

Archived documents for “Liang Sicheng’s Beijing courtyard demolished”

北京东城区称将查处违规拆除梁林故居行为

[Sina.com](#) (2012-01-28)

新华网北京 1 月 28 日电 (记者 岳瑞芳、万一)经过持续 2 年多的“拆迁”与“保护”的拉锯战，位于北京市东城区的[梁思成、林徽因故居终究没能逃脱碎为瓦砾的命运](#)。

27 日，有媒体报道称，位于北京市东城区北总布胡同 3 号四合院(现为 24 号院)的梁林故居已被拆除，引起网上一片哗然。记者在实地探访后发现情况属实。

早在 2009 年，梁林故居被拆一事就因得到职能部门干预而被叫停，但为何时至今日还是实施了拆除？新华社记者就此展开调查。

保护持续两年多 梁林故居终被拆

北京市东城区北总布胡同 3 号四合院(现为 24 号院)在 1931 年至 1937 年期间曾为梁思成、林徽因夫妇租住。这一时期是两人对中国建筑史及文物保护作出重要贡献的时期。他们从这里出发，完成了对中国古代建筑群落的大部分考察。2009 年，因涉及商业项目，24 号院门楼及西厢房被先后拆除。经媒体报道后，在社会上引起极大关注。同年 7 月 10 日，北京市规划委员会叫停了对梁林故居建筑物的继续拆除。同月 28 日，北京市文物局发布通报称，该局已会同北京市规划委员会专题研究了北总布胡同 24 号院的保护问题，并责成建设单位调整建设方案，在建设规划上确保院落得到保留。

2011 年 1 月 11 日，在东城区人代会(临时)二次会议上，东城区文化委主任李承刚曾公开表示，梁林故居已被列为文物普查登记项目，在居民腾退完毕后，这个院子将得到最大程度的恢复修缮。

记者在查询 2011 年 12 月 30 日国家文物局正式公布的第三次全国文物普查结果时也发现，位于北总布胡同 24 号院的梁林故居的确在此次普查中列为新发现文物项目。

然而 1 月 27 日有媒体在接到爆料后报道称，北总布胡同 24 号院梁林故居已被拆除，但北京市文物局并不知晓。而东城区文化委随后向北京市文物局递交的事故调查原因称，开发单位考虑到故居房屋腾退后，因陈旧、几经翻建、无人居住等原因，易出现险情，因此进行了“维修性拆除”。

北京市文物局局长孔繁峙在接受记者采访时也表示，拆除是由于建设单位为防止房屋在过节期间出现险情，而提前对房屋进行的“落架维修”，是维修前的一种“前期筹备工作”。

梁林故居不复存在 网友质疑“维修性拆除”

28日，记者来到北总布胡同24号院进行实地探访。虽然没有见到继续拆除的迹象，但现在梁林故居已不复存在，只剩下门楼上几根斑驳红漆的木房梁，从门楼走进后可见一片残砖烂瓦，门楼旁边的倒座房已全部被拆。

北总布胡同24号院原是一座两进四合院，坐北朝南。现在，四合院第一进北房的位置是一座3层小楼，3层小楼前后的建筑全部被拆。在被拆掉的建筑中，一部分为红砖建筑，一部分为青砖建筑。梁林故居南临的一栋居民楼上，写着红色的“拆”字并用圆圈圈起来，但并没有被拆除。

附近的居民告诉记者，故居院子里的很多建筑是新中国成立后修建的，上世纪80年代垂花门、东厢房被拆除后原地盖了一座三层小楼，目前院子里的住户都是在那时陆陆续续搬过来的。从2007年开始，这里由名为富恒地产的一家房地产公司进行拆迁，后来又经易手由华润置地介入，去年7月院内的正房被拆除，今年1月上旬又拆除了四合院的正门。

梁林故居被拆除的消息在节日期间爆出，在社会上引起了强烈反响。《新京报》、《南方都市报》等媒体相继跟踪报道事件进展，很多网友也通过微博、论坛等平台发表了自己的观点。

“Sorridente_Linda_蜜糖湾”说，当年梁思成竭力维护北京古城墙，最后还是被拆了，将来会后悔的。

对东城区文化委“维修性拆迁”的解释，不少网友也表示难以理解。名为“走平凡路”的上海网友说，拆与修在我们的字典中是不同意义的。名为“苗”的网友则调侃道，“维修性拆除”是一个新名词，没有学过！

也有网友表示，梁林故居被拆，不是只进行重建就行了。文物部门应该知道“真古董”与“假古董”的区别，把真的给拆了，再怎么重建也还是假的.....梁林故居的真正价值并不在建筑上，而在于建筑的历史、人文意义上，这些意义不在于物质载体如何，而在于其真实性上。

主管部门回应：建设单位“违规”拆除故居 节后开工复建

在解释梁林故居为“维修性拆除”后，28日，东城区文化委再次回应称，虽然华润集团富恒房地产开发公司(建设单位)是为了紧急抢险，才将危房落架拟修复的。但此次拆除未经报批，属“违规拆除”，东城区文化委将对此事依法进行查处。

据东城区文化委文物科负责人汪源介绍，北总布胡同24号院在全国第三次文物普查中的确被列为新登录项目，但未被核定为文物保护单位。依据文物法规定，虽然文物普查项目保护级别较文物保护单位级别略低，但仍属于文物建筑，即便要迁移和拆除，也必须在征得公布政府(东城区政府)和上一级文物部门(北京市文物局)的批准后才能进行。华润集团富恒房地产开发公司在未经报批的情况下擅自拆除旧居部分建筑属于违规行为。

汪源告诉记者，目前，东城区文化委已书面通知建设单位，不得继续拆除现存院落的原有历史建筑，并对落架后的全部传统建筑材料妥善保存，以便修建时使用。同时，加快该院落剩余住户的搬迁和中心楼的拆除，为尽快实施旧居的完整复建创造条件。东城区文化委将委托有资质的设计单位，在完善实测资料的基础上，制定复建方案。同时及时委托有修缮资质的企业实施抢修工作。在完成搬迁腾退后，该院落将最大限度地恢复原貌。目前，建设单位已开始清理现场，计划在春节过后开工，东城区文化委将对修复工程全过程进行监管。

至于此次梁林故居被“违规拆除”是否可以界定为“维修性拆除”或是“维修前期的筹备”，汪源表示，要等进一步调查之后才能确定。但梁林故居将来肯定是要复建的，建设单位此前也一直在做复建项目的申报。

北京市文物局则表示，无论是“维修性拆除”还是其他原因，文物修缮必须先报文保部门批准，文物局已责成东城区文化委到现场检查拆除单位保存的砖瓦木料，按照文保要求进行编号保存，为复建留存历史依据。同时，由东城区文化委督促、委托有文物设计资质的设计单位，对拆除建筑按照文物建筑规范进行修复设计，东城区文化委应监督复建全过程。

孔繁峙表示，上述意见已下达给东城区文化委，并向北京市政府和国家文物局上报。

Famous traditional courtyard bulldozed

[People's Daily English / Xinhua](#) (2012-01-29)

BEIJING, Jan. 28 (Xinhua)

– In the 1950s, his plan to prevent modern development in the ancient city of Beijing was nipped.

Three decades after his death, famous architect Liang Sicheng's former courtyard home in downtown Chinese capital met the same fate.

Liang's "siheyuan," the traditional courtyard home, was reportedly bulldozed by a real estate developer on Thursday in the name of preservation.

The former rectangular brick structure in Beizongbu hutong where Liang and his also architect wife Lin Huiyin (Phyllis Lin) resided and started the unprecedented profiling of ancient Chinese architecture during the 1930s was reduced to piles of rubble surrounding a lone wooden gate.

The government said Saturday that the demolition was not approved by the cultural heritage authorities and officials would investigate and deal with the case in accordance of the law.

The destruction was the latest ancient architecture lost in the Chinese capital's rush to modernization at the expense of cultural heritages.

Over the past decades, high-rising office buildings, apartment blocks, and sprawling shopping malls mushroomed in the heart of Beijing, replacing the maze of "siheyuans" and "hutongs" - the narrow alley lanes - which used to be the signatures of the city.

Liang's former residence was partially destroyed in 2009 but the demolition was halted after the public outcries for ancient architecture protection.

Since then, the site has been designated as a cultural relic, though a low-level one, that requires approval from the cultural heritage authorities for any redevelopment, said Wang Yuan, an official with the district culture bureau.

The official said the developer Fuheng Real Estate, a subsidiary of China Resources, claimed that it tore down the dilapidated architecture on safety grounds and pledged to have it restored in better preservation.

Wang said the municipal government had made it clear that Liang's courtyard home would be rebuilt and had ordered the developer not to remove anything from the rubble.

But the weak defense touched off a wave of criticism from the media and the public, lashing out at the apparently ridiculous logic.

A commentary posted on the government's china.org called the demolition in the name of preservation a "hoax."

In an online survey initiated by the popular microblogging site Sina Weibo, 89 percent of the 6,500 participants by Saturday night said the courtyard home should not be demolished because it has high historic value.

“In the blind pursuit of economic growth, China has not paid enough attention to the value of its culture,” said another commentary posted on the People’s Daily’s website. “We need to enhance the cultural relics protection in order to prevent the tragedy from repeating.”

The Chinese public was shocked by the demolition of Liang’s former residence as the architect, born in 1901, was considered “Father of Modern Chinese Architecture” for his extensive researches on Chinese architecture and pioneering role in advocating the preservation of ancient architecture.

Liang was particularly known for his proposal with another architect Chen Zhanxiang to preserve the ancient city of Beijing and build a complete new city to the west of it after the Communist Party of China seized the power and made Beijing the capital of the new republic.

But the proposal was vetoed. The country’s leaders back then opted for the alternative plan to build a political, economic, and cultural center within Beijing’s historical core.

Traffic jams, air pollution, and disappearing ancient architecture linked to poor urban planning in recent years had led more and more people to feel nostalgic for Liang’s ill-fated plan.

On Chinese New Year, Beijing Loses Part of Its Memory

[Bloomberg](#) (2012-02-03)

On Chinese New Year, Beijing Loses Part of Its Memory: Adam Minter

By Adam Minter Feb 3, 2012 7:47 AM CT

On Jan. 26, the fourth day of the Chinese New Year holiday, most Chinese in Beijing, and across the country, were lazing and paying little attention to anything other than celebratory events. It was a perfect day to break the law.

The managers at Beijing's Fuheng Real Estate, a subsidiary of a state-owned company, surely knew this. For years, they've wanted to demolish the former courtyard residence of [Liang Sicheng](#), the undisputed father of modern Chinese architecture, and his wife and collaborator, [Lin Huiyin](#), so as [to build a 28-story high-rise](#) on the property. Their attempt in 2009 created such national outrage that China's State Administration of Cultural Heritage felt compelled to name the house an "[immovable cultural heritage](#)." It's a low-level designation as historic sites go, but nonetheless one that requires a government-issued permit if a developer -- state-owned or not -- wants to redevelop the site.

If the managers at Fuheng Real Estate were in possession of a demolition permit, or a little shame, they might have waited until after the Chinese New Year to obliterate that old courtyard home. But lacking both, they hired a crew to destroy it last Thursday, when most of Beijing's government officials and reporters were [on vacation](#).

The demolition was an unabashed success. By late afternoon, word began to spread about it through Beijing's heritage preservation community, setting off a modest furor that charted, briefly, on the [trending topics](#) of [China's](#) microblogs.

For those microbloggers who could pull away from the holiday revelry, the demolition quickly came to symbolize a coarsening of a city that has already lost more than half of its [historic residential housing stock](#), as well as a climate where commerce and corruption seem to always triumph over tradition.

"[Heritage China](#)," the pseudonym of a professional preservationist in Jiangsu province, stated on Sina Weibo, China's most popular microblog: "It turns out that our state-owned enterprises are 'soul removers' as well as 'blood suckers.'"

The outrage is justified: During the six years that Liang Sicheng and Lin Huiyin lived in that courtyard home in the 1930s, they completed the seminal

book, “A History of Chinese Architecture.” It’s a heroic piece of scholarship that covers six periods of Chinese architecture.

Liang was also an ardent Communist Party member. In the late 1940s and early 1950s -- at the behest of the party — he developed a “[national style](#)” of architecture, perhaps most notable for its emphasis on large [concave roofs](#). He also founded two of China’s best-known architectural schools, including the prestigious [Tsinghua University](#) in Beijing.

Unsurprisingly, a few more influential voices interrupted their vacations to declare their disgust at the demolition.

[Wang Xuming](#), a publishing executive and former spokesman for the Ministry of Education, tweeted:

[The demolition] humiliates government departments related to culture, cultural relics, city planning, the National People’s Congress and the [Chinese People’s Political Consultative Conference](#), and a Beijing spirit which advocates patriotism, innovation, tolerance, and cultivation of benevolence. How can a city do other things if it can’t tolerate ... the former residence of Liang Sicheng and Lin Huiyin?

Despite the online backlash, neither Fuheng nor its powerful parent company, [China Resources Corporation](#), explained themselves. That sorry task was left to Kong Fenzhi, the director of the Beijing Municipal Bureau of Cultural Heritage, who reportedly learned about the demolition from the media. He told Xinhua, the state-owned newswire, that according to his understanding, Fuheng Real Estate was merely trying to protect the site from [celebratory fireworks](#) that would light up the city that night in honor of the God of Fortune.

Using a phrase that has gained mighty currency on China’s internet, Kong described the destruction as a “temporary demolition for maintenance” that will serve as a precursor to a newer, better and (sort of) restored Liang Sicheng courtyard home in the future.

In response to this new turn of phrase, the writer [Cuo Junshu](#) took to Sina Weibo to express his considerable disdain:

The government and the real estate developer jointly promote a unique term: temporary demolition for maintenance ... [T]hose liars are so stupid! What’s the difference between a maintenance demolition and a temporary rape? Can we call a newly-built house a former residence?

Online frustration at the demolition doesn't only reflect Liang's considerable accomplishments — in large part, they reflect the bitter irony of his greatest failure.

In the 1950s, while serving as the Vice Director of the Beijing City Planning Commission, Liang argued vociferously with others for the establishment of a new city west of Beijing that would house industry so that the old city of Beijing [could be preserved](#) as a political and cultural capital. The city's leadership, bent on economic growth, wouldn't hear of it. Today's crowded, traffic-jammed Beijing stands as a testament to their planning. Tragically, Liang died in 1972 at the height of the Cultural Revolution. The same Communist Party that had commissioned him to create a national style of architecture in the 1950s had turned against him, deeming his embrace of Chinese tradition as counter-revolutionary. He died persecuted and broken.

Academics and intellectuals — many of whom regard the foreign-educated Liang and Lin as cosmopolitan forebears — took particular offense at this act of cultural thievery and provided some of the most biting commentary.

[Meng Xianshi](#), a professor at Renmin University in Beijing, wrote on Weibo: “These two scholars [Liang and Lin] who tried so hard to protect the old Beijing city experienced political humiliation when they were alive. Now that they're dead, Beijing gives them another such a lesson.”

And Qiao Jun, a dean at Nanjing University, compared the demolition to desecrating the dead — one of the deepest taboos in Chinese culture. He tweeted:

Is there any difference between demolishing Liang's former residence and demolishing his ancestral grave? There are only two kinds of people who dig up ancestral graves: the hateful and the lunatics!

Qiao didn't choose sides, but he closed his comments with a not-so-subtle dig at Beijing's city planners: “Do you think that kind of person can build a tasteful city with culture?”

But late Monday, several news outlets began to report an unexpected twist to the story: Liang and his wife [allegedly never lived](#) in the house Fuheng Real Estate tore down. The Beijing Morning Post reported a woman named Wang

Jue as asking the press, “How did my house become Liang’s former residence?”

Liang’s house was across the courtyard from hers, Wang asserted, and had been destroyed in the 1980s. Reporters on the scene had little means to evaluate the truth of the statement. Chinese netizens, ever keen to propagate or debunk a conspiracy, jumped on the news — and then stepped back from it. True or not, the question of whether the house was destroyed last week or 30 years ago just emphasized the scale of the tragedy.

One [pseudonymous microblogger](#) distilled the issue with real poignancy: “What we protect is the memory of a culture, not a single family’s property. Culture is not wealth, heritage is not money, and Beijing is nothing without memory.”

That courtyard home demolished on Jan. 26, Liang’s or not, reduced Beijing by one more memory. Whether it served to reduce it closer to nothing is a question that Beijing’s city planners, and its real estate developers, will bear as an architectural legacy that may, sadly, last longer than Liang Sicheng’s.

(Adam Minter is the Shanghai correspondent for the World View blog. The opinions expressed are his own.)