

Licia VALLADARES
Rosa RIBEIRO (*)

RESUMEN

En el marco del análisis de los procesos de urbanización y la estructura interna de las áreas metropolitanas, este trabajo intenta ver los cambios ocurridos en el crecimiento de las favelas en el Area Metropolitana y la Municipalidad de Río, considerando los aportes más recientes desde diversos puntos de vista.

Los cambios son analizados en relación a dos fenómenos importantes: el decrecimiento del número de favelas al interior del area metropolitana y el aumento considerable de nuevos asentamientos en las márgenes metropolitanas: periferización de las favelas. Aquí se combinan una serie de mecanismos de exclusión y segregación de los pobres hacia las afueras de la ciudad. Un tercer fenómeno representativo de estos cambios ocurre con la densificación de las favelas ya existentes.

Estos cambios son explicados en el contexto de la declinación económica de los ochenta, los procesos de pauperización y el retorno de la democracia en Brasil.

* We would like to thank Marcia Coutinho and Marcos Santanna Lacerda from IPLAN-RIO who gave us to the Cadastro de Favelas and to the unpublished document "Delimitação Espacial das Favelas Cadastradas pelo IPLAN-RIO" (1991). Lidia Medeiros and Leonel Tractenberg prepared most of the tables presented here. Gizella do Prado Valladares was patient enough to polish our English.

THE RETURN OF THE FAVELA: RECENT CHANGES IN INTRAMETROPOLITAN RIO

The eighties, known in Brazil as the "lost decade", gave way to important changes in the overall urbanization process and within the internal structure of the metropolitan areas. The preliminary results of the 1991 census, which came out last February, show both the fall of the population growth rate (it fell from 2.46 in 1980 to 1.89 in the following decade) as well as the deceleration of metropolitanization. The forecasted urban explosion seems to have come to a turning point. In all of the nine metropolitan areas of the country (Belem, Fortaleza, Recife, Salvador, Belo Horizonte, Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Curitiba and Porto Alegre) there was a considerable fall in the annual growth rate when comparing the years 70-80 to the 80-91 period. Even the fastest growing metropolises of the seventies (Curitiba, São Paulo and Belo Horizonte) suffered from strong deceleration. As for the Rio de Janeiro Metropolitan Area, it has entered a state of stagnation (see Table One).

Less important changes seem to have occurred when considering intrametropolitan population distribution. The same preliminary results of the 1991 census show that although growth rates have fallen as a whole, there remains a differential pattern of growth between core and periphery. Since the seventies and throughout the eighties the peripheral rings of the metropolises (comprised

by the outer municipalities) have been expanding twice, sometimes three times as fast as the metropolitan core (central municipality).

The dominant view held by Brazilian scholars on the internal structure of the national metropolises has found inspiration in such type of evidence. Based on the idea of bipolarity, most authors have stressed the importance of peripheral growth to understand the metropolitan phenomenon. The model contrasts the metropolitan core with the outward rings: in the first is concentrated capital, jobs, services, public investments in infrastructure, etc. The distant peripheries, by contrast, are and are due to remain the space of reproduction of the labor force, lacking basic infrastructure, having little accessibility to services and providing few economic activities. The common image is that of fast growing dormitory towns where increasing proportions of the poor remain in segregated, low-density territories formed by unserviced and frequently illegal plot developments ("loteamentos"). Poverty and "peripherization" are pictured as intimately interconnected. Perverse mechanisms of the market, unequal distribution of public goods, land use regulations and urban renewal policies all contribute to the continuous expulsion of the poor from the core region towards the metropolitan fringes.

A few recent studies have been trying to re-examine in more detail the processes of internal growth and differentiation taking place within metropolitan regions. They call for a more in depth analysis of the so called "periferia" where economic activities, real estate capital and middle-class housing are on the move

(Ribeiro, 1991). They stress that bipolarity reproduces itself within the extended metropolitan core and within the metropolitan fringes where the socio-economic profile is becoming less and less homogeneous (Santos, 1990). They call for a renewal of interest in the core of the metropolis (after so much devotion given to "peripherization") where changes in the housing market and in segregation patterns suggest general restructuring within the metropolitan space (Plano Diretor de Sao Paulo, 1990; Taschner, 1991).

This paper is an attempt to look at changes occurring within Metropolitan Rio and the inner city (Rio de Janeiro Municipality) from the standpoint taken by the most recent literature. Of limited scope, it will look exclusively at what happened to "favelas" in the last decades - more specifically in the eighties when the impact of adjustment policies was clearly felt through recession, increasing poverty, informality and unemployment. According to official data the Metropolitan Area of Rio was the one in the 81-90 period where the proportion of the poor population grew more intensely (PNAD 1981-1990).

AVAILABLE DATA

Although much has been written on Rio's favelas (Valladares & Figueiredo, 1983), little is known about its recent developments. Difficulties arise basically due to the lack of precise data on its population. The census of 1960, 1970, 1980 do not publish separate results for the favela and the non-favela population.¹ The available information does not go beyond the number of agglomerations, their distribution within the metropolitan area

¹ / The very interesting results of these surveys can be found in Taschner (1978) and Taschner & Veras (1990).

and the total population and dwellings within each favela. Nothing like a specific census of the favela population exists, such as those done in São Paulo where two municipal agencies, SEMPLA and SEBES, collected data both on the characteristics of the agglomerations and on the socio-economic profile of residents.

In Rio, the only attempt to collect regular data on favelas comes from IPLAN-RIO. In 1981 it started to identify the existant agglomerations of the Municipality or Rio through aerophotogrammetry. Favelas located in the outer Municipalities (a total of 13) were not considered. Moreover, data collected does not refer to the residents but only to the physical area. A disparity refer to the residents but only to the physical area. A disparity immediatly was shown between census data and IPLANS'S: while the 1980 Census counted 192 favelas in the Municipality of Rio, IPLAN came out with the surprising total of 460 a year later. Such a difference was due to different criteria used by the two agencies. While IBGE only took into account those agglomerations with over 50 dwellings. IPLAN considered 20 dwellings as a minimum. On the other hand, IBGE generally looked at interlinked favelas as just one agglomeration while IPLAN-RIO considered each unit individually.

IPLAN-RIO has been concerned mainly with the physical environment and the infrastructure of favelas and has been providing information to different city planning agencies. In 1991 it updated the data of 1981. It found 545 agglomerations, that is 85 new favelas within a ten year period.

It is within the limits of the existing data that we shall discuss favela agglomerations in the eighties. But before discussing the present a few words must be said about the past.

FAVELA EXPANSION IN RETROSPECTIVE

The favelas of Rio are by now an old phenomenon. The first ones originated at the turn of the century and followed the expansion of the inner city as it grew in different directions (Parisse, 1969; Abreu, 1987). By the 30's, when Rio entered a phase of rapid

FAVELAS OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF RIO DE JANEIRO ACCORDING TO THE PERIOD WHEN THEY ORIGINATED

Periods	(%)
Up to 1920	4.8
1921 to 1940	8.6
1941 to 1960	35.4
1961 to 1981	21.8
1981 to 1990	9.3
Total	100.0 (*)

* 100% = 440 favelas on which there is available information
Source: IPLAN-RIO.

population increase, favelas multiplied accordingly. They soon became the home of the majority of migrant families who were pouring into the national capital of Brazil in search of better job opportunities.

Between 1940 and 1960 the number of favela agglomerations had an unprecedented growth: 35,4% of the total number of favelas of the Municipality of Rio originated in this period. Thus it is seen as the peak of favela multiplication. Census data on the population in favelas in different decades confirm the importance it had attained by then: in the period 1950-1960 the population living in favelas practically doubled. Moreover the increase in the population of favelas (99,3%) was more than double the increase in the total population (41,5%).

Starting with the 60's and throughout the 70's, favela growth enters a phase of decline; the number of new favelas decreased (21,8% between 1961-1981). These twenty years correspond nevertheless to two different trends. Between 1960-1970 the population in favelas still grew twice as quickly as the total

**POPULATION IN FAVELAS
AND IN THE MUNICIPALITY
OF RIO DE JANEIRO (MRJ)
(1950-1980)**

Years	Population MRJ (A)	Population in Favelas (B)	B/A (%)	Growth of Total Pop.	Growth of Favela Pop.
1950	2,337,451	169,305	7.2	-	-
1960	3,307,163	337,412	10.2	41.5	99.3
1970	4,251,918	563,970	13.2	28.6	67.1
1980	5,093,232	628,170	12.3	19.8	11.4

Source: IBGE Census

population living in the Municipality of Rio (67,1% versus 28,6%). It is only in the following ten years that a reverse occurs: for the first time the favela population grew more slowly than the total population (11,4% versus 19,8%).

Such abrupt change has at least three underlying processes. First the resettlement policy put forward within the Municipality as of 1962 and running until the early eighties which certainly had an impact on numbers: during the period 1962-1978 80 favelas were partially or totally destroyed (Valladares, 1978). Another possible explanation has to do with the fall in migratory flows to Rio. According to census data the percentage of migrants in the Municipality of Rio fell from 48,5% in 1950 to 42,0% in 1970 to 35,2% in 1980. Since migrant families favored this area, favela growth was certainly affected: the percentage of the migrant population in favelas fell from 62% in 1950 to 48% in 1970 (Oliveira et alii, 1983).

62 Finally the seventies were a decade of strong "peripherization" in which the poor became more and more concentrated in the outward rings of the metropolis. By the sixties recent migrants who might have chosen the favela were already settling directly in the Municipalities of Caxias, Nilopolis, Sao Joao de Meriti and Nova Iguacu, a large complex of dormitory towns (in 1970 the population of these four municipalities corresponded to 22,5% of the total population of the Metropolitan Region). The so called "loteamentos", which already existed, densified and expanded (Santos, 1980) through self-help housing ownership, becoming

increasingly an alternative for the poor. Remaining favelas were still under threat and many residents took themselves the initiative of moving out (Cavallieri, 1985).

The strong decline in favela growth within the Municipality of Rio was parallel in the seventies to the important increase in the number of favela agglomerations in the outward Municipalities. There were already 41 in 1970, and 66 in 1980, which represented an increase of 61%.

Favelas were indeed following the move towards the outskirts of the metropolis, developing strongly in the four municipalities of the periphery. Nevertheless they still had a stronger weight in the Municipality of Rio (74,4 versus 25,6%).

RECENT CHANGES

Based on the above one would expect that favela growth would continue to decline within the Municipality of Rio and that the expansion would be almost exclusive to the peripheral municipalities. The "peripherization" of favelas had already been detected and it was a move that had started within the Municipality of Rio itself, following the spread of the city as of the fifties (Santos, 1977).

A combination of exclusion mechanisms -such as the increase in land values, pressure coming from the middle and upper housing market, legislation and urban renewal policies- would supposedly

**GROWTH OF THE FAVELAS
IN THE METROPOLITAN
REGION OF RIO DE
JANEIRO**

	Number of Favelas		of Favelas		Growth 70/80
	1970	(%)	1980	(%)	
Rio de Janeiro (Municipality)	162	79.8	192	74.4	18.5
All other municipalities in Metropolitan Region	41	20.2	66	25.6	61.0
Total	203	100	258	100	

Sources: 1970 and 1980 Census

contribute to “preserve” the inner city by expelling the low income groups to distant neighborhoods and areas. The economic model of development prevailing since the seventies would be at the base of the increasing segregation of the poor in the metropolitan fringes.

The surprising data provided by IPLAN-RIO calls for a reconsideration. Between 1981 and 1990, i.e., in only ten years 85 new favelas appeared in the Municipality of Rio (an 18.0% increase), exactly when the process had seemed to have come to a halt. Within a one hundred year perspective such agglomerations represent 19.3% of the total number of favelas. Moreover IPLAN also found that 69 of the already existent favelas expanded, 198 densified and a total of 167 both expanded and densified. Only 26 (4.8%) remained as they were!

Although the preliminary results of the 1991 census have not yet been published regarding favelas, IPLAN-RIO’s findings seem strong enough to suggest an important increase in the favela population in the core Municipality. It may also show that the rate of growth of the favela population will once again exceed the population growth of the Municipality of Rio as it did in the fifties and sixties.

It is in the context of a declining economy and of stagnation of metropolitan demographic growth that the “return” of the favela has to be analysed.

One should consider that favela development does not have the

same strong link with migration as it had in the past when Rio was a fast growing metropolis. Its recent growth and expansion seems to be more associated with the natural growth of the population (second and third generation of the original squatters) as well as intrametropolitan flows and residential mobility. Similar to the São Paulo case, favelas seem to be growing by “downward filtering” or downward mobility (Taschner, 1978). The strong process of pauperization, resulting from economic stagnation on the one hand and increasing income concentration, on the other, has no doubt forced important contingents of the lower middle class to move from rental housing to improved and centrally located favelas. The degree of pauperization that has affected the Brazilian population in general and the inhabitants of metropolitan Rio in particular can be illustrated by the following data: between 1980 and 1989 the per capita income in the State of Rio de Janeiro as a whole was reduced by 15% (Oliveira, 1990). In Metropolitan Rio, those at the top of the pyramid jumped from 44,9% of revenue in 1981 to 54% in 1989 (Saboya, 1991). Within such a context it seems likely that impoverished families of non-favela origin are being forced to move into favelas in search of cheaper housing and central location.

One should also note that favelas do not remain “open” squatter areas. All spaces are quickly appropriated. A local housing market soon develops and both land and dwellings acquire market value. Differences in site, accessibility to services and infrastructure affect rent and sale prices. The favela, itself, gradually separates into neighborhoods often with distinctive characteristics. Over a period of time owner-occupiers tend proportionately to diminish

in relation to rental dwellers. Favelas are being upgraded and physical improvements are arriving: by today practically all favelas within the Municipality of Rio have electricity; since 1983 a special program (CEDAE-PROFACE) is bringing water and introducing sewage systems to an increasing number; garbage collection is slowly being introduced (Cavalierrri, 1985).

The process, briefly described above, does not occur with the same intensity in all favelas. Over a period of almost a hundred years the development of favelas can be seen in terms of a "continuum" represented at one end by a recently formed, small scale, socially homogeneous, precarious squatter area. At the other end are old consolidated agglomerations, highly stratified and diversified, transformed into high rise poor neighborhoods. In between there are many variations. Although a single category continues to be used, favelas should not be conceived through a single, static, unique model. Favelas are undergoing constant and qualitative changes: there are "favelas" and favelas...

The process of pauperization has strongly affected the poorer groups living in the favelas, especially in the well consolidated ones. It has become difficult to cope with the cost of living in an upgraded favela where one has to pay for water, electricity, perhaps the land tax (IPTU) and increasing monthly rents. They are being pushed out. Many organize and occupy new areas, creating new squatter settlements. In most cases they are rental dwellers who cannot afford rents and who expect to become owner-occupiers through squatting. The process starts all over again in a vicious circle. In a sense the new favela is a periphery of the consolidated one.

Evidence suggests that the new favelas "discovered" by IPLAN-RIO had a different origin from the more traditional ones. They are part of the pauperization process of the eighties. While the earlier ones resulted from gradual squatting and accretion growth (Leeds, 1969) the more recent ones seem to have resulted from successful collective invasions. The beginning of the eighties coincided in Brazil with the return to democracy following the end of the military regime. New elected state governors took power and the winds of democracy stimulated the fight for rights in all sectors. The right to land was an important demand of urban social movements and of political parties such as the PT and PDT. In Rio, in the first half of 1983, following the entrance of the Brizolla government, 14 organized invasions took place just within the Municipality of Rio (Valladares & Kayat, 1983). Others followed, within the core region and in the peripheral municipalities. Information coming from aerophotos show a regular subdivision of invaded land in the form of plots, a clear sign of an organized occupation.

Data coming from IPLAN-RIO (although with no information on the story of the recent agglomerations) provides some insight into such recent trend of favela growth. Table two (see appendix) presents the distribution of favelas in the Municipality of Rio in 1981 and 1990 according to five different macro-regions or zones. Such regions correspond to a socio-geographical division of the Municipality and aggregate different Administrative Regions (R.A.s.). The definition of the five zones is based on a combination of characteristics: location in relation to the city center, length of occupation, predominant type (s) of economic activity, general socio-economic profile of the resident population ².

2/ We are aware that such zoning deserves a more in depth characterization. We are personally involved in a research project involving IPPUR, IUPERJ and IBGE. One of its aim is to analyze the 1991 Census. In order to produce a social map of Metropolitan Rio based on several social indicators.

The emergence of new favelas was not uniform throughout the Municipality. More than half (52) appeared in only two regions, both low density areas: Region IV (The Developing Periphery) which showed an increase of 35%, and Region V (The West Zone together with the North Extreme Periphery) which had an increase of 26.0%. Within each of these macro-regions one Administrative Region (R.A.) stands out: Jacarepagua in the first case and Bangu in the second. Coincidentally both these R.A.s already had an important number of favela agglomerations in 1981 (39 and 43 respectively) and are better served by transport than any other R.A.s. in the same region. It is worth mentioning that Bangu and Jacarepagua were two important areas of resettlement in the sixties and seventies. Thousands of ex favela residents were transferred to Vila Kennedy and Cidade de Deus, two enormous housing schemes.

New favelas also appeared in Region III (The Traditionnal Industrial/suburban zone) a macro region of enormous concentration of favelas in the eighties (42% of the total number of favelas are located here). It did not, however, present an increase in the number of new favelas as important as Regions IV and V (16% versus 35% and 26%). Within Region III Inhauma and Madureira are the two R.A.s where new squatters predominate. Both are alongside the railway that crosses the whole extension of this large suburban area and Madureira constitutes one of the biggest commercial centers of Metropolitan Rio.

In contrast, there were regions where new favelas practically did not mushroom in the eighties: Region I (The Extended City-Center) and Region II (The High Rise, High Value, Middle and Upper Class Residential and Commercial Zone). Removal of favelas took place decades before in these zones and ever since there has been strong control of any unused land.

Summing up, such data suggests the increase in the trend of "peripherization" of favelas within the Municipality of Rio. Table 3 (see appendix) which gives the spacial distribution of favelas according to Regions in 1981 and 1990 shows, in fact, that the distant peripheries (Regions IV and V) are increasing their share,

while all others are reducing it.

The analysis of favela growth should not, however, limit itself to data on the newest squatter settlements. Densification and expansion of already existant favelas are two other very important aspects of recent favela growth and seem to be more relevant than the phenomenon of new agglomerations. Of the total of 545 favelas spotted in 1990, 198 (36,3%) had only densified, 69 (12,7%) had only expanded and 167 (30,6%) had both expanded and densified while the formation of new favelas only represented 15,6% of these overall changes.

Densification refers to the increase in dwellings within the favela's boundaries. Such increase normally occurs thorough the combination of the use of remaining open spaces plus vertical expansion. Several factors are involved: a) the natural growth of the local population -second and third generations build a second and third floor above the original family dwelling when they form a new household; b) the rise in living standards of some local residents- over the years they invest in their own homes, increasing the square metres of their dwellings; c) the expansion of the rental housing market in the favelas, expressed by the four, five, even six storey "buildings" subdivided into flats for rent.

The expansion of the existent favelas refers to a somewhat different phenomenon. It refers to the horizontal extension of the original boundaries by local residents or by newcomers who squatt or buy the right to squatting in the favela fringes.

Table 4 (see appendix) based on data obtained thorough aerophotogrammetry is very suggestive. When comparing the extent of new favelas to densification and expansion of the already existent ones, densification is by far the most expressive phenomenon in all regions considered, with the exception of region II where there was a slight predominance of expansion. No less than 365 or 67,0% of favelas in the Municipality of Rio densified in the eighties!. And even in Regions IV and V where the hew favelas were concentrated, densification is very relevant: 156 or 67,8% of favelas densified.

The table also calls attention to the high degree of densification in Region I. The Extended City Center, where a century ago the first favelas appeared and an area where innumerable favelas were destroyed by the resettlement policy.

Expansion of original boundaries constituted, in the eighties, the second most important form of favela growth: it occurred in 236 favelas or 43,3% of the total. The region where expansion was more significant (occurring in 66,7% of its favelas) was coincidentally the only region which saw no new favela appear in the decade: Region II, the High Rise, High Value, Middle and Upper Class Residential and Commercial Area. Although here there is great control over land, favelas were able to expand because most are located on the sides of steep hills.

A reference must also be made to the relation between favela growth and population in the favela. As mentioned earlier, no data has yet been published on favela population in 1991. We are thus forced to consider the population living in the favelas by the year 1980 and consequently cannot go much further.

Table 5 and 6 present the population in favelas and in Administrative Regions as well as the percentage of the poor population in each R.A. or Region. A first aspect to mention is that more than half of the total population living in favelas by 1980 (52.9%) were concentrated in only one region - Region III (The Traditionnal Industrial/suburban Zone)-. In absolute numbers this was the macro region where more new favelas were formed in the eighties: 30. We may say that such region had a strong reproducing force.

Attention should also be called to the ratio "population in favelas/ total population". In Region I, the core of the Municipality, almost one third of all dwellers are favela residents! In no other region was such a ratio so high! Coincidentally Region I is also an area very affected by poverty: no less than 49,1% of its population earned less than two minimum salaries in 1980.

A word on Region V (The West Zone together with the North

Extreme Periphery). In 1980 it corresponded to the poorest region of all (56,3% of its population earned less than two minimum salaries) and in the eighties it was an area of the mushrooming of favelas (no less than 28).

The above tables certainly show the existence of a strong relation between favelas and poverty. The poorest regions within the Municipality of Rio (V and I) are those where either new favelas are emerging more intensively or where densification is advancing more quickly. Interesting enough, these two regions correspond to the inner circle and the outer circle of the city of Rio. However, favelas are also expanding in rich areas, such as Region II where the phenomenon of expansion of original boundaries is predominant. Such data certainly calls for a reconsideration of the generally accepted hypotheses that the Brazilian metropolis has been succeeding in segregating the poor in the outskirts of town...

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper has dealt with recent trends in favela growth in the Municipality of Rio de Janeiro. Although the ideal would have been to consider the phenomenon within the wider spectrum of the Metropolitan Region, we were forced to limit our scope due to unavailable data on favelas in the thirteen other municipalities in the period 1980-1990.

Although it is known that favelas are expanding, and quickly, in the metropolitan outskirts (an estimate published in Anuario Estatístico 1991 counted 132 such agglomerations in nine of the thirteen municipalities) the favela remains a "typical" phenomenon of the inner ring of the metropolis. Data here presented showed the concomitance of two growth processes:

- 1) the "peripherization" of favelas, a move that started within the Municipality of Rio and that has continued throughout the neighboring municipalities.
- 2) the renewal of favela growth in the metropolitan core or, in other words, the return of the favela at full speed.

This renewed take-off results from a combination of processes: the mushrooming of new squatter areas, the physical expansion of existent favelas and, last but not least, the densification of the already consolidated agglomerations. Such processes have been occurring in all macro regions of the Municipality of Rio, from the old central area where the first favelas appeared a century ago to the recently urbanized fringes where the newest squatterments predominate.

All three movements indicate the self-reproduction of the favela. This expresses itself in different forms: first by the creation of new squatterments or the expansion of the already existent ones resulting from pressures in the rental market within the favelas themselves; second through the absorption of the subsequent generations; and third by the relative advantages it offers in comparison with other housing alternatives for the poor. Favelas are, by now, far better located and better equipped than the distant and peripheral "loteamentos".

Such "advantages", together with the process of pauperization that has been downgrading some sectors of the lower middle class, has brought new social group into the favela. These, in the long run, may modify the traditional social profile of favela residents.

Favela growth and expansion have experienced great diversification in the last hundred years. The trends identified in the eighties have made an already plural universe even more complex. What seemed to have been a simple expression of socio-geographical segregation is, instead, an intricated reality.

It has become a real challenge to study favelas as a form and as a manifestation of segregation. The results of the 1991 census are a fundamental instrument but are not yet available. This paper has only tackled the general trends. These should, in the near picture, be studied in depth both by statistical analyses and by anthropological case studies.

R E F E R E N C E S

- Abreu, Mauricio de A. (1987). *Evolução urbana do Rio de Janeiro*. Rio de Janeiro, Jorge Zahar Editor, 146 p.
- Fundação para o Desenvolvimento da Região Metropolitana do Rio de Janeiro (Rio de Janeiro, RJ). (1982). *Plano de desenvolvimento metropolitano. Caracterização da região metropolitana do Rio de Janeiro*. Rio de Janeiro.
- IPEA/IPLAN (1976). *Região Metropolitana do Rio de Janeiro: serviços de interesse comun*. Brasília, Comissão Nacional de Regiões Metropolitanas e Política Urbana, Rio de Janeiro, IBAM, 264 p. (coordinated by Ana Maria Brasileiro).
- Leeds, Anthony (1969). «The significant variables determining the character of squatter settlements». In *América Latina*, año 12, n. 3, pp. 44-86.
- Oliveira, Jane Souto de (1990). «Rio de Janeiro: a geografia dos contrastes sociais». In *São Paulo em Perspectiva*, v. 4, n. 3/4, pp. 38-50.
- Oliveira et alii (1983). *Favelas do Rio de Janeiro*. Rio de Janeiro, IBGE. Departamento de Estatísticas e Indicadores Sociais, mimeo, 296 p.
- Parisse, Lucien (1969). «Favelas do Rio de Janeiro: evolução sentido». In *Caderno do CENPHA*, n. 5.
- Ribeiro, Luis César de Queiroz & Lago, Luciana Correa (1991). «Transformações das metrópoles brasileiras; algumas hipóteses de pesquisa». In *XV Encontro Anual da Associação Nacional de Pós Graduação e Pesquisa em Ciências Sociais, Caxambu*, 32 p.
- Rio de Janeiro (RJ). Instituto de Planejamento do Rio de Janeiro (1991). *Delimitação espacial das favelas cadastradas pelo IPLANRIO no município do Rio de Janeiro*, mimeo.
- Rio de Janeiro (RJ). Secretaria de Estado de Planejamento e Controle (1985). *Bairros populares e favelas*. Rio de Janeiro.
- Saboia, João (1991). *A região metropolitana do Rio de Janeiro na década de oitenta; mercado de trabalho, distribuição de renda e pobreza*. Rio de Janeiro, CLAVES/ENSP/FIOCRUZ, mimeo.
- Santos, Carlos Nelson F. dos (1980). «Velhas novidades nos modos de urbanização brasileiros». In VALLADARES, Licia do Prado (org.) *Habitação em questão*. Rio de Janeiro, Jorge Zahar Editor, pp. 17-41.
- Santos, Carlos Nelson F. dos (1977). «Volviendo a pensar en "favelas" a causa de las periferias». In *Nueva Sociedad*, n. 30, maio/jun., pp. 22-28.
- Santos, Milton (1990). *Metrópole corporativa fragmentada; o caso de São Paulo*. São Paulo, Nobel, Secretaria de Estado de Cultural.
- Sao Pablo (SP). Secretaria Municipal de Planejamento (1990). *São Paulo: crise e mudança*. São Paulo, Brasiliense, 215 p.
- Taschner, Susana Pasternack (1978). «Favelas do município de São Paulo; resultados de pesquisa.» In BLAY, Eva Alterman (org.) *A luta pelo espaço*. Petrópolis, Vozes, pp. 125-47.
- Taschner & Veras, Maura P. Bicudo (1990). «Evolução e mudanças das favelas paulistanas». In *Espaço & Debates*, ano X, n. 31, pp. 52-71.
- Valladares, Licia do Prado (1978). *Passa-se uma casa; análise do programa de remoção de favelas do Rio de Janeiro*. Rio de Janeiro, Jorge Zahar Editor, 135 p.
- Valladares & Figueiredo, Ademir (1983). «Housing in Brazil; an introduction to recent literature». In *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, v. 2, n. 2, maio, pp. 69-81.
- Valladares & Kayat, Regina (1983). *Invasões de terra no Rio de Janeiro de 1983; uma cronologia*. Rio de Janeiro. IUPERJ (Série Estudos, n. 20), 45 p.

A P E N D I X

TABLE 1

ANNUAL GROWTH RATES
IN METROPOLITAN AREAS

Metropolitan Regions	1970/1980	1980/1991
Belém	4.30	2.67
Core Municipality	3.95	2.67
Peripheral Municipalities	11.33	2.67
Fortaleza	4.30	3.45
Core Municipality	4.30	2.73
Peripheral Municipalities	4.30	6.35
Recife	2.74	1.81
Core Municipality	1.24	0.66
Peripheral Municipalities	4.61	2.89
Salvador	4.41	3.10
Core Municipality	4.08	2.90
Peripheral Municipalities	6.53	4.20
Belo Horizonte	4.64	2.60
Core Municipality	3.73	1.28
Peripheral Municipalities	6.95	4.97
Rio de Janeiro	2.44	0.82
Core Municipality	1.82	0.43
Peripheral Municipalities	3.38	1.34
São Paulo	4.46	1.73
Core Municipality	3.67	1.00
Peripheral Municipalities	6.34	3.08
Curitiba	5.78	2.91
Core Municipality	5.34	2.11
Peripheral Municipalities	6.95	4.65
Porto Alegre	3.80	2.55
Core Municipality	2.43	1.05
Peripheral Municipalities	5.35	3.83

Sources: 1970 and 1980 Census;

CENSO 91- IBGE/CTD
(RESULTADOS PRELIMINARES)

TABLE 2**GROWTH OF FAVELAS IN
THE MUNICIPALITY OF RIO
DE JANEIRO**

Region	1981	1990	New favelas	Growth rate (%)
I. Portuária	11	12	1	
Rio Comprido	14	15	1	
São Cristóvão	12	13	1	
SUB-TOTAL	37	40	3	8.0
II. Botafogo	15	15	0	
Copacabana	4	4	0	
Tijuca	13	13	0	
Lagoa	8	8	0	
Santa Tereza	11	11	0	
SUB-TOTAL	51	51	0	0.0
III. Vila Isabel	10	11	1	
Méier	40	43	3	
Inhaúma	23	33	10	
Madureira	37	46	9	
Trajá	7	9	2	
Penha	25	28	3	
Ramos	31	32	1	
Ilha do Governador	21	22	1	
SUB-TOTAL	194	224	30	16.0
IV. Jacarepaguá	39	60	21	
Barra da Tijuca	30	33	03	
SUB-TOTAL	69	93	24	35.0
V. Bangu	43	62	19	
Campo Grande	13	15	2	
Santa Cruz	10	11	1	
Anchieta	12	17	5	
Pavuna	29	30	1	
Guaratiba	2	2	0	
SUB-TOTAL	109	137	28	26.0
TOTAL	460	545	85	18.0

Source: IPLAN-RIO

TABLE 3

SPACIAL DISTRIBUTION OF FAVELAS IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF RIO DE JANEIRO

Region	1981 Number of favelas	(%)	1990 Number of favelas	(%)
I	37	8.0	40	7.0
II	51	11.0	51	9.0
III	194	42.0	224	41.0
IV	69	15.0	93	17.0
V	109	24.0	137	25.0
TOTAL	460	100.0	545	100.0

Source: IPLAN-RIO

TABLE 4

FORMS OF GROWTH OF FAVELAS BY REGION 1980/1990

Region	Expanded	Densified	Did not expand nor densify	New favelas	Total of Favelas in 1990
I. Portuária, R. Comprido, S. Cristóvão	16 (40.0)	28 (70.0)	- -	3 (7.5)	40
II. Botafogo, Copacabana, Tijuca, Lagoa, Sta. Teresa	34 (66.7)	32 (62.7)	5 (9.8)	- -	51
III. Vila Isabel, Méier, Inhaúma, Madureira, Irajá, Penha, Ramos, I. do Governador	102 (45.5)	149 (66.5)	11 (4.9)	30 (13.4)	224
IV. Jacarepaguá, Barra	34 (36.6)	54 (58.1)	8 (8.6)	24 (25.8)	93
V. Bangu, Campo Grande, Sta. Cruz, Anchieta, Pavuna, Guaratiba	50 (36.5)	102 (74.5)	2 (1.4)	28 (20.4)	137
TOTAL	236 (43.3)	365 (67.0)	26 (4.8)	85 (15.6)	545 (*)

Source: IPLAN-RIO

(*) Note: In no direction do the totals of the table correspond to 100%. Of the 545 favelas 167 were counted twice as they both expanded and densified. 69 only expanded and 198 only densified.

TABLE 5

**POPULATION IN FAVELAS
AND IN ADMINISTRATIVE
REGIONS (R.A.S.) IN 1980
MUNICIPALITY OF RIO DE
JANEIRO**

Administrative Regions (R.A.)	Population in Favelas (A) N. abs.	%	Population in R.As. (B) N. abs.	%	A/B	% People earning less than 2 minimum salaries
I. Portuária, R. Comprido, S. Cristóvão	81,420	11.3	289,037	5.7	28.2	49.1
II. Botafogo, Copacabana, Tijuca, Lagoa, Sta. Teresa	103,108	14.3	982,023	19.3	10.5	34.1
III. Vila Isabel, Méier, Inhaúma, Madureira, Irajá, Penha, Ramos, I. do Governador	382,025	52.9	2,090,372	41.1	19.1	46.9
IV. Jacarepaguá, Barra	28,071	3.9	375,972	7.4	7.5	36.0
V. Bangu, Campo Grande, Sta. Cruz, Anchieta, Pavuna, Guaratiba	126,800	17.6	1,353,564	26.6	9.4	56.3
TOTAL	722,424	100.0	5,090,968	100.0	14.2	45.8

Source: IPLAN-RIO

IBGE-Sinopse Preliminar do Censo Demográfico do Rio de Janeiro - 1980 Baratz, F. & Villela, Y. (1985)

TABLE 6

**POPULATION IN FAVELAS
AND IN ADMINISTRATIVE
REGIONS (R.AS.) IN 1990
MUNICIPALITY OF RIO DE
JANEIRO**

Administrative Regions (R.A.)	Population in Favelas A	Population in R. As. B	A/B (in %)	Favelas in		% of People earning less than 2 minimum salaries in 1980
				1981	1990	
Ramos	128.530	254.952	50	31	32	51.7
São Cristóvão	38.314	93.849	41	12	13	54.8
Portuária	14.588	46.080	32	11	12	54.6
Rio Comprido	28.518	93.933	31	14	15	48.9
Lagoa	43.709	218.002	20	8	8	39.7
Méier	73.704	411.343	18	40	43	47.3
Ilha do Governador	30.578	171.316	18	21	22	40.4
Penha	54.800	315.837	17	25	28	52.2
Anchieta	55.951	337.873	17	12	17	52.9
Santa Teresa	9.699	61.579	16	11	11	41.1
Tijuca	28.593	205.692	14	13	13	33.9
Vila Isabel	20.449	178.176	11	10	11	35.7
Barra de Tijuca	5.389	49.117	11	30	33	47.3
Bangu	51.821	530.378	10	43	62	56.6
Irajá	28.621	273.281	10	7	9	47.0
Engenho Novo	21.357	207.930	10	-	-	39.1
Madureira	23.986	277.537	9	37	46	46.8
Jacarepaguá	22.682	326.855	7	39	60	49.4
Santa Cruz	7.036	151.372	5	10	11	61.3
Botafogo	12.186	268.047	5	15	15	33.0
Copacabana	8.921	228.703	4	4	4	28.3
Campo Grande	11.992	333.941	4	13	15	57.1
Centro	-	55.175	-	-	-	35.4
Ilha de Paquetá	-	2.264	-	-	-	51.7
Inhaúma	-	-	-	23	33	-
Pavuna	-	-	-	29	30	-
Guaratiba	-	-	-	2	2	-
TOTAL	722.424	5.093.232	-	460	545	45.8

Sources: IPLAN-RIO

IBGE Sinopse Preliminar do Censo Demográfico do Rio de Janeiro de 1980 Baratz, F. & Villela, Y. (1985)

