UNCHARTED

Understanding, Capturing and Fostering the Societal Value of Culture

The UNCHARTED project received funding under the Horizon 2020 Programme of the European Union

Grant Agreement number: 870793

Deliverable number	D1.2
Title	Analysis of the influence of urbanisation and social and spatial segregation in cities in the configuration of the values of culture

Due date	October 2020
Actual date of delivery to EC	30th October, 2020

Included (indicate as appropriate)	Executive Summary	☒	Abstract	☐	Table of Contents	☒

Project Coordinator:

Prof. Arturo Rodriguez Morató

Universitat de Barcelona

Email: rodriguez.morato@ub.edu

Technical Coordinator:
Antonella Fresa
Promoter S.r.l.
Email: fresa@promoter.it

Project WEB site address:

http://www.Uncharted-culture.eu

UNCHARTED

D1.2. Analysis of the influence of urbanisation and social and spatial segregation in cities in the configuration of the values of culture

Context:

Partner responsible for deliverable	University of Porto / ELTE
Deliverable author(s)	Eszter György, Gábor Oláh, João Teixeira Lopes, Sónia Apolinário, Lígia Ferro, Natália Azevedo
Deliverable version number	1
Dissemination Level	Public

Statement of originality:
This deliverable contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise. Acknowledgement of previously published material and of the work of others has been made through appropriate citation, quotation or both.

UNCHARTED

D1.2. Analysis of the influence of urbanisation and social and spatial segregation in cities in the configuration of the values of culture

TABLE OF CONTENTS

UNCHARTED

D1.2. Analysis of the influence of urbanisation and social and spatial segregation in cities in the configuration of the values of culture

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper takes into account the major paradigm changes in the recent urban development by focusing on the social processes of gentrification, touristification and segregation, and its consequences on urban heritage preservation. The adopted analytical perspective focuses on general values, practices and policies in the worlds of culture. Some important indicators of urbanism and tourism will be presented, followed by a final discussion on urban heritage in European cities.

In contemporary societies, culture and economy became intertwined in a complexity of values and roles. Urban landscapes are major reflections of such complexity, whether in urbanism or lifestyles. So, urban regeneration has been most permeable to neoliberal logics, and mostly characterized by gentrification. Initially observable in inner cities, gentrification has become a global and multi-scale territorial phenomenon. Urban spaces are also major hubs of human mobility, both of migrations and of recently growing tourism; these are multicultural places, where heritage, cultural industries and multi-ethnic neighbourhoods are now economic assets of tourism industry.

Cities are becoming a "brand", involved in powerful marketing campaigns, competing with each other in search for authenticity – but, paradoxically, prey to standardizing concepts and commercial strategies. In addition to the "mainstream tourism", today almost all major occidental cities have their "hipster" neighbourhoods, where the youngest and most qualified population meet the artists and "cultural tourists". This movement is tense and controversial. At the same time those houses, factories, or traditional markets are rehabilitated and transformed into artistic residences and cultural centres, public space is privatised, and the former popular residents and workers are expelled from these places.

Gentrification and touristification have become main characteristics of urban reconfiguration, creating socio-spatial segregation, as much as overtourism, as major concerning outcomes.

When it comes to the analysis of interrelations between urban heritage preservation and gentrification or socio-spatial segregation, it seems that heritage can not only act as an enabler on transformation of cultural spheres but with its increasingly important position in contemporary political and professional discourse on urban development, has major impacts on the above-mentioned urban configurations. Researchers claim that the current (third) cultural heritage regime offers a more complex notion of cultural heritage which moves from a conservation- or object-oriented approach to one that is value- or subject-oriented. The number of (urban) heritage sites is growing considerably, while due to the integration of the conceptual novelties of cultural heritage preservation (intangible heritage, cultural diversity, sustainability, resilience) the range of values to be preserved is expanding as well. The recent heritage discourses stress on the role of the local community and on the importance of participation in order to avoid such undesirable outcomes like gentrification. Meanwhile, when it comes to the heritage-protection or heritage making of more underprivileged historic neighbourhoods or cities, a great number of studies show that instead of the development of urban space, inequalities and segregational dynamics are reinforced.

UNCHARTED

D1.2. Analysis of the influence of urbanisation and social and spatial segregation in cities in the configuration of the values of culture

1. FOREWORD – THE VALUES OF CULTURE

Culture has, in contemporary societies, been assuming a growing role in several dimensions, with a corresponding widening of cultural values (Morató, 2010). If Heritage was, historically, a major cultural value in societies, its boundaries expanded to the current notion of Cultural Heritage, widely encompassing materiality and immateriality. Similarly, artistic creation expanded, from the classical subjects to a plurality of modes of expression, medias and techniques. Beyond classical arts, the aesthetics and cultural discourses and practices entered other fields, e.g., culinary, fashion, design, advertising, urbanism, tourism. In fact, culture is now closely linked to the economy. In the art world disappears the former dissociation between the logic of production and the logic of consumption (Harvey, 1989; Bourdieu, 1992; Moulin, 1992). This reality, or cultural order, is the so-called Society of Culture (Morató, 2007).

Cities are particularly rich places where societal transformations become visible and materialized in ever changing urban landscapes. Technical transformations in communications, along with the extreme mobility of tourism and migrations, are making cities, in almost all latitudes, more and more multicultural. Moreover, as societies became generally deindustrialized, cultural industries replaced many previous areas of economic activity in cities; creative industries, and cultural tourism as one of their spin-offs, are elements of an "economic exploitation of culture (…) based on the trading of symbolic meanings" (Evans & Foord, 2003:167-8).

A line of transformation in cultural policy, in the 20th century, brings light to these values shift: in the 1960s, the foundational cultural policy (André Malraux) is that of cultural democratization. In the 1970s, following the UNESCO Conference in Helsinki (1972), emerges the cultural democracy, in a valorisation of populations' identities. In the next decade, in a context of urban regeneration and economic promotion of territory, at the local level especially, the economic value of culture is then strengthened.

UNCHARTED

D1.2. Analysis of the influence of urbanisation and social and spatial segregation in cities in the configuration of the values of culture

2. SPATIAL AND SOCIAL (RE) CONFIGURATIONS - GENTRIFICATION AND TOURISTIFICATION

The concept of gentrification appeared in Ruth Glass' 1964 book about urban and social change in London. Later, it was most developed by Smith's Marxist approach of the "rent gap", in the context of emergent knowledge and services societies and new life-styles and consumption patterns (Smith, 1986; Lees, Slater, Wyly, 2010:xix).

Analysing the suburbanization processes, Smith (1986) states that the surge of a rent gap, relating to the disinvestment in inner cities, explains how these urban spaces were later the object of reinvestment of capital. If the restructuration of certain urban spaces responds to "aesthetic ideologies and lifestyles of gentrifiers" (Lees *et al.*, 2010:xix), Smith underscores the rationale of the contemporary capitalist economy, saying "Gentrification is a frontier on which fortunes are made".

Initially, the concept mirrored the circumscribed reality of "the transformation of a working-class or vacant area of the central city into middle-class residential or commercial use" (Lees, Slater and Wyly, 2008:xv). Though, it evolved from a marginal to a mainstream urban process, in what Smith calls "a global urban strategy" (Lees, et al., 2010:xv).

Gentrification is, according to several authors, a global capitalist phenomenon. Lees (2019:4) says it is a central element in the reproduction of capitalism. Brenner and Theodore have already analysed urban restructuring phenomena, mostly during 1980s and 1990s in North America and Western Europe, where "cities may be viewed as key politico-institutional arenas within the broader geographies of actually existing neoliberalism" (2002:367). They refer neoliberal forms of urban policy, specially through capital mobility, labour market flexibility and territorial competitiveness, acting in several levels of agency: supranational institutions (IMF, World Bank, GATT, OECD, European Commission); national mainstream political programs; and subnational scale of cities and city-regions.

The complexity and width of gentrification encompass several geographies: outside central city (rural/wilderness; suburban; slum; coastal), in different spatial scales (global; provincial; metropolitan; geo-economic competition between cities), in the city (super-gentrification; public housing; new-build; tourism gentrification; studentification) and recent types: retail gentrification, environmental/green gentrification, or, the cultural economy and gentrification (Lees *et al.*, 2010:xx; Lees, 2019:1).

If these territorial dynamics are actually capitalist or neoliberal in its essence, it is not surprising the emergence of gentrification resistance (Annunziata & Rivas-Alonso, 2019). Specifically, in the case of tourism gentrification (Cócola-Gant, 2019), protesters claim that touristic housing rental forces residents to live their neighbourhoods.

Urban spaces are also major hubs of human mobility, as migrations destinies and touristic attractions, which have intensified in this century. In the cities' geographies, the multicultural puzzle tends to aggregate specific and usually diverse ethnic groups and migrants in identifiable neighbourhoods – which carry, historically, social and economic stigma. Public policies and private intervention targeting these segregated environments have been applied since the 1980s in North America and European cities (Evans & Foord, 2003:168). Which set of values underlie those public initiatives and other urban regeneration processes, along inner city, industrial quarters and waterfront sites?

As mentioned, emergent values in cultural policies after the 1970s supported communities' identities, referred by Morató as "policies of diversity" (2010:44), specially at local level, aiming multicultural

UNCHARTED

D1.2. Analysis of the influence of urbanisation and social and spatial segregation in cities in the configuration of the values of culture

interrelations; on the other hand, occurred the multilateral capitalisation of culture within the economy of cities and communities. This duality of social and economic objectives can, as research vastly demonstrates, conflict with each other, not only due to a misrepresentation of these communities' cultures, but specially because economic principles tend to impose its rationale – sometimes reproducing socio-spatial segregations. Instrumental cultural policies, based on a social and economic functionalism of culture (Morató, 2010) are to be seen mainly in projects of territorial branding or "degraded" neighbourhoods regeneration, aiming new creative urban economies (Morató, 2010:47; Evans & Foord, 2003:169).

Evans and Foord (2003:173) distinguish three approaches to regeneration, regarding cultural diversity. It can be viewed as a problem to solve; as an opportunity (turning the "rich mix" of cultures into "new" cultural practices and products and profiting the existent labour force); or a resource (through *creative cities*, whose risks are sheer flagship art projects and property-led developments). These authors studied East London's case (Stepney neighbourhood), illustrative of "cultural diversity as a problem", and developed as "a culture/consumption/enterprise-led urban renaissance". The project assumed an inexistence of residents' cultural practices (mainly Bangladeshi Muslim migrants; Somalian refuges; aged white Europeans), which in fact happened in the informal spaces of the community and hadn't a "public face"– namely theatres, galleries, festivals. Moreover, the gentrified areas – the public park or the new housing – were not ideally suitable for the residents' general practices, values or living standards. Authors conclude (2003:168): "in certain circumstances the power to define culture meaning recreates social – and spatial – divisions in the name of regeneration".

Economic and aesthetic revalorisation of urban areas represents a complex dynamic also linked to tourism in cities, because cultural and leisure facilities and spaces attract touristic and cultural consumption. When associated with tourism, this is tourism gentrification. Taking ethnic difference as a resource for culture programmes and as part of the strategies to economic vitality - as much as heritage was first promoted – is sometimes the rationale for ethnic neighbourhoods' revitalization. First observed outside Europe – USA, Canada, Australia – and, more recently, all across Europe, ethnic neighbourhoods became touristic attractions, some of them specifically regenerated with touristic purposes (Rath & Hall, 2007; Evans & Foord, 2003). Aytar and Rath (2012:1) refer: "recent years have witnessed the rise of ethnic neighbourhoods – notably their shopping areas – as sites for tourism, leisure and consumption in cities around the world". Some examples are Banglatown in London, Klein Istanbul in Berlin, Quartier Indien in Paris, and countless Chinatowns in many cities.

Along with public and private agency, ethnic entrepreneurship plays also a very important role in the definition of these local economies (Rath & Hall, 2007; Aytar & Rath, 2012). It has been a source of self-employment and opportunities to people with or without qualifications, natives or immigrants, in many cultural and commercial activities – in a commodification process of cultural features like music, food, clothing or holydays. Naturally, Governments play also an important role supporting entrepreneurship through regulatory mechanisms.

As any social process, commodification of culture is potentiality conflictual among actors in play. East London, again, may be cited. Shaw and Bagwell (2012) illustrate how local community, especially the third-sector, resisted government and corporate-led efforts regarding ethnic branding of the neighbourhood (a similar situation happened in Perth: Jordan & Collins, 2012). However, this case also illustrates the creation of narratives of place – the metamorphosis of the "rag trade" into "London's Curry Capital" –, knitted by local government, business and civil society's alliances.

So, commodification of places and communities encompasses several actions of symbolic and instrumental character: strategies of re-imaging, performed by local and national authorities, often associated to identity

UNCHARTED

D1.2. Analysis of the influence of urbanisation and social and spatial segregation in cities in the configuration of the values of culture

narratives; and, the marketing of cultural "commodities" usually observable in the branding of cities, communities, and heritage, and intending to be competitive within culture and tourism industries. These intertwining between culture and economy may be called touristification, i.e., the transformation of culture (e.g., ethnicity) into "marketable commodities" (Novy, 2012; Mendes, 2018). The competition is observable also in the cities' governments applications for mobility infrastructures (air connections, high-speed train stations, cruise terminals). Rath and Hall clearly explain how deindustrialization processes are linked to urban tourism dynamics (2007:9):

> The growth of the urban tourism industry is intricately tied up with the rapid transformation of the manufacturing economy to an information economy and beyond. Deindustrialization resulted in a need for localities to differentiate themselves, in order to attract a share of the spatially mobile capital.

In world economy, tourism industry is one of the fastest growing sectors. Urban tourism has been dramatically growing, with deep consequences to life in cities. In 2018, two of the top three urban tourism destinations worldwide (measured in number of international overnight stays) were in Europe, and, London, Paris and Palma de Mallorca ranked in the top ten for overall international tourist expenditure (Amore, Falk and Adie, 2020:117). Overtourism is defined, by the United Nations World Tourism Organization (2018:4), as "the impact of tourism on a destination, or parts thereof, that excessively influences perceived quality of life of citizens and/or quality of visitors experiences in a negative way".

Excessive tourism became recently object of protesting in Barcelona and Mallorca (Annunziata & Rivas-Alonso, 2019), Amsterdam, Athens and Venice (Amore et al., 2020:122), or Porto (Barbosa & Lopes, 2020). Tourism gentrification is a most concerning feature in this scenario. Cócola-Gant (2016) describes the case of Barcelona – replicated in many other cities – where a "collective displacement" is substituting residential life for tourism in the city centre. As Lees remind (2019:8), Venice is already the dramatic example of a "dead city", with few residents left, because most property became used for tourism purposes. Since early 2000s there is a "snowball process" in Barcelona's historic centre, when entire apartment buildings were transformed into vacation flats. Progressive loss of residents, raising prices of housing and its scarcity – and loss of most residential conditions – excludes other potential residents from moving in, menacing the local community's reproduction. The main conclusion is the extent to which tourism can be a displacing process leading to urban inequalities, questioning public policy and the belief that tourism growth is inherently positive (Cócola-Gant, 2016:3-7).

Urban overtourism is also fuelled by liberalisation of air transport in Europe and recent diversification of leisure and hosting services (due to the sharing economy and social media) (Amore et al. 2020:118). Its impacts, and feeble destination planning, were reported by European Parliament (2018) as "significant damage to landscapes, seascapes, air and water quality, as well as the living conditions of residents".

As presented so far, social processes here in discussion generate some tensions among its actors: gentrification agents vs. displaced inhabitants; communities resisting ethnic commodification and neighbourhoods' touristification; or, inner cities' inhabitants against overtourism pressures. These are some of the tensions resulting from urban political economy and the politics of culture within urban areas.

UNCHARTED

D1.2. Analysis of the influence of urbanisation and social and spatial segregation in cities in the configuration of the values of culture

3. SPATIAL SEGREGATION AND OVERTOURISM - SOME INDICATORS OF LIFE IN CITIES

Socio-spatial segregation means clustering and isolation among communities. This is concerning when urban segregation entails unequal spatial distribution of different social groups - based on income, occupation, education, gender, ethnicity –, mostly differentiated by quality of life.

Statistics show that polarisation of wealth is most concentrated in urban areas; Eurostat reports that cities in Western Europe are among the least inclusive (due to relatively high shares of people living at risk of poverty and in low work intensity households, and/or high unemployment rates) – namely through the 2017 indicator "Proportion of the population at risk of poverty or social exclusion, by degree of urbanization" [1]. Housing is clearly a major variable connecting spatial segregation and poverty risks:

> In the majority of EU Member States, housing prices are growing faster than income. Overall, housing is the single highest expenditure (…), accounting for almost 25% of total EU household budgets in 2015 (…) Some major cities face a structural housing shortage with spiralling property prices and rent in high-demand areas. This is leading to a territorial divide (idem).

Regarding overtourism, the European Commission usually measures tourism pressures through an indicator of tourism intensity, defined as "number of overnight stays in relation to resident population" (important to analyse tourism sustainability). In 2014, "some of the most intense tourism pressures were recorded in cities around the Mediterranean coastline" (rates were higher in some of the smallest Member States, like Luxembourg and Malta) [2].

Amore et al. built a composite overtourism indicator intended to "look at key visitor indicators and the density of tourism activity in relation to surface, density and resident population", rather than focusing on negative perceptions among residents and visitors (2020). Applied in 2017 to 15 European cities, it revealed Venice as the city with the highest degree of overtourism, followed by Florence, Seville, Lisbon and Amsterdam; however, in several cities the overtourism potential is lower than expected (diverging from media's perception), meaning that all city users' opinions should be heard in planning processes (Amore et al., 2020:126).

Also for 2017, European Commission[3] reports, for the 27 countries, that one in ten enterprises in non-financial business economy belonged to tourism industries; and, more than half (56 %) of the enterprises in tourism industries were in Italy, France, Spain and Germany.

For 2018, statistics reveal that half of the total nights spent by non-residents in the EU were in Spain, Italy and France (Spain was the most common outbound destination in EU for travellers outside their countries: 23 % of the EU total nights spent). Finally, 64 % of EU residents made at least one personal tourism trip[4] .

---

[1] https://urban.jrc.ec.europa.eu/thefutureofcities/social-segregation#the-chapter .

[2] https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Urban_Europe_%E2%80%94_statistics_on_cities,_towns_and_suburbs_%E2%80%94_tourism_and_culture_in_cities

[3] https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Tourism_industries_-_economic_analysis

[4] https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Tourism_statistics

UNCHARTED

D1.2. Analysis of the influence of urbanisation and social and spatial segregation in cities in the configuration of the values of culture

4. IDENTIFYING GENTRIFICATION AND URBAN SEGREGATION AS THREATS IN THE HERITAGE DISCOURSES

At this point, the discussion takes into account the interrelations between heritage and gentrification or social segregation, and how heritage can act as an enabler on transformation of cultural spheres. Addressing the conceptual framework and the actual keywords in policy discourses, this final part reviews the mutual impact of heritage preservation and gentrification and focuses on urban segregation.

> It is important to recognise that the process of gentrification can affect communities and lead to the loss of a place's liveability and, ultimately, its character (ICOMOS, 2011).

The normative documents on urban heritage preservation always start with a list of threats which are becoming more diverse and complex (Sonkoly, 2017). By identifying gentrification as a major threat in the *Valletta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic Cities, Towns and Urban Areas* in 2011, it can be considered that the interconnection of heritage and gentrification has been progressively recognised and dealt with in international agreements and policy documents. The document argues that drastic shifts in real estate value and in social composition of the local population can be associated with the "heritagised neighbourhoods". The paradox fundamentally lies in the fact that while heritage has growing importance for urban communities in resistance, it simultaneously plays a significant role in the production of inequalities (Cesari & Herzfeld, 2015).

Gentrification has been a key concept in urban studies, and its intersection with the heritagisation process is a surprisingly overlooked topic (Cesari & Dimova, 2019). However, increasing attention is being paid to governmental and municipal strategies that promote tacitly or unambiguously gentrification through cultural developments, e.g., new facilities and events (Clerval & Fleury, 2009). Cesari and Dimova (2019) highlight the growing involvement of public authorities in these programmes, deeply untangled with local socio-economic development potentials, via tourism or creative economy, and inherently sustainable. When defining urban development goals, "revitalisation" or "revalorisation" are terms widely adopted, which at the operational level can be associated with the various modalities of spatial requalification, cultural investments or heritage management (Clerval & Fleury, 2009). Thus, it seems to be quite vague what the genuine objectives and who the real beneficiaries of these urban projects are.

The cultural consumption of urban heritage and its development by the real estate investors may be called "perverse effects of heritage industrialisation" (Choay, 1992:176); although international conventions effectively identified the primary threats to the historic centres (Nairobi Recommendations, 1976; Washington Charter, 1987), the enhancement of old neighbourhoods can produce secondary effects, e.g. population change or the loss of intangible cultural practices. Cities face issues like how to resist tourist flows or avoid "merchandising" historic centres, in the hope of developing degraded infrastructure.

Research reveals – as much as above referred about ethnic neighbourhoods – how urban interventions may be problematic. Based on anthropological field work - in Greece, Italy, Thailand – Herzfeld (2010) states how urban heritage preservation conflicts with housing rights, acting locally as dominant interpretation of history. Also Berglund and Gregory (2019) analyses gentrification as "curated experiences of authenticity" (p. 117), identifying values associated with nostalgia or authenticity, within certain strategies intending to hide traumatic pasts or disadvantaged population, in order to transform them into consumable urban life.

UNCHARTED

D1.2. Analysis of the influence of urbanisation and social and spatial segregation in cities in the configuration of the values of culture

Finally, Beeksma and Cesari (2019), examining the participatory method of Amsterdam's Van Eesteren Museum in a gentrifying neighbourhood, observed how higher-prestige social groups were actively involved in the participatory heritage practices, while disadvantaged groups with diverse background were left out; the intention of creating "affected citizenship" via participatory heritage leads again to the questions of who has the "right to the city", which heritage remains invisible and which is included in the local or national canon. Zukin (1987) has already pointed the appropriation of urban space, by imaginative reconstruction of gentrifying neighbourhoods' pasts.

How is urban heritage being approached? Bandarin and van Oers (2012) reminds the role of values underlying discourses on preservation; in fact, understanding the constant demand for reinterpretation of values associated with urban heritage, clarifies how certain cultural values are constructed. Nasser (2003) defined three leading objectives along the urban preservation's history: 1) the physical, relating the protection of building (unit)s; 2) the spatial, considering heritage a holistic entity, linked to townscape concepts; 3) the social, concerning the primary users of heritage (local community, its identity and practices). If the latter dimension is essential to maintain "urban life" or *genius loci*, it is mostly neglected by heritage-led rehabilitation projects; thus, heritage discourse tries to overcome this gap by promoting the sense of ownership of local community under the aegis of participation, namely with the concept of Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) (Sonkoly, 2017). This notion appeared in 2005 (UNESCO's Resolution on development of historic cities), and in 2011, the Recommendation on HUL reflects on how cultural diversity affects values and approaches to conservation (integrating natural and cultural factors in the conservation of the built environment, the increasing role of the historic city to arts and creative industries, and sustainability of heritage conservation). HUL has been a tool to integrate policies and practices of urban conservation (Bandarin & van Oers, 2012), even if heritagization of cities has started in 1972 with UNESCO's *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*.

What is the relationship between urban heritage and socio-spatial segregation? Despite the emphasis on cultural diversity and pluralistic values on the level of EU and UNESCO discourses, the nomination of a world heritage site or other heritage-making processes of more deprived historic urban areas led to gentrification and to an exclusionary understanding of cultural heritage and values, favouring tourists and middle class inhabitants instead of the local population – as following examples demonstrate.

Analysing Naples' regeneration – which he extrapolates to southern Europe –, Dines (2016) states that, besides public rhetoric of "multicultural spirit", the newly public space was imagined as a contact zone between civic-minded and culturally conscious citizens and tourists, neglecting the underprivileged migrant communities.

In American continent, two cases are illustrative of gentrified touristic neighbourhoods with eviction of local populations. Cartagena de Indias (Colombia) and Casco Antiguo (Panama City), UNESCO World Heritage sites respectively in 1984 and 1997 (Espino, 2015; Silva, Ospina-Tascón & Ristic, 2019). Silva et al. prove that, even though on the level of discourses, the originally "Western" concept of heritage evolved through the years toward a more pluralistic and inclusive notion (comprehending both tangible and intangible heritage, and a growing recognition of minority heritage), the heritagization in Cartagena represented the protection and revival of the colonial heritage and the demolition of the local Afro-heritage.

Finally, in European cultural capitals, the cultural regeneration of urban areas often led to disparities between the interests of local residents and investors (Gunay, 2010; Nylund, 2001).

In conclusion, as Cesari and Dimova (2019) state, heritagisation turns neglected and stigmatised historic city

UNCHARTED

D1.2. Analysis of the influence of urbanisation and social and spatial segregation in cities in the configuration of the values of culture

boroughs (traditionally inhabited by often racialised working classes, ethnic minorities, immigrants) into desirable places for white middle-class people, therefore:

> heritage-led regeneration is increasingly remaking cities, but empirical evidence points not to development for all but rather to evictions, displacements, and growing racial and class inequalities (p. 864).

5. CONCLUSIONS

This paper discusses several processes of the "Society of Culture", specifically focused on urban spaces. If there are several levels of cultural values in presence – intrinsically artistic, social and economic –, it has been the economic ones that have, in last decades, became dominant. In a capitalist rationale, it led to a widespread capitalisation of culture in its several dimensions: arts or material heritage; culture in the anthropological meaning of communities' practices, either material or immaterial (like music, gastronomy, symbols of identity); and, cultural and creative industries, often globalized (music, cinema, new medias, fashion, advertising). As Yúdice (2002) states, culture is a resource, widely mobilized for urban development, tourism, leisure and cultural consumption. Being mainly approached in a commodification logic, culture becomes most colonized by marketing and branding techniques, and manoeuvred within merchandising competition.

In cities, touristification and gentrification foster a culture of spectacle and consumerism, taken as a resource of city marketing. If, in a way, this opens some possibilities to cultural entrepreneurship and culture and creative industries, however, it does not facilitate more experimental and independent cultural circles or those with difficult access to market(s). Moreover, the globalized feature of culture industries creates what Featherstone (1995) refer as "third cultures", because global culture acts as a transnational reality beyond both nationality and locality.

Regarding cultural diversity in cities, it is visible the use of cultural and ethnic diversity as mere appearance or tokenism, or even a mobilization of multiculturalism as a "city discourse" at local government level - when in fact, persists feeble incorporation of interculturality as production of "hybrid cultures", as Canclini (1990) puts it. Even multicultural heritage discourses of the supranational entities are contradicted in the actual practices of urban regeneration and management.

So, public spaces in cities tend to follow a logic of "fiction urbanism" – in a generic and little complex set of contents – which reflects into cultural offer supported either by the state or by private sector. Contemporary urban scenarios suffer the "spectacularisation of the real" (reminding Débord's concept, 1971), and mostly characterised by artificial recreation of history and symbols.

For all these reasons, tensions become inevitable within urban spaces, as populations are evicted from their neighbourhoods in consequence of housing or tourism gentrification, and the history and social life of cities' centres are becoming commercial assets. As a signal of these inequalities, emerging resistance movements of citizens for housing rights are observable in several European cities – demonstrations, graffitis and urban art manifestations become new signs of the major spatial and social divides.

UNCHARTED

D1.2. Analysis of the influence of urbanisation and social and spatial segregation in cities in the configuration of the values of culture

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY AND WEBOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alföldi, G., Benkő, M., & Sonkoly, G. (2019). Managing Urban Heterogeneity: A Budapest Case Study of Historical Urban Landscape. In Roders, A. P. & Bandarin, F. (Eds.), *Reshaping Urban Conservation* (pp. 149–166). Singapore: Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-8887-2_8

Amore, A., Martin Falk, M., Adie. B. (2020). One visitor too many: Assessing the degree of overtourism in established European urban destinations. *International Journal of Tourism Cities*, 6 (1), 117-137.

Annunziata, S. & Rivas-Alonso, C. (2019). Resisting gentrification. In Lees. L. & Phillips, M. (Eds.) *Handbook of Gentrification Studies* (pp. 393-412). Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Arrigoitia, M. F. (2019). The Gentrification of Public Housing. In Lees, L. & Phillips, M. (Eds.). *Handbook of Gentrification Studies* (pp. 262-280). Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Aytar, V. & Rath, J. (Eds.). (2012). *Selling Ethnic Neighborhoods: The Rise of Neighborhoods as Places of Leisure and Consumption*. New York: Routledge.

Bandarin, F. & van Oers, R. (2012). *The Historic Urban Landscape: Managing Heritage in an Urban Century*. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119968115

Barbosa, I. & Lopes, J. T. (2020). "O Porto não se vende": resistências à gentrificação através da produção artística no período pós-austeritário. *Cadernos de Arte e Antropologia*, 9(2), 67-73. https://doi.org/10.4000/cadernosaa.3201

Beeksma, A., & Cesari, C. D. (2019). Participatory heritage in a gentrifying neighbourhood: Amsterdam's Van Eesteren Museum as affective space of negotiations. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *25*(9), 974–991. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2018.1509230

Berglund, L. & Gregory, S. (2019). Introduction: The aesthetics of neighborhood change. *Journal of Cultural Geography*, *36*(2), 117–120. https://doi.org/10.1080/08873631.2019.1595915

Bourdieu, P. (1992). *Les Règles de l'Art*. Paris: Seuil.

Brenner, N. & Theodore, N. (2002). Cities and the geographies of actually existing neoliberalism. In Brenner, N. & Theodore, N. (Eds.). *Spaces of neoliberalism: Urban restructuring in North America and Western Europe* (pp.21-32). Oxford: Blackwell. Retrieved from https://courses.helsinki.fi/sites/default/files/course-material/4682372/brenner_theodore_2002.pdf

Bunce, S. (2019). Alternatives to gentrification: exploring urban community land trusts and urban ecovillage practices. In Lees, L. & Phillips, M. (Eds.). *Handbook of Gentrification Studies* (pp. 412-427). Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Canclini, N. G. (1990). *Culturas Híbridas. Estrategias para Entrar y Salir de la Modernidad*. Miguel Hidalgo, Ciudad de México: Editorial Grijalbo.

Cesari, C. D. & Dimova, R. (2019). Heritage, gentrification, participation: Remaking urban landscapes in the name of culture and historic preservation. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *25*(9), 863–869. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2018.1512515

Cesari, C. D. & Herzfeld, M. (2015). Urban Heritage and Social Movements. In Meskell, L. (Ed.), *Blackwell readers in anthropology* (Vol.12). Wiley Blackwell. Retrieved from

UNCHARTED

D1.2. Analysis of the influence of urbanisation and social and spatial segregation in cities in the configuration of the values of culture

https://dare.uva.nl/personal/pure/en/publications/urban-heritage-and-social-movements(c988e7b0-4bb5-42e7-b2c5-a949c41e82ff).html

Choay, F. (1992). *L'allégorie du patrimoine*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Clerval, A. & Fleury, A. (2009). Politiques urbaines et gentrification, une analyse critique à partir du cas de Paris. *L'Espace Politique*, (8). https://doi.org/10.4000/espacepolitique.1314

Cócola-Gant, A. (2016). Holiday rentals: The new gentrification battlefront. *Sociological Research Online*, 21(3), 19. DOI: 10.5153/sro.4071

Cócola-Gant, A. (2019). Tourism Gentrification. In Lees, L. & Phillips, M. (Eds.). *Handbook of Gentrification Studies* (pp.281-293). Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Débord, G. (1971). *La Société du Spectacle*. Paris: Éditions Champ Libre

Dines, N. (2016). From 'southern' to 'ordinary': Conceptualizing and contextualizing segregation in public space in southern European cities. *Méditerranée*, (127), 101–108. https://doi.org/10.4000/mediterranee.8480

Espino, N. A. (2015). *Building the Inclusive City: Theory and Practice for Confronting Urban Segregation* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315747491

European Parliament (2018). Research for TRAN Committee - *Overtourism: Impact and Possible Policy Responses*. Strasbourg: European Parliament.

EUROSTAT (2016). *Urban Europe statistics on cities, towns and suburbs*. Luxembourg: Publications office of the European Union.

Evans, G. & Foord, J. (2003). Shaping the cultural landscape: Local regeneration effects. In Miles, M. & Hall. T. (Eds.). *Urban Future: Critical Commentaries on Shaping Cities*. London: Routledge.

Featherstone, M. (1995). *Undoing Culture. Globalization, Postmodernism and Identity*. London: Sage Publications.

Gunay, Z. (2010). Conservation versus Regeneration?: Case of European Capital of Culture 2010 Istanbul. *European Planning Studies*, *18*(8), 1173–1186. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654311003791234

Harvey, D. (1989). *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Henriques, C. H. (2020). Lisbon Historic Quarters: Identity vs. Overtourism. In Almeida, C. R. de; Quintano, A.; Simancas. M.; Huete, R. & Breda, Z. (eds.). *Handbook of Research on the Impacts, Challenges, and Policy Responses to Overtourism* (pp. 285-301). DOI: 10.4018/978-1-7998-2224-0.ch015

Herzfeld, M. (2010). Engagement, Gentrification, and the Neoliberal Hijacking of History. *Current Anthropology*, *51*(S2), S259–S267. https://doi.org/10.1086/653420

ICOMOS. (2011). *The Valletta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic Cities, Towns and Urban Areas. Adopted by the 17th ICOMOS General Assembly on 28 November 2011*. Retrieved from https://www.icomos.org/Paris2011/GA2011_CIVVIH_text_EN_FR_final_20120110.pdf

Jordan, K. & Collins, J. (2012). Symbols of Ethnicity in a Multi-ethnic Precinct: Marketing Perth's Northbridge for Cultural Consumption. In Aytar, V. & Rath, J. (Eds.). *Selling Ethnic Neighborhoods: The Rise of Neighborhoods as Places of Leisure and Consumption (pp.* 120 - 137*).* New York: Routledge.

UNCHARTED

D1.2. Analysis of the influence of urbanisation and social and spatial segregation in cities in the configuration of the values of culture

Lees, L., Slater, T., Wyly, E. (2008). *Gentrification*. New York: Routledge.

Lees, L., Slater, T., Wyly, E. (Ed.). (2010). *The Gentrification Reader*. London: Routledge.

Lees, L. (2019). Towards a C21st global gentrification studies. In Lees, L. & Phillips, M. (Eds.). *Handbook of Gentrification Studies* (pp. 1-9). Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Lees, L. & Phillips, M. (Eds.) (2019). *Handbook of Gentrification Studies*. Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Mendes, L. (2018) Tourism Gentrification in Lisbon. The panacea of touristification as a scenario of post-capitalist crisis. In David, I. (Ed.) *Crisis, Austerity and Transformations: How Disciplinary Neoliberalism is Changing Portugal* (pp. 25-46). London: Lexington Books.

Morató, A. R. (2007). La perspectiva de la sociedad de la cultura. In Morató, A. R. (Org.). *La Sociedad de la Cultura*. Barcelona: Ariel.

Morató, A. R. (2010). A metamorfose do valor cultural na sociedade contemporânea: Desafios e paradoxos. In Santos M. L. dos & Pais, J. M. (Orgs.). *Novos Trilhos Culturais. Práticas e Políticas* (pp. 37-50). Lisboa: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais.

Moulin, R. (1992). *L'Artiste, l'Institution et le Marché*. Paris: Flammarion.

Nasser, N. (2003). Planning for Urban Heritage Places: Reconciling Conservation, Tourism, and Sustainable Development: *Journal of Planning Literature*, *17*(4), 467–479. (world). https://doi.org/10.1177/0885412203017004001

Novy, J. (2012). Urban Ethnic Tourism in New York's Neighbourhoods: Then and Now. In Aytar, V. & Rath, J. (Eds.). *Selling Ethnic Neighborhoods: The Rise of Neighborhoods as Places of Leisure and Consumption (pp.* 16-33*).* New York: Routledge.

Nylund, K. (2001). Cultural Analyses in Urban Theory of the 1990s. *Acta Sociologica*, *44*(3), 219–230. https://doi.org/10.1080/000169901750528340

Rath, J. & Hall. M. C. (2007). Tourism, migration and place advantage in the global cultural economy. In Rath, J. & Hall, M. C. (Eds.). *Tourism, Ethnic diversity and the City* (pp. 1-24). New York: Routledge.

Sequera, J. & Nofre, J. (2019). Touristification, transnational gentrification and urban change in Lisbon: The neighbourhood of Alfama. *Urban Studies.* Doi.org/10.1177/0042098019883734

Shaw, S. & and Bagwell, S. (2012). Ethnic Minority Restaurateurs and the Regeneration of 'Banglatown' in London's East End. *In* Aytar, V. & Rath, J. (Eds.). *Selling Ethnic Neighborhoods: The Rise of Neighborhoods as Places of Leisure and Consumption (pp. 34-51).* New York: Routledge.

Silva, C. A. V., Ospina-Tascón, J. J., & Ristic, M. (2019). Heritage as a mediator of socio-spatial segregation. In M. Ristic & S. Frank (Eds.), *Urban Heritage in Divided Cities* (1st ed., pp. 162–172). Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429460388-10

Smith, N. (2007) [1986]. Gentrification, the frontier, and the restructuring of urban space. In Smith, N. & Williams, P. *Gentrification of the City*. London: Routledge.

Sonkoly, G. (2017). *Historical Urban Landscape*. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-49166-0

UNCHARTED

D1.2. Analysis of the influence of urbanisation and social and spatial segregation in cities in the configuration of the values of culture

Steele, J. (2019). Self-renovating neighbourhoods as an alternative to gentrification or decline. In Lees, L. & Phillips, M. (Eds.). *Handbook of Gentrification Studies* (pp. 467-480). Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.

United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). (2018). *'Overtourism'? Understanding and Managing Urban Tourism Growth beyond Perceptions*. Madrid: UNWTO.

Yúdice, G. (2002). *El recurso de la cultura. Usos de la cultura en la era global*. Barcelona: Editorial Gedisa.

Zukin, S. (1987). Gentrification: Culture and Capital in the Urban Core. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *13*(1), 129–147. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.13.080187.001021

WEBOGRAPHY

https://urban.jrc.ec.europa.eu/thefutureofcities/social-segregation#the-chapter

https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Urban_Europe_%E2%80%94_statistics_on_cities,_towns_and_suburbs_%E2%80%94_poverty_and_social_exclusion_in_cities

https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/environment-and-health/Housing-and-health/activities/housing-and-urban-inequalities

https://www.oecd.org/publications/divided-cities-9789264300385-en.htm

https://ec.europa.eu/growth/tools-databases/vto/

https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/tourism/publications

https://composite-indicators.jrc.ec.europa.eu/cultural-creative-cities-monitor/

http://business.turismodeportugal.pt/pt/Conhecer/Oportunidades_UE/recursos-UE/Paginas/virtual-tourism-observatory.aspx