

Singapore Management University

Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University

Research Collection School of Social Sciences

School of Social Sciences

1-1997

Culture and capital in urban change: The constitutive relationship between development imperatives and symbolic values in Singapore's built environment

Lily KONG

Singapore Management University, lilykong@smu.edu.sg

Follow this and additional works at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/sooss_research



Part of the [Asian Studies Commons](#), [Human Geography Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies Commons](#)

Citation

KONG, Lily.(1997). Culture and capital in urban change: The constitutive relationship between development imperatives and symbolic values in Singapore's built environment. *Asian Geographer*, 16(1-2), 89-102.

Available at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/sooss_research/2264

This Journal Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Social Sciences at Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Collection School of Social Sciences by an authorized administrator of Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. For more information, please email cherylids@smu.edu.sg.

CULTURE AND CAPITAL IN URBAN CHANGE: THE CONSTITUTIVE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEVELOPMENT IMPERATIVES AND SYMBOLIC VALUES IN SINGAPORE'S BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Lily Kong

Department of Geography
National University of Singapore

Abstract: Over the last three decades, Singapore has undergone tremendous urban change. These changes have been premised on the logic and rationality of economic planning, in which development goals have taken precedence over other symbolic values, be they historic, cultural, sacred, personal, social or aesthetic. In recent years, however, there has been tangible evidence that parts of the urban fabric are being retained, a reflection perhaps of increasing appreciation of the cultural and historical values of these built forms. Given this scenario, my intention in this paper is to explore the interconnections between symbolic values in the urban landscape, on the one hand, and economic values, manifested in development imperatives, on the other. For heuristic reasons, I have chosen to polarise the possible interconnections. First, I will focus on the circumstances under which there are conflicting symbolic systems and economic values. I will do so by discussing two arenas of contention. One is the establishment, relocation and demolition of religious buildings in Singapore, all of which follow pragmatic planning principles, which sometimes run counter to the sacred meanings and values that adherents invest in their religious buildings. The other is the clash between developmental goals and environmental values, in which the cultural appraisal of nature as aesthetically pleasing and as part of the nation's heritage is at variance with developmental needs for land, which causes the destruction of natural environments. Second, I will illustrate the situation when development openly harnesses history and culture, where they become part of the processes of production and consumption associated with capital accumulation. In other words, I explore those situations where history and culture become commodified in heritage and culture industries, often anchored in tourism.

Introduction

Singapore has been described in many arenas as one of the world's economic miracles today. Yet, when the island-state first attained internal self-government in 1959 and then full independence in 1965, the government inherited a host of problems, chief amongst which were unemployment, housing shortages, unsanitary conditions and poor economic performance. From the throes of Third World poverty and underdevelopment, the country made the quantum leap to the status of newly industrialised country within two decades. Indeed, as Prime Minister Goh Chok Tong indicated in his 1995 National Day Rally speech, Singapore will attain "developed nation" status by 1996, if only in per capita income terms (*The Straits Times*, 21 August 1995).

Much of these achievements are reflected in the tremendous urban change that has taken place over the last three decades. Slums and squatter settlements have been cleared; the housing landscape is now characterised mainly by highrise Housing and Development Board (HDB) flats; unhygienic roadside hawkers have been rehoused in modern hawker centres; and sanitary conditions have been vastly improved. All these have been made possible via a systematic urban planning process under the auspices of the Urban Redevelopment Authority (URA), with the cooperation of state agencies such as the HDB. This urban planning process has, for a long time, been premised on the logic and rationality of economic planning, in which development goals have taken precedence over other symbolic values, be they historic, cultural, sacred, personal, social or aesthetic. It is only in recent years that there has been tangible evidence that parts of the urban fabric are being retained, a reflection perhaps of increasing appreciation of the cultural and historical values of these built forms. Indeed, in recent years, government leaders have called for the preservation of cultural forms and the values they embody as a way of “anchoring” Singaporeans in their “Asian identity” (*URA Annual Report*, 1988/89:21) which unfortunately had been systematically eroded with the large-scale demolition of parts of the city.

The Establishment, Relocation and Demolition of Religious Buildings

One arena in which conflict arises between culture and capital is in the establishment, relocation and demolition of religious buildings. First, in the establishment of religious buildings, the state is guided by “rationality” and “pragmatic” planning. Specifically, the state sets aside parcels of land for tender by religious groups. These parcels of land are usually found in HDB new towns, allocated on the basis of the neighbourhood principle, adapted from British and European town planning practices. The basic planning philosophy is maximum self-sufficiency in the satisfaction of basic community needs and so within each neighbourhood, there will be shopping facilities, community centres, recreation facilities, schools, medical care and the like for residents. If there are more than three neighbourhoods close together, then a town or district centre will be built to provide higher order goods and services, such as banks, theatres, cinemas and departmental stores (Teh, 1969:175; Drakakis-Smith & Yeung, 1977:6). A strongly modernist stance is thus evident in town planning in which the successful formula is based on efficiency and functionalism (Ley, 1989:47-51). Urban planning, it would appear, is not primarily a matter of aesthetics or meanings, but of economics, and the basic guiding principle is to increase the working efficiency of the city.

Given these underlying values, religious building sites are provided in new towns as another amenity which sections of the population require. Precise planning standards guiding the minimum provision of such sites are drawn up as they are for other amenities, as shown in Table 1. These guidelines take into consideration “demographic characteristics”, “religious habits”, as well as space requirements and architectural design for the different religious groups (Correspondence with Strategic Planning Branch, URA; and Systems and Research Department, HDB). These planning standards are reviewed periodically in the light of demographic and social changes. The precise sites are usually proposed by the HDB and submitted for

consideration to the Master Plan Committee and approval of the Ministry of National Development.

Table 1: Planning standards for the provision of religious sites.

<u>Religious building</u>	<u>Approx. site area</u>	<u>Planning standard</u>
Church	3,000 m ² to 4,500 m ²	1 to 12,000 d.u.
Chinese temple	2,000 m ² to 3,000 m ²	1 to 9,000 d.u.
Mosque	2,500 m ²	1 to 20,000 d.u.
Hindu temple	1,800 m ² to 2,500 m ²	1 to 90,000 d.u.

d.u.: dwelling unit

Source: Systems and Research Department, HDB.

While the state uses these openly economic principles and processes, for religious adherents, the establishment of a place of worship should be guided by divine will and purpose. As Cheng, a Methodist suggested,¹ it is faith that underlies the setting up of churches and which “sweep(s) (people) to do as the spirit leads them.” The tension arises particularly when the two differing ideological systems embodied in pragmatic planning (championing economic values) and divine guidance (highlighting cultural meaning) pull in different directions. For example, in seeking to establish a building for worship, a group may feel that it is divine will and that the community is ready for it and needs it. The rationality and pragmatism of planning principles, however, may suggest that such a group cannot be offered any site for use. In the case of the Mount Carmel group, for example, Wong (1986) chronicles the way in which the group felt divine guidance led them to set up a church building (today the Clementi Bible Centre), and how the “rational” and “pragmatic” planning procedures made it difficult for their efforts to be realised quickly. For instance, in the planning blueprints, there were “no designated religious sites available” where they requested for one; when they tendered for a site in Pasir Panjang, they lost. Wong (1986) clearly illustrates the disappointments and frustrations that the group felt as a consequence of such conflict between their religious needs and the strictures of planning and developmental goals. Further evidence that economic imperatives are seen to be the overriding force in urban change is reflected in public conceptions that agencies and plans operating on principles of economic logic inevitably hold sway. Typical comments which illustrate such resigned acceptance include, for example,

HDB holds all the power. What right do we have?

If it is in the Master Plan, there is nothing we can do about it. We have to accept it.

This conflict between cultural and economic logic becomes more stark in situations involving relocation and/or demolition of religious buildings. I will elaborate on one of these situations, namely, when the sites of religious buildings are affected by public schemes. In 1973, a policy statement was made which asserted that

as people move out from old areas to be redeveloped, temples, mosques or churches will have to give way to urban renewal or new development, unless they are of historical and architectural value² (Press Statement, 25 November 1973).

In other words, religious buildings will be treated like any other building which may come in the way of development. Indeed, Dr Tan Eng Liang (the then Senior Minister of State for National Development), further declared: "The resettlement policy is clear-cut, irrespective of religions, irrespective of owners and irrespective of organisations" (Parliamentary Debates, 16 March 1978, col. 978). In putting this policy into practice, the government acquired and cleared 23 mosques, 76 *suraus*, 700 Chinese temples, 27 Hindu temples and 19 churches for public development schemes between 1974 and 1987 (Press statement from Prime Minister's Office, 3 October 1987). Even though religious groups may be offered alternative sites, such sites are not offered on a one-to-one basis for "pragmatic", "economic" reasons:

It is not possible to have a temple for temple, a mosque for mosque, a church for church substitution. This is uneconomic, impractical and, in the limited land space of Singapore, impossible (Press Statement, 25 November 1973).

Instead, religious buildings affected by clearance (usually effected through the Land Acquisition Act) are primarily allocated land on a joint basis. In other words, one site is made available to two or more existing buildings of the same religion. In one instance, as many as eight Chinese temples were affected by clearance and because each could not afford a new place, all eight groups came together to build one temple (in Tampines Street 21) to rehouse them all (*The Straits Times*, 8 July 1986).

Apart from religious buildings which have no choice but to leave under the force of the Land Acquisition Act, in some instances, the lease may have run out for the religious site just as redevelopment is about to take place. In such instances, the lease will not be extended, and those affected may not be allocated land. They will then have to tender and pay market value for sites set aside by the HDB for religious use, or sites put up for sale to religious groups and associations by the URA. This has caused some smaller religious buildings to close down completely because they could not find suitable alternative sites or because they could not afford the cost of new sites (*The Straits Times*, 15 June 1979).

While the development imperatives have taken precedence, many religious adherents in fact conceive of their religious places as sacred places that should not be destroyed, irrespective of their architectural or historical merit. This religious (cultural) symbolic value is manifested in a variety of ways. It is evident, for example, in those adherents who believe that religious places are intrinsically sacred, that is, the place is in and of

itself spiritual because of its association with some form of divine manifestation or with some sacred event of tremendous significance (Tuan, 1974:146). For instance, Chandran, a devout elderly Hindu interviewee, cited the example of how a person may be told by a god (perhaps through a dream) that a temple is to be built on a particular piece of land, or that the god wants to reside there. The land and the temple thus constructed are thus sacred. This, in fact, is believed to be the case for the Kaliamman temple at Old Toh Tuck Road, which was originally located at Lorong Ah Soo. Its founder had apparently been told in a dream by the deity of the new site and as a result, the temple had been moved to the new location. In such an instance, any attempt to demolish or relocate the temple for development purposes would not only represent the triumph of economic values over symbolic ones, it would be a serious defiance of divine will.³

Development and the Environment

Another arena in which conflict arises between symbolic meanings and economic values is in the contest between nature conservation and urban development. On the one hand, nature is invested with symbolic meanings. As Tuan (1971:38) suggested, nature may be viewed as a place for outdoor recreation, safe enough for the family; a museum of natural curiosities; or a religious sanctuary. On the other hand, nature could be construed as standing in the way of development. This happens when scarce land is taken up by natural areas such as forests when they could be cleared to make space for development, be it agricultural or urban development.

In the local context, economic considerations have for a long time taken precedence. In the early nineteenth century, there was a concern to develop agriculture on the island and in particular, to cultivate produce for export. In order to achieve this end, primary vegetation was cleared to make way for plantations. Such destruction was recorded in the writings of the British naturalist, Alfred Russel Wallace (1823-1913), who observed that much of the forest had been reduced to isolated patches, mostly on hilltops. In addition, he noted that what was not cleared for agriculture was subject to harvesting of timber, firewood, and forest products such as rattan, resins and gums (Wallace, in Corlett, 1988:38). By the turn of the century, there had been widespread clearance and subsequent abandonment of natural areas, and *belukar* and *lalang* overran the island, covering a significant 40 per cent of total land area. In 1900, only one-tenth of the island was left covered by primary rainforest and secondary jungle while swamps accounted for 13 per cent of total land area (Wong, 1969).

Insofar as nature is concerned, the triumph of economic values over symbolic ones became most apparent in the post-1960s. As I indicated at the beginning of the paper, the newly-constituted government in 1959 was confronted with a plethora of problems, amongst them, rapid population growth, housing shortages, high unemployment and poor infrastructure. As part of the national efforts to address these problems, various economic and social programmes were initiated. Each of these necessitated an immense degree of land-use planning and land and building developments which quickly became an integral part of Singapore's growth strategy. Such planning and development entailed sometimes radical changes in *inter alia* housing, industrial, commercial, and infrastructural facilities. For example, under the aegis of first the

Economic Development Board and subsequently the Jurong Town Corporation, Jurong's ridges, swamps and coral-fringed coasts were transformed into Singapore's largest industrial estate. All these changes have been possible partly through reductions in the extent of Singapore's natural habitats, as illustrated in Table 2. The proportion of Singapore covered by forests decreased from 6.5 percent in 1960 to 4.6 percent in 1990 while the proportion covered by swamps dropped from 7.9 percent to 2.5 percent in the same period. Correspondingly, the proportion of built-up area almost doubled from 27.9 per cent in 1960 to 49.1 percent in 1990.

Table 2: Land utilisation in Singapore, 1960-1990.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total^a</u> <u>km² (%)</u>	<u>Forest</u> <u>km² (%)</u>	<u>Swamp</u> <u>km² (%)</u>	<u>Farm</u> <u>holdings^b</u> <u>km² (%)</u>	<u>Built-up</u> <u>areas^c</u> <u>km² (%)</u>	<u>Others^d</u> <u>km² (%)</u>
1960	581.5 (100.0)	37.8 (6.5)	45.9 (7.9)	141.7 (24.4)	162.3 (27.9)	193.8 (33.3)
1965	581.5 (100.0)	35.0 (6.0)	35.0 (6.0)	131.6 (22.6)	177.4 (30.5)	202.5 (34.8)
1970	586.4 (100.0)	32.4 (5.5)	32.4 (5.5)	134.0 (22.9)	189.9 (32.4)	197.7 (33.1)
1975	596.8 (100.0)	32.4 (5.4)	32.4 (5.4)	105.9 (17.7)	228.4 (38.3)	197.7 (33.1)
1980	617.8 (100.0)	30.0 (4.9)	26.0 (4.2)	80.9 (13.1)	275.1 (44.5)	205.8 (33.3)
1985	620.2 (100.0)	28.6 (4.6)	18.7 (3.0)	58.9 (9.5)	295.0 (47.6)	219.9 (35.3)
1990	626.4 (100.0)	28.6 (4.6)	15.7 (2.5)	12.0 (1.9)	307.4 (49.1)	262.8 (41.9)

a Percentages do not necessarily add up to 100 because some figures have been rounded off.

b Licensed farms, excluding land under pure rubber and coconut plantations.

c Includes new industrial estates.

d Includes inland water, open spaces, public gardens, cemeteries, non-built-up areas in military establishments, quarries, rubber and coconut plantations, and unused land.

Source: Wong, 1989:774; *Singapore Facts and Pictures*, 1990.

Even as Singapore has destroyed much of its natural heritage, and at the same time, achieved significant achievements in economic development, it is tempting to ask if the time has come when nature conservation has a higher profile in Singapore's agenda. In citing a few examples where conflict has arisen between the demands of development and conservation, it becomes apparent that where conserving a natural area is thought to yield less benefit than the development of that area, pragmatic and economic considerations still take precedence.

As an example, requests were put forward in 1984 and 1990 to the Ministry of National Development to reconsider the destruction of Kranji marshes for development and to protect the area as a nature reserve. The development claims that had been put forward include Singapore Telecom which planned to have transmitting stations there; the then Singapore Broadcasting Corporation (SBC) which intended to put in transmission towers; and the Public Utilities Board waterworks associated with Kranji Reservoir. The Ministry's response was that the substantial costs involved in maintaining the marshes and the land constraints made it impractical to retain the area and specifically the heronry which takes up five hectares of the area marked out for SBC's use (*The Straits Times*, 15/10/90:21).

In 1992, the Public Utilities Board (PUB) revealed plans to clear 130 hectares of forests (which were nearly 100-years-old) at Lower Pierce Reservoir to build an 18-hole golf course. In fact, the forests had been protected under the National Parks Act as a nature reserve. That it was possible for the PUB to put forward plans for a golf course in place of forests reflects the extent to which the values of modern living have preceded the values invested in nature. This is a short step away from situations in which symbolic values become harnessed for economic ends.

The Built Environment: Heritage and Conservation

Earlier, I had indicated that parts of the urban fabric have been conserved in recent years. I had also suggested that some of these include religious buildings which have been preserved for their historical and architectural value. Taken at face value, it may well appear that such conservation of the historic urban landscape is a distinctly 'cultural' process, illustrating how cultural values have been given weight *vis-a-vis* the earlier dominance of economic imperatives. Yet, in what follows, I will show how culture and history are taken into the process of capital accumulation.

Despite the earlier priority given to demolition and redevelopment, conservation was given initial attention on the planning agenda in 1976 when the URA initiated studies involving the conservation and rehabilitation of whole areas. Chinatown was the most prominent among the large areas then under study (*URA Annual Report*, 1976/77), and the guiding principle then was basically to retain the distinctive identity and character of the whole area. However, the study remained at the exploratory stage and little more was done for a long while. In 1984, the Emerald Hill area was converted into a landscaped pedestrian mall and the Peranakan Corner at the junction of Emerald Hill and Orchard Road was completed. These became the first tangible results of the URA's conservation of distinctive areas (*URA Annual Report*, 1983/84:22-3). This was quickly followed by detailed studies of Chinatown, Singapore River, Little India and Kampong Glam in 1985 (*URA Annual Report*, 1984/85:3), which were presented to the public as the URA's Conservation Master Plan in 1986. The plan included the conservation of the city's historic district, named the Civic and Cultural District (*MND Annual Report*, 1987:35; Huang, Teo & Heng, 1995). The area was given further attention in the form of a Master Plan released to the public in March 1988, with aims to develop the area into a major historical, cultural and retail centre, as well as a venue for national ceremonies and functions (*URA Annual Report*, 1987/88:2). In the same year, conservation manuals and guidelines for Chinatown, Kampong Glam and Little

India were also published, designed to help the public understand the historical character, planning and architectural intentions in each district and assist them in conserving their properties. Ultimate recognition and acknowledgement were accorded to all these efforts in 1989 when the URA was made the national conservation authority. Their tasks were laid out in the Amended Planning Act of 1990, and included identifying buildings and areas of historical interest for conservation; preparing a conservation master plan; and guiding the implementation of conservation by the public and private sectors (Sections 10(6)(c), 13, 14 and 15, Planning Act, 1990). Since then, 20 areas have been officially designated "conservation areas".

What does the shift from the early preoccupation with redevelopment to the recent concern to conserve reveal of the place of cultural and historical values *vis-a-vis* economic ones? First, as intimated earlier, it signals a recognition of the value of Singapore's architectural and historical heritage (*URA Annual Report*, 1986/87). Second, this change was precipitated by developments in the tourist industry. In the early 1980s, there was a sharp fall in the rate of tourist arrivals. This led to the formation of a Tourism Task Force which was to identify the main problems and suggest solutions. One of their conclusions was that Singapore had "removed aspects of [its] Oriental mystique and charm ... best symbolised in old buildings, traditional activities and bustling roadside activities" in its effort to construct a "modern metropolis" (Wong et al., 1984:6). To woo tourists back to Singapore, it was recommended that Chinatown and other historical sites be conserved. That their recommendations were taken up reveals clearly the mutually constitutive relationship between capital and culture. Today, parts of Chinatown have already been conserved in accordance with stringent guidelines pertaining to the facade design, internal structure, signage, materials used and any other forms of alteration or addition with a view to retaining historical continuity and the architectural distinctiveness of the place (URA, 1988:52). Following these guidelines, property owners and developers have refurbished the visual and structural quality of shophouse units including their wall openings, five-foot ways, columns, pilasters, window shutters, balconies and ornamentation. Yet, the fact that these are not purely 'cultural' actions but economic ones as well is revealed in two ways: the ways in which shophouses are developed and marketed to businesses; and the ways in which the area as a whole is "imaged" and "sold" as a tourist spot.

Shophouses are sold on the market as "heritage" properties of particular interest to retailers wishing to "capture the shopping and gourmet traffic right in the traditional retail heart of Singapore" (*The Straits Times*, 23 September 1991). The URA has guided the process by encouraging certain types of building use and discouraging others. Approved trades include those usually identified as symbolic of Chinese tradition such as herbal tea shops, religious paraphernalia shops, Chinese medical halls, clog makers, *mahjong* makers, calligraphers and fortune tellers. On the other hand, certain pollutive or incompatible trades are proscribed, such as engineering workshops, tyre and battery shops, western fast-food restaurants, supermarkets and laundrettes (URA, 1988:72-73). Within these broad parameters, however, URA's underlying philosophy is that the types of trades should be determined by market forces. This is because owners of conserved buildings must be economically viable in

order to continue to restore and maintain them (*The Straits Times*, 23 October 1991). Thus, while meticulous attention is paid to preserving buildings and other structures, lifestyles and trades are left to the vagaries of free competition (*The Straits Times*, 23 October 1991). Yet, as many retailers rightly fear, such a system inevitably squeezes out the small, traditional businesses which cannot afford the post-conservation rent hikes. It is in fact only the new upmarket services such as pubs (for example, “Elvis” in Tanjong Pagar), restaurants (for example, “Blue Ginger” in Neil Road) and businesses (such as “Carrie Models” in South Bridge Road) that can afford to operate in “new” Chinatown. In other words, the ostensibly ‘cultural’ process of conservation is intimately embedded in processes of capital accumulation in which principles of profitability are prioritised.

As another example of how history and culture in Chinatown become embedded in processes of capital accumulation, I will focus on how conserved Chinatown caters to the tourist gaze. It is sold as the cradle of Singapore’s early civilisation and is identified in the Singapore Tourist Promotion Board literature with the pioneering spirit and enterprise of early Chinese immigrants to Singapore. It is showcased as a distinctively Chinese cultural area, what with the newly conserved shophouses, carefully adhering to pre-existing architectural styles,

[brimming] over with life, capturing the essence of the old Chinese lifestyle in its temples and shophouses and nurturing a handful of traditional trades [such as] herbalists, temple idol carvers, calligraphers and effigy makers ... in the face of progress (STPB, 1991:28-29).

Against a backcloth of shophouses and temples, large-scale festival activities, fairs, *wayangs*, puppetry and trishaw rides can be “staged” to provide both locals and tourists with “a different kind of experience” (URA, 1985:15). No matter if these no longer provide the genuine pulse of everyday life and no matter if they are performances rather than quotidian experiences. They form a crucial part of a promotional image which upholds a heritage industry.

Yet, for many Singaporean Chinese who live and work in Chinatown, the cultural life of the place does not simply derive from the architectural form but in genuine longstanding trades and small businesses, and the concomitant familiar retailer-client relationships that do not exist any more with the new gentrified shops managed by new people. They are not convinced that conservation is for the locals. While they see the conserved shophouses as “nice and charming”, they add that “they are not for us anymore”, that “locals do not carry out purchases there but go simply to look”, and that “the wares there are sold at tourist prices”. While the spanking cleanliness and bright hues of the conserved rows of shophouses are generally seen as attractive, some feel that they “somehow don’t look right”, that they are “inauthentic”, and that with the emphasis on the picturesque, they are suitably tailored to appeal to the “tourist’s way of seeing” (Relph, 1976:85). That conserved Chinatown is a landscape made for tourist consumption is particularly evident when dusk approaches and tourists are bussed off: Chinatown residents assert that the place takes on the “silence of a ghost town without a soul in sight” compared to before when it “can be said to be a place with no night”. Thus, Singaporeans interpret the Chinatown landscape as another

promotional effort for the tourists, far removed from the practicalities of their own daily lives. Hence, the conserved Chinatown landscape ignores “the inner workings of culture” (Wagner and Mikesell, 1962:5). In being taken up in the process of capital accumulation, culture and history are harnessed in particular ways suitable to the imperatives of economic growth and development.

Another example of how culture and history are to be harnessed for economic ends is the case of the conservation of the Convent of the Holy Infant Jesus in Victoria Street.

In 1981, a special area conservation working group was appointed under the auspices of the Urban Redevelopment Authority, comprising representatives from the URA and the STPB. The final report put together by this working group was completed late that same year, in which several dozen sites were put up for consideration as conservation areas. The central quadrangle of CHIJ was one of them.

As a concrete step towards conservation, the STPB invited architectural firms to study the potential ways in which the buildings could be restored. The study was aimed at helping the board evaluate and shortlist a panel of architects able to undertake individual restoration projects. From late February 1987 onwards, 48 architectural firms were involved in the study, with the hope that about \$260 million worth of restoration work would be bid for. An indication of what the STPB was hoping for was couched in the suggestions put forward by Mrs Pamela Lee, then STPB’s Divisional Director for Product Development to the Singapore Institute of Architects. These included the following: that any proposal would respect the architecture and former use of the premises; that the buildings could provide quality entertainment such as music and dance performances for audiences of “refined taste”; that the upper floors of the buildings could be leased to the performing arts for day-time operations; and that the ground floor and open spaces could be operated commercially for highly quality dining and entertainment, theme parties and the like (*The Straits Times*, 13 April 1987). Up to this point, conservation of the CHIJ buildings were still understood to be the business of the state and its agencies (whether URA and/or STPB), with the understanding that there would be every effort to preserve the ambience of the chapel and its buildings against the commercialisation of other like projects.

In March 1990, it was announced that the CHIJ site was to be tendered out, opening it to the vagaries of the commercial market. As many former students and other members of the public argued, private developers would not be able to maintain the character and mood of the place if they were too preoccupied with making it a commercial success. The URA on the other hand expressed the view that the government cannot finance all conservation projects; the private sector must be involved to ensure that conservation projects are economically feasible undertakings. The guiding principles in Singapore’s conservation, as expounded by the then Chief Executive Officer and the Chief Planner of the URA, Mr Liu Thai Ker, were that the private sector should be involved, particularly if no public sector use had been identified; that preservation must avoid wastage or duplication of efforts; and that buildings of architectural and historical significance should either be preserved or conserved. The decision to sell the site and hand over its conservation to commercial enterprises raised the ire of many. Public opinion focused on the view that by not

undertaking the conservation exercise itself, the URA was in effect serving the complex on a platter to the forces of commercialisation and all its concomitant ills of profit-making. In response to such criticisms, the URA revealed that safeguards had been introduced to ensure that conservation objectives were met. For example, the project's plot ratio would be kept to under 0.8 as opposed to 9 or 10 as in the surrounding commercial developments, that is, there would be no high rise construction. The chapel was to be used only for cultural, religious or other uses that are "sensitive to the history of the building", for example, for classical concerts. For the rest of the complex, cultural, arts and recreational activities were possible, including restaurants and shops, with trades, if they enhanced the image of the Civic District. The local consortium led by construction group Low Keng Huat (LKH), including jeweller Je Taime and restaurateur Lei Garden, won the bid on the basis of their "planning and design concept, proposed uses and trades", "the expertise of the developers and their consultants in developments of a similar nature" (*The Straits Times*, 22 March 1990).

Between their initial winning of the bid in February 1991 and 1994, the LKH consortium, first known as Cloisters Investment Pte Ltd, and subsequently, Chijmes Investments Pte Ltd has altered its marketing strategy, a reflection of its concern with economic viability and the changing retail scene in Singapore. The plans that were initially submitted included cultural and religious activities for the chapel, while the rest of the complex was given over to dining, retail and exhibition activities. Their plans were to create an upmarket, exclusive image of the complex. It was envisaged that the chapel could be rented out for weddings or other celebrations or used as a centre for cultural activities. Because of the good acoustics, it could be used for music, dance and drama performances. A courtyard of about ten metres deep would be built in the basement, serving as a focal point for cultural activities such as musical performances. It would be surrounded by two levels of retail shops and a food court. The retail space would house upmarket boutiques, gift shops and a jewellery centre. Indeed, a suggestion was made that the complex could be a one-stop place for a wedding celebration: after the ceremony in the chapel and reception in the courtyard, dinner could take place in the restaurant.

In early 1994, it was announced that the original concept of a retail complex with a food court would shift towards the establishment of an arts and lifestyle-based complex. The theme of fine food would still continue in the underground complex, together with an up-scale flea market for art and antiques. The chapel would have its functions expanded from services and weddings (and Japanese going abroad for their weddings are also targetted) to include even company annual general meetings with state-of-the-art facilities (with rentals at about \$5,000 a day). A permanent attraction would be negotiated in the form of a UK-based play, *Earth Child*, for children aged between eight and 12 (an acknowledgement of the fact that the site was always important as a school). The defining theme of the complex, it was said, would be a mix of the sense of the old as well as a sense of the upmarket. Hence, it would be possible to have a McDonald's if it looked old, while modern art would be totally acceptable if it was housed in a fine gallery. There are also plans for a brewery pub. Clearly, with unease about the continuing size and buying power of the market,

Chijmes has chosen to broaden its clientele base from an exclusive up-market one to a diversified base which may well include the mass hamburger-eating public.

From the time of the decision to conserve the complex of buildings to Chijmes' current marketing strategy ("Give the future of your business a glorious past"), all the changes reflect the constitutive relationship between historical and cultural values and economic principles. History and culture can be harnessed for economic goals, and history and culture has survived and been given a new lease of life precisely because of economic goals.

Conclusion

I began writing this paper with the intention to explore the interconnections between symbolic values on the one hand, and economic values, manifested in development imperatives, on the other. In order to do so, I polarised the possible interconnections by focusing on situations where there are conflicting symbolic systems and economic values; and situations where development openly harnesses history and culture, where they become part of the processes of production and consumption associated with capital accumulation, that is, when they become commodified.

For a long time, Singapore's urban planning agenda was dominated by the view that redevelopment should take precedence as the means by which to propel Singapore towards "growth and progress, providing not only environmental improvement, but also better employment and investment opportunities" (*URA Annual Report, 1974/75:7*). In other words, the imperatives of a rapidly developing economy (to provide housing, serve the transportation and other social service needs of the population; facilitate employment and hence further economic development and so forth) dictated the planning agenda. There was a real concern to maximise the redevelopment potential of scarce land. These principles continue to constitute planning policy and practice today, as reflected in my earlier discussions of religious buildings and the natural environment. In these situations, the countervailing pressures of modernisation, development and urban renewal on the one hand, and the need to give recognition to alternative values, on the other, persist.

In the second part of my argument, I develop the idea that earlier explanations of urban transformation which privilege economic processes alone must give way to another perspective, that culture plays a constitutive role in urban transformation. This is illustrated in the cases of Chinatown and CHIJ. Yet, not all histories and cultures are elevated. Those histories and cultures of value (in economic terms) find their way onto the conservation agenda more easily than others, which become ignored or marginalised (Anderson, 1983). In other words, histories and cultures which are less challenging to development objectives are privileged while those which cannot be so readily appropriated into development goals are sidelined. This is illustrated, for example, in the case of Eu Court, a curved corner building in Stamford Road. This refraction of the past attests to a range of differently empowered ideologies. Yet, for those histories and cultures that survive because they are incorporated into urban processes of capital reinvestment, they become, as Jacobs (1992:209) argues, "less as ongoing practices and more as sanitised, restored artefacts incorporated into capital

projects of tourism or retailing". This is clearly the case with Chinatown and CHIJ. Thus, while "[m]uch of the contemporary city may appear to have histories", yet increasingly, they are "histories of artefacts not ways of life" (Jacobs, 1992:209).

Footnotes

- 1 The field information on religious buildings was collected in 1989 and involved, *inter alia*, in-depth interviews with Christians, Hindus, Muslims and 'Chinese religionists'.
- 2 There are religious buildings which have been preserved for architectural and historical reasons by the Preservation of Monuments Board (Kong and Yeoh, 1995). However, there are none which are not historically and architecturally significant which have nevertheless been preserved because they are recognised as sacred space.
- 3 Elsewhere, I have discussed how conceptions of the sacred have been negotiated such that there is no overt resistance from religious groups when their religious buildings have been relocated or demolished (Kong, 1993b). Here, my concern is only to illustrate how development imperatives conflict with sacred meanings.

References

- Anderson, B., 1983, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso.
- Corlett, R.T., 1988, "Bukit Timah: the history and significance of a small rain-forest reserve", *Environmental Conservation*, 15, 1, 37-44.
- Drakakis-Smith, D. and Yeung, Y.M., 1977, "Public housing in the city states of Hong Kong and Singapore", Occasional Paper 8, Development Studies Centre, Australian National University, Canberra.
- Jacobs, J., 1992, "Cultures of the past and urban transformation: the Spitalfields Market redevelopment in East London", in K. Anderson and F. Gale (eds.) *Inventing Places: Studies in Cultural Geography*, Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 194-211.
- Ley, D., 1989, "Modernism, post-modernism, and the struggle for place", in J.A. Agnew and J.S. Duncan (eds.) *The Power of Place: Bringing Together Geographical and Sociological Imaginations*, Winchester, MA: Unwin Hyman, 44-65.
- MND Annual Report*, Singapore: Ministry of National Development.
- Parliamentary Debates, 16 March 1978.
- Press Statement from Prime Minister's Office, 3 October 1987.
- Press Statement, 25 November 1973.
- Relph, E., 1976, *Place and Placelessness*, Pion, London.
- STPB 1991, *Singapore: Official Guide*, Singapore Tourist Promotion Board, Singapore.
- The Straits Times*, Singapore.
- Teh, C.W., 1969, "Public housing", in J.B. Ooi and H.D. Chiang (eds.) *Modern Singapore*, Singapore: University of Singapore Press, 171-80.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu, 1971, *Man and Nature*, Commission on College Geography Resource Paper No. 10, Association of American Geographers, Washington D.C.

- Tuan, Y.F., 1974, *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes and Values*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- URA, 1985, *Conservation within the Central Area with the Plan for Chinatown*, Urban Redevelopment Authority, Singapore.
- URA, 1988, *Historic Districts in the Central Area: A Manual for Chinatown Conservation Area*, Urban Redevelopment Authority, Singapore.
- URA Annual Report*, Urban Redevelopment Authority, Singapore.
- Wagner, P.L. and Mikesell, M.W., 1962, "General introduction: the themes of cultural geography", in P.L. Wagner and M.W. Mikesell (eds.) *Readings in Cultural Geography*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1-24.
- Wong, D.W.F., 1986, *The Building of a Dream*, Singapore: Christian Life Publishers.
- Wong, K.C. et al., 1984, *Report of the Tourism Task Force*, Singapore: Ministry of Trade and Industry.
- Wong, Poh Poh, 1969, "The surface configuration of Singapore Island: A quantitative description", *Journal of Tropical Geography*, 29, 64-74.
- Wong, Poh Poh, 1989, "The transformation of the physical environment", in Kernal Singh Sandhu and Paul Wheatley (eds.) *The Management of Success: The Moulding of Modern Singapore*, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 771-787.