to support hydraulic works which were to improve agriculture.

In Spain, the 1940s were also characterized by experimental pilot interventions in farms purchased by the State for the purpose; the period from the 1950s until the mid 1960s was characterized by a more pragmatic/technocratic approach, resulting in the construction of new settlements, some of which required expropriation of previous landowners. In the mid 1960s the investment on new settlements tended to be replaced by investment on agricultural improvements, quite by the settlement of rural workers.

In both countries, landowners ended up being the greatest beneficiaries of the construction of new roads and hydraulic infrastructures: their lands became more valuable, while they could also take advantage of the new workforce made available by the settlement of rural workers. Implying as it did inner colonization, the agricultural policy of both countries, was clearly in line with Franco’s and Salazar’s rural utopias which brought about a dramatic landscape change.

In Spain, inner colonization may be seen as a land counter-reform, in that it nullified Republican policies with the political and social aims to “ideologically ruralize the proletariat”7; setting the population in the countryside meant controlling migration into the city and, consequently, mitigating the danger of proletarianization. The attempt to transform potential proletarians into petit-bourgeois8 was an issue also in Portugal, where the distribution of land associated with internal colonization implied “cultivated folklore and an organic view of society as a response to the harmful effects of modernization. However, Salazar’s ‘rational’ was imposed via powerful mechanisms of ideological indoctrination within the framework of a nationalist dictatorship”9.

In effect, an appropriate profile was required to be settler. In Pygmy, for example, they had to be healthy, sturdy, non-alcoholic and presenting “conditions of moral suitability and integrity”10. In addition, they had to go through a control process on a daily basis, this concerned both their agricultural work and social behaviour. All this bear witness to the ideological pressure on the new settlers and to the institutional interference in the settlers’ life. Agronomists played a crucial role in inner colonization of the Iberian Peninsula.

In the Portuguese case, the JCI acted as a sort of laboratory of the Institute Superior de Agronomia [Institute of Agronomy] which provided JCI with directors and technical staff; moreover, a great number of students developed theses in this context.

If we consider that, in architecture, the rise of a “profession-al thinking” (in Vieira de Almeida’s words), i.e. that the aspiration of intervening on society in a strictly professional frame, is indissociable of and blends with the Modern Movement starting from CIAM11, we should also accept that if the same attitude is evident in the agronomists’ actions, it should also be considered modernist.

The architects’ task was to design new habitants and, in some cases, they did manage to producing important achievements of surprising modernity. In Spain, settlements were surrounded by agricultural fields and featured a concentrated layout following a set of predefined rules and programs12. Pueblos and aldeas were always equipped with a centro cívico [civic centre] surrounded by houses with agricultural annexes and corral. The civic centre was organized around a square, including several buildings with pre-defined functions. In the aldea, these included a mixed school convertible in chapel, a teacher’s house and a small administrative building. In the larger pueblo, these included a church with the priest’s house, the town hall, schools, a syndicate’s building, a playground, a cinema, a lodge, a cafe, houses for professionals, doctors, teachers, town hall secretary and around 10% for artisans and shopkeepers13. Besides, the settlers’ layout was to follow the natural topography, trying to find an appropriate orientation of streets and lots, onto which houses and their annexes would be grafted14.
Normally, a single architect used to design each settlement, from laying out the general plan to designing the living units, while also being responsible for the architectural expression of civil equipment. This partly explains the formal unity characterizing these settlements.

Another important aspect is the use of a town planning matrix embedding specific solutions concerning the relation between rural housing and the street network, forming urban front. When we consider how the theme of the civic centre was interpreted in Spain, we find many references to what had been built in connection with the reclamation of the Pontine Marshes. However, the relationship between the rural house and the centre of the new settlement, as well as the resulting townscape differs from the Italian model.

The situation was rather different in Portugal, where the Italian influence is to be found in implantation of the casais (as at Gafanha or Pegões Velhos), featuring tracts of farmland in association with housing, which produces a dispersed layout. At Gafanha or Pegões, working areas of a medium farm (casal agrícola); a) in a dispersed habitat, whose position is subordinated to the working areas of a medium farm (casal agrícola); b) in semi-dispersed habitat, combining reasons for the proximity of both working areas and centres of interest; c) in a pro-concentrado [more concentrated] habitat, materializing neighbourhood and basic facilities needs; d) in a concentrated habitat, accentuating such needs and making them prevail over dispersion factors. In the case of concentrated settlements, although with a few variations, the layout tended to follow the contour lines, in an axial setting. Alderia Nova, Lugares de S. Mateus at Barroso Colony and Baúlhos are good examples of such an axial structure. However, we also find more organic solutions, adhering closer to the characteristics of the land, as in Criande at Barroso.

When bringing architecture into focus, we may find some similarities between Spain and Portugal, in their attempt to reinvent the rural house by adapting traditional forms to new hygiene standards, with a clear separation between spaces for people and others destined to animals. This architectural re-invention led to very diverse solutions, all sharing the common denominator of simplicity and functionality, some fully expressing an idea of modernity.

In Portugal, modernity was mainly expressed in the equipment architectural language, whereas in Spain the cubic-shaped dwellings, namely the functional separation between stables, d) in a concentrated habitat, accentuating such needs and making them prevail over dispersion factors.

As Rabasco Pozuelo has pointed out when commenting on the Spanish case, this was often an ambiguous form of modernity, expressing the tension between the architects’ creativ
ty and the quest for a traditional image of the rural world. The first settlements designed for INC, seem to reference “de-formed and preconceived ideas” of Castela-la-Mancha and Andalusia settlements, thus highlighting “a generally recognizable idea of a Spanish settlement prototype”. This is why we will find an almost generally white image, even in areas where white was not traditionally used.

In Portugal, the vernacular reference is also evident, resorting to stone in the North (Barroso, Baúlhos) and whitewashed walls in the Center/South (Gafanha, Pegões). Here however, we do not find direct references to traditional rural houses in their design. So, architecture produced in the framework of these colonization projects should perhaps be understood as reinvention of the tradition.

More similarities between Portugal and Spain become clear when we bring into the picture the inner organization of dwellings, namely the functional separation between stables,
normally, a single architect used to design each settlement, from laying out the general plan to designing the living units, while also being responsible for the architectural expression of civil equipment. This partly explains the formal unity characterizing these settlements.

Another important aspect is the use of a town planning matrix embedding specific solutions concerning the relation between rural housing and the street network, forming urban front. When we consider how the theme of the civic centre was interpreted in Spain, we find many references to what had been built in connection with the reclamation of the Pontine Marshes. However, the relationship between the rural house and the centre of the new settlement, as well as the resulting townscape differs from the Italian model. The situation was rather different in Portugal, where the Italian influence is to be found in implantation of the casaisian influence is to be found in implantation of the casais, as interpreted in Spain, we find many references to what

fig. 3. agustín delgado de robles y velasco, settlers’ houses, barquilla de pinares, spain, 1957. © modscape – josefina gonçalves calheta, 2017.

in the case of concentrated settlements, although with a few variations, the layout tended to follow the contour lines, in an axial setting. aldeia nova, lugar de s. mateus at barroso colony and baúlhoa are good examples of such an axial structure. however, we also find more organic solutions, adhering closer to the characteristics of the land, as in criande at barroso. when bringing architecture into focus, we may find some similarities between spain and portugal, in their attempt to reinvent the rural house by adapting traditional forms to new hygiene standards, with a clear separation between spaces for people and others destined to animals. this architectural re-invention led to very diverse solutions, all sharing the common denominator of simplicity and functionality, some fully expressing an idea of modernity. in portugal, modernity was mainly expressed in the equipment architectural language, whereas in spain the cubic-shaped houses clearly reflected the architectural trends of the time.

as rabasco pozuelo has pointed out when commenting on the spanish case, this was often an ambiguous form of modernity, expressing the tension between the architects’ creativity and the quest for a traditional image of the rural world. the first settlements designed for inc seem to reference “de-formed and preconceived ideas” of castela-la-mancha and andalusia settlements, thus highlighting “a generally recognizable idea of a spanish settlement prototype”. this is why we will find an almost generally white image, even in areas where white was not traditionally used. in portugal, the vernacular reference is also evident, resorting to stone in the north (barroso, baúlhoa) and whitewashed walls in the center/south (gafanha, pegões). here however, we do not find direct references to traditional rural houses in their design. so, architecture produced in the framework of these colonization projects should perhaps be understood as reinvention of the tradition. more similarities between portugal and spain become clear when we bring into the picture the inner organization of dwellings, namely the functional separation between stables,
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1. The presentation of this work was funded by national funds through FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P., within the project UID/ EAT/04904/2013 and it is based on the research conducted under the proj- ect MODSCAPES – Modernist Reinventions of the Rural Landscape (HERA.15.097). This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agree- ment No 649098.
2. The Survey of Rural Architecture was planned to be published in three vol- umes: (1) The Northern Region, from 1942. (2) The Central Region pub- lished in 1947. (3) The Southern Region, whose publication was hindered by censorship. This volume only was published in 1953.
3. Francisco Franco (1929-1975) and António de Oliveira Salazar (1889- 1970) were, until their death, the dictators in power, respectively, in Spain and Portugal.
4. The 20th century internal colonization process is common to all Europe and Beyond. Associated with large scale developments and agricultural schemes to moderate the countryside, thousands of settlements were built.
5. In Portugal, these settlements are usually referred to as ‘colonies’ (colonias) and in Spain as ‘pueblos’.
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