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ABSTRACT

This thesis seeks to explore the role preservation planning can potentially have in a *favela*, or Brazilian self-built settlement, given the interventions taking place in the name of urban upgrading, tourism, and heritage designation. A general background is given for where the study is regionally focused - in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Case studies, which entail investigation of local and institutional perspectives, are conducted within the communities of Morro da Providência and Santa Marta. The objectives in this research are: to consider significance in these *favelas* from the points of view of ‘outsiders’ and ‘insiders’; to gauge the benefits and costs resulting from interventions; and to determine if preservation planning is possible and desirable, and thus a necessary intervention, how it would be implemented, and by whom. Through this process, I explore the boundaries of preservation planning so that it may become more relevant to planning practices in the broader vision of peaceful and sustainable development.
INTRODUCTION

What is worth preserving from modernism? What makes this architectural era and/or practice intriguing is that it is not only about individual buildings but also, or perhaps more so, about city planning in the wake of rapid industrialization and resulting urbanization. One existing challenge for preservationists in today’s attempt to construct modernism’s legacy is how to interpret its unintentional effects.

With a regional focus in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, I begin to weigh the role of preservation planning in the favela, or Brazilian slum, in the story of modern city planning - just as the favela establishes its legitimate role in the city. What might socially-conscious preservation planning look like in a built environment that is characterized by rapid evolution and a history of political negligence? What is worth preserving in a favela? What approaches to preservation planning can be considered outside of conventional standards and methods? Is there urgency given interventions that are already taking place? Should preservationists intervene? And if so, how?

First, I assess significance by asking, “what features, tangible and intangible, are worth preserving in a favela?” I address this question from the perspectives of ‘outsiders’ - UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) World Heritage; IPHAN (National Historic and Artistic Heritage Institute of Brazil); the City of Rio de Janeiro; tour companies; and other professionals or researchers - as well as from the perspectives of ‘insiders’ - local residents and organizations within the communities.

Following this assessment of significance is a gauging of interventions already occurring that may be impacting those significances, facilitating or hindering preservation in a favela. These interventions include favela upgrading, favela tourism, and heritage designation. I develop an analytical framework of criteria to assess each favela’s significance and interventions by utilizing existing literature, contact with other professionals (within and outside of Rio de Janeiro) whose work is relevant to this research, and primary investigation of institutional and local perspectives in each favela. Ultimately, the aim is to determine whether or not preservation is a desirable intervention for these communities, and if so, how it could be implemented.

Favelas I considered for evaluation in Rio de Janeiro include Morro da Providência because it was the first informal settlement in Brazil termed a ‘favela’, Santa Marta and Morro da Babilônia because they are within the boundaries of Rio’s UNESCO World Heritage Site, and Rocinha because it is the favela that has and continues to draw the most tourism (Figure 1). Due to factors such as accessibility and feasibility for this study, the two communities I focus on are Morro da Providência and Santa Marta.
Morro da Providência is located in the historic port area adjacent to the downtown center of the city, which is currently undergoing significant urban upgrades that often entail demolition of historic structures. There is tension within the community and between the community and the City of Rio, particularly with the UPP (Pacifying Police Units), a state law enforcement and social services program that reclaims territories from control of gangs and drug dealers, and the SMH (Secretary of Municipal Housing), the department within the City of Rio that addresses the urbanization and regularization of favelas and new housing developments.

Santa Marta is located on the edge of a more affluent neighborhood, Botafogo, in Zona Sul (southern zone of the city). Tourism has a big presence in Santa Marta, with several micro-companies leading guided tours through the community. This is in conjunction with the occupation of the UPP and aesthetically-oriented urban upgrading projects taking place.
Utilization of existing literature and data as well as contact with professionals and researchers is necessary, but primary investigation of institutional and local perspectives in each *favela* is the key to this research. It entails interviews, observations, mapping, photographic documentation, and access to local literature. This fieldwork enriches the understanding of layers in historic development as well as ‘outsider’ and ‘insider’ dynamics inherent in the communities and could not have been achieved without being on site in Rio de Janeiro.

Working in the city of Rio de Janeiro periodically over the past two years with Instituto Rio Patrimônio da Humanidade and Studio-X Rio, one of Columbia University, GSAPP’s global satellite studios provided me a good foundation to expand my work in the city. A familiarity of local knowledge, language, and connection in Rio prepared me for the research task at hand.

This research is important because it seeks to make preservation more relevant to planning practices by considering significance outside of current standards and by looking at alternative forms of preservation. But, perhaps more importantly, in the context of pressured interventions such as upgrading, tourism, and heritage designation, it helps to promote institutional support for community representation and empowerment in the interest of peaceful and sustainable development principles.
Part I. Background
CHAPTER 1: Defining the *Favela* and its Development History

The term *favela* itself comes from the name of a tree found in the northeastern Brazilian state of Bahia (Figures 2 & 3). Soldiers traveled from here to the city (then national capital) of Rio de Janeiro in 1897 in order to receive their wages following the Canudos War (Figure 4). Upon being denied their wages, these soldiers settled on the city’s hillsides by the other informal communities - which they named after the tree of their homeland - while they waited to be paid. The government never paid them, and the soldiers never left; thus, the term ‘*favela*’ stuck - and this hill became known as *Morro da Favela* (Figure 5). Today it is referred to as Morro da Providência.¹

Essentially, today a *favela* is defined as a Brazilian slum, but it is important to note that no two favelas are the same. *Favelas* can vary by landscape, security, building fabric, and demographics. It would be inaccurate to categorize them with all informal settlements in developing countries. According to the IPP (Pereira Passos Institute), an urban planning agency for the municipality of Rio de Janeiro that deals with mapping and statistics, *favela* is defined as:

an area predominantly used for housing, characterized by the occupation of land by the low income population, scarceness of urban infrastructure and public services, pathways that are narrow and with irregular alignment, lots of irregular shape and size, and unlicensed constructions, that do not conform with the legal patterns.²

A *favela* is a self-sustaining community, though not by choice. Although *favelas* are found in several cities in Brazil, the City of Rio de Janeiro has the largest concentration of them (*Figure 6*). It is home to 25% of the Brazilian *favela* population.³ And, it is estimated that 22% of Rio de Janeiro’s population resides in *favelas*.⁴

With the significant growth of the *favelas*, especially relative to the rest of the population, it became more difficult to ignore them or to simply see them as a problem to be solved. *Favelas* have become a character-defining feature of the city. In the process of Rio de Janeiro’s ongoing efforts to promote itself as a global city, it also continues to search for the legitimate role of the *favela*.

---


The first informal settlements of Rio de Janeiro to occur on a large scale were a result of the emancipation of slavery in 1888.\(^5\) There was a period of internal migration in Brazil, mostly ex-slaves coming from declining coffee and sugar regions. In addition, it is estimated that 5 million immigrants entered Brazil between 1820 and 1930, with the largest influx arriving around the turn of the century. About a third of the immigrant population came from Italy and another third from Portugal, but the origins of the remaining population included Spain, Germany, Japan, Ukraine, Russia, and Lebanon.\(^6\) Because Rio de Janeiro was the main point of entry into the country, it undoubtedly retained a large number of immigrants which further contributed to growing trends in urbanization and housing woes.

Former President Fernando Henrique Cardoso (1995-2003) recalls the general outlook on favelas during the mid-20th century:

> Back in the 1950s...to be black was to be poor in Brazil. This could be summed up in one word: favela. The favela was really much more than a shantytown or a very poor neighborhood - back then, it was a cluster of homes that didn’t have basic sanitary services, didn’t have a police presence, and didn’t even appear on maps. In the Brazilian public imagination, it was a place that didn’t technically

---


\(^6\) Fernando Henrique Cardoso, The Accidental President of Brazil, A Memoir. Public Affairs, 2006 (26).
As the favela population in the City of Rio grew and diversified over time, this made it more difficult for everyone, particularly the government, to ignore the realities. However, interventions would not result in positive consequences for favela residents.

While favelas have existed in Rio de Janeiro for over 100 years, their most precipitous period of growth occurred during the 1960s and 1970s. As the country rapidly industrialized under a dictatorial regime, urbanization rates nearly doubled. With the military coup in 1964, the government ceased policies that attracted foreign migrants, leaving the Brazilian economy to rely heavily on internal migration. Populations typically flowed from states in the nordeste (Northeast) and the neighboring state of Minas Gerais into the wealthier states of São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro; between 1960 and 1990 approximately 8.1 million people left the nordeste and 3.8 million left Minas Gerais. Citizens across the country migrated to the cities for work, and favelas offered community with a cheap means of housing that was proximate to jobs. These settlements were predicated on illegal occupation of land without government services.

---

7 Cardoso, 48-49.
CHAPTER 2: An Overview of Favela Interventions

Favela interventions have been a topic of discussion since the early 20th century. Up until 1982, many efforts were made to reform favelas and most ‘intervention’ took the form of favela clearance and demolition - especially in the downtown area of Rio de Janeiro. The city began utilizing infrastructural intervention to physically treat informal areas in 1983 and eventually moved toward social and urban integration programs in 1993.  

Social and urban integration programs were activated in the 1990s with the creation of Brazil’s National Housing Policy and the provision of a legal framework that “guarantees access to land and housing based on the principle of the fulfillment of the social function of the city and property” in their 1988 Constitution. Although the principle had been part of the Constitution since 1934, it was never put into practice. These policy changes were part of a larger move from authoritarian rule to decentralized federalism, which included the devolution of administrative powers to municipalities. Such policy changes instigated a slow movement towards participatory, community specific planning and awareness of the critical need to address insufficient housing for the low-income population.

Several government-led programs have been, or are currently being, implemented in Rio de Janeiro that reveal the city’s efforts towards favela-city integration. These programs also illuminate the existing capacities, resources, knowledge bases, and services the city has to assist in favela improvement, and some limitations surrounding their implementation (Figure 7).

---


Brazil, and particularly Rio de Janeiro, is progressive with regard to its evolving perspective on inherent potentials, instead of problems, in self-built settlements; however, issues arise when one questions who will benefit from these potentials? Favelas are characterized by rapid physical evolution, but how do these changes differ when they are initiated by local residents vs. outsiders? Given that interventions are occurring at an accelerated pace from outsiders, it is worth taking a step to assess the significance of places before they are intervened upon. A strong pushback is inevitable when rapid urban renewal is implemented.

It is important to note that current urban interventions are occurring on a city-wide scale in order to self-promote in the process of globalization. At present, urban upgrading is taking place primarily to prepare for the Olympic Games in 2016, tourism is rising - with a significant boom in favela tourism that only became legitimated by the City in 2006, and it was just recently in 2012 when boundaries were declared for a UNESCO World Heritage Site in Rio.

The most obvious urban upgrading example referred to is the teleférico, or cable car (Figure 8). Most recently, in Morro da Providência this infrastructural intervention is a particularly contested issue because even though it is publicized as ‘minimum intervention, maximum benefit’ urban acupuncture, it takes away built fabric and public space that was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Favela-Bairro</td>
<td>A physical upgrading program for favelas in Rio that functioned until 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Bolsa Familia</td>
<td>A welfare program that targets families with incomes below the poverty line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Program de Aceleração do Crescimento</td>
<td>Strictly an initiative to upgrade the public realm of the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Unidade de Polícia Pacificadora</td>
<td>A state law enforcement and social services program that reclaims territories from control of gangs and drug dealers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Minha Casa, Minha Vida</td>
<td>Builds new construction on vacant land for the purpose of affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Morar Carioca</td>
<td>Essentially a continuation of the Favela-Bairro program and is being promoted as part of the Olympic Plan for Rio de Janeiro.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
previously used by the community, and it is not clear whether the new use serves the community better than the previous use.\textsuperscript{14} As previously mentioned, slum clearance is generally an outdated intervention at this point, but it is important to realize that demolition at the expense of who is living in these communities still does take place.

![Figure 8: “Providência Gondola Finally Opens in Rio” (The Rio Times, July 8, 2014).](image)

Although distinct, some urban upgrading interventions are decidedly connected to tourism. \textit{Favela} tourism has been taking place since the early 1990s, especially in Rocinha due to its location between two affluent neighborhoods in Zona Sul, access to breathtaking views, and proximity to hotels; however, it was not until 2006 when Rocinha was the first \textit{favela} to become an official tourist attraction.\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Favela} tourism in Rio de Janeiro has since snow-balled into a thriving global industry encouraged by the establishment of the UPP in 2008 and the Olympic bid win in 2009. The first UPP was placed in Santa Marta, now also host to booming tourism.

As of now, no portion of a \textit{favela} is listed as patrimônio cultural (listed heritage) in Rio de Janeiro, nor would it be likely to occur. Standards of significance and management tend to rely heavily on physical integrity as well as legitimacy and ownership. Although these communities and the built environments they create, inhabit, and recreate have evolved and expanded over time, is there something in need of and worth preserving? Two \textit{favelas}, Santa Marta and Morro da Babilônia, are within the boundaries of Rio de Janeiro’s UNESCO World


Heritage Site (Figure 9).\textsuperscript{16} Within the documentation for this site prepared by IPHAN, there is mention of informal settlements but only as a concern for the integrity of the site, and they are not mentioned by name.\textsuperscript{17}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{map.png}
\caption{map of Rio de Janeiro’s UNESCO World Heritage Site boundaries, with locators for favelas Santa Marta and Morro da Babilônia.}
\end{figure}

Although there is yet to be an official listing of a \textit{favela} as a heritage site, it is worth noting that some efforts in preservation have taken place through research and documentation. The Department of Cultural Heritage in the City of Rio de Janeiro published a work documenting some historic markers and recording oral histories in the Morro da Providência in 1992.\textsuperscript{18} In 2007, the City of Rio attempted to open a museum in Morro da Providência called “a céu aberto” (the open sky); however, due to a lack of investment and initiative from local


\textsuperscript{17} “Rio de Janeiro: Carioca Landscapes between the Mountain and the Sea.” World Heritage Nomination, 2012.

authorities, the museum was not sustainable (Figure 10). Instead, now local residents are organizing their own museum called Museu Comunitário, Morro da Providência. And, it appears to have been active since early 2014.

![Plan of Interventions for Favela-Bairro and the first stage of the open air museum in Morro da Providência (Source: “Museu a céu aberto”)](image)

Other communities have opened their own museums as well. Local residents in Pavão-Pavãozinho and Cantagalo established the MUF (Museu da Favela) one year prior to the insertion of the UPP from the City. Museums have also been opened in the communities of Horto, Rocinha, and Maré. This is not to say that exhibits do not take place outside of the communities. Quite the contrary. Expositions regarding design in informal settlements are especially popular. Studio-X Rio has been host to several. But it is not just local. The fascination with the favela has gone international evinced by Favela Chic in Paris, France (http://favelachic.com) and the recent exhibit in New York’s MoMA (Museum of Modern Art), “Uneven Growth: Tactical Urbanisms for Expanding Megacities.” A full-circle connection is again made to tourism.

What is essential to gauging interventions taking place in the favelas is assessing significance. Once significance is assessed, through the points of view of outsiders and insiders, the role of preservation planning among these interventions taking place can be considered. And, in order to prepare next steps, it is important to have an understanding of planning history in Rio de Janeiro and its coinciding relationship with preservation.

---


21 Davies, 2014.

22 Ibid.

CHAPTER 3: 20th Century Planning, Preservation Roots and Aspirations

Rio de Janeiro has a history of authority figures wanting to reinvent the identity of the City, through social and physical changes, in effort to disassociate it from previous leaders and reigns of government. This is particularly seen during the early to mid-20th century when there is a high turnover rate in systems of government and especially in Rio de Janeiro, given that it was the capital of the nation and had been so since 1763.²⁴ It was the center of politics, commerce, culture, and social life, and it was the city that received the most attention during the rising popularity of urban renewal, city beautification, and modern design.

As an outgrowth of the City Beautiful movement taking place in Europe and the United States, Mayor Francisco Pereira Passos, an engineer, set the stage for sweeping urban renewal in Rio de Janeiro during the first decade of the 20th century in the spirit of Baron von Haussman decades earlier in Paris. His projects, which were implemented by the federal government, intended to do many things:

- to update the image of Rio to match the current cosmopolitan, belle époque model of a world metropolis, and so compete with Buenos Aires in attracting investment. They were designed to make the city structure more functional to allow for new modes of production and communication, particularly in and around the port. They were needed to eradicate typhoid and other epidemics related to living conditions. And, finally, they sought to transform the morphology of the city center so as to reflect the new logic of capitalism.²⁵

The physical and social results of these objectives were the widening of alleys and streets into avenues and boulevards, a new port, demolition of old quarters and colonial buildings to give way to eclectic European architecture, displacement of poor families, and a city center that developed an identity for capital and prestige (Figures 11, 12, 13, & 14).²⁶ Beautification, the aesthetics of a place, played a significant role in the beginnings of city planning as a practice and would continue throughout the 20th century.

Urban reforms that took place during the early 20th century in Rio de Janeiro incited conflicts with two major groups: “renters and householders” and “groups of intellectuals who intended to preserve the old townscape, especially colonial churches and monuments.”²⁷ This invariably links the history of preservation concerns to the history of housing issues in the city. Although motivations among each group differed, they were roused by the substantial demolition occurring as a result of aggressive planning practices.

---

²⁴ In 1960, the national capital was moved from Rio de Janeiro to the newly constructed city of Brasília.

²⁵ Pinheiro and del Rio, 52.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Outtes, 157-158.
The insertion of historic preservation into national policy was also done in effort to foster national identity and pride. Preservation first became part of Brazilian national policy with the 1934 Constitution, and it referred only to historic objects. This occurred during a period of transition, following the Revolution of 1930 which put an end to the oligarchic Old Republic, with no elections and whereby Getúlio Vargas - Governor of Rio Grande do Sul and a cattle rancher with a doctorate in law - assumed authority. This culminated in his period of dictatorial rule known as Estado Novo (New State) between 1937 and 1945.

A new Constitution was signed at the beginning of this period in 1937, where the right to culture preservation was referred to for the first time. At the request of the Minister of

28 1934 Brazil Constitution, Title 5, Chapter 2, Article 148.
29 Outtes, 157-158,
30 1937 Brazil Constitution, Title 5, Chapter 20, Article 134.
Education, Gustavo Capanema, writer Mário de Andrade had drafted a bill in 1936 defining heritage as “all of the works of pure, applied, popular, learned, domestic or foreign art that belong to the public authorities, the social organisms, and the national and private individuals who are resident in Brazil,” marking the beginning of debates on the preservation of Brazilian cultural and artistic heritage.\footnote{Sapiezínskas, 37.}

In 1937, SPHAN (National Historic and Artistic Heritage Service) was established, which would come to be known as IPHAN (National Historic and Artistic Heritage Institute) by 1970, to share the task of identifying and listing historical, cultural, and artistic heritage with the federal states and local authorities in Brazil. Nearly half of all listings in today’s official registry of national heritage were completed before 1945.\footnote{Williams, 90.} It would be impossible to disconnect the authoritarian Estado Novo period from the “legal and administrative invention of patrimônio” to protect “an exemplary collection of cultural treasures,” also known as “the identity documents of the Brazilian nation.”\footnote{Ibid.}

Favelas were already in existence but of little consequence when Donat-Alfred Agache, an internationally-known French planner, designed a plan for Rio de Janeiro in 1930 (Figure 15).\footnote{Outtes, 160-161.} The modern ideas of city planning:

brought another image of the city, a new townscape and a different experience of living. These developments were characterized by proto-modern architecture, skyscrapers built on large avenues, distant housing with long journeys to work for the poorest, or overcrowded favelas around the city centre.\footnote{Outtes, 162.}

Although Vargas felt that the Agache Plan was associated with the old regime, some ideas from it would be altered and implemented in the years to come. The most well-known urban reform taken from the plan is the construction of Avenida Presidente Vargas in the early 1940s (Figure 16). It is a broad east-west avenue that spans the port area of Rio de Janeiro and passes by Central, the main transportation hub, and Morro da Providência. This was considered a significant instance in which SPHAN failed to prevent the municipality of Rio from destroying several hundred historic structures (Figures 17 & 18). On November 29, 1941, President Vargas issued Decree-Law 3.866, “giving the president of the republic the discretionary power to revoke tombamentos,” (protected properties). This action encouraged the continuance of absolutism in government practices.

\footnote{Sapiezínskas, 37.}
\footnote{Williams, 90.}
\footnote{Ibid.}
\footnote{Outtes, 160-161.}
\footnote{Outtes, 162.}
Urban renewal projects in Rio de Janeiro continued through the mid-20th century. With the demolition of two large hills in the downtown, Santo Antonio and Morro do Castelo, space was created for new high-rise buildings and landfill provided for new coastal expressways and parks, namely Parque do Flamengo (Flamengo Park) which hosts the Museu de Arte Moderna (Museum of Modern Art) (Figures 19, 20, & 21). Tunnels were drilled through the Pão de Açucar (Sugar Loaf) mountains, making way for development of beachfront modern high-rises in Zona Sul and neighborhoods such as Flamengo, Botafogo, Copacabana, and Ipanema (Figure 22).

---

The Cultural Corridor Project implemented in 1979 in downtown Rio de Janeiro was the “first large-scale urban-design project in Brazil” specifically purposed for “preservation and revitalization in the inner city.”\textsuperscript{37} This was the beginning of numerous historic districts that would be defined in Rio de Janeiro. The city now has 16 designated areas referred to as Áreas de Proteção do Ambiente Cultural (APACs) that are typically defined and reviewed for proposed alterations according to character-defining features within neighborhood boundaries. What exactly an APAC is defined as has evolved since the 1980s; however, at present the IRPH (Rio World Heritage Institute) describes it as follows:

constituted by built properties - which can consist of and be defined by houses of small/medium/large size - sidewalks, streets, plazas, uses and activities, a set environment (homogeneous or not), appearance, smells, idiosyncrasies,

specificities, cultural values and ways of life that grant a unique identity to each urban area.\textsuperscript{38} The APAC program has done well to bring together preservation and development in order to manage change in an urban environment. It is a great stride in recognizing urban heritage. Thus far, this planning tool has only been applied to historic neighborhoods that hold legitimacy in the city. Whether it has the potential to be applied to a \textit{favela} has not been considered yet.

In the early 1990s, research on histories of Rio de Janeiro’s neighborhoods was being done and composed for publication by the (General Department of Cultural Patrimony). Municipal Secretary of Culture, Tourism and Sports Carlos Eduardo Novaes was motivated to expand the publication of histories for each neighborhood in the city to record the memory of the \textit{favelas}. The following quote was taken from the introduction to the only book that became published, \textit{Morro da Providência: memórias da “Favella”}:

\begin{quote}
The concept of what really represents cultural patrimony, for many decades restricted to the artistic expressions of official history, have been reconsidered by theorists that study the city. It is known today that everything makes it, all of the testimony of the presence and of the performance of man in his everyday, constitutes a significant element in the construction of the memory and the identity of a people.\textsuperscript{39}
\end{quote}

There has not been effort within the Departamento Geral de Patrimônio Cultural since this time to explore potential historic significance in a \textit{favela}. This is largely due to the fact that property is not considered legitimate within self-built settlements and therefore cannot be listed as patrimônio. In fact, informal settlements are often considered a feature that detracts from the integrity of listed sites. According to Isabelle Cury, Architect and Landscape Advisor for IPHAN in the State of Rio de Janeiro, National and international organizations such as IPHAN and UNESCO are at a loss to intervene due to the legal exclusion by local governments of informal settlements from being listed in addition to the mountain of work that comes with managing properties already listed.\textsuperscript{40}

Common tools that preservation planners refer to when they want to save a place include documentation, tourism, reuse, and/or designation. I aim to discover other methods or ways in thinking about these tools in the case study process so that the field can continue to broaden its scope and its reach of heritage. Substantial progress has already been made in preservation planning in Rio de Janeiro, but it can be furthered and should periodically be reassessed. Considering significance in \textit{favelas} is the next step.

\begin{flushright}


40 Interview with Isabelle Cury (December 29, 2014).
\end{flushright}
Part II. Case Studies
CHAPTER 4: Methodology

The goal of this research is to identify significance, according to outsiders and insiders, of a favela; to gauge interventions that are occurring, specifically urban upgrading, tourism, and heritage designation; and to determine if, how, and to what extent preservation planning would be an appropriate action to take by ‘outsiders’ and ‘insiders’ within the communities. Although there are numerous favelas throughout Brazil, the city of Rio de Janeiro is host to one of the largest concentrations of favela dwellers. Regionally-focused here, I look more deeply into the communities of Morro da Providência - the first informal settlement in Brazil termed a ‘favela’ - and Santa Marta - one of two favelas located within the boundaries of Rio de Janeiro’s UNESCO World Heritage Site. In addition to factors of accessibility and feasibility, I chose to explore these two communities in order to tackle preservation issues inside and outside of UNESCO World Heritage Site boundaries.

In order to perform this international research, I utilized existing literature and data, contacted professionals within and outside Rio de Janeiro, and investigated local and institutional perspectives. My fieldwork procedures involved interviews, observations, audio recording, as well as photographic and cartographic documentation. Stakeholders who I reached out to included local residents, tour guides, tour visitors, researchers, residents’ associations, UNESCO representatives, IPHAN representatives, and City representatives. Each person interviewed, recorded, or photographed consented to participate in this study. All interviews were conducted in person and in Portuguese by myself, with no compensation or other remuneration offered. I did not seek out anyone with special regard for gender, age, and ethnicity as it is not the focus of my study.

During one month spent in Rio de Janeiro, I was in contact with approximately 33 people or organizations and I had informal, but informative, conversations with a handful of people either in person or by email. In order to shape a well-rounded impression that was based on views from multiple stakeholders, I conducted formal interviews with the following six people:

Isabelle Cury, Architect and Landscape Advisor for IPHAN in the State of Rio de Janeiro
Sonia Zylberberg, Researcher for IRPH (Rio World Heritage Institute) and contributor to Morro da Providência: memórias da “Favella”
Sheila Souza, Resident of Santa Marta and Founder of Brazilidade
Evandro Silva, Tour Guide and Founder of Bambui Tour in Rio de Janeiro
Maurício Hora, Resident and Photographer of Morro da Providência
Omar Blanco, Urbanist Architect and Activist in Rio de Janeiro.

I accessed local literature in Portuguese specific to the communities of Morro da Providência and Santa Marta that had been limitedly circulated.\footnote{Morro da Providência: memórias da “Favella.” Departamento Geral de Patrimônio Cultural e Departamento Geral de Documentação e Informação Cultural na Prefeitura da Cidade do Rio de Janeiro, 1992; Santa Marta: O Morro e Sua Gente. IETS (Instituto de Estudos do Trabalho e Sociedade, Executive Director Manuel Thedim), 2010.} I took 205 photographs,
gathered 119 photographs taken by residents in Santa Marta from five disposable cameras, and gathered 213 photographs from Maurício Hora of Morro da Providência. I had printed out maps of the communities, thinking that residents may want to mark specific places of significance; however, sites were not distinguishable to them from an aerial point of view (Figures 23, 24, 25, & 26). It proved simpler to get a visual in person and to locate the site later on a digital map. Mapping my tracks using the Trails application on my smartphone facilitated this.

Figures 23 & 24: aerial map showing boundaries of Morro da Providência (top); street map showing boundaries of Morro da Providência (bottom) (Source: Instituto Pereira Passos).
The initial questions to contacts in Rio de Janeiro were posed in order to begin a discussion about the meanings and potential roles of preservation planning in a *favela*. Each set of questions was sent out in both versions of English and Portuguese. To researchers, organizations, and institutions, I asked:

1. Are there places or qualities in the favelas that are worth preserving? (for example, culturally? socially? historically? politically? environmentally? architecturally? economically?)
2. It seems that the only favelas inside the boundaries of a listed cultural site are Santa Marta and Morro da Babilônia in Rio de Janeiro’s UNESCO World Heritage Site. Are there implications in this?

3. Do you think the interventions in the communities need to be reexamined, especially because of the demolition occurring? And, also gentrification? Should preservationists intervene?

4. It is common when preservationists want to save a place, the options include documentation, tourism, reuse, and/or designation. Documentation is already an endeavor in some places and at least always an option. Of course, tourism exists in the favelas. Do you think that tourism is, could be, or should be a form of preservation in the favela? For informal settlements, designation does not seem like an acceptable action at this point, and reuse does not seem like a good option because the favelas already have an important use - housing and community for people with low income. So, are documentation and tourism the only options? Do others exist?

To local residents in the communities of Morro da Providência and Santa Marta:

1. Are there any places here that have special significance for the community that are worth preserving? (for example, culturally? socially? historically? politically? environmentally? architecturally? economically?)

2. How do you feel about the interventions occurring? Do you think that they need to be reassessed?

3. Are there any places significant to the community that have been demolished unjustifiably?

4. Do you think that tourism helps to preserve the culture of the community here?

To tour guides and companies:

1. Can you tell me a bit about your customers and where they come from?

2. Who do you market to? What do you hope to convey on the tours?

3. What do visitors look for? And what do they see?

4. What do you think are the positive and negative effects of tourism on the favela?

5. Are there any places here that have special significance for the community that are worth preserving? (for example, culturally? socially? historically? politically? environmentally? architecturally? economically?)

The responses I received helped to clarify preservation planning issues that exist both from a community perspective, from an entrepreneurial perspective, and from an institutional perspective.

There was the obvious limitation of time, only having one month to perform fieldwork - during which many people were indisposed for holidays and summer vacations - so it was a
challenge to make contact with some stakeholders whose insights I thought would be valuable to this research. However, the participants who graciously provided their insights contributed to an initial well-rounded analysis of the potential role of preservation planning in a favela. This will not be an end-all-be-all statement of preservation planning in a favela, but rather an indication toward further research and discussion with regard to its application in self-built settlements, in Rio de Janeiro and in an international context.
CHAPTER 5: Stories and Reflections from Morro da Providência

Morro da Providência holds the origins of the term ‘favela’ as it is known today, referring to a Brazilian slum. As previously mentioned, soldiers from the Canudos War bestowed the name ‘favela’ upon this hillside settlement in the port area of Rio de Janeiro in 1897, having been denied their wages by the government and being compelled to settle here.

The hills that circled Canudos were covered with a tree called ‘favela’, whose leaves cause a tremendously painful prick; the plant is also known for its capacity for survival in desert-like settings. It is not apparent when exactly the name Morro da Favela was exchanged for Morro da Providência, but by the beginning of the 20th century, ‘Providência’ appeared on maps. According to historian Carlos Alberto de Medina, the name Providência (Providence) came to replace Favela in order to promote the overcoming of struggles of living on the hillside settlement - “the hunger and deprivations that punished the body and spirit.”

Providência is a name easily attributable to soldiers in the military, but there was a population already living on the hillside before the soldiers arrived. It is not clear who made up this population, but it probably included former residents from the condemned cortiços (tenements) in the city center, closed by the Administration of Hygiene, as well as immigrants - national and foreign. According to the 1890 Census, one quarter of the population in Rio de Janeiro was concentrated in cortiços, and hillside habitations were already in existence. Two other hills in the downtown, Morro do Castelo and Morro de Santo Antônio, were also host to informal settlements before they (the actual hills) were demolished for urban renewal projects in the early to mid-20th century.

Even before Morro da Providência was given its name, the downtown city center of Rio de Janeiro, which includes the port area, was already holding a strong rate of growth in population due to its concentration of factories, manufacturers, port activities, and commerce; this was in spite of the beginning of expansion into suburbs, facilitated by the construction of trains and cable cars (Figure 27). However, the unreliability and price of transport prevented...
expansion to distant areas in the city, and access to the city center was still essential for everyday living.46

Figure 27: photograph of the port area in Rio de Janeiro, early 20th century. Morro da Providência is the hill to the left (Source: Mauricio Hora).

The city reflects the social, economic, and political relationships between the classes of the society in which it lives. What determines its appearance is the continuous reorganization of urban space attending the interests of capital. During the late 19th century and early 20th century, the main objectives for the city were beautification and sanitization, following a Parisian model, in order to consolidate the city of Rio de Janeiro as the touristic and financial capital of Latin America. Laws were put in place to prevent precarious housing from being built in the ‘Old City’, but it was tolerated on the hills; 1903 is known as the year legislation liberated construction on the hills.47 A stigmatization developed for those living on the hills of marginality, incapacity, dirtiness, dependence, violence, etc (Figure 28).

Figure 28: caricature of Osvaldo Cruz ordering the evacuation of residents from Morro da Favela, 1908 (Source: Morro da Providência: Memórias da ‘Favella’).

During the 1920s, French urbanist Alfred Agache did survey work in Rio de Janeiro in preparation for his proposal for a city plan (Figure 28). He included a chapter concerning favelas, in effect identifying them as a problem of hygiene to be solved and mentions Providência as a favela “that will easily be

46 Ibid, 23.

remodeled in residential villas” due to its location in the port, “its proximity to the commercial center, and its hygienic advantages afforded by its elevation.”48 The Building Code of 1936 in Rio de Janeiro, during the reign of President Vargas, initiated what was then referred to as the regularization of favelas.49 However, this meant demolition and relocation, taking place throughout most of the 20th century. The beginning of residents’ associations in favelas during the 1960s and 1970s helped to push back against these efforts. It is not known how many people in Providência were displaced then.

Urban upgrading projects are still attempted in Morro da Providência. Most notable is the recent teleférico, or cable car, completed in 2014. This was actually an idea first proposed by Columbia University, GSAPP architecture students during a brief visit to Rio de Janeiro in 2011 that captured the interest of Mayor Eduardo Paes, so it went forward as an initiative in improving mobility and accessibility to be included in the master plan for Porto Maravilha - a project aimed at upgrading the port area of Rio de Janeiro.50 The project suffered from a lack of community participation, and the installation of the teleférico took away the only public plaza - and one that was consistently used by residents (Figure 29). Sonia Zylberberg, researcher for IRPH and contributor to Morro da Providência: memórias da “Favella” noted this public plaza as the place of socialization, of parties, of encounters.51 With regard to the project, Maurício Hora, resident and photographer of Morro da Providência said, “the teleférico is good. It’s just that there are many things needed before the teleférico, like housing and streets.”52


50 Interview with Mauricio Hora (January 7, 2015).

51 Interview with Sonia Zylberberg (January 5, 2015).

52 Interview with Maurício Hora (January 7, 2015) (translated by author).
Hora talked about the SMH marking structures, homes, within the community for demolition starting in 2011, without speaking to their residents (Figure 30). Of course, they were marking during the day, when a majority of people were at work. This was just before the UPP entered Providência in 2012. Hora brought me to the main staircase in the community, on the right side of which the city plans to demolish homes in order to construct an inclined train to facilitate movement up and down (Figure 31). But, he said, the city also wanted to remove the homes on the other side of the staircase “to have a view of the city.” In truth, he says “the idea is to take away the maximum number of people from the hill.”

Zylberberg talked about the criticism gained from favela interventions. Speaking of Favela-Bairro, she said “the actions were pointed but not intensely affecting. They were not done with the thought of urbanization or improved circulation… [but of] trails and platforms to observe the landscape, everything in the perspective of tourism… Really, tourism has success in some cases, but if this is going to benefit the [favela] resident, I do not know…” The viewing
platform Hora showed me on the west end of Providência was representative of the types of interventions Zylberberg referred to (Figure 32). Architect and activist in Rio, Omar Blanco, points out that for the City, “the step of participation comes after the process of planning… everything happens in the office… that ‘to participate’ means ‘to listen’… There is no collective design taking place.”

As Hora and I continued our walk through Morro da Providência, we roughly followed what would have been the walking tour for the “a céu aberto” museum - part of the Favela-Bairro initiatives - which was marked by metal strips on the ground (Figure 33). We reached the top of the staircase and arrived at A Casa Amarela (the yellow house), Hora’s hub for art projects exhibitions, and just across the plaza was Capela de Nossa Senhora da Penha (Our Lady of Penha Chapel), a marker of the community constructed ca. 1900 (Figure 34). We passed another marker when circling back along the backbone of the hill, the Oratório, or A Capela das Almas, which was constructed in 1902 and remains in good condition (Figure 35).

Figures 32, 33, 34, & 35: photograph of viewing platform (top left); photograph showing marked pathways for the “a céu aberto” museum (top right); photograph of the Capela de Nossa Senhora da Penha behind a plaza renovated through the Favela-Bairro program (bottom left); photograph of the Oratório (bottom right) (taken by author).

53 Interview with Omar Blanco (January 7, 2015).
Hora, being a prominent photographer, was willing to share several of his photographs taken in the community, 213 to be exact. 61 of these photos are historic photos from the early 20th century noting the hillside community’s relationship to the port area and downtown as well as the structural conditions in the community which consist of predominantly wooden homes. 105 of the more recent photographs have people in them. Of those 105, 35 show community members gathering in public spaces (many of which are in front of the Oratório) or performing daily tasks, such as laundry (Figure 36); 53 reference his art installation projects, one of which involved pasting photographs of residents on the outside walls of their homes - humanizing the structures (Figure 37); 6 show public protests (Figure 38); and 5 are taken on the escadaria (main staircase) (Figure 39). Of the remaining photographs, 23 showcase impressive views (Figure 40); 6 show progress in construction (Figure 41); and 2 display local businesses (Figure 42).
It is apparent that the people are a significant and defining feature of Morro da Providência, and when threatened are willing to stand up for themselves and their community; however, there seems to be some difficulty in harnessing a united effort. The impression I get from Hora and from my observations is that there are tensions within the community and between the community and the City of Rio. It became clear to me close to sunset when UPP officers began scanning the pathways with raised weapons (Figure 43). Hora informed me that this occurs daily, and furthermore, that at that time, it was not safe to explore the neighborhood that essentially was outside of the paths marked for the open air museum. Divisions exist in the community, some of which can be defined by different hillsides, that have been present since Morro da Providência was first settled upon. The side that faces the port tends not to associate with the side that faces the downtown.
In terms of interventions occurring in Morro da Providência, urban upgrading is being pushed on a grand scale due to the community’s location in the port area, which is currently undergoing a structurally ambitious rehabilitation project (Porto Maravilha). These urban upgrades appear to be motivated by tourism, which is not in itself negative. But, the interventions taking place are being planned and implemented with a focus on tourism and at the expense of assets the community finds valuable and issues they would prefer to be addressed. Heritage designation has yet to be a topic of discussion for Morro da Providência, but if it were to be considered, a new unconventional form of designation would be necessary. Interestingly, the appeal for preservation exists in Morro da Providência as much as the desire for upgrading intervention does for both ‘outsiders’ - primarily the City of Rio de Janeiro - and ‘insiders’ - local residents; however, there is a disconnect between each set of stakeholders’ motivations and what is worthy of preservation or urban intervention.

Concerning preservation, local resident Hora states that “the house of wood that characterized the original favela is already lost, but you still have something interesting, the people.” What makes, and carries, the memory are the people. What is lacking in planning is a bigger dialogue with the people, with the residents. From the perspective of a researcher, Zylberberg stated “if you do analyses of all the favelas, it will be difficult to encounter something that has, something that maintains some data of how it was…” Essentially, the only evidence of the past is the memory of older generations in the favela. “The City never thought of this [preservation of the favela]. [The book] was not done with the idea to create rules of protection for the favelas. It was just a book for the population to contemplate its own past.” For Morro da Providência, it is evident that what is key to preserving the memory of the favela is the people. And, by pushing for demolition of homes and public spaces for the primary purpose of appealing to tourism is an unjustifiable compromise of the integrity of that significant feature.

Following the fallout of the open air museum in Morro da Providência, local resident Roberto Marinho, responded and put efforts toward establishing the Museu Comunitário, Morro da Providência in 2014. So far, the community museum does not have a physical space, but it functions virtually via facebook and a blog - where photographs and stories can be posted and potentially reach a wide audience.54 What is especially impressive is the initiative the museum is taking in addressing interventions that take place in the community. On March 26th of this year, the organization posted a survey to its facebook page that seeks feedback from local residents on

---

their needs. The Museu Comunitário could be just what the City needs to access inherent values and concerns in Morro da Providência.

---

CHAPTER 6: Stories and Reflections from Santa Marta

‘Dona Marta’ is often heard in conjunction with, or instead of, ‘Santa Marta’. This is because the favela Santa Marta is located on the Morro (hillside) Dona Marta. Some locals in Rio de Janeiro will refer to the favela as Dona Marta so as not to confuse it with the neighborhood of Santa Teresa, which often just goes by ‘Santa’. The following historical references from Santa Marta: O Morro e Sua Gente, a limitedly published book through IETS (Institute of Work and Society Studies) in 2010 are based on the writings of Itamar Silva, resident of Santa Marta and Director at the Brazilian Institute of Social and Economic Analyses (IBASE) and translated by the author. It was a research and study conducted just shortly after the UPP entered Santa Marta in 2008.

Occupation of Santa Marta began in the late 1930s but was not registered on the Census until 1948. The majority of the first occupiers were from towns within the State of Rio de Janeiro and neighboring states. Beginning in the late 1950s and into the 1960s, many nordestinos (people from the northeastern states of Brazil) arrived in Santa Marta and became the majority through migratory process. Until the 1970s, the majority of residents were of African descent.

The period of Santa Marta’s formation between 1938/9 and 1950 indicated all of the problems that would later cause tension: “lack of water, precariousness of electric energy, occupation of interior space, the presence of external agents, initiatives for schools inside the favela, etc…” Many men in the community worked in construction but not all; some worked in commerce. And, it was common for women to be domestic workers in other people’s homes. Some people raised chickens or pigs.

The 1960s was a period of consolidation for the favela. During the mid-1960s, perceptible changes included the disappearance of backyards, some of which were fenced by

56 Santa Marta: O Morro e Sua Gente. IETS (Instituto de Estudos do Trabalho e Sociedade, Executive Director Manuel Thedim), 2010: 12.
57 Interview with Sonia Zylberberg (January 5, 2015).
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wood or plants, with houses expanding to these boundaries - some to two stories; the demand for space increased. The affluent neighborhood at the base of the hill, Botafogo, was changing too. New housing construction was being erected, old buildings were being demolished, and it was easy for residents of Santa Marta to buy discarded wood from the demolitions to use in their own houses (Figure 44). “Tiles were always used tiles.”

Figure 44: photograph of Santa Marta at the end of the 1960s when it still had a rural aspect (Source: Santa Marta).

Regulations through Fundação Leão XIII, an initiative between the Catholic Church and the City of Rio de Janeiro, at this time prohibited construction using brick in favelas; however the leaders of residents’ associations were not motivated to enforce it. The Associação dos Moradores do Morro de Santa Marta (Residents’ Association of Santa Marta) was founded on October 24, 1965. There was a structural collapse in 1966 that destroyed many homes and killed three people. As a result of this and other changes occurring, many people moved out of the community.

The 1970s was the peak of problems with electricity and water for Santa Marta, largely due to the increases in consumption. Itamar Silva provides a vivid description of Santa Marta at this time:

During the 1970s, Santa Marta was already well densified. There were many huts of wood, some constructed over trenches and in difficult conditions. Tiles were a mix of zinc and French tiles, with many houses suffering from leaks. Households were larger. It was common for a couple to have 4, 6, up to 8 children. Those who had the ability began canalizing water to their homes while paying a tax to the Residents’ Association. There were some homes that looked finished without cracks or fissures. Some houses already had bathrooms. But the challenge of having quality light and a decent quantity of water was felt by
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On rainy days, it was common for groups of people to be seen cleaning the trenches so that the water remained unobstructed. “The hope was that the trash would flow to Rua São Clemente where Comlurb (City garbage collection agency) would pick it up, but the primary objective was to prevent the water from getting to the homes.” The ‘gato net’ (hanging electrical wires) preceded the parabolic antenna in Santa Marta, which was at best shared between two homes. In Silva’s words, the sound on the television was good, but you couldn’t tell whether someone was pretty or ugly, so you created your own ideal image. To have television in the 1960s in Santa Marta was a symbol of high status... Radios were common and used often as clocks, for it was a luxury to have a watch or a clock.

Carnaval traditions were taking place early in Santa Marta’s development. A carnaval procession known as Furiosa went from Santa Marta to Copacabana until 1957. O Bloco do Boi, a carnaval expression, in Santa Marta that arrived at Praça Cantão (former Praça Império) took place until 1976, when Santa Marta entered the route of organized blocks that go through the Sambadrome Marquês de Sapucaí each year in Rio de Janeiro (Figure 45). Football was both a leisure activity to either play or watch as well as a source of tension in the community between the late 1960s and early 1980s, due to limited public space; it helped to reinforce territorial identities. Spiritual leaders helped form community cores, and the religious diversity present in Santa Marta, including Catholic, Evangelical, and African religions Umbanda and Candoblé, helped confront the physical difficulties of the favela until the 1980s.

Figure 45: photograph of Praça Império toward the end of the 1970s (Source: Santa Marta).

The 1980s was defined by conquests. A clinic was inaugurated in 1983 on top of the hill, groups emerged to construct and fix homes (Casa Santa Marta and Unape-Anchieta), day cares and schools opened, and the first urbanization project took place. The 1990s were regressive in some ways. The clinic closed, the Residents’ Association lost its legitimacy, there was a fire in 1992, and
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armed conflicts that began in 1987 continued with many young boys connected to drug trafficking being killed by the police and army.79

In 2000, community articulation resumed and a response was organized against the proposal from the State Government to construct buildings in Santa Marta.80 The urbanization commission for Santa Marta was created.81 New elections took place for the Residents’ Association, and for the first time a position was created for a female representative in the community.82 A beautification project of the favela, as seen from the outside, known as Projeto de Melhorias Habitacionais (habitat improvements project) began in 2007 but was interrupted in 2008.83 Santa Marta was chosen as the first favela to be subject to UPP occupation and reform in 2008. According to founder tour guide of Bambui Tour, Evandro Silva, this was due to the public outcry from Botafogo, the wealthy neighborhood adjacent to Santa Marta.84

Mobility was an endeavor in the favela since 1985, when the first proposal for urban upgrading was proposed for Santa Marta. It would be a radical change, especially for those living on the Pico do Morro (top of the hill), but it also threatened to displace people who had lived in the community for a long time. The inclined train was inaugurated in 2009.85 With a population of some 5,000 people, Santa Marta currently has pipes below ground, fewer trenches, and fewer gatos; although there are still several places where you can encounter trash.86

Noticeable changes have resulted in Santa Marta since the UPP entered in 2008. It created a wide opening into the community for outsiders. The tourism industry intensified. A tourist information kiosk currently sits at the entrance to the community, along with a map noting reference points and sites worth visiting (Figures 46 & 47). Groups typically congregate here before beginning tours. When I met with Sheila Souza, resident of Santa Marta and founder of Brazilidade - a grassroots tourism group that prioritizes community sustainability and educational outreach - she talked about changes she noticed when the community opened up to government interventions, the influx of tourism, and the subsequent increase in cost of living.87
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Souza brought me to the plaza in front of her home to talk, the famous Praça Cantão (former Praça Império) that is surrounded by the houses painted in multiple angles and colors (Figure 48). This project led by Dutch artists Haas & Hahn was documented and circulated through a 2014 TED Talk and earned praise for creativity, beautification, and community participation. However, according to Sheila, the residents on the plaza did not consent to the project, nor would they have chosen to paint it as such. When houses are finished, she said they are traditionally painted white due to the extreme heat in Rio de Janeiro. She said the painting made her dizzy. Additionally, Souza pointed out that critical drainage issues are present directly in front of the plaza, but attention is never drawn to this (Figure 49).

The painted houses in combination with her statement reminded me of ‘camouflage architecture’ - a method of disguising built environments that emerged during the Modern movement. It was widely used during World War II to hide locations of factories, army bases, flight hangars, and ships. It brings to question whether the intentions and/or results of the paint laid on the surfaces of these homes in Santa Marta are better characterized as an exercise in beautification or in obscurity.

Furthermore, on the subject of the plaza, Souza noted that the name of it had been changed from Praça Império to Praça Cantão after the City entered with the UPP and upgrading efforts. The Praça Império had a history of samba associated with it, and when its name changed, that identity was stripped. It was not only the plaza. All of the street names were changed (Figure 50). It is not clear exactly why, but it seems to be in effort to organize the community on the terms of the municipality. It is a way of stripping away identity, a violence. Souza simply stated that it was rape.

She gave the impression that many people now in Santa Marta were not born here, especially in regard to people operating the numerous tourism “micro-companies” now present. Souza owns her home, but she mentioned that rent in the area where she lives was between 250 and 500 reais before pacification and afterward, rose to 900 reais. In essence, the cost tripled. And, in her words, “if you leave here, you can only live in another favela… or in the suburbs.”

Although Santa Marta is one of the most accessible favelas in Rio de Janeiro, I wanted to get a glimpse of it through the eyes of local residents. With the help of Souza and her community connections, I gathered 119 photographs taken with five disposable cameras by various local residents. 18 of these photographs displayed structures or construction materials (Figure 51); 13 showed community gathering (Figure 52); 7
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showed off views (Figure 53); 7 called attention to street art (Figure 54); and 6 noted the presence of tourism (Figure 55).

The photographs taken by local residents reflect a community that is perhaps searching for its identity in response to the large influx of tourism that has occurred since the UPP entered in 2008. A lot of construction is taking place; views are being appreciated; street art has a big presence in conjunction with (or in competition with) the City’s program for painting houses, Coral; and public spaces are being accommodating to tourist traffic as evinced by the Michael Jackson platform, where nearby ‘Santa Marta’ merchandise is sold. Yet, some events still take place in the community that do not directly deal with tourism. There are programs for children, one of which Souza helps run, and sustainable gardening taking place in readapted containers (Figure 56). Art seems to play a big role in Santa Marta’s identity and activities (Figure 57). A camaraderie is evident among residents; friendliness was a character-defining feature in the community, for the most part. Although I did not experience tension
within the community, like Morro da Providência, a tension exists between the local residents and the UPP (Figure 58). One night after I had left from a visit to Santa Marta, Souza relayed to me that across the plaza from where we were sitting, some boys had started throwing rocks at the police station. There are times that are cause for concern in the community, and what appears to be a mutual lack of respect felt between the residents and the UPP contributes greatly to it.

Figures 56, 57, & 58: photograph showing old stereos being used as planters (top left); photograph of street art along the wall of a staircase (right); and photography representing the police presence in the community (bottom left) (taken by author).

In terms of interventions occurring in Santa Marta, tourism has a huge presence in the community. And, this is mostly felt due to the numerous guided tours led through it. About 1/3 of the people I encountered were from outside of the community and did not appear to know someone who lived there. There are relatively minor urban upgrading interventions taking place, influenced by tourism of course, such as the house painting and replacement of street names. Even though it may not seem significant, it gradually contributes to
a chipping away at the community identity. As mentioned previously, Santa Marta is within the UNESCO World Heritage Site boundaries, but this does not seem to affect the people or structures of the community. And, this may be primarily due to the fact that no one is aware of it. Preservation as a professional field is probably not a topic that is widely circulated in favelas. Blanco believes that this is not something residents typically reflect on.\(^91\) He says “patrimônio serves as a reference to conventional values.” It is apparent that favelas are not considered conventional. However, it is worth exploring this concept of what it could mean when a self-built settlement is included within the boundaries of a designated site.

As an ‘insider’, Souza advocates for the preservation and strengthening of neighborhood identity through her organization, Braziliadade; however, she is outnumbered by several ‘outsider’ tour companies seeking entrepreneurial opportunities. And, as an ‘outsider’, the City of Rio de Janeiro encourages it by implementing programs that lack true participatory process and that are purposed for projects that are probably not of priority for local residents. But, because Santa Marta is booming with tourism, perhaps many residents are embracing it along with the economic opportunities that come with it. Community identity is a value, but when significant change occurs rendering a new identity, which one should be embraced?

Talking with tour guide Silva, who is not from Santa Marta and also leads tours in the favelas of Complexo do Alemão and Rocinha, is an individual entrepreneur who responded to the demand for tours that now exist in favelas.\(^92\) He went to school for tourism, has worked internationally, and offers tours in Portuguese, English, or Spanish. In his words, “Santa Marta is a postcard for the city. It is the calmest favela and the most accessible… And in twenty years, it will not be a favela.” This would mean that favela tourism in Santa Marta would cease to exist. This creates an impression that the tourism industry is simply responding to evolving conditions in favelas and not impacting them, but is it possible that favela tourism will simply and inevitably ‘tour itself (and the favela) out’?

Considering this likely scenario, tourism is literally, albeit subtly, stripping away Santa Marta’s historic identity. More research should be done to determine how the majority of local residents feel about the issue. But, even if this is for the better and most residents are willing to adapt, it is worth taking the time to document that historic identity and making it accessible to the general public. There is very little literature on individual favela history that is widely circulated. As seen in Morro da Providência, the people - the local residents - are key to carrying this out because the structures have and continue to be subject to alteration. So, when the people are gone, so are the memories. Perhaps if significance is assessed in these communities, they will no longer be seen as a detriment to the integrity of what they exist alongside.

\(^91\) Interview with Omar Blanco (January 7, 2015).
\(^92\) Interview with Evandro Silva (January 6, 2015).
Part III. Outcomes
Preservation is an intervention. It combines structure and story. Often, preservation professionals will prioritize one of these in their practice. But, they are both important. In the case of the favela, the structure is valuable in that it continues to represent the current results of a marginalized community’s livelihood no matter how much it alters over time, and the story is important because it carries those changes over time. Both have the potential to benefit from interventions but instead face apparent threats. An essential question might be: Is preservation more about places or places for people? And, if it is about places for people, which people?

Architect and activist Omar Blanco reminded me that all capitalist cities function on a certain social structure that requires the presence of the laborer, or blue collar worker. And, this social structure is manifested through social and spatial segregation, which was facilitated by modern city planning. Typically, poor neighborhoods are located far away from wealthy neighborhoods, but this is where Rio de Janeiro is different. Favelas are present throughout the city, next to and between affluent and legitimate neighborhoods. Now, favelas do not carry the same standards of living as the legitimate neighborhoods, but it does not mean that they are not a character-defining feature of the city and it should not mean that they should be excluded from consideration of significance in urban heritage, in human heritage, and in world heritage.

UNESCO is making strides in its urban heritage efforts through their “Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape” which in essence protects regeneration. I would recommend that this “Recommendation” be tested for its applicability to a favela. If the features of an informal settlement can be addressed through this UNESCO document, then what would remain is the challenge of following through with UNESCO ideals to the level of local government. Optimal outcomes in preservation efforts are most likely to occur in strong communities that have the will to follow them through. But, institutional support, not control, can greatly help this process. UNESCO could go further to promote humanitarian ideals by drafting methods and standards for assessing significance in informal settlements and by creating a universal definition for ‘participatory planning’.

Even though IPHAN may not have the staff and resources to perform an assessment of favelas, perhaps the organization can still make initiatives to get the ball rolling. College students in the preservation or planning fields could be recruited to help survey communities through an annual program. Periodic assessment is a task that is particularly relevant to a built environment characterized by rapid physical and social evolution. And, it could be greatly aided by community-driven mapping and recording. In India, children are aiding urban planners by

---
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drawing maps of their informal communities.\textsuperscript{95} Inclusion of local community members and organizations is recommended for help in documentation and assessment in order to gain that critical ‘insider’ perspective and to promote participatory planning from the beginning.

The City of Rio de Janeiro could develop its planning practices in support for community-based planning and encouragement of grassroots tourism. Typically plans have been carried out in a top-down approach, and this is especially problematic for the undertaking of interventions in \textit{favelas}, because it is unlikely that many \textit{favela} residents are working as planners for the City. And, if City employees are not even in communication with \textit{favela} residents, the cultural incompetence reveals itself upon project completions. Also, the City of Rio should continue its project that began in the early 1990s to research, document, and publish a work for each neighborhood and \textit{favela} in the city. And, in addition, the City may consider applying or adapting the APAC program to the \textit{favelas}, just as the neighborhood documentation project was once applied to a \textit{favela}. This would further legal acknowledgement and protection in effort to manage change over time in a definable urban area. The IPP has already done the job of mapping the boundaries of these communities. What remains is the identification of their character-defining features, and legislation regarding a \textit{favela} would only be successful with consideration of its people.

The following recommendations are community-based and are specific to Morro da Providência and Santa Marta; however, the essentials of them should have the capacity to be applied to other \textit{favelas}, as well as other informal settlements, outside of Rio de Janeiro and Brazil.

For each community, I recommended making a prioritized list of desired interventions - an endeavor the Museu Comunitário has already begun to do in Morro da Providência with its Google survey.\textsuperscript{96} I would be interested to see the results, and hopefully, it proves to be accessible enough for most residents. By having a list prepared that reflects the needs and/or desires of the entire community, it will facilitate participation with the city government and make planners more receptive to involving the community in the planning process. In addition, formulating a list of what the community values and wants to hold onto could be valuable as well.

I mentioned that IPHAN should take advantage of local residents and organizations in efforts toward encouraging community-driven mapping and recording, but residents and organizations can also take initiative and begin the process themselves. In Morro da Providência, Museu Comunitário has already created a platform for photographs and stories online, and A Casa Amarela has been utilizing art as a tool for mapping and recording people and their stories. Brazilidade in Santa Marta, principally through the method of oration, is bringing a layer of


\textsuperscript{96} See Chapter 5.
depth to the tourism industry by relaying the history of the community, the experiences of its people, and the culture that is present in the favela. Local residents and organizations should be equipped with knowledge about their communities in order to defend it, and if this information can be published and circulated, it would be beneficial for ‘outsiders’ to have the ability to grasp what life is like in the community in a comprehensive way.
CHAPTER 8: Conclusions

As an exercise in assessing significance, in the attempt to compare ‘outsider’ and ‘insider’ perspectives in relation to interventions occurring, it proves a challenge to find the overlap - the happy medium(s) that could exist between the interests of community residents and the interests of the City of Rio de Janeiro, the tourism industry, and preservation professionals. Even if the limitation of time was not present in my case, it would be a challenge. I received a brief glimpse of the communities of Morro da Providência and Santa Marta which contributed to an initial assessment. The next steps in research involve going further in-depth, by observing more of the physical fabric and speaking to more residents. My assessments and recommendations speak to the heart of the matter - which is taking a step forward, outside the current boundaries of preservation planning into informal territory characterized by rapid evolution and a history of political negligence.

One key aspect this research helps bring to light is the importance of oral histories in terms of preservation and community voices in terms of planning. Local perspectives of what occurred years ago and of what is happening at this moment are not only character-defining features of a place, but are under threat when they are not heard - because like structures, they have a limited lifetime. They should be documented for historical purposes and incorporated into decision-making processes that help inform the direction interventions take.

The planning field seems to acknowledges this, but a constant reminder of it is necessary. Public participation is far too often seen as a box to check off rather than an essential ingredient in the planning process. In the field of preservation, successful work is built upon extensive background research and a visual analysis, or structural assessment. Unless a significant figure is associated with a site or structure, the people associated with it, past or present, are typically not prioritized in research or assessment. Ultimately, for the preservation and planning fields, both in academia and in practice, the involvement of a local population in projects to going to uncover another, equally if not more important, layer of significance that enriches the history and future of a site or structure.

The occupation of preservation planning is often taught and practiced within a legal scope and from a top-down approach. But, integration of the grassroots approach can be invaluable to the endeavors and scope of preservation planning projects - especially with regard to informal settlements. By formulating methodologies that integrate ‘outsider’ (professional) perspectives as well as ‘insider’ (local) perspectives on individual projects, with professional skills and cultural competence on an equal playing field, projects are more likely to be successful for everyone. And, the broad goals of global peace and sustainability in development practices are on their way being achieved.
APPENDIX

Image 1: aerial map of Morro da Providência roughly showing my footsteps within the community (Source: Trails application and Google Earth).

Image 2: aerial map of Morro da Providência zoomed in to roughly show my footsteps within the community (Source: Trails application and Google Earth).
Image 3: aerial map of Santa Marta roughly showing my footsteps within the community [I also walked through the upper portion of the community, entering from the top of the hill, but was unable to record this] (Source: Trails application and Google Earth).

Image 4: aerial map of Santa Marta zoomed in to roughly show my footsteps within the community [I also walked through the upper portion of the community, entering from the top of the hill, but was unable to record this] (Source: Trails application and Google Earth).
Images 5 & 6: photograph of A Casa Amarela shortly after it had been marked for demolition by SMH (taken by Mauricio Hora) (top); cover of informational booklet for Brazilidade (left).
Images 7 & 8: photographs of entries to IRPH (left) and IPHAN’s regional office (top) in Rio de Janeiro (taken by author).
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