

Issues for Developing National Heritage Protection Areas for Tourism: A Case study from China

HILARY DU CROS

Hilary du Cros, Professor, Institute for Tourism Studies, Macao SAR, China

ABSTRACT

Shamian Island is a nineteenth century European designed historical precinct in Guangzhou, which is also one of the oldest cities in China that has always been a key point for trade and communication. Steamships in the nineteenth century use to bring Western tourists to the city and more lately it has developed a reputation for business and heritage tourism. The Island has continued into the twenty-first century to be a focal point for these visitors. A longitudinal study has been conducted over the last six years that applies the indicators from Butler's Tourism Area Life Cycle model (1980, 2006) to examine the key issues in its development as a cultural tourism product area. Visits were undertaken annually where observations were made of changes in land use, conservation of heritage assets and tourism development. Interviews were conducted with key stakeholders regarding tourism development and heritage management issues. It was found that the area shows some unexpected characteristics in its development, due to the nature of its protection and management.

KEYWORDS: *Heritage tourism, tourism product areas, heritage management, China*

INTRODUCTION

Cultural tourism can be defined as, "a form of tourism that relies on a destination's cultural heritage assets and transforms them into products that can be consumed by tourists," (McKercher and du Cros, 2002:6). Christou (2005) notes that the term "cultural tourism" is used interchangeably with that of "heritage tourism", which while this is true, is ignoring the fact that the latter really fits neatly within the former. Cultural tourism has been recognized as a special interest tourism segment by the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) since 1976, although it is much older in its origins in the ancient world with the Romans engaged in an earlier style of packaged tourism activities (McKercher and du Cros, 2002).

What is understood as modern cultural tourism has only been studied in detail from the 1980s onwards (Tighe, 1986; Boniface, 1993). Since 1991, members of the Association for Tourism and Leisure Education (ATLAS) have carried out surveys, as part of the Cultural Tourism Research Project, to add a global perspective on demand and supply issues. For instance, the 2004 ATLAS covered more countries than any previously and discovered that the market did not comprise entirely older and wealthier middleclass international tourists as previously thought. It also included significant numbers of domestic tourists, young people wanting to experience new cultures and overall these tourists spent only 10 percent more than other leisure tourists (Richards, 2007).

If cultural tourists are not the same as mass tourists, then will the product areas they like to visit develop in the same way as mass tourism product areas? What are the similarities and what are the differences? What other factors may also come into play?

This article only has space to examine one case study in relation to these questions given the complexity of the background to its development for tourism. A longitudinal study has

been conducted over the last six years that applies the indicators from Richard Butler's Tourism Area Life Cycle model (1980, 2006) to cultural tourism product area of Shamian Island, Guangzhou, China. Over this period, visits were made annually where observations were made of changes in land use, conservation of heritage assets and tourism development. Interviews were conducted with key stakeholders regarding tourism development and heritage management issues.

LONGITUDINAL CASE STUDY: SHAMIAN ISLAND, GUANGZHOU

Guangzhou in the People's Republic of China has been seen as a city that provides a stable base for steady economic growth for at least 2,200 years. It was involved in foreign trade as early the Han dynasty (206 B. C. – 220 A.D.) and soon grew to become the most important southern trade center on the Silk Maritime Route (Yeung et. al., 1992; Paludan, 1998). However, its exposure to modern tourism has been more recent.

Cultural tourists have been coming to Southern China since the days of steamship cruises of the late nineteenth century offered packages to Hong Kong and Canton (with Macao occasionally included). Cultural tourism in Southern China is entering a new phase as Asian tourists become wealthier and travel more within the region. Research has been conducted in this area since the late 1990s with the return of Hong Kong and Macao to China. There is also a greater interest in studying the growth of mainland Chinese tourist market regarding its potential for consuming cultural tourism products throughout Asia in view of the relaxation of visa restrictions (du Cros, 2007).

Shamian Island is located in the Liwan district of Guangzhou on the northern bank of the Pearl River. The rest of the district has undergone extensive redevelopment in the last 15 years to improve transport efficiency and housing. Surprisingly, Shamian Island has remained relatively untouched by the land and housing reform that have required the construction of transport corridors and redevelopment of 1950s industrial and residential areas around it (Yeung et. al., 1992; Wu and Yeh, 1997, 1999). Accordingly, local Chinese traditional style vernacular housing stock in the rest of the Liwan District is less intact than Shamian Island with its Western style architecture (see Figure 1). This is often a problem for Chinese cities with developing economies (Logan, 2002).

As a piece of reclaimed land, it was set aside as an enclave for foreign residents in Canton after China was forced to sign the Treaty of Tientsin in 1858 by British and French armed forces. It continued to have a troubled history as a result of poor race relations in the early twentieth century in Guangzhou. The area is now an enclave of Western-style buildings that have high aesthetic values based on their exotic architecture and layout. The street plan was always more spacious, park-like and European in nature than old Canton.

Shamian or Shamien originally meant, 'sand flats'. The reclaimed land of the Island (in the shape of a rounded crescent) was built to encompass an area of 900m by 300m with a canal on the northern side that separated it from the northern riverbank of the Pearl River and the Chinese populated urban area (Garrett, 2002). Two small bridges were constructed to link it to this over the canal. The street plan is more spacious and European in nature than old Canton with tree-lined streets and a central avenue known as "Broadway" running east-west that also includes parkland in the middle.

The Island had its heyday around the turn of century and prior to the tumultuous 1920s. Most of the larger buildings date from this period. It reverted to Chinese control after the Japanese surrender in 1945. The main evidence of significant recent construction is the five-star White Swan Hotel that was built on open ground on the south-west edge of the island's foreshore. It opened in 1982, requiring access for motor vehicle traffic to the island for the first time (Garrett, 2002). As such, it pushed the Island into the second of Butler's phases - the involvement in tourism phase - as accommodation and access made the Island attractive to both international and domestic tourists.

INVOLVEMENT PHASE I: SHAMIAN IN 2002

Shaiman Island is administrated at street-level by the Liwan district government, despite its designation as national level heritage asset. In the early years of the communist rule, the Island was the home of foreign embassies, government authorities and organisations responsible for foreign affairs. When it was first visited in 2002 by the author, it was a mixture of residential, commercial and tourist land use. There were over 60 enterprises and service organisations employing more than 6,000 people (du Cros, et. al, 2005). The authority directly responsible for heritage conservation and tourism promotion of the Island is the Shamian Island Management Committee set up by the District government in 1984 (Zhong, 1999).

The heritage value of the 'Shamian Historical Buildings Zone' was not officially endorsed until the 1990s. In 1992, the Guangzhou Municipal Government declared it a cultural heritage protection area. This designation was enhanced by its inscription "as a major historical site with buildings of high degree of representation in contemporary history" by the State Council of the Central government in 1996 (Zhong, 1999: 234; Municipal Government of Guangzhou, 2003). By 1998, the Island was formally listed as a "national level historical heritage protection unit" (JUDCAC, 1998), and is protected by the *National Historic Relics Act, 1982* and *The Plan of Municipal Guangzhou for Protecting the Building Cluster of Shamian Island, 2001*.

A noticeable development that showed increasing government commitment is that on the way from a municipal to a nation level heritage protection unit, the bureaucratic status of the Shamian Sub-District Street Management Committee was visibly lifted in 1993 by putting it under the chairman of a vice mayor (Zhong, 1999). Officials note that major initiatives for Shamian Island's conservation include the renovation and maintenance of buildings between 1998-2000 under the government policy of urban upgrade and improvements to gardens and parks. On visiting the area for the first time, some limited restoration of the Island's buildings was evident. Only one historic building appeared to be vacant and at risk from demolition by becoming too dilapidated to restore. Most buildings had received some basic maintenance and plaques have been mounted on the exterior with the date of construction and original building name in Chinese and English.

The Department of Architecture of the South China University of Technology had encouraged its students to do measured drawings of the buildings and had also collected historical documents and photographic material. The first stage of a heritage project - an inventory - was completed in 1999 (Ou, 2003). Western architects were involved in the project but are no longer.

Local planning and heritage officials agreed that the heritage conservation problems include:

1. Difficulty in balancing the need to preserve and maintain with the desire by commercial organisations/residents to make alterations of internal layout and renovations. There was also some conflict over use and maintenance of the buildings.
2. Limited financial support for conservation works.
3. Lack of a long-term development plan.
4. The serious threat of fire hazard, particularly in those buildings occupied as unrenovated residences (as the stove and other cooking facilities are not always properly installed).

The complex issue of property rights is a problem for both conservation and economic development. Owners of the buildings include provincial and municipal authorities (around 40 percent), enterprises, and private individuals (Ou, 2003). Twenty-five to 30 percent of these buildings are used for residential purposes. In 1990, there were altogether 5,456 people in 1,387 households on Shamian Island (Zhong, 1999). To protect this historic area from further deterioration, the municipal government established a strict policy regarding

“domestic purposes”. It prevents outsiders moving in, and when buildings are vacated, through the removal and relocation of residents, these have been proposed for conversion to commercial and tourist uses by city planning authorities (Municipal Government of Guangzhou, 2003).

Hong Kong based property management and development companies were brought in to assist in building conversion to new commercial uses, such as offices or retail. This example of privatization and regional co-operation allows the government department that is in control property leasing, the Bureau of Land Resources and Management, to be involved in the work and building management without carrying out the conversion work. In line with government policy, tenants can only lease these buildings for strictly non-residential uses such as offices, restaurants, tea houses, coffee shops, and retail and for larger buildings, uses such as convention and exhibition halls.

However, heritage officials that approved the design plans for the above projects on historic buildings preferred to restrict conversions by adhering to the state policy for heritage management of national level designated cultural relics. They interpret this as requiring conservation work that is, “closest to its heritage form (*xiu jiu ru jiu*): no maintenance (or reconstruction¹) work is preferred, also preservation and protection is preferred over development for income generation or other economic purposes.” (Municipal Government of Guangzhou, 2003). The greatest clash between heritage officials and other areas of government is over the latter part of this policy. The national level designation allows the Guangzhou Cultural Heritage Bureau (GCHB) to implement the policy very strictly. In relation to the implementation, the planning, management and heritage officials (at municipal and district level) have clashed regarding the:

1. Strictly enforced heritage controls on new construction that requires reusing the existing buildings. District Council officials would have liked to expand the space currently available for disposal in existing buildings (10,000m) by making additions.
2. Difficulties getting approval from heritage authorities, if too many changes are proposed. Some projects have waited for three years without a response.

It is likely that in many other countries a national government or non-governmental organisation brokering a development plan for the area that balances commercial and conservation concerns would resolve much of this conflict. However, there were no NGOs or governmental organisations involved in heritage development in Guangzhou at the time, although Western architects and planners have been employed intermittently on projects (Hugentobler et al., 2002). Nor was there the groundswell support amongst Guangzhou citizens, who were only just beginning to see Shamian Island as important in their lives as good place for recreation on weekends. In general, the heritage conservation of the Island has been mostly a top-down endeavour dictated by the municipal government without any community involvement with only professional architects and scholars being invited to voice their opinions on its appropriate development on occasions (Zhong, 1999).

Regarding private investment, the National Level Protection Unit status of Shamian makes public-private partnerships at a local level difficult, because of the greater restriction on the use or reuse of buildings, more laws and regulations within which to conform. The closest arrangement to this a public-private partnership is the privatization of some property management aspects to Hong Kong companies, although it is not seen as this by either authority. Greater involvement of central planning is seen in the number of tiers of government involved in the consideration of the development approval (hence the three-year wait for application responses). The national protection status does have the advantage, as one heritage official from the Guangzhou Cultural Heritage Bureau saw it, of “creating a positive (cultural) image for the city, higher cultural status, an attraction for tourism, and lifting the (cultural) quality of life”, hence the endorsement by the Vice-mayor’s department.

Accordingly in 2002, the level of commodification for tourism on Shamian Island was relatively low and did not reflect any awareness that it had the potential for greater development for cultural tourism. The newest and most recent constructions were the White Swan Hotel and the Victory Hotel. The latter is an attempt at a sympathetic example of modern infill, which the locals deride as being “fake heritage”. Neither hotel promotes Shamian-themed niche product accommodation or tour packages, nor does much to shape the tourists’ experience of the area, but this could still be explored in the conversion of historic buildings to boutique heritage hotels by the aforementioned Hong Kong property developers.

The Street Committee representative noted that they would give approval for a “Western style restaurant” over Chinese ones, as they would issue less smoke from cooking. He also stated that they have some contact with tourism authorities, but the awareness of the level of planning and co-operation needed to make the Island a successful tourism product seems to be limited on both sides. Indeed, it is possible that the policy orientation has been shifting from the stress on tourism development in 1980s to greater emphasis on heritage conservation in 1990s with heritage agencies, in particular, the GCHB, playing a dominant role because of its national level protection unit status and status of its management committee within the local administration.

In summary, the emergence of a private sector for China is only a recent phenomenon and the bureaucratic approach for Shamian Island as a tourism product area in 2002 indicated a lack of experience and positive expectations of partnerships with the former. Instead of the kind of investment that is usually associated with heritage controls and gentrification, there was a development of buildings for a limited range of hospitality and retail uses. But this was not enough when the pressure began to increase with the greater visitation of international and regional tourists after SARS in 2003.

INVOLVEMENT PHASE II: SHAMIAN IN 2003-06

In 2004, the public relations vice-director of the White Swan Hotel² observed to the author that the local authorities, particularly the Street Committee, had gone through three strategies in trying to develop Shamian Island for tourism:

- Lan Kwai Fong model.³ With help from Allan Zeman, a pilot project has helped set up a few bars. The Street Committee stopped encouraging this model as there were concerns that this approach would make the area lose its ambience as a family attraction.
- Xintiandi (from Shanghai) model.⁴ This was tried only briefly, possibly because they could not get investors interested.
- “Romantic European Culture Island” model. This approach highlights Shamian as a “business and cultural heritage tourism island that has a Continental European ambience.”⁵

The Street Committee secretary stated that they had adopted the third model in 2004, which allows the growth of tourism to be centred on the conservation of cultural heritage assets. This approach is apparently welcomed by one major stakeholder, the White Swan Hotel, which views Shamian Island as an “exotic place within Guangzhou.” At the time, the hotel drew fifty percent of its occupation on average from Western countries and most of its guests are families. If Shamian Island became “too touristy” with too many bars, then it could create a “sleazy” atmosphere and ruin the park-like and family-friendly ambience (and no doubt the quality of life of the local families as well) and, in turn, the guest-drawing power of the hotel. Thus, it is not surprising to see an agreement being reached by both the Street Committee and the area’s major stakeholder to follow the least disruptive approach to its key tourist market then and to heritage conservation on Shamian Island.

Developing a cultural tourism product area of this kind has involved a certain amount of uncertainty about how to proceed, because of the administrative environment in which the Street Committee and other local officials operate. First, China’s rapidly transforming economy has affected many aspects of its public administration. Market liberalisation

processes have had a major impact on the way the Chinese state now operates. Ma and Chan (2004) describe it as being a move from the traditional Leninist totalitarian model to a much less monolithic entity with the notion of “local state corporatism” forming a major component. As a result of fiscal reform, Chinese local government authorities have been allowed to retain part of the extra tax revenue they raise. It is expected by Central government that this would motivate the local authorities to develop entrepreneurial endeavours that benefit local communities. Individual senior cadres in these local bureaus are expected to speed up the process of economic reform by undertaking this responsibility. To retain a type of market preserving federalism, Central government has instituted a type of rewards system that is designed to encourage officials to act responsibly, and which gives the State a sense of central control. In changing from a loyalty-based to performance-based system in the 1990s, an appraisal process was set in place to provide rewards or penalties to officials. Under the Target Management Responsibility System, officials can be rewarded financially or politically (e.g. receive a promotion within the party) (du Cros and Lee, 2007). By loosening the system, much of China’s economic reform has become an experimental bottom-up not top-down affair.

Overall, the market liberalisation in China has some positive implications for the management of heritage assets in that it could start to change administrative structures and public attitudes towards seeing private investment (both company and individual) in restoring building stock and other forms of conservation works in a more appealing light. However, unbridled commercialization of heritage assets in inner city areas could result in a loss of heritage values, tourism market appeal and quality of life.

Hence, government heritage authorities that fear the latter often find themselves in conflict with other stakeholders, particularly other government agencies at the municipal level. Some of these agencies are seeking a more entrepreneurial and less bureaucratically controlled approach to heritage development and conservation similar to that found in most market economies, which have recognized that heritage asset conservation can not be borne by government alone, if a high quality urban environment is their ultimate aim.

DEVELOPMENT PHASE I: SHAMIAN IN 2006-08

This is the phase where Asian tourists really discovered Shamian as a cultural tourism product with the additional benefit of wedding photography and promotion by private retailers of the area. These tourists began to outnumber the Western tourists as a key market for hotels and shops. Consequently, wedding clothes hire and photography shops mushroomed within the historic buildings. The wedding couples select outfits and use the buildings (particularly the two churches as backdrops for their photographs). None are Christians seeking to be married in their chapels. The tourists just want the European aesthetics of the setting. Most of these couples stay outside of Shamian Island at night and come in during the day by taxi or in the shops’ own shuttle buses.

The key market for the hotels remain international tourists (American families mostly, who like the ambience). A growing number of mainland and Hong Kong Chinese tourists are also finding the Island convenient for access to new shopping malls opening across the canal from it. In response to this change, new retail shops selling traditional Chinese medicines, souvenirs and art has increased. A Disney shop opened and closed within the space of twelve months, because it was out of context for the international and Hong Kong Chinese tourists and too expensive for the mainland Chinese ones. However Starbucks has been more successful, as the one American branded restaurant given permission to open on the Island.

Shamian Island has also extended its playground facilities for families even though many have been moved out of the buildings to aid conversion to more lucrative commercial uses. Chinese families from all around the city visit the Island in large numbers on weekends treating it as an another type of city park. The children of international tourists also enjoy

these facilities happily with them. Any historical interpretation of the Island's more stormy racial relations has been ignored (du Cros, 2006). It is likely this is the reason that the proposed tourist information centre to present the Island's history that continues to be promised by authorities has yet to appear.

Most heritage buildings by April 2008 had had some form of building conservation or maintenance. Two approaches appear to have been taken. The first is a very slow program of works with attention to authenticity and detail by government employed contractors. The second is a faster conversion for commercial use undertaken by the contractors of Hong Kong and mainland Chinese property management companies. The latter is less sympathetic to the cultural values of buildings in the rush to get them open for business. This was evident in the conversion completed last year of the former Hong Kong Shanghai Bank staff quarters to offices where its remarkable wooden shuttered windows were replaced with aluminium window sills and glass. The Street Committee seems to have loosened its control on these private property management companies as it increasingly requires the rental fees for other conservation works. Despite this increasing need for revenue, none of the buildings have been converted to high-end serviced apartments or boutique hotels to attract more of the international and Hong Kong cultural tourists that are known to visit. The Island is still awaiting the advent of a first class international or Western restaurant that could be easily housed in any of the buildings in keeping with their essential style, although some have been interested.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Altogether, three stages are to be found in the development of Shamian Island as a cultural tourism product area: involvement in tourism stage 1 (1982-2003); involvement in tourism stage 2 (2003-2006); and development of tourism stage 1 (2006-2008). Since the advent of the White Swan Hotel in 1982 as the first five star joint venture hotel in China, the Island has been an example of unique tourism history as well as a tourist area product bringing some other factors into play that are not part of a more conventional type of tourism product area life cycle development. However, returning to the questions raised earlier stemming from the application of the Butler (1980) model some answers might be found if we summarise the information further according to the indicators for the phases of that model that the research indicates the Island's development straddles (see Table 1 below).

TABLE 1. Summary of Shamian Island's Compliance in Early 2008 with Butler's (1980) Involvement and Development Phase Indicators

<i>TALC Phase Indicators</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Involvement Phase: Pressure on government to provide tourism infrastructure	Yes, with one important exception	Has most typical tourism infrastructure, except as a cultural tourism attraction it needs a visitor information centre to fully interpret it, but there is no real pressure for it from stakeholders
Involvement Phase: Some advertising for tourism	Yes	The area is promoted by local private stakeholders not the government tourism authorities, unlike other cultural attractions in the city
Development Phase: Well defined tourist market area and heavy marketing	Not yet	There is tourism development model, but no explicit plan for its marketing
Development Phase: Local community involvement and control of tourism declines	Yes	However local control was never there, with the exception of the White Swan Hotel, as the most powerful stakeholder that has always been partly publicly owned

Development Phase: Old facilities (e.g. visitor accommodation) superceded by larger more elaborate, more up-to-date facilities provided by outside organisations	No	More modern construction is not in line with heritage conservation protection measures, only the Victory Hotel has been built as a heritage replica in the last 10 years
Development Phase: Natural and cultural attractions are marketed specifically, supplemented by artificial facilities	Yes	The setting of the historic buildings and park area is supplemented by the wedding clothes hire and photography shops
Development Phase: Changes in physical appearance	Yes, but limited	More of the historic buildings have been converted to retail or office usage, but only a few more restaurants in the last two years
Development Phase: Regional and national involvement in planning of facilities	Yes, but limited	Major renovations and demolitions need approval at the national level. However, there has been no masterplan for tourism development sponsored by the national authorities as promised
Development Phase: Number of visitors will exceed locals in peak periods	Yes	Not all are likely to be tourists as city dwellers from nearby suburbs are using it for recreation. However, less than 4,000 residents remain
Development Phase: Imported labour will be used	Yes	Particularly to service international visitors as limited English is spoken on the Island
Development Phase: Auxiliary industries, such as laundries, start to appear	Yes	Have been evident since the advent of the two major hotels
Development Phase: Type of visitor will range towards midcentric (see Plog 1991: 64)	Yes	Many are also families

So, if cultural tourists are not the same as mass tourists, then will the product areas they like to visit develop in the same way as mass tourism product areas? From this example the answer seems to be both yes and no to this important question. No - that cultural tourists in this example need more explanation of a site's history than mass tourists purely there for recreation or photography. The cultural tourists who come to Shamian Island usually stay at one of its major hotels to have better experience of its ambience and aesthetics, even if it is not yet possible to learn more about its history from tourist facilities.

On the most recent visit, the author found that guided tours are being developed by young tour operators studying tourism part-time at university. These tour products recognise there is a growing need for better interpretation of the area's history for English and Chinese speaking tourists that is not being addressed in the signage or walking maps provided by the hotels. In this respect, the story that would normally be presented by local authorities or community historical societies has become the responsibility of the private sector by default. Not known for its bravado in regard to hot interpretation, it is likely that tours will remain "family friendly" and not outline much about the more dramatic events that have taken place on the site, such as 1925 massacre of Chinese military academy students by British troops (du Cros, 2006). Hence the answer to the former question is also yes, cultural product areas do develop differently if the private and public sector are keen to keep the tourist experience free of any

real depth of understanding of an area's historical development or unable to develop themed cultural tourism products adequately.

What are the similarities and what are the differences to be found when applying the Butler's indicators to a tourism area, such as Shamian Island, as against a national park in Canada or a beach resort in Thailand? Like the elephant in the room that no one can ignore, the White Swan Hotel keeps looming over the proceedings, even more than the local authorities, as dominant stakeholder pushing the Island's tourism development towards family friendly products more than the government. However, instead of becoming fully privatised as might be expected with Butler's model (1980), the Hong Kong developer has sold out its share of the hotel to the government joint partner. Meanwhile, no other major private developers or investors seem interested in establishing boutique hotels or high-end restaurants in the restored buildings, despite the growing popularity of place with locals and tourists. Could the area's cultural values and murky history be to blame? What other factors may also come into play?

While certain cultural associations could play an indirect role in the area's recent development for tourism, it is more likely that the semi-socialist nature of China's administrative system in relation to managing heritage assets for tourism is the key factor. The lack of real dialogue between the local and national authorities concerning the planning development of the Island for tourism has led to patchy involvement by private investment and ad hoc property management and presentation. After many years of discussion, the Island still lacks a firm tourism development plan endorsed by all stakeholders or any consistent promotion as key heritage attraction in Guangzhou. The situation probably has its roots in the lack of resources and capacity for local authorities to plan to become its marketers and developers, despite bottom up entrepreneurship that the current administrative system seems to be advocating. Meanwhile, private entrepreneurs and developers are discouraged by lack of incentives from developing the Island's unique resources appropriately for cultural tourism in accordance with the existing model of a "business and cultural heritage tourism island that has a Continental European ambience."

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank those interviewed from the Liwan District Council, Shamian Street Sub-District Office, Guangzhou Cultural Heritage Bureau, Guangzhou Tourism Bureau, and the Guangdong Provincial Tourism Administration. The author would like to thank especially: Tracy Lu, formerly of the White Swan Hotel, and numerous street retailers for their views on how Shamian Island should develop.

REFERENCES

- Agnew, N. and Demas, M. (2002): Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China. (English language translation), Los Angeles, China ICOMOS and the Getty Conservation Institute.
- Boniface P, Fowler P (1993): Heritage and Tourism in 'the Global Village,' Routledge, London.
- Butler, R.W. (2006): Tourism Area Life Cycle Vol 1, Applications and Modifications. Clevedon, Channel View Publications.
- Butler, R. W. (1980): The Concept of Tourism Area Cycle of Evolution: The Implications for Management of Resources. *The Canadian Geographer*, 24: pp. 5-12.
- Cristou, E. (2005): In Sigala, M. and Leslie, D. (eds.) *International Cultural Tourism. Management, Implication and Cases*, Oxford: Elservior Butterwoth Heinneman: pp. 3-15.
- du Cros, H. (2007): Too Much of a Good Thing? Visitor Congestion Management Issues for Popular World Heritage Tourist Attractions. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*. 2 (3): pp. 225-38.
- du Cros H. (2006): The "Romantic European Culture Island" with a Turbulent History: The Intrinsic and Extrinsic Values of Shamian Island, Guangzhou. *China Tourism Research* 1 (2&3) (Chinese and English): pp. 193-220.
- du Cros, H. and Lee, Y.S.F. (2007): *Cultural Heritage Management in China: Preserving the Pearl River Delta Cities*. London, Routledge.

- du Cros, H., Bauer, T., Lo, C.S. and Song, R. (2005): Cultural Heritage Assets in China as Sustainable Tourism Products: Case Studies of the Hutongs and the Huanghua Section of the Great Wall. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 13 (2): pp. 171-194.
- Garrett, V. (2002): *Heaven is High, the Emperor Far Away: Merchants and Mandarins of Old Canton*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hugentobler, M., Beisi, J., Moavenzadeh, F., Hanaki, K. (2002): AGS Future Cities: Guangzhou – A Partnership for Sustainable Urban Development. *Inhaltsverzeichnis DISP* 151 (4/2002): pp. 51-8.
- Jilin University Dictionary of Culture and Archaeology Committee, (1998): *A Dictionary of Culture and Archaeology*. Beijing: Wai Wen Chu Ban She.
- Kirkpatrick, C. and Lee, N. (1997): Market Liberalisation and Environmental Assessment” In F A Wilson (Ed.) *Towards Sustainable Project Development*, (pp. 56-76) Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Leung, Y.F. (2001): Environmental Impacts of Tourism at China’s World Heritage Sites: Huangshan and Chengde. *Tourism Recreation Research* 26 (1): pp. 117-22.
- Logan, W.S. (2002) Introduction: Globalization, Cultural Identity and Heritage. In Logan, W.S. (ed.), *The Disappearing Asian City. Protecting Asia’s Urban Heritage in a Globalizing World*. Oxford University Press, Oxford: pp. xii-xxi.
- Ma, S.Y. and Chan, W.Y. (2004) Heritage Preservation and Sustainability of China’s Development. *Sustainable Development* 12 (1): pp. 15-31.
- McKercher, B. and du Cros, H. (2002): *Cultural Tourism: The Partnership between Tourism and Cultural Heritage Management*, Binghamton, The Haworth Press, New York.
- Municipal Government of Guangzhou (2003): Regulation on the Protection and Management of Shamian, the 4th Draft; Municipal Government of Guangzhou. (In Chinese)
- Ou Qingzhou (2002): The Study of Contemporary Building Clusters in Shamian, The Draft of the Master Thesis for Oral Examination, Southern China Polytechnic University, Guangzhou. (In Chinese)
- Page, S.J. and Hall, M. (2003): *Managing Urban Tourism*, London: Prentice Hall.
- Paludan, A. (1998): *Chronicle of the Chinese Emperors*, Thames and Hudson, London.
- Plog (1991)
The Peoples Daily, (2002)-3.
- Richards, G. (2007): Introduction: Global Trends in Cultural Tourism. Richards, G. (ed.) *Cultural Tourism, Global and Local Perspectives*; Binghamton, The Haworth Press, New York, pp. 1-20.
- Tighe, Anthony J. (1986): The Arts /Tourism Partnership, *Journal of Travel Research*, 24 (3): pp. 2-5.
- Wu, F. and Yeh, A. (1999): Urban Spatial Structure in a Transitional Economy, The Case of Guangzhou, China. *American Planning Association* 65 (4): China. pp. 377-94.
- Wu, F. and Yeh, A. (1997): Changing Spatial Distribution and Determinants of Land Development in Chinese Cities in the Transition from a Centrally Planned Economy to a Socialist Market Economy: A Case Study of Guangzhou. *Urban Studies* 34(11): pp. 1851-79
- Yeh, A. and Wu, F. (1999): The Transformation of the Urban Planning System in China from Centrally-planned to Transitional Economy. Article available online since 4 March 1999 on <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science>
- Yeung, T.M., Deng, Y.Y., Chen, H.X. (1992): Guangzhou The Southern Metropolis in Transformation. In Yeung, T.M., and Hu, X.W. (eds) *China’s Coastal Cities. Catalysts for Modernization*, University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu: pp. 240-65.
- Zhong J. (1999): Ed. Shamian: Nearly a Century’s Secret Veil, Guangdong People’s Press, Guangzhou. (In Chinese)
- Zhu, J. (1999) *The Transition of China’s Urban Development, From Plan-controlled to Market-led*, Westport Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.

¹ Materials conservation terms used by the officials in the interviews did not exactly match those of the interviewer and it is suspected that definitions may have also differed amongst the officials themselves. The State Administration for Cultural Heritage (SACH) has tried to standardise terms with exact meanings in their new set of Conservation Principles (Agnew and Demas, 2002). However, the local heritage official’s concern here appears to be that any modification to the historic buildings that they do not control closely will result in a loss of the original fabric and its historic value. It is probably justified, as there is not much local expertise available in the area of Western building conservation in Guangzhou.

² During an interview in December 2004 with the author.

³ Lan Kwai Fong is a successful bar and nightclub district on Hong Kong island.

⁴ Xintiandi is an upmarket Western style shopping and restaurant complex established in a historic district of Shanghai with Western buildings similar to some of those in Shamian. It has been reasonably successful, although the refurbishment was very expensive and not always that respectful of the building's interiors.

⁵ The description of the Street Committee's current brand's meaning during an interview in December 2004.