

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

Meehwa Cho<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad Politécnica de Catalunya

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

There is an effort to visualize different urban situations throughout the text and the provided information may be valid at some points. But various questions arise from the beginning, from the premise of using "boundaries" as a tool to define social identity and as a strategic planning tool.

Even if there were clearly two different identities since pre-hispanic, it is unlikely that they have been maintained to the point where they can be clearly distinguished by a boundary, six centuries after they were transferred into another logic. And a series of events that occurred thereafter doesn't seem to match completely to the same boundary neither. Moreover, clear political-administrative division with single lines is only possible after modern land surveying, and before that, boundaries used to include physical surface or volumes.

On the map, it seems that there are no morphological differences between San Pedro and San Andres. And the author himself mentions that there is no "difference or separation in the perception of their everyday inhabitants and visitors". If so, the question arises again whether there is a need to reinforce dichotomous thinking by identifying virtual boundaries that do not correspond to physical elements.

If differences in historical, social and cultural identity are real, it would seem more appropriate to visualize them as urban tissues with land use, social organizations, specific streets, symbolic buildings, etc. instead of boundary, and to find "border zone" where different identities meet or mix. Furthermore, if a discrepancy between "border zone" and administrative "boundary" exists, it can be understood as a conflict, and strategic plans or projects are more necessary at that point.