

Francis Violich and the Rise and Fall of Urban Developmental Planning in Chile, 1956-1969

Francis Violich y el auge y caída de la planificación del desarrollo urbano en Chile, 1956-1969

Francis Violich e o auge da queda da planificação de desenvolvimento urbano no Chile, 1956-1969

AUTORA

**Andra Brosy
Chastain**

University of
California, Berkeley,
California, Estados
Unidos

andra.chastain@berkeley.edu

RECEPCIÓN
29 mayo 2011

APROBACIÓN
29 agosto 2011

DOI

**10.3232/RHI.2011.
V4.N2.01**

The decades following the Second World War were a period of increasing U.S. involvement in Latin America, especially under the Alliance for Progress and its economic aid and technical assistance programs begun in 1961. As part of this broad agenda of modernization, the U.S. was also active in promoting certain concepts of urban planning and development through dynamic partnerships between U.S. and Latin American universities and government agencies. Drawing on a rich body of personal correspondence, university memos, and other primary documents, this paper analyzes the involvement in Chile of Francis Violich, a prominent urban planner at the University of California-Berkeley from the 1940s to the 1970s and frequent planning consultant in Latin America. It argues that the city became the object of transnational modernization goals as actors in both countries sought to construct urban planning as a discipline in Chile. The paper concludes that despite a period of intense exchange of urban planning ideas and expertise sponsored by the U.S. government and Ford Foundation before and during the Frei administration, this exchange suffered a crisis at the end of the decade, precipitating the withdrawal of Violich as well as major U.S. institutional support from Chile.

Key Words

Chile; Francis Violich; Alliance for Progress; Modernization, Urban planning; Transnational exchange of expertise; Latin American city.

En las décadas posteriores a la Segunda Guerra Mundial se vivió un período de incremento de la presencia de Estados Unidos en América Latina, especialmente bajo el proyecto de la Alianza para el Progreso y sus programas de asistencia económica y técnica que comenzaron en 1961. Como parte de esta amplia agenda de modernización, Estados Unidos fue activo en la promoción de ciertos conceptos en la planificación del desarrollo urbano, los que se trabajaron en conjunto con universidades y agencias gubernamentales chilenas. En base a un rico material derivado de correspondencia personal, memorandos de universidades e instituciones gubernamentales, este artículo analiza el

involucramiento en Chile de Francis Violich, un prominente planificador urbano de la Universidad de California, Berkeley entre las décadas de 1940 y 1970 y consultor para varias iniciativas latinoamericanas. El argumento es que la ciudad se transformó en un objeto de modernización de carácter transnacional con metas y actores que desde ambos lugares contribuyeron a desarrollar el campo de la planificación urbana en Chile.

Palabras clave

Chile; Francis Violich; Alianza para el Progreso; Modernización; Planificación urbana; Intercambio transnacional; Ciudad latinoamericana.

Nas décadas posteriores à Segunda Guerra Mundial houve um incremento da presença dos Estados Unidos na América Latina, especialmente sob o projeto da Aliança para o Progresso e seus programas de assistência econômica e técnica que começaram em 1961. Como uma parte desta ampla agenda de modernização, os Estados Unidos foram ativos na promoção de certos conceitos na planificação do desenvolvimento urbano, que foram trabalhados em conjunto com universidades e agências governamentais chilenas. Baseado num rico material derivado de correspondência pessoal, memorandos e instituições governamentais, este artigo analisa o envolvimento, no Chile, de Francis Violich, um prominente planificador urbano da Universidade de California, Berkeley entre as décadas de 1940 e 1970 e consultor para várias iniciativas latino-americanas. O argumento é que a cidade se transformou num objeto de modernização de caráter transnacional com metas e atores que, dos dois lados, contribuíram com o desenvolvimento na área da planificação urbana no Chile.

Palavras-chave

Chile; Francis Violich; Aliança para o Progresso; Modernização; Planificação urbana; Intercâmbio transnacional; Cidade latino-americana.

Introducción

In June 2008, the president of Chile, Michelle Bachelet, traveled to California to sign a series of cooperative agreements in the areas of energy, agriculture, the environment, and higher education. She toured a vineyard at the University of California-Davis, met with Governor Schwarzenegger in the state capitol, and gave a public speech at the University of California-Berkeley¹. Beneath the banner of “Chile-California: A Partnership for the 21st Century” were many agreements that would be signed by Bachelet, Schwarzenegger and other state officials from both countries, but Bachelet’s promise to invest \$6 billion in scholarships to Chilean students for graduate study abroad was especially noteworthy. She announced to the California State Assembly that education was Chile’s “short cut to development” because it would allow Chile to “take a giant step and become a developed nation in the span of one generation”. Educational exchange was to be the cornerstone of Chile’s plan for development in the 21st century².

As local newspapers readily noted, California and Chile had a long history of educational partnership dating back over four decades. In her speech at the capitol, Bachelet hailed the Chile-California exchange that brought hundreds of Chilean students to Berkeley, Davis, and Los Angeles in the mid-1960s to earn their graduate degrees. "They talked of agrarian reform, they talked of modernization theory, they wanted to change the world," she said. "And they changed the face of Chile because they learned how to; here in California"³. Beyond the promotional purpose of her talk, Bachelet was right: the University of California system had been a major partner with Chile in developing the fields of agriculture, the natural sciences, and the social sciences in the 1960s. The question of the way in which this partnership "changed the face of Chile", however, is more complex. Equally important is the contested process by which expertise and ideas traveled up and down the Pacific Coast. This was not just a partnership between a country and a state that happened to share similar geographies and similar modernization goals, but a project meant to cement Chile's ties to the United States at a contentious moment for both countries. At the height of the Cold War, as President Kennedy was initiating a massive program of aid to Latin America with the Alliance for Progress and President Eduardo Frei was pushing ambitious reform programs in Chile, the exchange of academic expertise between California and Chile crystallized the high hopes and high stakes of the era.

This paper will focus on one aspect of the Chile-California educational exchange by examining the relationships that formed between Berkeley and Chile in the area of urban planning and development. This was a particularly rich time for urban planning, both in the U.S. and Latin America. By the late 1950s, urban planning had consolidated itself as a discipline in the United States, with Berkeley and Harvard/Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) leading the way in research and training of new professionals and the American Institute of Planners tracing its roots to the first national planning convention in 1909⁴. In Latin America, the Inter-American Planning Society (SIAP), founded in 1956, was representative of the growing concern over urbanization and underdevelopment in the region that was manifested in diverse fields, from economics and sociology to architecture and engineering⁵. This mushrooming of social science institutes devoted to the study of the Latin American city from the mid-1940s to the late 1960s went hand in hand with an urban population explosion as rural migrants moved to cities and settled informally in shantytowns on the urban periphery⁶. For example, more than 50 percent of the sharp growth experienced by the Santiago metropolitan area, from 1.35 million in 1952 to nearly 3 million in 1970, was due to internal migration⁷. It was in this context of swift population growth, seemingly uncontrolled urbanization, and persistent underdevelopment that an exchange of urban planning ideas and expertise developed between Berkeley and Chile.

To analyze this exchange, this paper will focus on the involvement in Chile of Francis Violich, a prominent urban planner at Berkeley from the 1940s to 1970s. By doing so, the paper aims to contribute to the scholarly literature on the transnational exchange of expertise between Chile and the United States in the mid-20th century. In addition to urban planning, exchanges developed in the areas of economics, agriculture, and law. Perhaps the most famous case of knowledge transfer between the U.S. and Chile is the so-called Chicago Boys, the generation of young Chilean economists trained at the University of Chicago in the 1950s who went on to work

with the Pinochet regime to bring about radical free-market reforms⁸. Beginning in the late 1960s, a partnership with the University of California-Davis helped modernize Chile's agriculture industry, which many scholars have studied in relation to agrarian reform, export-oriented neoliberal policies, and effects on women and the working poor⁹. More recently, the rise of human rights discourse and the continued hegemony of neoliberalism have been studied in the context of changing legal cultures in the U.S. and Latin America and the transnational exchange of ideas between the two regions¹⁰.

This paper aims to add another dimension to our understanding of the exchange of expertise between Chile and the U.S. by looking at the city as the object of transnational modernization goals. It also aims to use the case of Francis Violich to illuminate the micro-level negotiation of power among all actors involved. Thus, by tracing Violich's relationship with Chilean planners, I will argue that urban planning constituted a significant emerging field of knowledge in Chile that, like economics, agriculture, and law, was the focus of hemispheric modernization concerns. At the same time, I will show how the complex power relationships among students, planners, architects, engineers, and bureaucrats in both Chile and the U.S. shaped the construction of urban planning as a discipline in Chile.

The analysis consists of five parts. To provide background on the ideas that would be exported to Chile, the first section discusses the career of Francis Violich and the context of urban planning in the United States and at Berkeley in particular. The second section examines the way planning had evolved in Latin America to this point, while the third section addresses the early stage of Violich's engagement with Chile, roughly 1956-1963, his relationship with several Chilean graduate students who promoted his vision of comprehensive planning, and the push to establish a training center for planners in Chile. The fourth section shows how the Cold War, and Kennedy's Alliance for Progress in particular, was the condition that allowed a massive aid program to Chile to take place in the mid-1960s which, coupled with President Frei's ambitious reform program, created a propitious environment for Violich's urban planning ideas to spread in Chile. This section focuses on both the Chile-California program sponsored by the Alliance for Progress and the University of Chile-University of California academic exchange begun in 1965. The final section examines the tensions inherent in these programs, the collapse of U.S. urban planning aid programs in Chile in the late 1960s, and the rise of a new type of politicized community-level planning.

This trajectory suggests that although the mid-1960s represented a moment of effervescence around urban development planning in which the objectives of Chilean and North American planners seemed to converge, by the late 1960s this apparent consensus had unraveled from the pressure of internal contradictions. At the same time, however, a new form of planning was emerging in the wake of the faltering developmentalist model. The story of Violich's involvement in Chile, the confluence of North American and Chilean visions of urban planning, and the shifting political context serves as a cautionary tale about the limitations of urban planning within a political world.

The evolution and consolidation of a new profession

Francis Violich had a long and rich engagement with Latin America over the course of a career that spanned more than five decades. Born to Croatian parents in 1911, he grew up in San Francisco near Golden Gate Park and graduated in landscape architecture from UC-Berkeley in 1934¹¹. He went on to graduate studies in urban planning at Harvard and MIT, then embarked on a study tour of Latin America in 1941 as the Second World War was underway. His ten months of travels took him to ten countries, including longer stays in Brazil, Argentina, and Chile, with two planned trips cancelled due to war conditions¹². His ties to Latin America were strengthened by his marriage soon after to Mariantonia Sanabria, sister of the prominent Venezuelan architect José Sanabria¹³.

Upon returning from Latin America, Violich worked as an urban planner in the Bay Area and began teaching city planning and landscape architecture at Berkeley. He also formed part of an interdisciplinary network of environmentally minded colleagues called Telesis which would go on to influence the founding of Berkeley's Department of City and Regional Planning (DCRP) in 1948 and, a decade later, the creation of the university's College of Environmental Design (CED)¹⁴. According to a retrospective he published shortly before his death, he was part of a generation of architects, landscape architects, and planners whose thinking on urban problems was heavily influenced by the Depression and New Deal. The reality of inequality during this period left an impact on Violich and imparted a social conscience to his work and that of Telesis¹⁵.

Beginning with his tour in 1941, much of Violich's research and writing concerned urban planning and development in Latin America. His first book, *Cities of Latin America: Housing and Planning to the South* (1944) is based on his travels in Latin America. It approaches the social, economic, and physical problems of Latin American cities from the perspective of an enthusiastic, optimistic onlooker writing for a popular North American audience, in part aiming to show what U.S. urban planners can learn from their southern counterparts. His second book, co-authored with the Chilean planner Juan Astica, *Community Development and the Urban Planning Process in Latin America* (1967), adopts a more practical and action-oriented approach aimed at the professional community. Over the course of the 1960s and 70s he also developed a comprehensive project on urban planning in Latin America with a focus on the four case studies of Caracas, Bogotá, Santiago, and São Paulo, which was eventually published as *Urban Planning for Latin America* in 1987, after more than ten years of retirement from Berkeley¹⁶.

Violich's relationship with Latin America, however, was most strongly felt as an educator and mentor. He consulted on several studies of planning education in Latin America sponsored by the United Nations and Rockefeller Foundation (1956), the Inter-American Planning Society (1960), the United States Operations Mission (USOM) in Chile (1960), and helped set up at least two graduate training centers for planners, in Santiago in 1960 and in Caracas in 1968. He also exerted a powerful influence on graduate students who came from Latin America to study architecture and city planning at Berkeley. Upon Violich's retirement in 1976, the chair of the Department of City and Regional Planning remarked that "single-handedly, he proved remarkably effective in attracting and advising Latin American students"¹⁷. As early as 1953 he was helping

to facilitate the application of Latin American students to the City and Regional Planning program by arranging a meeting for an applicant with the associate dean of the graduate division; later he went so far as to put an applicant in touch with Clark Kerr, president of the University of California¹⁸. In 1958, the year before the College of Environmental Design was founded, Violich boasted that “the largest number of Latin Americans from any single subject on the campus” were in the architecture program¹⁹. He used his connections at Berkeley and frequent visits Chile, Colombia, Venezuela, and Brazil to build up a cohort of students dedicated to investigating and solving the problems of mid-century Latin American cities.

When these students arrived in Berkeley, however, they encountered not only Violich but an entire array of planning ideas and assumptions that had developed in the United States up to this point. A brief sketch of the evolution of planning education in the U.S. between the 1930s and 60s will illuminate Violich’s own formative years and situate him in the wider world of planning debates at the time. Because Berkeley’s department of City and Regional Planning tended to reflect the status of the field at large, this will also clarify the world in which so many Latin American graduate students were immersed in the 1950s and 60s.

When Violich received his education as a city planner, this field had only just begun to emerge as a distinct profession in the U.S. Although Harvard was the first university in the U.S. to introduce a course on city planning in 1909, it did not establish an independent program in city planning until 1929, only a few years before Violich arrived for his post-graduate studies. It was during the Depression, the period that Violich acknowledged as most significant in shaping his sense of planning’s social mission, that programs proliferated across the country. Each institution approached planning in a distinct way, however. At Harvard, Cornell, and the University of Illinois, planning reflected its origins in landscape architecture, while at the University of Nebraska it was taught as part of engineering. In rural schools in the South and Midwest, by contrast, the approach was influenced by federal conservation programs and the Tennessee Valley Authority. The leaders of the newly emerging profession acknowledged that, for many, “planning” was a vague term, certainly not as demarcated as architecture, engineering, or law. In fact, it drew from all these fields, as the head of Harvard’s program wrote in 1927. “It seems[...]that there does exist a very important and rapidly growing mass of knowledge which is not engineering, which is not architecture, which is not law, which is not medicine, but which furthers certain general goods toward which, each in its specific way, all these specialized professions and a good many more are also contributing.” It was in this milieu of a diversity of approaches to planning that Violich studied landscape architecture at Berkeley and city planning at Harvard²⁰.

By 1950, however, planning had become “institutionalized into comprehensive land-use planning” and had developed a more consistent body of knowledge independent of architecture and engineering. It had also become part of the governmental process through the work of agencies such as the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Port Authority of New York, as well as through the adoption of urban renewal and comprehensive planning by cities across the U.S.²¹ The job of the planner was to create city plans, develop codes to enforce those plans, and then enforce those codes. Master plans, blueprints, and comprehensive plans were therefore the central tools of the trade. At Berkeley, where planning had been consolidated with the formation

of the Department of City and Regional Planning in 1948, the figure of T. J. Kent was emblematic of this period, which planning historian Peter Hall calls the first of three “waves” in city planning at Berkeley. The model planner of this period was both rational and intuitive, assuming the role of apolitical expert while synthesizing the best solutions from personal experience on the job. According to Hall, this model – alternately referenced by its use of comprehensive plans, master plans, or Kent’s idea of the urban general plan – endured in planning classrooms into the 1960s.

In the late 1950s and through the 60s, however, there was a paradigm shift in planning brought about by new European geographic and economic theories as well as Cold War weapon systems. Planning was now conceived as a calculated, scientific process “in which vast amounts of precise information were garnered and processed in such a way that the planner could devise very sensitive systems of guidance and control, the effects of which could be monitored and if necessary modified.” Heavily indebted to engineering, systems planning became especially important in transportation planning, for example, because it promised a precise way to predict traffic demand based on land uses. Despite the methodological differences between comprehensive planning and systems planning, a common set of assumptions underlay both processes: “the planning system was seen as active, the city system as purely passive; the political system was regarded as benign and receptive to the planner’s expert advice.” In reality, however, the planner was trying to act as both objective social scientist and active designer, all the while engaged in the messy world of politics and public opinion²².

In addition to comprehensive and systems planning, two more “waves” were to hit the shores of the planning academy during Violich’s tenure. From roughly 1965 to 1975, another paradigm shift occurred, partly influenced by the civil rights and free speech movements, Vietnam War, and race riots of the period. Planning was increasingly seen to operate within a pluralistic world in which the planner had lost his “claim to unique and useful expertise” and instead took on the role of community advocate. Part of the shift was due to a turn from strictly physical planning (i.e., planning of the built environment) toward social and economic planning. Mel Webber, who like T. J. Kent was an important figure in the College of Environmental Design, could be considered part of this new Berkeley “wave.” Finally, Hall argues that the influential turn toward Marxism in the 1970s led by geographers such as Henri Lefebvre, David Harvey, and Manuel Castells – the last of whom served on the city planning faculty at Berkeley for many years – comprised another “wave” in planning²³. Castells is an intriguing foil to Violich given the former’s involvement in the Santiago urban planning scene in 1968²⁴ and his appointment at Berkeley in 1979, three years after Violich’s retirement. Nonetheless, this last “wave” was much less significant in shaping Violich’s career and the planning ideas he promoted in Chile than the earlier modes, most notably the modes of comprehensive planning and community-based planning.

By the time that Violich was beginning to attract Latin American students to study city planning at Berkeley, the profession had thus been consolidated in the U.S. after a period of diverse approaches based on other disciplines such as architecture and engineering. Though the planning field was beginning to evolve in the late 1950s, planners retained the confidence and conviction that their technical expertise, properly applied, could solve the most pressing problems facing cities both in the U.S. and overseas. When Chilean graduate students came to Berkeley

to study planning, they too drew on a recent history of urban planning which, though distinct from the North American experience, prepared them for their time in California.

Planning in Latin America

When the first wave of Chilean students began arriving on campus and attending classes in the “Ark,” the small, Arts and Crafts-styled brown shingle building that housed the early architecture and city planning programs, they brought with them an education in urban planning that, like planning in the U.S., drew on an array of influences. Urban planning was not consolidated as a distinct discipline, but the many streams of other traditions that fed into it had been developing over the past three decades or more. In fact, profound transformations in Chilean society that occurred between the early years of the 20th century and 1960 had precipitated a growing interest in planning and urban development that coincided with the increased role of the state in the economy and social welfare. Thus, Armando de Ramon, a prominent historian of Santiago, could write that there was no great interest in studying the planning of urban development at the beginning of the last century, either on the part of Chilean universities or government ministries, while another urban historian, Adrian Gorelik, could describe the meteoric rise of Santiago in the mid-century to become a “fundamental laboratory of Western planning”, with a critical mass of university programs, government ministries, professional organizations, and internationally funded studies dedicated to applying cutting-edge social theories and scientific techniques to spur development²⁵. Violich also commented on the concentration of urban experts in Chile, writing in 1968 that with all the “inputs” from international groups, Chile “should be a model in the field of urban and regional planning!”²⁶. The dramatic ascent of planning in Latin America and Chile reflected the changing tides of architecture and planning thought in Europe as well as the evolution of related disciplines.

When Violich returned from his whirlwind tour of Latin America in the early 1940s, he remarked that two of the most distinctive features of Latin American planners compared to their North American counterparts were their European orientation and the wide-ranging, versatile approach in which they had been trained²⁷. These two traits were related. Because their education was highly informed by continental European practices, they tended to consider themselves *urbanists* rather than *planners*. As other historians have noted, Europe was the central point toward which Latin American architects and urbanists gravitated from the late 19th century until the Second World War²⁸. Violich credited this European influence for imparting a more imaginative, humanistic, and philosophical touch to the urbanists he met in Latin America. Most practicing planners had in fact been trained (and usually continued working) as architects or engineers, and their work as planners was seen as an offshoot of those fields, rather than its own distinct profession. Similarly, urban historian Arturo Almandoz has described the greater attention to design that the term *urbanist* implied, as opposed to the more technical, North American category of *planner* that superseded it around the Second World War. Violich was right that before the Second World War, Latin American urban planners were informed less by his home country than by cross-Atlantic influences.

This European orientation that early Latin American planners and urbanists shared was not uniform, however, because the trends in architecture and urbanism that were imported across the Atlantic varied over time and place. In the late 19th century, the monumental style of Baron Haussmann's Paris was a major influence on Rio de Janeiro, Buenos Aires, and Santiago. This Parisian model of wide, diagonal avenues designed to cut through the congested city center and ease traffic circulation, along with elegantly landscaped parks designed to beautify the city and improve public health was the inspiration, for example, for the embellishments of the Alameda and Santa Lucía park in Santiago that mayor Benjamín Vicuña Mackenna carried out in the 1870s. The Latin American versions of Haussmann's reforms never achieved the same level of comprehensive, total planning that the baron managed in Paris, but the French urban influence was nonetheless very strong throughout Latin America into the early decades of the 20th century²⁹.

Overlapping with the influence of French urbanism was the rise of the garden city movement in England, which grew out of the social reformism of the Victorian era and its efforts to relieve the miserable living conditions of industrial, inner city slums. Promoted by Ebenezer Howard, the garden city concept was designed to move workers out of the city into self-sufficient satellite communities composed of low-density single-family housing as well as industry to provide employment. However, when transplanted to Latin America, the idea usually devolved into the promotion of bedroom suburbs on the edge of major urban areas, rather than self-contained developments with jobs and industry integrated into the plan³⁰. The garden city idea was very influential in Santiago in the 1930s when Karl Brunner, an Austrian urban planner, helped develop the eastern neighborhoods of Providencia and Ñuñoa into tree-lined, homogeneous, middle-class suburbs³¹. As the garden city model suggests, the influence of European urbanism on Latin American cities is not easy to classify: for example, one historian understands Brunner's impact as part of the humanistic, design-oriented European approach, while other scholars consider the garden suburbs he promoted as antagonistic to the earlier European tendency toward dense, compact cities and instead group it with the low-density suburban model that came to dominate U.S. development and which would be blamed for the subsequent uncontrolled growth of Santiago³².

Concurrent with the rise of the garden city idea and the lingering influence of Haussmann-style urbanism, another set of powerful architecture and planning concepts was gaining force in Europe and soon crossing the Atlantic. Alternately known as modernism or simply as the architecture and planning promoted by members of the Congrès International d'Architecture Moderne (CIAM), this movement rejected the academic, ornamental classicism then being taught in Europe in favor of functional architecture inspired by industrialization, making use of new building materials such as glass, steel, and concrete. By the 1940s, the CIAM style was gaining steam in Chile in the journal *Arquitectura y Construcción*, which ran from 1945 to 1950, and by 1954 the Athens Charter, one of the movement's manifestos, had been translated into Spanish. In addition to functional architecture, modernism also adhered to the principles of functionalism in planning, whereby the four urban functions of housing, industry, recreation, and circulation were to be spatially segregated to promote efficiency and a higher quality of life. Modernism quickly became "the mainstream into which the diverse methodological influences of the planning profession were incorporated", so that already in the early 1950s, as the first comprehensive plan for Santiago was on the drawing board, the functional separation of uses became the guiding principle behind the Plan Intercomunal de

Santiago when it was published in 1960³³. Further evidence of modernism's popularity can be seen in the major Chilean architecture journal of that decade, *AUCA: Arquitectura, Urbanismo, Construcción, Arte*, which quoted CIAM luminary Le Corbusier in its inaugural issue, invoking the movement's sense of mission: "architecture is not a profession; it is a spiritual state"³⁴.

After the Second World War, the U.S. began to overtake Europe as the center of influence for Latin American planning³⁵. The field began to adopt a more technical stance and broadened its horizons beyond the workings of the city to encompass regional and national development. This shift from European-inspired *urbanismo* to the *planificación* drawn from the U.S. entailed a move from art to science, toward "systemic, procedural and/or political values, relying for purpose on the social sciences and its technical apparatus, rather than design"³⁶. In the 1950s and 1960s, modernization theory and, specifically, the growth pole theory of development took hold of social scientists, planners, and government ministries throughout Latin America³⁷. With this concept of stimulating regional development through "concentrated decentralization" by targeting certain smaller cities or rural areas for public and private investment, governments began implementing growth pole plans in the mid- to late-1960s. One economist, writing in 1973, proclaimed that Chile had "produced the first comprehensive national plan for regional development in Latin America" in 1968, under the Frei administration, with the three main poles set to be Antofagasta, Valparaíso, and Concepción³⁸. As the turn towards technical, social scientific urban planning and the rise of regional and national development planning already suggests, the category of planning itself came to encompass multiple disciplines. When Violich conducted a study on urban planning education in Chile in 1960, he identified not only architecture but also engineering, economics, sociology, law, and public administration as key components of a planner's education. These first two professions had a long history of overlap with the area of urban planning, while economics had only recently begun focusing on economic development planning³⁹; moreover, sociology and public administration were even newer fields in Chile, according to Violich. In the post-war years, therefore, planning in Latin America and particularly in Chile came to mean a multi-disciplinary, multi-scalar technical endeavor oriented toward stimulating development.

Before turning to the first interactions between Violich and his Chilean planning students, it is worth briefly outlining the organizational scaffolding and political scene that existed in Chile in the sphere of urban planning by the late 1950s, when the first crop of Chileans left for Berkeley. In 1928, the University of Chile's School of Architecture had introduced the first *urbanismo* courses in the country, which were soon followed by similar courses at the Catholic University of Chile⁴⁰. Meanwhile, in response to a 1928 earthquake in Talca, the first significant planning law was passed the following year, which required all cities of more than 20,000 inhabitants to create a master plan⁴¹. In Santiago, the need for increased coordination of urban development was most acutely felt because of the city's population growth and territorial expansion. Around 1910, the city's urbanized area had grown beyond the boundaries of the Santiago *comuna*, which led to a lack of coordination because each *comuna*, or municipality, had its own government. This was especially problematic for urban planning because, in 1891, the law of municipal autonomy had given *comunas* the power to sell off subdivided land. As lot sales became an attractive source of income for municipalities, urban growth boundaries were quickly disregarded⁴². With the Santiago metropolitan area already comprising 17 different municipalities in 1960 and without a single

governing body for the entire city, this constituted a severe handicap for planners' attempts to organize and coordinate development across the city⁴³.

Yet planning impulses were reenergized in 1939, when reconstruction after a major earthquake in Chillán (260 miles south of Santiago) spurred the creation of the Corporación de Fomento de la Producción (CORFO), which ushered in a new era of strong state intervention in the economy under the leadership of the Marxist-reformist coalition of the Popular Front (1938-1941). With CORFO's construction of hydroelectric projects, search for oil deposits, and promotion of domestic industries, Chile became a pioneer in planned development, which was continued by the moderate governments of Juan Antonio Ríos (1942-46), Gabriel González Videla (1946-52), and Carlos Ibáñez del Campo (1952-58)⁴⁴. This planning soon encompassed urban services with the creation of the Corporación de Vivienda (CORVI) in 1953 and the Ministerio de Vivienda y Urbanismo (MINVU) in 1965⁴⁵. When the first group of Chilean graduate planning students arrived in California in the late 1950s, an institutional framework for national, regional, and urban development planning had emerged in Chile. Nonetheless, persistent disorganization among municipalities and ministries and underfunding by the conservative Alessandri government (1958-64) were common complaints.

The field of urban planning in Chile in the late 1950s was thus both old and new. It had a mature tradition of European urbanism drawn from Haussmann's Paris, Britain's garden cities, and the CIAM modernist style, but it was also undergoing a transformation toward a more North American-centered technical approach. One way of appreciating these changes is to set Violich's opinion of Latin American planners in 1944 alongside his assessment of Chilean planners in 1960. As discussed above, on his first visit he praised European-trained planners for their "versatile," "less specialized" approach that allowed architects and planners to intermingle and cooperate closely⁴⁶. Yet fifteen years later he faulted Chilean planners – generally educated as architects, engineers, or economists – for keeping too much within their specialized disciplines. "Each field works far too much within its own orbit," he lamented, a tendency exacerbated by the way departments were dispersed across Santiago⁴⁷. The apparent discord between Violich's view of planners in 1944 and in 1960 is explained by two changes: on the one hand, the increasing number of disciplinary fields encompassed within the umbrella of "planning" and, on the other hand, the technical, specialized character imparted by these new disciplines. To remedy the narrow-mindedness he perceived among Chilean planners in 1960, Violich recommended not only increased interdisciplinary contact but – most significantly for our purposes – increased contact with universities outside the country, pointing to the economics exchange program between the Catholic University of Chile and the University of Chicago as a model for how U.S. urban planning programs could partner with Chilean universities to facilitate the transfer of expertise. This was precisely Violich's goal as he began recruiting young Chilean planners to study in Berkeley's College of Environmental Design in the late 1950s.

Violich's Early Engagement with Chile, 1956-1963

In 1956, a decade and a half after his first encounter with Chile as a young, newly minted planner, Violich made his second extensive visit to the country. He met with established professionals such as Emilio Duhart, a distinguished modernist architect who had studied with Le Corbusier in France and Walter Gropius at Harvard, as well as a group of ambitious young planners who were attracted to the idea of doing graduate work at Berkeley. Violich was enthusiastically received at the Catholic University's School of Architecture, where he advised Chilean urbanists to work more cooperatively in order to exert more influence as a field⁴⁸. This moment represents the start of a decade-long relationship with planning students, practitioners, and the institutional world of universities, government ministries, and U.S. funding sources. One young planner whom he met in Chile, Nicolás García, would join the Berkeley Department of City and Regional Planning (DCRP) the following year, while another, Juan Astica, would remain in Chile but maintain a close working relationship with Violich; they would even co-author a book in 1967. Meanwhile, another Chilean student, Antolín López, had just started studying at Berkeley. Together these three figures – García, Astica, and López – formed the nucleus of Violich's contacts in the world of Chilean planning in these early years. While they shared the same vision of the role of planning in spurring development, their dynamic relationships illustrate the obstacles that planners faced at this juncture in Chile and the differing ways they responded⁴⁹.

García and Astica both expressed deep frustration with the prevailing institutional context of urban planning in Chile, criticizing the way it was undervalued by the government and uncoordinated across different government offices. Six weeks after García had returned to Chile, he wrote to Violich that he was "back to normal again, that is to say, an adjusted chilean (sic) architect that often talks about city planning, a scarcely known business in this corner of the world." The "shock" of seeing his country through Berkeley-colored glasses was beginning to wear off, and he was growing "fond" of it again. "Everything in Chile but the cities is wonderful. Man, what a landscape! to say nothing of the climate, women, etc. At least in these fields we can play major league any time!" However, the tone of his letter quickly shifted.

Professionally, I came back during a bad moment for planning since the present government is somewhat the do-it-yourself type, run by very capable engineers (most of them U.S.-trained) out to do things fast and efficiently & none wishing to waste time on trifles like planning. But we planners are, however, bravely trying to educate them and have hopes of a few good results.

Despite the antagonistic climate at the Planning Division of the Ministry of Public Works, the national-level ministry where García worked, he kept an upbeat attitude. An "honest to goodness planning crisis" had swept over the Planning Division, as he described it, because it had been unable to undertake any new projects and instead was caught up in solving day-to-day problems, and yet in the same breath he remarked that "more and more people [are] listening to me". He wrote enthusiastically of his two cherished projects: first, his efforts to rewrite planning laws and, second, his interest in creating a new graduate school of urban planning, a project on which he hoped to enlist his mentor. Moreover, he was thrilled that his private architecture

practice, which he continued to pursue as a planner, was “crowded with clients” and had brought in “several good jobs” recently. This letter reveals one of the main frustrations that he and Astica felt as planners; namely, a lack of governmental support and recognition of the value of urban planning. It also hints at one of the factors that motivated figures like García and Astica to build bridges with Violich: he had the potential to open doors to sources of institutional prestige (UC-Berkeley) and funding (the U.S. government, the Ford Foundation) that promised to transform the way that cities were managed in Chile⁵⁰.

Astica, who also worked for the Planning Division of the Ministry of Public Works, had a more personal complaint against his employer. In 1958, he had planned to attend a seminar on urban planning in Bogotá with the Centro Interamericano de la Vivienda (CINVA) and had received permission to attend from the Ministry of Public Works, but when the government abruptly reduced spending he was denied the funds to travel. He lamented that *urbanismo* was not part of the military, since the armed forces were not affected by the new government spending restrictions. “I would have made the trip in any case on my own,” he wrote, but he had to pay his own way for a separate conference and could not afford to pay for both. Two of his colleagues were going to the CINVA conference because, “fortunately, they are not public sector workers” he noted bitterly at the end of his letter⁵¹ Unlike García, his description of life as an urban planner was not leavened by tales of a thriving private practice or peers who were increasingly receptive to his ideas; this may have been partly a factor of not having studied for two years at Berkeley, as García had, in that he may not have had the same (perhaps naïve) optimism and idealism drilled into him by Violich⁵². However, like García, he valued Violich as a well connected mentor. In this letter, for example, he asks Violich to send him copies of the CINVA conference proceedings. Later he will call on him for much more.

As we have seen, García and Astica had slightly different outlooks on the professional environment that conditioned their day-to-day work as urban planners for the Ministry of Public Works in Santiago. One way in which they responded to perceived obstacles was a shared effort, however. In 1958, they approached the local Point IV office, the United States’ technical assistance program, to fund a three-prong project to improve city planning in Chile⁵³. One objective was to bring a U.S. advisor to consult on urban renewal projects; another sought an advisor to carry out master plans; and the third objective, which Astica and García were particularly excited about, was designed to improve planning education. Antolín López, who had studied for two years at Berkeley and was now working for Point IV, served as liaison between the Planning Division, where Astica and García worked, and Violich, whom all three were hoping to enlist as the advisor on planning education. The way that they envisioned Violich working with Point IV and the Planning Division is noteworthy because it would be considerably altered. What López, Astica, and García originally wanted was for the University of California to found a training center modeled directly on Berkeley’s College of Environmental Design, which, significantly, had just been christened that year in California. But instead of linking the center with the University of Chile or the Catholic University, they intended for it to attach directly to the Ministry of Public Works and the municipalities to train government planners⁵⁴. If Astica’s sentiments were widely shared, they found the universities very frustrating to work with because of the “ridiculous” way planning was taught as an “academic” course for architects⁵⁵. In their proposal to Violich, they hoped to cut

out the meddlesome middleman of academia and create a direct transfer of knowledge between Violich and the relevant planning agencies.

Their mentor in California was polite but firm in his response to his former students' proposal. After conferring with his colleagues, he answered that "we would question the advisability of establishing a 'Center for Teaching City and Regional Planning following the main lines of DCRP at Berkeley', since it would be a major undertaking beyond our capacity and could be destructive of the already established University programs in Chile". Instead, he thought it would be smarter to "strengthen existing programs" and work directly with the universities, not the Ministry of Public Works or the municipalities, although the University of California would still exercise control over the project by choosing U.S. advisors⁵⁶. The original proposal, ironically, had the potential to cause greater disorganization and lack of coordination among planners by creating a separate center that purposely cut itself off from the educational institutions that had for decades been the training ground for planners and architects alike. In addition, as Violich notes, it could have generated hostility from these traditional sectors or, at the very least, siphoned talent away from them, thereby exacerbating the existing problem, which Astica had identified, of "duplicated" planning programs in both the University of Chile and the Catholic University⁵⁷. The relationship between Violich and his ex-students, as this episode illustrates, was not based on a simple transfer of knowledge from advisor to advisees. Astica, García, and López were highly receptive to the ideas coming from Berkeley, but they were so eager to implement the technical, comprehensive mode of planning they had learned that their proposal was perhaps more radical than Violich wanted in its vision of a center modeled directly on Berkeley's DCRP and connecting directly with government planners. Their plan was meant to reform the planning profession immediately, while Violich, on the other hand, envisioned a longer-term project that would train future teachers of urban planning and send young professionals to study at Berkeley, rather than just assist current practitioners.

The agreement between the Planning Division and Point IV began to move forward, and at the end of 1959 Violich was officially invited by the United States Operations Mission in Chile (USOM-Chile, see footnote 47) to serve as consultant on a brief mission to assess planning education and recommend a course of action⁵⁸. The next year, not long after completing a similar mission to assess planning education throughout Latin America sponsored by the Sociedad Interamericana de Planificación (SIAP) and the Ford Foundation, he spent October and November in Santiago, published his report⁵⁹, and, in December 1961, USOM-Chile announced to him that "after much pulling and hauling", it had secured the funds to open a position for a longer-term consultant who would actually design the program and have it up and running by 1963. The chief of the USOM-Chile housing and planning division noted that much of the credit needed to go to the Center for Economic Planning at the University of Chile. Unlike the school of architecture, the economics department there had shown interest in expanding disciplinary boundaries to include social considerations; it also had "the backing of the most influential planners in government circles"⁶⁰.

Although it is not at first obvious why architecture, the field with the longest history of producing planners, was resistant to the new project, it may well have been due to the impact

of the modernist movement. The CIAM, Violich wrote in 1958, had been a “potent influence in advancing this ‘super-architect’ concept”, thereby isolating architects from related areas such as engineering or other technical fields. “Architecture throughout Latin America has kept city planning as its own dwarfed child these years and must now let it grow and flourish with a healthy stimulus from many fields”⁶¹. When USOM-Chile distributed a job announcement for the position of “City Planning Educator-Administrator” to get the program up and running, it likewise noted that the architecture departments at both universities were “too restricted to the design approach to permit inclusion of the various social and political sciences that are essential in the education of technicians” who must plan for urban development⁶². Violich’s goal of instituting a comprehensive planning model in Chile was, therefore, not only about being “interdisciplinary,” as he so often put it, but about moving away from the realm of art and design and toward the technical science of developmentalism and modernization. I will return to this point in the next section.

By now it may be clear that one of the main benefits accruing to Violich from his relationship with García, López, and Astica was their physical presence as foot soldiers on the ground who could lobby for the comprehensive, social-economic development planning espoused by their mentor⁶³. Astica’s role is especially salient. Before the U.S. office (now known as the International Cooperation Administration) had chosen a consultant, Astica wrote that he was “convinced” that Violich was the “key person to orient us” and, for this reason, had “insisted” that he be given “first priority”. Astica was anxious to iron out dates for the study, since there was a real threat that it would conflict with the SIAP assessment of planning education in Latin America, which Violich was committed to doing the same year. However, Astica wrote that “if it is absolutely impossible for you, I should prefer you suggest me the name of another expert of your personal confidence, and I could give that name to ICA, because if not, ICA can bring anyone they select in a hurry”⁶⁴. Astica was skillfully lobbying on behalf of Violich, carefully trying to outmaneuver the U.S. bureaucrats who may have had different candidates in mind⁶⁵.

With his close relationship to Violich, Astica not only lobbied for his mentor but used him as a resource to advance his own career. As mentioned above, Astica had a much dimmer view of life as a government planner than his colleague Nicolás García did. One of the ways he sought to remedy the situation was by using his multiple contacts among planners in other countries to secure a new job. In the same 1960 letter cited above, he wrote that “local considerations (very conservative government, don’t like Planning), are forcing me to think in leaving Planning Division.” Violich had already put in a word for him for a position in São Paulo, but this had fallen through⁶⁶. Violich, clearly interested in using his weight to help Astica, also recognized an opportunity for mutual gain. Within weeks after Astica had detailed his predicament, Violich had written to the Ford Foundation to request funding to bring Astica to Berkeley as a research assistant for at least a year⁶⁷. While it is unclear how much time Astica spent in Berkeley, he did continue to work with Violich through the end of the decade while based in Chile, and the two co-authored the book *Community Development and the Urban Planning Process in Latin America* in 1967⁶⁸.

With the crucial aid of Astica and García in the Planning Division of the Ministry of Public Works and López in the U.S. office, Violich had successfully advanced a new mode of planning

in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Drawing on economics and social science, this new form of expertise departed from planning's earlier emphasis on design and architecture and represented a turn toward planning as an engine of urban, regional, and ultimately national development. When the U.S. office announced the job opening for the consultant who would finally design and launch the new training center, Violich scrambled to ask his Berkeley colleagues for candidate suggestions. "Now that you've pushed them into doing all this", a colleague wryly remarked, "it's imperative that an able faculty be gotten". In the end, John A. Parker, the chairman of City and Regional Planning at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, was the chosen expert to turn those plans into reality.

Mid-1960s collaboration and effervescence

The apparent fate of the training center that Violich had strived to create offers a window onto the evolution of U.S.-sponsored urban development programs in the mid-1960s. Despite the hire of Parker, an experienced educator and administrator, it appears that the training center sponsored by the U.S. at the University of Chile never materialized. However, a nearly identical program called the *Centro Interdisciplinario de Desarrollo Urbano y Regional* (CIDU), sponsored by the Ford Foundation and based at the Catholic University, did emerge in 1966 as a prominent player in the world of Chilean planning⁶⁹. It is striking how similar the description of CIDU is to Violich's proposal from six years before. "An interdisciplinary urban development program has been established at the Catholic University of Chile, involving the Faculties of Law, Economics, Sociology, Engineering, and Architecture", the Ford Foundation reported. "Initiated in January 1966, the Program is evolving both undergraduate and graduate courses leading to a professional specialization in urban development planning"⁷⁰. These are precisely the same departments that Violich believed should be incorporated into urban development planning.

If the appearance of CIDU at the Catholic University indicates the growing interest in urban planning, the travails of the proposed center at the University of Chile illustrate how fraught with institutional problems and political tensions this field was. The center's main liaison with the University of Chile, José Vera, soon became a "major obstacle" because of his staunchly anti-U.S. views. Violich and Astica described him as an "arch opponent of all pro-U.S. democratic movements," most likely referring to the Christian Democratic Party which would win the presidency in 1964⁷¹. In 1963, the year that the center should have been accepting its first students, Aaron Horwitz, one of the consultants on the project, found himself in tense talks with the university's rector, Juan Gómez Millas. Both sides blamed the other for "delays" and "inaction," but they agreed to name architect Jorge Poblete as the center's new director, decided to pursue new sources of funding from the United Nations and the Ford Foundation, and left the meeting with "friendly optimism"⁷². Yet within a few months, the plan was stymied again, this time by university politics. Gómez Millas was up for re-election for the rectorship, and the North American consultants halted their search for new funding while waiting for the outcome. In the end, Gómez Millas lost to a candidate from the Socialist Party, although it is unclear how the nascent center was affected by the change in university leadership.

The rise of the training center at the Catholic University and the demise of the proposals for a center at the University of Chile illustrate an important characteristic of U.S.-backed planning in Chile in the mid-1960s: as more groups became involved, there was a dual tendency toward increased interest and synergy –as well as disorganization and heightened tensions. The interest generated in urban development was largely due to the combination of the Alliance for Progress, begun in 1961, with the election of President Eduardo Frei in 1964. Together, these created a political context that, unlike in the late 1950s, was highly receptive to the modernizing reforms embedded in the discipline of urban (and regional) planning. This section will address the convergence of interest in urban planning, while the following section will turn to the conflicting objectives and struggles within this movement.

In August 1961, President Kennedy signed the Alliance for Progress charter at a meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council of the Organization of American States in Punta del Este, Uruguay. It was designed to be a 10-year, \$20 billion aid program that aimed not only to promote economic development and political reform, but, through these mechanisms, to usher in a modern age in Latin America. As scholars have shown, the concept that there exists a linear path from traditional to modern societies, advocated by modernization theorists such as Walt Rostow, underlay the massive aid program. With thoroughgoing agrarian reform, “rational industrialization,” income redistribution, and health and education programs, the architects of the Alliance for Progress believed that Latin America could leap ahead to the next stage of development – imaginatively called the “take-off” stage – which would lead inevitably to the final, mature stages of development that characterized Europe and the United States⁷³.

In practice, however, the implementation of aid policies frequently depended more on anti-communist security concerns than on the stated goals of social, economic, and political reform. In Chile, for example, the programs of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID, the main agency administering the funds) were often designed to prevent the Marxist coalition, led by Salvador Allende, from winning power. Leading up to the 1964 presidential election, USAID’s coordinated efforts to stabilize food supply, curb inflation, and carry out small educational or health projects in “electorally significant areas” were successful, and the Christian Democrat candidate Eduardo Frei won by a large margin⁷⁴. Frei’s election signaled not only the effectiveness of these short-term, strategic aid projects, but a new political era. Under the banner of “revolution in liberty,” his goals of agrarian reform, agricultural modernization, dramatic increases in low-cost housing, and urban development coincided remarkably well with the objectives of the Alliance for Progress. The area of low-cost housing indicates just how ambitious his goals were: he pledged to build 60,000 new homes each year for the next 6 years. As of 1960, by contrast, the average construction rate was only 8,000 new homes per year. The conjuncture of unprecedented funding and political will represented by the Alliance for Progress and the Frei administration provides a backdrop for the similarly ambitious programs in urban development spearheaded in the mid-1960s⁷⁵.

While the Alliance for Progress was explicitly directed toward economic development, health, and education, urban development was also recognized as an essential ingredient to modernization. A report by a staff member declared that “planning for cities and for urban

growth will be central to the success or failure of the Alliance for Progress”, since efforts to speed economic development in Latin America had the potential to worsen urban conditions unless proper measures were taken⁷⁶. The report hailed the Alliance as a major opportunity to link national economic development with improved urban living conditions so that Latin America did not suffer the same consequences of industrialization as Europe and North America, thereby “bypass[ing]” the “19th century industrial city, with its inhuman congestion and cruel exploitation”⁷⁷. The city became a major focus of the Alliance to the extent that it was implicated in the dynamics of unbalanced development and the accompanying problems of urban population explosions, squatter settlements, the location of industries, economic planning, and the potential for political unrest.

The relationship between urban planning and the broader modernization goals of the period can also be understood in the way that city planners described their own work. Writing two years before it was signed, Violich anticipated the Alliance for Progress’s goals of social development, democratic reforms, and global security and articulated the role of planning in achieving them. Latin America’s current urban planners, he wrote, “well realize that to face up to the problems of the physical environment – of the city and the region, is at the same time to face up to the underlying and long-standing social problems of Latin America that hold back the normal evolution of the culture of its peoples.” As long as planners do not “face up” to the issues of the built environment and thus to social issues, he wrote, “it cannot make the contribution to the stabilizing of world relationships as a whole that it is capable of making.” He continued on by noting the importance of “democratic processes” and the dangers of “dictatorship”⁷⁸. Urban planners were sometimes quite explicit in announcing the broad aims of their work; they saw themselves not simply as bureaucrats concerned with demographics, zoning, and master plans, but as agents of social, political, and economic transformation.

Out of this conjuncture of modernizing, reform-minded agendas headed by the Alliance for Progress and the Frei administration, there was a proliferation of urban development initiatives in both Berkeley and Chile, which created a definitive moment of collaboration and synergy in the mid-1960s. In Chile, the two most important institutions created in this period were CIDU (1966), the new graduate center for urban planning discussed above, and the national Ministerio de Vivienda y Urbanismo (MINVU, 1965), which brought housing and urban planning out from the folds of the Ministerio de Obras Públicas (MOP) to give these concerns greater attention. Meanwhile, California began two landmark projects that promised to link it closely to urban development in Chile. The first of these, signed in late 1963 shortly after Kennedy’s death, comprised a technical assistance agreement between Chile and the state of California in the areas of economic budgeting and planning, agriculture, water resources, education, and highway transportation. Encompassing both public and private sectors and financed by USAID as part of the Alliance for Progress, the Chile-California plan was envisioned as way to bring a “warmer,” more “human” touch to transnational development efforts as well as to stop communism in Chile. “It is our hope,” Preston Silbaugh, the program’s director said, “that California will be instrumental in helping this country achieve economic development and thus contribute to democracy’s victory and communism’s demise”⁷⁹.

In addition to the Chile-California program, a more strictly academic exchange was proposed to the Ford Foundation by committees from the University of Chile and the University of California in 1965⁸⁰. It was designed to include the four areas of social sciences, natural sciences and engineering, agricultural and veterinary medicine, and the arts. Financed to the tune of \$1 million per year by the Ford Foundation for five years beginning in the fall of 1965, it was planned to encompass about 135 faculty and 250 students in long-term stays, plus 120 professors in short-term stays. One campus bulletin emphasized that this was only the beginning of what was hoped to be an ever-widening set of relationships between the California university system and the University of Chile⁸¹.

Both the Chile-California program and the academic *convenio* between the University of Chile and the University of California generated a flurry of visits and proposals by planners on both sides of the equator. In October 1965, the director of the Chilean national budget and dean of the University of Chile's Faculty of Economics, Edgardo Boeninger, made a visit to Berkeley and the University of California-Los Angeles (UCLA). With such an influential figure on campus, several faculty members and administrators jumped at the chance to discuss their personal projects and research with him. He was spirited away to the DCRP department at Berkeley, for example, where Violich discussed his plans for using the *convenio* to create a long-term exchange of faculty and graduate students in urban planning⁸². He also met in Los Angeles with representatives of the Chile-California program, the *convenio*, the Dean of UCLA's new College of Architecture and Urban Planning, and two urban planning professors from Berkeley. John Dyckman, one of the Berkeley faculty members in attendance, explained that Boeninger was especially interested in creating a transportation economics study group, which had the potential to benefit all parties involved. It could enrich Berkeley's transportation planning field, lend legitimacy to UCLA's school in its "infancy", "beef up" transportation and developmental economics in Chile, and provide a "coveted" academic link for the Chile-California program, which would allow it "greater leverage" when recruiting technical personnel⁸³. As Boeninger's visit demonstrates, the mid-1960s saw a convergence of interest in both the U.S. and Chile around urban planning and the related areas of transportation, developmental, and economic planning.

Further evidence of heightened interest in these questions can be seen in the impact of Violich's visit to Santiago in June 1966, when he spent a week exploring the possibility of an urban planning exchange through the *convenio*. That fall, the coordinator in Chile wrote that Violich's visit was already "bearing fruit" and generating "considerable interest" among students and professors in different departments at the University of Chile; one student was already preparing to apply for a scholarship to study sociology and planning at Berkeley⁸⁴. In October 1966, Violich was instrumental in arranging a similar visit from René Urbina, of the University of Chile's Instituto de Vivienda, Urbanismo, y Planificación (IVUPLAN). Urbina had become so enthused about a potential urban planning exchange within the *convenio* – and frustrated by the limitations of the four existing areas – that he pushed for a fifth area to be added to the *convenio*, entitled "Planning and Design", which would be modeled on the fields within Berkeley's College of Environmental Design⁸⁵. This proposal is quite reminiscent, in fact, of Nicolás García and Juan Astica's plan in the late 1950s to establish a center modeled on CED, discussed above in Part III. Violich's response to Urbina's bold proposal was, like his response to García and

Astica, cautious and conservative. He worried that an entirely new group apart from the social sciences and engineering –areas that he felt were integral to planning– would cause unnecessary divisions. Instead, he recommended working within the four-area model and creating a working group on planning and the environment⁸⁶. Urbina's visit in turn sparked such interest among Berkeley faculty that one professor, Corwin Mocine, who had little previous experience with Latin America, was inspired to develop a proposal for a seminar in Chile as part of the *convenio*⁸⁷. As these episodes indicate, the University of Chile-University of California *convenio* proved to be a venue for urban planning experts in both countries to come together in the hope of forging long-lasting ties.

Indeed, the urban development initiatives organized under the *convenio* crystallized the spirit of the moment. Outside the realm of direct exchanges sponsored by the Ford Foundation and USAID, there was a general feeling of effervescence around planning in Chile. One Chilean architect who studied city planning at Berkeley in this period found that, when he returned to Chile in 1965, planners were the stars of the show – the “vedettes” – who were in such high demand that they worked twelve-hour days⁸⁸. Astica, who had complained of being undervalued as a planner during the Alessandri administration, now found his services highly sought after by the Frei government⁸⁹. Another Berkeley planner took a tour of Latin America, where he was wooed by government planning agencies in Venezuela and Peru as well as Chile. He stayed in Santiago, where he felt that his services were highly valued because urban planners with knowledge of economic and social issues were so “in demand”⁹⁰. Finally, an observer in Chile during the same period remarked that Berkeley's years of work to influence the direction of planning in Chile had finally paid off:

I think that you and your colleagues in C&R Planning can take a lot of satisfaction from the impact Berkeley is having on Chilean policies. Men like Kusnetzoff, Astica, Urbina, Geisse, Lopez, Eyheralde and many others seem to have moved into positions of influence in the new Government and in the university and they draw on their experiences at Berkeley with great frequency⁹¹.

Planning –of the economy, of industry, of agriculture, and of the metropolitan areas implicated in all of these– summed up the zeitgeist of the mid-1960s moment⁹². With the flurry of visits, proposals, and transnational discussions they generated, the California-Chile program and the University of Chile-University of California *convenio* channeled this spirit.

Tensions and transitions

Beneath the apparent collaboration among multiple actors and institutions engaged in urban planning in 1965 and 1966, however, a series of tensions threatened to derail the entire project. The world of urban planning now included not only architects and engineers, but economists, social scientists, and all stripes of government workers from both Chile and the U.S. whose political leanings increasingly rose to the surface in their dealings with one another. The very

convergence of interest in urban development planning brought many disparate actors together whose objectives, though ostensibly aligned, in fact incorporated multiple and often contradictory aims. The changing political climate in Chile helped spell out the end of U.S.-led comprehensive urban planning and bolstered an emerging paradigm of participatory community planning.

One of the most significant tensions was between Violich and his own colleagues. When a comprehensive metropolitan transportation study of Santiago was proposed as a joint project between the Chile-California program and Berkeley planners, Violich was deeply skeptical. "I distrust very much North American technical people", he wrote, "especially university types, who are eager to work in Chile, India or Venezuela in order to experiment with their own ideas on projects that can't be realized at home in the States". The study was not overtly experimental, but in Violich's view it aimed too rigidly to reproduce U.S. methods in Latin America and failed to take Chile's "greatest needs" into account⁹³. The country's limited funds should be spent on housing and education, he argued, rather than a cutting-edge transportation system⁹⁴. While some planners in Chile welcomed the metropolitan transportation project⁹⁵, one Berkeley contact who was in Chile at the time warned that the proposed study could only gain support if it was broadened to include the regions, since "Santiago is already too much emphasized and the provinces have no attention and have problems of equal or greater dimensions"⁹⁶. Berkeley planners did carry out the study, but not before the project was reworked to be cheaper, simpler, and more tailored to Chile's needs.

As this drama suggests, power relations were close to the surface in the workings of the Chile-California plan, dominated as it was by government agencies. Paul Wendt, the Berkeley observer who had warned of the proposal's overemphasis on Santiago, also gave Dyckman and Webber advice on how to navigate the Chilean academic and political system to assure the success of the metropolitan-transportation study. He set up a meeting between Robert Keating, head of the Chile-California program, and Chilean government officials, for example, which he "purposely avoided" attending because of generalized sensitivity to "too much gringo dominance". Yet he, Keating, and Webber were not averse to political manipulation. Wendt wisely (perhaps cynically) suggested that the study be proposed to MINVU, since it was such a new ministry that it had no "carefully formulated plans, organizations, or policies" yet⁹⁷. Given such open political tensions, it is not surprising that the California-Chile program was experiencing political "difficulties" after only two years of operation⁹⁸.

The university-based *convenio* also gave rise to contested relationships, although these were less overtly political and more academic in nature. As René Urbina had sensed, the field of urban planning and development did not fall tidily under the rubric of social science, art, agriculture, or natural science. Given its mixture of sociology, economics, architecture and design, and engineering, it could plausibly draw from three of the four areas that the *convenio* comprised. Though Violich managed to avert potential hostility from the *convenio* coordinators by forestalling Urbina's proposal of a fifth independent field, he did not entirely avoid the problem of disciplinary boundaries. When he sent his own proposal for an interdisciplinary seminar at the University of Chile that would address decentralized, municipal-level planning, the Social Science Subcommittee approved it only on the condition that he indicate his "intention to give the seminar and your related research a special social-science emphasis," rather than a physical-engineering

emphasis⁹⁹. A similar “jurisdictional question” vexed Corwin Mocine, the Berkeley professor who had felt compelled to participate in the exchange after Urbina’s visit. Mocine had proposed a short seminar for the summer of 1967, but as his departure date drew near he grew anxious because he had not been able to secure a departmental home for his seminar in Santiago. Urbina, who was based at the University of Chile’s Institute of Housing, Urbanism, and Planning, was eager to host the seminar, but Mocine preferred to work with Boeninger, who was associated with an institute for public administration. Weeks before he left, however, Mocine learned that Boeninger did not want him¹⁰⁰. It is unclear how this problem was resolved, but what does seem obvious is that Mocine, inexperienced in Chile, lacked the crucial intermediaries that Violich employed to such great effect. Without former students in Chile to lobby for him, Mocine found himself adrift in a world that did not feel obligated to work with him simply because he was a foreign expert. In mid-1960s Chile, foreign planning consultants were in abundance¹⁰¹.

Yet within five years, many of these consultants were no longer on the Chilean scene. Both the Ford Foundation and its director of urban development programs, John Friedmann, had “closed out” by 1969; Friedmann went on to a career as a planning professor at the University of California-Los Angeles, while the Ford Foundation returned to its “palatial building in New York,” as Violich put it wryly¹⁰². Meanwhile, the university *convenio* had become “practically paralyzed” and unable to move forward on pending scholarships for Chilean students until the outcome of the election for the University of Chile’s leadership was decided¹⁰³. At the same time that high-profile experts returned to the U.S., however, a new mode of planning was arising out of the ashes of the old. This new approach was community-based, participatory, and increasingly politicized. One harbinger of this new mode was the mobilization of shantytown residents, or *pobladores*, who pressed for land, housing, and urban services from the government in the late 1960s and early 1970s¹⁰⁴. These two trends were in fact related: the political conditions that precipitated the withdrawal of many U.S. programs were also what gave added urgency to community-based, politicized planning.

Community-based planning had in fact been gaining popularity at the beginning of the decade, when Violich and Astica presented a paper on the topic at the SIAP Congress in Santiago in 1962. This paper was an early version of research that was later turned into their book *Community Development and the Urban Planning Process in Latin America* (1967), which argued for a mild form of participatory planning. It did not do away with the role of the expert-run government planning process, but rather called for an incorporation of local community concerns – including participation by residents themselves – into that planning process. Unlike the radical form of community participation later espoused during the Popular Unity, Violich and Astica’s vision of participation sought to bring excluded, marginal populations into “modern systems of life” by accelerating “social integration”¹⁰⁵. The paper presented in 1962 was favorably received by other attendees at the Congress, especially Peruvian delegates, and Astica observed that Colombia was also interested in community-based planning. The Christian Democrats also took a keen interest in the topic at the 1962 Congress, and they asked Astica to present the paper to their members. To Astica’s surprise – he was politically independent and was not invested in convincing them – the party wanted to adopt community development as part of their platform for national development¹⁰⁶.

Indeed, the Christian Democrats adopted community-based housing policies during the Frei government. Their central program, called *operación sitio*, distributed land parcels to homeless residents, who were then to be given material support in building their own homes. This was meant to be a gradual process of bringing urban services such as sewers, water, and electricity to “marginal” populations that had recently migrated to Santiago. At first the program seemed to work because it reduced the number of illegal land occupations as homeless residents expected to receive land from the government. Yet by 1968, the failure of Frei’s housing program was evident. With only 10 percent of families in need granted land through *operación sitio*, the number of illegal land occupations (*tomas*) began to increase¹⁰⁷. This turn of events not only pushed housing to the forefront of the Popular Unity’s agenda in 1970, but helped radicalize the political environment in which all urban planning projects were carried out¹⁰⁸.

With this failure of Frei’s housing policies, moderate U.S. figures were left with dwindling possibilities for urban reform. At the beginning of the decade, when the success of the Cuban Revolution and the threat of Allende winning power in the 1964 elections had spurred the Alliance for Progress to invest heavily in the pro-U.S. Christian Democrats, Frei was considered the “last best hope” for countering communism in Chile¹⁰⁹. “I am convinced that we have only a few years to act and to achieve concrete goals in Latin America”, wrote one Alliance staff member in 1962, “if we want to preserve their political institutions within the democratic system”¹¹⁰. The erosion of support for the Christian Democratic government in the late 1960s thus also meant, in a way, the failure of U.S.-backed development projects. The closure of the Ford Foundation urban development offices in Santiago, the “paralysis” of the university *convenio*, and the political “difficulties” with the Chile-California program can best be explained alongside the process by which Frei’s urban reform program faltered and lost public support.

These political conditions also gave rise to a new, mobilized form of community development. At the end of Frei’s government and during the Popular Unity, *pobladores* stepped up their demands for land, housing, and urban facilities, forming mobilized *campamentos* which sought to foster collective living and political action. In this radicalized context, decisions about land use, urban services, and housing were increasingly made through politicized grassroots organizations, such as *juntas de vecinos* (popular neighborhood councils). Although the *pobladores* movement is beyond the scope of this paper, it is important to note that it was gaining ground as U.S.-backed programs were waning¹¹¹. The technical, comprehensive planning led by organizations such as the Chile-California program was in retreat, while the localized, politicized form of community development and mobilization –especially in *poblaciones*– was on the rise. The heady mid-1960s moment of U.S.-Chile collaboration centered on urban planning and development had passed.

Conclusion

Throughout the 1960s, Chile was at the center of transnational efforts to use urban interventions as a means of spurring the country's economic, social, and physical development. Through the work of Chilean students who studied at Berkeley and became vocal proponents of comprehensive planning when they returned, as well as the work of North American academics and consultants, the field of urban planning became the focus of multiple and sometimes conflicting goals of modernizing the country, lifting *pobladores* out of poverty, and balancing regional development. The early years of Francis Violich's involvement in Chile, from the late 1950s to the early 1960s, show that Chilean students sought to leverage their connections with Berkeley to improve the state of urban planning in their country. They were eager in their attempt to reform the profession by setting up a U.S.-sponsored training center for urban planners, while Violich was more cautious and proposed a gradual program of changes. His vision of an educational center attached to the University of Chile, however, ran into a series of obstacles, including a change in university leadership and opposition from those who viewed U.S. actors with suspicion. Nonetheless, both Violich and his Chilean students gained from their relationship: Violich's former students lobbied for their mentor in Chilean planning circles, used their training in Berkeley to advance their careers, and even went to Berkeley to work on Violich's research projects.

These personal relationships between planners in Chile and the U.S. were expanded into major institutional exchanges in the mid-1960s, when the combination of the Alliance for Progress and the Frei government channeled ever more attention and funding to Chile's problems of urban development. Through the U.S.-sponsored Chile-California program and the academic exchange between the University of Chile and the University of California supported by the Ford Foundation, the flow of urban development expertise reached its height in the mid-1960s. Yet the intense energy that went into promoting urban planning was marred by conflicts among planners over the best path to development and, more seriously, by the political contingencies of an intensifying *pobladores* movement and the failure of Frei's housing policies, which shifted the focus from the role of technical experts to the agency of urban residents themselves. Thus the success or failure of the era's planning initiatives hinged not only on the personal relationships forged among Violich, his students and allies abroad, and the network of academics, professionals, and government officials they worked with in Chile, but on the transnational political climate that both supported their work and later restricted it.

Ultimately, the fate of the mid-1960s moment of high hopes for modernizing the country – indeed, the hemisphere – through urban interventions suggests the limitations of planning in an ever-political world. To the extent that planning declared itself wholly technical and universal, as modernizing urban development programs did, it left itself vulnerable to challenges from those who might question its basis in U.S. interests or its top-down approach with urban decisions flowing from supposed experts. The “short cut to development” that urban planners sought throughout the 1960s was fraught with good intentions amid conflicting objectives and narrowing political options. Chile's current plans to employ educational exchange to “become a developed nation in the span of one generation” will no doubt be subject to a new set of political contingencies as well.

Bibliografía

- Almandoz, Arturo. "From Urban to Regional Planning in Latin America, 1920-1950". *Planning Perspectives*, Vol. 25, No 1, Jan. 2010, pp. 87-95.
- Almandoz, Arturo, ed. *Planning Latin America's Capital Cities, 1850-1950*. London, Routledge, 2002.
- Camacho, Luis Eduardo. "Sociedad Interamericana de Planificación, SIAP 50 Años Vida Institucional y Programática". *Revista Bitácora Urbano Territorial*. Enero-diciembre, Vol. 1, No. 11, Bogotá, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, pp. 268-284.
- Castells, Manuel. *The City and the Grassroots: A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1983.
- Chile-California Program*. Sacramento, June 8, 1964.
- Conroy, Michael E., "Rejection of Growth Center Strategy in Latin American Regional Development Planning". *Land Economics*. Vol. XLIX, No 4, Nov. 1973, pp. 371-380.
- De Ramón, Armando. *Santiago de Chile (1541-1991) Historia de una sociedad urbana*. Santiago, Catalonia, 2007.
- Dezalay, Yves and Garth, Bryant G. *The Internationalization of Palace Wars: Lawyers, Economists, and the Contest to Transform Latin American States*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Gillam, Jerry. "California, Chile, U.S. Join in Alliance Pact". *Los Angeles Times*, 7 Dec 1963, p. 11.
- Gorelik, Adrián. "A produção da 'cidade latino-americana'". Trans. Fernanda Arêas Peixoto. *Tempo Social, revista de sociologia da USP*, Vol. 17, No 1, junho 2005, pp. 111-133.
- Garcés, Mario. *Tomando su sitio: El movimiento de pobladores de Santiago, 1957-1970*. Santiago, LOM, 2002.
- Gross, Leonard. *The Last, Best Hope: Eduardo Frei and Chilean Democracy*. New York, Random House, 1967.
- Hall, Peter. *Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century*. 3rd ed. Oxford, Blackwell, 2002.
- Hardoy, Jorge E. "Theory and Practice of Urban Planning in Europe, 1850-1930: Its Transfer to Latin America". In Richard M. Morse and Jorge E. Hardoy (eds.) *Rethinking the Latin American City*. Washington, D.C., Woodrow Wilson Center Press, and Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- Holder, Kathleen. "Chilean Fresh." *UC Davis Magazine Online*, Vol. 22, No 3, 2005 http://ucdavismagazine.ucdavis.edu/issues/sp05/feature_3.html>
- "In Memoriam: Francis Violich". University of California Academic Senate. <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/inmemoriam/francisviolich.htm>>
- Maclay, Kathleen. "Francis Violich, emeritus professor of city planning and landscape architecture, dies". 7 Sept 2005. UC Berkeley News. http://berkeley.edu/news/media/releases/2005/09/07_violich.shtml
- Morse, Richard M., and Hardoy, Jorge E. *Rethinking the Latin American City*. Washington, D.C., Woodrow Wilson Center, 1992.
- Natanson, George. "California Ally of Chile in Red Fight: State's Project Significant with Election of Frei". *Los Angeles Times*, 17 Sept 1964, p. 16.
- Needell, Jeffrey D. "Rio de Janeiro and Buenos Aires: Public Space and Public Consciousness in *Fin-de-Siècle* Latin America". *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. Vol. 37, No 3, July 1995, pp. 519-540.
- Palmer Trias, Montserrat. *La ciudad jardín como modelo de crecimiento urbano, Santiago 1935-1960*. Santiago, Facultad de Arquitectura y Bellas Artes de la Universidad Católica de Chile, 1987.
- Parrochia Beguin, Juan. *Santiago en el tercer cuarto del S. XX*. Santiago, Departamento de Planificación Urbano-Regional, Facultad de Arquitectura y Urbanismo, Universidad de Chile, 1980.
- Pávez Reyes, María Isabel. *En la ruta de Juan Parrochia Beguin: Premio Nacional de Urbanismo, Chile, 1996: Formación y reseña de su obra en vialidad y transporte masivo*. Santiago, Facultad de Arquitectura y Urbanismo de la Universidad de Chile, 2003.
- Sabatini, Francisco and Soler, Fernando "Paradoja de la Planificación Urbana en Chile". *Revista EURE*, Vol. XXI, No 62, 1995, pp. 61-73.
- Scott, Mel. *American City Planning since 1890: A History Commemorating the Fiftieth Anniversary of the American Institute of Planners*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1969.
- Sociedad Interamericana de Planificación (SIAP). "La Enseñanza de la Planificación en la América Latina: Informe de la Misión Técnica organizada por la Sociedad Interamericana de Planificación con la ayuda financiera de la Fundación Ford". San Juan, Puerto Rico, SIAP, May-Sep 1960.
- Taffett, Jeffrey F. *Foreign Aid as Foreign Policy: The Alliance for Progress in Latin America*. New York, Routledge, 2007.
- Tinsman, Heidi. *Partners in Conflict: The Politics of Gender, Sexuality, and Labor in the Chilean Agrarian Reform, 1950-1973*. Durham, Duke University Press, 2002.
- , "Politics of Gender and Consumption in Authoritarian Chile, 1973-1990: Women Agricultural Workers in the Fruit-Export Industry". *Latin American Research Review*, Vol. 41, No 3, 2006, pp. 7-31.
- Valdés, Juan Gabriel. *Pinochet's Economists: The Chicago School in Chile*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Violich, Francis. *Cities of Latin America: Housing and Planning to the South*. New York, Reinhold, 1944.

----- "Education for urban and regional planning in Chile: A report to the United States Operations Mission to Chile and the Ministry of Public Works of the Government of Chile". Berkeley, 1960.

----- "Intellectual Evolution in the Field of City and Regional Planning: A Personal Perspective Toward Holistic Planning Education, 1937-2010". June 2001 IURD Working Paper (Institute of Urban and Regional Development).

Violich, Francis and Astica, Juan B. *Community Development and the Urban Planning Process in Latin America*. Los Angeles, Latin American Center, University of California Los Angeles, 1967.

Violich, Francis, in collaboration with Robert Daughters. *Urban Planning for Latin America: The Challenge of Metropolitan Growth*. Boston, Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain; Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 1987.

Wallace, Bill. "Francis J. Violich – Noted UC professor of urban planning". *San Francisco Chronicle*, 26 Aug 2005. http://articles.sfgate.com/2005-08-26/bay-area/17385571_1_uc-berkeley-urban-planning-city-planning

Webber, Melvin. "Proposal for a Chile-California Project: Program for Improving Transit Service in Metropolitan Santiago". Memorandum to Robert B. Keating, 1 Sept 1965.

Notas

¹ Henceforth UC-Berkeley or simply Berkeley.

² "Chilean leader speaking at UC during state visit," *San Francisco Chronicle* (NewsBank), June 12, 2008. "Address by her excellency Michelle Bachelet Jeria President of the Republic of Chile," *Assembly Journal*, June 12, 2008, p. 3, 2 <<http://192.234.213.35/clerkarchive/session/chileanpre120608.pdf>>.

³ "Address by her excellency", *op. cit.*, p. 2.

⁴ See Scott, *American City Planning since 1890*; Hall, *Cities of Tomorrow*; and APA History and Organization," <<http://www.planning.org/apaataglanche/history.htm>>.

⁵ Luis Eduardo Camacho, "Sociedad Interamericana de Planificación, SIAP 50 Años Vida Institucional y Programática", *Revista Bitácora Urbano Territorial*, enero-diciembre, Vol. 1, No. 11, Bogotá, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, pp. 268-284.

⁶ Adrián Gorelik, "A produção da 'cidade latino-americana,'" trans. Fernanda Arêas Peixoto. *Tempo Social, revista de sociologia da USP*, Vol. 17, No 1, junho 2005, pp. 120-21.

⁷ By comparison, in 1960 Los Angeles had 6 million, New York more than 10.5 million, and Buenos Aires 7 million people. See Francis Violich, in collaboration with Robert Daughter, *Urban Planning for Latin America: The Challenge of Metropolitan Growth*. Boston, Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain; Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 1987, pp. 259-263, 324.

⁸ A good starting point on this academic exchange, transfer of knowledge, and reception of these ideas in Chile is Juan Gabriel Valdés, *Pinochet's Economists: The Chicago School in Chile*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

⁹ On agrarian reform and gender up to the 1973 coup, see Heidi Tinsman, *Partners in Conflict: The Politics of Gender, Sexuality, and Labor in the Chilean Agrarian Reform, 1950-1973*. Durham, Duke University Press, 2002; for the neoliberal period see Heidi Tinsman, "Politics of Gender and Consumption in Authoritarian Chile, 1973-1990: Women Agricultural Workers in the Fruit-Export Industry", *Latin American Research Review*, Vol. 41, No 3, 2006, pp. 7-31. For UC-Davis's take on its own role, see Kathleen Holder, "Chilean Fresh", *UC Davis Magazine Online*, Vol. 22, No 3, 2005, http://ucdavismagazine.ucdavis.edu/issues/sp05/feature_3.html

¹⁰ See Yves Dezalay and Bryant G. Garth, *The Internationalization of Palace Wars. Lawyers, Economists, and the Contest to Transform Latin American States*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2002.

¹¹ Kathleen Maclay, "Francis Violich, emeritus professor of city planning and landscape architecture, dies", 7 Sept 2005. UC Berkeley News. http://berkeley.edu/news/media/releases/2005/09/07_violich.shtml

¹² Francis Violich, *Cities of Latin America. Housing and Planning to the South*. New York, Reinhold, 1944, p. x.

¹³ Bill Wallace, "Francis J. Violich – Noted UC professor of urban planning", *San Francisco Chronicle*, 26 Aug. 2005. http://articles.sfgate.com/2005-08-26/bay-area/17385571_1_uc-berkeley-urban-planning-city-planning

¹⁴ Maclay, "Francis Violich", *op. cit.* Telesis is defined as "the intelligent direction of effort toward the achievement of an end" (Oxford English Dictionary), suggesting the group's belief in the ability of rational environmental planning to achieve desired social and physical ends.

¹⁵ Francis Violich, "Intellectual Evolution in the Field of City and Regional Planning: A Personal Perspective Toward Holistic Planning Education, 1937-2010", June 2001, IURD Working Paper (Institute of Urban and Regional Development).

¹⁶ He also returned to his roots in Croatia late in life with his book *The Bridge to Dalmatia: A Search for the Meaning of Place* (1998).

¹⁷ Quoted in "In Memoriam: Francis Violich", University of California Academic Senate. <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/inmemoriam/francisviolich.htm>

¹⁸ Francis Violich Papers (FVP), Carton 11, Chile folder, 29 Dec 1953 letter from Violich to Dean Stewart; FVP, Carton 11, Chile folder, exchange beginning Dec 1961 between Violich and Louis Sleeper.

¹⁹ FVP, Carton 11, Chile folder, 13 Aug 1958 letter from Violich to William Wurster.

²⁰ Peter Hall, *Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century*, 3rd ed., Oxford, Blackwell, 2002, pp. 354-55; Mel. Scott, *American City Planning since 1890: A History Commemorating the Fiftieth Anniversary of the American Institute of Planners*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1969, p. 101, 266, 366.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 174-78, 247-54.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 360-63.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 367-72. The rise of Marxist geography was, of course, a complex process with a vast literature that cannot be summarized here.

²⁴ Gorelik, *op. cit.*, p. 123. Gorelik writes that Castells was in Santiago sponsored first by the Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) and then by the Centro Interdisciplinario de Desarrollo Urbano (CIDU), a center for urban planning graduate studies with which Violich was heavily involved. Castells then stayed on to work in Allende's government.

²⁵ Armando de Ramon, *Santiago de Chile (1541-1991) Historia de una sociedad urbana*. Santiago, Catalonia, 2007, p. 220; Gorelik, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

²⁶ FVP, carton 11, Chile folder, 31 July 1968 letter from Violich to Nicolás García.

²⁷ Violich, *Cities of Latin America*, *op. cit.*, p. 158.

²⁸ Arturo Almandoz (ed.), *Planning Latin America's Capital Cities, 1850-1950*. London, Routledge, 2002; Arturo Almandoz, "From Urban to Regional Planning in Latin America, 1920-1950." *Planning Perspectives*, Vol. 25, No 1, Jan. 2010, pp. 87-95; De Ramón, *op. cit.*, pp. 220-221; Jorge E. Hardoy, "Theory and Practice of Urban Planning in Europe, 1850-1930: Its Transfer to Latin America", in *Rethinking the Latin American City*. Eds. Richard M. Morse and Jorge E. Hardoy. Washington, D.C., Woodrow Wilson Center Press, and Baltimore., Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992; Francisco Sabatini and Fernando Soler, "Paradoja de la Planificación Urbana en Chile", *Revista EURE*, Vol. XXI, No 62, 1995, pp. 61-73.

²⁹ Hardoy, *op. cit.*, pp. 27-35; Sabatini and Soler, *op. cit.*, p. 63; for Brazil and Argentina, see Jeffrey D. Needell, "Rio de Janeiro and Buenos Aires. Public Space and Public Consciousness in *Fin-de-Siècle* Latin America", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 37, No 3, July 1995, pp. 519-540.

³⁰ Hardoy, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-27.

³¹ De Ramón, *op. cit.*, pp. 208-211, 222-225; Montserrat Palmer, *La Ciudad jardín como modelo de crecimiento urbano, Santiago 1935-1960*, Santiago, Facultad de Arquitectura y Bellas Artes de la Universidad Católica de Chile, 1987.

³² For the former view, see Almandoz, "From Urban to Regional Planning", *op. cit.*, p. 90; for the latter, see Sabatini and Soler, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-65. All acknowledge a certain tension in Brunner's plans between the European urbanism of monumental, dense cities and the growing tendency toward low-density suburban growth associated with Britain and the U.S.

³³ Almandoz, "From Urban to Regional Planning in Latin America", *op. cit.*, p. 91, 93; Sabatini and Soler, *op. cit.*, p. 64, fn. 6.

³⁴ "La arquitectura no es una profesión, es un estado de espíritu" (all translations mine), *AUCA* Dec 1965, No. 1, p.1. Here the editors also describe the journal's precursors such as *Arquitectura y Construcción* from 1945 to 1950.

³⁵ In his 1944 *Cities of Latin America*, p. 169, Violich wrote that the "younger practicing architects and planners...look toward the United States rather than to Europe to learn more about building the cities of the future, and they always asked of possibilities for traveling, studying, or working in our country." Architecture also shifted its focus to the United States, in part because leading figures such as Walter Gropius and Mies Van der Rohe had fled Europe during the war.

³⁶ Almandoz, "From Urban to Regional Planning in Latin America", *op. cit.*, p. 93.

³⁷ Gorelik, *op. cit.*, pp. 114-119.

³⁸ Michael E. Conroy, "Rejection of Growth Center Strategy in Latin American Regional Development Planning", *Land Economics*, Vol. XLIX, No 4, Nov. 1973, p. 371. He describes a quick reversal from growth center strategy across Latin America in the early 1970s, but this does not concern us yet. The political context of the late 1960s and early 1970s will be discussed later in the paper.

³⁹ In fact, economics had only very recently begun to emerge as a discipline in Latin America. The absence of economics as an established department at the Catholic University in Santiago is partly why it developed such a close exchange with the University of Chicago in these years.

⁴⁰ Almandoz, "From Urban to Regional Planning in Latin America", *op. cit.*, p. 88.

⁴¹ De Ramón, *op. cit.*, p. 221.

⁴² Sabatini and Soler, *op. cit.*, pp. 67-68.

⁴³ De Ramón, *op. cit.*, pp. 226-227. By contrast, Santiago comprised 35 *comunas* in 1980.

⁴⁴ The actual work of reconstruction after the earthquake was assigned to a separate entity, the Corporación de Reconstrucción. The proliferation of government agencies with similar aims became a trend in Chile, which many blamed for bureaucratic confusion and inefficiency.

⁴⁵ De Ramón, *op. cit.*, p. 215, 233-234

⁴⁶ Violich, *Cities of Latin America*, *op. cit.*, p. 158.

⁴⁷ Francis Violich, "Education for urban and regional planning in Chile. A report to the United States Operations Mission to Chile and the Ministry of Public Works of the Government of Chile", Berkeley, 1960, p. 15.

⁴⁸ He also proposed an exchange with the University of California. In response, the Catholic University group proposed that they receive a doctoral student who could teach as a professor for a year, with possible funding from the Fulbright

Commission. This idea appears to have fallen through, however.

⁴⁹ FVP, carton 11, Chile folder, 7 Feb 1957 letter from Enrique Ruffat to Violich; FVP, carton 11, Chile folder, 15 March 1957 letter from Violich to Ruffat; FVP, carton 11, Chile folder, 17 Oct 1956 notes from a meeting of the Comisión de Docencia, School of Architecture, Catholic University of Chile.

⁵⁰ FVP, carton 11, Chile folder, 11 Nov 1959 letter from Nicolás García to Violich.

⁵¹ FVP, carton 11, Chile folder, 1958 Oct 14 letter from Juan Astica to Violich.

⁵² And Violich, as we shall see, was nothing if not optimistic and idealistic. In a 1959 paper presented at a Stanford conference, he wrote that "systematic" urban planning could improve society as a whole through "equable distribution" of schools (thus combating illiteracy), sanitary sewer systems and pure water supply (thus improving health and the "physical vigor needed for the drive toward self-betterment"), distribution of parks and recreation facilities (thus improving health and mental well-being), housing, and economic betterment (FVP, carton 12, unnamed folder, "Urban Development in Latin America: A review," paper for Stanford Conference on Latin America, 1959, pp. 15-16). A decade later, as U.S.-Chile planning partnerships deteriorated, he recognized the desperate situation but was still strikingly optimistic: "After [my sabbatical] I'll have ALL the answers for Latin America. And, from what I've seen on my recent trips, they are needed, but URGENTLY, Peace Corps types not withstanding" (FVP, carton 11, Chile folder, 28 July 1969 letter from Violich to Don Neuwirth).

⁵³ Point IV derived its name from President Harry Truman's inaugural speech, in which technical assistance was his fourth foreign policy objective. The International Cooperation Association (ICA) and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) were later iterations of what was essentially the same U.S. office of technical assistance in Chile. The names shifted, but the office remained the same in terms of how the actors involved related to it. The United States Operations Mission to Chile (USOM-Chile) was also closely related to Point IV, ICA, and USAID.

⁵⁴ FVP, carton 11, Chile folder, 23 Oct 1959 letter from Antolín López to Violich. García and Astica also discuss the same Point IV agreement in their letters cited above.

⁵⁵ FVP, carton 11, Chile folder, 25 Jan 1960 letter from Juan Astica to Violich.

⁵⁶ FVP, carton 11, Chile folder, 16 Nov 1959 letter from Violich to Antolín López.

⁵⁷ FVP, carton 11, Chile folder, 25 Jan 1960 letter from Juan Astica to Violich.

⁵⁸ FVP, carton 11, Chile folder, 23 Dec 1959 letter from Lester Manning to Violich.

⁵⁹ For the USOM-Chile report, see Violich, "Education for urban and regional planning in Chile." For the SIAP report, see Sociedad Interamericana de Planificación, "La Enseñanza de la Planificación en la América Latina."

⁶⁰ FVP, carton 11, Chile folder, 26 Dec 1961 letter from Edmond Hoben to Violich.

⁶¹ FVP, carton 12, unnamed folder, Sep 1958, "Urban Growth and Planning in Chile" manuscript.

⁶² Emphasis mine. FVP, carton 11, Chile folder, 27 Dec 1961, "City Planning Educator-Administrator" job announcement.

⁶³ The military metaphor is apt, as Violich himself described his efforts in a similar vein. "Indeed, in the training of persons to deal with problems of development in a country where social and economic conditions are as pressing as they are in Chile, one is inspired to seek the kind of short-cut training methods employed in wartime as a means of turning out an army of workers to attack the problems in need of planning." Violich, "Education for urban and regional planning in Chile," *op. cit.*, p. 32.

⁶⁴ FVP, carton 11, Chile folder, 25 Jan 1960 letter from Juan Astica to Violich.

⁶⁵ Astica also lobbied to have Violich included on the team who carried out the SIAP study of planning education in Latin America. See the same 25 Jan 1960 letter to Violich.

⁶⁶ FVP, carton 11, Chile folder, 25 Jan 1960 letter from Juan Astica to Violich.

⁶⁷ FVP, carton 11, Chile folder, 24 Feb 1960 letter from Violich to Juan Astica.

⁶⁸ See FVP, box 2, Chile folder, 16 July 1963 letter from Violich to Claude F. Della Paolera, which makes clear that Astica spent at least two months in Berkeley with Violich in 1962.

⁶⁹ Similar centers had been established in Peru with the Inter-American Urban and Regional Planning Center (PIAPUR) and in Argentina with Jorge Hardoy's Instituto de Planeamiento Regional y Urbano at the Universidad de Litoral, created in 1962 and later moved to Buenos Aires as the Centro de Estudios Urbanos y Regionales (FVP, box 2, Barañano, Eduardo (Alliance for Progress) folder, "Planning Education and the Alliance for Progress," address by Eduardo Barañano to the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, 1 March 1962.

⁷⁰ FVP, carton 12, Proposed Chilean Visit-Convenio folder, "The Ford Foundation Urban and Regional Development Advisory Program in Chile," pp. 4-5.

⁷¹ FVP, box 1, K folder, 5 March 1963 memo from Violich to Jack Kent.

⁷² FVP, box 1, H folder, 18 May 1

963 letter from Aaron Horwitz to Violich and John Parker.

⁷³ Jeffrey F. Taffett, *Foreign Aid as Foreign Policy. The Alliance for Progress in Latin America*. New York, Routledge, 2007, pp. 5, 20-21; Inter-American Economic and Social Council, Alliance for Progress official documents, pp. 10-11.

⁷⁴ In addition to USAID's projects, the Frei campaign was also given a major boost from secret CIA funding.

⁷⁵ Taffett, *op. cit.*, p. 76, 79.

⁷⁶ FVP, box 2, Barañano, Eduardo (Alliance for Progress) folder, "Planning Education and the Alliance for Progress," address by Eduardo Barañano to the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, 1 March 1962.

⁷⁷ FVP, box 2, Barañano, Eduardo (Alliance for Progress) folder, "Planning Education and the Alliance for Progress," address by Eduardo Barañano to the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, 1 March 1962.

- ⁷⁸ FVP, carton 12, unnamed folder, "Urban Development in Latin America: A review," paper for Stanford Conference on Latin America, 1959, p. 15.
- ⁷⁹ George Natanson, "California Ally of Chile in Red Fight: State's Project Significant with Election of Frei." *Los Angeles Times*, 17 Sept 1964, p. 16.; Jerry Gillam, "California, Chile, U.S. Join in Alliance Pact", *Los Angeles Times*, 7 Dec 1963, p. 11; *The Chile-California Program*, Sacramento, June 8, 1964.
- ⁸⁰ FVP, carton 12, Proposed Chilean Visit-Convenio folder, "Proposal to the Ford Foundation from the University of Chile and the University of California," 12 March 1965.
- ⁸¹ FVP, carton 12, Proposed Chilean Visit-Convenio folder, "University of Chile and University of California establish an 'agreement of cooperation,'" University bulletin, 16 Aug 1965, p. 24; FVP, carton 12, Proposed Chilean Visit-Convenio folder, 11 June 1965 memo from Dean Fretter to "Faculty interested in Latin America."
- ⁸² FVP, carton 12, Proposed Chilean Visit-Convenio folder, 27 Oct 1965 memo from Violich to DCRP faculty.
- ⁸³ FVP, carton 12, Proposed Chilean Visit-Convenio folder, 4 Nov 1965 memo from John W. Dyckman to DCRP faculty.
- ⁸⁴ FVP, carton 11, U of Calif-U of Chile Cooperative Program folder, 5 Oct 1966 letter from Earl Jones to Violich; FVP, carton 11, U of Calif-U of Chile Cooperative Program folder, 14 Oct 1966 letter from Earl Jones to Violich.
- ⁸⁵ FVP, carton 12, Proposed Chilean Visit-Convenio folder, 5 Aug 1966 letter from René Urbina to Violich, 16 Sept 1966 letter from René Urbina to Violich.
- ⁸⁶ FVP, carton 12, Proposed Chilean Visit-Convenio folder, 15 Sept 1966 letter from Violich to René Urbina.
- ⁸⁷ FVP, carton 12, Proposed Chilean Visit-Convenio folder, 29 May 1967 letter from Corwin Mocine to Coordinating Committee, University of Chile-University of California Exchange Program.
- ⁸⁸ FVP, box 2, Chile folder, 21 June 1965 letter from Guillermo Geisse to Violich.
- ⁸⁹ FVP, carton 11, Calif-Chile Urban Studies folder, 31 May 1965 letter from Juan Astica to Violich, 13 July 1965 letter from Violich to Juan Astica.
- ⁹⁰ FVP, carton 11, Calif-Chile Urban Studies folder, 12 Oct 1966 letter from Dick Willig to Violich.
- ⁹¹ FVP, carton 11, Calif-Chile Urban Studies folder, 29 May 1965 letter from Paul Wendt to Violich.
- ⁹² The country's architecture journal protested that the physical city itself was being lost in the picture, engulfed by other types of planning. "Today everyone speaks of planning: planning in the economy, in education, in health, in agriculture," complained a 1967 editorial. "Nonetheless, we have forgotten to speak of THE PLANNING OF OUR CITY." It was not that the city had been abandoned. Far from it: city planning had come to mean so many different things to so many different government agencies that the earlier notion of architecture-centered planning had taken a backseat to a comprehensive vision of economic, social, and physical urban planning (*AUCA*, No. 10, 1967, p. 11).
- ⁹³ FVP, carton 11, Calif-Chile Urban Studies folder, 28 May 1965 letter from Violich to Bill Wheaton; FVP, carton 11, Calif-Chile Urban Studies folder, 13 July 1965 letter from Violich to Juan Astica.
- ⁹⁴ Violich, *Urban Planning for Latin America*, *op. cit.*, p. 289.
- ⁹⁵ Assistance from the Chile-California program included a survey of origin-destination transportation data, which Juan Parrochia, head of the Metro planning commission, praised as the first study of its kind in Chile (Parrochia, p. 47).
- ⁹⁶ FVP, carton 11, Calif-Chile Urban Studies folder, 27 May 1965 letter from Paul Wendt to Bill (Wheaton).
- ⁹⁷ FVP, carton 11, Calif-Chile Urban Studies folder, 27 May 1965 letter from Paul Wendt to Bill (Wheaton).
- ⁹⁸ Political tensions were no doubt exacerbated by the shifting U.S. stance toward Chile in the first years of Frei's government. The U.S. became more strict about how it dispensed aid (far more than it was with Alessandri, ironically), in part because there was not as much urgency in terms of a Communist threat as in 1963-4. In terms of economic policies, especially regarding the 1966 loan terms, the U.S. became more interested in promoting stabilization policies (cutting government spending to curb inflation and promote a stable market and investment environment, supported by the IMF and World Bank) than in structuralist policies ("priming the pump" by encouraging government spending and import substitution industrialization policies to create domestic consumers and industries, supported by CEPAL economists such as Raúl Prebisch). See Taffett, *op. cit.*, ch. 4.
- ⁹⁹ FVP, Carton 12, Proposed Chilean Visit-Convenio folder, 22 Nov 1966 letter from Johannes Wilbert to Violich.
- ¹⁰⁰ FVP, Carton 12, Proposed Chilean Visit-Convenio folder, 29 May 1967 letter from Corwin Mocine to Coordinating Committee, University of Chile-University of California Exchange Program. Mocine also emphasized that the physical location of Boeninger's institute was more centrally located in Santiago than Urbina's institute, and thus could potentially attract interdisciplinary students more easily. It seems ironic – or perhaps fitting – that Mocine became so preoccupied with the *physical location* of his summer seminar, given his profession as an urban planner.
- ¹⁰¹ The presence of Berkeley planners, the Ford Foundation, and John Friedmann is one example of the abundance of foreign urban planning experts. Another example is in the advice of John Strasma, an agricultural economist working in Chile for the University of Wisconsin, who cautioned the Berkeley DCRP that they would need to convince Chileans of the usefulness of studying in California, given the many connections to opportunities with other institutions, both domestic and international, that they already had (FVP, carton 12, Proposed Chilean Visit-Convenio folder, 12 Jan 1966 memo from John Dyckman to Violich *et al.*) It appears ironic that there was some "duplication" of effort and lack of institutional coordination, given Astica's early complaint about lack of coordination in Chile planning, and his effort to remedy that by turning to Berkeley.
- ¹⁰² FVP, carton 11, Chile folder, 28 July 1969, letter from Violich to Waldo López.
- ¹⁰³ FVP, carton 11, Chile folder, 19 Feb 1969 letter from Waldo López to Violich.
- ¹⁰⁴ Another sign was the trend of newly minted Berkeley planners to join the ranks of the Peace Corps volunteers in Chile

working on community development, rather than to secure jobs related to comprehensive city-wide plans, as Berkeley graduates had done in the late 1950s and early 1960s.

¹⁰⁵ Francis Violich and Juan B. Astica, *Community Development and the Urban Planning Process in Latin America*, Los Angeles, Latin American Center, University of California Los Angeles, 1967. p. 8, 28.

¹⁰⁶ FVP, box 1, K folder, 5 March 1963 memo from Violich to Jack Kent.

¹⁰⁷ De Ramón, *op. cit.*, p. 248.

¹⁰⁸ The politicized environment is evident not only in *poblaciones* but within the urban planning ministries themselves. In 1967, there was a strike by employees at the Corporación de Vivienda (CORVI) and protests by MINVU architects that management did not treat them with dignity and that it was unfairly docking their pay. In response, management criticized these architects for isolating themselves and failing to adapt to the “epoch in which we live, which is of ‘the masses’ and not of ‘the elites’” (*AUCA*, No. 10, p. 13).

¹⁰⁹ Leonard Gross, *The Last, Best Hope, Eduardo Frei and Chilean Democracy*, New York, Random House, 1967.

¹¹⁰ FVP, box 2, Barañano, Eduardo (Alliance for Progress) folder, 30 March 1962 letter from Eduardo Barañano to Violich).

¹¹¹ For a starting point on the *pobladores* movement, see Mario Garcés, *Tomando su sitio: El movimiento de pobladores de Santiago, 1957-1970*. Santiago, LOM, 2002; and Manuel Castells, *The City and the Grassroots: A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1983., pp. 199-209.