

The disintegration of the urban limits of Lisbon in the early 1960's. Portuguese architectural debate about exclusion and the importance of the historic city

NUNO CORREIA

University of Coimbra and CEEA

Abstract

In the early 1960s, the uncontrolled growth of the suburban areas of Lisbon invading peripheral territory, was destroying the definition of its urban limits. At that moment, a new generation of Portuguese modern architecture, identifies two key-problems in the growth of the city. First, the uncontrolled expansion of its periphery, transformed into a suburb, and second, the permanent destruction of the integrity of the centre, caused by the unqualified replacement of old buildings by new ones. But this debate had two different dimensions – a dimension of urban design and a social one. On the urban design dimension, it was urgent to review some of the principles of modern planning and to recover the permanent urban values of the historic city. But on the social dimension, the architects of the new generation unconditionally adopted the modern principles expressed in the Athens Charter, and demanded the right of the population to housing and to inhabit the city.

Nei primi anni Sessanta, la crescita incontrollata delle aree suburbane di Lisbona che invadevano il territorio periferico, stava distruggendo la definizione dei suoi limiti urbani. In quel momento, una nuova generazione di architettura moderna portoghese identifica due problemi chiave nella crescita della città. In primo luogo, l'espansione incontrollata della sua periferia, trasformata in un sobborgo, e in secondo luogo, la distruzione permanente dell'integrità del centro, causata dalla sostituzione non qualificata dei vecchi edifici con nuovi. Ma questo dibattito aveva due dimensioni diverse – una dimensione del disegno urbano e una dimensione sociale. Sulla dimensione del disegno urbano, era urgente rivedere alcuni dei principi della pianificazione moderna e recuperare i valori urbani permanenti della città storica. Ma sulla dimensione sociale, gli architetti della nuova generazione hanno adottato incondizionatamente i principi moderni espressi nella Carta di Atene e hanno chiesto il diritto della popolazione all'abitazione e all'abitare la città.

Keywords

Historic City, Portugal, Twentieth Century.

Città storica, Portogallo, Novecento.

Introduction¹

One of the crucial aspects of Portuguese critical thinking about the urban expansion of Lisbon in the early 1960s was the need to assure that the urban expansion of the centre

¹ This work was funded by national funds through FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P., within the project UID/EAT/04041/2016.

would still be part of the city, because the uncontrolled growth of suburban areas violently invading peripheral territory was destroying the definition of its urban limits.

A different problem, which also required some kind of clarification, was how it would be possible to integrate the modern city into the historic city. Because that uncontrolled growth of suburban areas was also destroying any possible model of city planning. Both the historic-city model, defined by blocks, streets and squares, and the modern-city model, defined by the free arrangement of buildings in a more extensive territory, structured by a system of independent roadways, according to the "Athens Charter".

During the previous decade of 1950, the urban growth of Lisbon had been shifted from the centre to the periphery, it had become suburban. And it is within this scenario that one must deal with this Portuguese architectural debate in the turn of the 1950s to the 1960s.

At that moment, a new generation of Portuguese modern architecture sought to update its critical thinking with the contemporary international debate, produced after the end of Second World War. This new generation – constituted by architects born mainly in the 1920s and early 1930s – proposed to review some of the formal principles of the modernist architecture largely widespread in Europe in the inter-war period. They proposed to abandon the so called "International Style" and to revise the excessively functionalist urbanism of the "Athens Charter".

In Lisbon, a group of this new generation, that begins to publish the magazine «Arquitectura» since the end of the 1950s – replacing the previous generation, which had constituted the ICAT group and had edited the magazine for about 10 years – identifies two key-problems in that unruly growth of the city, responsible for the destruction of its urban landscape. First, the uncontrolled expansion of its periphery transformed into a suburb; and second, the permanent attacks against the historic integrity of the centre, caused by the unqualified replacement of old buildings by new ones.

However, this debate about the urban expansion of Lisbon had two different dimensions that it is important to distinguish. A dimension of urban planning, and a social dimension.

In the urban planning dimension, the need to revise some of the modernist principles expressed in the "Athens Charter" was largely consensual among the architects of the new generation, who refused the general concept of zoning and were determined to avoid the misunderstandings caused by the Garden City model. This new generation claimed the return to the permanent urban values of the historic city, which meant relearning to create collective urban spaces that could serve the everyday life of the communities.

But in the social dimension, the architects of the new generation unconditionally adopted the modernist urban principles, and demanded the right of the population to housing and the right to inhabit the city. Recovering the historic city meant demanding the right to the city.

1. The origin of the problem

In an article published in 1955, in the Portuguese magazine «Vértice», Francisco Keil do Amaral (1910-1975), one of the most respected and influential architects of his generation, summarizes the essence of the enormous complexity of the problems that affected the major cities, at that moment: "Population is growing in the major Portuguese cities, and the contacts are more often. People jostle on the sidewalks, in the concert halls, in the transports. There are larger gatherings, movement, hustle, noise ... but also solitude. The loneliness in common!" [Keil do Amaral 1955, 89; the author is responsible for the translations of all quotes].

From the reading of this article, it was possible to understand that the observation made by Keil do Amaral, which referred to a recognizable fact of Portuguese cities, was also a

problem affecting the most important European and American cities, and represented one of the most up-to-date themes that inspired the international architectural debate among the most recognized modern architects, at that moment.

In the previous paragraph, the author quotes an expression used by Ernesto Nathan Rogers at the 8th CIAM Congress, held four years earlier, in 1951, in Hoddesdon, England. "The Apathy, selfishness and social indifference caused by isolation' – referred by the Italian architect Rogers in a congress of the CIAM, on the theme 'The heart of the city'" [Keil do Amaral 1955, 89].

Later, in the same article, Keil do Amaral quotes also José Luís Sert, who referred exactly to the same problem: "In addition, the system has other dangers, to which the president of CIAM, José Luis Sert, called attention to at the above-mentioned congress: 'Certain conditions in our cities today tend to intensify the problem, for instance, over-expansion, traffic congestion, and suburban sprawl, which segregate men from men, creating artificial barriers between them'" [Keil do Amaral 1955, 90].

The observations made by Keil do Amaral about one of the problems that most painfully affected the life of the great Portuguese cities at that time were therefore, to some extent, similar to the observations that could be made on the problems affecting the great cities of the western world.

In fact, this exponential growth of cities had not immediately occurred in Portugal when it had in most countries. And that difference of speed between the fast progress caused by the industrial revolution in the more developed countries, and its slow reflection on the development of Portuguese industrialization had also manifested itself in the slow updating of the Portuguese architectural debate about the growth of the cities during the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century.

However, suddenly, at that moment, in the words of Keil do Amaral there was an unfortunate coincidence with the international present-day progress.

About one decade before the publication of this article in «Vértice», in a text written for a conference about the housing problem, held in 1943 [Keil do Amaral 1945, 12] and published in a book in 1945, Francisco Keil do Amaral had already pointed out the main causes that were at the origin of that problem and that, after more than 10 years, had taken completely uncontrolled proportions.

In that text, the author explains how the industrial revolution attracted a large population to the main cities of Europe at the end of the eighteenth century, causing an urgent need for housing.

At that time, the scientific and economic progress provided by industrial revolution caused also a sudden growth of population worldwide, further accentuating the population increase in major cities. But, neither the construction of housing, nor the planning of urban centres followed the needs of this growth, and these displaced workers began to accumulate in improvised neighbourhoods, without any conditions of habitability or public health.

The housing problem in Portugal did not assume the same proportions immediately, because the industrialization process in the country was more than a century behind the more developed countries [Keil do Amaral 1945, 28]. It just really began, only at the end of the 19th century. And all the problems of urban concentration that had already been manifested in the main European cities during the nineteenth century, only began to be felt in Lisbon at the beginning of the 20th century.

In another book, published more than two decades later [Keil do Amaral 1969], the author updated the statistic data that it had been possible to know during the 1950s and 1960s, and which allowed to understand the true dimension of the problem.

Between 1910 and 1950, the population of Lisbon almost doubled. It increased about 350 thousand inhabitants, approximately from 430 thousand to 780 thousand. By 1950, about two-thirds of the buildings in the city had been built or rebuilt in those four decades. But from that moment on, the growth the city had become essentially suburban.

The 1960 census showed that since 1950, the population of the city had increased by only about 20,000 inhabitants, from 780,000 to 800,000, representing a significant slowdown over the previous four decades. Meanwhile, in the same period, the population of the urban agglomerations on the peripheries of the city had increased almost tenfold, from about 345,000 to 530,000 [Keil do Amaral 1969, 13-26].

During the 1950s, the growth of Lisbon had shifted from the centre to the periphery, and had become suburban [Keil do Amaral 1969, 19].

Therefore, after more than a century of delay, suddenly the main housing problems affecting the expansion of the city during the 1950s had become comparable to the problems faced by the major cities in the western world. For, as José Luís Sert stated at the CIAM Congress of 1951, the fact that the expansion of great cities had become suburban was one of his main problems at that moment.

At that 8th CIAM, held in England, the first in which a Portuguese delegation was present – a delegation led by Alfredo Viana de Lima was present representing the Portuguese group of CIAM in formation [Mumford 2002, 204-205] –, the debate about “The heart of the city” had not exactly represented the recognition of the need to return to the historic city, and to abandon the previous agreements about the modernist city. The theme proposed for discussion in the Congress simply meant to recognize the importance of having a centre in the modern city, and to try to understand better what role could that centre play.

In fact, the choice of this theme showed that the planning of post-war cities required a revision on some of the strictly functionalist principles expressed in the “Athens Charter”. And it also showed that the agreement built about a unique model of modernist city, that had been possible to maintain during the first half of the twentieth century, was no longer possible.

During the Congress, José Luis Sert did declare that contemporary urbanism had become sub-urbanism, and that if one wanted to do something in favour of the cities, it was essential to solve the problem of the heart of each city, and to begin to discuss its urbanity [Mumford 2002, 203].

Indeed, in 1951, at the 8th CIAM, the debate was not leaning towards a total break with all the critical thinking produced about the modern city during the first half of the twentieth century. Nor for a sudden return to the urban model represented by the historic city. But because CIAM concentrated the leading figures of the avant-garde of modern international architecture, especially from Europe and USA; and because it gathered the leading architects and critics who remained more peremptory in relation to its founding principles; the recovery of that urban model to the debate represented a rather destabilizing shift to what had been the thinking produced by these individualities for about three decades, especially since the beginning of CIAM in 1928 (La Sarraz, Switzerland).

Moreover, at that moment, outside the CIAM, especially in the countries of southern Europe, the dominant critical thinking was already beginning to address the need to review some of the founding principles of modern architecture of the first half of the twentieth century (Bruno

Zevi publishes *Storia dell'architettura moderna* in 1950). And in Portugal, especially since the end of the 1950s, that also began to be the trend of debate.

2. The social problem

During the 1950s, the expansion of Lisbon had, therefore, become suburban, and this suburban growth of the city, which continues to worsen for a decade more, raises the problem of the disintegration of its urban limits, but it also raises a problem of social exclusion, because this disintegration was the consequence of the banishment of a large part of the population from the historical centre of the city.

In an issue of «Arquitectura» dedicated to the publication of some recent projects of buildings for luxury apartments located in the centre of Lisbon – edition nº 67, April 1960, with a title that can be translated as “Buildings of income in Lisbon” – in a text written by Fernando Gomes da Silva that presented two projects designed by Vítor Palla and Bento de Almeida, one a building located at “S. Bernardo” Street, and the other at “Visconde de Valmor” Avenue; the author explains why the centre of Lisbon was becoming a place destined to luxury housing.

Gomes da Silva explains that, because there were no building sites left in the historic centre, the construction of a new building required the purchase of an already occupied property, and the demolition of a pre-existing construction.

To overcome this additional charge, investors preferred to address their investments to the more financially wealthy social classes, and they opted for a better quality type of construction.

At “Avenidas Novas”, a detached house with a few floors and a large garden area was easily replaced by a multi-storey and larger building, occupying the entire front of the lot, and using the interior area for parking or a garage construction.

In the historic centre of Lisbon, at that moment, it began to become common the construction of luxury housing – buildings with larger areas, and with more divisions than the current income buildings.

That was the case of the buildings of “São Bernardo” Street and “Visconde de Valmor” Avenue, designed by Vítor Palla and Bento de Almeida, or the buildings at “Elias Garcia” Avenue, by Artur Pires Martins, or “Marcos Portugal” Street, by Francisco Conceição Silva, all published in that issue of «Arquitectura».

In the presentation of that issue of the Portuguese magazine, the editors explained the uncontrolled urban growth of the city as a consequence of real estate speculation and lack of effectiveness of the existing legislation, which was outdated and had failed to comply with its regulatory function [Editorial 1960].

According to that editorial introduction, from the reading of the census of the Portuguese population of 1940 and 1950, it was apparent that there was a much greater population growth in the suburban areas of Lisbon than in the centre of the city. And the 1950 census also revealed that a considerable part of the population living in the centre inhabited in poor conditions. About 21% of this population shared a house with other families and lived in extremely small spaces – “lived in parts of houses, in many cases overcrowded” [Editorial 1960, 16].

It started to become perfectly clear from that moment that the problem of extreme inequality in access to housing in the historic centre of the city had two different consequences. One of the immediate effects was the reduction of housing conditions for the most disadvantaged social classes – the problem of “sub-renting” in the centre.

And the other effect, which was a disastrous alternative to this, was the banishment of this population to the suburbs into poor living conditions – the problem of the “clandestine neighbourhoods” in the periphery.

The following year, in another article published also in «Arquitectura», António Freitas [António Freitas 1961], makes a description of how the suburbs of the Metropolitan Area of Lisbon were being invaded by illegal construction operations, responsible for lodging in very poor conditions a sector of the population that had no financial capacity to inhabit the centre, and was being expelled to the periphery and segregated from the city.

These “clandestine neighbourhoods” represented an extreme degree of the degradation reached in the suburbs of Lisbon, and were distributed in the counties of the periphery, on the north and south banks of the River – Loures, Sintra, Oeiras, Almada, Seixal, Moita – and the author identified and documented some of the most well-known cases – Vale da Figueira, Prior Velho, Quinta da Horta, Quinta do Rato, Quinta da Brandoa, Quinta das Galinheiras, Campo do Rio, Carenque ...

This article is the result of a survey carried out by the author using information collected from dispersed sources, whether from official documents written by public institutions, or from daily newspapers. See the Report of the draft Law on the Master Plan for urban development of Lisbon [p. 27]; “Diário de Lisboa” of May 12th 1959 [p. 29], March 19th 1959 [p. 31], September 22th 1960 [p. 35]; a series of articles published in “Diário Ilustrado” from November to December 1960 [p. 31]; A Report of the Porto City Council [p. 33].

The author describes the entire process of construction of these clandestine neighbourhoods as a savage behaviour, aiming only speculative profits, and reveals cases of extreme insalubrity, where people was exposed to many risks, and exhibit images that document this description. Constructions built on hills with abrupt falls, and support walls built with masonry brick – Quinta da Brandoa – railroad crossings without the minimum security conditions – Baixa da Banheira – buildings leaning against each other with the occupation of basements – Prior Old – and enormous difficulties of water supply.

A few years later, in 1964, Maria Tavares da Silva publishes a report about the problem of housing sub-renting in the city of Lisbon, a study developed from the provisional results of the 1960 general census of Portuguese population.

That study, first published in the first issue of «Boletim GTH» [Tavares da Silva 1964b] – an edition of “Gabinete Técnico da Habitação”, which was a Department of the City Hall of Lisbon – was then reissued in «Arquitectura», in the same year and was based on the evidence of an undeniable fact – “three or more families were living in a house that was intended to be occupied by a single family” [Tavares da Silva 1964a, 169].

Since the beginning of the 1960's, almost until the end of the following decade, the housing problem was one of the dominant themes in the architectural debate in Portugal. It was, for sure, one of the dominant themes covered by the Portuguese magazine «Arquitectura». And, certainly, the problem of the uncontrolled urban growth of Lisbon and of the disintegration of its urban limits, was inseparable from the housing problem.

Since that beginning, those two combined problems have been subject of deepened study both on the social and the urban dimensions of the problem, both in architecture and in the field of human sciences.

In a study published in 2007, José António Bandeirinha – one of the Portuguese architects and theorists who has paid more attention to the study of the housing problem in Portugal in the 1960s and 1970s – analyses how that problem was subject of debate among the Portuguese architects throughout the 1960s – conferences, exhibitions, publications,

congresses ... – and how this debate led to the experience of the process “SAAL”, instituted by Nuno Portas in the months following the 1974 democratic revolution [Bandeirinha 2007]. One can also find relevant studies and publications about these problems on a sociological perspective since the beginning [Silva Pereira 1963; Silva Pereira 1968]; studies about the uncontrolled proliferation of clandestine neighbourhoods in the periphery on the perspective of human geography [Barata Salgueiro 1977; Barata Salgueiro 1977, 29]; and contemporary researches on urban sociology [Silva Nunes 2011], which proves that this problem continues to be object of interest until now, and it is an important part of the knowledge needed to understand the difficulties faced today in the contemporary city.

3. The importance of the historic centre

Soon after the publication of the article by Fernando Gomes da Silva in 1960, in «Arquitectura», the following year, in another text of Gomes da Silva that introduces now two projects for commercial spaces located downtown – the remodeling of the old “Tabacaria Havaneza” in Chiado, and the remodeling of “Loja das Meias” in Rossio – the author once again expresses the concern of the editors of the magazine for a series of changes that were transforming the heart of the historical centre of Lisbon [Gomes da Silva 1961].

In fact, the root of the two problems presented by Gomes da Silva, both in 1960 and 1961, was the same. The transformation of the downtown was a consequence of the enormous extent of peripheral growth, which became too far from the centre. That distance between the centre and the periphery, and also the functional specialization of the suburbs as places assigned almost exclusively to housing, were emptying the centre of any nocturnal activity. And those changings were threatening its function of public space.

Following these two articles published by Fernando Gomes da Silva in «Arquitectura», in 1960 and 1961, the publication of two other chronicles in «Jornal de Letras e Artes», the following year, 1962 – one written by Francisco Silva Dias, and the other by António Freitas, author of the article on clandestine neighbourhoods – made it clear that, at that moment, the architectural debate on the uncontrolled expansion of the city and the disintegration of its urban limits was inseparable from the debate on the importance of the historic centre.

António Freitas [Freitas 1962] describes the “urban centres” as places where all the urban relations of the city converge, and where, therefore, their density is emphasized. Places that are collective spaces, and where the main institutions of the city are concentrated. Buildings representative of political power, justice, religion, economy, culture.

The author defines these centres as historical places which it is essential to preserve, but also as places with which it is necessary to learn a lesson, and which should serve as a model for the new areas of expansion of the contemporary city.

He recalls that, in the best international experiences of recent urban planning, the creation of such centres is manifested by the attention given to the public space, often through the creation of exclusively pedestrian spaces – where automobile access was restricted or even forbidden – and by the inclusion of buildings of collective interest, equipment that allow to keep alive a notion of community. In this text, the author stresses the importance of urban centres for the contemporary city.

In the other chronicle, Francisco Silva Dias [Silva Dias 1962] insists on some of the key-ideas that had already been exposed by his colleagues about the need to defend the historic integrity of the centre, but in this text the author makes it even more clear how it can be interpreted the debate about this conflict between the “historic city” and the “modern city”, for his generation. Silva Dias expressly claims that it is necessary to retreat in relation to the modernist

composition system of urban planning – excessively fragmented, composed by tall and isolated buildings – and that it is necessary to recover the urban model of the street and the square.

The text was illustrated by four images, which represented four fragments of the urban fabric of the city, and documented four different periods of the growth of the city – the historical city, previous to the industrialization, before the twentieth century in the case of Portugal, represented by “Alfama”; the city of the early twentieth century, represented by “Avenidas Novas”, planned in the late 19th century and built throughout the first half of the 20th century; the contemporary city disorderly raised, that represented the result of pure speculation; and the modernist city, represented by the neighbourhood of “Olivais”, planned in the late 1950s according to the principles of the “Athens Charter”, and built during the 1960s.

Of these four images, the plans of “Alfama” and “Olivais”, the first and the last ones, were the most contrasting. And it was quite apparent, from the perspective of the public space, that they represented opposite models of city planning.

From the image of “Alfama”, it was perfectly clear that the structure of this fabric consisted mainly of a combination of two key urban elements – the street and the square. And the author underlines the importance of combining these two elements for the definition of a collective space, and for the establishment of a spirit of community.

In opposition, the plan of “Olivais” represented the modernist city, according to the “Athens Charter”. Silva Dias describes this model of city as a fragmented body, where the layout of buildings obeys mainly to principles of rational composition, and where the “traditional street” was banned, compromising the function of place of meeting, and the service to the community. Francisco Silva Dias claims that it is necessary to return to this function of the urban space, and that it is necessary to recover the “traditional street”.

In an article published in «Arquitectura» in 1964, Silva Dias criticizes again a current practice at that moment, which consisted of the demolition of old buildings in the city centre, to replace them with new ones, of much higher volumetry.

This practice not only allowed the destruction of buildings that could have some architectural value, but above all, allowed the destruction of the integrity of an urban fabric that represented a certain historical moment and had a certain coherence.

In addition to a series of problems which the author points out to the transformation of the urban landscape of Lisbon at that time – problems related to urban infrastructures, transportation facilities, lack of collective equipment – one of the most serious problems pointed to the growth of Lisbon in the early 1960s was the de-urbanization of the periphery. The lack of a clear urban measure in its areas of expansion.

Neither there was a limit to the city nor the expansion of the urban territory was able to integrate the territory of the periphery as it invades small settlements that became suburbs. Both the historic centre and the periphery were disintegrating.

“The transition between the city and the countryside has been, until recently, experienced by a gradual replacement of the urban environment with an intensely humanized rural landscape. All the changes of this transformation are now violently destroyed by the explosion that the urbanised area of the city has suffered in the last decades, and by the circle of legal and clandestine dormitories that externally mark the administrative limits of Lisbon” [Silva Dias 1964, 119].

From the reading of this text, and of a large part of all critical thinking published by Portuguese architects about the urban expansion of Lisbon and the disintegration of its urban limits, especially during the first half of the 1960s, it became apparent that there were two rules that it was crucial to respect in order to protect the historic centre.

Storia e immagine della diversità urbana: luoghi e paesaggi dei privilegi e del benessere, dell'isolamento, del disagio, della multiculturalità



1: Cover of the Portuguese magazine «Arquitetura» nº 67, April 1960. 2: Article about “Clandestine neighbourhoods” published in «Arquitetura» nº 73, December 1961.



3: The article published in «Jornal de Letras e Artes» about “The body of de city”, October 1962. 4: The article about “Problems of urban landscape in Lisbon”, published in «Arquitetura» nº 83, September 1964 (p. 115). 5: The same article, p. 117.

First, it was urgent to protect the most valuable buildings, not to allow them to be destroyed or hidden by buildings that were too voluminous and disqualified. And second, it was also imperative to protect the integrity of the urban fabrics, consolidated in different periods of time, which represented the evolution of the city, regardless of its greater or lesser antiquity. Mainly until the end of the 19th century, when the effects of the industrialization began to manifest in the city, for each moment of its urban growth the urban structure represented different forms of coherence and balance, different forms of integration – integration with natural accidents of relief, integration of buildings with each other, social integration. But at that moment, the changes violently imposed to the urban landscape, without any consideration or measure, represented an attack against these forms of integration. They represented a form of disintegration of the city.

Conclusions

At the end of the 1950s, when a new generation of Portuguese modern architecture is emerging and the terms of the debate are beginning to change, to defend the historic centre represented, in some way, to diverge from the recent achievements of the previous generation, the second generation of Portuguese modern architecture – consisting mainly of architects born in the 1910s, who had been the authors of the most important modernist buildings, built especially during the 1950s.

This new generation, the third – consisting mainly of architects born in the 1920s and early 1930s – respected these recent achievements, and admired the previous generation but, at the same time, recognized that it was important to review some of the rules that had remained unquestioned in the international debate over the previous thirty years, especially since the beginning of CIAM in 1928.

For about a decade, between the beginning of the second half of the 1950s and the end of the first half of the 1960's, it is possible to find in the Portuguese critical thinking many references to the debate about the conflicts between the centre and the periphery, and about the conflicts between the modern city and the historic city. Even among the architects of the second generation, it is possible to find relevant references on the importance of the historic city [Huertas Lobo 1955 and 1960a-b].

Moreover, and above all, that debate about how the city was suffering fatal attacks, both from the inside and from the outside, allows us to understand that the need to defend the historic city did not have a single dimension. And it could not be represented by the simple opposition between two factions, or two generations. It could not be summarized in a reaction against the modern architecture of the first half of the twentieth century.

That discussion had also a social dimension. And, almost a decade before the publication of "Le droit à la ville", in 1968, by Henri Lefebvre, and although without a perfectly well-defined philosophical awareness, in Portuguese architectural debate, in the early 1960's, to defend the integrity of the historic city represented an absolute continuity with the achievements of the modern architecture of the previous generation – it represented to defend the right to inhabit the city.

Bibliography

- BANDEIRINHA, J.A. (2007). *O processo SAAL e a arquitectura no 25 de abril de 1974*, Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade.
- BARATA SALGUEIRO, T. (1977). *Bairros clandestinos na periferia de Lisboa*, in «Finisterra – Revista Portuguesa de Geografia», vol. 12, n. 23, pp. 28-55.
- Prédios de rendimento em Lisboa* (1960), in «Arquitectura», n. 67, pp. 16-17, 62-63.

- FREITAS, A. (1961). *Bairros clandestinos*, in «Arquitectura», n. 73, pp. 27-35.
- FREITAS, A. (1962). *Centros urbanos*, in «Jornal de Letras e Artes», n. 32, p. 13.
- GOMES DA SILVA, F. (1960). *Os prédios da Rua de S. Bernardo e da Av. Visconde Valmor*, in «Arquitectura», n. 67, pp. 36-38.
- GOMES DA SILVA, F. (1961). *Aspetos da alteração da paisagem da baixa lisboeta*, in «Arquitectura», n. 70, pp. 13-14.
- HUERTAS LOBO, J. (1955). *O funcionalismo pombalino e Manuel da Maia*, in «Vértice», n. 138, pp. 144-153.
- HUERTAS LOBO, J. (1960a). *Evolução histórica do conceito de cidade*, in «Binário», n. 23, pp. 269-278.
- HUERTAS LOBO, J. (1960b). *Evolução histórica do conceito de cidade*, in «Binário», n. 24, pp. 301-316.
- KEIL DO AMARAL, F. (1945). *O problema da habitação*, Porto, Livraria Latina.
- KEIL DO AMARAL, F. (1955). *A solidão em comum*, in «Vértice», n. 137, pp. 86-95.
- KEIL DO AMARAL, F. (1969). *Lisboa, uma cidade em transformação*, Lisboa, Europa-América.
- LEFEBVRE, H. (2001). *O direito à cidade*, São Paulo, Centauro.
- MUMFORD, E. (2002). *The CIAM discourse on urbanism, 1928-1960*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, MIT Press.
- SILVA DIAS, F. (1962). *O corpo das cidades*, in «Jornal de Letras e Artes», n. 54, pp. 5,12.
- SILVA DIAS, F. (1964). *Problemas da paisagem urbana lisboeta*, in «Arquitectura», n. 83, pp. 115-117, 119.
- SILVA NUNES, J.P. (2011). *Florestas de cimento armado – Os grandes conjuntos residenciais e a constituição da metrópole de Lisboa (1955-2005)*, Lisboa, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian / Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia.
- SILVA PEREIRA, R. (1963). *Problemática da habitação em Portugal – I*, in «Análise Social», vol. I, n. 1, pp. 33-66.
- SILVA PEREIRA, R. (1963). *Problemática da habitação em Portugal – II*, in «Análise Social», vol. I, n. 2, pp. 225-269.
- SILVA PEREIRA, S. (1968). *O problema da habitação em Portugal – Necessidades e sua evolução*, in «Arquitectura», n. 101, pp. 6-9.
- TAVARES DA SILVA, M. (1964a). *A sublocação em Lisboa*, in «Arquitectura», n. 84, pp. 169-173.
- TAVARES DA SILVA, M. (1964b). *A sublocação em Lisboa*, in «Boletim GTH», vol. 1, n. 1, pp. 44-51.