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1. Introduction

Naquele tempo, só havia uma favela no perímetro urbano de Belo Horizonte. Era a que ficava situada nas imediações da Pedreira Prado Lopes. Voltei minha atenção para aquele problema. Tratava-se de uma grande área, localizada bem próxima do centro comercial, e que poderia ser recuperada, transformando-se num aprazível bairro residencial. Assim, idealizei um conjunto residencial popular, destinado à classe operária que, cada dia, se tornava mais numerosa...¹

In his autobiography published in 1976, Juscelino Kubitschek remembered the urban reforms that he had initiated during his term as the mayor of Belo Horizonte, the capital of the federal state of Minas Gerais in southeastern Brazil, in the early 1940s. In the quoted passage, he refers to a public housing complex that is known in Belo Horizonte as the Conjunto IAPI.² Built in the neighborhood of Lagoinha between 1944 and 1951, it was the outcome of a collaboration between the Prefeitura de Belo Horizonte (PBH)³ under Kubitschek and the Instituto de Aposentadoria e Pensões dos Industriários (IAPI),⁴ to which they had agreed some years earlier. For Kubitschek and Belo Horizonte’s municipal administration, the new multi-story housing development symbolized the city’s modernization.

The project was also a manifestation of societal and political transformations that had been in progress in Brazil, and other Latin American countries, since the early 1930s. After he had seized power in the so-called ‘1930 Revolution,’ Getúlio Vargas adopted a populist style of gov-

---

¹ Kubitschek, Juscelino: Meu caminho para Brasília. Vol. 2: a escalada política. Rio de Janeiro 1976, 32. “At that time, there was only one slum within the city limits of Belo Horizonte. It was the one that was located right in Pedreira Prado Lopes. I turned my attention to that problem. It concerned a large area, located close to the commercial center, which could be renovated, transforming it into a pleasant residential district. So, I conceived a public housing complex for the working-class, which was growing every day…” I have translated all Brazilian quotations into English in the footnotes.

² Its official name is Conjunto Residencial São Cristóvão-IAPI. I use the shorter and more common designation.

³ This is the official name of Belo Horizonte’s municipal administration.

⁴ The Brazilian national government under Getúlio Vargas established the IAPI in 1936 as a pension fund for industrial workers. See chapter 2.
erning. He introduced new legislation that provided the growing urban working class medical care, paid vacation, elementary education, and old-age pensions, among other benefits. These measures accompanied a policy of import-substitution industrialization that sought to foster national development (desenvolvimento nacional) and reduce the influence of traditional oligarchic elites and supposed foreign imperialism.\textsuperscript{5} Other populist regimes that came to power in Latin America between the 1930s and the 1960s followed a similar course, especially the governments of Lázaro Cárdenas in Mexico (1934-1940), Juan Perón in Argentina (1946-1955), and Victor Paz Estenssoro in Bolivia (1952-1956 and 1960-1964). Populist leaders across the subcontinent sought to organize their societies from above and strengthen their hold on power by pursuing policies of social harmony, which included forging alliances between different social classes.\textsuperscript{6} These policies were a strategy to gain public support by preventing social unrest and thereby maintain themselves in power. However, Vargas’s social policies actually reinforced existing inequalities since only those who were employed in the formal economy could benefit from them.\textsuperscript{7}

In Brazil, the lack of housing for the growing number of rural migrants coming to the cities in search of work was a serious threat to harmony. From 1937 until the second half of the 1960s, when the military regime abolished them, the state’s most important tool for the creation of housing were the Institutos de Aposentadoria e Pensões (IAPs). These were government-controlled corporations that the Estado Novo had originally established as public pension funds in 1933.\textsuperscript{8}

\textsuperscript{6} Ianni: \textit{A formação do estado populista na América Latina}, 124.
Recently, the IAPs and their mid-20th-century housing programs have sparked growing interest among scholars of architecture and urbanism. However, historians have almost entirely ignored this important period in the early history of social housing in Brazil. This empirical historical study takes a step toward addressing this lack. Scholars of the IAPs’ housing programs have consulted historical sources, but they have not made full use of the wide range of relevant contemporary documents. In this study, I work with official reports, legislative texts, autobiographical material, newspaper and magazine articles, printed versions of political speeches, articles from professional journals, photographs, and interviews. By analyzing these sources with historical methods, I pursue the study’s main subject, the complex interrelationships among social housing policies, socio-spatial segregation, and territorial stigmatization, which have not yet been studied from the perspective of social history. More specifically, I explore these interrelationships through a case study of the Conjunto IAPI in Belo Horizonte, whose history, as I explain in the next section, has not yet been the subject of detailed study. I focus on the period from the early 1940s, when it was decided to build the Conjunto IAPI, to the early 1970s, by which time its apartments had been sold to their tenants and several infrastructural projects in its neighborhood were completed.

Historians of social housing should be sensitive to the contemporary national and local sociopolitical context. So, I analyze the interests of the federal and city authorities who were responsible for housing programs. I also consider how continuities and changes in national and municipal policies affected the development of residential areas in the long term. But my study is not limited to such political and structural issues. I consider social housing in the terms of social and cultural history. Research within a range of disciplines has largely overlooked the course of daily life in social housing complexes in the past and the present, but I regard neighborliness and social life as particularly relevant and explore them through interviews with residents.

In their work on housing and segregation in Latin American cities, sociologists have emphasized that the stigmatization of slums has harmful consequences for their residents.9 I use ‘stigmatization’ in Goffman’s

---

(1975) sense of a process in which one group ascribes some negative moral attribute to another. The residents of public housing in Brazilian cities have been stigmatized by outsiders who stereotype their residences as concentrations of poverty. So, I analyze the historical dynamics and consequences of territorial stigmatization, for I understand public housing not only as a result of government policy but also as urban spaces that individuals and groups experience and shape by their actions.

In his memoirs, Kubitschek wrote about the “favela problem” and the transformation of the Lagoinha neighborhood into a pleasant residential district. Because public housing has had a profound impact on the social spaces, architecture, and street scenes of Brazilian cities since the late 1930s, its history is an important part of Brazilian urban and social history, and, so, it is important to consider how conjuntos habitacionais (public housing complexes) have contributed to the changing faces of the neighborhoods around them. And, as social housing is a factor in the development of urban infrastructure, I also consider how infrastructure, in particular, shops, hospitals, and schools, influenced daily life in the Conjunto IAPI. Researchers into social housing in Brazil have not yet pursued these issues in detail nor have they paid much attention to the relationship between the IAPs’ housing projects and the transformation of local social structures. For example, the excerpt from Kubitschek’s autobiography quoted at the start of this chapter makes it clear that construction of the Conjunto IAPI had far-reaching consequences for the inhabitants of the neighboring favela of Pedreira Prado Lopes. I describe these repercussions in discussing how social housing contributed to the social exclusion of the poor, particularly, favela inhabitants, and, more generally, to processes of socio-spatial segregation, including the different access of social groups to urban infrastructure and public services like housing, public transportation, healthcare, and education.

I approach all of these issues from multiple perspectives, for social housing in Brazilian cities in the mid-20th century involved political, urban, social, and cultural developments both locally and nationally. Thereby, I seek to explain the complex historical relationships among urbanization, social housing, segregation, and territorial stigmatization.

10 Goffman’s book was first published in the United States in 1963.
11 In section 1.4, I discuss conceptual approaches to territorial stigmatization that have been developed by urban sociologists and explain why these concepts are useful for my work.
1.1. The State of Research

Since the mid-20th century, architects, city planners, sociologists, historians, geographers, and others have studied the history of Brazilian cities, mostly large cities in southeastern and northeastern Brazil in the 20th century. The four most important lines of research have been urban modernization, the historical development of city planning as a profession and an academic discipline, housing, and conceptions of the city.

Research into housing was the starting point of Brazilian urban studies. Since the second half of the 1960s, the spread of impoverished enclaves, in particular favelas, has been a popular topic of this research. And the housing crisis that accompanied the gradual political liberalization (abertura) of the late 1970s stimulated academic interest in the history of housing. At first, historians of housing focused largely on the development of workers’ neighborhoods (vilas operárias) during the República Velha (1889-1930), a subject that mirrored the general interest in the social history of the early 20th century that began at that time. In the 1980s, most of the work on the history of housing focused on Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, and Recife (Bonduki 1982, Vaz 1985/1986, Abreu 1986). By the end of the decade, though, some authors had taken up a national perspective. In the next decade, the founding of research associations like the Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação e Pesquisa em

13 Ibid., 24.
15 In 2005, the sociologist Lícia do Prado Valladares published A invenção da favela. Do mito de origem a favela com, which is the most detailed study available of the historical development of research on favelas.
16 Bonduki: “Habituação no Brasil: uma história em construção”, 3. Throughout the 1970s, theories about capitalist accumulation influenced research into urbanization and its outcomes, the housing deficit, the actions of the state, and possible alternatives.
17 Ibid., 3-5. Drawing upon post-Marxist approaches and Foucault’s concept of micropolitics, several Brazilian scholars described the vilas operárias as instruments of exploitation and social control.
18 Ibid., 4-5.
Planejamento Urbano e Regional (ANPUR) and the organization of conferences (particularly the first Seminário de História da Cidade e do Urbanismo in 1990) were important steps towards the institutionalization of urban studies and encouraged scholars to broaden their studies of the history of urban housing in Brazil. At the same time, the establishment of the research network Urbanismo e Planejamento Urbano no Brasil, 1900-1950, signaled a shift of interest from housing to city planning.\(^9\)

Research has addressed the role of the state in the history of housing. Before the early 1980s, most studies of housing policies had focused on the activities of the Banco Nacional da Habitação (BNH) since its inception in 1964.\(^{20}\) Scholars then began to study a wider range of issues, like the influence of the state on the real estate market\(^{21}\) and the consequences of rent control and the Leis do Inquilinato, which the Estado Novo introduced in the 1940s and succeeding governments strengthened.\(^{22}\) Since then, research has addressed the influence of housing policies on socio-spatial segregation. Several authors (e.g., Azevedo and Andrade 1982, Maricato 2009) have concluded that real estate speculation and the state’s fostering of private interests have increased social inequality and segregation. Most of the work that has approached these subjects historically has focused on the spread of illegal housing since the early 20\(^{th}\) century.\(^{23}\) Public housing projects built by the state after 1937, like the Conjunto IAPI, have received much less attention. Taking a broader approach, the geographer Flávio Villaça (1997/2001/2003) and the political scientist Wanderley Guilherme dos Santos (1979) have shown that there is a historical correlation between housing policies and socio-spatial segregation. I discuss their findings in the last section of this introduction, for they provide a useful framework for my analysis of the relationship between the Conjunto IAPI’s historical development and the process of segregation in the neighborhood of Lagoinha.

19 Leme et al. (1999) published the results of the network’s studies in eight Brazilian cities.
22 See, for instance, the work published by Melo (1987, 1991 a) and Bonduki (1994).
23 Maricato, Erminia: “Por um novo enfoque teórico na pesquisa sobre habitação.” In: Cadernos Metrópole (PUC São Paulo) vol. 21 (2009), 34-35.
Allow me to summarize the state of research into the IAPs and their housing activities between 1937 and the late 1960s. Architects have done most of it. However, Marta Farah’s master’s thesis in sociology (1983) was a pioneering work in which she collected data on the IAPs’ public housing projects and analyzed the contemporary ideological background. Melo (1987) and Varon (1988) also discussed the IAPs and their housing programs. The history of social housing had finally stimulated academic interest, and this early work was part of a growing interest in the development of housing policies before 1964. However, many authors still ignore the IAPs and regard their activities as insignificant.

In 1998, the architect Nabil Georges Bonduki published *Origens da Habitação Social no Brasil: arquitetura moderna, lei do inquilinato e difusão da casa própria*, in which he presented his extensive research on the development of working-class housing in Brazil between 1930 and 1964. Several revised editions have been published, and the book has become the main reference for scholars of the IAPs and their public housing projects. Bonduki discussed the political and social circumstances that led the Brazilian government to consider the housing crisis from the 1930s onwards. His approach was interdisciplinary with sociological, social historical, political, and economic dimensions.

---

24 Melo’s work was a Ph.D. thesis in political science. Varon wrote her master’s thesis in architecture on the IAPs.
25 See Bonduki: “Habitação no Brasil: uma história em construção”, 4-5. The authors mentioned were among the first scholars to approach housing from a historical perspective and with a national focus.
26 See, for example, Lehfeld (1988, 24), Silva (1989, 38), and Maricato (2004, 36).
28 All citations are to the 5th edition (2011) of Bonduki’s book.
In his introduction, Bonduki defined social housing (habitação social) as follows:\(^{30}\)

Neste sentido, utilizamos o termo habitação social não apenas no sentido corrente, ou seja, habitação produzida e financiada por órgãos estatais destinada à população de baixa renda, mas num sentido mais amplo, que inclui também a regulamentação estatal da locação habitacional e incorporação, como um problema do Estado, da falta de infra-estrutura urbana gerada pelo loteamento privado [of land].\(^{31}\)

Bonduki’s definition of social housing is useful in that it refers to the state’s responsibility for solving the problem of missing infrastructure in public housing developments and their surroundings. I draw upon this understanding of social housing when, in chapters 3 and 4, I consider the development of infrastructure in the neighborhood around the Conjunto IAPI and the effects of the complex’s central location.

Bonduki’s book helped to make the history of social housing in Brazil and the activities of the IAPs current subjects of interest. Since 1995, Bonduki has coordinated the research group Pioneiros da Habitação Social, which includes architects from several universities in São Paulo.\(^{32}\) The group specializes in the relationships among the state, working-class housing, and modernist architecture in the 1940s and 1950s. Several of its publications describe how housing became a social issue in the context of modernization, intensified capital accumulation, and accelerated urbanization.\(^{33}\) In his book, Bonduki remarked on how social housing policies and the deterioration of public areas and their equipment in housing develop-
ments have influenced sociability in them since the late 1960s. However, neither his book nor the publications of the Pioneiros da Habitação Social have addressed social life in detail, an important matter for a social- and cultural-historical understanding of the IAPs and their housing programs.

The BNH and housing policies under the military dictatorship have traditionally been much more popular subjects of research than the IAPs and the municipal and federal entities responsible for housing between the 1930s and the 1960s.

Given the range of subjects in urban and housing history that historians have studied, it is astonishing that they have continually ignored the IAPs. The attention that architects now pay to them is the result of programs in the history of architecture and urbanism at Brazilian universities. But their studies have left many questions unanswered and many sources undiscovered. Therefore, the history of Brazilian social housing in the mid-20th century and the actions of the IAPs, in particular, is an open field for historians.

The IAPs in Belo Horizonte have attracted even less attention than their activities in other cities have. Research into Belo Horizonte’s urban history has tended to concentrate on certain periods. Several studies have discussed the political and ideological background of the city’s founding in the 1930s and the 1940s. In late 2014, Bonduki and the architect Ana Paula Koury published the three volumes of Pioneiros da Habitação Social. The second volume includes a detailed analysis of the most important Brazilian state organs for social housing between 1930 and 1964.

34 See Bonduki: Orígens da habitação social no Brasil, 318-319.
35 The book Habitação e poder: da Fundação da Casa Popular ao Banco Nacional da Habitação (1982) by the sociologist Sérgio de Azevedo and the political scientist Luís Aureliano Gama de Andrade is still an important reference for studies of the BNH and the development of housing policies after 1964. It is important to note that the authors analyzed the BNH while it was still in operation. They also discussed the Fundação da Casa Popular, the first Brazilian state organ for housing, which operated nationally between 1946 and 1964. Bonduki (1998), Gawryszewski (2002), and Trompowsky (2004) have also discussed this institution.

36 Since 2001, the meetings of the Associação Nacional de História have included workshops on urban history, but, remarkably, social housing has not been among the topics discussed.

37 Until the late 1990s, the historiography of Brazilian architecture ignored social housing complexes since many architects found that they lacked aesthetic quality. See Bonduki: “Habitação no Brasil: uma história em construção”, 2-3.
1897 and its development in the following years. Juscelino Kubitschek’s urban reforms of the early 1940s have also been subjects of research. But few scholars have studied Belo Horizonte’s urban development in the 1950s and 1960s.

Research into housing in Belo Horizonte has centered on city housing policies, favelas, and the recent increase in the number of upper-class gated communities (condomínios fechados). Recent research has emphasized the creation of lifestyles, relations among neighbors, and social life in Belo Horizonte’s traditional working-class districts. Housing and socio-spatial segregation have been prominent topics among sociologists, architects, and geographers. Costa (1994), Andrade (2003), Mendonça (2003), and Nascimento (2007) have concluded that socio-spatial segregation has characterized Belo Horizonte’s growth since the late 19th century. Other authors have also approached the subject historically. The sociologist Berenice Martins Guimarães (1991) wrote her doctoral thesis on the development of people’s housing in Belo Horizonte between the 1890s and 1945. An article by the historian Carla Ferretti Santiago (2007) provides a useful overview of the history of the city’s housing crisis and the responses of its governments up to 1960. However, few historians have published detailed work on housing and segregation in Belo Horizonte.

Almost no one has looked into the history of mid-20th century social housing and the activities of the IAPs in Belo Horizonte. From 1936 on,
IAPs built condominiums and houses in the city, but none of these projects has yet been the subject of social historical study. The same is true of the Conjunto IAPI. Guimarães did mention it, but she discussed only the circumstances of its planning, saying that it had been one of Kubitschek’s urban reforms and involved tearing down much of the neighboring favela. Santiago also wrote a few sentences on the conjunto, saying that it was the first working-class housing that the PBH had built but that it did not help solve the housing crisis. The architects Bonduki (1998), Bonduki and Koury (2014), and Botas (2011) analyzed the architecture of several Brazilian public housing developments, including the Conjunto IAPI.

In sum, social housing and the IAPs’ contributions to it over three decades have only recently become the subjects of research, but that work has not discussed some of their important social-historical aspects, like relations among neighbors and the role of social housing in socio-spatial segregation. With few exceptions, existing studies of housing and of the IAPs either have a national focus or consider only Rio de Janeiro or São Paulo. Interest in the history of the Conjunto IAPI, which was the largest and most important of the IAPs’ housing projects in Belo Horizonte, has been limited to details of its planning in the 1940s. So, this study covers a time and a place that has received very little attention from historians of housing.

---

44 Ibid., 221.
45 Santiago, Carla Ferretti: “O problema da habitação popular em Belo Horizonte: 1894-1960.” In: Cadernos de História (PUC Minas) vol. 9 no. 12 (2007), 62. The conclusions drawn by Guimarães and Santiago have been echoed by several authors who mentioned the Conjunto IAPI in their work but did not discuss the background to its founding in detail.
46 In 2007, Belo Horizonte registered the Conjunto IAPI as part of its cultural heritage. As part of its new status, a team of architects and historians published a dossier (GEPH 2007) that includes a detailed analysis of the buildings and grounds. It also summarizes the planning process in the 1940s and the neighborhood’s historical development. Guilherme Maciel Araújo (2009) wrote about the conjunto’s promotion in his master’s thesis in architecture.
1. Introduction

1.2. The Structure of the Book

The book is divided into six chapters. In the last section of this introduction, I outline the main concepts and theoretical approaches that I employ.

In chapter 2, I summarize the history of social housing policies in Brazil between the 1930s and the early 1970s. I show that the 1930s were a watershed in the development of housing policy, for from then on, the housing crisis in the cities was a subject of public discourse. However, early federal action over housing expressed the Vargas government’s political and ideological program. Specifically, I consider the social housing programs of the Institutos de Apodentadoria e Pensões (IAPs) between 1937 and 1964, because one of them, the IAPI, was vital in the establishment of the Conjunto IAPI. I also show that the features that marked social housing policies since the late 1930s continued to do so after 1945, despite Brazil’s return to democracy after the military had removed Vargas from power. As I explain, to understand developments in Belo Horizonte, one must realize that the IAPs offered housing only to participants in the formal economy who became associados, that is, members, who paid monthly fees. Moreover, in the 1940s, 1950s and early 1960s, clientelism and the power of personal contacts limited the extent to which people benefited from social housing all over Brazil. Finally, I also discuss the restructuring of social housing policies under the military dictatorship during the first few years after the 1964 coup d'état and explain how the new regime instrumentalized social housing.

Chapter 3 concentrates on the Conjunto IAPI between the early 1940s and the early 1970s. To begin, though, I summarize the history of the housing crisis in Belo Horizonte and the area of Lagoinha in particular. Working with several sources from the period between 1940 and 1951, I then identify the intentions and motivations of the different actors who participated in the conjunto’s planning and construction. Official documents and municipal legislation defined who could live in the new development. The analysis of these sources shows how leasing regulations that denied the poor access initiated the process of socio-spatial segregation. I also explain how social housing policies, Belo Horizonte’s growth, and

---

47 Bonduki: *Origens da habitação social no Brasil*, 73-77.
municipal urban planning influenced that process. Interviews I conducted with long-term residents of the Conjunto IAPI show that many residents used their personal contacts with powerful figures to get apartments, and I explain how such practices reinforced social exclusion and segregation.

Daily life in the IAPs’ housing projects has received little attention from social historians. Chapter 3 includes a section on the development of relationships among neighbors in the Conjunto IAPI between circa 1948 and the early 1970s. Interviews with residents provide insights into their experiences of living in public housing and identify the events, situations, and places that interviewees remembered as important for establishing social contacts. Residents have suffered from their stigmatization as poor, uneducated, and immoral. The conjunto is located close to a favela and an infamous red-light district, and I explain how its stigma is at least partly the product of municipal policies steering the historical development of its environment. I also analyze how that stigma has affected residents’ lives and show how their social cohesion is a defensive strategy.

One aim in this study is to explain how social housing complexes and their urban environments shaped each other socio-spatially. In chapter 4, I discuss how urban planning and new infrastructure affected the Conjunto IAPI and its neighborhood between the early 1940s and the early 1970s. Beginning in the 1940s, the PBH modernized local traffic routes and expanded public transportation, and throughout the next three decades it established several public institutions, for example, the Hospital Municipal, the Mercadinho Popular, the Colégio Municipal, and the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros, all close to or, in the case of the last, inside of the Conjunto IAPI. I discuss the influence of these institutions on daily life in the complex and show the importance of the development of infrastructure to the history of social housing.

I also take up another of my main subjects, viz., the relationship between social housing and socio-spatial segregation, and I explain the transformation of local socio-spatial structures that took place after the Conjunto IAPI was opened in 1948. As part of this, I consider its important role in the urbanization of Lagoinha. Studying the public institutions in the conjunto’s neighborhood shows why a significant segment of Lagoinha’s population, and its favelados in particular, benefited so little from urbanization. I explain how these institutions became places of socio-spatial segregation from which the poor, contrary to most of the conjunto’s residents, were excluded.
In the last section of chapter 4, I turn my attention to the parish of São Cristóvão (Paróquia São Cristóvão), whose parish business office is within the Conjunto IAPI. Though my subject is state-organized social housing, the role of the parish is important for two reasons. One is that the Paróquia São Cristóvão has contributed to the local urban and social development in significant ways since the early 1950s. For example, it has performed charity work since then. I describe who participated in this work and who benefited from it, for this information is helpful in determining whether the Church worked for social inclusion or, rather, excluded the poor of Lagoinha. The second reason is that several written sources and some of the interviews that I conducted indicate that the parish was important to residents’ daily lives and to sociability in the complex.

The detailed social history of the relationship between the Conjunto IAPI and the neighboring favela, Pedreira Prado Lopes, illustrates how urbanization, social housing, socio-spatial segregation, and territorial stigmatization have interacted in Brazilian cities. In chapter 5, I explain how construction of the conjunto in the 1940s and, later, of public institutions in its vicinity led to evictions in the favela. On the basis of several contemporary sources, I discuss whether or not the conjunto was built in order to bring about the destruction of the favela. Comparing official documents with the memories of inhabitants reveals conflicting perspectives. I infer from this that the relationship between the Conjunto IAPI and Lagoinha’s development between the early 1940s and the early 1970s is an example of how social housing policies and urban planning denied the poorest citizens access to housing and, thereby, stimulated socio-spatial segregation.

I also describe in chapter 5 the different stigmas that outsiders have given the Conjunto IAPI and the role that residents attribute to the favela in the process of stigmatization. The evictions of favelados from their homes generated tension in the neighborhood over several decades, but relationships between residents of the conjunto and inhabitants of the favela involved more than conflict. My interviews are sources for analyzing the nature and intensity of social contacts between the two in the period under consideration.

---

49 I focus on the Catholic parish even though other congregations, particularly the Igreja Batista da Lagoinha, grew in significance throughout the period under consideration.

50 Ribeiro et al. (2001) and Soares and Antunes (2001) have published collections of interviews with inhabitants of Pedreira Prado Lopes. See below.
consideration, and they provide information about the social segregation between these two residential areas in Lagoinha.

In chapter 6, I discuss the conclusions that can be drawn, and I end with some remarks on further potential research on the history of social housing in Brazil.

1.3. Methodology and Sources

Given the lack of research about the history of social housing in Belo Horizonte, I have consulted contemporary written documents and historical photographs from several local archives and libraries. The interviews that I conducted in the Conjunto IAPI are also sources for this work.

1.3.1. Written Sources and Historical Photographs

Since Belo Horizonte’s founding in the late 19th century, the municipal administration has published annual reports (relatórios anuais) on its activities and developments in the city. I analyzed several of these published between 1942 and 1972.51 They provide information about the activities of the departments of public transportation, public health, education, and housing and present officials’ justifications for their decisions. They also reveal officials’ political interests and their interest in depicting the results of their actions positively.52 The annual report for the year 1940-1941, which includes a detailed description of the Conjunto IAPI, then in its planning stages, is an important source for analyzing the project’s beginnings. In its annual reports for 1948, 1949, 1952, 1953, and 1954, the administration described the establishment of several public institutions in the conjunto’s neighborhood. The Coleção Belo Horizonte at the library of the Escola de Arquitetura of the Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais

51 The reports are available on the PBH’s homepage. http://portalpbh.pbh.gov.br/pbh/ecp/contents.do?evento=conteudo&idConteudo=24201&chPlc=24201 (accessed 23 January 2018). The collection includes annual reports from 1899 to 2005, though several years are missing, and communiqués from the PBH’s employees to the mayor (prefeito). Most of the annual reports were commissioned by mayors, who were accountable to the Câmara Municipal and the governor of Minas Gerais for their activities.
52 Their authors are unknown, but it is likely that they were city employees.
(UFMG) includes other contemporary publications of the PBH, for example, the Anuários de Belo Horizonte (1953-1959)\textsuperscript{53} and a research report from 1959 entitled “Estrutura urbana de Belo Horizonte.” The authors of this report analyzed the spatial distribution of different social classes in Belo Horizonte and categorized the city’s residential areas, including the recently built Conjunto IAPI.\textsuperscript{54} I analyzed these documents and complemented the analysis with Juscelino Kubitschek’s autobiographies \textit{Por que construi Brasília} (1975) and \textit{Meu caminho para Brasília. Vol. 2: a escalada política} (1976), which include his memories about the planning of the \textit{conjunto} in the 1940s.

The Hemeroteca Histórica of the Biblioteca Pública Estadual Luiz de Bessa has a digitalized newspaper databank where I found news articles about workers’ housing, the Conjunto IAPI, and its neighborhood published in three daily newspapers, the \textit{Estado de Minas}, the \textit{Folha de Minas}, and the \textit{Diário da Tarde}, between 1939 and 1971. They informed me about the contemporary views of Belo Horizonte’s local press on questions of housing and urban policies more generally, and about how journalists portrayed the Conjunto IAPI. Their analysis is part of understanding how the media contributed to images of the complex.

Belo Horizonte’s municipal archive, Arquivo Público da Cidade de Belo Horizonte (APCBH), has digitalized versions of several local historical magazines on its homepage, including issues of \textit{Revista Belo Horizonte} (1933-1947),\textsuperscript{55} \textit{Revista Novidades} (1944-1945),\textsuperscript{56} and the commemorative magazine \textit{Revista BH na palavra do prefeito Juscelino Kubitschek} (1944).\textsuperscript{57} These magazines published articles on urban development and housing in Belo Horizonte, the PBH’s plans for the Conjunto IAPI, and public institutions in Lagoinha.

\textsuperscript{53} These yearbooks were similar in content to the PBH’s annual reports.
\textsuperscript{54} The report contained the results of a study that the Sociedade para Análises Gráficas e Mecanográficas Aplicadas aos Complexos Sociais conducted between August 1958 and April 1959. See chapter 3.
\textsuperscript{55} \textit{Revista Belo Horizonte} was a weekly magazine about literature, society, and events in Minas Gerais. It was directed toward a female readership. Its circulation was limited to Belo Horizonte and some of the state’s larger cities.
\textsuperscript{56} \textit{Revista Novidades}, also published in Belo Horizonte, was similar in content to \textit{Revista Belo Horizonte}.
\textsuperscript{57} In this magazine, the Rotary Club of Belo Horizonte published Kubitschek’s speech to the Rotarians of December 1943 in which he spoke about the new project and the construction of the Hospital Municipal.
The archive of Belo Horizonte’s archdiocese (Arquivo Arquidiocesano) provided historical documents of the Paróquia São Cristóvão from the 1950s and 1960s, including private letters, handwritten memoirs, flyers, official reports, and unpublished internal communiqués. These sources complemented my interviews with residents of the Conjunto IAPI about the significance of the Church for daily life there, and they provided information about local urban development. The unpublished communiqués also shed light on clerics’ perceptions of the local population, which were not free of stereotypes. As the archive has not categorized its documents, I use headlines, main subjects, data, and assignments for purposes of reference.

The archive also includes the register of weddings that were celebrated in the Paróquia São Cristóvão between 1952 and 1960. The register of weddings since 1960 is kept at the parish office. It includes information on brides’ and grooms’ birthplaces, baptisms, and places of residence. I analyzed 1,278 of the registers’ entries from the period between 1952 and 1970. 274 of these included at least one partner with an address in the conjunto. So, my analysis produced information on the origins of some of the conjunto’s residents, and by comparing the addresses of brides and grooms I was often able to infer the addresses of spouses in the parish who had married residents. With these data I verified interviewees’ statements about social contacts between residents and others in the neighborhood.

Compared with the ecclesiastical archive, it was difficult to find contemporary documents about educational institutions in the conjunto’s neighborhood. Between 1954 and 1972, the Colégio Municipal was located across the street from the housing complex. The municipal department of education (Secretaria Municipal Adjunta de Educação) would not say if matriculation lists from that school still existed. The Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros was opened in the complex in 1966, but the records clerk simply refused to look for relevant class registers. I had more success at the library of the UFMG’s Faculdade de Educação, where I found two books (one published in 1962, the other in 1973) by former teachers at the Colégio Municipal. They are informative sources on the history of the school, the social background of its pupils and teachers, and daily school life.

58 A list of all primary sources, including the uncategorized documents from the archive of the archdiocese, can be found in the appendix.
Architects and engineers played a vital role in the history of Brazilian social housing. The IAPI gave the project to the architecture firm C.A.S.A. but made one of their own engineers, White Lírio Silva, its supervisor. Unfortunately, very little information is available on either. A dossier published by the city’s Gerência de Patrimônio Histórico Urbano in 2007 includes copies of the original blueprints, but neither Silva nor C.A.S.A. left any other relevant documents.

I have also made use of historical photographs from the 1940s to the 1970s. The photographs, most of which come from a collection in Belo Horizonte’s city archive, portray the Conjunto IAPI, its neighborhood, and local public institutions. They were also sources for my analysis of local processes of segregation. Maps depict Belo Horizonte’s development and the transformations of residential areas. Unfortunately, there are no detailed historical plans of the conjunto’s neighborhood.

1.3.2. Oral History

The residents of the Conjunto IAPI interacted with their neighbors in the complex and those in the neighborhood, and they reacted to internal developments and influences from outside. They are social actors who shaped their environment. They are also witnesses to history, and their memories show how they experienced daily life in the complex. Between 2012 and 2014, I conducted 11 interviews with 10 long-term residents, one former resident, and the parish priest of the Paróquia São Cristóvão. My interviews contribute to our understanding of how residents remembered the socio-spatial dynamics in their neighborhood during the period, and they help us to understand residents’ perceptions of the stigma that outsiders have attached to the conjunto and their experiences of living in a stigmatized place.

59 See Jäger (2009) for the use of photographs as historical sources.
60 The Escola de Arquitetura of the UFMG maintains a collection of historical city maps. In 1997, the Fundação João Pinheiro published Panorama de Belo Horizonte: atlas histórico, which includes reprints of city maps from the 1890s to the 1990s. I did not reprint any city maps, except for the Planta Geral da Cidade de Minas (1895), because of copyright protection.
61 Three were group interviews.
I chose subjects who had lived in the complex either for a long time or during the period under consideration and who had experience with local public institutions or the parish. Six of the 12 were either born in the complex or had moved there some time between 1947 and 1957. Eight were male and four female. Most were between 55 and 70 years old. I contacted them via a blog that one interviewee had hosted since 2009. Some of my first contacts then put me in touch with their neighbors. I later found more subjects by visiting the Igreja São Cristóvão and the local primary school. I conducted most of the interviews in subjects’ apartments, which gave me the chance to see how they looked. The interview process was not always easy. Some residents cancelled at the last minute, and I had little success finding new subjects through telephone calls or during my visits to the complex. Some who refused to be interviewed clearly mistrusted me, and official documents from the Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Minas Gerais (PUC Minas) declaring my status as a researcher did not help. Still, despite their limited number, the interviews provide a perspective on the history of social housing in Brazil that has been largely ignored.

The sociologist Paul Thompson, the historians Alistair Thomson, Jan Vansina, and Lynn Abrams and the literary scholar Alessandro Portelli have discussed the subjectivity of oral history sources in detail. I cannot take up those debates here, but I can point out that written documents are often as subjective as oral sources. Subjectivity is an important issue for me since I consider the social and cultural history of social housing to include individuals’ experiences. So, for example, some interviewees made claims that other sources falsified. Yet, some scholars have de-
fended the reliability of memories recounted in oral history interviews. According to Portelli, such recountings are useful because they show the significance that events, experiences, and prevailing assumptions have for interviewees.\textsuperscript{68}

I began the interviews by asking participants to talk about their backgrounds, for I wanted to know about their reasons for moving into the Conjunto IAPI. Elderly subjects spoke about their childhoods and teen-age years in the complex in the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s,\textsuperscript{69} which gave me an impression of how they remembered the complex and its development over time. I also asked participants how they or their relatives had managed to obtain an apartment in the \textit{conjunto}. Contemporary documents show that official regulations excluded the poor, and the interviews make clear how actual practice reinforced this exclusion and contributed to the process of segregation.

As many residents have suffered from the stigma attached to public housing, I asked interviewees to tell me about the \textit{conjunto}’s reputation among Belo Horizonte’s population. I show how their confrontation with outsiders’ stereotypes influenced their comments about the intensity of social relationships within the complex. Interviewees also mentioned more recent developments, and analyzing their statements shows how their perceptions of present living conditions have romanticized their memories of the past.

I asked interviewees about their perceptions of the neighborhood and its infrastructure and about their experiences with several nearby public institutions and the Paróquia São Cristóvão. In answering, they also recalled which social groups had had access to healthcare, education, and other public services in the neighborhood. I show that their memories shed a different light on the history of Lagoinha’s urban development than do contemporary documents of the city, those public institutions, and the parish. The interviews helped me to determine how much contact residents and


\textsuperscript{69} Drawing upon neurobiology and psychology, oral historians have stressed that memory does not necessarily deteriorate with age and that older people’s memories are as reliable as younger people’s. As people grow older, they increasingly tend to review their earlier years, and research has found that they remember their childhoods more clearly than recent events. See, for instance, Thomson (2011) and Abrams (2010).
people from Pedreira Prado Lopes had and the environments in which they socialized together. Ribeiro et al. (2001) and Soares and Antunes (2001) have published collections of interviews with inhabitants of the favela some of whom remembered the Conjunto IAPI and the local public institutions in the relevant period. I compare their statements to those of my interviewees and to official documents in order to have the sort of contrasting perspectives on local urban development that contribute to understanding the complex relationships between social housing and local processes of socio-spatial segregation.

Given my extensive use of interviewees’ reported memories, I here summarize some of the findings in the literature about memory and its significance for oral history. For a long time, criticism of oral history focused on the unreliability of memory. In analyzing interviews, I take into account that later experiences and the present social and cultural contexts in which people live shape memory. Current research into this matter has revisited and advanced the work on collective memory (memoire collective) of the French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs, who used ‘collective memory’ to refer to the supposed fact that individuals’ memories are affected by collective processes of remembering. According to Halbwachs, present cultural settings are the social frameworks that constitute the background against which social groups form their collective memories. Individual members communicate with their social environment, and such interaction shapes their recalling and interpretation of personal experiences. On this view, interviewees’ memories do not represent their past perceptions of events but are subjective reconstructions of those perceptions put together in the course of the interview. It was easy to see that interviewees’ memories were socially framed in multiple ways. For example, they incorporated into their own memory reports the memories of their older relatives. And their reports mirrored public opinion, which is a product of the media, about the past. Subjects’ personal needs and strategies also determined how they recounted their memories.

---

70 See Thompson (2006) on interviews as sources with a great variety of standpoints and opinions.
72 In the early 1980s, the Popular Memory Group described television, magazines, and books as sources of the general public’s opinions. These media provide interpretations of the past that individuals fall back on when they remember. They also desire the acceptance and affirmation of family and peers, the so-called ‘particular
1.4. Research Concepts and Theoretical Considerations

Social inequalities are common in cities all over the world. Since the early 20th century, scholars from a range of disciplines have developed concepts of socio-spatial segregation to describe how inequalities find expression in urban spaces.73 I use the term ‘socio-spatial’ in Bourdieu’s sense:

…the social world can be represented as a space (with several dimensions) constructed on the basis of principles of differentiation or distribution constituted by the set of properties active within the social universe in question, i.e., capable of conferring strength, power within that universe, on their holder. Agents and groups of agents are thus defined by their relative positions within that space. Each of them is assigned to a position or a precise class of neighboring positions (i.e., a particular region in this space)…74

Scholars of segregation often employ the theoretical concepts of European and North American researchers, but the nature of segregation varies across local and national settings, and, according to several authors, these concepts are not useful for understanding socio-spatial segregation in urban Latin America.75 The concepts of Latin American sociologists and geographers who have studied social inequalities and their spatial dimension in cities on the subcontinent are more fruitful for studying local processes of socio-spatial segregation in Belo Horizonte and, specifically, the neighborhood of the Conjunto IAPI.

For example, due to their shared colonial past, many Latin American cities have similar spatial structures. For centuries, political power was
concentrated in the central areas of cities so that residing downtown indicated a high social status. Beginning in the 1930s, federal economic planning and migration from the countryside to the cities resulted in enormous social polarization and spatial segregation. Summarizing the features of urban socio-spatial segregation in Latin America until the 1980s, Francisco Sabatini stated that the upper class concentrated in central districts while the poor lived on the urban periphery, where infrastructure was underdeveloped. But he noted that this typical pattern was too simple to describe segregation accurately, for favelas, for example, also exist in high-income districts.

For another example, race has long been important in US-American research on urban segregation, but Brazilian scholars explained urban segregation in their country as a socioeconomic phenomenon and largely ignored race for a long time. The source of this difference was the persisting Racial Democracy myth (democracia racial). However, US-American anthropologist Edward E. Telles (1992, 2006) published pioneering work on housing segregation and race in Brazil, and as a result recent research pays more attention to the relationship between skin color and residential inequality in Brazil. However, most of these studies target the present because there is a lack of historical sources and statistical data on the past. This lack of sources makes it impossible to analyze the racial structure of residency in the Conjunto IAPI and its surroundings and, so, to consider

78 The source of the firmly established assumption that Brazilians of all colors enjoy equal opportunities was Gilberto Freyre’s Casa-Grande e Senzala (first published in 1933), though Freyre did not there use the term ‘democracia racial.’ Over decades, this myth masked social inequalities and racial discrimination. Since the 1990s, Brazilian and foreign scholars have rejected it. See, for instance, Twine (1998) and Nascimento (2007).
whether race was a factor in determining access to social housing in Belo Horizonte in the period under consideration.

In his book *Espaço intra-urbano no Brasil* (2001), Flávio Villaça described the main features of urban segregation in Brazil on the basis of his analyses of the spatial structures of São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Belo Horizonte, and Recife and their historical development. He emphasized that urban social groups tend to live apart. However, this does not mean that different social groups do not reside in close proximity to another, as the existence of *favelas* in many high-income districts illustrates. In an article on the Cruzada São Sebastião, a public housing project in Rio de Janeiro’s upper-class Leblon district, the sociologist Luiz Cesar de Queiroz Ribeiro (2008) stressed that the paradox of physical proximity despite social distance is a main feature of segregation in Brazilian cities. As in other Latin American countries, central districts are usually more heterogeneous than peripheral ones, since the upper-middle and upper classes do not reside in the latter, except for *condomínios fechados*, gated communities that have been constructed outside central areas since the 1990s.

According to Villaça, segregation is an instrument for domination through social exclusion and the denial of access to infrastructure and pub-

---

79 “Tal como aqui entendida, a segregação é um processo segundo o qual diferentes classes ou camadas sociais tendem a se concentrar cada vez mais em diferentes regiões gerais ou conjuntos de bairros da metrópole...” (Villaça, Flávio: *Espaço intra-urbano no Brasil*. 2nd Edition. São Paulo 2001, 142). “As it is understood here, segregation is a process in which different classes or layers of society increasingly tend to concentrate themselves in different regions or clusters of neighborhoods in the metropolis...”

80 Construction of Cruzada São Sebastião in the 1950s was the result of an initiative by Rio de Janeiro’s auxiliary bishop Dom Hélder Câmara. According to Ribeiro, most of the residents nowadays are young blacks many of whom are either unemployed or work in the informal sector. Thus, their socioeconomic status is different from those who live in the adjacent district of Leblon, which is one of the wealthiest in Rio de Janeiro’s southern zone. Ribeiro, Luiz Cesar de Queiroz: “Proximidade Territorial e Distância Social: reflexões sobre o efeito do lugar a partir de um enclave urbano”. In: *Revista VeraCidade* vol. 3 no. 3 (2008), 2-3.

81 Ibid., 1-2.

82 Villaça: *Espaço intra-urbano no Brasil*, 143, 339-340. For a long time, researchers considered the pattern of centrally located high-income areas and impoverished urban peripheries to be the predominant characteristic of segregation in Brazilian cities, but several scholars have recently criticized this claim. According to Villaça, a circular sector model best describes the socio-spatial pattern of segregation in Brazilian cities.
lic services like schools, hospitals, parks, and shopping centers. In Brazilian cities, the overwhelming majority of the poor lives in *favelas*, in impoverished neighborhoods on urban peripheries, and in central areas that have fallen into decay despite their location, where they have little access to urban infrastructure, while the middle and upper classes enjoy public services and other amenities. The poor of Lagoinha who lived close to public and private institutions often were not able to make use of them. I explain the influence of factors like poverty, discrimination, and physical violence on this state of affairs.

Official regulations, government action, and municipal urban policies contributed significantly to the exclusion of the poor from housing and public services. Furthermore, the creation of the Conjunto IAPI and new infrastructure in its neighborhood brought with it evictions from the neighboring *favela* and resettlement. As part of my explanation of these developments, I consider how research has interpreted the role of the state in the formation of socio-spatial structures in Brazilian cities.

Unlike in some other countries, particularly the United States and South Africa, segregation in Brazil was never *de jure*. However, several authors have argued that government action is responsible for the persistence of enormous residential inequality. In his book *Cidadania e justiça: a política social na ordem brasileira* (1979), Wanderley Guilherme dos Santos analyzed the historical development of social policies in Brazil, included housing policies and the activities of the IAPs, and formulated the concept of *cidadania regulada* to characterize the social order that the Vargas government had established after the so-called ‘1930 Revolution.’ His concept is useful for understanding the interrelation of state action, the worsening of social inequalities, and socio-spatial segregation. According to Santos’s definition of ‘*cidadania regulada*’:

> Por *cidadania regulada* entendo o conceito cujas raízes encontram-se, não em um código de valores políticos, mas em um sistema de estratificação ocupacional, e que, ademais, tal sistema de estratificação ocupacional é definido por norma legal. Em outras palavras, são cidadãos todos aqueles membros da co-

83 Villaça, Flávio: “A segregação urbana e a justiça (ou a Justiça no injusto espaço urbano).” In: *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Criminais* vol. 11, no. 44 (Jul/Sep 2003), 342.
84 Ibid., 342-344.
85 Mendonça (2003), Andrade (2003), and others have considered the state’s role in the development of socio-spatial segregation in Belo Horizonte. See chapter 3.1.
munidade que se encontram localizados em qualquer uma das ocupações reconhecidas e definidas em lei.86

Under Vargas, the state provided healthcare, housing, and other services only to those employed in the formal economy;87 those working in the informal economy or who were unemployed were excluded from such services. The Vargas regime employed this practice to control the political organizing of the working class.88 The inequalities created by the new social order also manifested themselves in residential segregation and inequality. For example, only people working in the formal economy could rent apartments in public housing developments like the Conjunto IAPI.89

Villaça also studied the state’s role in creating urban socio-spatial segregation and residential inequality. He explained that segregation had contributed to the unequal spatial distribution of resources in Brazilian cities, where processes of segregation determine the locations of residential areas, commercial establishments, and public institutions.90 According to Villaça, elite groups exercise economic, political, and ideological control over urban spaces.91 Regulation of the housing market is their most important economic instrument, but political domination requires control of the apparatus of the state, which has a spatial dimension. State institutions are usually situated within or close to high-income areas. Municipal legislation and the uneven distribution of investment in infrastructure reflect the interests of social elites.92 Segregation is also in their interest. According to Villaça, high-income districts in Brazilian cities tend to grow in certain geographical directions, e.g., southeastwards in Belo Horizonte, that are constant over decades. As a result, prosperity concentrates along certain

86 Santos, Wanderley Guilherme dos: Cidadania e justiça: a política social na ordem brasileira (Contribuições em Ciências Sociais 1). Rio de Janeiro 1979, 75. “By ‘cidadania regulada’ I understand the concept whose roots are found not in a code of political values but in a system of occupational stratification, and, furthermore, this system of occupational stratification is defined by legal norm. In other words, citizens are all those members of society who are to be found in any of the jobs recognized and defined in law.”
87 Ibid., 77.
88 Ibid., 78.
89 See chapter 2.
91 Villaça: Espaço intra-urbano no Brasil, 335-336.
92 Ibid., 336-339.
corridors that determine the locations of new roads, shopping, and other infrastructure. Consequently, the rich and powerful have an easier time shopping, picking their children up from school, and commuting to work.\textsuperscript{93}

According to Villaça, the control of urban spaces also has an ideological dimension, for state authorities and the elite want to present their own concerns as if they were matters of public interest. Thus, the historic centers of many Brazilian cities have been allowed to fall into decay, which city politicians and the upper class continually describe as a natural process caused by the aging of buildings, pollution, and permanent traffic congestion. At the same time, they disseminate negative images of areas outside the districts where they live to justify more investment in the infrastructure of those districts. The result in many cases is the relocating of public institutions, shops, and other infrastructure from historic centers to high-income districts.\textsuperscript{94} According to Villaça, socio-spatial segregation and stigmatization are complementary results of this process. Sabatini and Sierralta described the experience of living in blighted areas and of outsiders’ stigmatization as subjective perceptions of segregation. Often, these perceptions keep people from socializing with members of different social groups and thereby contribute to the consolidation of stigma.\textsuperscript{95}

The residents of the Conjunto IAPI have suffered from outsiders’ stereotypes. Simplistic attitudes toward the conjunto as a place of impoverishment have contributed to the rise of further stereotypes associated with poverty. Negative images of the complex and its residents are also the result of its location in Lagoinha, with its long history of prostitution, and close to the infamous favela of Pedreira Prado Lopes. I show how municipal policies, social housing, and socio-spatial segregation since the middle of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century have produced stigmas and consolidated them over time and how an understanding of territorial stigmatization helps explain this complex relationship.

The French sociologist Loic Wacquant has developed a useful theory of territorial stigmatization that emphasizes the relationship between spatial

\textsuperscript{93} Ibid., 339-340.
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid., 348-349.
\textsuperscript{95} Sabatini and Sierralta: “Medição da segregação residencial”, 171-172.
location and stereotypes. The stigmatization of residential areas harms the inhabitants of illegally built communities and public housing. Outsiders tend to perceive them as slum dwellers, criminals, alcoholics, and drug users. They suffer discrimination, for example, in job interviews, because of their addresses, and such stigmas influence the decisions of state actors. Civil servants also tend to regard assignments in stigmatized districts as a serious obstacle to advancement. Such attitudes contribute to the low quality of local public services and infrastructure. The press’s dissemination of negative images and the predominance of stereotypes in public discourse reinforce territorial stigmatization. According to Villaça, large sections of Brazilian cities outside of high-income districts have bad reputations. The media tend to portray these areas as peripheral even if they are, like Lagoinha, close to the city center. Such representations contribute to the degradation of entire districts. Sabatini and Sierralta drew similar conclusions in their research on Chilean cities. Stigmatized neighborhoods stand in stark contrast to the prestigious quarters of the same city that enjoy excellent reputations. People who can afford to reside in such areas benefit from services and infrastructure of high quality, and living in such neighborhoods brings residents high social status. Thus, both the negative and the positive prejudices about residential districts reinforce social inequalities and socio-spatial segregation.

In Latin American cities, both slums and public housing are stigmatized. In Brazil, many people associate the term ‘conjunto habitacional’ with poverty and believe that residents of public housing quarrel with each other all the time. According to Ribeiro (2008), public housing projects are blamed for the decay of neighborhoods, especially when they are situated in high-income areas. In such cases, wealthy residents often avoid contact with their publically housed neighbors. Despite the many differ-

99 Villaça: Espaço intra-urbano no Brasil, 348-349.
100 Sabatini and Sierralta: “Medição da segregação residencial”, 171-172.
101 Ibid., 172.
102 Ibid.
104 Ibid., 7-10.
ences between public housing and *favelas*, outsiders often think that they are the same,\textsuperscript{105} especially when they are close to one another. In this study, I analyze the historical processes that lead to such oversimplified images.

A summary of considerations about how territorial stigmatization affects the attitudes of people who live in stigmatized places is helpful to understanding the strategies that they adopt in response. Wacquant articulated a range of possible reactions to being stereotyped. For example, those affected often echo what outsiders say about them and their places of residence, thereby multiplying the negative effects.\textsuperscript{106} Ribeiro discovered that some of his interviewees from Cruzada São Sebastião reacted by attributing the same stereotypes to their neighbors.\textsuperscript{107} This reproduction of stigma alienates public housing residents from one another, which impedes the development of community consciousness and political activism. Another common reaction is that residents conceal their address and do not invite visitors to their homes.\textsuperscript{108} Retreat into the private (family) sphere and moving out at the first opportunity are also responses to territorial stigmatization. Such strategies result in marginalization, social fragmentation, a lack of mutual support among residents, and a failure to identify with one’s place of residence.\textsuperscript{109} Wacquant described these protective reactions as strategies of submission.\textsuperscript{110} Other responses are more defiant such as individually or collectively defending the reputation of the neighborhood and stigma inversion.\textsuperscript{111} Reactions to stigmatization depend on factors like one’s experiences, social status, age, seniority in the complex or neighborhood, and ethnicity.\textsuperscript{112}
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I describe how interviewees have reacted to stigma and analyze their motivations for the strategies they have employed. I also show that, contra Wacquant, Slater, and Pereira (2014), territorial stigmatization is not just a recent phenomenon of the so-called ‘advanced urban societies’ of the late 20th century. For, though territorial stigmas change over time, the current stigmatization of the Conjunto IAPI has a historical dimension, being a result of stereotypes that have been consolidated over decades. I explain this history by analyzing the relationships among the formation of stereotypes and stigmas, local urban development, socio-spatial segregation, and housing policies.

113 Ibid., 1273-1275.
2. The Development of Social Housing Policies in Brazil from the 1930s to the Early 1970s

As casas operárias, construídas pelas Caixas e Institutos em vários Estados, ainda são em pequeno número e de preço elevado, em relação às posses dos empregados. Dei instruções ao Ministério do Trabalho para que, sem prejuízo das construções isoladas onde se tornarem aconselháveis, estude e projete grandes núcleos de habitações modestas e confortáveis. Recomendei, para isso, que se adquiram grandes áreas de terrenos e, se preciso, que se desapropriem as mais vantajosas; que se proceda à avaliação das mesmas; que se levem em consideração os meios de transporte para esses núcleos; que se racionalizem os métodos de construção; que se adquiram os materiais, diretamente ao produtor; tudo enfim, de modo a se obter, pelo menor preço, a melhor casa...\textsuperscript{114}

In a speech given on 10 November 1938 on the occasion of the Estado Novo’s first anniversary, Getúlio Vargas spoke about the social housing programs that the IAPs had begun the previous year. As the passage shows, Vargas portrayed his regime as working for the social inclusion of the working class. Vargas intended his populist rhetoric to generate public support for the Estado Novo and prevent social unrest, and he emphasized the government’s construction of new housing because the press and public were paying increasing attention to the spread of illegal shantytowns as a consequence of urbanization and the flow of rural migrants into the cities.\textsuperscript{115}

\textsuperscript{114} Getúlio Vargas on 10 November 1938, apud Bruna, Paulo Júlio Valentino: Os primeiros arquitetos modernos: habitação social no Brasil 1930-1950. São Paulo 2010, 119. “The workers’ housing constructed by the pension funds and institutes in various states are still few in number and expensive in relation to the assets of employees. I instructed the Ministry of Labor to study and make projections for large settlements of modest, comfortable dwellings, without prejudice against the construction of detached houses where it turns out to be advisable. Therefore, I recommended that they acquire large tracts of land and, if necessary, expropriate the most suitable; that they proceed to their evaluation; that they take into consideration the means of transportation for these settlements; that they rationalize construction methods; that they acquire the materials directly from the producer; everything in order to obtain in the end the best house at the lowest price...”

\textsuperscript{115} Bonduki: Origens da habitação social no Brasil, 73-82.
In fact, housing shortages had accompanied the growth of Brazilian cities and contributed to the deterioration in workers’ living conditions since the late 19th century. During the República Velha (1889-1930), a large number of rural migrants, including former slaves, and immigrants from Europe and Asia came to Brazilian cities in search of better lives. They found accommodations in settlements called ‘cortiços,’ ‘cabeças de porco,’ ‘casas de cômodos,’ ‘estalagens,’ and ‘favelas,’ which were dirty, overcrowded, and, lacking sewage facilities, disease ridden. City authorities, the upper class, and the press saw them as sources of epidemics and their inhabitants as vagrants and criminals.116

Throughout the early 20th century, city and federal governments left the provision of workers’ housing to the private sector. It built vilas operárias, but they did not meet the need, and illegally built hovels in favelas were often the only option for the poor.117 The state was not a passive observer of the worsening problem, but, instead of addressing the need driving it, federal and city authorities, sharing the view of the upper class that the favelas were a threat to the cities, violently evicted their residents.118 Urban renewal projects, like the reforms of Pereira Passos in Rio de Janeiro (1902-1906), brought about the destruction of many slums,119 which intensified the social exclusion of the poor. However, the profound social and political changes that occurred in Brazil after 1930 soon began to reshape the state’s role in the provision of working-class housing.

2.1. The Vargas Era and the Housing Debate after 1930

In the early 1930s, engineers, architects, journalists, and medical doctors began to discuss urbanization in terms of hygiene, sanitation, urban transit,
and the need to modernize. Those who had attended international conferences introduced European and North American concepts of urbanism and city planning, and in light of the growing presence of favelas, the discussion focused on solving the housing problem. Many experts and leaders of political parties agreed that the state had to take charge of the design and administration of housing programs. In the late 1930s, some of these experts began working for the state. The engineer and architect Rubens Porto, for example, became the technical advisor to the Conselho Nacional do Trabalho (CNT), a bureau of the Ministério do Trabalho, Indústria e Comércio (MTIC). In 1938, Porto published what, according to Bonduki, was the first systematic study of housing policy written by a Brazilian. As a follower of social Catholicism (Catolicismo social), Porto believed that it was the state’s responsibility to satisfy the urgent need for adequate workers’ housing. However, he also defended the existing social hierarchy and the desire of those at the top to maintain social control over the residents of public housing. This attitude, which Porto shared with other experts, was in accord with the ideology of the Estado Novo.

The federal government did respond, but its provision of housing served its own purposes. Firstly, social housing fit into the project of national development (desenvolvimento nacional) that Vargas had introduced after the 1930 Revolution. As I mentioned in chapter one, the Estado Novo sought to accelerate industrialization by substituting domestic goods for imports. It saw Brazil’s progress as a transformation from a predomi-

120 Followers of the movimento moderno, mainly architects and engineers, emphasized the need for rational city planning. See Bruna: Os primeiros arquitetos modernos, 168, 245-246.
121 Lima, Fábio José Martins de: “Por uma cidade moderna: ideários de urbanismo em jogo na trajetória de engenheiros e arquitetos entre os anos 30 e 40.” In: Anais do Seminário de História da Cidade e do Urbanismo (2004), vol. 8 no. 1, 14.
122 Bruna: Os primeiros arquitetos modernos, 168, 245. See also, Bonduki: Origens da habitação social no Brasil, 77-82.
123 Bonduki: Origens da habitação social no Brasil, 153.
nantly rural to an industrialized economy and saw decent workers’ hous-
ing as good for the productivity of the workforce.\textsuperscript{125}

Secondly, the Vargas regime expected government housing to stimulate public support for the Estado Novo. Since 1930, the regime had worked to concentrate decision-making power in its own hands.\textsuperscript{126} Vargas did not break up the traditional hierarchy of Brazilian society; rather, he tried to modernize it from above, a conservative approach that earned him the support of the upper class.\textsuperscript{127} However, contrary to his predecessors, he also paid attention to workers’ concerns. According to Melo, his partial inclusion of the working class into the broader society, itself under the control of the federal government, was a populist strategy to preserve social order.\textsuperscript{128} The Vargas government also intended to create the \textit{homem novo}, the culturally and ideologically conformist laborer. Toward this end, many Catholics, like Rubens Porto, saw family life as the place to inculcate Christian morality among workers.\textsuperscript{129} They believed that life in the slums made people immoral and expected the state’s provision of decent housing to induce in residents their conservative values.\textsuperscript{130}

The Vargas administration was the first national government in Brazilian history to be active in the creation of working-class housing. However, as Bonduki and others have emphasized, its attitude toward workers was paternalistic, and its primary concern was gaining public support.\textsuperscript{131} Furthermore, much of the urban population, particularly \textit{favelados} and work-
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ers in the informal economy, were denied access to state housing. The actions of the IAPs illustrate these claims and the ambivalence that was inherent to the social housing programs of the Vargas regime and succeeding populist governments.

2.2. Multi-Storey Buildings and Detached Houses for Workers: The Institutos de Aposentadoria e Pensões (IAPs) and the Fundação da Casa Popular (FCP), 1937-1964

In order to meet the demands of labor unions for old-age pensions and other workers’ benefits, the government of Artur Bernardes passed the Lei Elói Chaves in 1923 to be the legal basis for establishing the so-called ‘Caixas de Aposentadoria e Pensões’ (CAPs). Throughout the following years, various enterprises established these pension funds, and by 1930 their number had grown to 47 with 140,000 members.\(^{132}\) The CAPs offered retirement insurance, widows’ pensions and low-cost medicine to their *associados*, workers who paid monthly fees.\(^{133}\) After the 1930 Revolution, the Vargas government restructured the social welfare system by establishing the Institutos de Aposentadoria e Pensões (IAPs), which replaced the CAPs over the next several years.\(^{134}\) Individual companies had founded the CAPs, but the state controlled the new pension funds. The members of each IAP came from a particular economic sector, for example industrial workers, railroad workers, and bank tellers and membership was obligatory.\(^{135}\) Vargas created the pension funds in order to increase the government’s control over workers who, if organized into labor unions,
would have the power to oppose the state. They also played a significant role in the country’s industrialization and the consolidation of capitalist structures. Vargas advertised them as contributing to the social protection of the working class but posing no threat to conservative and business interests. Between 1933 and 1939, his administration set up the Instituto de Aposentadoria e Pensões dos Marítimos (1933), dos Bancários (1934), dos Comerciários (1934), dos Industriários (IAPI, 1936), dos Condutores de veículos e empregados de empresas de petróleo (1938), and dos Estivadores (1939). Two federal offices controlled them all: the MTIC appointed their presidents, and the CNT had authority over their investment decisions.

The IAPs managed retirement funds and provided medical insurance; housing was of secondary importance. Although authorized to provide housing by decree no. 19.497, issued on 17 December 1930, they were almost inactive in the housing market until 1937. In the meantime, privately constructed rental housing continued to fall short of demand. In fact, the continuing migration from the countryside and rising land prices made the problem worse. Finally, on 28 June 1937, the Vargas government enacted decree no. 1.749, which researchers interpret as the start of the pension funds’ housing programs. The law allowed them to invest up to 50% of their financial reserves in housing. The IAPs introduced three programs for investing in real estate two of which were for new housing. **Plano A** was for building and purchasing detached houses and apartment buildings, which units were sold or let to their *associados*. **Plano B** offered *associados* financing to buy a house or land on which to build. **Plano C** offered mortgages to any interested person or entity, though the IAPs also used **Plano C** money for large-scale real estate investment, which brought
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in considerable revenue.\textsuperscript{143} So, \textit{planos} \textit{A} and \textit{B} were the funds’ social housing programs; \textit{plano} \textit{C} was for their own profit. Spending on \textit{plano} \textit{A} and \textit{plano} \textit{B} projects was often limited because fund administrators transferred money to their \textit{plano} \textit{C} accounts.\textsuperscript{144}

Between 1937 and 1964, the pension funds had built or purchased a total of 123,995 housing units for their \textit{associados}.\textsuperscript{145} Although the IAPI provided the largest number of these (36,413), only 2.5\% of its working-class \textit{associados} saw any benefits. The bank employees’ pension fund (IAPB), for example, built fewer residences, but it provided housing to 33.1\% of its \textit{associados}.\textsuperscript{146} The IAPs built most of their \textit{conjuntos} in the southeastern states of Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, and Minas Gerais and, beginning in the late 1950s, Brasília. According to Bonduki, this distribution corresponded to the distribution of political and economic power, and the concentration of public housing in Rio de Janeiro, where a large number of workers lived, shows that social housing was an instrument for controlling political organizing.\textsuperscript{147}

Leading IAP executives argued over how to distribute revenue across the \textit{planos},\textsuperscript{148} architectural styles, and whether to rent or sell to their \textit{associados}. Their debates were part of the national discussion on workers’ housing that was then taking place in newspapers, professional architecture and engineering journals, political speeches, and at housing confer-
The Vargas government wanted the funds to build, and sell, detached houses (casas próprias), believing that workers who became homeowners would recognize the rewards of hard work and be less drawn to the left. Architects and engineers in the modernist movement (o movimento moderno) whom the IAPs hired for several of their projects argued in favor of apartment buildings, for they saw multi-storey conjuntos as the most practical way to create affordable housing. In the end, most of the funds leased apartments in conjuntos to their members, believing that leases would be more profitable than sales and that the public would see vertical housing developments as symbolic of their activities. Rents were uncontrolled; they remained low for several years only because of the Lei do Inquilinato, which the Estado Novo had passed in 1942.

The IAPs built apartment buildings of from three to seven or more storeys, for example, the Conjunto Residencial Penha (Rio de Janeiro, 1942-1949, 1,284 units), Várzea do Carmo (São Paulo, 1938-1950, 4,038 units originally planned), Mooca (São Paulo, 1940s, 576 units), Bangú (Rio de Janeiro, 1949, 2,410 units), Moça Bonita (Rio de Janeiro, 1949-1950, 498 units), and the Conjunto IAPI (1944-1951, 928 units) in Belo Horizonte. Other of their developments, like the Conjunto Habitacional Vila Guiomar (Santo André, 1937-1945, 1,411 units) and Realengo (Rio de Janeiro, 1940, 2,347 units), were comprised of apartment buildings and detached, duplex, and row houses.

The pension funds instructed project managers to keep costs down. So, they also used mass-produced materials. Their architects were inspired
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by the international trends on display at the Congrès Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne II (Frankfurt, 1929), III (Brussels, 1930), and IV (Athens, 1933). The designs of Le Corbusier, Ebenezer Howard’s garden cities, and Clarence Arthur Perry’s concept of the neighborhood unit were further sources of inspiration.¹⁵⁶

Most of the architects believed that it was essential for residents’ quality of life that public housing include urban infrastructure like schools, daycare centers, healthcare facilities, and shopping.¹⁵⁷ Some added libraries and sports facilities to the list, which would make for a dynamic community life. The IAPs agreed that such community amenities were important but as instruments of moral education. So, modernist architecture, the paternalism of IAP managers, and the Estado Novo’s authoritarian style of governing all fit together.¹⁵⁸

The IAPs’ activities reflected the ambivalence of social policy under Vargas. For example, only their associados could apply for an apartment in their conjuntos, and, according to Bonduki, they thereby contributed to the exclusion of the poor, especially those in the informal economy, agricultural laborers, domestic servants, and the unemployed. Their housing programs were thus an example of cidadania regulada, i.e., the exclusion of the poor from social services, illustrating the fact that many Brazilians had no place in the new social order.¹⁵⁹ Nepotism and clientelism also determined who received apartments as did the influence of fund employees, union leaders, and those with political connections, all of which reinforced exclusion.¹⁶⁰

Scholars have not paid much attention to the consequences of the locations of social housing in Brazilian cities. The pension funds often built on the edges of cities, where land was cheaper. The IAPI, however, put most of its conjuntos close to city centers, like the Conjunto IAPI in Belo Horizonte, where residents benefited from the proximity to downtown.¹⁶¹ The

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 86-91.
¹⁵⁸ See Ibid., 164.
¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 108-110.
¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 108-109.
complexes, especially those built near the downtown, contributed to the transformation of the urban landscape and local social structures, as I show in chapters 3, 4, and 5.

The IAPs built 52.1% of their housing between 1946 and 1950\textsuperscript{162} in response to socio-political developments after the Estado Novo and the Second World War. The government of General Eurico Gaspar Dutra (1946-1950) saw the provision of housing as a way to counter the working class’s growing attraction to Communism. At the same time that leftist and other popular movements were harshly repressed,\textsuperscript{163} social housing was an instrument for generating public support. On 1 May 1946, Dutra established the Fundaçao da Casa Popular (FCP), Brazil’s first federal office for housing. From the start, though, interest groups and political factions criticized the new office. High-ranking fund officials and leading figures in the MTIC feared losing the influence and privileges that their personal connections gave them, and union leaders and the Communist Party of Brazil had their own complaints.\textsuperscript{164} In addition to housing, the FCP was responsible for administering urban infrastructure projects. According to Bonduki, the office’s ambitious plans show that it saw housing as an integral part of its urban planning.\textsuperscript{165} However, its extensive agenda exceeded its institutional and financial capacities.\textsuperscript{166} Between 1946 and 1964, the FCP built a total of 18,132 units of housing.\textsuperscript{167} Contrary to the pension funds but in line with the Dutra government’s conservative course, the FCP preferred detached houses in order to turn workers into homeowners. Its average size house was between 60 and 70 square meters divided into three rooms.

\textsuperscript{162} Bonduki: \textit{Origens da habitação social no Brasil}, 130-131.
\textsuperscript{164} Bonduki: \textit{Origens da habitação social no Brasil}, 118-120. The Communists saw the FCP as a symbol of reactionary housing policies.
\textsuperscript{165} Ibid., 123. See also, Trompowsky, Mario: “A FCP-Fundaçao da Casa Popular e a implantação de uma política habitacional no Brasil: o processo de uma experiência governamental no campo da habitação popular.” In: \textit{Anais do Seminário de História da Cidade e do Urbanismo} vol. 8 (2004), pages 1-6 of 17.
\textsuperscript{166} Azevedo, Sérgio de, and Luis Aureliano Gama de Andrade: \textit{Habitação e poder. Da Fundação da Casa Popular ao Banco Nacional da Habitação}. Rio de Janeiro 1982, 21-22. For this reason, Azevedo and Andrade concluded that the Dutra government’s conception of the FCP was an illusion.
\textsuperscript{167} Bonduki: \textit{Origens da habitação social no Brasil}, 129.
on one or two levels. Like the funds, the FCP was particularly active in southeastern Brazil, especially Rio de Janeiro and provincial cities in Minas Gerais.

Many of the professionals who had coordinated social housing programs under Vargas continued to work in the field after 1945. Thus, it is not surprising that characteristics of the government’s activities during the Estado Novo persisted throughout the Fourth Republic (1946-1964), for example, political interests and personal relationships often influenced the FCP’s decisions on where to build. It introduced a classification system for selecting residents. Officially, salary and family size were the most important criteria, but, since applicants could earn up to 12.8 times the minimum wage, middle-class applicants were more likely than poor ones to move in. And, since clientelism was as important to the FCP as it was to the IAPs, inhabitants of favelas and those with neither the contacts nor the information necessary for successful application were excluded.

Social control continued to mark the daily lives of public housing residents. Paternalistic government and FCP officials believed that if they did not teach workers how to live in a modern urban environment, then the new residences would soon fall into disrepair. Justified, then, by residents’ “backwardness,” FCP agents regularly visited and inspected their homes; residents risked eviction if they refused to let them in.

Because of its financial shortcomings, the FCP did not reduce the urban housing deficit. According to Bonduki, it epitomized the inefficiency of

168 Trompowsky: “A FCP-Fundação da Casa Popular e a implantação de uma política habitacional no Brasil”, 5.
169 Azevedo and Andrade: Habitação e poder, 34-35. According to Azevedo and Andrade, its regional focus was the result of the close relationships between the FCP and the mineiro political elite.
170 Ibid., 27.
171 Trompowsky: “A FCP-Fundação da Casa Popular e a Implantação de uma Política Habitacional no Brasil”, 5.
172 Azevedo and Andrade: Habitação e poder, 28-30.
173 Ibid., 31.
174 Ibid., 31-32. According to Azevedo and Andrade, the FCP’s efforts to control the inhabitants of public housing soon lost their effectiveness and the inspections were subsequently ended.
the Fourth Republic’s management of social housing. In his explanation of the failure, however, Melo stressed the role of groups who were opposed to a national bureau for social housing and whose political pressure in defense of their interests made the development of coherent and efficient social housing programs extremely difficult.

By 1952, the FCP’s failure to solve the housing problem had become obvious. Many rural migrants to the cities had no other option than to illegally build shacks in *favelas* so that the FCP’s failure resulted in rapid and chaotic growth of slums on the outskirts of cities. In Rio de Janeiro, Belo Horizonte, and other cities, the poor lived in *vilas* and *favelas* that often lacked even the most basic infrastructure. State actors offered some proposals for reform. In 1953, FCP officials suggested the creation of the so-called ‘Banco Hipotecário’, but neither the Vargas administration (1951-1954) nor succeeding governments put the proposal into practice. The administration of President Kubitschek (1956-1961) paid little attention to housing, concentrating public investment on its ambitious Programa de Metas and industrialization. According to Melo, under the guise of the imperative to industrialize, state actors exploited the IAPs and the FCP for their own purposes instead of reforming them. As a consequence, the money available for social housing was depleted. During the 1950s, the pension funds built little new housing, investing large amounts of *plano C* money in real estate instead. Rising inflation soon made public housing unaffordable for the lower-middle class. Clientelism became ever more important in the allocation of apartments. At the same time, federal state governments and municipal administrations all over Brazil established their own departments for housing, but they developed only few new programs, concentrating their efforts rather on demolishing *favelas*.
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176 Bonduki: *Origens da habitação social no Brasil*, 115, 125.
180 Azevedo and Andrade: *Habitação e poder*, 40-42.
181 Melo: “Estado e mercado”, 104.
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In the early 1960s, inflation worsened as a result of Kubitschek’s expenditure on the Programa de Metas. The short-lived government of Jânio Quadros (January-August 1961) saw itself confronted with the threat of social unrest and responded with two ambitious housing reforms. The Plano de Assistência Habitacional called for the construction of 100,000 detached houses within 18 months, and the Instituto Brasileiro de Habitação was to be a federal bureau charged with the development of social housing projects. But Quadros remained in power for only seven months, and neither plan was carried out.

Accelerating economic decline, political polarization, and a dramatic worsening of the housing situation for the poor marked the tenure of the government of João Goulart (1961–1964). In numerous cities, favelas grew downtown and on the outskirts. Some city governments set up programs supposedly to improve their urban infrastructure, but most were short-lived and intended only to win votes. In fact, city governments vigorously set about evicting slum-dwellers. The events of these years exacerbated Brazil’s already profound social inequalities. In the early part of the century, government public housing policies had been limited to the demolition of favelas; federal and municipal authorities now adopted strategies of control and regulation to address the “favela problem” in which several factors determined whether a favela would be razed or urbanized.

Often, inhabitants protested against the demolition. They formed community associations and joined organizations like the Federação das Associações das Favelas do Estado de Guanabara, which was established in Rio de Janeiro in 1963. Though such associations had an effect, they were not able to bring about fundamental social change. During the last two years of Goulart’s presidency, architects, engineers, and others demanded that the housing crisis be included in the government’s Reformas.
de Base program. The government did support research on housing, for example, it established the Conselho Federal de Habitação in 1963; however, its measures had no effect, for the military overthrew Goulart the following year.

In sum, experts on the IAPs’ housing activities have emphasized both the considerable number of housing units that these institutions built and their advanced conceptions of public housing. Bonduki (2011) and Botas (2011) stressed that the work of the pension funds should not be underestimated, since they were the most important state programs for social housing until the 1960s. Throughout the era of the Estado Novo and the Fourth Republic, however, populist government policies for social housing were intended to create public support, and paternalistic bureaucrats strove to control the residents of public housing. Clientelism and personal connections determined the selection of residents so that large segments of the population were excluded.

In the next section, I discuss how the military restructured housing policies during the first few years after the coup d’état in 1964. On the one hand, the new regime wanted to end populism; on the other, it adopted some of the ideas about housing that had been developed in the 1950s and early 1960s.

2.3. The Military Dictatorship and Housing Policies from 1964

On 21 August 1964, a few months after it had seized power, the military regime established the Banco Nacional da Habitação (BNH), which was to be Brazil’s most important housing institution through the following two decades. It also founded the Serviço Federal de Habitação e Urbanismo

191 Bonduki, Nabil Georges, and Ana Paula Koury: “Das reformas de base ao BNH. As propostas do Seminário de Habitação e Reforma Urbana”. In: Arquitextos 10.120 (São Paulo, 2010), unp., apud Ferrari: Projetos de habitação popular, 154.


193 Silva: Política habitacional brasileira, 48.
and introduced the Plano Nacional de Habitação. These measures served the regime’s political, ideological, and economic purposes. Firstly, it sought to end the populist practices of the Fourth Republic. Thus, it closed the FCP in 1964 and ordered the IAPs to stop new construction of housing. And two years later, it merged the pension funds into the Instituto Nacional de Previdência Social (INPS), an independent agency though it was linked to the Ministério de Previdência e Assistência Social. Secondly, the regime intended for these new measures to display its competence in dealing with social issues. Thirdly, it, like its predecessors, provided urban working-class housing in order to prevent social and political unrest. Once more, then, social housing was intended to generate public support.

In a statement in 1964, the BNH’s first president, Sandra Cavalcanti, predicted that home ownership would turn workers away from Communism and into defenders of the new system. That had been the motivation of Getúlio Vargas and the FCP, but the military also had an economic motivation, viz., to stimulate the national economy by giving workers an incentive to save and creating jobs in the construction sector.

In order to create a stable financial basis for its housing programs, the regime founded the Sistema Financeiro de Habitação (SFH) in 1964, under the control of the BNH, and the Fundo de Garantia do Tempo de Serviço (FGTS) in 1966. Employers were obliged to pay 8% of their employees’ monthly salaries into the FGTS. In justifying the compulsory contributions, the government argued that subsidies, which had been the cornerstone of housing finance in the Fourth Republic, had fostered clientelism. Between 1964 and 1986, the BNH built around 4.3 million
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apartments and houses, over 50% of which (2.4 million) were public and financed with money from the FGTS.\textsuperscript{201}

The years between 1964 and 1969 saw the institutionalization and expansion of social housing programs as the government centralized control.\textsuperscript{202} At the same time, the BNH authorized numerous private enterprises to build new houses and apartment buildings and sell units in the complexes they already had.\textsuperscript{203} The Companhias de Habitação (Cohabs) built and managed housing developments for people who earned up to three (and later five) times the minimum wage.\textsuperscript{204} The regime was convinced that it was possible to reconcile social housing and the BNH’s entrepreneurial nature,\textsuperscript{205} which shows that solving the housing crisis was not at the top of its agenda.\textsuperscript{206} From the late 1960s onwards, frequently delayed funding destabilized the FGTS, and, consequently, investment in social housing fell. As a result, white-collar workers and civil servants benefited from state housing while the situation for the poor got worse.\textsuperscript{207}

Between 1970 and 1974, social housing was in enormous decline. The number of new houses and apartments built for the Cohabs’ clients in this period decreased by more than 50% compared to the previous five years. In late 1971, the BNH restructured its reserves\textsuperscript{208} and increased its invest-
ment in urban infrastructure, which, according to Azevedo and Andrade, was supposed to increase revenues. Under the generals Costa e Silva (1967-1969) and Médici (1969-1974), the military regime saw economic growth and capital accumulation as more important than social policy. Numerous violent evictions from favelas in Rio de Janeiro’s high-income southern neighborhoods between 1968 and 1973 symbolized the fact that the regime’s priority was the interests of the social elite. With its gradual political liberalization and increasing public protest, the Geisel administration (1974-1979) increased investment in social housing. Once more, however, the intention was to quiet unrest, and the new investment had no significant effect on the housing crisis.

Though the creation of the BNH was a watershed in the history of housing in Brazil, some elements of previous approaches survived the change in political system. For example, earlier proposals to establish the Instituto Brasileiro de Habitação inspired the establishment of the FGTS in 1966, and officials continued to believe that workers should become homeowners. However, despite the considerable amount of new public housing, the military regime’s social housing programs contributed to an enormous growth in social inequality and poverty in Brazil’s cities, as scholars from different fields have pointed out. The Cohabs built poor-quality urban housing that was cut-off from most of the city, and the regime ordered the IAPs to sell their apartments to their tenants. Bonduki has argued that privatization often led to the deterioration of conjuntos’ public spaces and equipment and a more private, individualistic lifestyle.

The apartments in Belo Horizonte’s Conjunto IAPI were sold to their residents in 1971. Current residents disagree over the effects of privatization on relations among neighbors in the complex. Before taking up this issue, I explain in the next chapter how the federal government’s social housing activities, municipal policies in Belo Horizonte, and the city’s growth interacted in the creation of the Conjunto IAPI in the 1940s.
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3. “…Apartamentos para os industriários, servidores da Prefeitura e outras classes…”: The Conjunto IAPI in Belo Horizonte

Plans for the first multi-storey public housing complex in Belo Horizonte, the Conjunto IAPI, were made in late 1940. The planned *conjunto* was a reaction to the enormous housing shortage that the city had suffered from for decades. To show that, I first summarize, in section 3.1, the history of workers’ housing in Belo Horizonte and the city’s response to the housing deficit before 1940, when the growth and spread of *favelas* and socio-spatial segregation was continual, especially in areas like Lagoinha in the city’s *zona suburbana*. The history of Lagoinha in the early 20th century is part of the explanation of the later exclusion of that segment of the local population that had traditionally suffered the most from segregation and inadequate housing.

3.1. *Urbanization and Residential Segregation in Belo Horizonte in the Early 20th Century*

In the late 19th century, the political and social elite of Minas Gerais discussed the need to modernize. With its colonial architecture, they considered Ouro Preto, the state capital since 1823, to be a symbol of backwardness. So, after the proclamation of the republic in 1889, the discussion turned to establishing a new capital in the geographical center of Minas Gerais. In the next years, the architect Aarão Reis designed the Planta Geral da Cidade de Minas. Reis and the *comissão construtora* (construction commission) divided Cidade de Minas into three zones, the *zona urbana*, the *zona suburbana*, and the *zona rural*, in order to control the city’s growth.216

216 Andrade, Luciana Teixeira de.: “Segregação socioespacial e construção de identidades urbanas na RMBH.” In: Jupira Gomes de Mendonça, and Maria Helena de Lacerda Godinho (eds.): *População, espaço e gestão na metrópole: novas configurações, velhas desigualdades*. Belo Horizonte 2003, 180-181. See also, Nascimento, Alexandra: “Da cidade de Minas ao eixo sul: reflexões sobre a constru-
3.1. Urbanization and Residential Segregation in Belo Horizonte

The new city was inaugurated on 12 December 1897. In 1901, its name was changed to Belo Horizonte. Over the following years, municipal authorities concentrated public investment in infrastructure in the *zona urbana*,\(^{217}\) where businesses, the capital building, and public institutions were located.\(^{218}\) A ring avenue, Avenida 17 de Dezembro (later changed to Avenida do Contorno), marked the zone’s boundaries. Though the *zona suburbana* was three times larger, the city built streets and squares almost
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\(^{217}\) Nascimento: “Da cidade de Minas ao eixo sul”, 154.

\(^{218}\) Andrade: “Segregação socioespacial e construção de identidades urbanas na RMBH”, 181.
exclusively in the *zona urbana*,\(^{219}\) where civil servants and others of the middle class had been settling since 1897.\(^{220}\) The wealthy settled around the Praça da Liberdade,\(^{221}\) where access to urban infrastructure and public institutions was easy.\(^{222}\)

Being attuned only to the interests of the upper class, the *comissão construtora* had not considered the need to house workers. From the start, therefore, there was a considerable housing shortage and socio-spatial segregation began with the city’s founding in 1897.\(^{223}\) People from the countryside, including former slaves, and immigrants came to the new city in search of work and better lives, but, for the most part, they lived in self-built shacks, which were called ‘cafuas’ at the time.

Even before the city’s founding, *cafuas* clustered in what was to be the *zona urbana*.\(^{224}\) As early as 1902, their inhabitants demanded that the city provide them potable water, street lighting, and sewage disposal, but, in most cases, their demands were ignored.\(^{225}\)

\(^{219}\) Villaça: *Espaço intra-urbano no Brasil*, 119. See Villaça for a detailed description of the zoning system, which was introduced in the 1890s.

\(^{220}\) Therefore, a part of the *zona urbana* was called ‘Funcionários.’ Today this is the name of a district in Belo Horizonte’s *zona centro sul*.

\(^{221}\) The Praça da Liberdade is located in the southern part of Belo Horizonte’s center. Today the square is in the upper-class district of Savassi.

\(^{222}\) Villaça: *Espaço intra-urbano no Brasil*, 120.


\(^{224}\) Guimarães mentioned two centrally located concentrations of *cafuas*, which had existed since 1895, one on the bank of the *Leitão* river (in the district of Barro Preto) and the other at the Alto da Estação. See Guimarães: *Cafuas, Barracos e Barracões*, 70.

\(^{225}\) Santiago used the metaphor of one city containing two within it to describe the unequal living conditions in Belo Horizonte in the early 20th century: “O desdobramento de todo esse processo é, desde os primeiros anos da história de Belo Horizonte, o surgimento de duas cidades em uma só: uma oficial, planejada e bem dotada de serviços e equipamentos, mas com uma população rarefeita; outra populosa, concentrando a pobreza e a carência. Nessa segunda cidade molda-se uma arquitetura silenciosa, fruto da exclusão e da impossibilidade de acesso pleno à cidade pelos canais formais (públicos ou privados).” Santiago: “O problema da habitação popular em Belo Horizonte”, 58. “The outcome of this whole process, since the first years of Belo Horizonte’s history, is the appearance of two cities in one: one official, planned, and well endowed with services and infrastructure but inhabited by a select population, the other populous and concentrating poverty and misery. In this second city, a silent architecture shapes itself, the fruit of the exclusion from and the impossibility of full access to the city by official channels (public or private).”
For some years, city authorities and the social elite tolerated impoverished workers, who were needed to build the new city, settling in the zona urbana. At the same time, though, they perceived their enclaves as places of disease, misery, and promiscuity. Therefore, the PBH soon began to evict the poor from their cafuas. (So did other city governments. See chapter 2.) In 1912, 68% of Belo Horizonte’s residential buildings were located in the zona suburbana and zona rural. Districts like Lagoinha and Floresta, which were close to the city center but on the other side of Avenida do Contorno, soon became working-class neighborhoods.

I should mention here that ‘Lagoinha’ traditionally referred to an area wider than the district’s official border. In fact, the Conjunto IAPI is located on the boundary of Lagoinha and São Cristóvão. As I explain below, the name ‘São Cristóvão’ came into common use only several years after the Conjunto IAPI was built in the 1940s. Mid-20th-century authors used ‘Lagoinha’ or ‘região da Lagoinha’ to refer to the complex and its surroundings. Therefore, I use ‘Lagoinha’ and ‘area of Lagoinha’ with its popular and historical denotation, which cannot be exactly specified in geographical terms.

The first settlers came to the area of Lagoinha in the first half of the 18th century. When Cidade de Minas was being planned, Reis and the comissão construtora confined Lagoinha to the zona suburbana’s section VI. In the early 20th century, people arriving from Sabará and Ouro Preto settled there because of its proximity to the city center, the Mercado Municipal, and the train station. Because the Arrudas River and the railroad tracks separated Lagoinha from the zona urbana, it was less attrac-
tive to the wealthy. Despite, or perhaps because of, the diverse origins of its population, Lagoinha soon acquired a reputation for poverty. The unemployment that many inhabitants endured during the First World War reinforced that reputation. Beginning in the 1920s, the steady growth of favelas like Pedreira Prado Lopes, Vila Senhor dos Passos, and Vila Santo André made matters worse for Lagoinha (see below). In its annual reports, the PBH worried about the growth of slums in Lagoinha, and other parts of the city, but said nothing about the shortcomings in urban planning and lack of public investment that drove it.

Because city authorities neglected the areas outside the zona urbana, researchers have claimed that the city’s zoning system caused its profound socio-spatial segregation. Though short-sighted urban planning has had negative repercussions on housing conditions in Lagoinha since the city’s founding, infrastructure differed across the area. The PBH first installed streetlights there in 1909. In the early 1930s, it supplied some parts of Lagoinha with drinking water though large areas remained without access to artesian wells or water tanks. In the late 1920s, the heavily polluted stream running through Lagoinha was a threat to public health, but the
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PBH never implemented its plans to solve the problem.240 The construction of Avenida Dom Pedro II in 1926/1927 was the first of several large-scale urban development projects in the area. In 1933, the Aeroporto da Pampulha was opened about six kilometers north of Lagoinha. For some years, Estrada Velha de Venda Nova was the main access road to the new airport,241 but as the narrow, winding street could not accommodate the increased traffic the city built Avenida da Pampulha. The avenue divided the area of Lagoinha into two parts, which underwent different urban and social development from the 1940s onwards (see below).242

Though this and other projects have continually disadvantaged Lagoinha, it has traditionally been socially, economically, culturally, and religiously diverse. In the 1930s Lagoinha became an entertainment district, when music clubs, bars, restaurants, cinemas, and sports clubs first opened around the Praça Vaz de Melo on its southern boundary. Traditional Catholic families and bohemians lived harmoniously side by side.243 In the previous decade, the city had banned prostitution from the city center, for it was not part of the elitist vision of a modern city.244 Soon Lagoinha’s Rua Paquequer and Rua Bonfim were red-light districts. According to the sociologists Luciana Teixeira de Andrade and Alexandre Eustáquio Teixeira (2004), Lagoinha’s unorthodox denizens gave it a mixed reputation.245 The historian Heloisa G. Machado and the political scientist Maria de Lourdes Dolabela L. Pereira (1997) explained Lagoinha’s red-light districts as result of the city’s marginalization of the district.246

Beginning in the 1920s, the PBH tried to stop the spread of favelas by stopping the illegal selling of land on the city’s outskirts and building vilas operárias, usually close to factories in districts north and west of the city center.247 However, these housing complexes often lacked sewage facili-
ties, raising the threat of disease; running water; and electricity. Many soon became favelas.248

One of the oldest and largest favelas in Belo Horizonte was Pedreira Prado Lopes in the area of Lagoinha. In the early 20th century, stone for the city’s construction was quarried from Lagoinha’s Pedreira Lagoinha and Pedreira Prado Lopes, and rural migrants who found work as quarrymen settled in the area. In the first decades of the 20th century, when the city was demolishing favelas in the zona urbana, evicted inhabitants often had nowhere to go, and, consequently, many moved to Pedreira Prado Lopes and lived without sewage disposal or drinking water, a lack of infrastructure that persisted for many years.249 By 1942, Pedreira Prado Lopes had approximately 3,000 inhabitants living in 483 domiciles, mostly wooden shacks.250 Even decades later, inhabitants from that time still remembered how bad conditions were:

E de modo que eu conheço a favela desde essa época [the 1940s] era uma favela assim escura, não tinha iluminação, não tinha rede de esgoto, não tinha conforto nenhum, era aquele trem só, lá no campo. Um mal cheiro medonho, porque gente morando e não tinha condições...251

By the early 1940s, favelas like Pedreira Prado Lopes were the visible testimony of the city’s failure to address the housing problem and of the processes of segregation that it had allowed to run unchecked, particularly in districts outside the zona urbana, like Lagoinha, since the turn of the century. But by that time the PBH, like authorities in other cities, had come to see rational urban planning as a precondition for industrialization and
modernization. So, working-class housing became a central topic of the official discourse. Thus, the administration of Juscelino Kubitschek, who became the mayor of Belo Horizonte on 16 April 1940, set about planning, in collaboration with the Instituto de Aposentadoria e Pensões dos Indústriários (IAPI), the city’s first significant social housing project.

3.2. Planning and Building the Conjunto IAPI: 1940-1951

On 6 April 1939, an article in the Estado de Minas referred to a document that representatives of Belo Horizonte’s retail trade association had submitted to Mayor José Osvaldo Araújo during a meeting on the previous day. It suggested that the PBH work with the IAPs to develop housing programs, as was happening in other Brazilian cities:

...venho, conforme ficou assentado, confirmar o que verbalmente pleiteamos junto de v. excia., que é o seguinte: [...] Influencia [sic] de v. excia. junto a administração dos Institutos da Aposentadoria no sentido de que sejam construídas em Bello [sic] Horizonte, ainda que nas adjacências [sic] e em bairros novos, villas para operarios [sic], funcionarios [sic], comerciarios [sic] e etc., a exemplo do que estão fazendo em S. Paulo, Victoria e S. João d’El-Rey. V. excia. como um dos maiores e mais amigos impulsionadores de construções de casas próprias [sic] em Bello [sic] Horizonte, através de facilidades bancárias, bem sabe, como são necessarias [sic], entre nós, essas construções [sic] que os institutos de previdencia [sic] vêm fazendo em outras cidades... Araújo did not accept their idea. But in the following year, his successor, Juscelino Kubitschek, implemented an extensive construction program, which included multi-storey buildings downtown and the establishment of
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new upper-class residential districts like Pampulha and Cidade Jardim. He intended to integrate Belo Horizonte into what he called “the circle of modern cities.” Like his predecessors, Kubitschek sought to control the spread of *favelas* as out of sync with his elitist vision of a modern city. He emphasized that the provision of workers’ housing was among the PBH’s most important tasks, and in his 1940-1941 annual report to the federal *interventor* of Minas Gerais, Benedito Valadares Ribeiro, he wrote that it was necessary to balance spending on upper-class districts with expenditures on workers’ housing. In fact, he borrowed much of the Vargas government’s populist rhetoric on housing and the social inclusion of the working class. Thus, I believe that Kubitschek also saw social housing as a way to gain public support.

Kubitschek didn’t consider *vilas operárias* a solution to the housing shortage, opting instead for multi-storey apartment buildings, whose advantages over the former he stressed in his 1940-1941 report. Kubitschek’s report is important for two reasons. First, his preference for multi-storey buildings was the opposite of Vargas’s plan to make workers homeowners. Second, Kubitschek rejected *vilas operárias* for economic reasons but also because they had to be built on the edge of the city. Thus, one can read his report as being implicitly in favor of centrally locating social housing.

---

254 Pampulha is about 8 km. north of Belo Horizonte’s city center. Kubitschek and his successors intended to turn Pampulha into a upper-class district and tourist destination. The architects Oscar Niemeyer and Lúcio Costa designed several of Pampulha’s tourist attractions. The district has become well known for its modernist buildings, like the Igreja de São Francisco de Assis, the Cassino (which today is the Museu da Arte Moderna), and the IATE Clube. Lincoln Continentino planned the district of Cidade Jardim in the early 1940s. He found inspiration in Northern American suburbs as well as in the English garden city concept from the early 20th century. In the 1950s, Cidade Jardim was among the first districts in Belo Horizonte’s *zona sul* to attract middle-class and, later, upper-class residents. See Bahia (2005), Souza (1998), Cajazeiro (2010), GEPH (2007).


256 During the Estado Novo, ‘Interventor federal’ was the official designation for state governors. Benedicto Valadares Ribeiro was the *interventor federal* of Minas Gerais from 1933 to 1945.

257 PBH: *Relatório do prefeito Juscelino Kubitschek de 1940-1941*, 76.

258 See Cedro and Delgado (2006) for a detailed study of the Estado Novo’s influence on Kubitschek’s city administration.

On 24 October 1940, the PBH decided to build a multi-storey complex, which it referred to as ‘o bairro popular,’ in the Lagoinha area about 1.5 kilometers north of the city center. In his report, Kubitschek mentioned the exact location of what would later be known as the Conjunto IAPI:

O bairro popular será localizado em terrenos de propriedade da Prefeitura, na sexta secção suburbana, delimitado [...] do lado direito pela avenida Pedro I; nos fundos, até, no máximo, a rua Araribá, por uma linha com a extensão de 230 metros, normal ao eixo longitudinal do bairro; na frente pela junção das avenidas Pedro I e José Bonifácio (projetada); e do lado esquerdo por uma rua a projetar, simétrica à avenida Pedro I em relação ao eixo do Bairro. O terreno referido terá uma área total de cincoenta [sic] e seis mil metros quadrados...

Municipal decree no. 75, issued on 24 October 1940, was the start of the conjunto. The authors of the decree justified multi-storey housing on the grounds that low-wage earners would be able to afford apartments. Monthly rents were to be, depending on size, between Cr$70.00 and Cr $250.00, the latter of which was based on the legal minimum wage. The complex was originally to comprise about 11 five-storey buildings, but for unknown reasons planners and architects later decided to build only nine buildings that varied from five to nine floors. Illustration 2 shows that the plans included green areas.

---

260 The PBH and newspapers referred to the housing complex as ‘Bairro Popular’ until the second half of the 1940s.
261 PBH: Relatório do prefeito Juscelino Kubitschek de 1940-1941, 79. “The Bairro Popular will be situated on land belonging to the city, within the sixth suburban sector, demarcated [...] on the right by Avenida Pedro I, on the bottom, to, at the most, Rua Araribá by a line of 230 meters perpendicular to the Bairro’s longitudinal axis, on the front[sic] by the junction of Avenida Pedro I and Avenida José Bonifácio (planned), and on the left side by a road to be planned symmetrical to Avenida Pedro I in relation to the Bairro’s axis. The land referred to will cover a total area of 56,000 square meters...” In the early 1940s, Avenida Pedro I was the name of the street that ran from the northern part of the city center to Lagoinha. Some months later, it was extended and renamed ‘Avenida da Pampulha’ (see below). Today, Avenida Pedro I is a street that connects Pampulha and Venda Nova.
262 PBH: Decreto-lei nº 75 de 24 de outubro de 1940, apud PBH: Relatório do prefeito Juscelino Kubitschek de 1940-1941, 77.
263 Ibid., 78. The Vargas government introduced the cruzeiro (Cr$) in October 1942. On 1 May 1940, decree no 2.162 defined the legal minimum salary as 240$000 (Mil Reis), which was equal to 240 cruzeiros. In July 1943, the national government increased the minimum salary to 300 cruzeiros. See http://www5.jfpr.jus.br/ncont/salariomin.pdf (accessed 28 October 2015).
264 Guimarães: Cafuas, Barracos e Barracões, 216.
The PBH; the IAPI; and the Companhia Auxiliar de Serviços de Administração S.A. (C.A.S.A.), a company based in Rio de Janeiro that offered administrative services, collaborated in the planning and construction. Kubitschek later remembered that he had contacted President Plínio Catanhede of the IAPI and reached an agreement with him guaranteeing the project’s financing. On 29 November 1940, the three signed a contract defining each party’s obligations. Catanhede went to Belo Horizonte to attend the signing, after which he held a press conference to announce the release of the IAPI’s funds to begin construction, stating that the IAPI’s executive committee intended to prevent exploitation of the pension fund’s associados by intermediaries.

Illustration 2. Planning sketch of the Conjunto IAPI (1940-1941).

Source: PBH: Relatório do prefeito Juscelino Kubitschek de 1940-1941, 80 a.

265 Kubitschek: A escalada política, 32.
266 PBH: Relatório do prefeito Juscelino Kubitschek de 1940-1941, 78.
267 Estado de Minas, 30 November 1940, 3: “Vae ser installada em Bello Horizonte a Caixa Imobiliaria do Instituto dos Industriários”.
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The contract stipulated that the PBH would lease 56,000 square meters of land to the IAPI; the city was responsible for supplying water, disposing of sewage, building sidewalks, installing street lighting, and providing telephone connections; and the IAPI would finance construction. The C.A.S.A. and IAPI together drew up the blueprints, and the C.A.S.A. assisted the PBH and IAPI in construction and inspections. Both paid the C.A.S.A. for its services.

Though IAPs usually provided housing only for their members (see chapter 2), the PBH and the IAPI agreed that city employees could also apply for apartments in the Conjunto IAPI. As Kubitschek put it:

O I.A.P.I. se obriga: [...] a conceder aos funcionários e empregados da Prefeitura de Belo Horizonte, que não tenham residência própria, as mesmas vantagens e regalias que outorgar aos industriários para locação ou aquisição de apartamentos ou quartos do bairro [Conjunto IAPI].

Nevertheless, Santos’s (1979) interpretation of the IAPs’ housing programs as instances of the *cidadania regulada* applies to the Conjunto IAPI. People who could not prove that they were *associados* of the IAPI or employed by the city were not eligible to live in the new complex. As I explain below, people often found ways to circumvent the rule, but that required money or contacts. Thus, many locals had no chance to move in. Moreover, a careful reading of Kubitschek’s report suggests that he used the project to justify the demolition of the neighboring *favelas* , in particular Pedreira Prado Lopes, for it includes the following sketch of the *conjunto*, in which Pedreira Prado Lopes does not appear. Though C.A.S.A. architects drew the sketch, it reflects Kubitschek’s vision of Lagoinha as a pleasant district without slums.

---


269 Ibid., 80-82.

270 Ibid., 80. “... The I.A.P.I. commits itself to [...] granting to those functionaries and employees of the city of Belo Horizonte who do not own their residences the same advantages and privileges that it grants to industrial workers in the renting or acquisition of apartments or rooms in the complex.” In fact, apartments in the Conjunto IAPI were not sold to the tenants until the early 1970s (see below).

271 Ibid., 76-77.


The project attracted publicity. On 12 December 1942, the 45th anniversary of the founding of Belo Horizonte, the *Estado de Minas* published several articles that praised Kubitschek’s work. One of these, headlined “Duas grandes realizações em favor do operiado,” was on the Conjunto IAPI and the *vila operária* of Mato da Lenha.²⁷² The article said that Pedreira Prado Lopes had already been partly demolished and made no secret of its approval.²⁷³ It also described the design of the Conjunto IAPI and mentioned that work on it would soon start. According to the article, both initiatives would improve workers’ lives.²⁷⁴

In January 1943, the *Revista Belo Horizonte* also published an article on the city’s anniversary that celebrated Belo Horizonte’s modernization under Kubitschek’s administration, mentioning the installation of sewage

---

²⁷² The administration under Kubitschek planned to build the *vila operária* of Mato da Lenha near Gameleira on Belo Horizonte’s western outskirts. Some families whose dwellings in Pedreira Prado Lopes had been destroyed were resettled there. See chapter 5.
²⁷³ See chapter 5.
²⁷⁴ *Estado de Minas*, 12 December 1942, 5: “Duas grandes realizações em favor do operiado”.
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disposal, the destruction of *favelas*, the paving of streets, and the projects under construction in Pampulha. It described the Conjunto IAPI in language similar to that used in the *Estado de Minas* some weeks before. In fact, some expressions were identical, and the author of the magazine’s article likely copied them from the newspaper. Both authors mentioned who was eligible for apartments in the complex. According to the magazine: “Onde existiam cerca de 483 ‘cafuas’ com uma população aproximada de 3 mil pessoas, serão construídos [sic] onze edifícios de cinco pavimentos cada um, destinados a apartamentos para os industriários, [sic] servidores da Prefeitura e outras classes...”\(^{275}\) Since the author did not specify who he meant by ‘outras classes,’ it is not possible to say if he assumed that others besides members of the IAPI and employees of the PBH would be able to live in the *conjunto*. According to both articles, people who had been evicted from Pedreira Prado Lopes had found housing in the *vila operária* of Mato da Lenha, and resettlement had improved their living conditions. Neither author expressed the slightest criticism of their having been forced from their homes.\(^{276}\)

In December 1943, Belo Horizonte’s Rotary Club organized a celebration of the city’s 46th anniversary at which Kubitschek gave a speech. In the following year, the club published the speech in the commemorative *BH na Palavra do Prefeito Juscelino Kubitschek*, which included a commentary on the Conjunto IAPI:

…‘Bairro Popular’- Para resolver um dos mais difíceis [sic] e complexos problemas para os que não possuem casa própria [sic], a Prefeitura Municipal e o Instituto de Aposentadorias e Pensões dos Industriários estão construindo o ‘Bairro Popular’ [the Conjunto IAPI], moderno conjunto de edifícios, destinando à residência dos servidores municipais e dos industriários. É plano interessante e que permite a solução de problema até aqui difícil [sic] [...] O início das obras foi assistido pelo prefeito Juscelino Kubitschek e pelo presidente do I.A.P.I., dr. Plínio Catanhede, autoridades às quais a capital ficará de-


\(^{276}\) See chapter 5.
vendo este grande empreendimento, cujo valor ultrapassará a quarenta e cinco milhões de cruzeiros...

It is easy to see that the elitist Rotary Club supported the PBH’s plans for the housing project. The quoted text was the caption of the following illustration of the Conjunto IAPI:


‘...‘Bairro Popular’- In order to resolve one of the most difficult and complex problems for those who do not own their own homes, the city and the Instituto de Aposentadoria e Pensões dos Industriários are building the ‘Bairro Popular’ [the Conjunto IAPI], a modern housing complex meant for municipal employees and industrial workers. This is an interesting plan that offers a solution to a so far difficult problem [...] Present at the beginning of construction were Mayor Juscelino Kubitschek and the president of the I.A.P.I., Dr. Plínio Catanhede, authorities to whom the capital owes this great undertaking, whose cost will exceed 45 million cruzeiros...


The drawing, which was done by the C.A.S.A., depicts the housing complex from the front. It is noteworthy that it portrays the central square as a wide area with lawns and broad sidewalks resembling a park. In light of the nationalist character of the Estado Novo’s cultural politics, it is not surprising to find the Brazilian national flag flying from a flagpole in front. The drawing shows the complex surrounded by unspoiled hills. The perspective gives it a monumental appearance, and the design of the buildings reminds one of the architectural styles favored by totalitarian regimes in Europe during the 1930s and 1940s. I read the drawing as an expression of how city managers and urban planners envisioned the Conjunto IAPI after the urban renewal of the Lagoinha area. The fact that the neighboring favelas do not appear supports this interpretation.

The two articles mentioned above show that the press and the social elite supported the project. The print media usually had nothing but praise for the Kubitschek administration, and federal and city authorities used...
newspapers and magazines to proliferate their ideologies. \(^\text{279}\) However, contemporary newspapers did provide different perspectives on the Conjunto IAPI. Construction began on 17 May 1944. On the following day, the *Estado de Minas* published an article based on an interview with José Francisco da Silva, the president of the city’s union of footwear industry workers (Sindicato dos Trabalhadores da Indústria de Calçados de Belo Horizonte). Though the author welcomed the fact that the city had put housing on its agenda, he said that da Silva was openly critical of the project and the decision to build rental apartments rather than houses that workers could hope to own:

> Em primeiro lugar o propósito do I.A.P.I. é alugar os apartamentos, e não vendê-los aos seus ocupantes. Quer isso dizer que o operario [sic], continuará a ser o inquilino que sempre foi, não se libertando completamente da situação em que hoje se encontra. A grande ambição do trabalhador é possuir casa própria [sic], ser dono da sua habitação... \(^\text{280}\)

And the author agreed:

> Por outro lado, nada há que recomende a localização de massas operarias [sic] em edificios de apartamentos. Esse tipo de habitação coletiva tem a sua clientele própria [sic], que não se recruta nos meios operarios [sic]. O trabalhador prefere a casa, com um pedaço de terra em que possa plantar a sua horta e que sirva de recreação para seus filhos. Esses habitos [sic], de simplicidade do proletario [sic] contraindicam a construção de ‘arranha-céus’ para residência de sua família [...] Conservar a ordem e a higiene num grande edifício, habitado por trabalhadores, não é coisa que se possa obter facilmente... \(^\text{281}\)

---


280 *Estado de Minas*, 18 May 1944, 10: “A construção do bairro popular da Lagoiinha.” “In the first place, the proposal of the I.A.P.I. is to rent the apartments instead of selling them to their occupants. This means that the worker will continue to be a tenant, as he always was, rather than liberating himself completely from the situation in which he finds himself today. It is the worker’s great ambition to own his own house, to be the owner of his home...”

281 Ibid. “On the other hand, there is nothing to recommend accommodating the working masses in apartment buildings. This type of collective housing has its proper clientele, but workers are no part of it. The worker prefers a house with a piece of land where he can plant his vegetable garden and that serves for the recreation of his children. These habits, the simplicity of the proletariat, contraindicate the construction of a skyscraper for his family’s residence [...] Preserving order and hygiene in a large building inhabited by workers is not something that can be easily achieved...”
By 1944, some workers had realized that the new conjunto would not do anything for them because the PBH and IAPI were intending to rent to middle-class tenants, and the author shared their opinion.

Both quotations suggest that the author also agreed with da Silva that it was better for workers to become homeowners rather than apartment tenants. If he did, then he was re-opening the debate of the previous decade over whether the casa própria or the multi-storey apartment building was the more appropriate sort of housing for workers. (See chapter 2.) Ideologists of the Estado Novo believed that home ownership would help prevent unrest among workers, and the author shared that conservative attitude. Some of his remarks are also reminiscent of contemporary authorities’ belief in the need to control and morally educate the residents of public housing. However, he added that he had no disdain for the working class and apparently felt able, having interviewed a high-ranking labor leader, to represent workers’ views about the Conjunto IAPI: “...Em resumo, todos os motivos desaconselham a solução proposta pelo I.A.P.I. relativamente à construção do Bairro Popular [the Conjunto IAPI] na Lagoinha. É este o ponto de vista dos trabalhadores de Belo Horizonte.”

Other workers’ representatives shared the author’s view. In late May 1944, a group of union members went to Rio de Janeiro to submit a petition to the IAPI’s president Plínio Catanhede in which they, like the author, complained that the Conjunto IAPI was going to be for the middle class and proposed that vilas operárias be built in Cachoeirinha and several other districts instead. Catanhede responded by defending the project:

...o presidente do I.A.P.I. encarece a conveniencia [sic] do plano, pois permitirá o abrigo a 800 famílias em moradias economicas e confortaveis [sic] e plenamente acessíveis aos salarios [sic] dos trabalhadores. Em caso contrario [sic], por exemplo, com um plano de construçoes isoladas não seria possível a

282 Ibid.: “In brief, all of the arguments speak against the solution proposed by the I.A.P.I. concerning the construction of Bairro Popluar [the Conjunto IAPI] in Lagoinha. This is the point of view of the workers of Belo Horizonte.”

283 Cachoeirinha is in Belo Horizonte’s zona nordeste to the east of Avenida Presidente Antônio Carlos. According to the petition that the union members gave to Catanhede, about 3,000 workers lived in Cachoeirinha in 1944. See Estado de Minas, 1 June 1944, 10: “Solução melhor para o problema da casa própria”.

284 Estado de Minas, 1 June 1944, 10.
3. The Conjunto IAPI in Belo Horizonte

localização de mais de 80 ou 100 casas, de custo elevado, pois em correspon-
dencia [sic] com o alto valor do terreno.285

On 14 June 1944, Kubitschek met with representatives of workers who were members of the IAPI and stressed the need to solve the housing problem as soon as possible. On the following day, the Estado de Minas wrote that the IAPI, in collaboration with the PBH, was planning to build more public housing in Belo Horizonte on the model of projects it had built in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo.286 However, the Conjunto IAPI was to be the only development of its kind. The IAPI built no more multi-storey housing complexes in Belo Horizonte.287

Work on the Conjunto IAPI began on 17 May 1944.288 The engineer White Lírio da Silva and the architects José Barreto and Antônio Neves, who had drawn up the blueprints, supervised.289 The PBH and the IAPI employed about 800 construction workers.290 Quarrymen used dynamite to cut the large amount of stone needed from nearby quarries.291 Current residents of the complex who had moved in before work on all nine buildings was completed, remembered the explosions. In her interview, Leticia,292 who had lived in the Conjunto IAPI for about 65 years, remembered how the explosions disturbed daily life: “...Quando eu vim para cá, o edifício número nove, ele não existia. Era uma mina, era uma pedreira

---

285 Estado de Minas, 15 June 1944, 5: “Varios empreendimentos do I.A.P.I. solucio-
narão o problema da moradia do operario em Minas”. “...the president of the I.A.P.I. emphasizes the plan’s convenience, for it will allow the sheltering of 800 families in dwellings that are inexpensive and comfortable and entirely affordable for workers. On the other hand, with, for example, a plan for solitary construc-
tion, it will not be possible to build more than 80 to 100 houses, of higher cost, because of the high cost of the land.”

286 Ibid.

287 Guimarães: Cafusas, Barracos e Barracões, 221.

288 Ibid., 218.

289 Gerência de Patrimônio Histórico Urbano; Secretaria Municipal Adjunta de Re-
gulação Urbana (GEPH): Dossiê de Tombamento Conjunto Residencial São Cristóvão – IAPI. Belo Horizonte 2007, 23. White Lírio da Silva, who worked as an engineer for the IAPI, coordinated construction of the Conjunto IAPI. Unfortunately, it was not possible to find any information on José Barreto and Antônio Neves.

290 Ibid., 25.


292 I have changed the names of all interviewees.
Sometimes, flying debris even shattered the windows of her apartment. Leonardo, who moved in in 1950, remembered construction delays:

O edifício 9 tinha muita pedra e eles não conseguiram construir na época em [19]48. Então ficou aquele aberto ali, do edifício não tinha nada. Porque eles tinham que furar essa argila pra tirar aquela mina de água que tinha. Então quando foi 1951 conseguiram furar essa argila...294

293 Interview with Letícia, conducted in the Conjunto IAPI, Belo Horizonte, on 24 August 2012. “...When I came here, Building number 9 did not exist. It was a mine; it was a quarry with a mine. At 11:00 in the morning we had to hide inside, I hid in a shed, because they used to set off dynamite.”

294 Interview with Leonardo and Teresa, conducted in Leonardo’s apartment in the Conjunto IAPI, Belo Horizonte, on 8 August 2012. “Building 9 had a lot of stone and they did not manage to build it in [19]48. So, there was this opening there, the building did not exist. Because they had to make a hole in the clay to drain that source of water that was there. So, in 1951 they managed to make a hole in the clay...”
Illustration 5. *The Conjunto IAPI under construction in the late 1940s. The building on the left is part of the Hospital Municipal.*

Source: APCBH, Fundo ASCOM. Imagem 14812.

Some of the construction workers lived in the neighboring *favela* of Pedreira Prado Lopes. The work was hard, and the hours were long: “...foi muito trabalho, porque nós enchia o caminhão de pedra, caminhão de terra, e pra nós era serviço demais. Nóis pegava empreitada pra fazer aquele serviço, mas foi trabalho demais da conta.”

Soares and Antunes: *Pedreira Prado Lopes*, 138. “...it was a lot of work because we had to fill up the rock truck, the dirt truck, and for us it was way too much work. We worked in shifts to do it, but it was too much work.” I have not corrected errors in spelling and grammar in the quotations from Soares and Antunes (2001).
even fatal accidents. Leonardo remembered a tragic incident in the early 1950s:

> Na explosão das bombas uma pedra atingiu uma criança numa rua popular ali. Foi a parte do acidente. A pedra saiu do edifício 9 ali, as cinco horas da tarde fazia as explosões das bombas pra quebrar as pedras pra abrir, pra descer a mina. E, uma pedra atingiu uma criança na rua popular.

In his autobiography, Kubitschek wrote that the work had gone quickly. But he did not mention that more than three years had passed between the signing of the contract in 1940 and the start of construction. Nor did he say anything about problems and the delays they caused. Thus, the story that residents and former construction workers tell is more realistic than Kubitschek’s sanitized version.

Though still under construction, the conjunto was inaugurated on 1 May 1948. The PBH and the IAPI probably chose this date because it was Labor Day. In attendance were union leaders, journalists, and a delegation of high-ranking IAPI officials. Three days later, the *Estado de Minas* published an article about the ceremony and the progress of the construction work, the authors also mentioning that the IAPI had not yet solved the problem of supplying water:

> Apesar de um dos edificios estar completamente pronto há quase cinco meses e de um outro ficar concluído até fins de julho próximo, perfazendo ambos um total de 153 apartamentos, o Instituto dos Industriarios [sic] acha se impossibilitado de alugar os referidos apartamentos, porque o problema do abastecimento de agua [sic] do conjunto, cujo estudo vem sendo objeto de enten-

---

296 Ibid., 138-139.
297 Interview with Leonardo and Teresa, 8 August 2012. “In the explosion from the charges, a stone hit a child in a public street over there. It was an accident. The stone came off of Building 9; at 5:00 in the afternoon they would set off the charges to break the stones in order to open, to descend into the mine. And a stone hit a child in the public street.” With the expression ‘rua popular,’ Leonardo referred to the alleys in the immediate neighborhood, probably in Pedreira Prado Lopes.
298 Kubitschek: *A escalada política*, 32.
299 Kubitschek’s term as Belo Horizonte’s mayor ended in 1945, when construction of the Conjunto IAPI had just begun.
300 *Estado de Minas*, 4 May 1948, 3-4: “Grandes serviços e empreendimentos do I.A.P.I. nesta capital”.
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They did say that a reservoir would be ready by August 1948. In fact, residents had to cope with water shortages throughout the 1950s and 1960s.

From the 1940s on, multi-storey buildings shaped the center of Belo Horizonte, and the Conjunto IAPI, though not in the center of town, symbolized this vertical growth. It also contrasted sharply with the neocolonial and Art Deco buildings in its neighborhood and the shacks of the nearby favela. The complex was thus a new and distinctive architectural feature of Lagoinha. Its nine buildings (Edifícios 2-10) are compact cylinders with rounded corners and plain roofs and walls. All are similar except for their different numbers of floors. Each building has four wings enclosing an inner courtyard. On each floor, 16 apartments are evenly distributed along the wings, two wings of two-bedroom and two of one-bedroom apartments. All include a living room, bathroom, and kitchen. Their sizes range from about 60 to about 100 square meters. There are no elevators; the apartments are accessible only by stairs. Footbridges connect the buildings at the sixth floor. The nine buildings are arranged in the form of a horseshoe surrounding a public square (Praça Professor Corrêa Neto) with three buildings on each of its eastern, western,
and northern boundaries.\textsuperscript{307} According to Bonduki, the Conjunto IAPI’s fortress-like layout was modeled, and is the only housing project in Brazil to be modeled, on Vienna’s \textit{Höfe Siedlungen}.

\textbf{Illustration 6. Footbridge between two buildings in the Conjunto IAPI.}

(\textit{Photo by Mario Peters, 2014})

Today, the site comprises an area of approximately 75,000 square meters, including the Igreja São Cristóvão; the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros; a sports field; a playground; and landscaped areas where Brazilwood, Gameleira, Jequitibá, and Paineira trees grow.\textsuperscript{309} The complex has 928 apartments with space for more than 5,400 residents.\textsuperscript{310} I was not able to determine if all of the apartments were rented after the inauguration in 1948, nor did I find any information on changes

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{307} See Ibid., 54-55.
\item \textsuperscript{308} Bonduki: \textit{Origens da habitação social no Brasil}, 174.
\item \textsuperscript{309} GEPH: \textit{Dossiê de Tombamento IAPI}, 54-55.
\item \textsuperscript{310} Ibid., 25.
\end{itemize}
in tenants and rates of occupancy. Some interviewees commented on these matters, but their remarks were contradictory, as I explain below. Thus, I cannot say if the number of residents has changed significantly over the years. As I mentioned previously, the apartments were sold to their tenants in the early 1970s, when part of the complex was being renovated, and some residents had the opportunity to enlarge their apartments by incorporating a room from an adjacent unit. However, information on whether apartments had ever been altered before they were sold is inconsistent. According to a study published by Belo Horizonte’s Gerência de Patrimônio Histórico Urbano (GEPH) in 2007, all of the apartments were originally 60 square meters. However, the same document says that the complex was designed to house singles, couples without children, and large families. Interviewees alsoremembered that the number of people living in apartments had varied significantly (see below). Thus, I assume that the average size before 1971 was about 60 square meters. Apparently, this did not keep the IAPI from renting to whole families.

3.3. The Allocation of Apartments and Early Experiences of Living in the Conjunto IAPI

In order to understand the complex’s social structure and residents’ experiences of living in social housing, I asked interviewees where they had lived before. Many who came to the conjunto in the 1950s and 1960s had moved to Belo Horizonte from villages and small towns in the interior of Minas Gerais. According to Gilberto, “Era a família humilde, gente que vinha de Diamantina, de Ouro Preto—minha avó veio de Ouro Preto. Tinha família que vinha de Diamantina, tinha uma família grande aqui lá de Paracatu, do norte de Minas.[...] É, todo mundo era da roça.” Several

311 Ibid., 56.
312 Ibid.
313 Ibid., 25.
314 The influx of rural migrants to Belo Horizonte was similar to other cities. Since the 1930s, steadily increasing migration from the countryside had fueled the accelerating growth of many Brazilian cities.
315 Interview with Gilberto, his son Cristiano, and Teresa, conducted in Gilberto’s apartment in the Conjunto IAPI, Belo Horizonte, on 19 February 2013. “It was the humble family, people from Diamantina, from Ouro Preto—my grandmother came from Ouro Preto. There was the family that came from Diamantina, there
long-term residents said their parents or grandparents had come from small towns like Abaeté and Ouro Preto. Most interviewees did not remember how their families had traveled to Belo Horizonte. According to one, some of his later neighbors came from other parts of the city by horse cart. Though the *conjunto* was the first residence in Belo Horizonte for some of my interviewees, others had lived in different districts before they had moved in. Leonardo, for example, who came to Belo Horizonte from northern Minas Gerais, lived for some years in Santa Efigênia before he moved into the *conjunto* at the age of nineteen. Gilberto was born in the district of Santa Tereza in 1947. A few years later, he lost his father and moved to the *conjunto* with his mother, brother, sister, and grandfather.

In the original contract, the IAPI had agreed to reserve 20% of the complex’s apartments to employees of the PBH, the remaining 80% being for its members. Several interviewees said their parents had managed to rent an apartment because of that arrangement. Gilberto remembered that his grandfather could move in because he worked for the city. When his family moved in in the 1950s, Roberto, whose father worked for the city, was still a young boy: “Os funcionários da prefeitura teriam direito a uma parte [of the apartments]. E como o meu pai era funcionário da prefeitura ele acabou tendo direito a um apartamento aqui. Eu era rapazinho ainda. E foi aí que nós viemos morar no Conjunto IAPI.”

The contract had imposed a rent ceiling of 250 cruzeiros per month. According to Leonardo, the rent was much higher when he came 10 years later: “Cheguei aqui em 1950. Fiz um contrato de locação em [19]51. Um contrato pagando 416 cruzeiros, 416 cruzeiros por mês de aluguel. Era aí que nós viemos morar no Conjunto IAPI.”

See, for instance, the interviews with Leonardo and Teresa (8 August 2012); Tiago and Teresa (conducted in Teresa’s apartment in the Conjunto IAPI, Belo Horizonte, on 18 September 2012); Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013); and Roberto (conducted in Roberto’s apartment in the Conjunto IAPI, Belo Horizonte, on 28 August 2013).

Interview with Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013).


Interview with Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013).

Interview with Roberto (28 August 2013). “The bureaucrats of the city government had a right to a part [of the apartments]. And since my father was a city functionary he had the right to an apartment here. I was still a little fellow. And that was how we came to live in the Conjunto IAPI.”
aluguel, não prestação.”322 According to Sofia, who moved to the complex when she got married in 1954, potential tenants had to apply at the IAPI.323 It and the PBH then decided on the application. According to Roberto, preference was given to applicants with a modest income or a large number of children.324 In fact, though, the IAPI and the PBH did not follow the rules to which they had agreed. Gilberto and his son Cristiano complained that the IAPI had not allocated apartments according to the principles agreed to in the 1940 contract: “O requisito básico era de ser da indústria ou ser funcionário da prefeitura. [...] Só que eles não usavam muito esse critério.”325

In fact, many inhabitants got their apartments through personal contacts and clientelism. Teresa’s father had worked for the National Department of Motor Vehicles (Departamento Nacional de Estradas de Rodagem) in the 1950s, when he was living very modestly in a favela. When his wife became pregnant a friend who was a member of the IAPI arranged for them to get an apartment in the complex where Teresa was born in 1957:

Ai ele foi morar num barraco muito simplezinho lá na [favela] Barroca. [...] O meu padrinho que era amigo dele, meu padrinho trabalhava no IAPI. E meu pai tava morando nesse barraco, minha mãe tava grávida da primeira filha. [...] Então o meu padrinho arrumou pra meu pai vim morar aqui.326

Some interviewees claimed that some applicants had used their contacts with local politicians to secure apartments:

Você conseguia apartamento através de um deputado, através de um vereador, através de um amigo prefeito [...] Então entravam nos apartamentos aqui, às vezes por influência. Então isso ai atrapalhou muito a habitação. [...] Foi na

322 Interview with Leonardo and Teresa (8 August 2012). “I arrived here in 1950. I signed a rental agreement in [19]51. A contract for 416 cruzeiros, 416 cruzeiros per month as rent. It was rent, not an installment.”
323 Interview with Sofia, conducted in the Igreja São Cristóvão, Belo Horizonte, on 29 April 2014.
324 Interview with Roberto (28 August 2013).
325 Interview with Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013). “The basic requirement was to be either an industrial worker or a city functionary. [...] However, they did not use this criterion much.”
326 Interview with Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013). “So he went to live in a very simple shack there in the Barroca [slum]. [...] My godfather, who was a friend of his, my godfather worked for the IAPI. And my father was living in this shack, my mother was pregnant with her first daughter. [...] Then my godfather arranged for my father to come and live here.”
According to Letícia, approved applicants could indicate the apartments they wanted, but I was not able to confirm that they could choose them. In Gilberto’s opinion, the improper allocation of apartments had negative effects on living conditions:

...e outra coisa que foi errada aqui. Que eles não faziam uma pesquisa, um cadastro da pessoa que fosse morar nos blocos. Tinha pessoas que ficaram com dez crianças tinha apartamento de um quarto, era ocupada aquele apartamento. E tinha apartamento com dois, três quartos, que vinha pessoas, casal com um filho ocuparam aquele apartamento.

Several scholars have interpreted the fact that the IAPs provided housing only to their members as an element of the cidadania regulada and as denying the poor their rights. However, interviewees emphasized social diversity of the residents. Verifying their statements or otherwise determining the conjunto’s social structure was not easy, for there are few sources of information about residents’ socioeconomic status, education, and employment. However, there is one reliable source. In a study carried out in 1958-1959, 10 years after the inauguration of the Conjunto IAPI, the Sociedade para Análises Gráficas e Mecanográficas Aplicadas aos Complexos Sociais (SAGMACS) collected data on variables like income, level of education, profession, and the availability of urban infrastructures in residential areas to analyze Belo Horizonte’s socio-spatial structure.

---

327 Ibid. “You got an apartment by seeing a congressman, through a city councilman, through being friends with the mayor. [...] Thus, sometimes they got apartments here through influence. So, this really disrupted housing here. [...] This was at the time of the inauguration. This was already at the time of the inauguration. It was already like this, understand?”

328 Interview with Leticia (24 August 2012).

329 Interview with Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013). “...and another thing that was wrong here. That they didn’t do a study, a census of who would live in the buildings. There were people with ten children who had a one-room apartment, that apartment was occupied. And there was an apartment with two, three rooms, and people came, a couple with one child live in that apartment.”

330 See the next section.

331 The SAGMACS was founded in São Paulo in 1947 by the French priest Louis-Joseph Lebret, who was also the founder of the Mouvement Économie et Humanisme. Throughout the following decade, he influenced urban planning in various Brazilian cities. For a detailed study of Lebret, his activities in Brazil, and the SAGMACS, see Cestaro (2015).
structure. In its final report, researchers classified the majority of the Conjunto IAPI’s residents as lower-middle class.\textsuperscript{332} They put the complex into its own socio-spatial category on the grounds that its origin was completely different from the historical development of the surrounding areas.\textsuperscript{333} However, the report did not specify the extent to which the conjunto differed socially from its neighborhood.

As in social housing projects in other Brazilian cities at the time, the rules for allocating apartments in the Conjunto IAPI excluded much of the local population, especially the inhabitants of the neighboring favela of Pedreira Prado Lopes. (See chapter 5.) Though interviews revealed that people found ways to circumvent the rules, this was no help to the poor, for they lacked the necessary social and economic capital. And the fact that politicians used their influence to help friends and potential voters get apartments in the complex reduced the number available to those entitled to apply. Thus, non-compliance with the rules through corruption and clientelism reinforced social exclusion.

In the 1940 contract, the PBH agreed to provide the complex with basic infrastructure. However, daily life there in the 1950s and 1960s included frequent water shortages and power cuts. According to Gilberto, residents had to fetch water in buckets from the opposite side of Avenida Antônio Carlos:

Nos temos falta de luz, muita falta de luz que era nosso problema aqui. [...] E água, muita falta de água. [...] Água, nos carregávamos água, atravessávamos a avenida, o posto Pedrosa. Antigo posto de gasolina que tinha poço artesiano nos fornecia água, ou então aqui atrás tinha mina, a gente pegava água, carregava água no balde pra levar pra casa. [...] Então o pessoal carregava água no balde e a gente comprava tambores de duzentos litros. Punha no chão na área e ia enchendo para poder jogar no vaso, pra poder lavar roupa, para poder tudo.\textsuperscript{334}

\textsuperscript{332} PBH: 

\textsuperscript{333} Ibid., 5.

\textsuperscript{334} Interview with Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013). “We had power outages, frequent power outages were our problem here. [...] And water, frequent water shortages. [...] Water, we used to carry water, we would cross the avenue, the Pedrosa station. The old gas station that had an artesian well supplied us water, or behind here, there was a source, we would get water, filled a bucket with water to carry it home. [...] People would carry water in buckets and we used to buy 200 liter barrels. Put it on the floor in the utility area and filled it in
The city connected the conjunto, and the rest of the neighborhood, to the local water main in 1956. Some years later, it dug an artesian well inside the complex, though an article in the Estado de Minas in August 1971 claimed that the lack of potable water was still a serious problem. In the complex’s first years, a separate generator supplied each of the nine buildings with electric light. Later, the nine generators were replaced by a single one, which was placed in front of Edifício 10. Between 1954 and 1957, the PBH installed streetlights in the Conjunto IAPI and its neighborhood.

Apartments came with modern household appliances. Gilberto’s first apartment was equipped with a water heater and an electric stove. The modern appliances attracted the attention of the local press in 1948:

Os magníficos edifícios de apartamentos em conclusão no Bairro dos Industriários, estão sendo dotados de instalações internas as mais modernas [...] estão servidos, todos, dos magníficos fogões elétricos ‘AG’ da fabricação da conceituada firma local, Almeida Gardini Cia. & Ltda...

According to Gilberto, however, many new residents did not know how to use their appliances:

As pessoas deixavam [o aquecedor] ligado e esqueciam e saía pra trabalhar. E ele explodia, ele não era automático. Porque ele tinha uma chave pra você order to be able to throw water into the toilet bowl, to wash clothes, to do everything.”

---

337 Estado de Minas, 20 August 1971, 7: “Conjunto IAPI faz protesto contra ameaça do Instituto”.
338 Interview with Leonardo and Teresa (8 August 2012).
340 Interview with Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013).
341 Estado de Minas, 4 May 1948, 3: “Os fogões ‘AG’ nos apartamentos do Bairro dos Industriários.” “The magnificent apartment buildings that are almost ready in the Bairro dos Industriários are being given the most modern appliances [...] they are all equipped with the magnificent ‘AG’ electric stoves manufactured by the respected local company Almeida Gardini Cia. & Ltda...”
Moreover, electricity was expensive, and many inhabitants could not pay their bills. Due to the frequent power cuts, electrical appliances often broke down. Sometimes, broken stoves were removed and inhabitants had to cook with charcoal or kerosene. Thus, actual conditions did not fit with the image of the Conjunto IAPI as a symbol of modernization.

Interviewees expressed satisfaction with their apartments. Gilberto was pleased with the appliances, which he thought of as modern despite their frequent problems. Leonardo was impressed with the quality of the building materials. Teresa and Tiago enjoyed the size and the interior design of their apartments. In section 3.2, I mentioned that union workers had protested against the Conjunto IAPI in the 1940s because they wanted to become homeowners. But older interviewees had no recollection that either the multi-storey buildings or the fact that apartments could only be rented had caused any hesitation among the first tenants to move in.


In one interview, Tiago, a resident since the 1980s, talked about a group of neighbors, known in the complex as ‘dinosaurs,’ that had been socializing together on weekends for decades:

Tem uma turma aqui, que morou aqui, há vinte, trinta, quarenta anos atrás. A gente fala que são os dinossauros do conjunto. Eu conheço todos também. Me dou muito bem com eles e tal. Então o seguinte, essa turma não ficou um fim...
de semana sem vir aqui tomar uma cerveja aqui no bairro. Tem uma turma também que joga truco [a Brazilian card game] que já é a turma mais nova, mas também todo sábado está aqui. Se você chegar aqui e ver o conjunto no sábado ou domingo de manhã, você não acredita a movimentação...

Tiago’s remarks show that several places in the complex have been important meeting points for its residents. According to experts on urban living, interactions among residents and between them and their surroundings are important for city dwellers to identify with their places of residence and establish solidarity with their neighbors, and research has shown that friendships, acquaintanceships, and the formation of interest groups, as well as competition and conflict, are the result of everyday encounters such as occur at the grocery store. Family circles and public celebrations are also important spheres of sociability, and people also forge social relationships in public squares, bars, restaurants, shops, churches, and any other place where they interact.

In this section, I consider the meaning that neighborliness, and social life more generally, have had for residents of the Conjunto IAPI, and I identify the places, events, and situations that interviewees recounted as important in this regard. As there are few documents that describe the conjunto’s social atmosphere, I have based this section on interviews with residents, whose oral histories are sources on the significance of socializing. Of course, their memories are subjective reconstructions; they are not necessarily accurate portrayals of the social climate of former times but, rather, show how residents now believe they experienced living with their neighbors. Moreover, the ways that interviev-

---

347 Interview with Tiago and Teresa (18 September 2012). “There’s a group of friends here that has lived here for twenty, thirty, forty years. We say that they’re the dinosaurs of the complex. I know all of them. I get along very well with them and so on. Let me tell you, this group did not let one single weekend pass without coming here to have a beer in the bairro [complex]. There’s another group that plays truco [a Brazilian card game], they are the newer group, but every Saturday they are also here. If you come here and see the complex on a Saturday or Sunday morning, you won’t believe the commotion...”


349 Freire, Cíntia Mirlene Pela, and A.A.M. Sales.: “Modos de vida e cotidiano no bairro Lagoinha: lugares, sociabilidade e vizinhança.” In: Andrade and Arroyo: Bairros pericentrais de Belo Horizonte, 132.
wees talked about the social life of the complex clearly revealed their desire to counter the negative stereotypes of outsiders.

As sociological research has shown, social relationships in urban districts change over time, and several interviewees reported that in recent years the social atmosphere of the complex has not been as convivial as it once was. Therefore, I also consider what interviewees had to say about the complex’s recent social life. In this way, it is possible to understand how perceptions of contemporary social dynamics and, in particular, the nostalgia of elderly residents influenced their reconstructions of the past.

Several older interviewees who had made life-long friends in the conjunto remembered its green spaces and the public square, the Praça Prof. Corrêa Neto, as places where neighbors regularly met and friendships formed.

---

A sports field in the Conjunto IAPI in the late 1950s. The complex’s outside areas were important for socializing.

Source: APCBH, Fundo ASCOM. Imagem 16090.

Adults also used to gather at two bars and a café that were in the complex in the 1950s and 1960s, but the public square and landscaped areas were particularly important for children. Teresa grew up in the complex in the 1960s. Her words apply to the similar childhood recollections of other interviewees:

Então jogava ping-pong, jogava futebol, as meninas contra os meninos na quadra aí da praça. E brincava de tudo. Andava pelo conjunto todo, brincava de pique e esconde. Então como aqui é muito grande, a gente juntava assim, eram umas vinte a trinta crianças. E a pessoa que ia procurar, chamava pegador, e tinha de ser cinco para poder achar. Era muito bom, a gente saía daqui para tocar a campainha na casa dos outros, bater nas portas e corria, sabe?

Illustration 7. A sports field in the Conjunto IAPI in the late 1950s. The complex’s outside areas were important for socializing.

Source: APCBH, Fundo ASCOM. Imagem 16090.

351 Interview with Sofia (29 April 2014).
Coisa de menino mesmo. Muito alegre, muito bom. Brincava muito na praçinha também. Era muito tranquilo, muito tranquilo.\textsuperscript{352}

In October 1957, the PBH and the IAPI put in a playground on the square. The IAPI also introduced rules for the use of the landscaped areas and forbade playing soccer in the courtyards. However, children did not care about the rules, and there were conflicts with the watchmen.\textsuperscript{353} Though such incidents might seem trivial at first glance, they reveal that conflict was a part of daily life in the complex. Interviewees, however, remembered most conflicts as incidental. Throughout the interviews, such romanticized memories led subjects to skip over serious quarrels in the past that contradicted their image of the Conjunto IAPI as a harmonious community.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{352} Interview with Teresa (18 September 2012). “So we used to play ping-pong, soccer, the girls against the boys on the court at the square over there. And we made games of everything. We would run around the whole complex, play hide and seek. So, since this is a very large area, we got together here, 20 to 30 kids. And the one who would go looking, called the catcher, had to count to five before start looking. It was great, we went out to ring doorbells, knock on doors and run, you know? Really childish. Very happy, very good. We would also play a lot on the little square. It was very peaceful, very peaceful.” Sofia also mentioned that the Praça Prof. Corrêa Neto offered a lot of space for children to play. Interview with Sofia (29 April 2014).

\textsuperscript{353} Interview with Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013).
\end{flushleft}
Neighbors also socialized in their apartments. In the 1950s, the IAPI installed a radio antenna. Some years later, they added a television antenna, and the first television sets turned their owners’ apartments into meeting places.\textsuperscript{354} Television was especially attractive to children:

\ldots quando tinha televisão, a primeira televisão foi na casa do Waltinho, lá no Edifício 3. [...] Então a primeira televisão surgindo foi na casa dele. A gente tomava banho, a gente era pequenininho, penteava o cabelo bonitinho, combi-

\textsuperscript{354} TV Itacolomi was the first television station in Minas Gerais. It started broadcasting in 1955. Soon television was essential in many households. See Fundação João Pinheiro. Centro de Estudos Históricos e Culturais: \textit{Belo Horizonte & o comércio: 100 anos de história}. Belo Horizonte 1997, 120.

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Inauguration of the playground in the Conjunto IAPI (1957).}
\end{figure}

Source: APCBH, Fundo ASCOM. Imagem 14401.
Sofía’s husband was among the first to buy a television. Grinning, she recalled that a lot of children used to knock on her door and ask if they could watch television:

Então quando saiu a televisão, meu marido comprou uma televisão, naquela época era uma televisão [...] então ia os meninos, ‘dá licença, dá licença’, então ia. Você num imagina a educação dessas crianças pra vê televisão. Ficava aquela coisa, aqueles filmes antigos. [...] E ficavam, na hora que terminava a novela que saía todo mundo, que começava o jornal que ia embora. Era uma coisa muito boa. E essas crianças hoje são tudo gente que você vê, uns são médicos, uns são advogados, tem até um que é delegado que é meu amigo. Então você vê essas crianças, a gente fala com eles: ‘Ah você lembra?’ ‘Ah eu lembro quando eu ia na sua casa vê televisão.’ Era muito bom, sabe?! E os jovens também, as amizades. A gente lembra. Eu lembro, é muito bom, a família unida...

It was easy to see that Sofía remembered nights in front of the television with nostalgia, and such get-togethers generated long-lasting friendships. However, other interviewees did not share her view of television as something that brought neighbors together. In Leticia’s opinion, neighborliness in the complex had suffered from its introduction, for it induced people to stay indoors. Thus, she thought, the increasing popularity of television led

355 Interview with Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013). “...when there was television, the first television was in Waltinho’s apartment, over in Building 3. [...] Well, the first television to appear was in his apartment. We would take a bath, we were very young, comb our hair nice, everyone would arrange to meet, ten, twenty kids, or more. Dressed up like that we rang his doorbell. To ask to watch television.”

356 Interview with Sofia (29 April 2014). “Well when television came out, my husband bought one, at that time it was a television [...] then the boys would come, ‘please, please’; so they came in. You have no idea how well these kids behaved in order to watch television. It was this thing, these old films. [...] And they stayed, when the soap opera would end, everybody left; when the news would start, they would go away. It was so nice. And today these children are all people that you see: some are medical doctors, some are lawyers, there’s even one who is a superintendent, who is my friend. Well you see these kids, and we say to them, ‘Ah, do you remember?’ ‘Ah, I remember when I used to go to your apartment to watch television.’ It was very good, you know?! And the young people too, the friendships. We remember. I remember, it’s very good, the family unit-ed...”
3.4. Memories of Social Life and the Impact of Territorial Stigmatization

to distance and isolation whereas residents’ former lack of material possessions had contributed to conviviality:

Antigamente, você vivia num ambiente mais gostoso do que da atualidade. Por que? Porque a gente não tinha televisão, a gente não tinha nada. Era muito, entendeu? [...] Porque agora todo mundo trabalha, [...] entra dentro seu apartamento, quer assistir televisão...não vive a vida, o cotidiano das áreas externas.\textsuperscript{357}

A comparison of the two quotations shows how subjective memories are and how experiences differ. The introduction of television exemplified the ambivalent effects that certain developments had on sociability in the complex, for interviews indicated that the spread of television enhanced the conviviality of some small groups but also kept many residents from frequenting the public spaces.

When asked about their memories of social life in the Conjunto IAPI, some interviewees spoke about holidays. Some celebrated New Year’s Eve and Festa Junina, in late June, together on the Praça Prof. Corrêa Neto.\textsuperscript{358} On Christmas Eve, neighbors visited each other in their homes. Gilberto and his friends used to divide up the presents that their relatives had given them. In the following quotation, it is easy to see that he remembered those nights with nostalgia:

...o nosso natal aqui, que eu me lembro de criança era um natal mais bonito. Era um natal mais lindo. [...] Todo mundo aqui ficava de porta aberta. Você entrava de uma casa na outra cumprimentando no dia, na noite de natal. E mostrando os presentes que você ganhou. [...] Então aqui era muito democrático, nesse sentido de festa. Natal, ai no natal... aquela beleza.\textsuperscript{359}

\textsuperscript{357} Interview with Leticia (24 August 2012). “Formerly, the atmosphere was lovelier than nowadays. Why? Because we didn’t have television, we didn’t have anything. It was a lot, understand? [...] Because now everybody works, [...] they go into their apartments, want to watch television...don’t live life, the daily life of the areas outside.”

\textsuperscript{358} Interview with Roberto (28 August 2013).

\textsuperscript{359} Interview with Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013). “…our Christmas here, what I remember from my childhood was a prettier Christmas. It was a more beautiful Christmas. [...] Everybody here used to leave their doors open. You would go from one apartment to another greeting people during the day, on Christmas Eve. And showing the presents you had received. [...] Well, it was very democratic here, in this sense of celebration. Christmas, Oh on Christmas… there was such beauty.”
Leonardo, Teresa, and Lucas compared the social atmosphere of the complex to that of a small town in provincial Minas Gerais. Interestingly, they shared a vision of life in Brazilian rural communities as the epitome of neighborliness when in fact traditional rural life in Brazil has always involved violence and extreme social inequality. Such comparisons of the Conjunto IAPI with rural towns are instances of the widespread assumption that neighbors there are close. At the same time, people often believe that life in big cities is anonymous since the excess of human contact leads city dwellers to behave more remotely towards their neighbors, thus putting social distance between people who live close together. According to Andrade and Mendonça, however, this distance provides greater privacy and freedom. On the other hand, it can lead to coldness. Since cities are socially differentiated, relations among neighbors there often develop a complex character. There is a variety of urban ways of life, ranging from complete anonymity to friendliness among neighbors. Be that as it may, given the prevalence of these assumptions about rural and urban life, I read the statements of Leonardo, Teresa, and Lucas as expressions of their desire to distinguish life in the Conjunto IAPI from the supposed anonymity of large cities.

Leonardo and Tiago referred to the complex as a ‘bairro’ (neighborhood or district). The Conjunto IAPI covers a significant part of São Cristóvão, but it is not a district of its own. Tiago said that the conjunto had more inhabitants than many towns in Minas Gerais, and its large number of residents, as well as the fact that it was earlier called ‘Bairro Popular,’ probably led some interviewees to believe otherwise. In the early 1950s, the local press and state actors called the complex ‘Bairro dos In-

360 See the interviews with Leonardo and Teresa (8 August 2012), Teresa (18 September 2012), and Lucas (conducted in Lucas’s apartment in the Conjunto IAPI, Belo Horizonte, on 24 September 2012).
361 According to Andrade and Mendonça, sociologists like Max Weber and Ferdinand Tönnies described big cities as places where neighborhood relationships used to be less intense. See Andrade and Mendonça: “Estudo de bairros”, 3.
363 Ibid., 4-5.
364 Interviews with Leonardo and Teresa (8 August 2012), and Tiago and Teresa (18 September 2012).
365 Interview with Tiago and Teresa (18 September 2012).
However, the public perception of district boundaries does not depend on the official or the media’s use of a name. According to Andrade and Mendonça, people describe certain areas within a district as ‘their community.’ Interviewees’ use of the term ‘bairro’ in reference to the Conjunto IAPI points in this direction and is evidence for the thesis that a city’s district borders are often “imperfect operational definitions of neighborhoods for research and policy.” When it comes to what people identify as their neighborhood, perceptions of relations among neighbors are more important than demographical data.

Andrade and Mendonça argue that what is most relevant is whether or not inhabitants identify themselves with their vicinity, if they have a feeling of belonging to a certain area. Interviewees were keen to express pride in their place of residence. At first glance, their statements seem to express a strong identification with the complex. Their recurrent use of the term ‘bairro’ indicates that they distinguished the conjunto from the surrounding areas and attributed positive characteristics to it. And they placed special emphasis on their friendly relationships with their neighbors. Several described the Conjunto IAPI as a big family (grande família), by which they meant that the residents formed a cohesive group in which everyone knew and supported each other. In pointing to the advantages of living in the complex, Roberto named proximity to the city center, the public institutions in the immediate vicinity, and the access to public transportation, but, above all, was its neighborliness:

...aquele negócio que eu te falei que aqui a gente considera uma grande família, aqui no Conjunto. E as grandes amizades que a gente tem, encontros que a gente tem no final de semana, a gente tem um barzinho aqui que a gente vai, quem gosta vai e toma uma cervejinha, vai bater papo, vai discutir futebol.

---

369 See, for instance, the interviews with Leonardo and Teresa (8 August 2012), Teresa (18 September 2012), Roberto (28 August 2013), and Sofia (29 April 2014).
Lucas believed residents’ different socioeconomic statuses and levels of education had generated unity among them because they benefited from each other’s life experiences. He described the *conjunto* as a community united in the struggles of everyday life:

> É, o que eu posso falar é que a riqueza da união é muito importante. Porque aqui existem pessoas de nível social baixo e de nível social muito alto. Aqui podemos falar que é composto por doutores e sabichões [know-it-alls]. Pode ter certeza. É doutores formados pela faculdade da vida, sabichões pela experiência de vida. Então são pessoas altamente diplomadas. E são pessoas que, de nível social e cultural é muito diversificado mas a linguagem é uma só. Se fala uma linguagem só. Há uma língua só. A experiência de vida que você tem você consegue tirar das pessoas mais idosas, a lição é muito grande. Porque já caminharam por caminhos, por estradas que nós ainda não caminhamos. Então sabedoria está no tempo de vida. E, eu considero que no conjunto, os moradores têm a mesma cabeça, o mesmo pensamento, as mesmas conquistas e tentam transpor todos os obstáculos que tem aí fora. Nós somos sobreviventes em todos os lugares, de todas as classes sociais. Todos que saem de casa saem pra matar um leão por dia. Só que aqui tem gente com poder aquisitivo mais baixo mas tem gente aqui que pode comprar dez apartamentos se quiser. Tem capital pra isso. Estão aqui porque gostam de estar aqui. Um povo unido.

---

371 Interview with Roberto (28 August 2013). “...this thing that I told you, that here we consider this as a big family, here in the Conjunto. And the great friendships that we have, the get-togethers that we have on the weekends, we have a little bar here where we go, whoever wants to goes and has a beer, has a chat, discusses soccer. This is what I think is very important, this integration that we have here in the complex. [...] For myself, the most important of all is this great contact that we have here.”

372 Interview with Lucas (24 September 2012). “What I can say is that the value of unity is very important. Because here there are people of low social status and very high social status. Here we can say that it is composed of intellectuals and sabichões [know-it-alls]. You can be sure. They are intellectuals taught by the school of life, know-it-alls taught by life experience. So they are highly degreed people. And they are people with very diverse social and cultural levels, but there’s only one tongue. One speaks just one tongue. There’s only one language. The experience of life that you have, you get from older people, the lesson is very big. Because they have already walked along paths, along roads that we haven’t walked yet. So there’s wisdom in age. And I think that in the complex, the residents have the same mindset, the same thinking, the same conquests, and try to get over all of the obstacles that are out there. We are survivors in all places, from all social classes. Everybody who leaves the house goes out to kill a lion every
On the one hand, the fact that many of its residents have lived in the Conjunto IAPI for a long time has contributed to a dynamic community life. On the other, interviewees’ emphases on the alleged unity among its residents and that it is a pleasant place to live appear to be a strategy against outside discrimination and stigmatization. Like all of the other interviewees, Teresa was convinced that a lot of Belo Horizonte held stereotypical views of the complex and its inhabitants. In apparent reply, she referred to it as ‘meu IAPI’ and claimed that its community spirit had motivated some outsiders to move in:

Teve uma senhora que falou comigo, ela era louca para vir morar aqui no IAPI, que ela tá amando. Ai eu falei, ‘Porque?’ Ela falou, ‘Porque essa aqui é uma família muito grande.’ É muito bom, você pode contar com as pessoas quando você precisa.

The following quotation from the interview with Leonardo shows how closely connected the perception of stigma and identification with the Conjunto IAPI are:

...aí virou uma família de 928 apartamentos. Todos com a mesma ideia: a união faz a força. E isso foi o que toda a vida eu preguei no IAPI. Eu lutei. Quando falavam mal daqui eu brigava. Não aceitava. Eu fui um dos que briguei demais pra que ninguém difamasse isso aqui.

As I mentioned in section 4 of chapter 1, public housing in Brazil has acquired the stigma of poverty, and interviewees confirmed that that is the public’s opinion of the Conjunto IAPI. Although the prevalence of this attitude annoyed them all, Tiago was the only one to say that the stigma made him want to move out of the conjunto. In the opinion of most interviewees, the main reason for the conjunto’s reputation was its proximity to day. It’s just that here there are people who have less purchasing power but here there are people who can buy ten apartments if they want to. They have the capital to do so. They are here because they like it here. A united people.”
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the favela of Pedreira Prado Lopes. Tiago said that the friends of residents’ children were not allowed to visit because their parents thought the neighborhood was too dangerous (see below). The complex’s stigma as impoverished and dangerous has reinforced other stigmas, as I explain in chapter 5.

Sociological research has identified the defense of one’s place of residence as an offensive strategy often adopted by inhabitants of disreputable areas to counter stereotypes. Several interviewees emphasized that the great majority of residents perceived the complex as a good place to live. Teresa and Letícia mentioned that some did not identify with it but described them as a minority, Teresa adding that most of those who did not like the conjunto had moved in only recently. According to Lucas, most inhabitants had not chosen to live there for financial reasons, but his insistence on this point seems to indicate that the opposite may often have been the case. The following quotation agrees with what several other interviewees said:

Olha, eu acho que noventa e nove por cento ama isso aqui. Eu tenho certeza. Porque eu já fiz um trabalho de porta em porta, em quase todos os apartamentos. [...] Gostam. Sentem seguras. É um lugar bom. É um lugar que não tem briga. É um lugar que não tem disputa, tráfico. Então eu tenho certeza que noventa e nove por cento das pessoas moram aqui porque gostam daqui. Tem muitos que já se mudaram e voltaram. Porque veem que o mundo lá fora é diferente desse mundo daqui. Aqui todos se conhecem. Todos sabem quem é filho de quem, então é uma família. É um lugar, é uma cidade pequena, pacata...

Lucas described the conjunto as a world of its own. Teresa described it as a place where cohesion among the residents offered protection: “...vai pro-
teger a gente. Vai defender, vai tomar as dores, isso é a família IAPI. O pessoal que são todos por um. [...] Se acontecer alguma coisa com qualquer um de nós, a gente vai defender a honra.”\footnote{Interview with Teresa (18 September 2012). “...it’ll defend us. It’ll defend, take our side, that’s the IAPI family. People stand up for each other. [...] If anything happens to anyone of us, we will defend their honor.”}

Some interviewees reported that they had moved to other places but then returned. Teresa and Lucas both identified conviviality as the main reason for returning. According to Lucas, most of those who had lived elsewhere for some time held the complex’s neighborliness in high regard.\footnote{Interviews with Teresa (18 September 2012) and Lucas (24 September 2012).} But, though Teresa felt that its solidarity offered protection, she also said that the neighborhood’s increasing violence had driven many residents away (see below).\footnote{Interview with Teresa (18 September 2012).}

The insistence on social cohesion, the image of a big family, the recurrent comparison to small towns, and the frequent claim that the complex was a good place to live all derived from the need to combat what residents believed were widespread negative images. Teresa mentioned that conversations with outsiders were often frustrating because they spoke ill of the \textit{conjunto} but knew nothing about it. Interviewees reacted to stigmatization with a positive image that those who lived in the complex and really knew how it was, held to firmly: “Só quem conhece aqui, fala bem daqui. Quem não conhece, não fala não.”\footnote{Interview with Teresa (18 September 2012). “...only those who know this place talk well about it. Those who don’t know it sure don’t do that.”}

Responses to the question of whether there was a lot of turnover of residents were inconsistent. Leonardo said that the younger generation tended to leave,\footnote{Interview with Leonardo and Teresa (8 August 2012).} but Lucas did not share his view, claiming that children often took over their parents’ apartments.\footnote{Interview with Lucas (24 September 2012).} However, Teresa and Tiago pointed to the influx of new people over the last decades. They saw a causal connection between the number of newcomers and the \textit{conjunto}’s increasingly anonymous atmosphere: “...os próprios moradores que vieram para cá, os novatos, eles não frequentam muito as atividades que a gente promove aqui dentro. Eles não têm interesse...”\footnote{Interview with Teresa (18 September 2012) “...even the residents who came here, the newcomers, they do not participate a lot in the activities that we organize here. They’re not interested...”} In general, interviewees distin-
guished between the majority, long-term inhabitants with positive opinions about the complex, and the minority, mostly new inhabitants who did not share these views: “Podem existir pessoas que não gostam de estar aqui, mas é a minoria. São pessoas frustradas...” 388 By portraying those who neither liked the conjunto nor participated in community events as a frustrated minority, interviewees expressed their disapproval of their attitude. And though they acknowledged that some of their neighbors had no interest in community life, they also tried to avoid giving the impression that a significant proportion of residents did not identify with the complex. However, the new tendency to spend more time at home is part of a general trend in many countries: people participate less in life on the streets. 389

Some interviewees were annoyed with their neighbors. Teresa complained that they were not taking care of the playground and the sports field on the Praça Prof. Corrêa Neto. They have fallen into disrepair, and many no longer frequent these once important meeting places.390 According to Lucas, his neighbors were still organizing social events on the praça in the 1980s and 1990s, but fewer and fewer residents were attending since the Residents’ Association (Associação de Moradores) began several years ago to politicize such events for its own purposes.391 However, others, like Tiago, said that people still gather at and stroll around the praça and the landscaped areas.392 On my visits, I saw that some of the facilities were run down, but people of different ages exercised, played ball, and engaged in small talk on the public square.

388 Interview with Lucas (24 September 2012). “There might be people who don’t like to be here, but they’re the minority. They’re frustrated people...”
389 Research has shown that several factors have contributed to this development, among them are processes of social and racial segregation, increased violence, and the introduction of new technologies. See D’Inaco (1992).
390 Interview with Teresa (18 September 2012).
391 Interview with Lucas (28 August 2013).
392 Interview with Tiago and Teresa (18 September 2012).
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Illustration 9. Landscaped areas in the Conjunto IAPI.

(Photo: Mario Peters 2012)
Interviews also revealed that conflicts were a part of daily life in the complex. According to Gilberto, residents used the courtyards of certain buildings as thoroughfares, which has caused frustration and anger:

O [Edifício] 2, o 3, o 4, o 6, certo. Tem prédio que você não entra. Então passa por outros prédios. Mas o 5 e 10 passa. Quer dizer, o 10 sofre com isso. Porque o 10 é mais depredado, é mais usado. Pessoas que moram no 9, moram no 8, usam o 10, porque o 10 é a linha de acesso pra eles [...] pra mudança, pra um monte de coisas... \(^{393}\)

---

393 Interview with Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013). “Buildings 2, 3, 4, 6, fine. There are buildings that you don’t enter. So you go through the other buildings. But there’s access to 5 and 10. This means 10 suffers from it. Because 10 is more used, it’s more worn. People who live in 9, in 8, use 10 because 10 is the quickest way for them [...] to move their stuff, to do a lot of things...”
In recent years, the activities of the Residents’ Association (Associação de Moradores) have also caused conflict. All of the interviewees who talked about this criticized the association’s current leaders. Leonardo, Lucas, and Teresa had once been members, but they resigned some years ago because of fierce disagreements. Others said that they had no interest in joining the association because of the aggressive atmosphere. In one interview, the parish priest of São Cristóvão also criticized the associations’ members and complained that he had to stop them from politicizing church events.

Interviewees not only attributed the perceived change in atmosphere to the inappropriate behavior of some of their neighbors but also to the effects of structural transformations caused by federal action. In 1971, the IAPI’s successor, the INPS, sold the conjunto’s apartments to their tenants, following the government’s orders. Gilberto believed that this was why the conjunto had become more anonymous. In his view, residents no longer acted together; rather, each building formed its own interest group. Gilberto lost close friends and neighbors to privatization, but interviewees had different opinions on the implications of privatization for relationships among neighbors. According to Leonardo, many residents had moved out after only a short stay when the IAPI and INPS administrated the complex. They did not want to stay if they could not own their apartments. Leonardo believed that the Conjunto IAPI had become a big family only after the

394 I did not find reliable information about forms of community organization in the Conjunto IAPI before the 1970s. Interviewees remembered only more recent developments.

395 Initially, I intended to interview the current head of the Conjunto IAPI’s Residents’ Association. However, during a five-minute talk that we had in August 2012, he was interested only in advertising his personal achievements since he was running for a position as councilman in the upcoming local elections. Taking this into account, and considering the fact that he was only 36 years old, I decided that an interview would not have been useful.

396 Interviews with Leonardo and Teresa (8 August 2012), Teresa (18 September 2012), and Lucas (24 September).

397 See the interview with Tiago and Teresa (18 September 2012) and the interview with Beto, conducted in Teresa’s apartment in the Conjunto IAPI, Belo Horizonte, on 18 September 2012.

398 Interview with the parish priest of the Paróquia São Cristóvão, conducted in the Igreja São Cristóvão, Belo Horizonte, on 4 April 2014.

399 Interview with Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013).
privatization in 1971.\textsuperscript{400} Contrary to both, Roberto recalled no change in atmosphere.\textsuperscript{401} This demonstrates that perceptions of relationships among neighbors are subjective. Thus, oral history shows that it is not possible to analyze the historical development of social life in the Conjunto IAPI without taking into account the opinions of residents.

Interviewees also emphasized the negative effects of the area’s drug trafficking and violence on social life. According to Teresa, violent confrontations in the neighborhood had led many inhabitants to stay indoors: “Quando que a gente podia imaginar isso, sabe? Que podia chegar num ponto desse no lugar de um convívio tão bom que tinha, sabe? Então hoje a gente tá resumida assim dentro de casa, dentro do apartamento e na área interna aqui.”\textsuperscript{402} She had lost important social contacts over the last years because many of her friends and neighbors had moved away because of these developments. The rise in violent crime over the last decades led Teresa to emphasize that the neighborhood had been peaceful during her childhood.\textsuperscript{403} The perception of recent developments thus reinforced nostalgia.

To summarize, interviews with residents of the Conjunto IAPI revealed that elderly residents remembered the friendly relations among neighbors of former times with nostalgia. However, their perception of increasing social isolation has resulted in romanticized memories of the past. Outsiders’ stereotypes of the conjunto have made interviewees feel stigmatized, and they have reacted to stigmatization by stressing the complex’s human qualities. They emphasized residents’ identification with the complex, its social harmony, and the lack of serious conflict. However, their statements about its increasingly anonymous social atmosphere and their criticism of neighbors in this regard conflict with their claims about solidarity, mutual protection, and the feeling of a big family. Interviewees attributed the reduced participation in communal life to the complex’s newcomers whom they dismissed as a minority, a strategy that probably helped them to maintain the image of a family.

\textsuperscript{400} Interview with Leonardo and Teresa (8 August 2012).
\textsuperscript{401} Interview with Roberto (28 August 2013).
\textsuperscript{402} Interview with Teresa (18 September 2012). “How could we have imagined that, you know? That things could come to this in a place where people had gotten along together so well, you know? So, today we stay inside, inside the apartment and in the internal area here.”
\textsuperscript{403} Ibid.
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My focus has so far been on the Conjunto IAPI itself and life inside it. In the next chapter, I show that the conjunto’s development was closely related to the development of its neighborhood and that the development of the neighborhood influenced daily life in the complex.
4. The Conjunto IAPI and the Development of the Lagoinha Area, circa 1940-1973: Social Housing, Urbanization, and Socio-Spatial Segregation

Quem acompanha a evolução de Belo Horizonte, compreende que o progresso não permite à administração pública permanecer inativa. O crescimento constante da cidade é fator que reclama do poder municipal permanente atividade, sem o que seu desenvolvimento se paralisaria. [...] Assim atacámos, na medida do possível, os serviços que nos pareceram mais urgentes, afim de que a cidade contasse com novas fontes de progresso...

In his annual report for 1940-1941, Juscelino Kubitschek wrote of his intention to modernize Belo Horizonte through an extensive program of urban reforms that included building the Conjunto IAPI and transforming Lagoinha. During his term of office, the PBH took on several infrastructure projects, such as Avenida da Pampulha and the Hospital Municipal, that altered living conditions in Lagoinha. Over the next three decades, successive city governments added further public institutions, like the Mercado Popular and the Colégio Municipal, to the neighborhood.

In this chapter, I consider whether the presence of the Conjunto IAPI, with its thousands of residents, in Lagoinha was among the reasons that led the PBH to invest in the area. Since the development of infrastructure is important to the history of social housing, I also explain some of the effects of the new establishments on daily life in the complex, including which groups had access to them and whether the conjunto’s residents and those living in the neighborhood gathered at any of them to socialize. Not all of the social groups in the Lagoinha area could use the services that these public institutions offered, and several sources reveal how such ex-

404 PBH: Relatório do prefeito Juscelino Kubitschek de 1940-1941, 5. “Whoever is part of Belo Horizonte’s evolution understands that its progress does not permit the public administration to remain inactive. The city’s constant growth is a factor that demands permanent action from the municipal authorities, without which its development would be paralyzed. [...] So we addressed, within the bounds of possibility, the services that seemed to us to be most urgent in terms of the city’s finding new sources of progress ...”

405 In the following referred to as ‘annual report’.

406 See Bonduki: Origens da habitação social no Brasil, 14.
Conclusion and social segregation characterized the daily lives of local inhabitants. Each section of the chapter focuses on one aspect of daily life served by public institutions, private actors, and the Catholic Church: road infrastructure and public transportation, healthcare, grocery shopping, education, and social assistance.

4.1. Building Connections: Road Infrastructure and Public Transportation

Like the national government under Vargas, Belo Horizonte’s politicians saw Brazil as a latecomer to modernity, and in the early 1940s they adopted the Estado Novo’s rhetoric on the need for modernization from above, i.e., orchestrated by federal and city actors. And they saw urbanization, industrialization, and rational city planning as its necessary preconditions. In his annual report, Kubitschek pointed to the uncontrolled and chaotic growth of areas outside the city center to justify expenditure on his program of urban reforms; announced measures, such as street paving and the canalization of rivers and streams, to improve traffic conditions; and explained that the construction of large radial avenues would reduce the congestion caused by the narrow curved streets outside the zona urbana. In his autobiography, he recalled that in the early 1940s the PBH had intended to get Belo Horizonte ready for the era of the automobile by extending the city’s main avenues and building new ones.

One of Kubitschek’s main goals was to make Belo Horizonte more attractive for its wealthy citizens and for tourists. The transformation of Pampulha, situated about eight kilometers north of the city center, into an upper-class residential and entertainment district was his most important project in this regard. But the opening of Belo Horizonte’s first airport, in Pampulha in 1933, as well as the creation of industrial areas in the city’s northern zone, had caused a continually increasing volume of traffic.

410 GEPH: Dossiê de Tombamento IAPI, 10.
Until the late 1930s, Estrada Velha de Venda Nova had been the main access road to Pampulha, but soon after he took office Kubitschek decided to replace it with a new road. Explaining his decision in the annual report, he predicted that Pampulha would soon become one of Belo Horizonte’s most beautiful districts, and it was necessary to ensure that motorists could get there easily.\(411\)

The report also included a description of the new road’s course. Since its main purpose was to connect Pampulha with the city center, it is interesting that Kubitschek mentioned ‘Bairro Popular,’ i.e., the Conjunto IAPI, and Vila Cachoeirinha, two large, working-class neighborhoods between downtown and Pampulha:

> Partindo da rua Formiga [a street in Lagoinha about 100 meters south of the Conjunto IAPI], o novo trecho passa pelos terrenos marginais do Bairro Popular [the Conjunto IAPI], em demanda da Vila Cachoeirinha e dali, em linha reta de 4.200 metros de extensão até a Reprêsa.\(412\)

In the late 1930s, the municipal administration of Otacílio Negrão de Lima built a road from the city center to Lagoinha; construction on the stretch between Lagoinha and Pampulha began in 1941. When finished, the road, which was called ‘Avenida da Pampulha,’ was 6,500 meters long and 25 meters wide. It was opened for public use in 1943 and renamed Avenida Presidente Antônio Carlos three years later.\(413\)

Over the following decades, as the automobile became the most important mode of transportation, constantly increasing traffic damaged the road’s surface, and it was repaired, broadened, and modernized several times between 1953 and 1972.\(414\) In his autobiography, Kubitschek recalled that he had conceived of the road as a classical European boulevard:

Não seria, pois, tão-somente uma auto-estrada, mas um verdadeiro boulevard, do tipo dos que havia visto em Paris, com diferentes pistas de rolamento, alei- as [sic] ajardinadas, gramados redolentes, bancos de madeira para quem qui-

\(411\) PBH: Relatório do prefeito Juscelino Kubitschek de 1940-1941, 22.  
\(412\) Ibid., 22-23. “Coming off of Rua Formiga [a street in Lagoinha 100 meters south of the Conjunto IAPI], the new stretch runs past the edge of Bairro Popular [the Conjunto IAPI], connects with Vila Cachoeirinha, from where it continues straight for 4,200 meters to the dam.”  
\(413\) Avenida Presidente Antônio Carlos is usually called ‘Avenida Antônio Carlos.’ Therefore, I will use this name in the following.  
\(414\) See, for instance, the PBH’s annual reports for 1953, 1961, 1967, and 1971.
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But this is not how Avenida Antônio Carlos actually affected urban growth and social dynamics in the areas through which it passed. In contemporary official documents, city politicians, urban planners, and engineers uniformly described the road as making daily life easier for people living along it by allowing them to reach the city center quickly. However, scholars have concluded that Avenida Antônio Carlos had negative impacts on daily life in the Lagoinha area. According to Lemos, the thoroughfare for people on their way to and from downtown increased the amount of traffic passing through Lagoinha, and the incessant traffic reduced contact between districts on its two sides. The architect Aurora Pedersoli argued that Avenida Antônio Carlos cut the Lagoinha area in two, and the social and urban development of the two parts differed throughout the second half of the 20th century.

I asked interviewees how Avenida Antônio Carlos had influenced daily life in the Conjunto IAPI. On the one hand, they saw it as an important element of the local infrastructure, but, on the other, they said that living close to it was a burden. They disagreed on whether it had reduced contact among people in the neighborhood. As I mentioned in Chapter 3, Gilberto recalled that in the 1950s residents frequently had to get water from the other side of the avenue. And children from neighboring districts came to the complex to play soccer, but he could not recall if children from the other side of the avenue had participated. From Sofia’s point of view, Avenida Antônio Carlos did not prevent contact with people on the other

415 Kubitschek: *A escalada política*, 46-47. “Thus, it would not only be a highway but a real *boulevard*, of the kind I had seen in Paris, with several lanes, landscaped paths, fragrant lawns, wooden benches for whomever wanted to unwind, and, above all, large open spaces for the pleasure of the view and relaxing the nerves.”

416 See, for instance, *Revista Mineira de Engenharia* vol. 21 no. 75 (February 1958), 27. In an article entitled “Solenemente iniciada a pavimentação asfáltica da Avenida Presidente Antônio Carlos,” the *Revista Mineira de Engenharia* wrote that the PBH had started to pave Avenida Antônio Carlos in early 1958 and applauded the work, saying that it would improve public transportation and road safety.

417 Lemos: “*A Lagoinha e suas imagens*”, 122-123, 126-127.

418 Pedersoli: *Uma conceituação de recuperação urbana*, 52.

419 Interview with Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013).
According to Teresa, many people used to cross it every day, for public institutions and churches on both sides had been important for the entire Lagoinha area. These statements indicate that contact was frequent, but Roberto did not share this view:

É uma espécie de separação mesmo. Então, dessa região da Antônio Carlos pra cá você tem mais contato com o pessoal todo, da Antônio Carlos pra lá já vai caindo, vai diminuindo, porque ali já passa a ser o bairro Concórdia. Tem o bairro Concórdia, o bairro Cachoeirinha, então vai diminuindo essa reunião do pessoal. Eu, no meu caso pessoal eu praticamente não tenho contato com ninguém lá nesses bairros.

In talking about the effects of Avenida Antônio Carlos on contact between the Conjunto IAPI and the neighborhoods on the opposite side, interviewees did not clearly distinguish between former decades and recent times. The register of weddings held in the Paróquia São Cristóvão between 1952 and 1970 is a source for the intensity of contact between the complex and its neighborhood during those years. I analyzed a total of 1,278 entries among which 274 weddings had included at least one person from the Conjunto IAPI. 34 of them had married someone with an address in a district on the opposite side of Avenida Antônio Carlos, like Cachoeirinha, Concórdia, Colégio Batista, and Floresta. At first glance, this small number seems to support the hypothesis that Avenida Antônio Carlos was

420 Interview with Sofia (29 April 2014).
421 Interview with Teresa (18 September 2012).
422 Interview with Roberto (28 August 2013). “It’s really a kind of separation. Well, in this part of Antônio Carlos over here, you have more contact with all the people; on Antônio Carlos over there, it’s already dropping, it gets less, because over there it becomes the Concórdia district. There is the Concórdia district, the Cachoeirinha district, so people come together less often. I, in my case, I have practically no contact with anyone there in those districts.”
423 The data do not include weddings celebrated between late November 1957 and early February 1960.
424 Arquidiocese de Belo Horizonte: Paróquia São Cristóvão: Registo de Casamentos 1952-1960. Consulted at the Memorial da Arquidiocese de Belo Horizonte, Arquivo Arquidiocesano; Arquidiocese de Belo Horizonte: Paróquia São Cristóvão: Registo de Casamentos. Livro 02 de 06/02/1960 a 27/07/1968. Consulted at the Paróquia São Cristóvão, Belo Horizonte; Arquidiocese de Belo Horizonte: Paróquia São Cristóvão: Casamentos. Livro 03 (25/05/68) a (14/02/72). Consulted at the Paróquia São Cristóvão, Belo Horizonte. I analyzed the data from 1968 to 1970 at the Paróquia São Cristóvão. When I returned to get the data from 1970 to 1972, the register was missing.
a barrier to interaction. But the fact that a similar number of residents (43) had married someone from a neighborhood on the same side of the avenue (for example, Lagoinha, São Cristóvão, Bonfim, and Bom Jesus) puts the first figure into perspective. Furthermore, these data are only for weddings held in the Paróquia São Cristóvão. Therefore, neither interviews nor the wedding register indicate much social separation between inhabitants on different sides of the avenue.

Nevertheless, it is probable that the avenue’s heavy traffic, which made crossing it a dangerous undertaking, made it harder for people to keep in touch. The memories of interviewees differ from official documents from the 1940 s, 1950 s, and 1960 s on the impact of Avenida Antônio Carlos on daily life along its route. Municipal authorities, urban planners, and engineers throughout those decades claimed that improvements to the road enhanced its safety and traffic flow, but interviewees recalled the problems that the traffic caused. Sofia said that it had always been difficult to cross Avenida Antônio Carlos because there was no pedestrian overpass. According to Teresa, crossing it was already dangerous when she was a child. She pointed to the lack of crosswalks and recalled many accidents that had occurred in front of the complex. Her memories agree with an article in the Estado de Minas in August 1971 about a campaign organized by the complex’s residents to prevent the closure of grocery stores located in it. According to the article, residents complained that otherwise they would have to cross the busy street, which already in the early 1970 s had the reputation of being dangerous to life and limb, to do their shopping:

Como as lojas vendem gêneros e artigos de primeira necessidade, os moradores acham que serão forçados, depois da retirada, a atravessar a av. Antônio Carlos, onde morre gente toda hora, para comprar uma simples caixa-de-fósforo. [...] O grande argumento é o de que, fechadas as mercearias, as compras dos gêneros mais simples-pão, leite, bebidas, fósforos, cigarros-teriam que ser feitos do outro lado da av. Antônio Carlos, ‘a avenida mais perigosa de Belo Horizonte.’

425 Interview with Sofia (29 April 2014).
426 Interview with Teresa (18 September 2012).
427 See section 4.3.
428 Estado de Minas, 20 August 1971, 7: “Since the shops sell basic needs, the residents believe that after the closure they will be forced to cross Av. Antônio Carlos, where people die all the time, just to buy a box of matches. [...] The main argument is that if the grocery stores close, the simplest purchases-bread, milk,
So, though neither interviews nor the wedding register clearly show that Avenida Antônio Carlos divided the Lagoinha area in two, it is safe to say that the perception of it as “the most dangerous avenue in Belo Horizonte” reduced the amount of contact between its two sides.

Throughout the following decades, the problem got worse. Referring to the recent widening of the street,429 several interviewees agreed that it had improved things for drivers but had made crossing the road more dangerous for pedestrians, especially children and elderly people.430 In 2013/2014, the PBH erected a bus stop for the new BRT Move bus system and finally put crosswalks in front of the Conjunto IAPI.

Though interviewees detailed the negative effects that the heavy traffic had had on their daily lives, they also acknowledged that Avenida Antônio Carlos had given them direct access to the city center, Pampulha, and other districts. More generally, several interviewees spoke highly of Kubitschek’s urban reforms. Gilberto said that the construction and extension of radial avenues had brought progress to Belo Horizonte.431 In fact, he was referring to events before his birth, and it is likely that he was influenced by Kubitschek’s good reputation among most mineiros, for the firmly entrenched attitudes of the public shape the ways that people think about the past.

Since the late 1940s, Avenida Antônio Carlos brought streetcar and bus stops close to the Conjunto IAPI. In what follows, I discuss the development of public transportation and residents’ use of it as part of examining the complex’s urban integration, the relevance of its proximity to downtown, and the frequency with which residents went there and to other districts.

In the early 20th century, streetcars were the most important mode of public transportation in Belo Horizonte. This was still the case when the


430 Interviews with Letícia (24 August 2012) and Teresa (18 September 2012).
431 Interview with Gilberto, Teresa, and Cristiano (19 February 2013).
Conjunto IAPI was built in the late 1940s, despite Kubitschek’s desire to make the city accommodating to automobiles, which were a symbol of progress and expected to become the transportation of the future. The Lagoinha area had been connected to the public transportation network since 1913, and the reach of streetcar lines to different neighborhoods since then indicated the unequal quality of infrastructure and public services in different parts of the city. Streetcars ran often within the downtown area, but their frequency along the Lagoinha and Bonfim lines did not meet the needs of the inhabitants of those neighborhoods. By the late 1930s, streetcars, and a few buses, ran along Rua Itapecerica and Rua Bonfim from Praça Sete in the city center to Lagoinha. But these two steep, narrow, and winding streets, and technical problems with the cars, caused frequent accidents. In 1941, Kubitschek’s administration decided to connect Lagoinha with Vila Santo André several hundred meters to the west by streetcar. A passage was blown through the rock of Pedreira Prado Lopes and became Rua Pedro Lessa. (See illustration 11.) It is not clear if the excavations required the removal of dwellings from the favela nor is there any evidence to suggest that the extension of the streetcar line to Vila Santo André had anything to do with the plans for the Conjunto IAPI, which would be built nearby. In his annual report, Kubitschek mentioned only that streetcar lines passed near the site of the complex; he did not comment on the extent of its integration into the city’s transportation net-

---

432 On the occasion of Belo Horizonte’s 50th anniversary in December 1947, the magazine *Revista Social Trabalhista* mentioned the routes of all 23 streetcar lines. With 75 functioning vehicles, the streetcar network had reached its maximum extent earlier that year. See *Revista Social Trabalhista*: “Belo Horizonte completou 50 anos.” Edição especial comemorativa do cinquentenário de Belo Horizonte. 59 (12 December 1947), 124.


435 Ibid., 120. The first buses in Belo Horizonte were introduced after a drought had caused power cuts in 1928. By 1937, there were 17 bus lines. Like the streetcars, the buses often were overcrowded and their timetables inadequate.

work. In my opinion, this suggests that Kubitschek, who believed in the automobile, either considered public transportation irrelevant for social housing or expected future residents to drive cars.

**Illustration 11. Streetcar on Rua Pedra Lessa.**


At the time the first residents were moving into the Conjunto IAPI, the streetcar lines that connected the Praça Sete with Pampulha, Cachoeirinha, Santo André, and Bonfim passed close by the complex. The nearest stops were on Rua Itapecerica, Rua Pedro Lessa, and Avenida Antônio Carlos.

Several interviewees who were long-time residents of the Conjunto IAPI emphasized the convenience of the complex’s proximity to the city.

437 In the same report, Kubitschek wrote that the inhabitants of Vila Santo André had campaigned for the extension of the streetcar line. PBH: *Relatório do prefeito Juscelino Kubitschek de 1940-1941*, 27.

center\textsuperscript{439} and its stops for public transportation. In the 1950s, Leonardo used to take the streetcar to go to the centro or Pampulha:


Gilberto also recalled riding the streetcar to the centro and to Avenida Silviano Brandão.\textsuperscript{441} In the 1950s, his relatives had lived on the outskirts of the city where without access to public transportation life was much harder than in the Conjunto IAPI. In Gilberto’s opinion, many residents had moved to the complex at that time because of the easy access it afforded to public transportation.\textsuperscript{442}

The Santo André and Bonfim lines also connected Pedreira Prado Lopes to the city center. Interviews with elderly inhabitants of the favela show that they used streetcars with the same frequency as their neighbors in the Conjunto IAPI.\textsuperscript{443} Therefore, I conclude that social differences between the two groups did not entail unequal access to public transportation. It would be interesting to compare the number of favelados and con-

\textsuperscript{439} See interviews with Letícia (24 August 2012); Tiago and Teresa (18 September 2012); Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013); and Roberto (28 August 2013).

\textsuperscript{440} Interview with Leonardo and Teresa (8 August 2012). “The transportation was fast. In two hours you would arrive in Pampulha. Rapid transit. It used to leave from Praça Sete, enter Rua Tiradentes, go past Praça Vaz de Melo, climb up [Rua] Itapecerica, descend [Rua] Formiga, enter [Avenida] Antônio Carlos, descend, go until Pampulha, descend to the late [the yacht club in Pampulha]. When it would arrive at the late, that was the end of the Pampulha line. But there were sections. [...] You wouldn’t just pay for the trip to Pampulha. You’d pay per section. The driver charged to Cachoeirinha. From Cachoeirinha to São Francisco he charged again. And then, from São Francisco it was direct to there [Pampulha]. There were three sections...”

\textsuperscript{441} The Kubitschek administration built Avenida Silviano Brandão in the early 1940s. It connects the districts of Graça and Horto Florestal.

\textsuperscript{442} See interview with Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013).

\textsuperscript{443} Soares and Antunes: Pedreira Prado Lopes, 37-38.
residents who were able to afford a car. Unfortunately, such data do not exist.

When she was a small child, Teresa often went downtown by streetcar. By that time, the era of the streetcar was coming to an end in Belo Horizonte. Since the early 1950s, the city had been planning to replace its streetcars, which it saw as obsolete and inadequate to the public need, with electric buses. According to the PBH’s annual reports from the late 1950s, several problems delayed the replacement. Nevertheless, the number of streetcars was continually reduced until they were eliminated in June 1963. Though authorities cited the population’s preference for buses in justifying the replacement, it in fact provoked public protests. As in other cities in Brazil and other countries, buses with diesel engines soon became the principal means of public transportation.

According to interviewees, the switch from streetcars to buses did not affect their access to public transportation. Tiago mentioned the direct bus line between the complex and the university in Pampulha. Roberto emphasized that there were numerous bus lines that ran along Avenida Antônio Carlos:

Outra coisa também importante que eu acho, se bem que o nosso transporte coletivo é uma avacalhação danada, mas aqui a gente tem transporte pra praticamente todos os bairros de Belo Horizonte. [...] Porque tem muitos ônibus, qualquer bairro que você for você pega aqui na frente do conjunto e ele te deixa no outro bairro.

Though interviewees spoke highly about the Conjunto IAPI’s integration into the municipal transportation network, some, like Roberto, also criticized the recent state of public transportation. Actually, shortcomings in

445 The old streetcars were stored near Pedreira Prado Lopes. In the 1960s, that place became known as ‘streetcar cemetery’ (Cemitério de Bondes). See Arroyo: A Diversidade Cultural na Cidade Contemporânea, 98.
446 Fundação João Pinheiro: Omnibus, 160-161.
447 Ibid., 223.
448 Interview with Tiago and Teresa (18 September 2012).
449 Interview with Roberto (28 August 2013). “Another thing that I think is important, although our collective transportation is a damned mess, here we have transportation to practically all of the districts of Belo Horizonte. [...] Because there are many buses, any district you might want to go to, you catch the bus from here in front of the complex and it takes you there.”
Belo Horizonte’s transportation system are nothing new. In 1959, the SAGMACS concluded that the distribution of streetcar and bus lines reinforced the social polarization between the city center and the outlying districts.\textsuperscript{450} And service got worse when the municipal government handed the administration of public transportation over to private companies some years later.\textsuperscript{451} In the early 1970s, bus stops in the city center were frequently moved, and traffic congestion steadily increased. By the end of the decade, the local press predicted the imminent collapse of the city’s transportation system. Newspapers criticized its lack of organization and outdated vehicles and mentioned that passengers and bus drivers often got into heated arguments.\textsuperscript{452} These problems led some interviewees to complain that public transportation had been bad for decades. Still, they maintained that the complex’s location was advantageous because it was easy to walk to the city center, avoiding overcrowded buses and traffic jams:

Tranquilo, sem problema nenhum. Eu já fiz isso várias vezes. Sem nenhum problema, deu vontade, andando sem problema nenhum. É uma caminhada tranquila, só que não passa pela [Avenida] Antônio Carlos por causa da poluição. Eu ia por aqui e pela, como se chama... [Rua Itapecerica]. Você vai descer direto porque lá na boca do metrô também teve uma coisa, assim tem problema nenhum. Então é tudo assim, muito fácil.\textsuperscript{453}

In Roberto’s opinion, the advantage of the conjunto’s central location was that one could either take one of the numerous buses or walk to the city center. Other interviewees would not walk through the Lagoinha area. Gilberto said that he had always preferred to take a streetcar or a bus.\textsuperscript{454} Lucas had once walked through the neighborhood, but he eventually stopped because he thought it was too dangerous.\textsuperscript{455}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{450} Fundação João Pinheiro: Omnibus, 187.
\textsuperscript{451} Ibid., 222-223.
\textsuperscript{452} Ibid., 262-263.
\textsuperscript{453} Interview with Tiago and Teresa (18 September 2012). “Easy, no problem at all. I have done it several times. Without any problems, when I felt like it, walking with no problem at all. It’s a peaceful walk, just so that you don’t walk down [Avenida] Antônio Carlos because of the pollution. I used to walk over here and along, what is it called... [Rua Itapecerica]. You would walk straight down because at the entrance of the subway there was also something going on, this way there is no problem. So, everything is very easy.”
\textsuperscript{454} Interview with Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013).
\textsuperscript{455} Interview with Lucas (24 September 2012).
\end{flushright}
We can draw some conclusions from interviews about the frequency with which residents used to go to other parts of the city. For example, they show that the city center and Pampulha were the areas outside of the Conjunto IAPI’s neighborhood most frequently visited. Leonardo and Gilberto described Pampulha as a place to have fun that was easily accessible from the complex.\textsuperscript{456} The Parque Municipal in the city center was also a place for picnics and other recreation. When he was a teenager, Roberto did not go to the centro very often, but later he went every weekday for work.\textsuperscript{457} In her younger days, Teresa often went there to do her shopping, go to the movies, and meet friends at night.

However, Teresa also said that her daily life had revolved around the conjunto and the neighborhood, and other interviewees said similar things.\textsuperscript{458} The explanation was probably that many residents had relatives and friends in the complex. (See chapter 3.) But the frequency with which people leave their place of residence or neighborhood also depends on the availability of infrastructure and public services. Beginning in the 1940s, the PBH founded various public institutions in the area of Lagoinha. The first, the Hospital Municipal, opened in late March 1944, some weeks before work began on the Conjunto IAPI.

4.2. Relieving Urgent Shortages: The Provision of Healthcare at the Hospital Municipal

By the early 1940s, Belo Horizonte had established itself as the political and economic capital of Minas Gerais. Due to the lack of jobs and infrastructure in most of the state’s rural areas and small towns at the time, many moved to the capital, and this influx produced a constantly worsening housing deficit and continually greater difficulty in feeding the population and providing it with adequate medical care, in particular in the growing suburban districts north and west of the city center.\textsuperscript{459} At the

\textsuperscript{456} See interviews with Leonardo and Teresa (08 August 2012) and Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013).
\textsuperscript{457} Interview with Roberto (28 August 2013).
\textsuperscript{458} Interview with Teresa (18 September 2012).
time, the Santa Casa de Misericórdia, which had opened in the district of Santa Efigênia in 1899, was the most important hospital for the working class, but it, like other such health facilities, was overcrowded. So, as part of the Kubitschek administration’s planned reforms of the healthcare system, it built a new public hospital, the Hospital Municipal, in Lagoinha.460 Its outpatient facility was inaugurated on 30 March 1944. In his speech for the occasion, Kubitschek, who had worked as a surgeon at the Santa Casa de Misericórdia in the late 1920s, explained that the PBH had built the new hospital to improve the lives of workers living in the districts north of the city center whose healthcare had been inadequate:

Esta larga faixa da cidade, constituida [sic] pelos bairros da Lagoinha, Santo André e Cachoeirinha, dispunha de pouco recurso no setor hospitalar. Para uma simples consulta era necessário [sic] que os seus moradores se dirigissem à Santa Casa, grande e generosa instituição, situada, porém, no extremo oposto da cidade.461

Two years earlier, in his annual report for 1940-41, he had said that the new hospital would be located on Avenida José Bonifácio next to the Conjunto IAPI.462 Kubitschek did not explicitly say that the new housing project was the reason for putting the hospital there, but in his autobiography, written more than 30 years later, he explained that both projects were part of his plan for Lagoinha’s urban transformation:

Concluído o núcleo inicial [land on which the Conjunto IAPI was to be built], preocupei-me com os problemas de alimentação e assistência médica para os trabalhadores. Surgiu, então, o primeiro restaurante popular, da cadeia denominada Restaurantes da Cidade, e dei início à construção do hospital municipal.463

460 PBH: Relatório do prefeito Juscelino Kubitschek de 1940-1941, 83-84.
461 Estado de Minas, 31 March 1944, 12: “Brilhante discurso do prefeito, saudando o governador do Estado.” “This large part of the city, comprising the districts of Lagoinha, Santo André and Cachoeirinha, had few resources in the hospital sector. For a simple appointment, residents had to go to the Santa Casa, a large and generous institution but at the opposite end of town.”
462 PBH: Relatório do prefeito Juscelino Kubitschek de 1940-1941, 84.
463 Kubitschek: A escalada política, 32. “When the initial core area [land on which the Conjunto IAPI was to be built] was finished, I concerned myself with the problems of food and healthcare for the workers. So, the first people’s restaurant of the Restaurantes da Cidade chain was opened, and I began work on building the Hospital Municipal.”
Construction of the hospital started in August 1943 on a 7,942-square-meter site bordered by Rua Formiga, Rua Pedro Lessa, Rua Saldanha Marinho, Rua Dr. João Carvalhais de Paiva, and Avenida José Bonifácio.\textsuperscript{464} The work impacted local social and urban structures. For example, several dwellings in Pedreira Prado Lopes had to be demolished. In his earlier annual report, Kubitschek had announced, “Inicialmente, serão feitos os trabalhos de preparação do terreno, para o que se tornará necessária a transferência de vários moradores do local, a maioria dos quais edificaram suas casas em terrenos da própria Prefeitura…”\textsuperscript{465} In expressing his displeasure about the favela’s illegally located houses, he also mentioned the eviction of favelados from the site where the Conjunto IAPI was to be built three years later. The city resettled some of the displaced inhabitants in Vila Operária do Mato da Lenha on the city’s western outskirts. (See chapter 5.) Those who were unhappy with their new address had to find their own alternatives. Thus, the city and its mayor touted the benefits of the new infrastructure for workers while these two projects resulted in the expulsion of some of Lagoinha’s poorest residents, severing social ties and breaking up networks of solidarity. So, the Hospital Municipal and the Conjunto IAPI are early examples both of how new public institutions in Lagoinha drove the process of socio-spatial segregation and how Lagoinha’s urban transformation led to an enormous reduction in the size of Pedreira Prado Lopes.

The PBH hired Raffaelo Berti\textsuperscript{466} as the chief architect and construction supervisor of the hospital project. Berti’s plans for a three-storey building fulfilled Kubitschek’s desire for a symbol of modernization. In his annual report, Kubitschek wrote that the hospital was to be divided into three wings that would include a maternity clinic, an outpatient facility, a day-care center, and an emergency room. Its advanced equipment and large number of beds (306) would make it one of the country’s most sophisticated healthcare facilities.\textsuperscript{467}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[464] Gandra, Lemos, and Pereira: \textit{Hospital Municipal Odilon Behrens}, 19.
\item[465] PBH: \textit{Relatório do prefeito Juscelino Kubitschek de 1940-1941}, 86. “Inicialmente, the work of preparing the ground will be carried out, for which it will be necessary to remove several residents from the site, the majority of whom built their houses on land belonging to the city…”
\item[466] In 1922, Raffaelo Berti arrived in Rio de Janeiro from Italy. In 1929, he moved to Belo Horizonte. Since then, he was a professor of architecture at the UFMG.
\item[467] PBH: \textit{Relatório do prefeito Juscelino Kubitschek de 1940-1941}, 84-86.
\end{footnotes}
Illustration 12. Planning sketch of the Hospital Municipal (1940-1941) showing the building’s three wings.

Source PBH: Relatório do prefeito Juscelino Kubitschek de 1940-1941, 84-a.

High-ranking public officials, like the interventor of Minas Gerais Benedito Valadares; clerics; and representatives of civil society attended the official opening on 30 March 1944. The ceremony also caught the attention of the local press. The Estado de Minas and the Folha de Minas eulogized the PBH’s initiative. Both applauded the rapid construction and advanced equipment, the fact that doctors could treat several patients at once and that treatment would be free of charge, and the nearby stop on the Santo André streetcar line. And both called the hospital the result of a

468 See Folha de Minas, 30 March 1944, 10: “Grande obra de assistencia hospitalar às classes pobres da Capital”; See also, Estado de Minas, 31 March 1944, 12: “Entregues à cidade os ambulatorios do Hospital Municipal.” The Estado de Minas wrote that the first part of the hospital building had been completed within only six months while the second was almost finished and the third already under construction.

469 Folha de Minas, 30 March 1944, 10.
philanthropic initiative that contributed to the well-being of Belo Horizonte’s population. In the following year, the Revista Novidades published an article about the hospital that said, referring to the ongoing installation of X-ray machines, that it had become one of Brazil’s best-equipped hospitals in the short span of 12 months. This sort of coverage was a return to the support that the local press used to give the Kubitschek administration. However, it is possible, though it cannot be proven, that the lack of criticism was the result of the Estado Novo’s press censorship.

As I take different social groups’ access to public services to be an indicator of the extent of socio-spatial segregation, I wanted to determine which groups actually had access to the Hospital Municipal, but, unfortunately, information is inconsistent. In 1996, as part of their proposed renovation of the hospital building, the architects Andréa Magalhães Gandra, Celina Borges Lemos, and Lúcia de Paiva Pereira published a book about the hospital, which included a short overview of its history, in which they charged that since its opening only employees of the PBH and their relatives had been treated there. However, contemporary sources from the 1940s and 1950s support a different conclusion. In 1942, Kubitschek bragged that the Hospital Municipal would soon give the local population, and especially the poor, access to municipal healthcare: “Pôde se verificar, pela distribuição dos leitos, que o número de acomodações para indigentes será bem elevado, permitindo ao hospital exercer uma função de relevância na parte da assistência social.” Later, in March 1945, an article in the Revista Novidades denied the claims that the PBH’s employees and their families had been the hospital’s only patients. According to the magazine, the hospital had improved the city’s healthcare services:

Do Hospital Municipal, que se destina a todos e não somente aos servidores da Prefeitura, como às vezes, por engano, se diz, irradiam o plano de Assis-

470 Folha de Minas, 30 March 1944, 10; Estado de Minas, 31 March 1944, 12.
472 Gandra, Lemos, and Pereira: Hospital Municipal Odilon Behrens, 22.
473 PBH: Relatório do prefeito Juscelino Kubitschek de 1940-1941, 85. “One can verify, by the distribution of hospital beds, that the number of accommodations for indigent people will be quite high, allowing the hospital to exercise a function relevant to social assistance.”
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tência Popular Municipal e os Postos Médicos, espalhados por todos os bairros, cujos benefícios [sic] à população pobre têm sido incalculáveis.474

And the PBH’s annual report of 1952 included the number and category of patients who had been treated at the Hospital Municipal that year. It said that over 40,000 indigent people (indigentes) had been treated while the number of municipal employees (Servidores da Prefeitura) and members of their families (Membros das famílias dos servidores) had been significantly smaller.475 In 1956, employees of the PBH made up less than 10% of patients.476 These numbers seem to indicate that the Hospital Municipal really had opened its doors to the local population and its poor.

The recollections of elderly inhabitants of Pedreira Prado Lopes appear to confirm that:

Odilon Behrens que num era Odilon Behrens.477 Era Hospital Municipal. […] Hospital Municipal era um tipo de hospital público pra atendê pobre. Era isso a coisa, funcionava assim: atendia pobre que num tinha condições de pagá uma consulta. Depois foi modificando, foi crescendo. Era pequeno, foi ganhando espaço […] foi ganhando mais medico, foi ganhando mais enfermeiro e mais espaço. Passou a ser Odilon Behrens.478 Da criação do Hospital Odilon Behrens, lembro. Meus menino quando eles era pequenininho, vivia sempre doente, com gasinterícia. Eu passava noitada lá com eles.479

474 Revista Novidades 78 (March 1945), 43. “The Hospital Municipal, which is open to all and not only city employees, as is sometimes erroneously claimed, was the start of the municipal social assistance plan and of the healthcare centers, distributed in all districts, whose benefits to the poor population have been incalculable.”


476 PBH: Relatório Anual de 1956, 79.

477 In 1959, the hospital was renamed ‘Hospital Municipal Odilon Behrens’ after its first director. Thus, the speaker was referring to some time before that year.

478 Soares and Antunes: Pedreira Prado Lopes, 142. “Odilon Behrens wasn’t yet Odilon Behrens. It was the Hospital Municipal. […] The Hospital Municipal was a kind of public hospital to serve the poor. That was the thing, the way it worked; it served the poor who couldn’t pay for a doctor’s appointment. Later it was changed; it grew. It was small; it became larger […] gained more doctors, gained more nurses and more space. It became Odilon Behrens.”

479 Ibid. “I remember the creation of Hospital Odilon Behrens. When my boys were little they were always sick, with gastroenteritis. I would spend all night there with them.”
Me ajudou sim, o que era naquele tempo Hospital Municipal, me ajudou sim. [...] Ajudou a comunidade. [...] Hospital Municipal que hoje é Odilon Behrens. Então me ajudou sim.\textsuperscript{480}

These statements indicate that \textit{favelados} and others from the neighborhood did have access to the hospital. Thus, both oral history and official documents from the 1940s and 1950s show that the consequences of the new hospital for the lives of the local population were a mix of good and bad. Some \textit{favelados} were driven from their homes, but the hospital benefited those who remained in Pedreira Prado Lopes.

The hospital did not meet Kubitschek’s optimistic expectations of the early 1940s. It faced financial problems in the first years, and the number of patients rose throughout the 1950s and soon exceeded the hospital’s capacity.\textsuperscript{481} According to the PBH’s 1958 annual report, the exhausted hospital staff was no longer able to fulfill their professional duties because of the large number of patients:

Todavia, dentro de suas naturais limitações, vinha o Hospital Municipal pres-tando relevantes serviços, não só aos funcionários e a suas famílias, aos quais se destina, mas também à população em geral, inclusive imigrantes. Tal fato acarretou a saturação da sua capacidade. [...] Essa verificação tornou imperi‐osa a medida de excluir da assistência médica naquele estabelecimento os que não fossem funcionários municipais ou seus dependentes…\textsuperscript{482}

According to the same report, members of the IAPs had made up 30% of the hospital’s patients in 1957 and 1958. So, in 1958, the PBH decided that only its employees and their families could receive care. The PBH thus guaranteed public healthcare for those residents of the Conjunto IAPI who worked for it, but it excluded those employed by the IAPI. The change in hospital policy in 1958 did not have the expected results. Information about the Hospital Municipal in the early 1960s is scarce, but the PBH’s annual report for 1967 described financial, administrative, and

\textsuperscript{480} Ibid., 142-143. “Yes it helped me, at that time it was the Hospital Municipal, yes it helped me. [...] It helped the community. [...] Hospital Municipal, which today is Odilon Behrens. Back then it helped me.”

\textsuperscript{481} See the PBH’s reports for 1949, 1952, 1953, and 1954.

\textsuperscript{482} PBH: \textit{Relatório de 1958}, 6/4. “However, within its natural limits, the Hospital Municipal offered relevant services, not only to the functionaries and their families, for whom it was intended, but also to the general population, including immigrants. This fact led to its being used beyond its capacity. [...] Verification of that made it imperative to exclude from medical care at this establishment all those who were not municipal employees or their dependents…”
technical problems. The city instituted technical and personnel reforms\textsuperscript{483} in the following year to improve the situation, but they were not successful.

As I mentioned, Gandra, Lemos, and Pereira (1996) claimed that only the PBH’s employees and their families received treatment, but sources from the hospital’s first years refute their assertion. However, the PBH’s decision in 1958 did turn the policy into what the authors charged it always had been. According to them, the hospital opened its doors to the general public only in the late 1980s, when it was integrated into the Sistema Único de Saúde, the National Health Service.\textsuperscript{484} I assume that from 1958 until then the possibility of receiving public healthcare depended on working for the city, so that most of the local population could not use the Hospital Municipal. Like the contract between the PBH and the IAPI that had specified who could apply for housing in the Conjunto IAPI, the change in hospital policy denied the poor, that is, people without regular employment and the unemployed, their essential social rights.

Evidently, the PBH did not open any other healthcare facilities for the neighborhood’s poor. Magazines and official documents reported on the creation of \textit{postos medicos}, small health centers, in some of Belo Horizonte’s working-class districts.\textsuperscript{485} However, there is no indication that any such center was opened in Lagoinha after 1958. Even if it were, in light of their limited personnel and equipment I assume that the extent and quality of medical care at the \textit{postos medicos} were not close to comparable to what the Hospital Municipal provided. So, I conclude that in terms of the availability of medical care social segregation and exclusion in Lagoinha intensified after 1958.

There are few contemporary sources on the significance of the hospital for the residents of the Conjunto IAPI. 20\% of its apartments had been reserved for city employees and the hospital served only such people from 1958 to the late 1980s. So, it is likely that a considerable proportion of its patients lived in the complex. To verify this hypothesis, I wanted to examine the patient register from the 1950s and 1960s for patients’ addresses, but, according to the clerk in charge, one needed to know patients’ names,

\textsuperscript{484} Gandra, Lemos, and Pereira: \textit{Hospital Municipal Odilon Behrens}, 25-26.
\textsuperscript{485} See, for instance, \textit{Revista Novidades} 78 (March 1945), 43; PBH: \textit{Relatório de 1958}, 6/5.
which I didn’t have, to find them in the register. Contemporary sources in-clude no information on patients’ addresses. However, I did find the follow-ing remark in the PBH’s annual report for 1956: “Com os melhoramen-tos introduzidos nas suas instalações pela atual Administração, pôde o Hospital, em alguns de seus setores, ampliar a assistência médica dêle re-clamada pela população local, especialmente os servidores municipais.”

This makes two claims. First, it says that locals had been dissatisfied with the hospital’s care. Second, it indicates that city employees who lived in the neighborhood had wanted the hospital to expand its services, and this raises the possibility that some of these employees lived in the Conjunto IAPI. Also, 10 years later the PBH opened a chapel in the hospital, and, according to its report for 1967, most of those who used the chapel were residents of the complex. This suggests that a considerable number of residents received care at the hospital.

Interviewees certainly had opinions about the Hospital Municipal, which, it is important to realize, was the only hospital in the neighborhood until 1968, when the Hospital Belo Horizonte was opened. They were not as strong as those they had about other institutions in the neigh-borhood, probably because people do not use the hospital as often as they do public transportation, schools, and grocery stores; still, several intervie-vees did say that it was an important addition to the neighborhood’s in-frrastructure. Teresa, Roberto, and Sofia said that it had improved resi-dents’ quality of life. In contrast to the PBH’s description in the late 1950s of an establishment suffering from structural problems, Sofia had very positive memories of the hospital. She confirmed that it had treated city employees exclusively though she was not specific about the time pe-riod: “Então fizeram esse hospital aí, eram os melhores médicos de Belo

486 See PBH: Relatório Anual de 1956, 79. “With the improvements in its equipment introduced by the current administration, the hospital is able, in some of its sections, to expand medical care, as demanded by the local population, especially municipal employees.”


488 The Hospital Belo Horizonte is about one kilometer north of the Conjunto IAPI in the Cachoeirinha district. At the time of its inauguration, it was called ‘Hospital Santa Monica.’

489 See interviews with Leonardo and Teresa (8 August 2012); Roberto (28 August 2013); and Sofia (29 April 2014).
Horizonte que trabalhavam aí. Era da Prefeitura só, atendia funcionário da Prefeitura só..."490

After its integration into the National Health Service in the late 1980s, the Hospital Municipal contributed to Lagoinha’s growing significance.491 People from Pedreira Prado Lopes also said that the hospital had improved their quality of life over the last two decades.492 However, one resident cited in Ribeiro et al. (2001) complained that the quality of healthcare had declined recently because of the increasing number of patients.493

4.3. Groceries and Commercial Infrastructure

Kubitschek recalled in his autobiography that, after the lack of healthcare, the food shortage was the biggest cause of suffering for workers in Lagoinha and other districts in the 1940s. During his term in office, the PBH opened restaurantes populares, where the underprivileged could eat free of charge.494 Later municipal administrations built two new public markets in the Lagoinha area. However, an examination of the development of the local commercial infrastructure shows that for residents who had moved into the Conjunto IAPI after 1948 small, privately owned stores were at least as important as the new public institutions.

In 1948, the Mercado Municipal, at the intersection of Avenida Amazonas and Avenida Augusto de Lima downtown, was Belo Horizonte’s most important food market. Merchants offered fruit, vegetables, meat, bread, milk, and other groceries at their stalls. As can be seen from the following passage from the PBH’s annual report of that year, most shoppers lived in the zona urbana, for it was hard for the inhabitants of outlying districts to get there:

A organização do Mercado Municipal não corresponde às exigências da cidade. No Mercado, realmente, abastece-se a população de limitada área da zona urbana. A população que reside distante não pode valer-se das oportunidades

490 Interview with Sofia (29 April 2014). “Then they built that hospital over there; Belo Horizonte’s best doctors worked there. It was the city’s hospital only, it only served city bureaucrats...”
491 Lemos: “A Lagoinha e suas imagens”, 128-129.
493 Ibid., 173-174.
494 Kubitschek: A escalada política, 32.
Belo Horizonte’s rapid growth made feeding the population an increasingly difficult task for the municipal administration and private retailers. In the late 1940s, the PBH developed new strategies for dealing with the food deficit, and these affected working-class neighborhoods, especially on the city’s periphery. Decree number 85, promulgated on 9 June 1949, introduced new regulations for *feiras livres*, small, open-air markets, which had existed since the 1920s, where vendors sold produce, meat, eggs, flour, sweets, and dairy products once or twice a week, that were intended to lower the prices for such items, making them affordable for the underprivileged. Throughout the 1950s, the number of *feiras livres* increased, and the PBH established *mercados distritais*, *mercadinhos*, and *mercados dos subúrbios*. It claimed that these small markets would improve living conditions in working-class neighborhoods. In fact, the PBH spent more money on the development of commercial infrastructure in the *zona centro-sul*. This policy benefited the upper echelons of society because it led to a gradual shift of shops, entertainment, and public institutions from the *centro* to the upper-class central-south neighborhood of Savassi. And, over the following decades numerous buildings in Belo Horizonte’s historic center, especially around Rua dos Caetés, fell into decay.

---

495 PBH: *Relatório de 1948*. Apresentado à Câmara Municipal pelo Prefeito Otacílio Negrão de Lima. Belo Horizonte 1949, 95-96. “The organization of the Mercado Municipal does not meet the city’s exigencies. Actually, the population of the limited *zona urbana* area shop at the market. People who live far away do not benefit from the opportunities offered by the market. The fact that the Companhia Força e Luz does not provide streetcars makes it impossible for the people to do their shopping at the Mercado...”

496 Fundação João Pinheiro: *Belo Horizonte & o comércio*, 124. According to the PBH’s annual reports for 1948 and 1949, retailers at the *feiras livres* sold more food than those at the Mercado Municipal. The 1948 report listed further measures to guarantee the supply of food. For example, the city increased investment in food production, opened grocery stores, and improved road infrastructure to facilitate distribution. See PBH: *Relatório de 1948*, 95-97, 107-110; PBH: *Relatório de 1949 apresentado à Câmara pelo prefeito Otacílio Negrão de Lima*. Belo Horizonte 1950, 186.


these developments would exceed the limits of the present work, it is clear that they contributed to the consolidation of social inequalities. For example, compared to workers who lived in districts north and west of the city center, the inhabitants of high-income neighborhoods came to enjoy access to a broader range of goods and services of higher quality.\textsuperscript{499} Villaça observed that this uneven distribution of commercial establishments was a typical feature of segregation in Brazilian cities. (See chapter 1.4.)

Throughout the first half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, Lagoinha’s commercial infrastructure was a miscellaneous collection of tailor’s shops, wholesalers and warehouses, baker’s shops, shoe stores, antique dealers, and second-hand furniture and clothing shops.\textsuperscript{500} Like other working-class districts outside the \textit{zona urbana}, Lagoinha was affected by the food shortages of the late 1940s. So, the PBH built the Feira dos Produtores on Avenida Pedro II, an open-air market where, according to Lemos, people came to buy fruits and vegetables, household appliances, and everyday items.\textsuperscript{501} The Feira dos Produtores also drew visitors from other cities. And, like the \textit{feiras livres}, it was a place where people socialized and spent their leisure time.\textsuperscript{502} In 1948, the PBH announced the creation of another new neighborhood market in Lagoinha, the Mercado Popular.\textsuperscript{503} Construction began the following year at the intersection of Avenida Antônio Carlos and Rua Formiga, very close to the Conjunto IAPI, which was still under construction. In his annual report of 1949, Mayor Otacílio Negrão de Lima wrote that he expected the new market to contribute to the well-being of the local population, in particular, those who lived in the districts north of downtown:

\begin{quote}
Emprestamos nossa decisiva colaboração à Beneficência \[sic\] da Prefeitura para a construção do Mercadinho Popular, cujas obras se acham bastantes adiantadas. Esse estabelecimento destina-se ao abastecimento da população da zona Norte da cidade, e se acha localizado à av. Antônio \[sic\] Carlos, c/ esquina de rua Formiga, próximo ao Bairro Popular \[Conjunto\], do I.A.P.I.
\end{quote}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{499} Villaça: \textit{Espaço intra-urbano no Brasil}, 270.
\item \textsuperscript{500} Machado and Pereira: “A Recuperação da Lagoinha”, 42.
\item \textsuperscript{501} Lemos: “A Lagoinha e suas imagens”, 149.
\item \textsuperscript{502} Ibid. In 1981, the PBH relocated the Feira dos Produtores to the Cidade Nova district.
\item \textsuperscript{503} PBH: \textit{Relatório de 1948}, 96.
\end{itemize}
Compõe-se de 30 lojas e 30 bancas cobertas. As lojas destinar-se-ao a Peixaria, Charque, Farmácia, Frigorífico e Restaurante...

Though Lima mentioned the Conjunto IAPI as a point of reference, he did not say that it was the reason for the PBH’s decision to locate the Mercado Popular in Lagoinha. Nevertheless, the authors of the Dossiê de Tombamento Conjunto Residencial São Cristóvão IAPI, published by Belo Horizonte’s Gerência de Patrimônio Histórico Urbano (GEPH) in 2007, cited a part of this passage in explaining that Lima’s administration had built the market to supply the *conjunto* and the surrounding areas with enough food. Its location less than 200 meters south of the complex suggests that this was the case, and the hypothesis is supported by the fact that the PBH began work on the new market only one year after the first tenants had moved in.

The Mercado Popular opened its doors to the public in 1951. In its first years, it was known as the Mercadinho da Antônio Carlos, the Mercadinho da Lagoinha, and the Mercado da Lagoinha, but the inscription on the building read ‘Super Mercado Popular Municipal’ years before Belo Horizonte’s first supermarket was named ‘Super Mercado’ (see below). Unlike the Hospital Municipal some years earlier, construction of the Mercado Popular seems not to have displaced any of the inhabitants of Pedreira Prado Lopes because the building site was not within the borders of the *favela*. However, since the site was close to Avenida Antônio Carlos, it is possible that the shacks of *favelados* that had once stood there had al-

---

504 PBH: *Relatório de 1949*, 187. “We collaborated with the city’s welfare office in the construction of the Mercadinho Popular, work on which is well advanced. This establishment is meant to supply the population in the city’s northern zone, and it is located on Av. Antônio Carlos at the corner of Rua Formiga, close to Bairro Popular [Conjunto] of the I.A.P.I. It comprises 30 shops and 30 covered stalls. The shops will house a fish market, a butcher’s shop, a pharmacy, a meat-packing plant and a restaurant...”

505 GEPH: *Dossiê de Tombamento IAPI*, 13.

506 Freire: *Cotidiano, Memória e Identidade*, 44. Information on the date of the opening is scarce and inconsistent. In a study of Lagoinha’s urban development, the PBH (2011) wrote that the market was opened in 1958. I did not find any contemporary documents that said how long it had been open, but in its report for 1962, the PBH mentioned that the Mercado Popular had been open for several years. See PBH: *Relatório de 1962. Apresentado à Egrégia Câmara Municipal pelo Prefeito Amintas de Barros*. Belo Horizonte 1963, 7.

507 Fundação João Pinheiro: *Belo Horizonte & o comércio*, 125.
ready been demolished during construction of the avenue in the early 1940s.

Source: APCBH, Fundo ASCOM. Imagem 1794.

To discover the relevance of the Mercado Popular and the Feira dos Produtores for daily life in the Conjunto IAPI, I asked interviewees if they used to shop there. Surprisingly, no one mentioned the Feira dos Produtores, and Sofia was the only one who commented on the Mercado Popular. With an air of nostalgia, she remembered it as a smaller version of the Mercado Municipal: “E tinha o mercadinho. Vendia tudo que você queria, como no Mercado [Municipal], mas aqui era mercado da Lagoinha.”

Though this does not mean that residents did not shop at these markets, oral history and written sources suggest, as I show below, that they bought their food in the small grocery stores that were inside the complex in the

508 Interview with Sofia (29 April 2014). “And there was the small market. It sold everything you wanted, like the Mercado [Municipal], but here; it was the Lagoinha market.”
1950s and 1960s. In general, Brazilians in the mid-20th century, like people in other countries, bought groceries in corner shops close to their homes. In Belo Horizonte, the first indoor supermarkets did not open until the late 1950s. They coexisted with traditional grocery stores until they became more popular in the 1970s.

In the 1950s and 1960s, eight shops existed inside the Conjunto IAPI on the ground floor of several of the buildings. During the complex’s first 20 years, the IAPI leased some of them to private retailers and companies. Sofia mentioned two bars and a café. There was also a post office, and beginning in the early 1950s residents could buy milk and bread in a small shop in Edifício 4. Later, the Companhia Brasileira de Alimentos (COBAL), a state-owned chain, opened a grocery store that sold fresh fruit and vegetables at low prices. All of these shops made residents’ lives easier:

Antigamente tinha a administração que era do IAPI e tinha Correios, tinha um bar, tinha outro bar que vendia café, leite, antigamente o leite não vinha ensacado não; vinha nas garrafinhas que você comprava as garrafinhas. Você comprava aqui no [Edifício] 4, leite, pão, sabe? Era muito bom. [...] Do lado de cá tinha COBAL, que era um armazém da COBAL, que era do Estado, vendia mantimentos.

In an article published on 20 August 1971, the Estado de Minas commented on the shops in the Conjunto IAPI:

Existem oito lojas no conjunto, nos edifícios 3 e 5 e nos edifícios 4 e 6, duas em cada. As lojas foram ocupadas, através dos anos, por armarinhos, bares,

509 Fundação João Pinheiro: Belo Horizonte & o comércio, 121-123. The first two supermarkets in Belo Horizonte opened in the city center in 1956 and 1957. The PBH opened one on Avenida Barbacena in the Barro Preto district in 1958. In the course of the following years, the grocery business modernized. For example, customers themselves took products from the shelves, and they paid cash.

510 Ibid., 128-129.

511 In the 1940s and 1950s, retailers in Belo Horizonte and other Brazilian cities used to deliver meat, fruit, bread, and milk to the homes of their customers, though the COBAL shop did not make deliveries inside the complex. See Fundação João Pinheiro: Belo Horizonte & o comércio, 106.

512 Interview with Sofia (29 April 2014). “Formerly, there was the IAPI’s administration, and there was a post office; there was a bar; there was another bar that sold coffee, milk—at that time milk didn’t come in cartons, it came in bottles that you had to buy. You used to shop here in [Building] 4—milk, bread, you know? It was very good. [...] Here on this side was COBAL, a COBAL shop; it was state-owned; it sold groceries.”
4.3. Groceries and Commercial Infrastructure

butiques, casa de massas e de outras mercadorias. Atualmente, as oito lojas estão ocupadas assim: uma com a administração do conjunto; uma com agência dos Correios; uma com a repartição de pagamento aos aposentados do INPS; três vazias; e duas ocupadas por mercearias.\textsuperscript{513}

So, three of the eight spaces were vacant when the article was published. The article went on to say that the COBAL shop had recently closed, and the space taken over by the INPS, and the last two grocery stores would soon suffer the same fate.\textsuperscript{514} Residents protested against the impending closures. They unsuccessfully petitioned the INPS to keep the two stores open, complaining that their closure would force them to cross Avenida Antônio Carlos to buy everyday items.\textsuperscript{515} In my opinion, this shows that the shops were an important part of the local infrastructure for many residents.

The other shops, bars, and the café inside the complex also contributed to a dynamic community life.\textsuperscript{516} With regard to socio-spatial segregation, it is important to determine if people who lived in the neighborhood also frequented these places, for if they did, these businesses might have been places where different social groups came into contact with each other. Unfortunately, I found no information on this. Interviewees did not remember if people from the surrounding areas had frequented the establishments. Though some said they had regularly met their neighbors from the conjunto in the shops,\textsuperscript{517} none recalled people from the surrounding neighborhood shopping there, though some said that might have been the case. Interviews with the former shop owners would have been informative, but it was not possible to find out who they were in the 1950s and 1960s.

Sofia’s nostalgic memories of the conjunto’s stores were in contrast to her discontent over recent developments. Like several other interviewees, she perceived the neighborhood’s present scarcity of supermarkets, which adversely affects the quality of life in the housing complex, as the result of

\textsuperscript{513} Estado de Minas, 20.08. 1971, 7. “There are eight shops in the complex, in Buildings 3 and 5 and in Buildings 4 and 6, two in each. Over the years, the stores were occupied by tailors, bars, boutiques, pasta restaurants and other businesses. Currently, the eight shops are occupied as follows: one by the administration of the complex, one by a post office, one by the INPS pension distribution office, three are vacant, and two are occupied by grocery stores.”
\textsuperscript{514} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{515} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{516} Interview with Sofia (29 April 2014).
\textsuperscript{517} Ibid.
a lack of infrastructure. For many years, there was an EPA supermarket on the other side of Avenida Antônio Carlos, which, like the grocery stores once inside the complex, had made daily life easier for residents, who did not need to go to the city center to buy groceries.\footnote{Ibid.} Some years ago, however, the PBH tore the supermarket, and several other buildings, down in order to widen Avenida Antônio Carlos.\footnote{Prefeitura de Belo Horizonte: Intervenções na avenida Antônio Carlos priorizam fluidez.} Like Sofia, Letícia complained about the lack of supermarkets.\footnote{Interview with Letícia (24 August 2012).} From Teresa’s point of view, the closure of the EPA had reduced the quality of local infrastructure. She said there was only one small grocery store left in the vicinity. So, nowadays, residents have to shop in the city center and, in many cases, have to take a taxi or ask neighbors for a ride. Consequently, daily life is more difficult, especially for elderly residents.\footnote{Interview with Teresa (18 September 2012).} Tiago also remembered the closure of the EPA and said that since then the PBH had not provided the neighborhood with adequate commercial infrastructure. In his opinion, this is discrimination. He also complained that customers must pay cash in the small grocery store that is still in front of the complex, which, he thought, showed that the owner believed that locals were not creditworthy.\footnote{Interview with Tiago and Teresa (18 September 2012).}

A comparison of interviewees’ comments with the conclusions of researchers studying Lagoinha shows that present-day residents of the complex and inhabitants of the surrounding area suffer from similar infrastructural shortcomings, particularly the lack of supermarkets. According to the residents of Lagoinha that Machado and Pereira (1997) interviewed, the lack of supermarkets, green areas, and public squares are the neighborhood’s main problems.\footnote{See Machado and Pereira: “A Recuperação da Lagoinha”, 42-43.} Wholesalers, second-hand furniture stores, and car repair shops have long been the most numerous commercial establishments in Lagoinha. According to Lemos, development of Lagoinha’s commercial infrastructure continues to lag behind that of other districts in Belo Horizonte’s \textit{região noroeste}.\footnote{See Lemos: “A Lagoína e as suas Imagens”, 128.} Moreover, the city has continually invested in sophisticated commercial infrastructure in high-income districts, particularly in the city’s \textit{zona centro-sul}. I claim that, in terms of the avail-
ability of food and shopping facilities, this is what has made social inequality noticeable on a city-wide, rather than just the local, level.

In 1954, a few years after the Hospital Municipal and the Mercado Popular opened, another public institution moved into Lagoinha when the PBH relocated the Colégio Municipal, a public secondary school, from the Parque Municipal in the city center to a new building on Avenida José Bonifácio. We have seen that the lack of local commercial infrastructure affected the conjunto’s residents and people from the neighborhood in similar ways. In the next section, I discuss how social disparities affected the chances of children from the conjunto and the neighborhood to benefit from education.

4.4. Public Education: The Colégio Municipal and the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros

The founding of educational institutions was essential to Belo Horizonte becoming the political and economic capital of Minas Gerais. Since the 1930s, the number of elementary and secondary schools (colégios) grew continually. By the end of the following decade, however, many working-class districts still lacked adequate educational infrastructure. So, beginning in the early 1950s, the PBH built new public schools in residential areas outside the zona urbana.

My research in the Conjunto IAPI shows that two public schools were important for the education of its children in the period under consideration. The first was the Colégio Municipal, which was moved in 1954 from its original site to a location near the complex. The second, the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros, was opened inside the complex in 1966. In this section, I consider the significance of these two schools for daily life in the conjunto and whether it, with its thousands of residents, was a decisive factor in opening them. My detailed answer to the question also explains, in part, the complex’s role in the urbanization of the area of Lagoinha and whether or not the PBH really intended to provide educa-

tional infrastructure for the children living there. My considerations are based on my analyses of the PBH’s annual reports for 1953 and 1954; a book published by Honório Silveira Neto (1973), who worked as a teacher at the Colégio Municipal for over 20 years; and Sônia Maria Gentilini’s master’s thesis (2001). Interviews and several written sources from the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s show that many of the complex’s children attended class at the Colégio Municipal and the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros and participated in their organized extra-curricular activities. I also consider whether children from the neighborhood, especially Pedreira Prado Lopes, had the same opportunities, which provides new insights into the interrelations among housing, urbanization, and social exclusion.

In 1948, Otacílio Negrão de Lima’s administration opened the Ginásio Municipal in the Parque Municipal downtown. In the following year, it described the new school as an important step towards integrating underprivileged children into the public education system. The succeeding administration of Américo Renê Giannetti instituted an education reform that included building new schools in working-class districts outside the zona urbana. As part of the reform, it decided in 1951 to move the Ginásio Municipal to a new site. Following the recommendation of the Câmara Municipal, they chose a site on Avenida José Bonifácio in front of the Conjunto IAPI. On 9 March 1953, while the new building was still under construction, the PBH passed municipal law number 328, which transformed the Ginásio Municipal into the Colégio Municipal and instituted its regulations.

In its annual report for 1954, the PBH explained its three principal reasons for moving the Colégio Municipal to Lagoinha. First, the city owned the site. Second, it was close to the city center. Third, and most interesting,
the new location was close to several working-class districts, and, therefore, the PBH portrayed the move as giving less privileged children access to education:

Em suas novas instalações no Bairro São Cristovão [sic], em magnífico prédio situado nas imediações do Conjunto Residencial do I.A.P.I., o Colégio Municipal veio a desenvolver suas atividades no ano letivo findo com melhor aproveitamento, de vez que se acha no pleno gozo [sic] das prerrogativas regulamentares. [...] Resultando de apurado estudo, a localização do educandário em aprêço [sic] no Bairro São Cristovão [sic] foi determinada à vista de que, não somente a área escolhida pertencia à Prefeitura, e favorecia, em sua amplitude, à construção de um estabelecimento modelar, como porque a situação do imóvel, sem ser muito afastada da área urbana, prestava-se ainda a servir populosas localidades. Sendo ainda o local, por outro lado, ponto de convergência de vários bairros operários, tal fato vem permitir ao educandário cumprir com maiores possibilidades sua alta função social, de proporcionar o ensino secundário gratuito aos menos favorecidos pela sorte.⁵³¹

The Conjunto IAPI is mentioned as a point of reference in the quoted passage, but nowhere in the report do its authors explicitly say that the presence of the complex was among the reasons for moving the school to Avenida José Bonifácio. According to Neto (1973), Américo Renê Giannetti, Belo Horizonte’s mayor at the time of the relocation, and Hugo Pinheiro Soares, the director of the municipal department of education and culture, had pressed for the move.⁵³² Looking back in 1969, Soares remembered that classrooms in the old building in the Parque Municipal were too small and the park’s lack of lighting made it dangerous after

⁵³¹ PBH: Prestação de Contas do Executivo Municipal relativa ao exercício de 1954-encaminhada à Egrégia Câmara dos Vereadores em Fevereiro de 1955. Belo Horizonte 1955, 165. “In its new facilities in the São Cristóvão district, in a magnificent building situated in the surroundings of the I.A.P.I.’s housing complex, the Colégio Municipal saw its activities evolve more efficiently in the school year now ending, because it benefits from privileges. [...] Resulting from careful study, the location of the educational institution in the São Cristóvão district was determined not only because the chosen area belonged to the city and supported, due to its amplitude, the construction of an model establishment but also because the building’s location, not very far from the urban area, was still suitable for serving populous localities. Being the site, on the other hand, the point of convergence, of several working-class districts is a fact that will give the school better possibilities to fulfill its important social function of providing free secondary education to those who are less fortunate.”

dark. He recalled that residents of the Conjunto IAPI had been demanding a secondary school in the vicinity:

Havia, por parte do Dr. Giannetti, uma outra preocupação a solver: a Prefeitura deveria, no seu entender, construir nos terrenos vagos que possuía na zona mais central da cidade [...] Recomendou-me, então, que examinasse uma área de terreno localizada na Avenida José Bonifácio, no Bairro São Cristovão [sic], ao lado da pedreira [Prado Lopes], excelentemente situada, já invadida por uma favela, a fim de que nela fossem construídos um Grupo Escolar e o novo prédio do Ginásio—reivindicação permanente dos moradores do Conjunto Residencial do IAPI, comandados, na sua campanha, pelo dinâmico Padre Carlos Silveira Vaz de Melo, vigário da paróquia.

A careful reading of this passage suggests that the school’s relocation was part of the city’s anti-favela policy, and I believe that one of the real reasons for relocating it to Avenida José Bonifácio was to prevent Pedreira Prado Lopes from spreading, which was probably more important to the PBH than meeting the demands of the conjunto’s residents. As a result of the move, inhabitants of the favela were again evicted from their homes: “Depois vieram e construíram o colégio. [...] tiraram aquele povo tudo que morava ali ao redor, mandaram embora e fizeram o colégio.”

According to Gentilini, the city resettled some of the favela’s ousted inhabitants in the Vila Operária do Mato da Lenha, on the edge of the city, in 1953, which clearly shows that the relocation of the school initiated a

---

534 Ibid. “There was another problem that Dr. Giannetti had to solve. According to his understanding, the city was supposed to build on the empty land that it owned in the city’s most central zone. [...] Thus, he recommended that I examine an area located along Avenida José Bonifácio in the São Cristóvão district, beside the quarry [Prado Lopes], excellently situated, already taken over by a slum, in order to construct on it an elementary school and the new building of the Ginásio—a constant demand of the residents of the IAPI’s housing complex, whose campaign was led by the dynamic Padre Carlos Silveira Vaz de Melo, the vicar of the parish.”
535 I discuss the PBH’s anti-favela policy in detail in chapter 5.
536 Soares and Antunes: Pedreira Prado Lopes, 141. “Later they came and built the high school. [...] They removed all the people who were living around there, sent them away, and built the high school.”
process of socio-spatial segregation. Though the conjunto’s residents benefited from the school’s new location, as I show below, there is no evidence that that was the PBH’s intention. Apparently, tension between Mayor Giannetti and his predecessor Otacílio Negrão de Lima, who had founded the Ginásio Municipal in 1948, were behind the move.\footnote{Gentilini quoted Padre Taitson, the school’s principal from 1948 to 1954, according to whom politicians were paying attention to the demands of the Conjunto IAPI’s residents in the run-up to the city elections of 1951: A transferência desse Colégio do Parque Municipal para a Lagoinha foi por motivo político, porque um dos ajudantes de gabinete, o Giannetti, Américo Renê Giannetti, queria ser eleito vereador, então foi lá no conjunto do IAPI e pediu votos lá. Então falaram: nós damos se você fundar um colégio aqui. Ele falou:- Não, eu transfiro o Colégio Municipal para cá...} That is, Taitson believed that the Colégio Municipal was moved to Avenida José Bonifácio in order to buy their votes, a common practice in the populist Fourth Republic. So, I conclude that, in addition to eliminating part of the favela, the other reason for moving the school was to generate voters’ support for Giannetti.\footnote{Ibid., 81.\footnote{Ibid., 83. “The transfer of this Colégio from the Parque Municipal to Lagoinha was for political reasons, because one of the cabinet aides, Giannetti, Américo Renê Giannetti, wanted to be elected city councilman; so he went to the Conjunto IAPI and asked for votes there. So they said, ‘We’ll give you our votes if you establish a high school here.’ He said, ‘No, I’ll move the Colégio Municipal here…”}}
Classes began at the colégio in March 1954, though the new building was not inaugurated until August. Almost two decades later, a former teacher, Honório Silveira Neto, remembered daily life in the school after the move to Lagoinha:


Illustration 14. _The Colégio Municipal on Avenida José Bonifácio in the 1950s._

Source PBH: _Relatório de 1953, 86a._


541 Informativo do Colégio Municipal, n.° 7, 1970, apud Neto: *História do Colégio Municipal*, 76. “That time when school was held in the new and unfinished building was picturesque. There were no walls. The boys from the slum joked around...”
The number of pupils increased continually over the following years, and the building was enlarged several times in the late 1950s and early 1960s. The school became known for training future teachers. It remained on Avenida José Bonifácio until May 1972 when the city moved it into the building of the former Colégio Marconi in the zona centro-sul’s Santo Agostinho district, where the number of wealthy pupils increased. According to Gentilini, this relocation was the outcome of negotiations between the PBH and the Associação Beneficente Italiana de Belo Horizonte, which owned the building. The building on Avenida José Bonifácio housed a department of the new Colégio Municipal Marconi for some years.

In his annual report for 1953, Giannetti said of the transfer of the Colégio Municipal to the Conjunto IAPI’s neighborhood, “ENSINO PARA TODOS-Para facilitar a difusão do ensino, a Prefeitura está construindo o Colégio Municipal com capacidade para 2.500 alunos que receberão ali instrução gratuita.” That is, he trumpeted the city’s investment in educational infrastructure in a typically populist way, portraying the school as contributing to the well-being of Belo Horizonte’s population. In assessing his claim, I next consider the social background of the Colégio Municipal’s students between 1954 and 1972, a time when less privileged groups had little access to public education.

Since the late 1930s, the federal education department and city departments all over Brazil had tried to reduce illiteracy by establishing new public schools. However, these measures did not increase social inclusion, for large segments of the population still had only limited access to public education.
education, which reinforced their poverty. The following considerations about the Colégio Municipal are based on a range of sources, which show that the exclusion of the poor from education was closely connected to their place of residence.

Interviews showed that the Colégio Municipal was significant in the everyday lives of many of the conjunto’s residents. Recalling his daily routine, Roberto, who studied there in the late 1950s, explained how he managed to balance school and work:

Eu estudava aqui no colégio, o nosso horário aqui era de sete horas da manhã até às onze e meia. Então eu levantava cedinho, ia pro colégio e ficava até às onze e meia lá, voltava em casa, almoçava e ia direto pro meu serviço lá no centro da cidade. Eu pegava serviço lá na prefeitura uma hora da tarde e trabalhava até sete horas da noite. De uma até às sete da noite.

According to him, many of the conjunto’s children, and children from all over the city, attended the colégio in the 1950s and 1960s. Sofia moved to the complex in 1954, the year the Colégio Municipal opened in its new building. Several of her friends and acquaintances, including a later director of the Hospital Municipal, graduated from the colégio, and her husband, father-in-law, sister-in-law, and several acquaintances taught there. It was probably because of this personal connection that she said that it had been among Belo Horizonte’s best high schools. In a book published in 1962 by Guilherme Lage, the school’s principal at the time, I found a list of addresses of the school’s employees that shows that three teachers and several secretaries and janitors lived in the Conjunto IAPI.

548 Interview with Roberto (28 August 2013). “I studied here in the high school; our schedule went from 7:00 in the morning to 11:30. So, I would get up early, go to school and stay there until 11:30, return home, have lunch and go directly to work downtown. I worked for the city from 1:00 in the afternoon until 7:00 at night. From 1 until 7 at night.”
549 Ibid.
550 Interview with Sofia (29 April 2014).
551 Guilherme Lage was born in Ouro Preto in 1919. He graduated in philosophy and law and began work as a schoolteacher in 1941. In 1962, he published the book about the Colégio Municipal, which he wrote in collaboration with Honório SIlveira Neto and a group of 12 students. Lage was the colégio’s principal until the late 1970s. See Lage: Colégio Municipal de Belo Horizonte, 23, 75. See also, Gentilini: Colégio Municipal de Belo Horizonte: a utopia possível, 106.
552 Lage: Colégio Municipal de Belo Horizonte, 66-73.
Students from the complex not only attended class at the *colégio*; they also spent leisure time there. Roberto played the saxophone in a student band:

Na época que eu estava estudando no colégio eu tocava saxofone. Então a gente tinha uma charanga [brass band], sabe? [...] O colégio promovia torneios, de futebol, de salão, aquela coisa toda. E eu tinha organizado a minha charanga e a minha torcida lá pro time do colégio. Tocava saxofone. [...] Os torneios de futebol, e tinha as apresentações musicais também porque lá tem auditorio, e a gente fazia apresentações.\textsuperscript{553}

Cecília, who went to the school since she moved to the Conjunto IAPI in the mid-1960s, recounted similar experiences:

A gente participava, a gente brincava muito. Tinha um desfile, os jogos da primavera na cidade. Então o colégio sempre ganhava porque ele tinha o maior, o desfile mais bonito. Então chegava nos jogos a gente ganhava tudo. [She smiles]. O colégio investia muito. [...] Então a gente tinha além de equipe de futebol, vôlei, basquete, tinha equipe de ginástica olímpica, tínhamos um grupo de dança folclórica, eu participei. Tínhamos uma fanfarra que é muito famosa, tem muitos moradores que participaram, eu participei um dia só... Não era a minha praia... [She smiles.]

I conclude that the Colégio Municipal was a significant part of residents’ daily lives. Children went to school, spent leisure time, and made friends there, and a considerable number of adults worked there.

It is also important to determine if children from the surrounding area also attended the Colégio Municipal. I went to the Secretaria Municipal de Educação de Belo Horizonte to find students’ addresses in the class regis-

\textsuperscript{553} Interview with Roberto (28 August 2013). “At the time when I was studying at the high school, I played saxophone. So, we had a charanga [brass band], you know? [...] The school organized indoor soccer tournaments, that whole thing. And I had organized my band and its fans for the school’s team. I played saxophone. [...] The soccer tournaments, and there were also the concerts because there is an auditorium, and we gave concerts.”

\textsuperscript{554} Interview with Cecília conducted in the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros, Conjunto IAPI, Belo Horizonte, on 4 April 2014. “We participated, we joked around a lot. There was a parade, the spring games in the city. So the high school always won because it had the largest, the prettiest parade. When the games began, we won everything. [She smiles]. The school invested a lot. [...] So besides the soccer team, we had volleyball, basketball, there was a gymnastics team; we had a folk dance group—I took part in it. We had a fanfare that is very famous, there were a lot of residents who took part, I joined only for one day... That wasn’t really my thing... [She smiles.]”
ters from the 1950s and 1960s, but the clerks in charge did not know if they still existed. Therefore, the following conclusions are based largely on oral history. As I have said, the city claimed that it moved the colégio to Lagoinha in order to offer education to underprivileged teenagers. However, interviews with former teachers, pupils, and local residents, though sometimes contradictory, suggest that the poor, and specifically those from Pedreira Prado Lopes, were hardly ever students there.

Part of Pedreira Prado Lopes, including a soccer field, had been demolished to make way for the colégio’s new building. According to Gentilini, this caused conflict over the following years. For example, inhabitants of the favela sometimes threw stones through the school’s windows. In the late 1950s, the school administration erected a stone wall to keep favelados out. But, within a few years, tensions had eased because the school gave people from the favela food, water, and shelter during severe storms. When Guilherme Lage became the principal in 1960 he allowed children from the favela to play in the schoolyard on weekends, which, according to several former teachers and students, was intended to defuse hostility. And, though students had to pass an entrance examination, Lage reserved a number of places for poor students from the neighborhood. Thus, according to some former students and teachers quoted in Gentilini (2001), some students from the favela attended in the early 1960s. The teaching staff discussed ways to increase their number but without success. For one reason, many poor would-be students lacked the resources to prepare for the entrance exam and consequently failed. For another, the number of middle-class pupils increased continually.

Contrary to those former teachers and students who said that relations between the school and the favela had improved after Lage had become the principal, Cecília recalled that violent conflicts had continued through the 1960s:

A gente era muito hostilizado pelos meninos lá de cima que eles não tinham acesso. [...] Eu lembro que eu estudava lá na época, eles apedrejavam a gente durante a aula. Tava estudando de repente caía uma chuva de pedra na sala, vidro quebrado. [...] A maioria dos alunos era daqui do IAPI ou alunos de ou-

555 Gentilini: Colégio Municipal de Belo Horizonte: a utopia possível, 102.
556 Ibid.
557 Ibid.
558 Ibid., 102-103.
559 Ibid., 103.
4.4. Public Education

tras regiões, mas que passavam por processo seletivo. Os da Honorina [the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros] iam automaticamente pra lá e o restante passava por processo seletivo. Ele era um colégio meio elitizado, mesmo num ponto assim, ele e a Honorina, engraçado, né?!560

Interview with Cecília, 4 April 2014. “The boys up there were very hostile to us because they did not have access. [...] I remember that I was studying there at the time, they would throw stones at us during class. We were studying, suddenly a hail of stones would fall on the classroom, broken glass. [...] The majority of the students were from here, from the IAPI, or students from other areas, but they had to pass the selection process. Those from Honorina [the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros] would go there automatically and the rest passed the selection process. It was a pretty elitist school, even in a place like this, the high school and Honorina. Funny, isn’t it?!”. 

560
Older favela inhabitants also mentioned the Colégio Municipal in interviews published by Ribeiro et al. (2001): “As pessoas daqui não tinham acesso ao Colégio Municipal, era separado assim: o pessoal da favela não estudava lá...” This confirms Cecília’s statement that students from the favela hardly ever studied at the school. So, the facts were not in line with the PBH’s propaganda about including students from all social classes in

Illustration 15. The Colégio Municipal in 1967 with the favela of Pedreira Prado Lopes in the background. Oral sources suggest that students from the favela hardly ever had the opportunity to attend the school.

Source: APCBH, Fundo ASCOM. Imagem 8307.

561 Ribeiro et al.: Becos da memória, 154. “People from here didn’t have access to the Colégio Municipal; it was separated. People from the slum didn’t study there...”
the city’s school system. The Colégio Municipal thus symbolizes the exclusion of the poor from education in mid-20th-century Brazil.

According to the economists Fernando de Holanda Barbosa Filho and Samuel Pessôa (2009), 6 out of 10 Brazilian children between the ages of 7 and 14 did not attend school regularly in the mid-1950s. Consequently, the literacy rate was low throughout the country, and Belo Horizonte was no exception. To combat the problem, the PBH under Américo Renê Giannetti (1951-1954) opened new elementary schools, most, according to Giannetti’s 1953 annual report, in working-class districts that had none. Several, such as the Escola São José (on Rua Itapecerica, opened in 1952), the Escola Municipal Afonso Vaz de Melo (on Rua Rio Novo, opened in 1953), and the Grupo Escolar Mestre Carlos (on Rua Pedro Lessa, opened in 1953/1954) were in Lagoinha. In that report and the next year’s, the PBH mentioned the Conjunto IAPI, which it called ‘Bairro dos Industríários,’ in specifying where the students of the new schools lived.

Research has shown that throughout the years of the Fourth Republic (1945-1964) state actors failed to reduce class disparities in primary education. In Belo Horizonte, where the situation was comparable to the rest of the nation, the PBH’s efforts to improve the working class’s access did not produce results because many of its new schools lacked infrastructure and equipment and employed an inadequate number of teachers. In the early 1960s, such problems motivated residents of the Conjunto IAPI to campaign for a new school in their neighborhood. The city built the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros on the conjunto’s public square, the

563 PBH: Relatório de 1953, 79-80. According to the PBH’s 1953 report, 29.47% of the children between 7 and 14 who lived in the city were illiterate.
564 Ibid., 82, 84. See also, PBH: Prestação de Contas do Executivo Municipal de 1954, 159-161.
Praça Prof. Corrêa Neto. I could not discover if it did so in response to the campaign, but the school’s location suggests that it did.

On 25 July 1962, Mayor Amintas Ferreira de Barros visited the conjunto on the occasion of the festival of Saint Christopher and announced that construction of the new school would soon start. Two days later, the Estado de Minas published an article about his visit:

Em seguida, de público, o sr. Amintas de Barros passou a falar sobre o Grupo Escolar, com capacidade para mais de 1.000 (mil) alunos, que dentro de poucos dias deverá ter a sua construção iniciada no parque interno [the public square Praça Prof. Corrêa Neto] do conjunto residencial. O referido estabelecimento de ensino primário [...] será construído com todos os requisitos da técnica educacional moderna, devendo proporcionar escola inteiramente gratuita [sic] para os filhos de todos os moradores do bairro São Cristóvão. [...] A escola primária [...] será uma realidade, dentro em breve, para beneficiar os filhos dos moradores dos 928 apartamentos do conjunto... The article first says that students will come from the entire São Cristóvão district but, confusingly, in the last sentence it refers only to the Conjunto IAPI. But, as I explained in chapter 3, residents used to call the conjunto a ‘bairro’ (district/neighborhood). Assuming that the author used ‘bairro’ in ‘bairro São Cristóvão’ in this sense, both references together suggest that he expected most of the new students to come from the conjunto.

567 GEPH: Dossiê de Tombamento IAPI, 14. The school was named after the mother of Mayor Amintas Ferreira de Barros.
568 Amintas Ferreira de Barros was mayor of Belo Horizonte from 31 January 1959 to 31 January 1963.
569 See the next section for more information about this festival, which is still celebrated annually on 25 July in the Conjunto IAPI.
570 Estado de Minas, 27 July 1962, 9: “Calorosa manifestação ao sr. Amintas de Barros no bairro de São Cristóvão.” “After that, Mr. Amintas de Barros went on to speak, in public, about the elementary school, with a capacity for more than 1,000 students, whose construction would start within a few days in the internal park [the public square Praça Prof. Corrêa Neto] of the housing complex. The establishment for primary education referred to [...] will be built with all of the requirements of the modern educational technique, providing entirely free education for the children of all of the residents of the São Cristóvão district. [...] The elementary school [...] will shortly be a reality to benefit the children of the residents of the 928 apartments of the complex...”
The Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros was inaugurated in March 1966. 10 months later, on 25 January 1967, municipal law no. 1508 officially declared it to be a public school.\textsuperscript{571}


Source: APCBH, Fundo ASCOM. Imagem 4158.

According to the GEPH (2007), the school has enhanced quality of life in the neighborhood and the Conjunto IAPI.\textsuperscript{572} Wanting to find out how many children from the conjunto and the surrounding neighborhoods had gone to the school, I went there to examine the class registers from the late

\textsuperscript{572} GEPH: \textit{Dossiê de Tombamento IAPI}, 26.
1960s and early 1970s, but the clerk refused to look for them. Therefore, the following comes largely from oral history.

Interviewees’ remarks about the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros show how it influenced daily life in the Conjunto IAPI in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Leonardo’s son went there and later became a professor of engineering at the Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais. Roberto’s two sons and his daughter also completed their primary education there:

Ah, já tem, quer ver...minha filha está com quarenta. Já tem uns trinta e cinco anos por aí. Meus filhos estudaram, todos os três estudaram no colégio municipal, na escola aqui, Escola Honorina de Barros. Então meus filhos estudaram lá. Assim como praticamente todas as crianças do IAPI estudaram no colégio e na escola [Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros].

Roberto said that, like the Colégio Municipal when he had gone there, the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros offered students extra-curricular activities. Parents and teachers also held meetings and sporting events there. Such social gatherings generated long-lasting friendships that contributed to the community life of the complex:

E com isso a gente tinha aquela integração dos pais, dos pais dos alunos, dos pais que participavam dos festejos da escola, a gente ia tomando conhecimento. Então a gente conhecia os meninos, os pais dos meninos. A gente promovia torneio aqui na própria quadra aqui, em épocas de férias a gente fazia torneio, torneio de futebol com os pais, os pais dos alunos. E assim, a gente foi tomando conhecimento, foi adquirindo as amizades.

Cecilia, who attended the Colégio Municipal in the 1960s and has worked as a Portuguese and mathematics teacher at the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros, said:

---

573 Interview with Leonardo and Teresa (8 August 2012).
574 Interview with Roberto (28 August 2013). “Ah, it’s been, let’s see...my daughter is 40. It’s been some 35 years. My children have studied, all three went to the Colégio Municipal, to the school here, the Escola Honorina de Barros. So, my children went to school there. Just like practically all of the children from the IAPI went to the high school and the grammar school [Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros].”
575 Interview with Roberto (28 August 2013). “And in this way we got involved with the parents, the parents of the students, the parents who would participate in the school’s festivities, we got to know each other. So, we got to know the children, their parents. We organized tournaments here on our field, during school vacations we would hold tournaments, soccer tournaments with the parents, the parents of the students. And so we got to know each other, we made friendships.”
na de Barros since the late 1980s, recalled that many residents’ children had finished elementary school there.576

Teresa said that her elementary school was the Escola Estadual Silviano Brandão, which was established on Rua Itapecerica in Lagoinha in 1914.577 Cecília recalled that many of the complex’s children went to this school in the 1960s:

...os que não estudavam aqui [at the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros] nessa época [in the late 1960s], estudavam na rua Itapecerica, que é a [Escola Estadual] Silviano Brandão, também é próxima e é uma escola estadual. Os que não estudavam aqui, estudavam lá.578

No interviewee mentioned any of the schools that the PBH had opened in the neighborhood in the early 1950s. Therefore, Cecília’s statement indicates that the Escola Estadual Silviano Brandão had been the most important elementary school for residents’ children before the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros opened inside the complex in 1966. According to a former inhabitant of Pedreira Prado Lopes quoted in Ribeiro et al. (2001), children from the favela suffered discrimination and social exclusion at the Escola Estadual Silviano Brandão:

...eu estudei no Silviano Brandão e, naquela época, o pessoal da favela que entrava lá era assim, super, mas super discriminado mesmo, eles não tinham a menor atenção com a gente, nós éramos separados. Na época, nós não tínhamos a oportunidade de participar das festas da escola. [...] Essas festas eram separadas, eles escolhiam nas salas as pessoas que não eram da favela, porque a maioria dos meninos era do IAPI ou, senão, da região do lado de cá. Então separavam, o pessoal da favela não recebia convite para ir às festas que havia na escola...579

576 Interview with Cecília (4 April 2014).
577 Interview with Teresa (18 September 2012).
578 Interview with Cecília (4 April 2014). “...those who did not go to school here [at the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros] at that time [in the late 1960s], went to school on Rua Itapecerica, which is [Escola Estadual] Silviano Brandão, it’s also close and it’s a state-run school. Those who did not go to school here went there.”
579 Ribeiro et al.: Becos da memória, 163. “...I went to Silviano Brandão, and, at the time, people from the slum who went there were super, but super discriminated against; they did not pay the least attention to us; we were separated. At that time, we did not have the opportunity to participate in school parties. [...] Those people were separated; they would choose the people in the classrooms who weren’t from the slum, because the majority of the children were from the IAPI or, if not, from the area on this side. So, they would segregate; people from the slum wouldn’t get invitations for the school parties...”
So, children from the favela did go there, but teachers did not treat them as they did their classmates from other neighborhoods. Therefore, it is plausible that children from Pedreira Prado Lopes were less likely to finish grade school. If so, then the discrimination of teachers, and probably other pupils, harmed their future prospects and, thus, reinforced social inequality.

Though, as Roberto said, residents of the Conjunto IAPI whose children went to the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros met at the school and established social ties, I found no reliable information on whether children from the favela also went to school there in the period under consideration. So, I cannot say if residents and people from the favela socialized at the school. However, since the military dictatorship’s education policies did nothing for the social mobility of the underprivileged,\(^{580}\) I assume that very few if any of the favela’s children were enrolled at the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros in the late 1960s and early 1970s. If any did, they were probably discriminated against because of where they lived, as happened at the Escola Estadual Silviano Brandão.

Things seem to have changed significantly over the years. According to Cecília, most of the schoolchildren now at the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros come from Pedreira Prado Lopes. Only a few of her students live in the conjunto. In her opinion, residents prefer to enroll their children at other schools.\(^{581}\) Because children from the favela now go to the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros they enter the complex every school day. Therefore, contact between residents and favelados has increased. However, if, as Cecília said, residents send their children to other schools, then the two groups are still largely segregated.

4.5. The Paróquia São Cristóvão: The Catholic Church and its Influence on Daily Life in the Conjunto IAPI

As I explained in chapter 1, the role of the Catholic Church is important, for several reasons, in the history of social housing in Brazil. In this section, I briefly consider the establishment of the Paróquia São Cristóvão in 1950 and its development over the following two decades, but my main

\(^{580}\) Ghiraldelli Junior: História da educação brasileira, 112.

\(^{581}\) Interview with Cecília (4 April 2014).
theme is the significance of the Church in daily life in the Conjunto IAPI. I discuss residents’ attendance of mass and religious festivities and how activities organized by the parish enhanced conviviality among neighbors, and I explain why residents remember Padre Carlos Silveira Vaz de Melo, the first parish priest, so fondly. I also consider whether the Paróquia São Cristóvão, which began charity work soon after it was established, worked for the social inclusion of the poor, if it helped to establish ties between different social groups in the area of Lagoinha, and which groups actually benefited from this work and where they lived. There is no doubt that Padre Carlos and his colleagues were sincerely interested in helping underprivileged parishioners. It is even true that in mid-20th-century Brazil the Church took over the social tasks that the state was unable, or unwilling, to accomplish. However, I argue that the organization of social services was also a Catholic strategy to enhance the Church’s influence and increase the number of its followers. As there are no studies of the history of the Paróquia São Cristóvão, my discussion is based on interviews conducted in the Conjunto IAPI and written sources from the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s in the archive of Belo Horizonte’s archdiocese.582

Since colonial times, the Catholic Church has played a vital role in Brazil, where Catholicism has always been the predominant religion. In 1950, when the Paróquia São Cristóvão was founded, 93.5% of Brazilians identified as Roman Catholic.583 After the end of the Second World War, however, the Brazilian Church found itself in the midst of a crisis. According to the political scientist Scott Mainwaring, this crisis consisted in “...a resistance to secularization, the dramatic growth of Protestantism and Spiritism, declining mass attendance, a vocation crisis, growth of the Left, and a loss of influence among the dominant classes and the urban working class”584 and had its origins in the Church’s reluctance to introduce institutional reforms when the country was undergoing profound socio-political transformation. These developments led to a discussion within the Church

582 The diocesan archive is part of the Memorial da Arquidiocese de Belo Horizonte. Founded in 2010, the Memorial’s primary purpose is to preserve the Catholic Church’s historical and cultural heritage in Minas Gerais. http://www.arquidiociosebh.org.br/site/arquidiocese.php?id=2498 (accessed 24 February 2018).
about what its primary interests were, how to protect them, and the need for reform. However, there was no consent among the different factions about the reforms that the Church should pursue. Traditionalists believed it important to increase the Church’s privileges, its presence in society, and the number of believers. They wanted to combat secularization, communism, and the growing success of Protestant denominations, whose emergence they perceived as a threat to the Church’s interests, even though less than 4% of the Brazilian population was Protestant at that time.

This faction followed neo-Christian principles and cultivated a close relationship with ruling elites. A second faction was composed of priests concerned about the plight of the underprivileged. They were convinced that the Church had to work for social justice, i.e., the reduction of poverty and other inequalities. Mainwaring described this faction as “conservative modernizers,” who, like the traditionalists, wanted the Church to fulfill its “mission” of gaining new believers more effectively, but were more worldly than the traditionalists in that they wanted the Church’s rituals to satisfy people’s needs better, and they supported the establishment of lay organizations. Clerics with more progressive attitudes toward social change made up a third faction. Some of these later became exponents of Liberation Theology. The conflict among these different points of view and, especially, the equivocal attitudes of many clerics towards integrating the poor influenced events in Lagoinha.

On 25 July 1950, the archbishop of Belo Horizonte, Dom Antônio dos Santos Cabral, promulgated diocesan decree no. 67 establishing the Paróquia São Cristóvão. The parish office was inside the Conjunto IAPI. According to the GEPH (2007), the local population had campaigned for the establishment of a parish and the construction of a church

585 Ibid.
587 According to Mainwaring, the Neo-Christendom model would not have been classified as traditionalist before 1950. See Mainwaring: The Catholic Church and Politics in Brazil, 41.
588 See Mainwaring: The Catholic Church and Politics in Brazil, 42.
589 Ibid., 41-42.
in the neighborhood.\textsuperscript{591} However, I found no evidence of such a campaign nor did any of my interviewees remember relatives, friends, or neighbors participating in one since the complex had opened in 1948. Since most Brazilians were Catholics at the time, it is likely that a significant number of residents wanted a local parish, but, considering the Church’s crisis at the time, it is likely that founding the Paróquia São Cristóvão served the Church’s interests, and putting the parish office inside the Conjunto IAPI indicates that the archdiocese wanted to consolidate its influence there. Furthermore, Dom Cabral established the new parish only two years after the complex’s official opening. Both the location and the timing suggest that the Catholic Church was looking to reassure old followers and find new ones in the Conjunto IAPI.

Agreeing with the proposal of some of the members of the Comissão para a construção do Santuário de São Cristóvão, Dom Cabral named the new parish after St. Christopher, the patron saint of travelers.\textsuperscript{592} The Paróquia São Cristóvão comprised parts of the districts of Lagoinha, Concórdia, Aparecida, Santo André, and São Cristóvão. Consequently, neighboring parishes, in particular the Paróquia Nossa Senhora da Conceição, whose parish church was on Rua Além Paraiba in Lagoinha, had to accept reductions in their territories.\textsuperscript{593} Padre Carlos Silveira Vaz de Melo became the first priest of the new parish on 25 December 1951. According to the handwritten memoir of a former chaplain of the Hospital Municipal, who had served in that capacity for about 35 years, which I found in the archive of Belo Horizonte’s archdiocese, Padre Carlos had been Dom Cabral’s secretary and chaplain in the district of Vila Oeste since 1949.\textsuperscript{594}

\textsuperscript{591} GEPH: Dossiê de Tombamento IAPI, 14.
\textsuperscript{593} Arquidiocese de Belo Horizonte: Decreto n. 67. Criação da Paróquia São Cristóvão, 25 July 1950.
\textsuperscript{594} Handwritten memoir 40° anos da Criação da Paróquia São Cristóvão. 39° anos da Festa de São Cristóvão (1990), p. 1 of 6. [unsigned]. Mitra Arquidiocesana de Belo Horizonte. Memorial da Arquidiocese de Belo Horizonte. Arquivo Arquidiocesano. Caixa 276. The author wrote that he was the chaplain of the Hospital Municipal from 1950 to 1985. The manuscript dates from 1990. Employees of the archive tried but failed to identify the author by the handwriting.
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Interviewees attributed certain of the neighborhood’s transformations to the energy and drive of Padre Carlos, whom several elderly residents called the “builder” of the Igreja São Cristóvão.595 Sofia remembered him as a close friend who did his utmost to get the new parish church built and minister to the needs of parishioners. She also said that residents had him to thank for new infrastructure in the housing complex.596 In an interview conducted in April 2014, the parish priest then in charge called Padre Carlos the founder of the Paróquia São Cristóvão.597 Though his personality and commitment to the parish and improvement of its infrastructure earned Padre Carlos accolades, as a priest in a predominantly Catholic society, he had enjoyed the status of a moral authority and the trust of his parishioners from the start.598 Therefore, it is not surprising that almost all interviewees held him in esteem. Gilberto and his son Cristiano were the only ones to criticize him.599 The rest remembered Padre Carlos as a politically and socially committed man who had fought to improve living conditions in the Conjunto IAPI and the surrounding areas.600 Therefore, I conclude that the significance of the Catholic Church for residents lay to a large extent in the work and personality of Padre Carlos.

During his first years in the parish, Padre Carlos celebrated mass and other religious ceremonies in a shed that the parish leased from the IAPI. In late 1953, the city donated 1,890 square meters of land to the parish, which municipal law no. 332/1953, the legal basis for the donation, obliged it to use only for charity work and as the site of a church.601 Con-

595 See, for instance, interview with Roberto (28 August 2013).
596 Interview with Sofia (29 April 2014).
597 Interview with the parish priest of the Paróquia São Cristóvão (4 April 2014).
598 Even though the Catholic Church has faced increasing competition from other denominations over the last decades, most Brazilians (and Latin Americans in general) regard priests as very trustworthy. See Azevedo: “A Igreja Católica e seu papel político no Brasil”, 113.
599 Interview with Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013). Gilberto and Cristiano said that one of Padre Carlos’s nephews had once owned their apartment in Edifício 10. According to them, he later sold it to a friend who was not eligible for an apartment in the Conjunto IAPI.
600 See, for instance, interviews with Leonardo and Teresa (8 August 2012) and Sofia (29 April 2014).
struction of the Igreja São Cristóvão began with a cornerstone-laying ceremony on 19 August 1954\textsuperscript{602} and continued for almost two decades. One reason for the delay was that the new parish had financial difficulties in the early 1950s. Many years later, a parishioner remembered that the IAPI had blocked Padre Carlos from building a church inside the complex,\textsuperscript{603} which resulted in tension between him and the institute. In search of building materials and funding, he wrote to the president of Brazil in 1954,\textsuperscript{604} emphasizing that the local population needed a church:

...uma vez que a direção do I.A.P.I., não pensou na construção do templo católico, juntamente com o projeto dos edifícios [sic] de apartamentos, o que foi feito em outros Estados do Brasil, peço a V. Excia. que se digne autorizar a doação deste material [a shed and building materials sitting outside of the Conjunto IAPI] à Paróquia São Cristovão [sic], para que com a venda ou utilização do mesmo seja lavado em ritmo mais acelerado o andamento das obras já referidas. Agradece todo a atenção de V. Excia. para êste [sic] pedido, que não é meu, mas das 926 familias [sic] que residem nos apartamentos do conjunto residencial do I.A.P.I., na sua totalidade constituída [sic] de católicos e das familias [sic] residentes nas adjacências...\textsuperscript{605}

\textsuperscript{602} Diário da Tarde, 11 October 1957, 3: “O progresso de um dos mais novos bairros da Capital”.

\textsuperscript{603} Handwritten memoir Alguns dados sobre a paróquia de S. Cristóvão. Belo Horizonte, 3 July 1975, p 4 of 5. [signature illegible]. Mitra Arquidiocesana de Belo Horizonte. Memorial da Arquidiocese de Belo Horizonte. Arquivo Arquidiocesano. Caixa 276. The author’s signature was illegible, and the archive staff was not able to identify him. He wrote that he had been an activist with the local Ação Católica and worked as a lawyer for the Centro dos Chauffeurs de Belo Horizonte.

\textsuperscript{604} As the letter was not dated, it was not possible to determine whether Padre Carlos had written to Getúlio Vargas or his successor Café Filho, who was appointed President after Vargas’s suicide in August 1954. However, an internal memorandum from the MTIC referring to the letter shows that Padre Carlos must have sent it in 1954. It was registered with the reference MTIC-233.482/54. See Communication from José Justiniano de Magalhães, Chefe do Gabinete to Dr. Waldyr Niemeyer, Chefe do Gabinete do Exmo. Sr. Ministro de Trabalho, Indústria e Comércio. Ref.: Prot. 132.628/54. Rio de Janeiro, 13 January 1955. 1 page. Mitra Arquidiocesana de Belo Horizonte. Memorial da Arquidiocese de Belo Horizonte. Arquivo Arquidiocesano. Caixa 276.

\textsuperscript{605} Letter from Padre Carlos Silveira Vaz de Melo to the President of Brazil (1954). 1 page. Mitra Arquidiocesana de Belo Horizonte. Memorial da Arquidiocese de Belo Horizonte. Arquivo Arquidiocesano. Caixa 276. “...since the administration of the I.A.P.I. did not think about the construction of a Catholic church together with the apartment buildings, as was done in other states in Brazil, I ask Your Excellency to deign to authorize the donation of this material [a shed and building
In saying that the residents of the Conjunto IAPI were all Catholic, he ignored the fact that some were members of other denominations. His claim to the contrary shows that the church had symbolic value for him. As I read his letter, Padre Carlos considered it indispensable for his work. However, I also think it likely that he wanted the church in order to attract new followers. He also may have wanted it in order to keep Catholics away from Protestant denominations, though the Protestant community was small at the time. Unfortunately, I did not find out if the president responded to his request.

The parish’s finances and the consequent delay in completing the church soon caught the attention of the local press. In October 1957, an article in the Diário da Tarde about the district of São Cristóvão said that the parish had financial difficulties because parishioners did too: “...a população não dispõe de grandes recursos, não obstante a sua boa vontade, para a execução mais rapida [sic] das obras da igreja...” Thus, construction was probably delayed because of parishioners’ limited resources.

Several documents from the archive of the archdiocese reveal that continuing financial problems through the following years prevented completion of construction. Therefore, the parish solicited donations from parishioners. Until today, the donations of parishioners fund the construction of Catholic churches in Belo Horizonte. According to newspaper articles from the late 1950s and early 1960s, the parish staged events around Padre Carlos’s celebrations of mass on 25 July, St. Christopher’s day, in materials sitting outside the Conjunto IAPI] to the parish of São Cristóvão so that through its sale or use the pace of the work already referred to could be accelerated. Thanking your Excellency for all of his attention to this request, which is not mine but that of the 926 families who reside in the apartments of the I.A.P.I.’s housing complex, all of them Catholic, and of the families residing in the adjacent areas...”

Diário da Tarde, 11 October 1957, 3: “O progresso de um dos mais novos bairros da Capital.” “...the population does not have many resources at its disposal, despite its willingness to support faster work on the church...”

During the interview, conducted in April 2014, the then priest of the parish also attributed the financial difficulties with which his predecessor Padre Carlos had to deal for almost two decades to the fact that many low-income families lived in the Conjunto IAPI and the surrounding areas at the time.

order to get parishioners to donate to the building fund.\textsuperscript{609} In 1963, for example, it distributed a flyer in the Conjunto IAPI whose front page proclaimed, ‘Com a sua colaboração a Igreja de São Cristóvão brevemente estará concluída.’ (‘With your support, the Church of São Cristóvão will soon be finished.’) (See illustration 17.)

\begin{center}
\textbf{Illustration 17. Flyer, Paróquia São Cristóvão, July 1963.}
\end{center}


A considerable number of the conjunto’s residents donated to the building fund regularly. As Leonardo recalled, “Minha mãe contribuía. O meu salá-

\textsuperscript{609} See, for instance, \textit{Folha de Minas}, 25 July 1959, 8: “Conduzindo em procissão a imagem de São Cristóvão os motoristas comemoram o seu dia”; \textit{Estado de Minas}, 26 July 1960, 10: “Dia do Motorista assinalado por diversas comemorações”; \textit{Estado de Minas}, 26 July 1961, 6: “Comemorado ontem com brilhantismo o dia do patrono dos motoristas”.
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4. The Conjunto IAPI and the Development of the Lagoinha Area

...tudo tinha uma porcentagem pra igreja, construção da igreja.” Similarly, Teresa said, “...teve a época da construção da igreja que as famílias juntavam pra juntar dinheiro, faziam barraquinha...” Their statements indicate that a new church was important to residents.

Padre Carlos also sought donations from local businesses and politicians in the 1960s. Nevertheless, his financial problems persisted for several years. The Igreja São Cristóvão was finally completed after 18 years and consecrated with a mass on 23 July 1972.

610 Interview with Leonardo and Teresa (8 August 2012). “My mother had contributed. A percentage of my salary and that of my sisters was for the church, construction of the church.”

611 Ibid. “...at the time of the church’s construction, the families got together to collect money, they put up small stalls...”


613 Letter from Padre Carlos Silveira Vaz de Melo on behalf of the Obras Sociais da Paróquia São Cristóvão to unknown congressman. (8 April 1963). 1 page. [unsigned copy]. Mitra Arquidiocesana de Belo Horizonte. Memorial da Arquidiocese de Belo Horizonte. Arquivo Arquidiocesano. Caixa 276. In this letter, Padre Carlos asked the congressman, whom he did not mention by name, to fund his charity work.
The commitment of residents to building the parish church and their esteem for Padre Carlos show that the Paróquia São Cristóvão was a significant part of daily life in the conjunto, and interviewees confirmed this. They said that the parish had contributed to the good relations among neighbors and spoke of mass and other celebrations in the church as adding to conviviality in the complex:

Era assim devido a aproximação do padre Carlos, da igreja com o pessoal. A pessoa respeitava muito através da convivência na igreja. A igreja era o centro de reunião das famílias, porque a boa harmonia continuava no IAPI. Todos tinham uma boa harmonia devido a influência da igreja. E naquela era, naquela época era muito atuante. A igreja sempre, todos eram batizados na igreja.

Illustration 18. The Igreja São Cristóvão on Praça São Cristóvão, in front of the Conjunto IAPI.

(Photo: Mario Peters, 2014)
Sofia recalled the weddings and baptisms that Padre Carlos performed in the church: “Casamento aqui do Padre Carlos era uma coisa. A igreja ficava superlotada. Os batizados que ele fazia também era muito bacana.” Similarly, Roberto said that many residents had been married there. The analysis of the wedding register conveyed a similar impression. Of the 1,278 entries between 1952 and 1970 that I examined, 274, or more than 20%, included at least one spouse who was living in the Conjunto IAPI at the time. The parish also organized events, which residents attended. And, for a long time, residents used to get together after mass in the evening or on Sundays: “...então terminou a missa, tá ali um bate-papo, faz um lanchezinho, toma um cafezinho e tal. Uma espécie de ponto de encontro mesmo.”

Thus, interviewees confirmed what the former chaplain of the Hospital Municipal wrote about the atmosphere in the parish:

Apesar de estar localizada em um bairro próximo ao Centro da Cidade [sic], na paróquia, a primeira impressão que se tem é de estar em uma cidade do interior, isto por causa do carinho e dedicação dos paroquianos, empenhados no desenvolvimento de diversas atividades. Muitos movimentos leigos que

614 Interview with Leonardo and Teresa (8 August 2012). “It was due to the connection of Padre Carlos, of the Church with the people. One had a lot of respect through belonging to the Church. The Church was where families got together, because the harmony would continue in the IAPI. Everybody was in harmony because of the influence of the Church. And, in that era, in that time, the Church was very active. The Church always, everybody was baptized in the church here. [...] At that time, the Church contributed a lot to the education of the families of the IAPI.”

615 Interview with Sofia (29 April 2014). “A wedding here by Padre Carlos was really something. The church would be really full. The baptisms he celebrated were also very nice.”

616 Interview with Roberto (28 August 2013).

617 Arquidiocese de Belo Horizonte: Paróquia São Cristóvão: Registo de Casamentos 1952-1960; Registo de Casamentos. Livro 02 de 06/02/1960 a 27/07/1968; Casamentos. Livro 03 (25/05/68) a (14/02/72).

618 Interview with Roberto (28 August 2013). “...then the mass ended, there’s some chit-chat, have a little lunch, have an espresso, and so on. Really a kind of meeting point.”

168
In chapter 3.4, I explained that interviewees’ use of the metaphor of a small town to distinguish life in the complex from the supposed anonymity of big cities assumed a romanticized ideal of rural life. So, it is interesting that the parish priest used the same metaphor to describe the parish when I interviewed him in 2014. However, he added that quarrels have divided the community in recent years, which confirms what interviewees said about relations among neighbors recently. (See chapter 3.4.) If the priest’s observations are accurate, increasing tension might be among the causes of the nostalgia of especially older interviewees. And, though there is no doubt that the parish played a significant role in the social life of the Conjunto IAPI, I believe that some interviewees, like Sofia and Leonardo, had romanticized memories of ceremonies in Padre Carlos’s church in the 1950s and 1960s.

All of my interviewees said they were practicing Catholics, and their remarks quoted above suggest that at one time a large proportion of the Conjunto’s residents went to church frequently. Leonardo and Teresa said their families went to mass regularly, and, over the decades, they had participated in the parish’s community events. Sofia had positive memories of every priest who had served the parish since the 1950s. When I asked Roberto if his neighbors used to attend mass, he answered, “A grande maioria que vai à missa aqui são moradores do IAPI. Tem gente que vem de fora também, vem de fora pra assistir missa aqui, mas a maioria é de gente do IAPI mesmo...”

619 Handwritten memoir 40° anos da Criação da Paróquia São Cristóvão (1990), p. 3 of 6. “Even though it is located in a district close to downtown, in the parish the first impression that one has is of being in a provincial city, that’s because of the caring and dedication of the parishioners, people committed to developing diverse activities. Many lay movements that operate there today started several years ago, and with the passage of time, became more dynamic and better attuned to the benefit of the community.”

620 Interview with the parish priest of the Paróquia São Cristóvão (4 April 2014).

621 See interviews with Leonardo and Teresa (8 August 2012) and Teresa (18 September 2012).

622 Interview with Sofia (29 April 2014).

623 Interview with Roberto (28 August 2013). “The great majority of those who go to mass here are residents of the IAPI. There are also people who come from outside, come from outside to attend mass here, but the majority are really people from the IAPI...”
About the participation of the conjunto’s residents more recently, however, the parish priest said:

Tem mais de cinco mil habitantes, né? Dentro aqui do Conjunto. Então a participação deles na caminhada da Igreja é bem frágil, por mais trabalho que a gente faça. [...] Tem muitos que moram aí e participam em outras paróquias, outros lugares. \(^{624}\)

According to him, some of the residents were Catholics, but many were members of the congregation of the Igreja Batista da Lagoinha. \(^{625}\) No interviewee said he belonged to that Baptist congregation, but Roberto and Teresa both said that it was important for the local population. \(^{626}\) It is likely that more than a few residents have joined that and other Protestant congregations since the 1950s, for the parish has lost members and influence since the time of Padre Carlos, \(^{627}\) and, though it is not possible to say when exactly the decline first became noticeable, it corresponds to the increased popularity of Protestantism across Brazil in the last few decades.

According to the GEPH (2007), the Conjunto IAPI and the favela of Pedreira Prado Lopes have been two different worlds ever since the parish was founded in 1950. \(^{628}\) In light of the exclusion of the poor from public services documented in previous sections of this chapter, I next consider if the Paróquia São Cristóvão worked for the social inclusion of the poor and underprivileged, that is, if the parish benefited the inhabitants of the favela as much as it did the residents of the Conjunto IAPI. I also consider if the activities of the parish increased contacts between the two groups.

Soon after its founding, the Paróquia São Cristóvão was active in the favela. In June 1952, Padre Carlos celebrated his first mass there. A few years later, an article in the Diário da Tarde claimed that the parish had improved the lives of favelados:

---

\(^{624}\) Interview with the parish priest of the Paróquia São Cristóvão (4 April 2014). “There are more than 5,000 inhabitants, right? Here in the Conjunto. So their participation in Church activities is pretty bad, despite all the work that we do. [...] There are many who live there and participate in other parishes, other places.”

\(^{625}\) Ibid. Pastor José Rego do Nascimento founded the Igreja Batista da Lagoinha on Rua Formiga in Lagoinha, close to the Conjunto IAPI, in late 1957. In the 1960s, the church was moved to Rua Manuel Macedo in the São Cristóvão district, about one hundred meters north of the complex across Avenida Antônio Carlos.

\(^{626}\) See interviews with Roberto (28 August 2013) and Teresa (18 September 2012).

\(^{627}\) Interview with the parish priest of the Paróquia São Cristóvão (4 April 2014).

\(^{628}\) GEPH: Dossiê de Tombamento IAPI, 14.
A criação da paróquia foi outro passo avançado na evolução daquele núcleo residencial, devendo-se em grande parte, a essa providência [sic] da Igreja, a nova feição da Pedreira Prado Lopes [...] desaparecendo quase que por completo do noticiário [sic] policial da cidade.629

The article disputed the infamous *favela’s* reputation for disorder and said that the efforts of the parish and Padre Carlos had changed public opinion about Pedreira Prado Lopes.630 The fact is, however, that the *favela* and its inhabitants are still stigmatized. Therefore, I argue that the parish’s work in the 1950s made, at best, only a small and short-lived improvement in the reputation of Pedreira Prado Lopes.

Since colonial times, the Church had legitimated Brazil’s social hierarchy and encouraged the underprivileged to accept their position in it.631 In the 1950s and early 1960s, however, progressives in the Church, and among the laity, conducted a grassroots discussion about poverty and inequality. Some years later, in response to the military regime’s repression, the emerging Comunidades Eclesiais de Base turned their attention to the poor and deprived, organizing meetings and Bible readings in private homes where people discussed religion and social justice.632 These changes contributed to the gradual, cautious process of reform in the Brazilian Church, which was tolerated, and for some time (1952-1964) even supported, by the Vatican.633 As a result of the debates during the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) and the Conference of Latin American Bishops in Medellin in 1968, the Brazilian Church sought to strengthen its ties with civil society, and, as in other Latin American countries, priests paid increasing attention to social issues.634 Beginning in the late 1960s, Brazil was a hotbed of liberation theology. Among its most ardent defenders were Leonardo Boff and Rubem Alves, both of whom advocated...
ed the “preferential option for the poor” and reinterpreting theology from the perspective of the oppressed.  

In July 1955, as part of this trend, the parish founded Obras Sociais da Paróquia São Cristóvão, a welfare organization that offered social assistance, legal advice, medical care, and education and vocational training to parishioners in need and organized cultural events and recreational activities. It received public subsidies and collected monthly contributions from its members. Padre Carlos was the chairperson. His commitment and the participation of the laity are examples of early Catholic grassroots activism in Brazil.

To answer the question of whether the parish worked for social inclusion, one must consider which groups benefited from its welfare work and where they lived. In a letter to the managers of a company in late 1969, Padre Carlos described the social assistance programs that the parish offered residents of Pedreira Prado Lopes:

A Paróquia de São Cristóvão mantém um vasto plano de assistência Social [sic] aos Favelados da Pedreira Prado Lopes, auxiliando-os em permanente distribuição de gêneros alimentícios e promoção de vários [sic] cursos gratuitos de preparação da Mão-de-Obra especializada.

Documents from the 1960s and 1970s show that the Obras Sociais was particularly active in the favela. For example, Padre Carlos wrote annual reports on their activities, and according to the reports of 1967 and 1975 they took underprivileged children from there to the zoo and the movies.

636 Letter from Padre Carlos Silveira Vaz de Melo to unknown congressman (8 April 1963).
638 Letter from Padre Carlos to unknown addressees (1 December 1969). “The parish of São Cristóvão maintains a vast social assistance program for the slum dwellers of Pedreira Prado Lopes, aiding them with the continuing distribution of food and the organizing of various free vocational training courses.”
They also organized a public library and held Christmas parties with sweets and small presents for the favela’s children. And, in 1967, they financed a lunch for more than 800 children. According to the former hospital chaplain, the Obras Sociais worked with the city to improve the infrastructures in Pedreira Prado Lopes:

Na Pedreira que era a família [favela] mais afamada de Belo Horizonte, não havia escola, e nenhuma assistencia [sic] social. A preocupação das Obras Sociais Paróquia São Cristovão [sic], foi criar a Escola Municipal Prado Lopes, o Posto de Saúde [sic] e uma creche, tendo recebido o maior apoio e colaboração do então Prefeito Celso de Melo Azevedo [sic]. Foi construída [sic] também uma capela simples para os atos religiosos e reuniões.

Teresa remembered that her family had actively supported their welfare work:

Então a gente sempre fazia campanhas para ajudar lá [the favela], sabe, arrecadar uma campanha para sapatos, roupas, cobertas, alimentos e tal. E junto com o padre a gente fazia um almoço uma vez no ano, no natal para as crianças daqui de cima. Então descia aquela meninada toda...

So, the Obras Sociais did bring residents of the conjunto and the favela together, at least on special occasions. Though it is not impossible that such meetings reduced tensions and sustained contact between the two
groups, the fact is that they met as benefactors and those in need. Thus, the work of the Obras Sociais also perpetuated the social distance between the two.

Though the clerics of the Paróquia São Cristóvão worked to improve the lives of parishioners and especially those living in the favela, they had to face the local population’s lack of interest in the Church. Internal Church correspondences reveal their frustration. In the late 1960s, a leading member of the parish, probably Padre Carlos, wrote a letter to Bishop Serafim Fernandes de Araújo in which he expressed his anger over the lack of interest of couples attending the archdiocese’s marriage-preparation courses (cursos de noivos). Commenting on the character and social background of parishioners, he wrote:

Pela situação heterogênea, as classes sociais as mais variadas, predominando a operaria e na sua maioria mal sabem escrever o nome, analfabetos e ignorantes, muitos quando vem procurar a igreja para o casamento religioso, ja [sic] estão com o contrato civil preparado e com data marcada e pouca importância [sic] dao [sic] ao casamento como sacramento, casam por casar, ou por dever social, ou exibição [sic]...  

As the letter shows, the author did not just see the poor as needing the protection and support of the Church; he shared the widespread prejudice against them as ignorant. In the opinion of the parish priest in 2014, such

644 Unfortunately, I found only the first page of the letter; so, it was not possible to verify the authorship. However, that page shows that it must have been written by the parish priest of the Paróquia São Cristóvão. The letter was undated, but a reference to a previous letter on the same issue from September 1967 shows that it was written soon after.


646 Letter from unknown author [probably Padre Carlos Silveira Vaz de Melo] to Dom Serafim Fernandes de Araújo, D.D. Bispo Auxiliar (196?). 1 page. [incomplete]. Mitra Arquidiocesana de Belo Horizonte. Memorial da Arquidiocese de Belo Horizonte. Arquivo Arquidiocesano. Caixa 276. “Due to the heterogeneous situation, the most varied social classes, predominately the working class, the majority of whom hardly know how to write their names—illiterates and ignorant people—when they come to Church for the religious wedding ceremony, many already have their civil marriage licenses ready with the date set; they give little importance to marriage as a sacrament; they marry just to get married, or because of social obligation, or for show...”
classism was common among the Brazilian clergy in the 1950s and 1960s. He described the Church’s genuine efforts toward the social inclusion of the poor as a recent trend. His claim supports the hypothesis that the welfare work of Padre Carlos and the Paróquia São Cristóvão was not just philanthropy but also a strategy to gain new followers. Though I found no concrete evidence of a connection between the expansion of the parish’s charity work and the growth of rival denominations in the neighborhood, the temporal correlation suggests one.

In this chapter, I have shown that a significant proportion of the local population in the 1950s and 1960s had no or only very limited access to the public institutions in Lagoinha that provided services like healthcare and education. However, the extent to which the poor were excluded differed among institutions and changed over time. Thus, segregation was complex, and one’s chances to benefit from the local infrastructure depended on one’s affiliation with the city government, socioeconomic status, level of education, and personal contacts.

In contrast, the Paróquia São Cristóvão appears to have made genuine efforts to assist the poor. Still, its agenda was equivocal. Social assistance programs brought some relief to people in need, especially in Pedreira Prado Lopes, and the Obras Sociais provided food, clothing, and other necessities for the poorest. However, this did not lead to significant social change. Moreover, priests shared the stereotypes typical of Brazilians at that time.

As I have shown, the histories of the Conjunto IAPI and the neighboring favela were entangled since the first plans for the housing complex were drawn up in the early 1940s. In the next chapter, I discuss how the complex relationship between the two locations developed in the period under consideration.

647 Interview with the parish priest of the Paróquia São Cristóvão (4 April 2014).
5. “Eu sei que era dois mundos…”: The Entangled Histories of a Public Housing Complex and a Favela

In the early 20th century, Belo Horizonte made occasional efforts to demolish Pedreira Prado Lopes, one of the city’s largest and oldest favelas. In the quoted passage, an elderly resident recalled that the favela had once been enormous. After Juscelino Kubitschek had assumed office as Belo Horizonte’s mayor in April 1940, the demolition reached a new level.

In the first part of this chapter, I analyze official reports and newspaper articles from the early 1940s about the destruction and evictions and compare them with the recollections of some of the favela’s inhabitants, which give a completely different perspective. I also consider the circumstances under which affected favelados found new homes and where they found them. The Conjunto IAPI was the first of several projects to cause evictions from Pedreira Prado Lopes, and understanding the details of that causal connection allows one to draw conclusions about the interrelations among social housing, urbanization, and processes of socio-spatial segregation. The later establishment of various public institutions in the complex’s neighborhood, in accord with the city’s housing policies, brought further evictions from Pedreira Prado Lopes. As in other Brazilian cities, municipal actors removed favelas when they conflicted with their own interests or those of other powerful groups, but they tolerated them when they needed manpower or votes.

In the second part of the chapter, I consult the interviews that I conducted in the Conjunto IAPI and those that Ribeiro et al. (2001) and Soares and Antunes (2001) conducted with inhabitants of Pedreira Prado Lopes to

---

648 Ribeiro et al.: Beocs da memória, 52. “When I came to Belo Horizonte, Pedreira [Prado Lopes] went from Rua Carmo do Rio Claro to below, where it is bigger until it reaches Avenida [Antônio Carlos], from there downhill the slum was larger until it reached where the Hospital Municipal and the Conjunto IAPI are today...”
analyze the character and intensity of social contacts between the two groups in order to understand how socio-spatial segregation in urban Brazil played out in working-class neighborhoods. Because contemporary demographic statistics on the two populations do not exist, it is not possible to quantify any social gap between them. Still, the fact that only city employees and members of the IAPI were entitled to live in the complex indicates that there was one. Public housing residents, who were generally skilled workers with some socioeconomic capital, were full-fledged citizens, but people in the favelas enjoyed very few of the rights of citizenship.\textsuperscript{649}

According to the Brazilian sociologist Luiz Antônio Machado da Silva, the impoverished conditions of the favelas, particularly their physical appearance, determine the ways most Brazilians think of people who live there. Favelado is a social category constructed outside the favela and imposed on its residents by society. People tend to pigeonhole favelados, believe that all of them live in illegally built hovels, and ascribe negative moral attributes to them.\textsuperscript{650} The Conjunto IAPI has acquired the same stigma, which has affected residents’ lives for the worse. Interviewees said that they believed that the complex’s proximity to Pedreira Prado Lopes is the main reason for its reputation. In the chapter’s last section, I show how that belief has affected their own ambivalent attitudes towards the favela and its inhabitants, and I discuss how they and favelados have reacted to their stigmatization.

5.1. “A Natural Consequence of Progress”: The City’s Attack on Pedreira Prado Lopes

In his report for 1940-1941 (hereafter ‘the annual report’), Kubitschek described the misery in which the inhabitants of Pedreira Prado Lopes lived:

Em vários anos sucessivos, a dois passos da cidade, se vinham localizando classes de menor capacidade econômica, operários e até mendigos, na área conhecida pela designação de Pedreira Prado Lopes. [...] Nele fômos [sic] encontrar 483 casebres e cafunás [sic], em lamentáveis condições de construção, sob qualquer ponto de vista, a abrigar uma população superior a 3.000 pessoas. Tais habitações primárias não contavam com serviço de água nem instala-

650 Ibid., 227-228.
Kubitschek was clearly bothered by the favela’s proximity to downtown and the size of its population. He believed that it would be easy to urbanize the slum, i.e., supply it with drinking water and electricity and connect it to the sewage system and to public transportation, but, instead of pursuing that goal, he announced construction of the Conjunto IAPI on favela land where shacks stood. Years later, Kubitschek described the conjunto and the destruction of Pedreira Prado Lopes as core elements of Lagoa’s urban renewal.

651 PBH: *Relatório do prefeito Juscelino Kubitschek de 1940-1941*, 76. “For several successive years, classes of less economic capacity, workers and even beggars, have been locating themselves only two steps from the city in the area known as Pedreira Prado Lopes. [...] There we found 483 shacks and hovels in pitiful structural conditions, from any point of view, for sheltering a population of more than 3,000 people. These primitive dwellings had neither water service nor sanitary installations and exhibited in their totality, or almost, the most heart-breaking indices of habitability, inferior to what could be accepted as the minimal expression of elementary conditions of hygiene.”

652 Ibid.

653 Kubitschek: *A escalada política*, 32.
5.1. The City’s Attack on Pedreira Prado Lopes

Illustration 19. Pedreira Prado Lopes (1940-1941). Kubitschek included this photograph in his annual report. Therefore, it was probably taken by city employees during a visit to the favela, which was probably in preparation for the evictions.


Soon after the city began evicting people from Pedreira Prado Lopes in preparation for building the conjunto, the press picked up the story. On 9 August 1941, an article in the Estado de Minas headlined ‘O fim da Pedreira Prado Lopes,’ which approved of the city’s anti-favela policy, portrayed the evictions as peaceful, said that the affected families had agreed to being resettled, and called the demolition soon to take place a natural consequence of progress.654 In December 1942, the same newspaper published an article that described Pedreira Prado Lopes as a place where the poor lived side by side with criminals:

A Pedreira Prado Lopes, – fonte de discordia [sic], onde vivia um aglomerado de pessoas de mais diversa procedência e também levando cada um uma vida bem diferente da de seu vizinho. A Pedreira, situada além da Lagoinha, mas distante apenas um quilômetro do centro da cidade, estava bem mais perto que muitos bairros residencais. Gente humilde e trabalhadora, vivia, muitas vezes, no barracão separado do vizinho malandro e desordeiro apenas por fragil

654 Estado de Minas, 9 August 1941, 10: “O fim da Pedreira Prado Lopes”.
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Such descriptions of Pedreira Prado Lopes as a place where misery produced strife, disorder, and crime were common in the local press, as were similar stories in other Brazilian cities’ newspapers at the time. Both articles were in favor of the favela’s destruction. The author of the latter referred to it in the past tense, which indicates that it was almost completely demolished by December 1942.

Though the *Estado de Minas* described the evictions as nonviolent, long-time inhabitants remembered things differently. People suffered over the loss of their homes. Some cried on being forced to leave. According to one resident, the police carried out the subsequent demolitions, though another said that it was the PBH. Either way, the city was both ruthless and ignorant:

As pessoa que morava lá, eles tiraram as pessoas pra fazê o Conjunto. Tudo era barracãozinho, barracãozinho. Tirou até pessoas que tava ruim na cama pra morrê. Eles tirou e botou do lado de fora pra construir o IAPI. Judiou de mais com o povo. O IAPI, eles fez o IAPI pro pessoal da favela, que eles tiraram lá embaixo, onde é que é o IAPI. Depois que fez num arrumou, nem pra um. Pra nada. Botou foi esse povo pra pagá aluguel, num cumpriu o que eles

---

655 *Estado de Minas*, 12 December 1942, 5: “Pedreira Prado Lopes-spring of discord, where an agglomeration of people of the most diverse origin were living and each leading a life very different from that of his neighbor. Pedreira, situated beyond Lagoinha, but only one kilometer from downtown, was much closer than many residential districts. Humble and hard-working people would often live in a shack barely separated from their crooked and troublemaking neighbor by a frail wall made of reeds or tin cans. Promiscuity, a lack of order, and continuing drunkenness ruled in the taverns in that agglomeration of houses and were a permanent threat to good behavior. Rare the day on which there wasn’t a wounded person and even a corpse coming down from the hills of Pedreira, such were the fights that the people living there got themselves into.”

656 In its January 1943 issue, the *Revista Belo Horizonte* published an article on Belo Horizonte’s 45th anniversary. The article praised Juscelino Kubitschek’s urban reforms and covered Pedreira Prado Lopes and the plans for construction of the Conjunto IAPI. Contrary to the *Estado de Minas*, it did not differentiate between workers and criminals but attributed moral degeneracy and criminality to all of the favela’s residents. See *Revista Belo Horizonte* 148 (January 1943), 55.

657 Soares and Antunes: *Pedreira Prado Lopes*, 139-140.
The destruction of Pedreira Prado Lopes raised the question of where to put its displaced inhabitants. It seems that the PBH may have promised them that they could return to Lagoinha after a while. Apparently, some even expected to move into the Conjunto IAPI:

O IAPI foi feito na época pro trabalhador civil. Que era pros operário, cê entendeu? Pros operário que num tinha ganho suficiente. Então eles fizeram pra isso, que era pra acomodá os operário, né? Mas é que operário nenhum chegou a entra lá dentro. Não, porque os grande veio e tomou o lugá dos operário, tomou o lugar.659

But the legal basis for construction of the Conjunto IAPI, decree no. 75, of 24 October 1940, which defined who was eligible to live in the new complex, excluded the overwhelming majority of the favela’s inhabitants. The remark just quoted is evidence that almost no one from Pedreira Prado Lopes moved into the complex in its first years, though some may have either been members of the IAPI or worked for the PBH.

In his annual report, Kubitschek said that resettling the ousted inhabitants of the favela temporarily was a precondition on building the Conjunto IAPI, and he emphasized the advantages of Vila Operária do Mato da Lenha, on the bank of the Arrudas River near Gameleira,660 where the PBH had provided land and shelter for them:

658 Ibid., 140. “The people who were living there, they removed the people to build the Conjunto. It was all small shacks, small shacks. They even removed people who were fatally ill in bed. They put them out to build the IAPI. They mistreated the people too much. The IAPI, they built the IAPI for people from the slum, the ones they expelled down below, where the IAPI is. After they did that, they didn’t set up anything for anyone at all. Nothing. Whom they put in were these people to pay rent; they didn’t do what they said. They didn’t reimburse a thing. They didn’t reimburse a thing. Not one cent. They scattered everyone. Some were wanting to die; they took them out of bed and put them outside. And the others disappeared; everybody disappeared.”

659 Ibid., 141. “At the time, the IAPI was made for civil construction workers. It was for the workers, understand? For the workers who did not have enough money. So, that’s what they did it for, to house the workers, right? But not a single worker moved in there. No, because the big ones came and took the workers’ place, they took their place.”

660 Today, the area that was Vila Operária do Mato da Lenha in the early 1940s is part of the Salgado Filho district in Belo Horizonte’s zona oeste.
Convenientemente subdividida, [Vila Operária do Mato da Lenha] oferece hoje, nos seus trinta e cinco quarteirões, a soma de 682 lotes, o que vale dizer que, com sua capacidade, poderá completar a totalidade da população da antiga Pedreira Prado Lopes em condições que, mesmo em residências precárias, não só estão acima de tôdas [sic] aquelas encontradas no antigo bairro, mas atendem às exigências normais de um núcleo moderno, habitável. Assim se converteu a antiga Fazenda do 'Mato da Lenha' no segundo bairro popular, cuja construção a Prefeitura estudou, projetou e realizou, no período em exame.\textsuperscript{661}

One can see Kubitschek’s desire to show that he cared about people in need. He went on to describe this temporary resettlement as a step towards the urbanization of Pedreira Prado Lopes. However, it is clear that he intended to demolish the whole \textit{favela}, rather than modernize it, for slums were no part of his vision of a modern city. His resettlement plan also shows that he intended to expel the poor from the centrally-located Lagoinha area. In his report, he described the long distances between working-class residential areas and the city center as a serious problem,\textsuperscript{662} which was the PBH’s reason for locating the Conjunto IAPI in Lagoinha. (See chapter 3.) Yet Kubitschek did not mention that Vila Operária do Mato da Lenha was about 7 kilometers west of downtown on the city’s outskirts. Thus, it is clear that the first multi-story public housing project in Belo Horizonte, the Conjunto IAPI, involved forced displacements that initiated a process of socio-spatial segregation.

The affected inhabitants had to find new places to live. Some did go to Vila Operária do Mato de Lenha though, contrary to Kubitschek, the settlement did not have even basic infrastructure: “Aí foi aquele negócio, desapropriou. Uns foi lá pro lado da Gameleira. Era tudo muito atrasado

\textsuperscript{661} PBH: \textit{Relatório do prefeito Juscelino Kubitschek de 1940-1941}, 83. “Conveniently subdivided, [Vila Operária do Mato da Lenha] now offers in its 35 blocks a total of 682 land plots, so one can say that with its capacity it will be able to accommodate the total population of former Pedreira Prado Lopes in conditions that, even in poor residences, are not only better than all those found in the old district but even meet the standards of a modern, habitable residential area. So, the old Fazenda of Mato da Lenha was turned into the second people’s neighborhood, whose construction the city studied, planned, and carried out within the period under consideration.”

\textsuperscript{662} Ibid., 76-77.
também, lá era cheio de mato.”

Others went to São Bernardo, close to Pampulha, where the PBH was building another settlement for workers.

Most, however, did not leave the neighborhood: “As pessoas que moravam onde foi construído o Conjunto se aglomeraram mais acima, na topografia mais difícil da vila, e se comprimiram. [...] Porque a Pedreira ia até além da avenida Antônio Carlos e foi comprimida.”

Such comments contradict official documents and newspaper articles from the early 1940s and reveal that the city did not provide adequate housing for many of those whose houses in Pedreira Prado Lopes were destroyed. Consequently, those who did not move away built new dwellings higher up on the hill, where conditions were even worse. The favela was soon growing again, and by 1945 it had as many inhabitants as four years earlier.

So, Kubitschek’s plan to revitalize Lagoinha by eliminating the favela failed.

Two facts clearly illustrate the Conjunto IAPI’s role in this process of increasing socio-spatial segregation and social inequality. First, it was the reason that Pedreira Prado Lopes was partially destroyed and its inhabitants expelled. Second, almost none of those ousted were able to live in the complex. So, the housing project made life in Pedreira Prado Lopes even more difficult. Many Brazilian cities saw similar developments in the 1940s as a result of local and federal governments’ failure to solve the housing crisis for more than a small and privileged part of the constantly growing urban working class. (See chapter 2.)

The Kubitschek administration described Pedreira Prado Lopes stereotypically as chaotic and a threat to public health to justify its demolition as a necessary part of modernizing the city. Throughout the following years, the city continued its attack on Pedreira Prado Lopes, whose remaining in-
habitants were continually at risk of losing their homes. Even before the end of Kubitschek’s term in office, more of the favela was leveled for the Hospital Municipal, and, a few years later, the administration of Américo Renê Giannetti (1951-1954) razed another part along Avenida José Bonifácio to make room for the Colégio Municipal. As I now show, the sequential destruction of Pedreira Prado Lopes was a result of the city’s housing policies and mirrored nationwide developments.

Because of Belo Horizonte’s industrialization in the 1950s, many people migrated from the countryside to the city in search of work and better lives, and, consequently, the population had almost doubled by the end of the decade.668 Many of the new workers settled in vilas that lacked basic infrastructure, but the favelas were the only option for the poorest.669 At the same time, though, the PBH was tearing them down, claiming that the leveling of favelas and resettlement of their inhabitants was the most effective way to improve the lives of its poor.670 In his first year as mayor (1955), Celso Mello de Azevedo established the Departamento Municipal de Habitação e Bairros Populares (DBP) whose task was to eliminate Belo Horizonte’s favelas. The PBH planned to level all of them within a period of 10 to 14 years, but their number increased continually.671

As official documents from the late 1950s show, the PBH intended to eliminate Pedreira Prado Lopes completely: “São muitos os estudos que o órgão [the DBP] realiza, estando já concluído o que prevê a extinção da favela ‘Prado Lopes.’”672 However, the plan did not succeed. What transpired in Pedreira Prado Lopes exemplified what happened in many other favelas in Belo Horizonte, viz., the city failed to provide housing for those whose homes were destroyed. In most cases, the DBP tried to resettle them in housing projects on the edge of the city, but it was opposed by their Residents’ Associations (Associações de Moradores). In addition, leaders of displaced favelados rejected resettlement in apartment buildings and, like the labor unions that had protested against the Conjunto IAPI in

669 Ibid., 63.
671 PBH: Relatório de 1958, 6/2. In 1958, the PBH registered 34 favelas in the city.
672 Ibid., 6/3 “The organ [the DBP] carries out many studies, the one designed for the extinction of the slum of ‘Prado Lopes’ being already finished.”
1944, asked instead for detached houses.\textsuperscript{673} In the end, many of the displaced built new shacks in the same \textit{favelas} or moved to other ones, and the rising price of land due to real estate speculation forced many to build illegally. These developments, combined with the continual arrival of poor rural migrants, accelerated the growth of \textit{favelas}.\textsuperscript{674}

Crime was another worry. An article in the magazine \textit{Revista 3 Tempos} in June 1962 showed that the local press, and probably a considerable part of its middle- and upper-class readership, believed that the misery in the \textit{favelas} inevitably produced high rates of crime there. The article’s six pages portrayed a day in the life of Edivarde, a young boy living in Pedreira Prado Lopes.\textsuperscript{675} Its photographs depicted the \textit{favela} as a cluttered agglomeration of wooden and tin shacks with the clean lines of the Conjunto IAPI in the background. It said that alcoholism was rife—Edivarde’s father had drunk himself to death—and in such circumstances children like Edivarde became victims of their environment:

E, lá de cima, ele vê um mundão de cidade grande, edifícios enormes, e pensa que mora num barraco de um quarto só, de metro por metro e meio. E lembra de seu pai, que morreu tremendo de bebida, e dá uma vontade enorme de ter outro pai. É por isso que, sempre que vê alguém bem vestido, de quem gosta, fala com a mãe, de cara triste: – Ele podia tanto ser meu pai…\textsuperscript{676}

The authors clearly wanted to create sympathy for Edivarde, but to do so they employed common stereotypes of the \textit{favela} as a different world whose children did poorly in school and were unconcerned with their future.\textsuperscript{677} However, two weeks later \textit{Revista 3 Tempos} published an article about Belo Horizonte’s \textit{favela} associations, and this time it portrayed \textit{fave-
lados as politically committed and criticized the PBH’s anti-favela policy as violent and ineffective.678

Given the persisting prejudice against the poor, on the one hand, and rising criticism of its repressive clearing of favelas, on the other, and always interested in garnering votes, the city began to invest in urbanizing favelas, including Pedreira Prado Lopes, in late 1962.679 As in other Brazilian cities at that time, the program soon generated intense conflict between progressive and reactionary politicians and their supporters, in line with the country’s ideological polarization under João Goulart (1961-1964).680 After the military’s coup d’état on 31 March 1964, the PBH returned to the old policy, now implemented by the Serviço Municipal para o Desfavelamento das Áreas Urbanas e Suburbanas, founded in 1965, and the Coordenação da Habitação de Interesse Social de Belo Horizonte (CHISBEL), established in 1971. In that year, and again in 1972, CHISBEL expelled inhabitants from Pedreira Prado Lopes and tore down their dwellings.681 As these operations were violently carried out by the police, the residents of favelas perceived CHISBEL as an instrument of repression.682

678 Revista 3 Tempos, vol. 1, no. 24, 10 July 1962, 4 pages: “Nascimento de Uma Favela”.
679 Oliveira: O movimento de favelas, 140-141. See also, PBH: Relatório de 1962, 12.
The evictions carried out in Pedreira Prado Lopes since the early 1940s had dire consequences both for the displaced and for those who remained. According to the sociologist Luis Nascimento (2004), the reduction in the slum’s area increased the population density, and the displacement broke social ties among favelados, which undermined community organizing and political activism, and, in the long run, contributed to a rise in violent crime. That is to say that, though the decline in quality of life in Pedreira Prado Lopes had complex social causes, it is nonetheless true that the arrival of the Conjunto IAPI and the other elements of the urbanization

of the Lagoinha area contributed, and they reinforced Belo Horizonte’s socio-spatial segregation. Such consequences of Lagoinha’s urbanization are evidence that throughout the period under consideration Belo Horizonte’s authorities were sincerely interested not in solving the housing problem for the city’s most deprived but in expelling them from areas close to the city center.

5.2. Social Contacts between the Conjunto IAPI and Pedreira Prado Lopes

According to my interviewees, the Conjunto IAPI was socially diverse. (See chapter 3.) Inhabitants of Pedreira Prado Lopes said the same thing about the favela in interviews in Soares and Antunes (2001). Since there are nearly no contemporary socioeconomic data, it is difficult to say how diverse each was, and, for the same reason, it is also difficult to determine the extent of social inequality between them in the 1950s and 1960s. In 1959, the SAGMACS categorized the majority of the conjunto’s residents as lower-middle class (see chapter 3), but since its study of the city’s favelas was separate, it did not compare the two locations’ social and urban structures. So, the most detailed contemporary study of Belo Horizonte’s social-spatial structure does not tell us how large the social gap between the Conjunto IAPI and Pedreira Prado Lopes was at that time. My research, however, grounds some conclusions.

Many of the first to move into the housing project had previously lived in rural areas or small towns, like most who settled in Pedreira Prado Lopes at the same time. Membership in the IAPI or working for the city were the preconditions for living in the project, which only those with money or contacts could circumvent. Inhabitants of favelas, on the other hand, suffered social exclusion, and the city’s policy towards favelas intensified such social differences. Thus, it is likely that most of the conjunto’s residents had more social and economic capital than their neighbors in the adjacent slum. Moreover, the better access to education for children of the housing complex deepened the inequality throughout the period under consideration. The Paróquia São Cristóvão’s wedding regis-
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ter provides further evidence of the social distance between the two residential areas. From 1952 to 1970, the parish priest Padre Carlos married 68 couples from the complex, and another 77 residents married someone from Lagoinha or a nearby district (São Cristóvão, Bonfim, Bom Jesus, Santo André, Concórdia, Renascença, or Cachoeirinha).\(^{687}\) However, I did not find a single entry for a wedding of a resident of the housing complex and one from the favela. Assuming that people tend to marry within their social class, this suggests considerable social disparity between the two groups.

Compared to marriage, class differences are less likely to prevent friendships or acquaintanceships from forming. According to an article in the *Estado de Minas* on 20 August 1971 about the closure of the grocery stores in the Conjunto IAPI, “Desde que foi inaugurado, em 1948, o conjunto residencial do antigo IAPI viveu muitos problemas. Quando o bairro era quase desabitado, houve muitas brigas, principalmente quando os moradores da Pedreira Prado Lopes invadiram o conjunto.”\(^{688}\) The article said nothing more about the invasion, and I found no evidence of such incidents. However, the destruction that the conjunto had caused in the favela brought hardship and suffering to favelados. So, it is likely that the atmosphere was tense, and some of my interviewees recalled conflict and frequent arguments with inhabitants of the favela. But interviews also reveal that the residents of both met each other on several occasions and formed friendships.

\(^{687}\) Arquidiocese de Belo Horizonte: *Paróquia São Cristóvão: Registo de Casamentos 1952-1960; Registo de Casamentos. Livro 02 de 06/02/1960 a 27/07/1968; Casamentos. Livro 03 (25/05/68) a (14/02/72).

\(^{688}\) *Estado de Minas*, 20 August 1971, 7. “Since it was opened in 1948, the public housing complex of the former IAPI has gone through many problems. When the district was still almost uninhabited, there were a lot of fights, principally when the inhabitants of Pedreira Prado Lopes invaded the complex.”
Illustration 21. Housing in the favela of Pedreira Prado Lopes (1 June 1966). The Colégio Municipal’s sports field, which was under construction at the time, and the Conjunto IAPI are in the background.

Source: APCBH, Fundo ASCOM. Imagem 5478.

Sofía, who moved into the complex in 1954, had regular contact with the favelados of Pedreira Prado Lopes, for she sold different products to them.689 According to Tiago, people from the favela came to the complex with similar ambitions:

...minha sogra conta que antigamente você tinha lavadeira toda hora aqui que vinha lavar roupa. Eles vinham aqui ofereciam frango, queijo, verduras, pas-

689 Interview with Sofia (29 April 2014).
Letícia said that the two groups treated each other with respect. Several residents had close friends in the *favela*. Roberto described the atmosphere between the groups as warm:

Lembro perfeitamente. A gente tinha muito contato com o pessoal dentro lá. Toda festa que tinha aqui eles vinham, participavam. Quando a gente organizava futebol de criança, dos meninos e tal, eles vinham, participavam. E a gente tinha acesso, livre acesso lá pela favela.

Some elderly inhabitants of the *favela* also recalled good neighborhood relations:

...eu, particularmente, sou muito bem aceito lá no IAPI, tenho muitos amigos lá. A gente tem uma concorrência muito boa mesmo na área esportiva. Já trabalhei lá com criança, lá dentro também, ministrando aula de futebol. E as pessoas que moravam lá [in the Conjunto IAPI] eram todas simples, a gente entrava muito, daqui ia para ponte do [Edifício] cinco, chamava ‘Ponte do [Edifício] Cinco,’ chama até hoje. Ponte do Cinco e aqui a Ponte do [Edifício] Dez...

In the 1950s and 1960s, contrary to today, there were no walls or fences between the *conjunto* and the *favela*, and, as mentioned in the last quota-

---

690 Interview with Tiago and Teresa (18 September 2012). “...my mother-in-law tells that it used to be that you had laundresses who came here to wash clothes all the time. They would come here offering chicken, cheese, vegetables, they knocked at your door. Well, I mean, they were people who were living, the majority was living here in the slum, really.”

691 Interview with Leticia (24 August 2012).

692 Interview with Roberto (28 August 2013) “I remember perfectly. We had a lot of contact with the people there. Every party that we had here, they came over and joined us. When we organized soccer for children, for the boys and so on, they came and took part. And we had access, free access to the slum.” Lucas also recalled that *conjunto* residents and inhabitants of the *favela* had spent their leisure time together. Interview with Lucas (24 September 2012).

693 Ribeiro et al. : *Becos da memória*, 168. “...I’m particularly well accepted there in the IAPI, I have a lot of friends there. We have a very nice rivalry in sports. I’ve also worked there, inside there, with kids, coaching soccer.”

694 Ibid., 52. “And the people who were living there [in the Conjunto IAPI] were all modest, we went there often, from here we would cross the bridge of [Building] 5, it was called ‘Bridge of [Building] 5’—it’s still called that today. Bridge of number 5 and here is the Bridge of [Building] 10...” This interview was conducted in late 2000. The stone wall that now separates the Conjunto IAPI from Pedreira Prado Lopes was built a few years later (see below).
tion, favelados could enter the complex by crossing a footbridge, shown in the next photograph, which also shows that the two were then separated only by Avenida José Bonifácio.

Illustration 22. The footbridge between Edifício 5, on the right, and Avenida José Bonifácio. Pedreira Prado Lopes is on the left. (Undated)

Source: APCBH, Fundo ASCOM. Imagem 14810.

Some interviewees said that the complex and the favela enjoyed good neighborhood relations because of the shared social background of both groups. According to Leonardo, most of them had come to Belo Horizonte from the countryside in search of work and better lives,\(^{695}\) and according to one favelado, “Olha, o pessoal aí do IAPI tinha um bom relacionamento com a gente, porque era do mesmo nível, não é? Praticamente do mesmo

\(^{695}\) Interview with Leonardo and Teresa (8 August 2012).
However, taking into account that residents of the *conjunto* and the *favela* also met each other as benefactors and those in need, for example at the charity events that I described in chapter 4.5, such comments seem to try to minimize social differences.

Though most interviewees spoke of the good neighborhood relations with the *favela*, others disagreed. Like Tiago, Gilberto recalled that *favela* inhabitants sold goods and services in the complex, but he said these interactions often ended badly because residents tried to exploit *favelados*. Contrary to other interviewees, he also said that people from the *favela* were usually not invited to events in the *conjunto*. According to Gilberto, the two groups were in permanent conflict. And he claimed that residents had harassed inhabitants of the *favela*. Cecilia also spoke about hostility between the two. She described the two places as they were in her childhood in the 1960s as separate worlds: “Eu sei que era dois mundos. [...] Ao longo dos anos a gente percebe. As brigas, e mãe falava: ‘Não desce, porque tá tendo favelado lá em baixo.’ ‘Favelado’ era muito feio.”

Some elderly inhabitants of Pedreira Prado Lopes also recalled tensions. According to one, “Só que, pelo fato de ser um prédio, uma das coisas mais antigas aí, então eles se achavam elitizados, alguns de lá. O preconceito não era só daqui não, de lá também, é de ambas as partes.” However, the majority of those quoted in Ribeiro et al. (2001) described conflicts with residents of the *conjunto* as occasional and trivial.

So, there is a divergence of opinion about the neighborhood relations between the Conjunto IAPI and Pedreira Prado Lopes. Many of the *favelados* and residents of the *conjunto* had lived in the countryside or small towns before coming to Belo Horizonte in the 1950s. So, it is likely that some of the complex’s residents knew inhabitants of the *favela* in their

696 Ribeiro et al.: *Becos da memória*, 157. “Look, the people over there from the IAPI had good relations with us because they were on the same level, isn’t that so? Practically on the same level...”

697 Interview with Gilberto, Teresa and Cristiano (19 February 2013).

698 Interview with Cecilia (4 April 2014). “I know that it was two different worlds. [...] Over the years, you realize that. The fights, and Mom said, ‘Don’t go down there because down below is a favelado.’ ‘Favelado’ was very rude.”

699 Ribeiro et al.: *Becos da memória*, 168. “Just because of the fact that it was an imposing building, one of the oldest things there, they thought they were elite, some from over there. The prejudice wasn’t only from here, from there too; it’s from both sides.”

700 Ibid., 157.
hometowns, and they may have maintained their friendships after coming to the city. However, being the subject of an interview influences what people say and what they do not say, and I believe that most of my interviewees said that they had always been on good terms with favelados because they did not want to appear prejudiced.

5.3. The Impact of Stigmatization on Social Dynamics in a Working-Class Area

As I explained in chapter 3, interviewees believed that the Conjunto IAPI had a bad reputation among Belo Horizonte’s population. I now turn to what they believed was the favela’s role in the process of stigmatization that the conjunto has been subjected to. In proceeding, one must realize that interviewees were influenced by their perceptions of recent developments. Specifically, a considerable proportion of their statements about stigmatization referred to the recent past. Even though the period of consideration runs from the early 1940s to the early 1970s, it is important to consider these statements because they reveal that the formation and consolidation of stigmas are long-term effects of processes of urbanization and socio-spatial segregation whose origins preceded the mid-20th century.

Interviewees said that the complex has been stigmatized as a place of poverty, crime, and conflict for a long time and described the effects this has had on their lives. They believed that their stigma came from the complex’s location in Lagoinha, some adding that the city’s ineffective housing policies had made it worse and blaming the local press for reinforcing it. (See below.) Almost all agreed that the main reason for their bad reputation among Belo Horizonte’s population was its proximity to Pedreira Prado Lopes. According to Leticia, for example:

Antigamente, eu sempre falo por assim qualquer lugar em bairro de Lourdes, Gutierrez e Savassi: ‘Onde que é a senhora mora?’ ‘No conjunto do IAPI.’ [...] Eles espantam. Por que? Porque a fama daqui antigamente era muito arcaica. Por que? Por causa da Pedreira Prado Lopes...

701 Interview with Leticia (24 August 2012). “It used to be, I always say this anywhere in the Lourdes district, Gutierrez and Savassi: ‘Where do you live?’ ‘In the Conjunto IAPI.’ [...] They become frightened. Why? Because the reputation of this place used to be very archaic. Why? Because of Pedreira Prado Lopes...”
As a teenager, Teresa often got into arguments with other teens who made disparaging remarks about the *conjunto*, and, later, employers rejected her job applications because of her address. She was convinced that the reason for such annoyances was that the *favela*’s historical stigma had spread to the *conjunto* and its residents:

Porque, a imagem que as pessoas tem de favela, é que é caldeirão do diabo no mundo, entendeu? Eles acham isso. E que quem é vizinho faz parte disso. Não querem ter contato, não querem nada por quem tá ali. E não procuram, nem conheceram, então para mim é uma atitude de quem não pensa. Não tem raciocínio, não conhece, mas fala mal.\(^{702}\)

Given the traditional infamy of Pedreira Prado Lopes, it is not surprising that many there also said that they had suffered from stigma. For example, one inhabitant said that her own family was prejudiced against her neighborhood: “São tantas histórias tristes! O que mais me marcou aqui é...meus parentes dizem: ‘Como você agüenta morar lá?’ [...] A pessoa lá de fora pensa que aqui a pessoa passa fome, que a pessoa rouba, que a pessoa anda suja.”\(^{703}\) Others recalled how taxi drivers had refused to drive them home because they were afraid of getting robbed or killed. Like Teresa, some had been turned down for jobs because of their place of residence; consequently, many inhabitants gave São Cristóvão as their address.\(^{704}\) Lucas said that many of his neighbors in the Conjunto IAPI also tried to keep it secret that they lived in Lagoinha,\(^{705}\) though he criticized such behavior. Sociologists say that concealing one’s address is common among people who live in reputedly dangerous places. (See chapter 1.4.) Ribeiro et al. (2001) quoted a black nurse living in Pedreira Prado Lopes

---

702 Interview with Teresa (18 September 2012). “Because the image that people have of a slum is that it’s the devil’s cauldron on earth, understand? They believe that. And whoever is a neighbor is a part of it. They don’t want to have contact; they don’t want anything to do with people who live there. And they don’t come here, they don’t know it; so, for me this is an attitude of people who don’t think. They don’t reason, don’t know, but speak badly of it.”

703 Ribeiro et al.: *Becos de memória*, 152. “There are so many sad stories! What marked me the most here is...my relatives said ‘How can you stand to live there?’ [...] Outsiders think that people here go hungry, that they steal, that they are dirty.”

704 Ibid., 152-153.

705 Interview with Lucas (24 September 2012).
who said that several patients had refused to let him treat them because of his skin color and where he lived.\textsuperscript{706}

Despite such frustrating experiences, most of the people that Ribeiro et al. interviewed said they liked living in Pedreira Prado Lopes because of its neighborly atmosphere, people’s willingness to help each other, and the friendships they had formed over many years there: “O convívio aqui é bom, a gente é um pelo outro. Pelo menos as pessoas, assim, mais próximas, não é? Igual à vizinhança ali do lado, eu gosto muito dela. Eu tenho muito dó dela, ela é um pelo outro.”\textsuperscript{707} Such remarks seem to show that deteriorating living conditions and rising crime do not necessarily hinder solidarity. Still, they must also be understood as part of a strategy of compensating oneself for society’s rejection. As I have shown in chapter 3, residents of the Conjunto IAPI also reacted to stigmatization by identifying with their place of residence and emphasizing its social cohesion.

My interviewees were aware that inhabitants of Pedreira Prado Lopes had also suffered stigmatization and discrimination. Referring to what they believed was the historical role of municipal housing policies, Leonardo and Teresa said that construction of their conjunto was a core element in Juscelino Kubitschek’s plan to “hide” Pedreira Prado Lopes from the view of locals and tourists driving down the recently built Avenida Antônio Carlos to Belo Horizonte’s new upper-class district of Pampulha.\textsuperscript{708} Lucas shared their opinion and criticized journalists for portraying favelas as violent and crime-ridden without explaining the reasons for such conditions.\textsuperscript{709} Several interviewees said that stigma is an outcome of peoples’ tendency toward prejudice. Almost all interviewees said that the people of Pedreira Prado Lopes had given them nothing to complain about. Tiago called them ‘gente boa’ (good people).\textsuperscript{710} Roberto claimed that he had never gotten into an argument with anyone from there.\textsuperscript{711} Sofia, like others, said, “As pessoas que moram ali, tudo gente boa, gente tra-

\textsuperscript{706} Ribeiro et al.: Becos de memória, 162.
\textsuperscript{707} Ibid., 159. “The relationships here are good, we are there for each other. At least the people who are closer, isn’t that so? Like my neighbor on that side, I like her very much. I have a lot of sympathy for her; she is there for others.”
\textsuperscript{708} Interviews with Leonardo and Teresa (8 August 2012) and Teresa (18 September 2012).
\textsuperscript{709} Interview with Lucas (24 September 2012).
\textsuperscript{710} Interview with Tiago and Teresa (18 September 2012).
\textsuperscript{711} Interview with Roberto (28 August 2013).
balhadeira, gente que trabalha, que luta...”

Leonardo described them as peaceful neighbors and said that there were no social differences between them and the conjunto’s residents: “A Pedreira não é o que eles dizem. [...] Os moradores da Pedreira Prado Lopes são gente do interior, pessoas pacatas, ordeiras. Tem uma convivência como se fosse farinha do mesmo saco: IAPI e Pedreira Prado Lopes.”

In light of their belief that the favela was the source of their complex’s stigma, it is surprising that no interviewees were critical of favelados. I believe that the reasons for this were that interviewees did not want to seem prejudiced and that having accepted the favela’s existence as a fact they preferred to adopt a tolerant attitude rather than fight something that they know they cannot change. The latter would also explain why only those very few interviewees who did not remember the once peaceful relationship said that residents of the conjunto believed stereotypes about favelados. Moreover, interviewees’ need for self-compensation and their intention to fight images of the conjunto and the favela as places where people quarrel all the time may explain why no one, except for Gilberto and Cecília, mentioned conflict between the two groups.

The majority of those favela inhabitants quoted in Ribeiro et al. (2001) and Soares and Antunes (2001) did not mention any tension with their neighbors in the Conjunto IAPI. However, that does not mean that those neighbors were open-minded. Rather, I suppose that people from the favela confront stereotypes wherever they go and, so, do not perceive the residents of the conjunto as particularly prejudiced.

In previous chapters, I have shown that the urbanization of the Lagoinhá area between the early 1940s and the early 1970s fueled social exclusion and socio-spatial segregation. In the opinion of most of my interviewees, social inequality on a city-wide level, as an outcome of urban politics, caused the stigmatization of their neighborhood. They believed that both the conjunto and the favela were victims of their location in Lagoi-
ha, which had suffered from a continual lack of urban planning and public investment. They realized that proximity to a *favela* did not always stigmatize an area, \(^{715}\) for example, the prestige of high-income districts in Belo Horizonte’s southern-central area had made them immune to stigmatization by proximity. They also understood that its dilapidation had reinforced the *conjunto*’s reputation for many years. Letícia and Lucas criticized the city for not keeping the complex in good repair. \(^{716}\) Sofia said that the entire area of Lagoinha had suffered since the late 1970s from the destruction of the Praça Vaz de Melo and the construction of several road bridges. \(^{717}\) These statements suggest that interviewees saw themselves and the inhabitants of the surrounding area, including Pedreira Prado Lopes, as having suffered from the fact that municipal authorities and urban planners have long ignored their needs. I conclude that residents don’t blame people from the *favela* for their problems but blame, rather, the condition of Lagoinha and hold the city responsible for that.

715 Interviews with Tiago and Teresa (18 September 2012); Lucas (24 September 2012); and Gilberto, Cristiano, and Teresa (19 February 2013).
716 Interviews with Letícia (24 August 2012) and Lucas (24 September 2012). Roberto did not share their opinion. From his point of view, the residents themselves had to take responsibility for the complex since the apartments had been in private hands for a long time.
717 Interview with Sofia (29 April 2014).
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The photograph shows adult residents and their children participating in a community clean-up event. The buildings have already fallen into disrepair.

Source: APCBH, Fundo ASCOM. Imagem 34142.

And, yet, some of their statements revealed their own ambivalent attitudes towards the favela and its inhabitants. Interviewees found it important to distinguish their housing complex from the rest of the neighborhood and especially from Pedreira Prado Lopes. Some complained that outsiders tend to see the conjunto and the favela as one: “Eles não sabem que que é o conjunto IAPI. Então mesmo tudo de ruim, assim como a gente conhece
They believed that the *favela*’s recent drug trafficking and violent crime was another reason for the complex’s bad reputation. Roberto said that colleagues and friends often asked him how he could live in such a dangerous place, adding that many people had the wrong idea about the Conjunto IAPI. Tiago, who said that the *conjunto*’s children could not have their friends over because their parents were afraid of the neighborhood (see chapter 3), was critical of such inaccurate attitudes. To defend themselves against stigma, interviewees insisted that there was no drug trafficking or other crime in the complex.

In light of the Conjunto IAPI’s stigma of poverty and the desire of interviewees to distinguish it from the *favela*, one might think that residents’ social differences from the slum’s inhabitants would be important to them. However, they never referred to any such differences. One possible explanation for their silence is that they might have thought that mentioning such differences made them seem too prejudiced. Another is that social disparity was not as important to them as were the differences in terms of safety, crime, and violence between the *conjunto* and the *favela*.

Since the late 1970s, shootings in Pedreira Prado Lopes have aroused fear and induced many of the complex’s residents to move away. According to Teresa and Letícia, stray bullets have shattered the windows of apartments in buildings next to the *favela*. Thus, many residents supported the construction of a protective stone wall in the early 2000s.
Illustration 24. *The stone wall between the Conjunto IAPI and Pedreira Prado Lopes. The wall runs along the complex’s western and northern boundaries.*

(Photo: Mario Peters, 2014)

Also, one of the complex’s buildings is surrounded by a fence. Though walls and fences are now a trend in Brazilian cities, where people feel a need for safety, the *conjunto*’s wall demonstrates that many of its residents not only differentiate it from the *favela* when talking to outsiders but also want the two areas to be separated physically.

However, not every resident feels that way. According to Beto, who moved into the complex in 2005, social inclusion is the most effective reply to crime and violence and the prejudice and stigma they produce. The dance teacher said that he tries to interest children from the *favela* in the *capoeira* and samba lessons he has given in the *conjunto* for some years.723 Several other interviewees agreed on the need to fight against

723 Interview with Beto (18 September 2012).
stigma. Lucas, who criticized residents for concealing their addresses, said that self-confidence was important in the face of stereotypes. Teresa said that since 2009 she had used the Internet blog about the complex that she hosts to disseminate a more accurate image of the Conjunto IAPI.

Because of the decades of neglect, interviewees were very receptive to any kind of public investment in the conjunto, the favela, and the rest of their neighborhood. Sofia was happy about a new youth center in Pedreira Prado Lopes. Others said that two recent initiatives had reduced the conjunto’s stigma. On 25 April 2007, the Conselho Deliberativo do Patrimônio Cultural do Município de Belo Horizonte registered the Conjunto IAPI as a cultural heritage site, and, from April 2011 to May 2012, the city, the conjunto’s Residents’ Association, and various companies collaborated in painting the buildings’ facades, the work being financed by a public-private partnership. The media lauded the newly registered and painted housing complex as one of the city’s cultural assets.

724 Interview with Lucas (24 September 2012).
725 Interview with Teresa (18 September 2012).
726 Interview with Sofia (29 April 2014).

5. The Entangled Histories of a Public Housing Complex and a Favela
Illustration 25. Buildings in the Conjunto IAPI after being painted.

(Photo: Mario Peters, 2014)

In review, the relationship between the Conjunto IAPI and Pedreira Prado Lopes from the early 1940s to the early 1970s illustrates how closely connected social housing policies were to processes of exclusion and socio-spatial segregation during that time. Analyses of contemporary official reports, newspaper articles, and the recollections of the favela’s inhabitants have shown that the public housing project was a part of Juscelino Kubitschek’s plan for destroying the favela and banishing poverty from areas close to the center of Belo Horizonte. And the fact that people from the favela were not eligible to live in the conjunto when it opened in 1948 clearly illustrates the discriminatory character of Brazil’s federal and municipal public housing programs. Throughout the following years, evictions in Pedreira Prado Lopes continued as part of the city’s attempt to urbanize Lagoinha and I drew two conclusions from the close connection between the city’s anti-favela policy and its urbanization of the Lagoinha area. First, that connection makes it clear that the PBH had no interest in housing its poorest citizens. Second, infrastructure projects in the Conjunto...
to IAPI’s neighborhood were not undertaken to provide integral elements of social housing but to push slums out of the centrally located district of Lagoinha.

Because the Conjunto IAPI and Pedreira Prado Lopes are so close to another and have acquired the same stigma residents of the housing complex employ two strategies against stigmatization. On the one hand, they reject the stereotypes of their complex and the *favela*; on the other, they distinguish the two places. Most interviewees said that they had always been on good terms with their neighbors in the *favela*, and, though they saw its proximity to the *favela* as the main reason for the *conjunto*’s bad reputation, they did not speak ill of them because, in my opinion, they did not want to appear prejudiced. However, they did emphasize the differences, especially in terms of drug trafficking and violent crime between their complex and the *favela*. As interviewees did not talk about social differences between their neighbors in the *conjunto* and residents of Pedreira Prado Lopes, I cannot say if they mattered to them. However, though they criticized outsiders for talking about the *favela* as if it were hell on earth, they also said that it, as opposed to their complex, was dangerous. I infer from this that interviewees may not perceive living close to impoverished people as a major problem, but they employ prevailing images of *favelas* as crime-ridden and don’t want people to mix up their homes with such places.
6. Conclusion

After several decades of a continually worsening housing deficit, the PBH and the IAPI agreed in late 1940 to cooperate in building Belo Horizonte’s first multi-storey public housing project. Since the early planning stage, the Conjunto IAPI shaped the Lagoinha area’s urban and social development. Addition of various public institutions in the vicinity improved living conditions for its residents throughout the years that followed. At the same time, a large segment of the local population was not entitled to live in the complex’s apartments and benefited very little, if at all, from those same public institutions. According to my micro-historical approach, studies of the significance of social housing in Brazilian urban history must consider the action, interests, and perspectives of state actors, municipal politicians, residents, those excluded from social housing, and people who lived in the neighborhood, for only then is it possible to understand the complex interaction between social housing and its environment.

In Belo Horizonte, Juscelino Kubitschek pursued two objectives with the Conjunto IAPI. First, the urban growth, especially of illegal slums, driven by migration from the countryside forced him to respond to the worsening housing crisis, and with the construction of the large social housing project he could demonstrate his supposed concern for inadequately housed citizens. That is to say, the conjunto made for good propaganda. Second, Kubitschek portrayed the project as an integral part of his plan for modernizing the city and thereby boosting its economic development.

But labor unions opposed the project, for, they said, workers did not want to live in apartment buildings; they wanted the city to provide them parcels of land on which they could build their own houses. The debate over whether detached houses or apartments were the better form of working-class housing had been live across Brazil since the 1930s, and the criticism of labor unions showed that the PBH did not consider workers’ needs and preferences in its planning of social housing. Rather, the analysis of contemporary documents has shown that Kubitschek pursued his own agenda. Specifically, he built the Conjunto IAPI to justify the demolition of the neighboring favela of Pedreira Prado Lopes, which housed
about 3,000 people at the time but which he saw as the epitome of backwardness, disorder, and moral decline.

Consequently, construction of the *conjunto* drove socio-spatial segregation by expelling the socially deprived from the centrally located Lagoinha area. Most of the local population was excluded from living in the complex by the terms of the 1940 contract between the IAPI, the PBH, and the C.A.S.A. In other Brazilian cities, the IAPI provided only its members with housing, but in accord with the terms of the contract it set aside 20% of the complex’s apartments for employees of the PBH. Thus, the project was planned in line with the Estado Novo’s principle, which Santos (1979) described as *cidadania regulada*, to provide services only to workers in the formal economy, who were thereby subject to the social control of the state. Interviews with some of the *conjunto*’s residents showed that people who neither worked for the PBH nor were members of the IAPI used their contacts with local politicians or other powerful figures or bribery to get around the regulations. Consequently, some workers who met the requirements but lacked sufficient economic or social capital were turned down for apartments.

The analysis of oral history sources showed that the PBH’s evictions in Pedreira Prado Lopes in preparation for the Conjunto IAPI were repressive, in contradiction to contemporary official documents and newspaper reports that described them as peaceful. In most cases, the city did nothing to resettle evicted families; therefore, many of those whose homes had been demolished built new ones in the *favela*, where they continued to live but in worse conditions. Its growth after 1942 exemplifies what happened in numerous *favelas* in Belo Horizonte and in other cities whose governments failed to take serious steps to solve the housing problem for the underprivileged. Thus, developments in Belo Horizonte illustrate the continual discrepancy between official discourses on social housing and the experiences of city dwellers who suffered from the lack of state action.

As for what motivated people to move into the Conjunto IAPI in the 1950s and 1960s, interviewees mentioned its central location and the fact that for many residents, especially those who had come from rural villages or small towns, living conditions there were, as promised, better than what they had known before. However, oral history revealed that daily life there in the first years involved frequent infrastructural shortcomings, such as power cuts and an inadequate water supply. Therefore, actual conditions were not the image of modernization and progress that official documents and the local press portrayed at the time.
This work advances the state of research on socio-spatial segregation in Brazilian cities. Research has identified the tendency of social groups to live apart from one another, the paradox of social distance despite geographical proximity, and the contrast between centrally located, high-income areas and the urban peripheries where the poor live in abject conditions as the main features of segregation in urban Brazil. However, my study shows that housing conditions differed significantly within the Lagoinha area, a traditionally working-class area from which the middle and upper classes were almost completely absent.

The lack of demographic data makes it difficult to quantify social diversity in the Conjunto IAPI and the social gap between the better-off residents of the complex and their worse-off neighbors in the surrounding areas. However, my micro-historical study of the urbanization of the Lagoinha area between the early 1940s and the early 1970s showed that the complex’s residents and the people in its vicinity had unequal access to housing and public services, and it has uncovered the multiple dimensions of social inequality in their urban space by explaining how the extent to which people could make use of local urban infrastructure depended on whether or not they worked for the city, their social and economic capital, and their place of residence. The analysis of the relationships between the Conjunto IAPI and Pedro Prado Lopes also showed that housing differences were both a cause and an outcome of social inequality. That analysis also explained how infrastructure projects deepened that social inequality. For example, interviews with residents showed how the arrival of the Hospital Municipal, the Colégio Municipal, the Escola Municipal Honorina de Barros, and small privately owned stores improved the quality of life in the conjunto by providing residents work, education, healthcare, and convenient shopping. More carefully, detailed analysis of contemporary documents and oral history sources showed that the local infrastructure's unequal benefit to different social groups varied among the different institutions at different times. Though disparities in the quality of public transportation and the availability of commercial infrastructure were city-wide, residents of the Conjunto IAPI and those living in its surroundings did not have equal access to healthcare and education. The poor living in its surroundings were treated at the Hospital Municipal only for its first several years; in 1958, the PBH restricted use of the hospital to its employees and their relatives. And students living in Pedro Prado Lopes were excluded from the Colégio Municipal. All of this intensified the social inequality of the two groups during the period under consideration. Moreover, some of
these establishments contributed to the permanent spatial restructuring of Pedreira Prado Lopes and, thus, the deterioration in living conditions there.

The causal connection between the urbanization of the neighborhood and evictions from the favela reveals that Belo Horizonte’s authorities, like their counterparts in other Brazilian cities, built new infrastructure not as part of their social housing policy but in order to eliminate slums. Moreover, though interviewees emphasized how important the Colégio Municipal and the grocery stores inside the housing complex were to their daily lives, the fact that the stores were closed down and the colégio relocated to a high-income district in the southern-central zone in the early 1970s illustrates how little the city’s urban planning was concerned with the needs of public housing residents.

Studies of the history of social housing in Brazilian cities should consider the actions of the Catholic Church, and my research in the Arquivo Arquidiocesano demonstrates that historians of social housing can discover important sources in church archives. The analysis of documents that I found there, and of interviewees’ statements about the Paróquia São Cristóvão, provided information about local urban development and social dynamics in the complex and showed that the Catholic Church played a significant role in its social life. Interviewees remembered events organized by the Church as important for the complex’s social cohesion and its relations with the neighborhood. The Church’s charity programs brought some relief to underprivileged parishioners, especially in Pedreira Prado Lopes. Yet the analysis of internal Church communications showed how widespread prejudices about the poor were among the clergy. Priests like Padre Carlos were motivated by their Christianity and a sincere desire to help people in need, but the Catholic Church’s commitment to charity work also served its own interests, above all, to attract new followers and protect its influence against rival denominations. The Church’s strategic motivation to improve the lives of the poor was also a result of the crisis in the Brazilian Church after the Second World War.

Unlike previous work on social housing in Brazil, this study used oral history sources to develop a detailed socio-historical analysis of neighborly relationships and the importance of sociability in a public housing project. The Conjunto IAPI’s neighbors gathered in its apartments, public areas, and small shops and in the public institutions in and around it, and community events consolidated their social ties. Young and old participated in a dynamic community life, and residents formed long-lasting friend-
ships with, and sometimes married, one another. All of these findings challenge the widespread view that public housing residents interact only in conflict. Still, a careful reading of interview transcripts showed that the complex’s spatial conditions did cause conflict, though interviewees downplayed the amount. And they complained that there has been less sense of community recently, which they attributed to the arrival of newcomers who do not participate in community activities. Nevertheless interviewees described the Conjunto IAPI as still like a big family, claiming that they were on good terms with their neighbors and identifying with the complex, though they overstated the degree to which they did. Their awareness of recent changes in the sociability of community life has led them to romanticize their recollections of the social life of earlier times, and they either did not mention conflicts or portrayed them as insignificant. However, this does not reduce the value of oral history for research into social housing, for such recollections, and the fact that interviewees take interviews as opportunities to voice them, reveal the importance that they attached to good neighborly relationships. So, this study shows that making sociability a subject of interviews makes them sources for the emotional dimension of the history of social housing, and, in turn, for often overlooked perspectives on the experience of living in public housing. And my study shows that considering these perspectives is important in developing research projects in social and urban history.

Interviewees’ frequent use of the metaphor of a ‘big family’ to describe the Conjunto IAPI showed their intention to counter the stereotype of public housing as impoverished and the stigmatization of its residents as uneducated, immoral, and violent. Whereas sociological research has described territorial stigmatization as a recent phenomenon, my study has shown that the complex’s stigma comes from its location in Lagoinha, which has a long history of poverty and prostitution and that interviewees blamed their proximity to the infamous favela of Pedreira Prado Lopes. Thus, the formation and consolidation of the conjunto’s stigma are outcomes of long-term social and urban developments in Belo Horizonte, which are themselves the results of the unequal spatial distribution of public investment and city-planners’ traditional disregard of the city’s poor districts. Therefore, the stigmatization of residential areas is a consequence of decades of socio-spatial segregation and discriminatory urban policies.

Conversely, the Conjunto IAPI’s stigma has reinforced social inequality. It also has had harmful consequences for residents, for living in a stigmatized area reduces social interaction with other groups, career success,
and future prospects in general. Residents reacted to their stigmatization by adopting ambivalent attitudes, which sociologists have described as strategies of resistance and submission. To defend themselves from the stigma, which they knew also applied to Pedreira Prado Lopes, interviewees described the inhabitants of both the conjunto and the favela as “good people” (gente boa) and stressed that they were on good terms with the favelados. But they also firmly distinguished the two locations. These observations indicate that the residents of housing complexes located close enough to favelas to acquire their stigma reject outsiders’ stereotypes of both while, at the same time, differentiating their residence from the slum nearby. Their desire to protect themselves from violence and crime led residents to erect a stone wall separating their complex from the favela. I took this to be evidence that a long-term effect of urban segregation is increased social distance, which in turn, hinders solidarity among the inhabitants of stigmatized areas.

Later housing projects in Belo Horizonte did not resemble the Conjunto IAPI, nor did they slow the growth of the housing problem during the period under consideration, though the IAPs did follow some innovative approaches to social housing that benefited their working-class residents. Unfortunately, from the late 1960s onwards, the military regime, after abolishing the IAPs, tried an entrepreneurial approach to social housing, and, throughout the following decades, new projects, often poorly built, were located on urban peripheries where they were cut off from public transportation and the rest of the city. Consequently, many refused to live in them. This gave rise to the extreme inequality in housing that is the most visible expression of social inequality in Brazilian cities.

Belo Horizonte’s experience with the Conjunto IAPI has important lessons to teach. For one, ineffective state action causes socio-spatial segregation. For another, consideration of the unmet needs of both residents and those excluded from public housing shows the importance of a civil right to adequate education, health care, and work. And understanding the experiences of those living in public housing can help municipal authorities, urban planners, and scholars develop more effective housing programs that reduce social inequality and promote the inclusion of underprivileged groups. At first glance, recent initiatives, such as repainting the Conjunto IAPI and registering it as a part of Belo Horizonte’s cultural heritage, do not appear to address the root of the problem but seem, rather, intended to gain residents’ votes. However, their positive impact on the
complex’s reputation shows that among the basic needs that public policies must aim to satisfy is the elimination of stigma.

In demonstrating the significance of social housing for Brazilian urban history and the broad range of sources for the subject, this study can inspire further socio-historical research on the housing programs developed by the IAPs and other state institutions since the late 1930s. For example, comparative work on public housing in the center and on the edges of cities can identify the effects of location in Brazilian cities. Moreover, there is a need for further historical and interdisciplinary research into the impact of the development of urban infrastructures on social dynamics in public housing and its neighborhoods. Future studies might discuss why numerous public housing projects on the outskirts of Brazilian cities lacked the amenities that residents of the Conjunto IAPI enjoyed because of its central location. By following actor-centered approaches and including oral history, historians and sociologists can come to understand better residents’ experiences of living in social housing. By taking into account that people’s recollections are influenced by their agendas and their later experiences, scholars can discover new sources for their research. Interviews are especially useful sources for exploring the meaning of neighborly and neighborhood relationships in the past and present. They are also important sources for understanding the impact of stigmatization on social dynamics in working-class areas and, especially, for explaining the relationship between public housing and nearby impoverished neighborhoods, a subject that this study has only begun to explore and that deserves more attention.
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