

## **Urban marginalities in the making of heritage and cities**

*A project report prepared for  
the Swedish National Heritage Board*

Feras Hammami (19780823) is Assistant Professor of Conservation with Specialization in Built Environment, placed at the Department of Conservation, University of Gothenburg. Box 130; SE 40530 Gothenburg, Sweden; 0046317865700; feras.hammami@gu.se; www.conservation.gu.se

*Consortium:* The project was conducted by researchers with diverging backgrounds, including critical heritage studies, urban planning, urban studies, and geography. Feras Hammami, project leader, Department of Conservation GU; Chiara Valli, postdoctoral research fellow, The Institute for Urban Research, Malmö University; and Frejdel Haar Bidstrup, master student (short time), Department of Conservation, GU.

### **1. Background and Aims**

Changes in mobility, migration, density, proximity, diversity and other aspects of life are natural and inevitable. What's however critical is how we engage with and manage these changes. Several scholars of urban studies explain how the poor management of these changes can lead to sever processes of exclusion, marginalisation, gentrification, alienation and displacement following issues of income, ethnicity, class, political orientation or territoriality. Scholars of heritage studies also explain the risk these changes generate against the diverse aspects of tangible and intangible cultural heritage. The past few years however several debates have emerged in Sweden with interest in, for example, the creation of "new inclusive cultural heritage policy that hold Sweden together" (Kulturdepartementet, 2016-03-22). We have also seen several initiatives on the municipal levels, including social sustainability and equal cities ('Jämligt Göteborg–Hela staden social hållbar', see Göteborgs stad 2016). In this project we sought to contribute to these debates where heritage is expanded towards the city and everyday conduct. We departed from the argument that urban changes are often inspired by, and entangled in, a process of 'heritageization' that since the 19th century has been defining our valuable past and desired future (Harvey 2001; Smith 2006). It is a present-centred process, consciously and unconsciously reinforced particular notions and values of heritage and producing a range of urban injustices that often go unnoticed. Focusing on the ongoing urban restructuring of the suburb Gamlestaden in the city of Gothenburg, we explored the role heritage plays in approaching, enabling and legitimating particular trends of urban restructuring. These explorations have been guided by these questions:

- How do processes of urban restructuring in places with historic significance take the other layers of meaning into account, and how not doing this can lead to 'vertical' forms of marginality?
- How do processes of urban restructuring in places where local communities are formed by people from different ethnic backgrounds take this diversity into consideration, and how not doing this can lead to 'horizontal' forms of marginality?
- What new insights would a critical heritage studies perspective on urban governance provide to inclusion policies, and how does this differ from the traditional vertices of urban marginality—class, ethnicity, state?
- How can rethinking notions of 'marginality' through heritage offer new knowledge on the

conception and employment of ‘inclusion’ in both heritage and urban management?

## 2. Summary of results

The explorations of these questions within the context of Gamlestaden provided new insights on how heritage is engaged and or engaged with in urban neoliberalization, and the potential of heritage not only in urban and societal development but also in producing a landscape of urban injustices, many of which are legitimated, naturalised or silenced by the power of heritage. We found it imperative to critically explore the relations between heritage and urban change, and challenge any professional practice that does not see the expansion of heritage towards the politics of difference and subjectification. We have chosen to present some of the project findings in the following themes.

### *Heritage as a verb*

There is a growing consensus in heritage studies that heritage cannot and shouldn't be viewed and approached as a static thing rooted in a frozen past. How much this mirrored in practice differs from one context to another. In this project, we approached heritage through a processual understanding, meaning that it is a continuously changing manifestation of the past. It certainly not a permanent thing or ‘safely dead’ (Bailie *et al* 2010). We are aware about the commodification, exploitation and politicization of heritage and memory, and how this influence the ways through which people engage and experience the past and how this influences their identities. It is within this context; we see heritage as a verb and with an agency. Exploring these theoretical principles against urban change provides new insights on the contextual relevance of this change. In Gamlestaden, it helped us better understand the power dynamics that guide the ongoing urban change and how the implemented change takes into consideration the multiple layers of history and cultural diversity that characterise the former working-class neighbourhood. The empirical findings demonstrated how the ongoing urban change goes hand in hand with the municipal and national authorised heritage discourses. While this revealed the cherished political will for cultural heritage and conservation, it also uncovered a reserved and politicised approach to the inevitable interpretations of the past in the present. These interpretations and other processes of valuations in Gamlestaden seem to have always been prompted into four processes of contestations. These are: wholeness and healing; monumentality and alienation; multiplicities and boundaries; and dirty-clean binaries. We further explore these processes in the project’s publications (see section 5).

### *Scopic feast and unthreatening diversity*

Inclusion and other notions of living together-in-difference are usually debated in Gothenburg and other cities in Sweden in relation to the dominant discourses, social sustainability, mixed city and even multiculturalism or its interchangeably used term, cultural diversity. In a forthcoming article, the Scopic Feast of Heritage, we explore how professional heritage practices relate to these discourses and authorised heritage practices influence the representation of cultural diversity and other notions of living together in difference. Cultural diversity in Gamlestaden was celebrated when it takes an unthreatening form and when it is represented through Coombes’ (1992) ‘scopic feast’. It is unthreatening because difference has been spatially marked and made visible in the built environment. It is based on established hierarchies of power and socio-political dualism that include, but not limited to, authentic-added, local-international, and typical-foreign relations. These dualisms foregrounded the aforementioned four processes which in turn protect the dominating frameworks of the AHD and related processes of heritageization. Using the words of Coombes, the spatialisation of difference, as well as connecting it to time, articulating it into a collage of

exclusive identities, polarising it between a range of dualisms, and perceiving it as a heritage-led processes of otherness ‘threatens to collapse the heterogeneous experience of racism into a scopic feast’, where difference is represented ‘for easy consumption in ever more enticing configurations’ (Coombes 1992, p. 42). Although Coombes’ observation was made within the context of museums and as an attempt to decolonise the West and the Other, it supported the critical approach used in this project to explore the ways through which the question of difference is analysed in today’s debates about inclusive urban development and heritage management.

#### *Urban neoliberalization and the emergence of BID*

After long history of social welfare, urban neoliberalization found in heritage the potential to make its existence in Sweden possible. In Gamlestaden, it began through the Business Improvement District (BID) model. Despite the alerting process of gentrification and displacement of what is locally known as non-typical Gothenburg, the implemented renewal projects are celebrated as a bright future for a dark past. Paradoxically, a language of optimism dominates the local debates on urban change and describe gentrification as a positive change. In Valli & Hammami (2020) we explored the different dynamics of urban governance that foreground BID and make the sociated urban injustices sound natural. Furthermore, in the forthcoming article the Scopic Feast of Heritage, we investigated the exploitation of heritage in the urban neoliberalization processes and the impact of this on the representation of difference.

#### *Resistance*

While the enforcement of closure against those labelled ‘non-ordinary’ and ‘non-typical’ is devastating, the analysis showed that this enclosure has triggered new dynamics of resistance against gentrification, displacement or social marginalisation. In this sense, resistance cannot be reduced to the traditional forms of protest that emerge against economic exploitation (Littler 2008), gentrification (Hamnett 2003), marginalisation (Wacquant 2008), or spatial cleansing (Herzfeld 2006). A heritage-led forms of resistance can also emerge as an organised or non-organised activity against de-signification, dispossession, assimilation, marginalisation, cultural imperialism and other dynamic of exclusion and displacement. Furthermore, heritage can also inspire the emergence of new mechanisms that support the disarticulation of the exclusionary and arbitrary conceptions of diversity, and the re-articulation of diversity as a necessarily contextualized, changeable, impure, plural and inclusive formation. Linking heritage to urban change, injustices and resistance showed the potential of heritage in fighting the deeply structured relations that ground neoliberal hegemony and weaponize notions of difference against the growing ‘fear of sameness’ (Naidoo 2006). Revealing the heritage-led forms of resistance to urban injustices can support the emergence of new social responses from below and thereby disrupt the epistemic continuity of the ordinary and typical, and the dark and declining.

### **3. Theory and methods**

#### *Theory*

In this project we engaged and engaged with heritage through a multi-disciplinary approach, and dealt with heritage through a processual understanding. Doing this helped us see the expansion of heritage towards different policy arenas and everyday conduct. It also prompted us to explore a landscape of concepts, including ‘sameness and difference’ (Naidoo 2006), cultural diversity, living together in difference (Amin 2012), scopic feast (Coombes 1992), positive gentrification (Slater 2009), marginalisation (Wacquant 2008) and displacement (Lees *et al* 2015). The field

research showed how heritage in the so-called post-industrial cities is entangled in a complex process of urban neoliberalization (Peck 2010; Pinson & Morel Journel 2016). The post-industrial argument is often supported by other arguments that see history as grand narratives and as define periods of time. In this project, we approached Gamlestaden as an urban area with multiple layers of meaning and experiences some of which are related to the industrial history of the city. Similar to many cities with industrial history, when industry declined the city of Gothenburg sought to revitalise its economy by adapting to the needs of the 'creative class' (for other examples see Tocherman 2012, Florida 2012), and by joining new forms of development and technological advancement. The post-industrial argument provided the renewal projects with an authoritative ground to present themselves as the only solution to move Gamlestaden through its transition period. Heritage played an important role in making this transition possible but it wasn't alone.

By looking at the making and re-making of heritage within the context of urban renewal in Gamlestaden we found out that heritage in the neoliberal city is often entangled in four processes that together amount to the neoliberalization of the urban, or the former working-class neighbourhood of Gamlestaden. Firstly, public land and services are extensively privatized, in line with assertions about the greater efficiency of the competitive market in comparison with the State. Secondly, these privatised domains are deregulated, or rather re-regulated: laws relating to ownership, use, access and disposal of land and other urban assets are largely done away with. However, new regulations governing permitted behaviour, and licensing private authorities with pseudo-police powers, proliferate. Thirdly, the privatized, deregulated city is opened to financialization: speculation on land value, rental income, and debt, and the translation of real estate generally into financial commodities, as rapidly tradeable derivatives. City authorities offer substantial incentives, including publicly-subsidised infrastructure, to private developers who can remodel redundant industrial sites, thereby raising the market value of assets including formerly public land. Finally, all these processes are globalized: profits generated can be expropriated to other tax regimes, and development capital can be raised from global debt markets.

These four processes are in different ways transcended by and transcending the process of heritageization. The ways through which an authorised heritage is defined and protected can also lead to the celebration of particular urban patterns, even if this occurs at the expense of others. In this sense we see a critical relation between the processes of heritageization and the naming and shaming of places and experiences. Politicians, civil servants and other stakeholders might describe particular city areas as 'dirt' or as 'matters out of place' and call for their eradication in order to promote the typical, authentic and other elements of 'value' (Hammami & Uzer 2018; Herzfeld 2006; Douglas 1966). Wacquant (2009) refers to this as 'punishment' of places. While some explain how these are often justified and legitimated by publicly labelling them a 'lawless zone', 'outlaw estate', 'hellhole' or outside the 'common norm'. (Wacquant 2009: 67–9), in this project we also see how these practices are justified by heritage.

### *Methodology*

We used a case study methodology, with an explorative approach. The case study is the ongoing urban restructuring of the former working-class neighbourhood of Gamlestaden, located in the city of Gothenburg, Sweden. Large-scale urban renewal projects have been implemented in Gamlestaden to improve the social, cultural, historic, economic and spatial conditions of the neighbourhood, and to enhance its socio-spatial integration into the rest of the city, especially within the eastern region. Gamlestaden was built over the ruins of the medieval Nya Lödöse

(1473-1624) and is also popular for its 18<sup>th</sup> century Landriet<sup>1</sup> (large farms) and the industrial history that flourished between 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. This rich history brought to Gamlestaden people from different countries, and their ‘foreign’ languages, styles and preferences are still visible in the current community. Today, Gamlestaden is inhabited by more than 10,000 residents. About 32% of them were born abroad, while 42% have an international background – mainly from Italy, Iraq, Iran, Somalia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Syria, Finland, Yugoslavia, Poland, and Turkey. Their diversity has brought a mixture of second-hand shops, bustling markets, craft breweries, vintage shops, and restaurants to the neighbourhood (Göteborg stad 2018; Holmberg 2016). The adjacent former industrial area is Gothenburg’s oldest indoor flea market, Bellevue market (Bellevue marknad) where a range of small-scale businesses, cultural associations, and a mosque are also located. Gamlestaden and its neighbouring Bellevue are today viewed as one area, centrally located and attractive for investment and city development.

The field research in Gamlestaden was carried out on different occasions and during the first two years of the project. We began with the review of different official documents, produced by the municipality, county council and advisory boards especially those related to the archaeological excavations and heritage management. We also explored the different debates in different local newspapers as well the archive at the local library. Furthermore, we used ethnographic methods to explore the multiple layers of meaning that constitute Gamlestaden. We conducted 20 in-depth interviews with planners, city officials, real estate developers, archaeologists, local politicians, social workers and residents, in addition to 15 street-interviews (2-10min) with people either living, visiting or working in the neighbourhood. The in-depth interviews ranged between 45 and 120 minutes, and were carried out in participants’ working or living spaces. Findings from the interviews were also compared with analyses of secondary data which was mainly extracted from planning documents, heritage management documents, local history literature, archival print media coverage and social media posts, also constitute a major part of the empirical materials. Additionally, we organized a research day at the local library and talked with dozens more residents. With this data, we conducted a content and discourse analysis to uncover how Gamlestaden’s plural cultures, experiences, narratives, landscapes, semiotics, mobility means, functions, and layers of have been expressed in debates.

#### **4. Main results and impact**

The theoretical and empirical analysis revealed the following results:

- Heritage-neoliberalization: The growing socio-spatial polarization and the restructuring of state-market relations in the urban governance of cities in Sweden and other Scandinavian cities have inspired the emergence of new forms of partnerships rooted in the imported models of Business Improvement District (BID). In Gamlestaden, BID is celebrated as a successful model for uplifting the distressed former working-class neighbourhood without any critical debate on the extent to which the new development is socially just. While BIDs partners notice increased level of city attractiveness, sense of security, and real estate values, this uplifting is based upon the celebration of advanced architectural design of the new buildings and landscape, the removal of the most socioeconomically vulnerable residents and business owners or the disciplining of their behaviours and aesthetics, and the projection of the so called authentic past (medieval, industrial, typical) over the present everyday life. This study warns about the risk that BIDs as they are currently implemented

---

<sup>1</sup> Landerit is a leasehold agricultural property on donation land of the town. It includes agricultural and farming activities in addition to a manor house

in Sweden are used as a ‘neoliberal quick fix’ to move social problems elsewhere rather than solving them, which might lead to new landscape of exclusion and gentrification (see Valli & Hammami 2020). It also warns about the missing critical debates on the role that heritage might play to legitimate this fixation, and how this can lead to the distortion of the multiple layers of history that represent Gamlestaden today and lead to weakening urban social justice that BID promised to achieve. The findings from this study inspired and was also enriched by the analysis of relations between heritage and neoliberal economic development within the context of neighbourhood sustainable assessment tools (see Borges, Hammami, Wangel 2020).

- Inclusion and other notions of living together-in-difference: Despite the celebration of cultural diversity and mixed city discourse in Gamlestaden, notions of difference are represented through what Annie Coombes’ (1992) ‘scopic feast’. It became evident at the end of the field research that cultural diversity and heritage interpretations are usually prompted into four processes of subjectification and legitimization. These are: wholeness and healing; monumentality and alienation; multiplicities and boundaries; and dirty-clean binaries. What seems to happen at the heart of these process is an active production of an unthreatening form of cultural diversity. It is unthreatening to the new social class that could afford the new urban change in Gamlestaden, the scaled-up market value, and the legitimacy of the authorised layers of history. In this context, we argue that the uncritical adaptation of BID in Gothenburg and other neoliberal cities seems to have supported the emergence of heritage-led dynamics of urban change and exploitation of cultural diversity. It served to conceal the political interest at stake in its production and maintenance, and lead to a politicised representation of difference through the unthreatening form of cultural diversity. Ideologically, it advocates the projection of difference through a multiculturalism policy that exaggerates the internal unity of cultures, solidifies differences, and promotes the invention of ‘the Other’ and ‘the Self’ (more on liberal-democratic multiculturalism, Parekh 2000; Philips 2007). Similar ideological principles guide the municipal preservation program of the city of Gothenburg. As an inclusive practice, the program advocates and regulates the protection of the uniqueness of each layer of history. This practice is locally celebrated without any critical reflection on the ways in which inclusion and diversity are approached, defined and employed in the face of heritageization, and other processes of subjectification, signification and representation at a larger societal scale. Uncritical engagement with difference in the context of heritage and neoliberal economic development might thus make it expedient to label particular social and cultural experiences as an ‘added value’ to the authentic past, and thereby promote legitimate if not celebrated exclusion.
- Positive gentrification: these four processes of subjectification and legitimization supported the emergence of a positive process of gentrification as a supportive argument for urban renewal debates in Sweden and other countries (Slater 2009). The success of BID in spreading a dominant language of optimism despite the alerting process of gentrification in Gamlestaden, reveals its growing power as a neoliberal form of governance. What is happening in Gamlestaden can be compared with, for example, BID in Denmark. Richner & Olesen (2018, p.168) explain how BID’s logic is ‘grounded in a firm belief in the market’s ability to provide public services in a more efficient and attractive manner than the public sector’. Its policy to establish coalitions of real estate owners and endorse the authorised heritage and mixed city discourses provided BID and other models of neoliberal economic development with representative power, to seek partnership with local authorities and give shape to safe spaces where urban renewal projects and other processes of urban

restructuring become propagated – this despite associated processes of injustices.

- While there is a political will in Sweden for further integration of heritage and archaeology in urban planning, the case of Gamlestaden showed that this dialogue is case-specific and its interpretation into actual realities is limited. Though it began in the planning, if not the implementation, process, it was often driven into bottlenecks otherwise into neoliberal economic exploitation or individual endeavour. The limited resources made the archaeological excavations limited to the history of Nya Lödöse, ignoring the other layers of history including Landriet, and the industrial history. Other on-earth objects with historic significance were protected according to the municipal Preservation Program, the Plan and Building Act, and the Environmental Code. The celebrated integration of archaeology and heritage in the new built environment therefore ended up as arbitrary and scopic feast, ruled by the domination framework of heritage management. Furthermore, and as explained by the interviewed project leader of the archaeological excavation, the planners, architects and archaeologists speak different languages and this made it difficult for us to communicate values and priorities. It has been a learning experience and we will do better in the future.

### *Impacts*

While the main impacts of this project are on research, knowledge and education, the scope of this project expands towards policy and politics. This can be explained following these thematic issues:

- A shift in attitude towards a processual understanding of heritage and a positive engagement in contemporary manifestations of the past. Taking this debate towards practice can lead to (1) the reduction in the focus on the monumentality and pastness of heritage, and a progressive opening towards a more inclusive understanding of heritage in which these contemporary interpretations are incorporated in the authorised heritage discourses, and (2) the development of new skills in dealing with heritage as a tool for social inclusion and urban justice in which these interpretations are approached as constituent of heritage rather than added values. Such a shift helps to avoid the initiation and enhancement of feeling of difference, and heritage-inspired social conflicts.
- Increased confidence of heritage professionals, academics and policy makers in the active promotion of heritage as an integrated aspect and dimension of inclusive urban development, leading to reduced embarrassment of promoting heritage as a resource for sustainable development rather than a list of things that should be protected for the future generation and with a potential for tourism industry. Instead, heritage would be revealed as a process, relation and resource of identity of politics with an impact on people's attachment and sense of place.
- Development of a shared language of inclusion from heritage as a manifestation of the inevitable diverse interpretations of the past. Approaching heritage as plural manifestations of the past and a continuously changing process suggest new engagement in urban development and planning. The empirical findings of this project call for such an engagement in heritage and urban change to uncover the power dynamics that enable and legitimate the assimilative process of urban neoliberalization, and instead promote an inclusive process that sees the interlinked relations between the past, present and future.
- A future-looking window for research on the intersection of heritage, urban neoliberalization and planning. The project activities have led to the articulation of a rich

network of scholars and experts. Some of these scholars made direct contributions to the project's publications, especially the lecture series, Heritage, Borders, Marginality, and follow-up edited book *Heritage, Gentrification and Resistance*. Furthermore, local and national networks have also been established which are promising for future activities on theory and practice.

- New perspectives on cultural heritage conservation within the educational programs offered at the Department of Conservation, University of Gothenburg. Some of the research findings were developed into one master thesis on difficult heritage and several lectures exploring heritage debates as well the role heritage plays in neoliberal cities.

## 5. Results in relation to previous research

In Hammami & Uzer (2018), we explored the geometries of power that link heritage to resistance, legitimise urban transformations, and ignite 'resistance'. Dwelling on the findings reported in this article and other following publications from the former working class of Gårda, located in Gothenburg, this project demonstrated how ignoring the exploitation of heritage in urban neoliberalization can lead to severe social consequences, including gentrification, marginalisation, and other forms of displacement. What is specifically important here is how the politicisation of heritage expands towards the politics of difference and subjectification which is an under-researched question in both urban and heritage theory and practice (see also Benesch *et al* 2015). Such arguments are not explored in the current political debates on inclusive heritage in Sweden (Vision 2030, RA.A. 2016). There is a growing attention to these questions in critical heritage studies engage, with a particular focus on the relation of heritage to the politics of identity and memory (Smith 2006; Harrison 2012; Graham *et al* 2007). This remains under-researched within the context of urban. For example, what role the process of heritageization plays in giving shape to and legitimating particular patterns of urban change and associated injustices. Such uncritical exploration of heritage in relation to urban change is also evident in critical urban studies. The inspiring works of Henri Lefebvre, Manuel Castells and David Harvey provide important explanations of how poorly managed urbanization and other forms of urban change usually lead to displacement (Lees *et al* 2015), re-placement (Hamnett 2003), gentrification (Marcuse, 1985), poor well-being (Laska & Spain 1980), class fragmentation (Wacquant 2014), urbanization of injustice (Merrifield 2013; Fainstein 2011). Yet, the dynamics that lead to these problems are usually grounded in, for example, capitalism, class politics, and a range of ethnic-related politics (ethno-racial classifications in the US, ethno-national classifications in Europe, a varying mix of the two in Latin America and Africa). Heritage, which critically transcend issues of citizenship, ethnicity, nationalism, colonialism, and other related aspects of subjectification, is either treated through the dominating framework of the AHD or left unnoticed.

## 6. Results relation to cultural heritage and cultural heritage management

This project contributes to the current debates on inclusive heritage. For example, the 'new inclusive cultural heritage policy that hold Sweden together' (Kulturdepartementet, 2016-03-22) and 'Jamlikt Göteborg-Hela staden social halbar' (Göteborgs Stad 2016). Inclusion in these debates seems to be limited to the 'inclusion of people's different perspectives on Swedish heritage' (Kulturdepartementet 2016). This project contributes to this conception through a processual understanding of heritage. This suggests a new understanding of 'inclusion' beyond pastness, assimilation, static representation or single narrative. The idea is to move towards a new meaning of 'inclusion' that promotes 'plural heritages in Sweden', and a shift from 'what does heritage mean?' to 'what does it do?'. Engaging with heritage as a verb and through its political agency is useful to any discussion that see heritage as a present-centered process of contestation

and negotiation. In this sense, the relevance of this project exists in its capacity to bring a new language to heritage debates, to enhance the aforementioned shifts, and to support challenging the traditional divide, at least in vision and projected preferences, between heritage and planning practices. A transdisciplinary approach that dwells on critical heritage, urban and resistance studies was used in this project to uncover the overlooked entanglement of the process of heritageization in urban neoliberalisation. Further explorations of this entanglement can support the initiation of new dialogues on the role of heritage not only in social conflict and injustices but also in providing new opportunities for social equality and sustainability.

## 7. Dissemination: current and forthcoming

### *Journal articles, edited book and book chapters*

- Borges, L.A, Hammami, F. & Wangel, J. (2020). Reviewing Neighbourhood Sustainability Assessment Tools through Critical Heritage Studies. *Sustainability*, 12(4), 1605 (15 pages). DOI <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12041605>.
- Valli, C. & Hammami, F. (2020). Introducing Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) in Sweden: A social justice appraisal. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, (June 2020). DOI <https://doi.org/10.1177/0969776420925525>
- The 'scopic feast' of heritage (forthcoming). The promotion of unthreatening diversity in neoliberal cities. A scientific article. *Status*: in preparation.
- Heritage, Gentrification and Resistance. (forthcoming). an Edited book proposal submitted to Berghahn Books series' Exploration in Heritage Studies. *Status*: accepted for publication, and in second review. Co-edited with Daniel Jewesbury and Chiara Valli
- Cleaning up conflicts in the post-industrial city (forthcoming). A book chapter, part of the edited book Heritage, Gentrification and Resistance. Co-authored with Chiara Valli
- Valli, Chiara (In review). Art scenes and gentrification. Symbolic capital accumulation through space. *Urban Studies*.

### *Conference presentations*

Hammami, F. (2019). The earth always wins: a new language of heritage-led abolition of injustices. Paper presented at the Symposium Heritage and Conflict in the MENA Region. Cases from Aleppo, Beirut, Tunis, Hebron and Acre. Berlin, 28<sup>th</sup> October 2019.

Hammami, F. (2019). Heritage for emancipation: a new call for the abolition of the settler colonial logic of elimination. Paper presented from absentia at the Symposium Cultural Stability or Conflict: Border-Straddling Heritage in West Asia. Melbourne, 31 January 2019.

Hammami, F. & Harvey, D. (2018). Crossing Borders with Hopeful Heritage: Quiet Encroachment towards Safe Spaces. Paper presented at the 4<sup>th</sup> biannual conference of the Association of Critical Heritage Studies. Hangzhou, 1-6 September 2018.

*Corresponding author and co-presenter: Feras Hammami*

Hammami, F. (2018). Precarious Return: the case of decolonising Nakba in Palestine. Paper presented at the 4<sup>th</sup> biannual conference of the Association of Critical Heritage Studies. Hangzhou, 1-6 September 2018.

Hammami, F. & Valli, C. (2018). Rethinking urban justice from the authorized past: stories from the multicultural margin and centre. Paper presented at the annual congress of the Association of the European Schools of Planning (AESOP), Making Space for Hope. Gothenburg 10-14 July 2018.

*Corresponding author and presenter: Feras Hammami*

Valli, C. & Hammami, F. (2018). Marginalisation and emerging spaces of hope between neoliberal urbanism and 'inclusive heritage' in Gothenburg. Paper presented at the annual congress of the Association of the European Schools of Planning (AESOP), 2018, Making Space for Hope. Gothenburg, 10-14 July 2018.

*Corresponding author: Chiara Valli*

#### *Conference activities*

Making Space for Hope, the annual congress of the Association of the European Schools of Planning (AESOP), hosted by the University of Gothenburg, Chalmers University of Technology, Blekinge Technical University, Royal Institute of Technology. Gothenburg, 10-14 July. (Member of the Scientific Committee and the Organising Committee)

Heritage: a thematic track at the 2018-congress of the Association of the European Schools of Planning, Making Space for Hope. Gothenburg 10-14 July 2018. (*Co-chair with Zeynep Gunay and Nebojsa Camprag*).

A mobile workshop for 35 planning and heritage scholars, as part of AESOP's annual congress, 2018-7-12. (Convener with Chiara Valli)

Heritage, Borders and Conflicts, a no-paper session/workshop convened at the 2<sup>nd</sup> PARSE Biennial Research Conference. Gothenburg. 15-17 November 2017. (Convener, with Chiara Valli and Daniel Jewesbury).

Crossing Borders with Hopeful Heritage: Quiet Encroachment towards Safe Spaces, a standard paper session convened at the biennial Conference of the Association of Critical Heritage Studies. Hangzhou, 1-6 September 2018. (Convener, with David C. Harvey).

*Role: convener, with Klas Grinel (replacing Evren Uzer), and Michael Landzelius.*

Security and (In)justice: Beyond the Securisation of the Urban, a standard paper session at the *annual conference of the International Sociological Association Research Committee (RC21) on Urban and Regional Development*. Leeds, 11-13 September 2017. (Convener, with Simone Tulumello).

Heritage in the Making: Urban Transformations and Resistance, a standard paper session at the conference Creating the City: Identity, Memory and Participation. Malmö, 9-10 February 2017. (Convener, with Catarina Listerborn)

#### *Seminars*

- A lecture/seminar at the Interdisciplinary Studies Centre, Birzeit University in Palestine, with the title Reconstructing Spaces: Protest, Memory and Discourse by Feras Hammami and Tommaso Milani. March 2019
- A seminar at the University of Hebron, Palestine, with the title Heritage and Security. By Feras Hammami. March 2019
- Seminar/public lecture on Heritage and Resistance hosted by the Critical Heritage Studies Centre at the Department of Historic Studies, University of Gothenburg, delivered by Feras Hammami. 2018-02-21
- Seminar on Cultural workers in the restructuring of post-industrial cities at the Department of Geography, University of Gothenburg, delivered by Chiara Valli. 2018-04-23
- Seminar on Cultural labour and the city. Negotiating between identity creation, gentrification and resistance, at the Department of Conservation, University of Gothenburg, delivered by Chiara Valli 2018-05-23
- Seminar based on Sarah Tuner's work with the documentary "Public House" on gentrification and community organizing in London. Chiara Valli as s panellist with international scholars. The

- seminar was organized and hosted by the Department of Cultural Studies, University of Gothenburg. 2018-02-28
- Organisation of international seminar series Heritage Borders and Marginality with experts in the fields of heritage and resistance: 19<sup>th</sup> September – 23 December 2018
    - Event 1: 19th September. THEME: Shifting urban heritage-scapes: valuation and conflicts. SPEAKERS: Don Mitchell, Uppsala University; Japonica Brown-Saracino, Boston University; and Višnja Kisić, University of Belgrade.
    - Event 2: TBC November 2018. THEME: heritage, city and Identity: Gentrification and Resistance. SPEAKERS: Agustina Martire at Queen's University Belfast; Daniel Jewsbury, Valand Academy, University of Gothenburg; and TBC speaker.
    - Event 3: TBC December 2018. THEME: Post-Industrial city: heritage, futures, and present conflicts. SPEAKER: Maris Gillette, University of Gothenburg, Anna Störm, Stockholm University; Helena Holgersson, University of Gothenburg

## 8. References

- Amin, A. (2012). *Land of Strangers*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Coombes, A. E. (1994), 'The recalcitrant object: Culture contact and the question of hybridity', In F. Barker, P. Hulme and M. Iversen (eds), *Colonial discourse/postcolonial theory*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, pp 89-114.
- Coombes, A. E. (1998) 'Inventing the "Postcolonial": Hybridity and Constituency in Contemporary Curating', *New Formations*, 18, pp. 39-52.
- Fainstein, S. (2010). *The just city*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Hammami, F. & Uzer E. (2018). Heritage and Resistance: Irregularities, Temporalities and Cumulative Impact. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 24(5), pp 445-464. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2017.1378908>
- Harvey, D. (2001). Heritage pasts and heritage presents: temporality, meaning, and the scope of heritage studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. 7:319–38.
- Herzfeld, M.. (2006). Spatial Cleansing: Monumental Vacuity and the Idea of the West." *Journal of Material Culture* 11 (1-2): 127–149.
- Hewison, R. (1987). *The Heritage Industry Britain in a Climate of Decline*. London: Methuen Publishing Ltd
- Holmberg, H. (2016) Slutrapport: Återrapportering av ekonomiskt stöd till lokalt brottsförebyggande projekt. Accessed on 2018-11-23 from <https://bit.ly/2rNIK5j>
- Holtorf, C. (2013). On Pastness: A Reconsideration of Materiality in Archaeological Object Authenticity. *Anthropological Quarterly* 86 (2): 427–443.
- Hoyt L & Gopal-Agge D. (2007) The Business Improvement District Model: A Balanced Review of Contemporary Debates. *Geography Compass* 1: 946-958.
- Littler, J. (2018). *Against Meritocracy: culture, power and myths of mobility*. Routledge.
- Littler, J. (2008). Heritage and 'race'. In Howard, P. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*. Taylor & Francis Group. Abingdon. pp. 89-103.
- Massey, D. (2005). *For Space*. Loondon: Sage.
- Naidoo, R. (2006) "Fear of difference/fear of sameness: The road to conviviality", *Soundings* 33.
- RAÄ (Swedish National Heritage Board, or Riksantikvarieämbetet) (2016a). Vision för kulturmiljöarbetet 2030: Redovisning av regeringsuppdrag om ett offensivt och angeläget kulturmiljöarbete. Accessed on 2017-10-13 from <https://www.raa.se/2014/12/vision-kulturmiljo/>
- RAÄ. (2016b). Kulturarvsarbetet i samhällsutvecklingen: Redovisning av regeringsuppdrag om omvärldsanalys och kunskapsöversikt avseende kulturarvsområdet. Acessed on 2017-10-13 from <http://samla.raa.se/xmlui/handle/raa/9737>

- Richner, M. and Olesen, K. (2018). Towards business improvement districts in Denmark:  
Translating a neoliberal urban intervention model into the Nordic context. *European  
Urban and Regional Studies*: 0969776418759156.
- Sandell, R. (2002) Museums, Society, Inequality. (London: Routledge).
- Smith, L. (2006). *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge.
- Thörn, C. & Thörn, H. (2017) Swedish cities now belong to the most segregated in Europe.  
*Sociologisk forskning* 54: 293-296.
- Wacquant, L. (2008) *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*.  
Cambridge, MA: Polity Press
- Wacquant, L. (2009) *Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity*.  
Durham and London: Duke University Press