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

Anne Kristiina Kurjenoja[1]

1 Universidad de las Américas - Puebla

To begin with, it would be important to clearly specify in the Abstract as in the Introduction, the goals of this article. On the other hand, I would suggest to focus the contents to some specific issue and to one of the municipalities studied. As it is now, the manuscript seems to try to resolve to many themes making it confusing. Some specific observations:

- As mentioned, the two municipalities are quite different. You mention that: "San Pedro is the traditional town, preserving its cultural heritage, whilst San Andres is synonymous with modern high-end real estate development". The mentioned about San Andrés is only partially true. Indeed, the neoliberal real estate development have been concentrated on the Angelópolis district on the Western bank of the Atoyac-river, but greater part of the territory is occupied by traditional ru-urban human settlements with deep cultural and territorial roots, that should be considered. Also, in San Pedro, the zone next to the Zapotecas-hill, has been subject to the intense real estate activity focused on gated communities, that should be considered. Finally, the impact of the public policy of the neighboring city of Puebla regarding urban renovation and territorial extension should be considered from the beginning, when analyzing the urban transformation of the Cholulas.

- The manuscript mentions the "existing socio-spatial characteristics, and urban policies, in both municipalities", and then, identification and understanding of "borders and their effects in San Pedro and San Andres Cholula, and the consequences for their residents". Regarding this, it would be fundamental to study the concept of "altepetl" deeply present in the local culture of the Cholulas and certainly as one of the principal aspects present in the definition of borders and boundaries in the municipalities if the socio-spatial characteristics are really considered.

- Then, the manuscript mentions: "It is their administrative territory which works as the threshold between the urban / built and the rural". It is important to consider how this "administrative territory" should be understood. In Cholulas, territories, borders and boundaries appear in two kinds of contexts: 1) through urban planning tools, and even more importantly, 2) related to "altepetl" through the socio-territorial structure of barrios governed by the traditional socio-religious organization of land. Finally, between the urban and the rural, there are the villages or the ru-urban communities (fusion between the urban and the rural) with their particular socio-territorial and cultural characteristics that should be considered.

Legibility of the images (1).

- The manuscript mentions: "San Andres, where most of the land was available, developed a very ambitious urban development plan called Angelópolis plus-plan, supported by the authorities and executed by real-estate developers,

with new areas for high-end services and residential neighbourhoods … San Pedro's urban plan was completely different. It preserved the urban and cultural landscape that gave it its identity". How do you sustain these arguments, especially the second one? It would be important to study and analyze at this point, development plans of the two municipalities, besides that of the city of Puebla. In the scope of this manuscript, I consider this is too much. As I mentioned in the beginning, I would recommend to concentrate the text on the analysis of one of the two Cholulas, only.

- Now, the really important concept that should be considered here is that of the "territory". According to some authors:

  - "Based on human needs, this concept is understood as the superficial delimitation that belongs to a nation, inhabited by people with common characteristics and shared customs" (Rodríguez-Páez, 2012).

  - Gross (1998): "From a society-nature perspective (the territory) can be understood as the space of interaction of the natural and social subsystems, subsystems that make up the national, regional and local environment, establishing a relationship between the concepts of territory and environment ... the territory is not only understood as the physical environment where human, animal and plant life is framed and where natural resources are contained, but also includes human activity this space".

  - Haesbaert (2005) interprets the territory as "the physical boundary where community uses and appropriations modelling human behavior and vice versa are conceived" (cited in Santos & Silveiras, 2005)…Then, the territory is understood as the ecosystem of living and dynamic units, which promote the multiplicity of uses and customs as part of an environment. It also groups the physical delimitation where different interests in specific areas trigger intervention projects as prototypes of works (civil and/or architectural ones)".

- After all this, I come to the topic that I really consider the most important in the manuscript and that I would suggest as the focus point of it. That would mean a move to a more transdisciplinary analysis from a more phenomenological scope, studying the bona fide and the fiat-boundaries as elastic territorial differentiators in the framework of 1) altepetl-structure, colliding and clashing with the 2) Angelópolis-district-structure. Besides bona fide and fiat boundaries/zones, the interstices should be included in the study, as those areas of opportunity to the emergence of new, innovative urbanities. In this way, the analysis would take into account "the idea that a border is a fluid concept due to social, spatial, and temporary conditions", as well as "individual and collective ideologies". Those conditions are not yet considered in the manuscript, as I have mentioned before.

- There is thus a notable contradiction between the mentioned in the beginning of the manuscript and what comes next: the analysis made through "two 'lenses': the provision of basic urban services to the population, especially vulnerable populations, and the application of public policies in each of the municipalities". Where did all the phenomenological, ideological, and cultural topics disappear? Here you proceed with completely material, technological, and economic issues through your polygons. If you are really interested in purely technic-urban issues, you should not then mention the socio-temporal or cultural issues. Your "vulnerable population" is vulnerable regarding their socio-economic state (basic services in the house, e.g., drinking water, sewage, and electricity, access to basic public services, e.g. education / illiteracy, access to public health facilities), but in Cholulas are other vulnerable groups that are socio-culturally and racially vulnerable facing the current development tendencies, without being economically vulnerable. If

you are only interested in socio-economical aspects, once again, you should not mention the socio-cultural scope.

- Especially regarding public infrastructure, e.g., you mention "blocks without sidewalks or ramps, access to public transportation or cyclist infrastructure and other types of mobility (pedestrian, wheelchairs, bicycle lanes, and transit) could be not considered in the street design, affecting to the population that prefer or need to move using these modes". Now, in Cholulas the concept of the public space is different compared with that of the modern urban planning: it is not only mobility and transportation, it includes many cultural, religious, and ceremonial meanings that should be considered in their design. Which could be the innovative tools to treat these issues in contexts as that of the Cholulas?

- Finally, you have to specify, what the municipal development plans include. From what year are they? You mention: "disagreements between the population and the local government, the relationship of transnational companies with the municipality, and more". Which are these disagreements? What consequences have they had? What have been their impact on development plans? Have there been legal disputes?

- About your three groups or categories of problematics with which I totally agree: 1) lack of cooperation between municipalities-there are historical, legal and political reasons for this, 2) privatisation of resources-this is a serious question to be resolved, and 3) inconsistency between the development plan and reality-true. But you should argument better these three categories of problematics.

- Finally, I do not agree with your conclusions presented through the figure 6. It represents mainly the material, technological and socio-economic boundaries, ignoring the fundamental altepetl-barrio territorialities of the Cholulas, that finally are the framework to the urban reality of the municipalities, their communities and socio-territorial resistances and disputes. It ignores other fundamental boundaries deeply present in the Cholula-context.

- As a conclusion, your study is trying to fuse so many different things, without analyzing any of them deeply enough, thus you should concentrate your text on only one of the dimensions mentioned. There is material for several manuscripts focused on different urban and environmental problematics with potential to offer an innovative scope regarding urban and ru-urban development in a country such as Mexico.