



The old picturesque city of Olhão © Colecção Estúdio Mário Novais. Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, Biblioteca de Arte.

From the Late 19th Century House Question to Social Housing Programs in the 30s: the Nationalist Regulation of the Picturesque in Portugal

BY RUI JORGE GARCIA RAMOS, ELISEU GONÇALVES AND SÉRGIO DIAS SILVA

In the early 20th century in Portugal, a new architecture was produced as the offspring of different references, conforming to a process of “*Portugueseness*” based on the picturesque. From the beginning of the dictatorship in 1926, the State took advantage of that phenomenon to sublimate nationalist values. Through the first programs of mass housing construction, the single-family house became an object of consumption and a cornerstone of national identity. The search for identity brings together different architectures across the century featuring a renewed Portuguese sentiment infused with different perspectives on the “homeland”, its history and its culture.

On Transition

In the early years of the 20th century in Portugal, amid debates over national identities and modernity, a new architecture was produced as the offspring of different sentiments including iconic sources such as the *Casa Portuguesa* (Portuguese House), reference to the chalet or the modernist approach. These hybrid proposals had to deal with the selection of formal elements and visual memories according to epochal architectural design systems of inclusion and exclusion. Regardless of the results, they conformed to a process of “*Portugueseness*” based on the mainly English picturesque character firstly introduced into Portugal by intellectuals not necessarily connected to the State intelligentsia. Even in the *Primeira República* (First Republican regime after the end of the Monarchy in 1910) but, particularly, when the dictatorial regime was imposed in 1926, the State took advantage of that cultural phenomenon to sublimate nationalist values. Therefore, the first Act issued by the government, which successfully achieved large-scale low-income housing programs in the main cities, appeared in 1933, the year the dictatorship consolidated the constitution of a corporative authoritarian regime — *Estado Novo* (New State). Throughout most of the last century, the State, facing profound social asymmetries, poverty and deplorable living conditions, developed a set of public programs that promoted affordable houses in different forms, raising a need for different architectural responses to housing design.

The transition from the widespread late 19th century private house (for the bourgeoisie or working classes) to *Estado Novo* social housing programs was realized in five working-class neighborhoods built between 1919 and 1922 by the *Primeira República* regime. It can be considered a major change, which aggregated new urban and domestic space legislation and a political setting, dominated by totalitari-

anism and the affirmation of a strong national identity. The climax was reached when the corporative State introduced different measures for space and resident control, in particular, building social houses and transferring land property rights to the new owners.

With the first social housing program announced only in 1933, a broader reflection of the low-cost housing problem was started, reframing the issue of national identity from the fragile experience of modern architecture’s specific point of view. That cultural and political ambivalence, which reflects the conflict of being simultaneously Portuguese and modern, corresponded to a new setting for social housing and new urbanization solutions. This circumstance was matched with the first approach to mass housing production throughout Portugal, the development of design methods in order to standardize housing, the application of comfort and hygiene principles, the implementation of new strategies in land planning, as well as the creation of administrative and economic organizations as levers to build social housing and to establish new areas for expansion in cities. Although these subjects assumed the form of an authoritarian power, Pedro Vieira de Almeida (1933–2011) argues that, in an underdeveloped country, they also provided a true practical experience for a wide range of practitioners². Among them, some engineers and architects were involved or particularly interested in issues pertaining to modern architecture in addition to their main effort to propose pragmatic solutions against slums. Therefore, the approach to social housing design did not prevent the natural and fundamental discussion about modernity or the aspirations of inhabitants regarding hygienic and comfortable homes. This discussion occurred under the transverse issue of the interchanging process between *chalet* and *Casa Portuguesa* architecture.

In this way, in order to study Portuguese housing architecture in the 20th century it is relevant to understand the dynamics of hygienism or new home comfort standards, the approach to the relationship between interior and exterior space, or the arrangement of space to obtain minimum areas. It is particularly significant to analyze some experiments that took place when large bourgeois house resources were interchanged with standard popular house features. This approach brought out new practices including, for the first time, the idea of the house as an object of mass consumption. Connected to this point was the effort to fix rules and an order through administrative regulations. At the end of 19th century, the national department of health created central authorities to develop a wide set of legislative measures with regard to housing, whose pinnacle was the *Regulamento de Salubridade das Construções Urbanas* (Urban Building Health Regulation) published in 1903³.

As Carlos Sambricio (1945–) mentions, this transition period of impure solutions doesn't prevent the identification of the deep roots of the *modern architecture* experience. For the first time in the western world, *social architecture* as an extended phenomenon was designed for a specific program, under a limited budget and to be built through precise processes, anchored in new words like economy, society and salubrity⁴.

The *Casa Portuguesa* or the *chalet*, and even their hybrid variations (more or less modernized and destined for every economic and social stratum), can be pointed out as the first examples interpreted as mass consumer objects. Besides the subjection to the mechanisms of production, repetition and transaction, the house was no longer eternal in terms of use and users. These new conditions were decisive for the modern configuration of domestic space and furthermore for the architectural design project. The inclusion of architecture in the sphere of consumption objects is the prerequisite for popular and general acceptance of a new or reformed house. This fact, not always explicit, exceeds the understanding of the house design solely as an architectural issue. For example, it corresponds to the initiative of building “affordable houses” by building societies like the *Companhia de Crédito Edificadora Portuguesa*, which in 1920 presented a kind of catalogue with different house types and dimensions described as “national stylization”. After 1918, in the belief that the State should not be the sole entity responsible for solving the housing shortage, the establishment of subsidised loans by national legislation encouraged initiatives to build affordable houses for the working class. Also in 1928 (Salazar was already a minister under the two-year old dictatorship) there was still an effort to promote and to subsidize the private sector to construct cheap houses or to reduce *room and house rents* for the middle and lower classes. Like other legislation regarding the rent regime, land expropriations or cooperative enterprises, all these legal acts should be understood during those first years as decisive tools for house commoditization. In that context we must consider the house not just as a product but also as an architectural project vehicle related to real estate practices and typological investigations. All these phenomena should draw some attention to often ignored projects such




as “Houses with 5, 6 and 9 rooms for the South” designed by the architect Cottinelli Telmo (1897–1948) in the early thirties⁵. Intrinsic to philanthropic, industrial patronage or insurance companies' initiatives, these solutions suggest a timid but nonetheless remarkable policy to support affordable housing construction for the poorer classes by the private sector.

On Program

After the military coup that ended the *Primeira República* in 1926, the new dictatorship decided to terminate the social housing initiatives of the previous regime. The *Estado Novo* distanced itself from those initiatives, but completed the neighborhoods already under construction and recovered part of the groundbreaking legislation from 1918 (Decree no. 4,137 and, from 1926, no. 16,055 and 16,085)⁶. From the outset, the totalitarian state established an intricate bureaucratic network and issued laws prolifically in order to supervise daily life, namely in terms of political mobilization (*União Nacional*, 1930), monuments and public buildings (DGEMN, *Direcção-Geral dos Edifícios e Monumentos Nacionais* — General Directorate of National Buildings and Monuments, 1929) and their protection areas (1932), good taste and fine arts (*Conselho Superior de Belas Artes*, 1932), urban renting and expropriation regime (1928), urban improvement works (1932) and housing programs (1933). Oliveira Salazar (1889–1970) and his minister Duarte Pacheco (1900–1943) sought a solution for the *social ill-health* of urban areas by means of laws supporting private and public-private initiatives in social housing; in the belief the State should not develop these initiatives alone.

Those endeavors failed to boost housing construction and in 1933 a new line was chosen, with the first Affordable Houses program (Decree-Law 23,052) and the direct intervention of the State in financing and managing housing. This program was based on a kind of single-family house with a Portuguese feel, in different areas according to social status and under a rent to own system. The house then became a fundamental factor in the development of a cult of the nation, a strong state and a corporative structure, the corollary of the institutionalization of the *Estado Novo*⁷. The neighborhoods built under this program resorted to a set of nationalist repertoires, from national history and built heritage to popular tradition, producing and consuming new conformations to those cultural assets⁸. The intervention of the State in social housing was seen as an instrument of power and the house and the neighbourhood as the aim of its strategy.

The way that Salazar modeled the house as a cornerstone of national identity and a core aspect of his political action that never changed⁹ should be emphasized. In an interview with António Ferro (1895–1956), Salazar stated: “working one's own land is the great enemy of the tavern”¹⁰. This statement was made in 1938 while strolling through the newly finished neighborhood of Affordable Houses in *Alto da Ajuda*, in Lisbon, and sheds some light on the manipulation of house and ownership as a prophylactic measure targeting undesirable social behaviors, as the promise of



01-03 Row houses in Oliveira Monteiro Street, Oporto, 1898; Rodrigo Teixeira Mendes d'Abreu neighborhood, Oporto, 1907. © Câmara Municipal do Porto. Divisão de Arquivo Histórico.

ownership was linked to acceptable political and social conduct. Salazar feared the people as a social group that, if set in motion, could not be stopped, and so the adoption of a regime of small proprietors controlled by the state made sense. Simultaneously, the choice for the single-family house reflects the opposition to the bad influence of the large workers' phalansteries, the equivalent of having the people agglomerated in multifamily housing buildings. In the words of Salazar, the house is the great enemy of the revolution:

"It would be possibly easier to solve the housing problem in the vertical way, in the immense block. But the small independent house, and the quiet, the tranquility, the love, the righteous feeling of ownership, the family. The hive is promiscuity, revolution, hate, simultaneously in the individual and in the crowd."¹¹

This growing fear of the people can be seen in the reorientation of the state's identity discourse from that of the late 19th century, based on picturesque national culture, to a focus on a nationalist historical construction represented by its monuments¹².

The search for identity in architecture was therefore based more on setting up a historical artifact through a selection of collective memories rather than in its scientific and architectural confirmation. This confirmation had always been hesitant, since the first inquiries in the 19th century and in the transition to the 20th century¹³. A truly Portuguese origin that could unite all that was sought and wished for, and it is only with Orlando Ribeiro (1911–1997) that our diversity is definitely assumed (1945) and, later, confirmed, when José Mattoso (1933–) describes Portugal as a community of parts: "A country made of pieces that nothing can unify. It happens not only in socioeconomic structures, but also in cultural concerns, whose "norm" is the "discontinuity of generational leaps"¹⁴.

The program of Affordable Houses moved the Portuguese House, manipulated according to its principles, into the State's sphere of influence, using the small house and its picturesque features as a means of identity validation. This house that, as we have seen, was one of the inputs into the architectural problem of housing in the early years of the 20th century, then became a stereotype of the Portuguese House that should look like a house, much as a castle should look like a castle. This architecture of images was never intended to reproduce an authentic historical era, as that reproduction would not satisfy the needs of contemporary life. It intended, instead, to evoke a certain kind of homely environment, a solid *domesticity* of the house much as described by Bachelard (1884–1962), an environment we connote to our familiar past and to the image we carry of a primordial primitive house: "In a way, this should also be similar to speaking of a metonymic logic, according to which a single remnant of the past is more meaningful than a supposed recovery of its integrity (which will, actually, never be more than a sham)"¹⁵.

It is, in fact, this purpose that would guide, from 1929, the work of the DGEMN in the reconstruction of a monumental heritage in ruins as part of the reinforcement of a cult of the nation, where the monument fully understood by all

legitimizes its role in the recognition of a national identity. The work of the DGEMN on heritage may therefore be described as the transformation of the building or of its ruins into a product which can be easily classifiable historically and promptly consumed. This eloquent action is visible in photos of the time, such as those of the construction of *Paço dos Duques* in Guimarães (Rogério de Azevedo, 1934), with a method repeatedly disavowed in texts and interventions by Raul Lino (1878–1974).¹⁶

It is also this metonymic side that brings together different architectures across the century. These architectures, whichever their style, feature a renewed Portuguese sentiment infused with different ways to see the "community", its history and its culture (see Raul Lino, Keil do Amaral, Fernando Távora, Teotónio Pereira). But the success of the Portuguese House as an operation of identity, reinforced by nationalist practice and the Affordable Houses program, also shows the impoverishment of that perspective, exposing its problematic and discredited side in the appropriation of Popular Culture.

On Fragility

The debate concerning a national identity forged by romantic intellectuals of the 19th century and, later, through ethno-genealogical research, which deepened the material and immaterial domains of its representation in popular culture¹⁷, would be decisive for the nationalist character of the *Primeira República*. But the "role of republican indoctrination and propaganda in the production of the fundamental ingredients of the end of the century Portuguese nationalism"¹⁸ was not only decisive in improving the republican position, as it also allowed the creation of different national identity discourses in the following decades. The fundamental symbols and rituals of the nation were conceived throughout the *Primeira República* and they would be ideologically absorbed by the totalitarian nationalist regime imposed after the military coup in 1926. Therefore, the new political system granted a sense of "national regeneration", recovering from the conservative right of the early 20th century aspects such as the Lusitanian Integralism and the catholic movement¹⁹. After 1933, the *Estado Novo* maintained this appropriation, regulating it and placing it at the center of its action, entangled with the parochialism typical of the dictator Salazar. Until the sixties, the ferocity of national identity topics led to an "inability (or refusal) to consider their own culture in the big picture"²⁰ which meant, in architecture, production based on image and determined by personal talents²¹. These architectures, by recognizing their fragility, implicitly or explicitly, valued a kind of pastoral ideal linked to rurality, fluctuating between modern and regional, or taking historicist tendencies forwards to a monumental architecture.

Mapping those circumstances until 1950, meant tacitly accepting the possibility of a regional architecture, that is, a contemporary and heterogeneous transformation of the previous "Portuguese Style"²²: a hybrid and modernizing one, generally known as "*Português Suave*". Over and above the recognition of the mass spread of the "*Casa Portuguesa*"



04 Exhibition of the Portuguese World, Portuguese Villages Section (Alentejo), Lisbon, 1940. © Estúdio Horácio Novais, 1938-1939. Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, Biblioteca de Arte.

05 Illustration named "A Assistência Social" (The Social Assistance) with a photo of the Dr. Oliveira Salazar neighborhood (Paulino Montez, Lisbon, 1936) from the Affordable Houses Program. © Biblioteca Nacional, BN, in Leitão de Barros (dir.), Domingos Alvão (fotogr.), *Portugal 1940*, Lisboa, Secretariado da Propaganda Nacional, 1940.



06 Affordable Houses Program: *Madre de Deus* neighborhood (Luís Benavente, Lisbon, 1938). © Arquivo Municipal de Lisboa. Arquivo Fotográfico.



07-08 Affordable Houses Program: Paranhos neighborhood, Oporto, 1937. © Instituto da Habitação e da Reabilitação Urbana, IHRU.

model, this reading is also important because, in some cases, the proposals were *pièces de resistance*, both architecturally and politically, in opposition to the regime.²³ At the same time, this architecture permitted questioning the language of pure and fundamentalist Modernism and also the state-sponsored picturesque. We can see this through Ignasi de Solà-Morales (1942–2001) whose well-known concept of “frail architecture” is based on heterogeneity, diversity of times and occupied a paradigmatic peripheral position²⁴.

The subsequent architecture essays by Keil do Amaral (1910–1975) in 1942 and 1947 — *A Arquitetura e a Vida* (Architecture and Life) and “*Uma Iniciativa Necessária*” (A Necessary Action) — and by Fernando Távora (1923–2005) in 1945 and 1947 — *O Problema da Casa Portuguesa* (The Issue of the Portuguese House) — emerged from that chain of problems related to house form and must be understood inside the boundaries of that concept of fragility. Their goals were concurrent: Keil argued popular architecture roots as references for a new outlook, which would be the basis of the Regional Portuguese Architecture Inquiry carried out between 1955 and 1960 becoming the true principle for architectural renovation; Távora defended authenticity within national circumstances, founding a genuine and properly modern architecture. Both architects’ proposals were in favour of understanding housing conditions linked to knowledge of behavior patterns as a means of deepening Portuguese cultural identity and, therefore, establishing an architecture renewal separate from the orthodoxy of the Modern Movement²⁵.

In addition to this outline of the development of housing architecture incorporating nationalist ideals, social control instruments, international cultural exchanges and domestic architecture reform, we should mention accuracy issues related to established historical readings. The *return to the archive* is necessary in order to revisit some projects considered as common housing production and unclassified by some historiography²⁶. In this context, we can list Ventura Terra (1866–1919) and his row houses (*Casas em Banda*, Miguel Henrique dos Santos, 1900), Raul Lino and the minimal liveable space in the production of expandable houses; Marques da Silva (1869–1947) and the quadripartite houses based on the *Carré Mulhousienne* used in the *Cité Ouvrière de Mulhouse*²⁷, or others such as Adães Bermudes (1864–1948) and his *Arco do Cego* experiment. Later, the works of Carlos Ramos (1897–1969), Teotónio Pereira (1922–1989) or João Braula Reis (1927–1989), could be reassessed in order to note different paths in diverse architectures and times, disseminating forms and tastes and thus building the 20th century. As José Mattoso would say, all of them were questioning national identity in an attempt to capture it.

The transition to the 1950s witnessed new understandings of identity, nationality and propaganda issues, which would be reflected in the field of housing. A new framework for the issue of housing was developed, both through legal definition (more than political) of housing templates, namely the number of floors that can be built and through the attention devoted to the spatial features of the house as a translation of lifestyles. Although the single-family

country house model, introduced by the Affordable Houses Program, was assured by the regime from 1933 to 1972, from 1945 onwards it was to coexist with the new Affordable Rent Houses Program, which would allow for new architectural types, primarily the housing block. ■



Notes

- 1 For instance, the concept of “picturesque” was referred in Nikolaus Pevsner, “The Picturesque in Architecture”, *The Journal of the R.I.B.A.*, Vol. 55, No. 2, 1947, p. 55–61.
- 2 Pedro Vieira de Almeida, “Raul Lino, Arquitecto Moderno”, in *Raul Lino: Exposição Retrospectiva da sua Obra*, Lisboa, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 1970, p. 115–188.
- 3 Eliseu Gonçalves, “O Alojamento Operário Portuense nas Primeiras Décadas do Século XX: da Casa Familiar ao Bloco Comunitário”, in *Ilhas, Bairros Sociais e Classes Laboriosas na Cidade do Porto (1956–2006)*, Porto, FLUP, 2010, p. 126–134.
- 4 Carlos Sambricio (coord.), *Un Siglo de Vivienda Social (1903/2003)*, Barcelona, Editorial Nerea, 2003; Marie-Jeanne Dumont, *Le Logement Social à Paris 1850–1930: les Habitations a Bon Marché*, Liège, Mardaga, 1991; See also the video of Marie-Jeanne Dumont’s presentation: “L’invention du Logement Social Moderne: des Fondations Philanthropiques aux Cités-Jardins”, *Conférence sur l’Histoire du Logement, Cité de l’Architecture & du Patrimoine*, Collection Cours Publics, 2007–2008 (<http://bit.ly/Lk7hGD>).
- 5 Cottinelli Telmo, “Projecto de Casas com 5, 6 e 9 Compartimentos para o Sul do País”, *A Arquitetura Portuguesa*, No. 6, 1933, p. 41–42; No. 7, p. 55–54; No. 8–9, p. 70–71.
- 6 Decree no. 4.137, from 1918, is considered one of the first legal provisions where the phrase “affordable house” for “low income classes” is used, referring to European and American examples.
- 7 Manuel de Lucena, *A Evolução do Sistema Corporativo Português*, Vol. 1 — O Salazarismo, Lisboa, Perspectivas & Realidades, 1971, p. 25–88.
- 8 Pedro Ferreira, *Teoria da Arquitectura em Portugal, 1935–1945: Debates, Convergências e Dissidências com o Regime Político*, MSc thesis, Lisboa, Faculdade de Belas Artes da Universidade de Lisboa, 2001; João Leal, “Usos da Cultura Popular”, in José Neves (coord.), *Como se Faz um Povo: Ensaio em História Contemporânea de Portugal*, Lisboa, Fundação EDP, Edições Tinta-da-China, 2010, p. 125–137.
- 9 From 1962, some of the neighborhoods built under the Affordable Houses Program included multifamily housing buildings, yet the single-family house model was still present. The neighborhood of Viso, Porto, is one example of the use of both types within the same neighbourhood.
- 10 António Ferro, “Salazar Principio e Fim”, in *Entrevistas de António Ferro a Salazar*, Lisboa, Parceria A. M. Pereira, Livraria Editora, 2003 [1938], p. 169.
- 11 *Idem*.
- 12 Another example is the cautious implementation of the Museum of Popular Art, created in 1936 but symptomatically left to its own fortune, as is perceived from the electricity outage in 1952 or ceilings collapsing in 1962. See João Leal, “Da Arte Popular às Culturas Populares Híbridas”, *Resdomus*, Porto, Grupo Atlas da Casa, Centro de Estudos de Arquitectura e Urbanismo, FAUP, 2009, p. 7.
- 13 Rocha Peixoto, Sousa Viterbo, Júlio Castilho, Joaquim Vasconcelos.
- 14 José Mattoso, “Uma Ideia para Portugal”, *Público* (P2), March 6 2010, p. 4. (With a quote from Eduardo Lourenço, in turn quoting Miguel Real).
- 15 João Paulo de Sousa, *Memória e Futuro*, *Blog da Literatura*, June 9 2008. (<http://daliteratura.blogspot.com/2008/06/memria-e-futuro.html#links>).
- 16 See *Sé do Funchal*, 1936, proposal for the refurbishment of the façade of *Banco de Portugal* in Évora, accredited to Raul Lino, c.1945.
- 17 João Leal, “Usos da Cultura Popular”, in José Neves (coord.), *op. cit.*, p. 125–137.
- 18 Nuno Monteiro, António Costa Pinto, “A Identidade Nacional Portuguesa”, in António Costa Pinto (coord.), *Portugal Contemporâneo*, Lisboa, Dom Quixote, 2005, p. 58.
- 19 *Idem*, p. 60.
- 20 Quote by Milan Kundera used while discussing identity in António Feijó, “Um Feixe de Humanidades”, in António Feijó (com.), *Weltliteratur. Madrid, Paris, Berlim, S. Petersburg, o Mundo*, Lisboa, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 2008, p. 8–16.



09 The old picturesque city of Olhão and the Portuguese Pavillion at the International Exhibition of Paris (Keil do Amaral, 1937); a panel showing Olhão. © Coleção Estúdio Mário Novais. Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, Biblioteca de Arte.

10–11 Monte Pedral philanthropic neighborhood built in Oporto, 1899-1906. The author Marques da Silva drew this set of houses (ground floor plan on the left side) based on the famous Carré Mulhousienne (ground floor plan on the right side). © Bairro Operário do Monte Pedral no Porto, in *A Construção Moderna*, nº 57, Lisboa, 1902. Câmara Municipal do Porto. Divisão de Arquivo Histórico. *Habitations Ouvrières de Mulhouse*, in Émile Cocheux, *Les habitations Ouvrières en tous Pays*, Paris, Béranger éditeur, 1903 (12th ed.).



- 21 Manuel Botelho, “Os anos 40: A Ética da Estética e a Estética da Ética”, *RA*, No. 0, Porto, Revista da FAUP, 1987, p. 7–10.
- 22 This designation does not refer to the one set by José Manuel Fernandes in 2003, which relates this architecture to the formal marks of the *Estado Novo*. While not denying that relationship, this includes other productions, in line with the previous picturesque, archeological historicisms and also of modern renovation and critique. It seems this breadth could undo the misconception of the phrase, as was noted by José Manuel Fernandes, João Vieira Caldas and Nuno Teotónio Pereira in the radio broadcast *Encontros com o Património*, by TSF on March 28, 2009. José Manuel Fernandes, *Português Suave: Arquitecturas do Estado Novo*, Lisboa, Instituto Português do Património Arquitectónico, 2003.
- 23 See *Casa Afonso Barbosa*, 1941, *Pousada de Salomonde*, 1949, *Januário Godinho*; *Bloco da Carvalhosa*, Arménio Losa, 1945; *Parque Florestal de Monsanto*, *Casa de Chã do Miradouro de Montes Claros*, Keil do Amaral with A. Pessoa, H. Gandra, 1942; *Clube de Tênis do Monsanto*, Keil do Amaral, 1947; *Igreja de Águas*, Nuno Teotónio Pereira, 1949.
- 24 Ignasi de Solà-Morales, “Arquitectura Débil”, in *Diferencias. Topografía de la Arquitectura Contemporánea*, Barcelona, Gustavo Gili, 1995, p. 65–82.
- 25 Bandeirinha notes a relevant conjugation of purposes in those editions, stressed by the “absent” participation of these architects in the I National Congress of Architects, in 1948, where they informally indicate the necessity of another way of seeing modern architecture and Portuguese culture, a side aspect to the congress: José António Bandeirinha, *Quinas Vivas: Memória Descritiva de Alguns Episódios Significativos do Conflito entre Fazer Moderno e Fazer Nacional na Arquitectura Portuguesa dos Anos 40*, Porto, FAUP publicações, 1996 [1993]. See also on this subject and on its repercussions: Eduardo Jorge Fernandes, *A Escolha do Porto: Contributos para a Actualização de uma Ideia de Escola*, PhD thesis, Guimarães, Escola de Arquitectura da Universidade do Minho, 2011. Rui Ramos, *Arquitectura e Projecto Doméstico na Primeira Metade do Século XX Português*, Porto, FAUP, 2010, p. 272–286.

- 26 Rui Ramos, “«Produções Correntes» em Arquitectura: a Porta para uma Diferente Gramática do Projecto do Início do Século XX”, *NW Noroeste. Revista de História*, No. 1, 2005, p. 53–80.
- 27 Eliseu Gonçalves, “O Bairro do Monte Pedral e o Alojamento Operário em 1900”, in Rui Jorge Garcia Ramos (coord.), *Leituras de Marques da Silva*, Porto, FIMS, 2011, p. 100–109.

Rui Jorge Garcia Ramos

(b. Portugal, 1961) is an Architect and Associate Professor with Habilitation at the Faculty of Architecture of the University of Porto (FAUP). He is currently engaged in the Integrated Master's Degree Program (MIARQ) and in the PhD Program in Architecture (PDA). He is a researcher at the Study Center of Architecture and Urbanism (CEAU) in the working group “Atlas da Casa”, financed by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT). His research interests include: the house; living spaces and lifestyles; culture and housing; architecture and identity in 20th-century Portugal.

Eliseu Gonçalves

(b. Portugal, 1966) is an Architect and Assistant Professor with Habilitation at the FAUP. He is a researcher at CEAU in the working group “Atlas da Casa”, financed by the FCT. Currently developing a PhD thesis about working-class housing in Oporto in the beginning of the last century. Part of this research has been presented at conferences and journals.

Sérgio Dias da Silva

(b. Portugal, 1982) is an Architect and a PhD Student at FAUP, currently developing a thesis on the Estado Novo's Affordable Houses program. He is a researcher at the CEAU in the working group “Atlas da Casa”.