

A Study on the Identification of Historical and Cultural Resource Carriers Oriented by Value: A Case Study of the Taihu Lake Basin

Author’s Name: Guangfeng Zhai \ Zuyue Liu \ Yan Wang
Affiliation: Architecture College,Southeast University
Email: 552049116@qq.com

Abstract
China’s heritage protection system faces gaps as many historical resources remain outside legal frameworks due to inadequate classification standards. This study addresses legislative deficiencies by establishing systematic criteria to identify non-statutory cultural resources (e.g., place names, intangible skills). Combining international standards with domestic practice, it prioritizes conservation through value-based assessment—focusing on cultural genetics, intergenerational transmission, and regional identity. Using the Taihu Lake Basin as a case study, resources are analyzed across political, economic, social, technological, and geographical dimensions. The proposed recognition system clarifies resource value, enables timely protection, unlocks potential, and maintains cultural integrity within dynamic urban contexts. This approach sustains heritage significance while enhancing urban cultural resilience and exchange.

Framework Development for Historical-Cultural Resource Identification

Contemporary cultural heritage conservation confronts systemic deficiencies wherein resources embodying core cultural genes, adaptive continuity, and territorial recognition remain inadequately safeguarded due to fragmented protection frameworks. The dissolution of Beijing’s historic hutong toponyms and jurisdictional ambiguities surrounding Southern Song shipwrecks in the South China Sea exemplify fundamental contradictions in non-systematic conservation: isolated interventions sever organic connections across temporal stratification, spatial systems, and multi-subject dimensions. This precipitates not only physical degradation but also ruptures in cultural gene transmission. Fragmented conservation undermines heritage’s intrinsic value as integrated "structure-function-meaning" entities. Resolving these systemic challenges necessitates paradigm reconstruction through:

- 1.Dynamic correlation (dialectical unity of diachronic stratification, synchronic systems, multi-subject dimensions)
- 2.Value-oriented approaches (tripartite assessment of structural stability, functional adaptation, meaning cohesion)

Value Dimension	Weight	Core Indicators	Composite Weight
Cultural Gene Value	50%	Historical Stratification	20%
		Civilizational Continuity	15%
		Pluralistic Symbiosis	15%
Time Inheritance Value	25%	Modern Adaptability	7.50%
		Living Heritage Inheritance Ability	12.50%
		Innovation and Transformation Ability	5%
Regional Identity Value	25%	Geographical Relevance	10%
		Ethnic Community Awareness	8.75%
		Regional Representativeness	6.25%

Three-dimensional Value	Core Indicators	Quantification Criteria	Three-dimensional Value	Core Indicators	Quantification Criteria	Three-dimensional Value	Core Indicators	Quantification Criteria
Cultural Gene Value	Historical Stratification	Chronological Span: Number of historical stages covered by resources.	Time Inheritance Value	Living Heritage Inheritance Ability	Intangible Heritage (ICH) Practice Frequency: Annual number of traditional festivals and craft activities.	Regional Identity Value	Geographical Relevance	Landscape Coupling Degree: Spatial matching index between heritage and natural elements (water systems, terrain).
		Superimposition Density: Physical superposition layers of remains from different periods.			Inheritor Generational Span: Integrity of ICH inheritance and existing generational numbers.			Ecological Service Value: Contribution of heritage to regional ecosystems.
	Civilizational Continuity	Technical Iteration Cycle: Evolution frequency and span of key technologies (e.g., ceramic firing, water conservancy projects).		Modern Adaptability	Functional Conversion Rate: Proportion of functional reuse of heritage spaces.		Ethnic Community Awareness	Number of Multi-ethnic Collaboration Cases: Quantity of historical and contemporary multi-ethnic co-construction projects.
		Institutional Sustainability: Duration of institutional heritage.			Community Usage Rate: Daily usage frequency of heritage by contemporary communities.			Cultural Identity Index: Community's recognition degree of the "Chinese Nation Community".
	Pluralistic Symbiosis	Cultural Element Diversity: Number of coexisting multi-ethnic/cultural symbols.		Innovation and Transformation Potential	Digital Coverage: Completeness and access volume of heritage digital archives.		Regional Representativeness	Symbol Communication Breadth: Media exposure and online search volume of heritage as a local symbol.
		Interaction Frequency: Record density of cross-cultural exchange events in historical documents.			Cultural and Creative Economic Contribution: Annual sales of heritage-derived products.			Economic Dependence: Contribution rate of heritage to local GDP.