Introduction — Heritage as a Phantasmagoria of the 'Good City' in New Capitalistic Times[1]

Michel Rautenberg
(University of Sant Etienne, France)
michel.rautenberg@univ-st-etienne.fr

Deindustrialisation, white middle-class flight, demographic decrease, independent retail shops replaced by commercial chains, migrant inflow, 'social exclusion and unequal access to socio-economic opportunities' but also 'uncontrolled mass tourism', and 'rapid urban development', 'impact dramatically on the conservation and management of urban heritage' (Labadi and Logan eds 2016: 1). Since the 1970s, heritage policies and local economic development are in a particularly dramatic dialectic in cities, which are now considered as the core of the economic and social mutation of the world (Sassen 1991, Harvey 1989). Confronted with the massive destruction of monuments and vernacular landscapes that followed World War II, international frameworks have emerged in the last quarter of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century. Among the latest initiatives is the 2011 UNESCO Recommendations for Historic Urban Landscape (HUL), which enshrine the passage from an emphasis on the conservation of monuments to the management of urban heritage as an environment made of buildings but also of people, values, qualities and practices.

Unlike what happened in most countries across the world (Labadi and Logan eds 2016), from the 1980s urban planners, architects and engineers working in European cities began to develop new governmental models that favoured the 'project' over older bureaucratic models (Le Galès 2003). They did not turn their back on economic interests and political issues; actually, their approach became central in the ideological frame of the 'entrepreneurial turn' that emerged during the 1980s (Harvey 1989). Sometimes they defended utopian ideas in line with those of William Morris (Choay 2006) or Patrick Geddes (*Espaces et sociétés* 2016). In every continent, from the old French and British industrial cities (Labadi 2016) to the African neo-colonial and Asian metropolises that used heritage for branding their identities (M. P. Smith and Bender 2001), heritage plays a significant role in the specialisation of the global market by enhancing tourism and giving value to property assets (Boltanski and Esquere 2017: 455-455). Moreover, Boltanski and Esquere argue that heritage is becoming an important lever of enrichment, as it further enhances the wealth of landowners. Heritage is also mobilised in sustainable development projects because it is considered essential in terms of culture; that is, the fourth pillar of sustainability (Auclair and Fairclough eds 2015: 6). In this case, we can speak of 'sustainable heritage', which concerns a large number of social actors in sustainable cities (Rojas 2016). There, heritage arises from empowerment policies and supports social

---

cohesion by contributing to enhance the 'common' (Auclair 2015: 37). Yet, the commitment of inhabitants and various social actors who know local places and contribute to transforming their towns has often been neglected. Inhabitants had to struggle for their opinions to be heard even in the case of France's 'new towns' built in the 1970s as part of a planning policy aimed at implementing some of the democratic utopias of May 1968 (Rautenberg 2017).

Heritage in the 'New Capitalism'[2]

The effects of the International Heritage Convention, which seeks to fulfil the UNESCO's ultimate utopian goal of producing 'peace in the world of men' (Di Giovine 2015: 83) and the optimism of professionals and urban consultants must be considered carefully. This is clearly illustrated by the case of Ciudad de Mallorca where inheritance has helped to move the old working-class population into new urban classes (Morell 2011). Since the signing of the 1972 UNESCO Convention, and even more so since the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, heritage has been associated, for better or for worse, with the question of identity connected with the ideas of participation, emancipation, defence of indigenous peoples, cultural rights and, finally, the rediscovery of local commitments. This heritage policy, led by major international organisations, is not without great ambivalence. On the one hand, it involves the support for an almost counter-hegemonic defence of the communities; on the other hand, it is inspired by a neo-liberal ideological model of heritage preservation that brings about its commodification (Adell et al. 2015).

This model is evident in the ongoing transformations of capitalism and its 'cultural turn' (Thrift 2005). Not all places and activities are equally concerned, and not in the same way. Old industrial areas seem to be particularly affected when work activities switch to heritage for entertainment, leading to a deep destructuring of the working class communities (Dicks 2000).The 'capitalist class transfers value from its producers to itself, and in the process creates the deindustrialised zones of Europe, with attempts made to transform former industrial areas into artistic sites in an illusion of creativity' (Durrenberger 2018: 303). 'In this postmodern neoliberal world [...] illusion begets illusion. Soon we are unmoored from any reality, afloat in a sea of postmodern imagery' (Durrenberger 2018: 304). Fortunately, Durrenberger concludes his dark prophecies with a call to resist as humans, therefore as social creatures, to the neoliberal world that is developing before our eyes (2018: 318). As an anthropologist of work, he can be pessimistic when seeing the deep and rapid disqualification of manual and salaried workers. However, in today's anthropocene era, new social practices, forms of resistances and utopias are on the rise. Heritage can potentially transform politics by restoring an anthropological time in a situation where flexible capitalism and neoliberal politics have domesticated human time on the altar of financial profitability, where the trend is to convert citizens into simple consumers. Thus, heritage can revitalise democracy and citizenship (Tornatore 2017)

---

[2] The expression 'new capitalism' has been developed by Sennett (2006). Other related expressions exist, including 'late capitalism', 'post-industrial capitalism', and so on.

David Harvey (1990) notes that many authors have pointed out that the last third of the 20th century has been characterised by a big shake up in culture as well as in economics. The 'late capitalism' that arose after the decrease of the Ford-Keynesian capitalism of the post-war boom implied more flexible labour, more competition, the market as a quasi-religion, more mobility and more consumption practices in more and more sectors of human activity. Working men and women, who constituted not only the workforce but also a main section of citizenry, have lost their pivotal place in production. Many have become more vulnerable, 'being de-unionised and unable to forge a "class in itself" solidarity, [...] and they are unwittingly led to a grey area regarding their work identity and life trajectory' (Spyridakis 2018: 3). The living standard of a large proportion of middle-class people is stagnating while capitalists get richer and richer. Social capitalism has become a 'nostalgic memory' (Sennett 2006: 37) embodied in derelict industrial plants, old workers' neighbourhoods and all kinds of more or less scientific collection that express the memory of a time when society was supposed to be more protective and reassuring, a time when people kept the control of time and when personal skills were wealth. The legacy of a popular culture that was intimately connected with manufacturing and of the class relations that structured workers' relationship with the industrial enterprise becomes a political and societal issue that takes different forms; such as, alter-heritagisation versus metropolisation, a commitment to oppose a city centre's gentrification, the symbolic revival of the working class through artistic events or mural paintings and a renewal of concrete utopias.

Gentrification, Local Governmentality and Heritagisation

We are witnessing a profound transformation of cities under the strong pressure of capitalism on real estate. Many academics, activists and professionals have written about the tight connections in contemporary cities between gentrification, urban renewal and politics of the past.[3] Jane Jacobs was probably the first well-known activist and scholar who loudly denounced the collusion between real estate interests and urban policies. She posited that investors would wait until real estate prices reached a low point before taking advantage of the opportunity for investment (Jacobs 1969). In an invigorating article, Tom Slater recalls that the topic of gentrification has a long history in the social sciences. Long before the seminal *Gentrification of the City* (N. Smith 1986), the American sociologist Ruth Glass pointed out the links between housing and class struggle in London. Back in 1964 she used the term 'gentrification' in order to describe 'the displacement of working-class occupiers by middle class incomers' (Slater 2011: 571). For two or three decades, gentrification generated abundant international literature but also led to class struggles and urban social movements. For Slater 'Gentrification commonly occurs in urban areas where prior disinvestment in the urban infrastructure creates opportunities for profitable redevelopment, where the needs and concerns of business and policy elites are

---

[3] Urban heritage gave rise to many publications. It would be very pretentious to attempt here a synthesis. For very recent examples, the interested reader can refer to several articles in *The Palgrave Handbook of Urban Ethnography*, edited by Italo Pardo and Giuliana B. Prato (2018); in particular, Graezer-Bideau (2018), Rautenberg (2018) and Giordano (2018).

met at the expense of urban residents affected by work instability, unemployment, and stigmatisation. It also occurs in those societies where a loss of manufacturing employment and an increase in service employment have led to expansion in the number of middle-class professionals with a disposition towards central city living and an associated rejection of suburbia' (Slater 2011: 572). The main input of her review is that gentrification is 'an intrinsic part of something much larger than residential rehabilitation' (2011: 572). Three themes dominate:1) Production-side versus consumption-side explanations. 2) The role of the 'new middle-class' 3) The costs of gentrification today and in the future.[4] We shall look at the first two themes in the following pages. But before we do so, we need to look at another approach to gentrification that impacted on French scholarship.

In the 1990s, the French sociologist and political scientist Patrick Le Gallès proposed to reconnect with the Weberian tradition by considering that European cities are now major collective actors capable of dealing with states (Le Gallès 2003: 24). During the Fordist era, they were large, vertically integrated organisations; Weberian-style 'bureaucracies' marked Fordist enterprises, mass unions and political parties. In the 1980s, western European states began to delegate to urban élites the definition and implementation of planning policies. This was coupled with a renewal of urban planning and economic development which involved the renewal of historic neighbourhoods and industrial buildings as opposed to dismantling the old areas (Pinson 2009:10). Long-term planning promoted by the state was replaced by more pragmatic policies of cities' governments; preference was given to local networks mixing private and public actors rather than to top-down decisions and to 'urban projects' rather than to 'urban planning'. Urban marketing appeared as a new mantra for many cities, and many actions were evaluated according to visibility and concrete results. In the following pages we will observe several ways in which heritage is mobilised in urban marketing, in Paris suburbs, Lyon, Strasbourg and Saint-Etienne. In this context, cities have become major governance actors, extending well beyond their own areas. At least in Europe, cities began to embody both the 'change of scale of governmentality' and 'the transformations of the forms of public action' (Pinson 2009: 18). This evolution has affected the urban activism of cities, which can be acknowledged and used as a resource rather than a protest with its self-organising or 'DIY' (do-it-yourself) ethos. For more and more urban policies, activism appears less oriented towards protesting against something than to transforming cities at the level of everyday experience (Berglund and Peipinen 2018).

Heritage has become an important tool of urban policies because it allows easy mobilisation of communities, giving sense to collective action and shaping images and discourses toward citizens and tourist operators. I should also add that this new governmentality is not so far from some precepts of sustainable development that promote collective action, incremental and deliberative approaches in the public decisions, cooperation with social actors

---

[4] She concludes arguing for scholars' commitment and a policy aimed at avoiding forced rehousing operations that push popular classes away from the city centres.

in working on new projects. Citizens' confidence and the enhancement of social capital are supposed to be key notions of these policies. At the same time, political leadership has not disappeared. It deals with traditional instruments of political regulation, such as authority or hierarchy, and new ones, such as trust, identity, market, competition and social capital. Public action is conducted by a more social and networking regulation. According to Pinson, collective action can take forms very similar to project approach, encouraging interaction, in a given context, among the public sphere, the social sphere and the market sphere. The current post-Fordist period comes with disintegration of vertical forms of organisation and the development of networks, the promotion of the autonomy of the components of large organisations, the promotion of internal competition within organisations, the substitution of hierarchical relations with relations of trust and the promotion of internal identities to ensure social regulations. The relationships between the state and local governments are deeply impacted by these new modes of organising human action (Pinson 2009: 33).

However, more attention needs to be paid both to the problematic of the implementation process and to the adaptation of these tools to specific contexts. Only in this way the benefits that urban policies can bring to citizenship can be fully appreciated (DeVivo 2013: 24). The literature emphasises that great attention has been paid to the revaluation and possible exploitation of the old city centres, also in cultural terms. More generally, the economic infrastructures for competitiveness are supposed to be concentrated in cities. However, there are counter-examples that show the limits of this model. Unlike Italian cities like Milan, Turin and Rome, which are driving the national economic development, Naples 'is completely cut off from the network which at the national level link the most strategic large Italian cities' (DeVivo 2013: 29). Naples faces a twofold challenge, between the necessary adaptation to a globalised and competitive economy and managing its human resources and weak physical infrastructure (Pardo 1996). The conservation of extremely rich historical heritage is a very relevant illustration. On the one hand, heritage is a very good tourism resource that could provide important income. On the other hand, there is 'the lack of an effective communication policy on the part of the administration, as well as its inability to mobilise the residents to take an active role in carrying out the project' (DeVivo 2013: 35) to regenerate the historic centre that was declared a UNESCO World Heritage Site in 1995. Actors did not share the same interest and did not have the same weight and power, 'citizens as a collective actor' fluctuated from one party to another, the business community was split, different interest-groups such as trade-unions or political parties made different demands, as did environmental groups engaged in sustainability. It must be stressed that the success of this kind of participative project depends on how it is managed. 'The City government can play a key role in so far as it is able both to mediate the different interests at stake and to enforce the "rules of the game" to which all actors must abide' (DeVivo 2013: 37). This is what we will see in most of the papers that follow, particularly in Strasbourg and in Plaine Commune (near Paris), where the local governments are very proactive in heritage making.

Still, the project approach exposed by Le Gallès and by Pinson does raise certain questions. It favours urban élites who often share the same representations of the city and have similar professional practices that reinforce the marginalisation of the popular classes. Elites and middle classes weave direct links with municipal administrations in order to gentrify their neighbourhood at the expense of the old working-class inhabitants and the migrants with whom they cohabit. This process has been very well described for Ciutad de Mallorca by Franquesa and Morell (2005), who show how promoting neighbourhoods in old industrial places became an instrument for urban policies, which is called 'the Snake and the Ladder'. In the capital city of Majorca, power moved from local government to local governance by incorporating business agents of the 'third sector'. The consequence is 'the emphasis on place rather than on territory that is linked to the adoption of neighbourhood scale' and 'goes hand in hand with a new political discourse that stresses cultural questions and the idea of participation and citizen involvement' (Franquesa and Morell 2005: 197). Franquesa and Morell suggest that one effect consists in 'encapsulating the neighbourhood' through top-down and bottom-up processes (2005: 195). The top down practised by the public authorities encapsulates neighbourhood through the downscaling of particular urban policies from the corridors of public power: this is the 'snake' (ibid: 195). But this 'encapsulation can only take place if it is connected to the strategies of certain agents that use these snakes to put up their "ladders" and scale positions in the network of public power' (ibid: 196). In fact, 'neighbourhood planning not only serves public and market powers snaking down their strategies. It also offers opportunities for particular local leaders to put up the ladders that allow them to consolidate their power' (ibid: 216).

This policy values land rent; more precisely, it reconciles land tenure to the apparent preservation of vernacular urban landscapes. Heritage is thus at the service of urban renewal. It fully plays its role within the proactive approaches promoted by urban renewal professionals, approaches that are supposed to associate the inhabitants with the renovation of their streets and their neighbourhoods. However, these local policies create new distinctions among the inhabitants, separating the new ones who wish to live in the old renovated and increasingly expensive neighbourhoods from the old ones of the lower classes who will be relocated to new buildings at the periphery. This gentrified urban heritage is, thus, built without the people who provided its anthropological value, against the old inhabitants who are dispossessed of their living environment.

Global Phenomena, Local Occurrences

Beyond the theories, the ethnography of gentrified neighbourhoods accounts for sometimes contrasting and often complex situations. Brooklyn, NYC, is a seminal example of this complexity (DeSena and Krase 2015). Jerome Krase and Judith N. DeSena, who have done sociological research and social activism from the late 20th century until today in several neighbourhoods in Brooklyn, have detailed the city's gentrification process in time and space

(Krase and DeSena 2016).[5] According to their long-term ethnography, gentrification dislocates local communities and lessens support for the poor, such as public housing. As for residential displacement, they show how rent regulations are failing to protect inhabitants from the effects of gentrification. Gentrification started in the mid-1970s following a well-known process. For about two to three decades, from the 1960s to the 1980s, Brooklyn suffered a severe economic, social and demographic crisis. It experienced the spread of the middle-class flight that had begun in the 1960s, the race riots of 1964 that highlighted the racial injustice and growing civil unrest and the fiscal crisis of NYC in 1975. In response, mayors like Michael Bloomberg sought to reshape both the physical and the social landscape of NYC. Luxury housing development and loft conversions were accompanied by the introduction of new restaurants and retail establishments that favoured the upscale expansion of some local areas. Since then, these areas have experienced a reversal of fortune and, according to some tourist literature, Brooklyn is now supposed to be one of the most trendsetting destinations in the world. However, 'income inequality separates people by residence, resulting in increased spatial distance between rich and poor' (Krase and DeSena 2016: 90).

It is worth detailing some situations exposed by Krase and DeSena which, mutatis mutandis, could be seen in many big European cities, as noted by Yankel Fijalkow and Claire Levy-Vroelant, who base their analysis on ethnography collected in two neighbourhoods (Filjakov and Levy-Vroelant 2014). One is Greenpoint-Williamsburg, along the East River, facing Manhattan; a neighbourhood whose waterfront had become a 'desolate post-industrial ghost town' before being rezoned and where a new community of mostly luxury high-rise developments has risen. The other is Crown Heights/Prospect-Lefferts Gardens, in the middle of Brooklyn, where a predominantly white setting changed into one that is predominantly black. In both neighbourhoods, marginality exists in different ways. Greenpoint and Williamsburg are now among the most expensive places in Brooklyn. This results from a long and dramatic process. Williamsburg was viewed as a stigmatised place because of its density, public housing and non-white residents, while Greenpoint was perceived to be better. The racial composition changed in the 1960s and 1970s, causing panic among some long-term white residents. Some real estate agents sold to black people and Puerto Ricans, thus 'increasing racial tension and encouraging panic selling' (Krase and DeSena 2016: 29). Yet, segmentation can also be seen as a tactic to maintain the white communities and resist to the growth in the number of black inhabitants and Puerto Ricans. White people used a number of strategies to protect and preserve their ethnic enclaves and the larger neighbourhoods by advertising available apartments and houses by 'word of mouth' and through 'sponsorship' of home seekers. They also defended their neighbourhoods using informal surveillance and civilian observation patrols. In contrast to the past, homeowners now sell to the highest bidder, whose ethnic background seems to be down-played. The focus on local culture has shifted from maintaining a homogenous racial group through strategies of neighbourhood defence to welcoming the highest payer regardless

---

[5] See my review in *Urbanities-Journal of Urban Ethnography*, (7) 1 May 2017: 147-151.

of social characteristics. Crown Heights and Prospect-Lefferts Gardens are among the oldest urbanised places in Brooklyn; especially Lefferts Manor where local élites have lived since the 17th century. Historically, both Crown Heights/Prospect and Lefferts Gardens experienced ethnic segmentation. This was accomplished by formal and informal strategies to resist the increase in residents of colour. The process of gentrification was not homogeneous in the neighbourhood. It illustrates well the complex relationship that has taken place since the 1990s between gentrification, racial segregation and the increase of non-white communities. As the élite white groups abandoned Crown Heights, the neighbourhood benefited from the influx of secular middle-class people and working-class and Orthodox Jews. Crown Heights experienced the gradual deterioration of rental housing and the increased presence of poor black people but also of a large population of successful black homeowners. That of Lefferts Manor is a very well documented situation. The community maintained its homogeneous class outlook but gradually accepted non-WASP members. In 1969, people described it as 'white'. Then, it became 'integrated' and by the 1990s it became increasingly defined as 'black'. Today, for the inhabitants 'class matters most' (more than race). Ironically, 'a few black pioneers who moved into the Manor in the 1960s resented the fact that the neighbourhood became predominantly black' (Krase and DeSena 2016: 44). An explanation for this — unexpected — feeling is that their past experience taught them that black neighbourhoods suffer a decline in the quality of city services, lack protection from landlord abuse and from abusive real estate practices.

Gentrification does not only affect big city centres and tourist cities. It is a general phenomenon that we observe in many European cities (Le Galès 2003). Even shrinking cities are now touched by urban entrepreneurship and aim to attract middle urban classes (Rousseau 2008). Max Rousseau named them 'losing cities', such as Sheffield in Great Britain and Roubaix in France which he studied; Saint-Etienne could be another good example (Béal et al. 2017). I will address this issue in further detail in my contribution to this Special Issue. At this juncture, we need to know that 'losing cities' are industrial cities that have serious socio-economic problems but also a strong image deficit for both dwellers and foreigners, and where brownfields, poverty and unemployment have overtaken the storytelling of their former glorious industrial past. In order to counteract this negative representation of the city and attract investors and new inhabitants from the middle classes, local governments attempt to restore confidence through cultural policies and urbanism (Rousseau 2008: 88).

Heritage to Resist

In Brooklyn, people and communities try to resist gentrification, and sometimes succeed. In Crown Heights/Prospect and Lefferts Gardens, activism has been important in the defence of the neighbourhoods, in some cases associated with the defence of heritage. But goals and outcomes have been diverse and sometimes contradictory, including seeking social justice while preserving ethnic and class privileges and defending the neighbourhood from real and sometimes imaginary negative forces. The fight against gentrification is today conducted by community organisations and individual activists. It takes many forms, such as assistance to the

aggrieved; demonstrations, protests and petitions; taking matters to court; campaigns via Twitter, Facebook, conferences and lectures. In Williamsburg, sometimes mobilisation against gentrification succeeds. For instance, an agreement has been negotiated with the city that 20 to 25 percent of new residential units should be affordable to ordinary New Yorkers. In Lefferts Manor, the association defended both the neighbourhood and the old Victorian houses they lived in. Both were considered to be part of the common heritage that they aim to preserve from gentrification. Therefore, we could assume that preservation of Victorian architecture helped to stand up to real estate investors and prevent altering a quiet neighbourhood.

The examples given above show that heritage is not only a gift of the past, a social production. Heritage activism is now included in urban policies for better, for example when favouring co-construction of heritage with inhabitants (Auclair et al. 2017), or for worse, for example by erasing the memory of locals in Bosnia-Herzegovina (Bicakcic 2017). There is an obvious performative dimension of heritage that allows collective actors and communities to mobilise themselves, for example against urban regeneration projects. Heritage cannot be understood outside the frame of political activism, negotiations and prevailing power dynamics at a given time and place; it is usually supposed to belong to the category of common goods and to be shared by everybody. This quasi aporia is revealed particularly when different conceptions of heritage face each other and are accompanied by conflicts (Barrère et al. 2017). The heritage of some is not always the heritage of others, as demonstrated by the war in ex-Yugoslavia: Sarajevo's monuments and historic buildings were at the core of bitter battles among the three communities (Serbs, Croatians and Muslims) who made war to win the city because they each considered it to belong to their identity, while denying it had anything to do with the identity of the others. After the war, they became important elements of the collective memory (Capuzzo 2010). Heritage conflicts can appear at every level, from the basic neighbourhood relationship to war between nations. Even leaving aside extremes such as those experienced in Europe twenty-five years ago, many examples can be found of conflict between old working-class inhabitants and new urban residents about the 'authenticity' of industrial buildings. For some, these buildings are reminders of the difficult time they spent in them, for others they evoke a mythical popular culture. Other examples are the conflicts between inhabitants who aim to preserve their living conditions and local governments that are more interested in transforming the neighbourhood an entertainment place to go to and spend money in, as in the case of Majorca (Franquesa and Morell 2005), or of the real estate investors in Coney Island, who drive out the owners of the old attractions that contributed to the New York mythology (Busà 2017). The analysis of heritagisation helps to bring out social tensions. We have looked at such tensions and conflicts between civil society and local government in Brooklyn and in Majorca. Indeed, it is now accepted that heritage can be the stage of conflicts between communities and citizens collectives with private or public institutions; moreover, conflict could be inherent in heritage production (Barrère et al. 2017: 9). So, conflict can be a key element in our study of heritage which can also help us to understand better issues of urban regeneration and gentrification.

Urban Heritage as a Phantasmagoria of the 'Good City'

Following the Plato tradition, Ash Amin proposed 'to redefine the "good city" as an expanding habit of solidarity and as a practical but unsettled achievement, constantly building on experiments through which difference and multiplicity can be mobilised for common gain and against harm and want' (Amin 2006: 1020). He asked for a 'new urban centrality' that rediscovered 'empowered neighbourhoods, abundances of social capital, face to-face contact, and generally the goodness of urban social cohesion. (Amin 2006: 1021). Actually, a great ambivalence exists in the field of local heritage policies: The defence of an historic neighbourhood in Paris mobilised people of diverse ethnic origins, as well as artists and politicians, in order to preserve the old habitat threatened with destruction. They argued that given the quality of the neighbourhood and its cosmopolitanism, considered to be a sign of vitality, the local government should not follow investors' interests. Through building and urban landscape preservation, what was at stake was the preservation of urbanity and of a way of dwelling in Paris. However, the defence of this heritage led to increased tourism and to the merchandising of its multi-ethnic dimensions (Salzbrunn 2015). In fact, heritage plays a peculiar role in the deep mutations of urban landscapes and urbanity that we are witnessing. On the one hand, it is convoked by urban planners, architects and actors of gentrification as social or economic input; on the other hand, it is used to mobilise arguments against urban policies, or to distort those policies (Barrère et al. 2017).

We could speculate that the aforementioned issues of urban transformation would oppose different kinds of heritagisation; that is, *Authorized Heritage Discourse* that expresses heritage conceptualised and produced by official institutions (L. Smith 2006), on the one hand, and heritage from below defended by the civil society and by communities, on the other. However, similar objects and heritage storytelling may be present in both processes. They evoke an imagination of the European town that is largely shared, beyond political oppositions and social stratifications; it includes, nostalgia for the popular and for working-class sociability, supposedly more lively streets, the authenticity of former urban and industrial landscapes. In a nutshell, what is looked for beyond urban heritage would be a dreamed urbanity that we aim to revive (Rautenberg 2015).

Here is the main thread of this volume: urban heritage can be seen as a phantasmagoria of the built environment, the legacy of Walter Benjamin' Passages of the Hausmanian Paris (Benjamin 1989), the mall of the American cities targeted by the architect Victor Gruen to revitalize the social life of the suburbs of Detroit (Berdet 2013: 185), the Coney Island Historic District that would preserve the image of the technological utopias of the old amusement park (Busà 2017: 158). Benjamin's loafer 'who abandons himself to the phantasmagoria of the market' (Benjamin 1989: 291) and Halbwachs' urban wanderer whose memory is excited by 'the stones of the city' (Halbwachs 1950: 134) have paved the way for this dream city that is recharging itself in the images of the past. Pedestrians are key players in this imaginary of cities because they give life to urban landscapes that are fundamental to the identity of their everyday life. Sharon Zukin reminds us that artists and cultural activists, like Jane Jacobs in New York

during the 1960s, were the first to be engaged in the moral revitalisation of cities (Zukin 2017: 20). Jane Jacobs developed the notion of 'public character' in order to define the quiet and safe lifeworld for pedestrians that exists in some places such as Greenwich Village.[6] Meanwhile, the geographer and photographer John Brinckerhoff Jackson (1984) made an essential contribution to our view of the urban milieu with the concept of vernacular landscape. He opposed the 'country' that refers to politics and power, to the 'landscape' that refers to the space and place where people live and work. Today, his approach focuses on urban and suburban environments where vernacular landscapes directly concern ethnicity, commercial vernacular and old disused factories transformed into squats. According to Jackson the focus ought to be on the needs and tastes of average people because 'Landscapes are to be lived and not just looked at' (Krase 2014: 13). This phantasmagoria is put on display by buildings from past centuries, windows of mom and pop stores that are sometimes the most remarkable marks of ethnicity, urban furniture worn down by street art practices, advertising panels with degraded colours. In France, despite Michel de Certeau's pioneering work on the aesthetics of everyday life (1980) and Raymond Ledrut research on urban images (1979), sensitivity to vernacular urban landscapes really became apparent during the 1990s. The French philosopher Jean–François Augoyard argued that urban spaces had five issues, including a legal issue, a well-known accessibility and social issue. Urban spaces also offer material support to the sensitive dimensions of social relationships and they have an aesthetic value that is exploited by artists, activists and some dwellers (Augoyard 2000: 13), such as the 'artists-inhabitants' whom we will discover in Saint-Etienne.

The five articles that follow this Introduction will develop and illustrate this topic. Géraldine Djament-Tran analyses the new stage of the heritagisation of industry in Plaine Commune, an intercommunal structure in the northern suburbs of Paris where heritage is shaped by entrepreneurial appropriation. The first French industrial revolution appeared in those towns and some very important traces of plans from the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century can be found there. In this area, which is the most important bastion of the French Communist Party, some old factories are becoming synonymous with branding and entertainment, which is typical of the new phase of capitalism. Géraldine Djament-Tran also considers alternatives to this kind of heritagisation proposed by activists' approach to industrial heritage, local mobilisations and civic repurposing operations in the interstices of metropolisation. Plaine Commune is a seminal example of the dialectic between branding by the new capitalism and resisting gentrification that reminds us of the glorious worker culture of the past. Images and imagination of the previous industrial world serves both the neo-capitalistic trend — one thinks, for example, the famous filmmakers Luc Besson 's *Cite du Cinema* — and the anti-capitalistic activists who defend the popular attachment to the neighbourhood as a main feature of the workers' legacy.

---

[6] Quoted by Krase, 2014: 50

Alain Chenevez compares Boltanski and Esquerre's thesis about the economy of enrichment to Harvey's analysis on taking over the whole space by capitalism, particularly by the way of branding and consumption, to consider cultural heritage as the materialisation of surplus value and an instrument of communication for local development, which takes different forms according to local issues in the Grand Lyon metropolis. However, by neglecting inhabitants' commitment these critical approaches do not do justice to neighbourhoods or civil society. Chenevez develops this dialectic through four ethnographic observations. He takes a close look at the city centre district that is becoming a creative hub with its several abandoned industrial buildings; at an 'urban village' where middle class residents oppose the 'spirit' of their neighbourhood to the pressure of urban consolidation; at a 16th century village where heritage is used as an argument for attracting and selecting new residents; and at a working class district built in the 1930s as part of the famous architect Tony Garnier's project for housing working class people in Lyon, and where architectural heritage has been used by inhabitants and activists as a resource against social stigmatisation. In spite of their differences, all these cases tell the same story; a story of segregation, gentrification and social recognition that brings out the power of new capitalism, public policies, real estate issues in international cities and neighbourhood commitment.

Narratives are the core issue of heritage in the four multi-ethnic inner-city working-class European neighbourhoods undergoing gentrification studied by Fijalkow and Levy-Vroelant in Paris, Vienna, Lisbon and Brussels. Collective memory on a day-to-day basis and the emphasis on 'the magic of the neighbourhood' take over tangible heritage in the attachment to the local history, rooting personal biographies and collective migrations in the neighbourhoods' past. Therefore, collective memory validates opposition to the stigma that people bear and enables inhabitants to state their identity. This is a vernacular heritage that tightly combines the place where people live with their international bonds, providing hospitality with an aura of legacy. However, this does not prevent what divides from taking place. Negative representations emerge among long-time migrants who complain about new immigration, regretting the 'old village' and lamenting trafficking, dirt and fights. Thiers is a paradoxical heritage that is anything but smooth, as it is marked by hardship endured and feelings of unfairness. The 'good city' encapsulates hope for a better life, and the hard way to reach that goal belongs to the migrants' collective memory but is rarely shared outside.

Michel Rautenberg draws on the emotion that followed two recent pictures and a newspaper article about poverty in Saint-Etienne in order to discuss the shaping of the imaginary of the town in the long term through images and stereotypes. Well-known thanks to its industrial past, Saint-Etienne is also rich with many photographers who continue to shoot the urban vernacular landscape. All those images, and the feelings that they evoke, belong to the local cultural intimacy (Herzfeld 1997), but they do not really fit in the aims of the local government who want to develop a modern town that welcomes 'new urban classes'. However, their opposition is not frontal and reveals an ambiguous representation of the city: on the one hand, for all the actors — activists, photographers and politicians — the local popular culture

expresses the local identity; on the other hand, many photographers display the stigma and traces of the industrial past, showing mundane and sometimes ugly representations of the town that are detrimental to the local ambition to promote gentrification. As in the Fijalkow and Levy-Vroelant's essay, the 'good city' belongs to inhabitants' intimacy but is not really shared by the élites and the local government, who bet on another urban phantasmagoria, more in tune with the mantras of urban marketing.

In July 2017, Neustadt, a district of the French city of Strasbourg, built during the German annexation between 1871 and 1918, was designated as a UNESCO world heritage site. Cathy Blanc-Reibel, Sandrine Bubendorff and Sandrine Glatron show how this heritagisation, which reflects the ambivalence of the city that has been a main issue between France and Germany, is supposed to correct its solely folkloric and old-fashioned image. Neustadt is the symbol of the French/German friendship, a 'good city' where residents ensure the maintenance of their building and where municipal urban policies seem to be more or less in line with residents' expectations. However, the UNESCO designation is also seen as potentially affecting the quality of life of residents as it is believed to be the cause of a strengthening of the binding rules. In short, the inhabitants would not engage in a conflict with the municipality, but the Authorized Heritage Discourse (L. Smith 2006) on their neighbourhood does not seem necessary to them and they do not wish it to replace their homemade conception of heritage.

In short, this Special Issue offers five different ways to understand better to what aspects of their cities' past urban dwellers are attached and how they capture the past to imagine their life, sometimes in order to re-enchant their urbanity.

References

Adell, N., Bendix, R. F., Bortolotto, C. and Tauschek, M. (eds). 2015. *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice. Participation, Territory and the Making of Heritage.* Göttingen: Universitätsverlg Göttingen.

Amin, A. 2006. The good city. *Urban Studies*, 43 (5/6): 1009–1023. https://doi.org/10.1080%2F00420980600676717; accessed on 2 October 2018.

Auclair, E. 2015. Ordinary heritage, participation and social cohesion: the suburbs of Paris. In E. Auclair and G. Fairclough (eds), *Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability. Between Past and Future.*

Auclair, E. and Fairclough, G. (eds). 2015. *Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability. Between Past and Future.* London and New York: Routledge.

Auclair, E., Hertzog, A. and Poulot, M-L. (eds). 2017. *De la participation à la co-construction des patrimoines urbains. L'invention du commun ?* Paris: Editions Le manuscrit.

Augoyard, J. F. 2000. L'action artistique dans l'espace urbain. In J. Métral (ed.), *Cultures en ville, ou de l'art et du citadin*. La Tour d'Aigues: Editions de l'Aube: 13-22.

Barrère, C., Busquet, G., Diaconu, A., Girard, M., and Iosa, I. (eds). 2017. *Mémoires et Patrimoines. Des revendications aux conflits.* Paris: L'Harmattan.

Béal, V., Morel Journel, C. and Sala Pala, V. 2017. Des villes en décroissance stigmatisées? Les enjeux d'image à Saint-Étienne. *Métropolitiques*, 3 April. https://www.metropolitiques.eu/Des-villes-en-decroissance.html; accessed on 2 October 2018.

Benjamin, W. 1989. *Ecrits français*. Paris: Gallimard.

Berdet, M. 2013. *Fantasmagories du capital. L'invention de la ville marchandise*. Paris: la Découverte.

Berglund, E. and Peipinen, V. 2018. Creating Spaces of Insurgent Citizenship: Squatting in Activist Friendly Helsinki. *Urbanities* 8 (1): 34-49.

Boltanski, L. and Esquerre, A. 2017. *Enrichissement. Une critique de la marchandise*. Paris: Gallimard.

Bicakcic A. 2017. Le patrimoine et la mémoire, outils de revendication et d'effacement: le Monuments des partisans à Bosanski Novi et une plaque commémorative à Sarajevo, en Bosnie-Herzégovine. In C. Barrère, G. Busquet, A. Diaconu, M. Girard and I. Iosa (eds), *Mémoires et Patrimoines. Des revendications aux conflits.*

Busà, A. 2017. *The Creative Destruction of New York City. Engineering the City for the Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press

Capuzzo Derkovic N. 2010. Le rôle des expressions mémorielles dans la (re)construction urbaine et identitaire. Le cas de Sarajevo. In D. Baric, J. Le Rider and D. Boksandic (eds), *Mémoire et Histoire en Europe centrale et orientale*. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes.

Choay, F. 2006. *Pour une anthropologie de l'espace*. Paris: Seuil.

de Certeau M. 1980. *L'Invention du quotidien* 2 t. Paris: Union Générale d'Éditions.

DeSena, J. and Krase, J. 2015. Brooklyn Revisited: An Illustrated View from the Street 1970 to the Present. *Urbanities,* 5 (2): 3-31.

DeVivo, P. 2013. Symbolic Policies and Citizenship: The Case of Naples. *Urbanities,* 3 (1): 22-41.

Di Giovine, M. A. 2015. The Ethics of Participation, Community Formation, and Governmentality. In N. Adell, R. F. Bendix, C. Bortolotto and M.Tauschek (eds), *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice. Participation, Territory and the Making of Heritage*.

Dicks, B. 2000. *Heritage Place and Community.* Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Durrenberger, P. 2018. Anthropology in a neo liberal world. In M. Spyridakis (ed.), *Market versus Society: Anthropological Insights*.

Espaces et sociétés. 2006. Patrick Geddes en héritage, 4 (167): 7-18.

Fijalkow, Y. and Levy-Vroelant, C. 2014. Making new from old in France: urban change through housing renewal in two Parisian districts. *Renewing Europe's Housing*, Policy Press: 75-97?

Franquesa, J. and Morell, M. 2005. Heritage deviations in relation to town-planning in Ciutat de Mallorca. *Journal of Mediterranean Studies*, 15 (2):427-462.

Giordano, C. 2018. Imagined Multiculturalism in a Malaysian Town: Ideological Construction and Empirical Evidences. In I. Pardo and G. B. Prato (eds), *The Palgrave Handbook of Urban Ethnography.*

Graezer Bideau, F. 2018. Resistance to Places of Collective Memories: A Rapid Transformation Landscape in Beijing. In I. Pardo and G. B. Prato (eds), *The Palgrave Handbook of Urban Ethnography.*

Halbwachs, M. 1950. *La mémoire collective*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Harvey, D. 1989. *The Urban Experience*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Herzfeld, M. 1997. *Cultural Intimacy. Social Poetics in the Nation-State.* New-York and London: Routledge.

Jackson, J. B. 1984. *Discovering the Vernacular Landscape*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Jacobs, J. 1969. *The Economy of Cities*. New York: Random House.

Krase, J. and DeSena J. D. 2016. *Race, Class, and Gentrification in Brooklyn. A view from the Street.* Lanham Boulder New York and London: Lexington Book.

Krase, J. 2014. *Seeing Cities Change. Local Culture and Class*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Labadi, S. 2016. The impact of culture and heritage-led development programmes: the cases of Liverpool (UK) and Lille (France). In S. Labadi and L. Logan (eds), *Urban Heritage, Development and Sustainability. International Framework, National and Local Governance.*

Labadi, S. and Logan, L. (eds). 2016. *Urban Heritage, Development and Sustainability. International Framework, National and Local Governance*. London and New York: Routledge.

Ledrut, R. 1979. *Sociologie urbaine*. Paris : Presses universitaires de France.

Le Galès, P. 2003. *Le retour des villes européennes. Sociétés urbaines, mondialisation gouvernement et gouvernance*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po.

Morell, M. 2011. Working class heritage without the working class: an ethnography of gentrification in Ciutat (Mallorca). In L Smith, P. A. Shakel and G. Campbell (eds), *Heritage, Labour and the Working Class*. London and New York: Routledge.

Pardo, I. 1996. *Managing Existence in Naples. Morality, Action and Structure.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pardo, I. and Prato, G. B. (eds). 2018. *The Palgrave Handbook of Urban Ethnography*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pinson, G. 2009. *Gouverner la ville par projet. Urbanisme et gouvernance des villes européennes.* Paris: Presses de Sciences Po.

Rautenberg, M. 2015. L'urbanité comme patrimoine de la ville. In I. Pardo, G. B. Prato and W. Kaltenbacher (eds), *Diogenes. Placing Urban Anthropology*. Special Issue: 90-102.

Rautenberg, M. 2017. Changer de ville, changer de vie. Utopies, aspirations et engagements habitants à Villeneuve d'Ascq. *Ethnologie française*, XLVII (1): 121-130.

Rautenberg, M. 2018. The Strength of Weak Heritages: Urbanity, Utopias and the Commitment to Intangible Heritage. In I. Pardo and G. Prato (eds), *The Palgrave Handbook of Urban Ethnography*.

Rojas E. 2016. The sustainable conservation of urban heritage: a concern of all actors. In S.

Labadi and W. Logan (eds), *Urban Heritage, Development and Sustainability. International Framework, National and Local Governance*.

Rousseau, M. 2008. 'Bringing politics back in': la gentrification comme politique de développement urbain? *Espaces et sociétés*, 1 (132-133): 71-90.

Salzbrunn M. 2015. The Place Making of Communities in Urban Spaces: The Invention of the Village Saint-Louis Sainte-Marthe. In N. Adell, R. F. Bendix, C. Bortolotto and M. Tauschek (eds), *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice. Participation, Territory and the Making of Heritage.*

Sassen, S. 1991. *The Global City*. New-York: Princeton University Press.

Sennett, R. 2006. *The Culture of new capitalism*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Slater, T. 2011. Gentrification of the City. In G. Bridge and S Watson (eds), *The New Blackwell Companion to the City.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Smith, L. 2006. *Uses of heritage*. London and New York: Routledge.

Smith, M. P. and Bender, T. 2001. *City and Nation. Rethinking Place and Identity*. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers.

Smith, N. 1986. *Gentrification of the City.* London: George, Allen and Unwin.

Spyridakis, M. 2018. Introduction. In M. Spyridakis (ed.), *Market versus Society. Anthropological Insights*.

Spyridakis, M. (ed.). 2018*. Market versus Society. Anthropological Insights*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Thrift, N. 2005. *Knowing Capitalism*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Dehli: Sage.

Tornatore, J. L. 2017. Patrimoine vivant et contributions citoyennes. Penser le patrimoine 'devant' l'Anthropocène. *In Situ*, http://journals.openedition.org/insitu/15606; accessed on 24 November 2018.

Zukin, S. 2017. Pouvoir des mots, mots du pouvoir. In Y. Fijalkov (ed.), *Dire la ville c'est faire la ville. La performativité des discours sur l'espace urbain*. Villeneuve d'Ascq: Septentrion.