

# ICOA1042: THE SOCIAL VALUE OF URBAN HERITAGE: THE LIMITS TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPE RECOMMENDATION IN SHANGHAI

## Subtheme 01: Integrating Heritage and Sustainable Urban Development by engaging diverse Communities for Heritage Management

**Session 3:** World Heritage, Regulations and Guidelines, Authenticity and Integrity

**Location:** Gulmohar Hall, India Habitat Centre

**Time:** December 14, 2017, 12:00 – 12:15

**Author:** Plácido González Martínez

*PhD Architect and Urban Planner. Associate Professor, Tongji University. Executive Editor, Built Heritage journal. Member, Advisory Board of the Spanish National Plan of Conservation 20th Century Heritage (Spanish Ministry of Culture). Member, Scientific Board of Iberian Docomomo (Iberian Docomomo Foundation). Director, 8th Iberian Docomomo Conference (2013). Authored more than 70 publications (books, book chapters, research articles), his research topics include heritage and urban redevelopment in China and the Historic Urban Landscape.*

**Abstract:** Lights and shadows are cast over the UNESCO Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) Recommendation since it was passed in 2011. While its encompassing definition reveals multiple potential fields of heritage management and intervention, its loose understanding is jeopardizing its effective implementation.

This paper proposal will give an insight into the conceptual gap between the genealogy of the HUL Recommendation and the contemporary theoretical framework that applies to cultural heritage, especially referring to a critique of its biased value-based approach. Its aim is to fill this gap by means of a new definition of authenticity, a surprisingly neglected quality of urban heritage in the drafting of the Recommendation that needs to be brought back to stage in this discussion.

The paper will develop an enhanced definition of this concept, pointing at social values and the fulfilment of certain ‘rights to the city’ as a prerequisite for contemporary heritage authentication. Using the urban redevelopment of Shanghai as a case study, the paper will evaluate the potential of the unleashing of social values as the reference for urban heritage management, as well as its chances of success in front of the current marketing and propagandistic efforts to impulse a renovated aesthetic definition of Shanghai as a modern global city.

A review of particular cases relating the management of industrial and residential heritage in Shanghai will show how the perceived limitations of authenticity may constitute instead one of the greatest potential impulses for the future development of the heritage city.

**Key words:** *community, sustainability, development, equity*

## **Introduction**

Even though the Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation (UNESCO, 2011) refers to multiple factors which include geography, biodiversity, and anthropology among others, a simple analysis reveals a surprising lack of reflection about an intrinsically heritage notion as authenticity.

Referred only in the 24<sup>th</sup> paragraph of the Recommendation, authenticity seems to be an obstacle to what the promoters of HUL have described as the ‘management of change’ (Bandarin and Van Oers, 2012). References to this concept seem to be at odds with the uncontested, destructive logic of development, which has been changing the nature of Chinese cities in the last 30 years.

The origins of this conflict may lie on the different understanding of authenticity in the heritage discipline and in related fields such as tourism and the creative city. For these two last topics, authenticity has been formulated through a call to the flexible criteria of experience (Cohen, 1988; Chang and Teo, 2009; Cohen, 2010; Grodach, 2013), whereas for heritage remains based either in an orthodox understanding of ‘objectuality’, or in a conventional definition of values and attributes.

This article aims to explore how a new definition of heritage authenticity in terms of experience may lead to the enhancement and usefulness of this concept, beyond recent attempts to develop ‘attractive authenticities’ (Guttormsen and Fageraas, 2011). At least theoretically, the Recommendation on HUL allows for this, including participation as a fundamental part of heritage management and encouraging to the relocation of the human being –and not concrete objects or abstract values- at the centre of the production of heritage.

## **Heritage authenticity and experience. The possibility of its definition in China.**

The debate on the production of heritage has been fuelled in the last three decades by the rising importance of tourism. Tourism studies were the pioneers to introduce the experiential dimension in the definition of authenticity in the 1970s (MacCannell, 1973), when the emergence of the self in Western societies implied a search for personal improvement and cultivation beyond shared social goals. The answer from heritage came in 1996, when the ICOMOS San Antonio Declaration introduced the tourist as a legitimate stakeholder in the identification of heritage (ICOMOS, 1996). More recently, the legitimacy of the vision of gentrifiers has been also claimed by recent literature on the creative city (Schlichtman and Patch, 2014).

Even though we may question the adequateness of the representation of these two sectors (first, done by tourism agencies who help define tastes, and the second by design professionals who impose a global, gentrified landscape in heritage environments), there is consensus on the effectiveness of their action when transforming the pre-existence. For such reason this paper aims to incorporate the ‘experiential’ side of the original residents departing from its most basic, common ground: the definition of a framework of rights (Silverman, 2015). Authenticity would ensure the fulfilment of contemporary demands for rights within the built environment, in particular those who define the social space as the outcome of each society’s mode of production (Lefebvre, 1974; Harvey, 2008).

According to such request, the experience of heritage would be first determined by the opportunities that the local residents have to participate in the management of heritage areas, as well as in the appropriation of the outcomes and benefits of the heritage, of which they are a consubstantial part. Including the matter of rights within the framework of shared values (Jokilehto, 2012), ‘experience’ would also engulf misrepresented sectors of society, who are currently being deprived of the use and benefits of heritage (Silverman, 2015).

The possibility to develop this discourse in China is strongly determined by the particular definition of an experiential heritage authenticity, based in means of participation in accordance to the political system, as well as the enablement of effective appropriation methods amidst growing profit-oriented entrepreneurial heritage management methods. This ‘right to the city with Chinese characteristics’ would therefore be the outcome of the adaptation of individuals to political and economic constraints, plus unplanned and spontaneous changes of the built environment performed by the people to accommodate their needs (Wong and Liu, 2016). Together they would conform a body of manifestations of experiential authenticity which may inform the management of urban heritage, oriented not only to promote its change as the HUL Recommendation states (UNESCO, 2011), but rather to guarantee its continuity, as more recent voices claim (Rodwell, 2015).

### **A diagnose of the situation of HUL in China**

The application of the Recommendation on HUL has been a haphazard process since 2011. A loose definition of the implications of HUL, may well have contributed to this (Rey Perez and Gonzalez Martinez, 2018). Successful experiences such as Ballarat in Australia show how, from the action of the public sector and strongly relying in public participation, the administration can achieve great advancements towards the collective construction of heritage (WHITRAP and City of Ballarat, 2017). At the same time, the experience of Cuenca in Ecuador shows how despite the rigor of multilayered analysis, the implementation of HUL determinations is always subject to political will, normally taking little risk at the civic innovation of heritage (Rey Perez and Gonzalez Martinez, 2018).

We cannot speak of a better situation in China. The efforts fostered mainly from academic circles to incorporate citizens in participation process have frequently met a lack of political to proceed to the implementation of its determination. Also at an operative level, the difficulties found after the tragic death in 2015 of Ron van Oers, one of its most ardent promoters in the Shanghai WHITRAP, have been raising. Differences in the cultural definition of the term ‘landscape’, as well as lack of political will of implementing heritage determinations (Van Oers and Pereira Roders, 2013), have also set aside HUL as a priority of action by the WHITRAP itself, favouring the investigation on rural settlements in the recent times instead.

The generous criteria of the HUL require in any case careful attention. They may serve to perpetuate the identification between heritage and cultural and economic elites, favouring public and private stakeholders with a mere utilitarian interest on its identification and eventual commodification. Cases such as Lijiang in China show a clear example of the apparent limitations in making the benefits of heritage reach all layers of the population in a proportional manner (Su, 2011; Shao, 2017). Therefore, the difficulties in implementing the HUL in China may be attributed mainly to the excessive stress conveyed by economic expectations (Rey Perez and Gonzalez Martinez, 2018).

### **The example of Hongkou Creek in Shanghai**

The difficulties can easily be seen in one of the most significant cases where HUL has been aimed for implementation. The Hongkou Creek in Shanghai is an area with strong heritage characteristics where the end of industrial production has brought new businesses and entrepreneurs to transform obsolete facilities. This has also consequences in the surrounding residential tissue of *lilongs*, which are subject to processes of residential and commercial gentrification that challenge the traditional mixed use character of Chinese cities.

This case study shows a clear formulation that explicitly adheres to the promotion of tourism and creative industries in the city. Located south of Hongkou District, the site of the Shanghai Music Valley (SMV) is historically linked to its colonial history as part of the former International Settlement. Even though the area lacks statutory protection, its strong heritage character consists of a picturesque mixture of watercourses, factories and *lilongs*, which bears economic, social, cultural and architectural values.

Despite the importance of these heritage assets, only the former Shanghai Municipal Slaughterhouse received statutory protection in the 2004 general survey carried out by the Shanghai Municipality. The rest of the heritage assets have not been listed, either at municipal, or at a district level. All heritage conservation measures implemented to date combine both 'hard' infrastructures and 'soft' policies, and do not emanate from official planning or heritage determinations, but result from the initiative of stakeholders tied to the SMV.



Fig. 1- Shanghai Music Valley Area, Hongkou Creek, Shanghai. Legend: (1) 1933 Millfun main building (former Shanghai Municipal Slaughterhouse), (2), 1933 Millfun 2<sup>nd</sup> Building (former incinerator of the Shanghai Municipal Slaughterhouse) (3) China Industry Music Park, (4) Peninsula Bay Fashion Culture Creative Industrial Park, (5) Jiaxing Theatre, (6) Sanjiading Park (Former site of the Shanghai Rickshaw Pullers Association), (7) 1930 Xinxin Creative Park, (8) Old

An area under the academic survey of Tongji University for more than a decade, its stagnation demonstrates the gap between the high aims of scholarly analysis and the little concern shown by planning and management measures. Since the first academic proposals from 2006 established the preservation of large tracts of original *lilong*, a variety of plans produced by the Planning Department of Hongkou District in 2007 and 2014, allowed for extensive demolitions as the departure point of the development of the area (Gonzalez Martinez, 2017). These planning determinations did not take into consideration the municipal participation procedures that apply in Shanghai since 2009 (Tang, 2017).

By contrast, the efforts of the Shanghai Music Valley Creative and Innovative Management Co., who is in charge of the recent changes of urban heritage in the site, have focused in a new ‘creative’ narrative that has been applied to the adaptive reuse of an impressive stock of pre-existing industrial structures, with very questionable results (Gonzalez Martinez, 2017). In the meanwhile, changes in the social tissue of the *lilong* have been detained due to contradictory plans referring either to the construction of the Shanghainese version of Nashville as a music-centred urban neighbourhood inhabited just by musicians, which is purposed by the management company, or to the pure gentrification of the area aimed from the District Government through site redevelopment.



*Fig.2- RuikangLilong (the author)*

Very much in the same way that a timid gentrification has started through the renovation of particular houses in Ruikang and Ruiqinglilongs, the path to the exercise of authenticity can be found in a growing number of cases where the economic activity is being brought to the residential areas in an absolutely pervasive, contemporary way. The development of a growing sewing industry in small domestic workshops that both cater the local residents and the distribution networks of the Chinese e-commerce giant Taobao, may be a clear proof of the complexity and extent of this change. Authenticity thus becomes defined from the perspective of the right to the city, within the limits for citizen participation with the environment, which are mainly of economic nature, and by means of the possibility of an appropriation that is mainly defined in the reversible definition of ambiguous spaces beyond the limits of residence and production, the public and the private.

## **Conclusion**

A new definition of heritage authenticity from the point of view of experience is key to the full development of the potentialities within the HUL Recommendation. Acknowledging that the representation of the experience of tourists and newcomers may be guaranteed by the tourism industry



and designers, the right to the city defines the framework where citizen experience can be unfold and developed. Any action going against the exercise of this right, therefore, would be defined as contrary to the authenticity of heritage, and therefore rejected from a heritage perspective.

Very much as it would be meaningless to apply foreign concepts like Jane Jacob's ideals of neighbourhood livelihood in Chinese cities, the application of foreign methods of participation in the definition of heritage would also be lacking sense and leading to continuous frustration. How may we speak, then, of the development of a 'Historic Urban Landscape with Chinese characteristics'? Allowing for the spontaneous appropriation and participation of the benefits of heritagization by the people in everyday actions, this creativity can be expressed in the emergence of new contemporary commercial activities that imply the flexible, minimal adaptation of the built environment, which may be considered as the most appropriate to provide a sense of continuity in the conservation of the urban heritage of Shanghai.

This perspective is definitely not claiming for political change beyond the strict limits of the current situation, nor aims to resist the irresistible promises of a business driven society. Critics may argue that this position may be synonymous with the noncritical acceptance of unrestrained development and the definition of a harmonious society as expressed from the realm of power in China. The exposed ideas aim to detect authenticity among everyday practices the necessary support for spontaneous citizen creativity according to prerequisites of conservation as they have been dynamically defined by the Recommendation of HUL.

This does not mean that the solution lies on a complete *laissez faire*, practiced by the government, companies and the citizens. Consistent heritage conservation requires from our perspective of the conscious adoption of policy measures emanating from the realm of the government. What we propose in the meanwhile is to claim for any means of self-organization which may constitute an alternative for the existence of these neighbourhoods, taking advantage of the competitive scenario of the growing digital Wechat and Taobao economies. The HUL therefore would be expressed through the most immediate and natural expression of people's small-scale economic resilience, in conformity with the long accepted heritage ideal of liveliness of urban environments.

## Bibliography

- Bandarin, F., Van Oers, R. (2012). *The Historic Urban Landscape*. Hoboken: Wiley.
- Chang, T.C., Teo, P. (2009). The shophouse hotel: vernacular heritage in a creative city. *Urban Studies* 46 (2), 341-367
- Cohen, E. (1988). Authenticity and commoditization in tourism. *Annals of tourism Research* 15, 371-386.
- Cohen, E. (2010). Tourism, leisure and authenticity. *Tourism Recreation Research* 35 (1), 67-73.
- Gonzalez Martinez, P. (2017). Urban authenticity at stake: A new framework for its definition from the perspective of heritage at the Shanghai Music Valley. *Cities* 70, 55-64.
- Grodach, C. (2013). Cultural economy planning in creative cities: Discourse and practice. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37 (5), 1747-1765
- Guttormsen, F.S.; Fageraas, K. (2011). The social production of 'attractive authenticity' at the World Heritage Site of Roros, Norway. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 17 (5), 442-462.
- ICOMOS (1996). *The San Antonio Declaration*. [Online] <<http://www.icomos.org/en/charters-and-texts/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/188-the-declaration-of-san-antonio>> [Accessed 8.30.2016]

- MacCannell, D. (1973). Staged authenticity: arrangements of social space in tourist settings. *American Journal of Sociology* 79 (3), 589-603
- Rey Pérez, J.; González Martínez, P. (2018). Lights and shadows over the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape: 'managing change' in Ballarat and Cuenca through a radical approach focused on values and authenticity. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 24 (1), 101-116.
- Rodwell, D. (2015). Reconnecting the city: the historic landscape approach and the future of urban heritage. *Journal of Architectural Conservation* 21 (2), 136-138.
- Schlichtman, J.D.; Patch, J. (2014). Gentrifier? Who, me? Interrogating the gentrifier in the mirror. *International Journal of Urban Research*, 38 (4), 1491-1508
- Silverman, H. (2015). Heritage and authenticity. *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*. London: Palgrave Mac Millan.
- Shao, Y. (2017). Conservation and Sustainable Development of Human-inhabited World Heritage Site – Case of World Heritage Lijiang Old Town. *Built Heritage* 2: 51–63
- Su, X. (2011). Heritage Production and Urban Locational Policy in Lijiang, China. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 35: 1118–1132
- Tang, Z. (2017). Shanghai 2040. Towards a Global City of Inclusiveness. Lecture at the *2017 City and Society International Forum*. Tongji University, China, 28-29 October 2017.
- UNESCO (2011). *Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape*. [Online] <<http://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/638>> [Accessed 6.3.2016]
- Van Oers, Ron, and Ana Pereira Roders. 2013. "Road Map for Application of the HUL Approach in China." *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development* 3 (1): 4–17.
- WHITRAP, and City of Ballarat. 2016. "The HUL Guidebook. Managing Heritage in Dynamic and Constantly Changing Urban Environments." <https://www.historicurbanlandscape.com/index.php?classid=5355&id=170&t=show>.
- Wong, T.C., and Liu, R. (2017). Developmental urbanism, city image branding and the 'Right to the City' in transitional China. *Urban Policy and Research* 35 (2), 210-223.



# ICOA1042: LA VALEUR SOCIALE DU PATRIMOINE URBAIN. LES LIMITES DE LA MISE EN ŒUVRE DES RECOMMANDATIONS POUR LE PAYSAGE HISTORIQUE URBAIN DE SHANGAI

## Sous-thème 01: Intégrer le patrimoine et le développement urbain durable en engageant Diverses communautés pour la gestion du patrimoine

**Session 3:** Patrimoine mondial, Réglementations et directives, Authenticité et intégrité

**Lieu:** Hall Gulmohur, India Habitat Centre

**Date et heure:** 14 Décembre, 2017, 12:00 – 12:15

**Auteur:** Placido Gonzalez Martinez

*Professeur d'architecture et de planification urbaine, professeur associé, université de Tonghi. Editeur de la revue « Built Heritage ». Membre consultant du plan national espagnol pour la conservation du patrimoine du XXe siècle (Ministère de la culture). Membre scientifique de la direction de Docomomo-Espagne. Président de la 8eme conférence de Docomomo-Espagne (2013). Il est l'auteur de plus de 70 publications (livres, chapitres, articles de recherche). Son domaine de recherche est consacré au patrimoine et au développement urbain en Chine et aux paysages historiques urbains.*

**Résumé:** Des lumières et des ombres sont projetées sur les recommandations de l'UNESCO à propos du paysage historique urbain (Historic Urban Landscape HUL) depuis leur énoncé en 2011. Alors qu'une définition globale révèle une multitude de champs potentiels pour l'intervention et la gestion du patrimoine, une compréhension trop vague a compromis sa mise en œuvre effective.

Cet article propose de montrer l'écart conceptuel creusé entre la genèse des recommandations du HUL et le cadre théorique contemporain qui s'applique au patrimoine culturel, en se référant spécialement à la critique d'une approche basée sur des préjugés. Son but est de combler cet écart au moyen d'une nouvelle définition de l'authenticité, une qualité du patrimoine urbain qui a été curieusement négligée dans l'esquisse des recommandations et qui a besoin d'être réactivée dans le cadre de nos débats.

Cet article proposera une définition améliorée de ce concept, fixant comme prérequis la valeur sociale et l'accomplissement d'un certain « droit à la ville » pour authentifier le patrimoine contemporain. Prenant comme étude de cas le redéploiement urbain de la ville de Shanghai, cet article évaluera le potentiel d'une prise en compte des valeurs sociales comme référence pour la gestion du patrimoine urbain, ainsi que ses chances de réussite en face des habituels efforts de marketing et de propagande dans le but d'impulser une définition esthétique rénovée de Shanghai vue comme une ville moderne globale.

Un passage en revue de divers cas particuliers touchant à la gestion du patrimoine industriel et résidentiel montrera comment une perception restreinte de l'authenticité peut constituer, en revanche, un des plus grands facteurs potentiels de dynamisme pour un futur développement du patrimoine de la ville.

**Mots-clés:** communauté, durabilité, développement, équité