

# Review of: "Redefining borders in the contested territory between San Pedro and San Andres Cholula"

Viviana Leonardi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad Nacional del Sur

**Potential competing interests:** This research aims to redefine the borders of two municipalities in Puebla, Mexico: San Pedro and San Andrés, since these two cities have disputed their political and social borders since pre-Columbian times. To do this, they use the geographic information system (GIS) through which they construct critical polygons, which is a useful methodology for defining intervention policies. The ultimate goal of intervention policies is to move towards a fair and sustainable city where spatial justice is verified, understood as the integral development of each inhabitant, despite inequalities in the allocation of resources over space. The research begins by distinguishing the concepts of limit and border, highlighting that, in a methodological sense, the limit helps to define in a more precise way the analytical unit in territory, while the border is the area where the observable information is found, highlighting that the idea of border is a dynamic concept that is defined due to social conditions. spatial and temporal. The authors map each of the observed factors by creating what they call "critical polygon" maps. Thus, the concept of "border" as a strategic planning tool is of interest for defining intervention policies and evaluating their impact. It also serves as a guide to determine the type of intervention that could be carried out in the critical polygon to move towards a just city. In order to identify the existing borders in both San Pedro and San Andrés Cholula, the authors analyze: the provision of basic urban services to the population, especially vulnerable populations, and the implementation of public policies in each of the municipalities. It is at this point that it is worth quoting Harvey (1967): "The question of what kind of city we want cannot be divorced from the question of what kind of social ties, relationships with nature, lifestyles, technologies and aesthetic values we want" (p.23). Therefore, as the authors suggest, in order to overcome the limitations of the work, it is suggested to incorporate new variables in the construction of critical polygons, the existence of social capital, symbolic capital and perceptions of the inhabitants of the neighborhoods, may be relevant to think about the possibility of defining policies in a participatory way in order to reduce the asymmetry between plan and reality.

This research aims to redefine the borders of two municipalities in Puebla, Mexico: San Pedro and San Andrés, since these two cities have disputed their political and social borders since pre-Columbian times. To do this, they use the geographic information system (GIS) through which they construct critical polygons, which is a useful methodology for defining intervention policies. The ultimate goal of intervention policies is to move towards a fair and sustainable city where spatial justice is verified, understood as the integral development of each inhabitant, despite inequalities in the allocation of resources over space.

The research begins by distinguishing the concepts of limit and border, highlighting that, in a methodological sense, the limit helps to define in a more precise way the analytical unit in territory, while the border is the area where the observable information is found, highlighting that the idea of border is a dynamic concept that is defined due to social conditions. spatial and temporal. The authors map each of the observed factors by creating what they call "critical polygon" maps. Thus, the concept of "border" as a strategic planning tool is of interest for defining intervention policies and evaluating their impact. It also serves as a guide to determine the type of intervention that could be carried out in the critical polygon to move towards a just city.

In order to identify the existing borders in both San Pedro and San Andrés Cholula, the authors analyze: the provision of basic urban services to the population, especially vulnerable populations, and the implementation of public policies in each of the municipalities.

It is at this point that it is worth quoting Harvey (1967): "The question of what kind of city we want cannot be divorced from the question of what kind of social ties, relationships with nature, lifestyles, technologies and aesthetic values we want"

(p.23). Therefore, as the authors suggest, in order to overcome the limitations of the work, it is suggested to incorporate new variables in the construction of critical polygons, the existence of social capital, symbolic capital and perceptions of the inhabitants of the neighborhoods, may be relevant to think about the possibility of defining policies in a participatory way in order to reduce the asymmetry between plan and reality.