

Introduction

Contexts and concerns in Asian heritage management

Neel Kamal Chapagain

Asia is people. People till Asia's earth, write Asia's poetry, make Asia's laws, fight Asia's wars, and dream Asia's dreams.

(Welty 1966: 6; emphasis added)

And thus create, maintain and modify Asia's heritage.

(My addition)

The above remark by Paul Thomas Welty (1966) provides an excellent point of departure to reflect upon Asian heritage management. It reminds us that 'people' are the key patrons behind everything that happens in Asia, including what I added above – the creation, maintenance and modification of their heritage. It explicitly refers to people's interaction with the land, their creative expressions, policy frameworks, conflicts as well as aspirations, which are also some of the key aspects of Asian heritage. Primarily aimed for the American academic audience, Welty's book, titled *The Asians – their heritage and their destiny*, was 'written to introduce the people of Asia', whom Welty regarded as numerous, diverse, ancient and dynamic (Welty 1996: 1). Furthermore, Welty views Asian people as receptive of, and adaptable to, new ideas and institutions while also keeping up with their traditions. His reference to the diversity of Asian people and their versatile nature, which is well grounded in long-held traditions, is relevant to the discussion on Asian heritage management.

The reference to 'people' as the basis of discussing heritage reminds us of fundamental 'who' questions associated with heritage discourse – whose heritage, defined by whom, managed by whom, for whom, and so on. These questions have now become critical in the field of heritage management; as Luxen (2004: 5) mentions, 'the questions asked have graduated from "how to conserve?" to "why conserve?" and then to "for whom to conserve?"' Heritage management has attempted to acknowledge 'people' through the participatory processes for quite a while now. My reference to 'people' is, however, not intended to merely acknowledge and ask people's approval on preconceived conservation management plans; it is also to encourage us to step back from our professional mindset in order to approach the notion of heritage afresh from indigenous worldviews and practices (Chapagain 2009, 2011, 2012). This is not an easy task. Many communities or people may not even literally define their heritage as such,

because sometimes heritage is not an objective ‘thing’ to clearly articulate, but it is embedded in people’s life. This reference to ‘people’ is a call to look at their everyday beliefs and perceptions, evolving practices, and contemporary aspirations associated with their ‘heritage’. As we approach Asian heritage from the perspective of its people, we are often reminded to (re)think heritage as a living ‘thing’ – just like people – which is a key aspect to be considered in Asian heritage. Asian heritage is incomplete without the people; in fact, people enliven Asian heritage. This is not to negate the experts’ discourse on heritage, or to confront the prevalent material and history-centred heritage concepts. Using people as the primary anchor, I argue that many of the issues and complexities associated with Asian heritage management can be better understood and addressed to a greater extent. That is not necessarily easy though, because it may require us to give up some of our preconceived notions of heritage and what we, as heritage professionals, are typically trained to do (Chapagain 2011, 2012). Reference to ‘people’ as the key idea allows us to logically integrate, sometimes problematic, distinctions of the concepts, such as tangible and intangible, natural and cultural, and historic and living that permeate the contemporary conservation lexicon. It also reminds us to acknowledge the everyday and common sense notions of heritage that people associate with, as opposed to only expert-assessed notions of heritage. This is more important in Asian heritage management, as many essays in this volume demonstrate, because heritage in Asia is constantly created, maintained and modified by Asian people, their belief systems, and everyday practices. There is a growing interest to articulate contextual heritage management approaches appropriate for Asian contexts.

Generally, ‘Asia’ is understood as a geographically defined area – a continent. ‘Asian’ then refers to a sense of belonging to, and identity associated with, the continent. However, it is also argued that the term ‘Asia’ is generally regarded as a Western construct and ‘although residents of Asia have come to accept the term, the borders of the various regions of the continent are challenged by some of the participants’ (Beeson and Stubbs 2012: 1). Hence, the very term ‘Asia’ itself comes with ‘contestation, fluidity and ambiguity’ (Winter and Daly 2012: 5); so are terms like ‘Asian’ and ‘Asian heritage’ as well as ‘Asian identity’. The sense of Asian identity is argued to have originated ‘largely in the reaction against the Western colonial system and in the common denominator of anti-colonial sentiment which the system fostered’ (Shridharan 1988: vii). The premises of Asian identity, however, trace back to pre-colonial history when distinct cultures and civilizations were emerging on the continent. Today, the notions of geographically bound communities have been challenged (Anderson 1991). Also, the influence of globalization and cross-cultural mingling of populations across the world has challenged the perception of culture and heritage as bound within a defined physical boundary (Appadurai 1996, 2001). These contemporary discourses may be helpful in analysing the global stature of Asian heritage (both as influenced and influencing) as well as the complexities surrounding the basic terms. This volume instead focuses on Asian heritage as the physically grounded and historically evolved patterns in monumental as well as vernacular built

environment, traditional practices, intangible concepts, and cultural landscapes. The physical reference to the continent is important for many Asian cultures because the notion of heritage is deeply connected with their landscapes through the beliefs and enactment of various traditions in relation to the cultural landscapes. Asians do not just live *on* a particular continent; traditionally they live *in* it as an integral part of the landscape.

Asia is home to some of the most ancient civilizations and the oldest religious and philosophical traditions of the world. These histories and cultures of different groups and regions in Asia often overlap with each other. Sometimes the shared history and cultural traditions bring diverse communities under one cultural umbrella, whereas at other times specific local contexts give rise to diverse traditions within the same worldview. For instance, the influences of the three worldviews presented in this volume – Hindu, Buddhist and Islamic – have overlapped across time and space, resulting in a diverse heritage unique to different regions within the continent. Moreover, within each belief system, multiple traditions have emerged across different regions of Asia due to a myriad of reasons. Such complex historic and cultural processes often bemuse us so much that the notion of ‘Asian heritage’ seems ambiguous and even problematic; it is often difficult to articulate precisely what it is. Recognizing the fluidity and vagueness inherent with the term ‘Asian heritage’, it is used in this volume as an umbrella term to include the diversity of heritage and traditions that flourish on the Asian continent, and their shared historical and cultural affinities. The aim of this volume is to explore these unique historical and cultural processes of heritage in Asia and the approaches taken for their maintenance to examine the efficacies of current management practices, and to highlight some prospects emerging from and applicable to Asian heritage management.

Asian heritage consists not only of historic, monumental, and universally significant examples, but also constantly modified, locally appreciated examples that may exist at individual, familial or communal levels of importance. Asian heritage draws more from spiritual or intangible beliefs and worldviews than tangible or material aesthetic principles. Also, in general, Asian heritage encompasses people, nature and culture as integral parts of a holistic concept of heritage. The beauty of Asian heritage lies in its cultural pluralism which requires us to understand that each context has its own management needs and processes which are sometimes complicated by multiple layers of history and culture associated with it. Recent colonial history is another important layer added to many cases of Asian heritage. With some exceptions, the colonial history is accommodated within the historical and contemporary narrative in many Asian situations rather than being contested or discarded. As much as Asian heritage is rooted in its own traditions, it is currently also under the influence of globalization, particularly through institutions like UNESCO, the World Heritage and the Intangible Cultural Heritage listing process, through economic consequences such as tourism and urban migration, as well as conflicts arising from national and international geo-political scenarios. Therefore, Asian heritage management needs to respond to both local and global contexts. On the one hand, its historic

and cultural traditions provide tremendous prospects of formulating unique Asian ways of heritage management; on the other hand, Asian heritage management is increasingly influenced by global institutions, which are also, in turn, influenced by views emerging from the Asian context. I elaborate on these points in the following two sections, and then connect them with the contents of this volume.

Asian heritage

‘Heritage is Everywhere’, David Lowenthal (2004: 12) reminds us. On this, I would add that anything can become heritage when it matters to people. What matters to people is a cultural process, drawing from their worldviews, beliefs, practices, needs and aspirations. Smith (2006) rightly points out that there is ‘no such thing as heritage’ (*ibid*: 11) until the heritage elements go through a ‘cultural process’ (*ibid*: 3). In this volume, we regard heritage as a broadly used umbrella term for a variety of natural and human-made material objects as well as non-material aspects of culture. Some authors have delved into the definition, origin, and the uses of the term (Lowenthal 1998; Graham *et al.* 2000; Hewison 1987; Smith 2006). Here we will consider it in general everyday meaning. In its etymological sense, heritage is something we inherit, something we ascribe to ourselves, and something that we build upon. Hence, it is associated with our past, traditions, beliefs, rituals, memory, knowledge and skills, identity, pride, pain, shame, and many other aspects of everyday life as well. It is also perceived at different levels – from a very personal to a larger community level. Hence, Asian heritage can be conceptualized by reference to people at various levels – individual, familial, communal, national and international levels.

At the individual level, heritage may represent things and traditions that either an individual or a family inherits from their previous generations, or entities that represent them in the contemporary context. For example, a family house and keepsakes that are passed down from parents to their children, inherited family traditions and skills, and recent achievements that may be significant not only to present but future generations as well, could become a part of family heritage. The chapter in this volume by Syed Iskander Ariffin about Malay notions of heritage offers a typical case in Melaka, Malaysia, where an ancestral house was subjected to division and broken apart as per the will of the owner, so that his children could each inherit a piece of the family house. The division is not meant to ‘destroy’ the heritage but to ensure its continuity in both the material and emotional sense, through its use as part of multiple new houses built at different locations. Therefore, to look at an old house from a mere historical point of view does not often make sense. Thus, the concept of heritage and its conservation in Asian contexts needs more flexible perspectives than those afforded by current thinking on heritage management.

At a group or clan level, heritage may relate to ancestral places, worship of clan deities, and traditional livelihoods. In many Asian contexts, families of a clan trace their ancestry to the place where their great-grandparents lived and from where the later families branched out, which are celebrated, if not visited,

during rituals of remembering ancestors. This notion of ancestry, or one's traceable origin, in fact relates to larger communal groups as well. This is particularly so in modern socio-political contexts where both voluntary and involuntary migrations have led people to settle in different parts of the world, yet they keep relating their heritage to a particular place elsewhere. In Asia, one also comes across families that continue practicing their traditional professional work (craftsmanship, as the most familiar example) as their heritage. In some cases, this is even reflected in their family names; for instance, the *newārs* of Kathmandu Valley in Nepal bear traditional family names, such as *Chitrakār* (painters) or *Tamrakār* (metal craftsmen). The *newārs* as well as many other ethnic groups in Nepal have the tradition of revering a particular clan deity (*kul dēvatā*) which is often worshipped during special occasions by extended families belonging to the same clan lineage. There are also dedicated shrines for these clan deities, which form an important part of one's ancestral landscape.

Moving on to the community scale, Tara Sharma's chapter in this volume about the notion of heritage and its maintenance in traditional communities in Ladakh, India, illustrates some of the unique ways Asian communities define, maintain and promote their heritage. The heritage of Ladakhi communities is not valued in terms of their historic or archaeological values but on their everyday associations with traditionally recognized natural and man-made features of their village landscape. It must be noted here that many such community-based notions of heritage contradict the prevalent international notion of heritage and its management. This is because at the community level, the basis of recognizing heritage is people and their continued engagement with the cultural space rather than the material fabric of artefacts and buildings. Yet at another communal level, a village or a region might be well-known for certain traditional knowledge and services, or products thereof, which may be explicitly recognized as their heritage; the Ifugao rice terraces of Philippines Cordilleras are just one example. However, an increasing number of youths are migrating to urban areas leaving behind these farming practices, challenging the heritage of terraced farming. The increasing influence of urban economy and processes of urbanization is just one of many contemporary realities within which Asian heritage need to be situated.

Though mostly associated with what is inherited, heritage may also be a result of a recent phenomenon that attempts to ascribe meaning to present efforts and circumstances. The 'Chinese Pavilion', built for the Shanghai Expo in 2010, has become an important contemporary Chinese heritage asset, because it not only draws from the attributes of some of the unique architectural traditions of China but also makes a strong statement about the ongoing economic and technological leaps China is taking (Winter and Daly 2012). Hence, heritage is also a contemporary manipulation of the historic – how the past is interpreted in the present and connected to the future. In so doing, it involves tangible and intangible as well as cultural and natural features; it refers to places, objects or physical manifestations associated with certain events and memories.

The Asian landscape is full of traditional events and festivals that dramatically change the meaning and importance of a place or landscape. For example, people

in the southern plains (Terai – Madhesh) of Nepal celebrate an annual festival of *Chhath* during which at least one of the nearby water bodies (ponds and rivers) in each community is transformed as a sacred landscape (waterscape), regardless of its religious importance, where the community gathers to offer special homage to the rising sun on a particular morning. The festival spans a few days and involves various rituals and celebrations to thank the Sun for sustaining life on Earth, and to wish for prosperity for the family and community. In living cultures and communities across Asia, heritage, therefore, also refers to the ways by which beliefs and traditions are remembered as well as enacted to revere nature and ecology. Often a neighbourhood is temporarily transformed by informal construction as well as festive enactments associated with these rites. Each community has its cultural space ascribed to such festivities. In general they are not well defined; yet during the celebrations the logic of traditional planning and use of these spaces comes alive, and the built environment begins to make much more sense. Good examples include several religious processions (*jātrās*) in the Kathmandu Valley, which attribute meaning to the urban spaces in the traditional town layouts within the valley.

Such cultural practices also point out another dimension of cultural heritage in Asia, which is rarely understood within current conservation thinking. It is the temporary and informal transformation of built space, by which cultural memories are enacted and brought to life. Mehrotra (2007) calls such temporal transformation of urban spaces the ‘kinetic city’ that ‘constantly modifies and reinvents itself’, and which, often being built with recycled material, is ‘usually not perceived as architecture, but instead in terms of spaces, which hold associative values and supportive lives’ (Mehrotra 2007: 342). These temporary and informal transformations of Asian cities through processions and decorations give a spiritual significance to the city where the fixed built environment alone would not necessarily have achieved such a heightened cultural significance. Mehrotra (2007: 343) sees in these kinaesthetic processes ‘an indigenous urbanism that has its own particular “local” logic’. Moreover, the informal or kinetic urban heritage is not necessarily an adaptation out of poverty but rather ‘a temporal articulation and occupation of space which not only creates a richer sensibility of spatial occupation, but also suggests how spatial limits are expanded to include formally unimagined uses in dense urban conditions’ (Mehrotra 2007: 343). Mehrotra sees this as an important paradigm that is still missing in the heritage discourse in the Indian context of conservation education, which still borrows heavily the notions of significance and values, and heritage management approaches from monument- and history-centric heritage discourses originating in the European context. Mehrotra thus emphasises the importance of paying attention to the ‘kinetic and informal’ cities in addition to the ‘static and formal’ cities as a contextual framework for heritage conservation education in India. This argument is also valid for the rest of the Asian context. Using ‘people’ as a reference in heritage conceptualization would help us recognize these processes. Asian heritage is not only about formal definitions of tangible or intangible and natural or cultural heritage, but it is importantly about how people are involved

in these cultural processes and how they intuitively interconnect nature and culture, as well as tangible and intangible dimensions of heritage.

Apart from people manipulating and enacting cultural activities on a given urban space to create important heritage expressions, there are also state institutions that create, manipulate and propagate what should be considered ‘heritage’ and its broader political implications. At the national level, heritage is (re)created, (re)defined and promoted in certain historic and political contexts as well. However, heritage as a strategy of national unification or national pride is not free of contestation. For example, Jiawen Ai (2012) argues that the ruling Chinese Communist Party (CCP) has consciously created official narratives of China’s cultural traditions to emphasise ‘the “refined” beliefs, customs and values that manifest in Chinese history’ (Ai 2012: 136) and thus, ‘(c)ultural heritage has become one of the main vehicles through which the CCP is marketing and promoting itself both domestically and internationally, seeking to anchor itself onto the legitimacy of thousands of years of history, while both conveniently bringing the rich diversity of cultural heritage under the umbrella of “Chinese” and white-washing the stain of the Cultural Revolution’ (Ai 2012: 137).¹

The colonial legacy is another nuance in Asian heritage. The colonial imprint is sometimes regarded as memorable heritage while other times it is intentionally forgotten or erased as a bitter experience. For instance, Seoul in South Korea, ‘one of the oldest and largest cities in the world’, represents ‘the co-existence of Korean, Japanese, Chinese, and Western cultural elements’ in its built environment. However, despite ‘the successive layers of different political, economic, social, and cultural features of over 600 years of history’, ‘the Japanese impact on the city has not been accepted’ (Rii 2002: 74). Such rejection of the Japanese influence (despite the physical evidence in built form) is an emotional response to the Japanese colonial project which allegedly tried not only to colonize but to wipe out the Korean culture. In most other cities in South and Southeast Asia, urban heritage associated with colonial legacies is not discarded but woven into the respective national heritage lists. For example, Sri Lanka has accommodated the colonial legacies within her national patrimony.

At times, the multiple layers of political history and associated cultural influences also add complexities to the way heritage is perceived, recognized and promoted. In Myanmar, the military regime’s inconsistent approach towards its colonial buildings reflects the complications surrounding the responses to colonial heritage. Some of Myanmar’s colonial heritage is intentionally erased and forgotten to show the modernization and progress led by the ruling force; whereas some is preserved to validate the military regime as the force of national unity emerging out of a colonial past. Moreover, Nwe and Philp (2002) elaborate that the military government has also strategically used heritage protection – particularly for Buddhist heritage – as a way to demonstrate their ‘concern to preserve the “Asian” values and cultural identity of Myanmar’ to reject ‘the internationally accepted notions of “democracy” and “human rights”’ (Nwe and Philp 2002: 164). ‘The contradictions inherent in state policy concerning what is defined as cultural heritage, the impossibility of denying the colonial past, and the reluctant

acknowledgement and selective denunciations of Western influences are unique characteristics contributing to the re-invention of heritage in Yangon today' (Nwe and Philp 2002: 165). Anila Naeem's chapter in this volume also elaborates a similar condition that occurs at the national level in Pakistan. Here, the colonial legislative history and the intention of creating a national identity based on the Islamic faith of the majority lead to the neglect of other diverse cultural heritages within her national boundaries.

The multiple layers of history and community associations found in Asia may also complicate heritage management, particularly in terms of claims on the ownership and authority of heritage. A prominent case, for instance, is the Babri Masjid (mosque) in Ayodhya, India, which was vandalised by a Hindu mob in 1992. They claimed the existence of a Hindu temple dedicated to Ram (one of the Hindu Gods, who was believed to be born at this site in Ayodhya) prior to the mosque's presence at the site. This fuelled a long-standing debate on the ownership of the site. Such a conflict poses a challenge in heritage management as to what form such sites should be restored (Wijesuriya 2003). Sometimes the issue of ownership has even involved two neighbouring countries, such as the case of Preah Vihar being a conflict zone between Thailand and Cambodia. Winter (2010) notes the heightened tension between the two countries following Cambodia's successful nomination of Preah Vihar as a World Heritage site in 2008. The World Heritage listing intensified the already existing conflict of ownership of Preah Vihar, causing a military cross-fire between Cambodia and Thailand that resulted in some casualties as well (Winter 2010). Evidently, 'while heritage can unite, it can also divide' (Silverman and Ruggles 2007: 3).

Apart from the conflicts due to overlapping ownership of heritage, there are other bitter instances where religious and political extremism has threatened Asian heritage. As in the unfortunate case of the Taliban's destruction of Bamiyan Buddhas in Afghanistan,² heritage suffers when it is used as a target to express religious fundamentalism. Another example of destruction of heritage sites due to ethnic conflicts comes from Kandy in Sri Lanka, where the Temple of the Tooth Relic, belonging to the majority Sinhalese Buddhists, was intentionally attacked by the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Elam, a separatist political organization, in 1998. 'The destruction of the temple is one of the most notable examples of heritage being deliberately targeted during a conflict in an attempt to destroy the identity of a group' (Wijesuriya 2007: 87).

Another challenging context for Asian heritage comes from the 'difficult heritage' sites that are 'places of pain and shame' containing 'scars of history resulting from involvement in war and civil unrest or adherence to belief systems based on intolerance, racial discrimination or ethnic hostilities' (Logan and Reeves 2009: 1). The sites and objects associated with the Khmer Rouge regime and its leaders, as well as places of mass massacre carried out by them in Cambodia are prime examples of such 'difficult heritage' which are increasingly becoming 'heritage' and 'tourism' sites (Long and Reeves 2009). Most of the Asian countries with colonial history have sites associated with war that are increasingly being presented as war memorials and war-time heritage that often face the challenge

of balancing between the representation of history and commemoration of the struggle. Another challenge for many local Asian heritage sites comes from the discrimination propagated by privileged groups in a society; for example, there are some Hindu temples where so called ‘untouchables’ (people traditionally regarded as belonging to lower social status in Hindu caste systems) were prohibited from engaging in certain activities in the temples. Public awareness of such unfair practices has significantly increased in recent decades, thus modifying problematic practices. These problematic traditions are also ‘difficult heritage’, which impede upon the human rights of certain groups of people in society. Managing heritage in such circumstances can be meaningful only when we approach heritage in relation to its fair use by all groups of people affiliated with it. Reference to people (of all groups) allows the management practice to seek alternatives or modifications to traditions rather than only blindly adhering to what may otherwise be termed as ‘heritage’.

Despite some difficult and bitter situations, Asian societies, for the most part, acknowledge the cultural pluralism and co-existence of multi-cultural heritage. The predominantly Islamic nation of Indonesia promotes the Buddhist site of Borobudur as a part of its Hindu-Buddhist cultural history.³ Many religious sites in Asia are visited by followers of different religions; for example, numerous shrines in the Kathmandu Valley are venerated both by Hindus and Buddhists. Mehrotra (2012) observed that the Taj Mahal in India, a famous mausoleum of a Mughal queen who is a Muslim by religion, was regarded by a group of Hindu visitors from rural India, as if it were a sacred shrine, just like any other Hindu temple for them. Lumbini, the birthplace of Buddha and a World Heritage site in Nepal, has been a site where participation of the international community is much encouraged (see Kai Weise’s chapter on Lumbini). Such conscious or unconscious acts of people remind us of prospects of harmony and pluralism amidst the richly diverse Asian heritage. Therefore, the complexity of context and concerns of Asian heritage demands ‘pluralism’ in management approaches as well. Pluralism is not just the acknowledgement of diversity but active and meaningful engagement with this diversity. There cannot be one universal approach based on a single, overarching value system; heritage management must be contextualized to the needs and beliefs of each Asian cultural context.

Asian heritage management

Heritage management can generally be defined as a process of maintaining (and, sometimes enhancing) the significance of a particular heritage and making it available for relevant groups of people to engage with it. Cody and Fong (2012: 101) indicate that the term ‘management’ is a ‘paradigm’ in heritage discourse that ‘became popular first in North America and Europe and then elsewhere’. This global paradigm of heritage management could contradict with Asian paradigms of heritage management. If we look at many traditional or indigenous ways of maintaining heritage in Asian cultures, it appears that heritage had been managed to ensure the continuity of its spiritual and social values. Fundamentally,

this is how much of Asian heritage has survived to date. This may not necessarily mean the survival of a particular material existence, however. There is a fundamental philosophical difference between the informal Asian ways of managing heritage and the formal North American, European or international paradigm of heritage management. In general, the concept of management is considered the domain of professionals formally trained in conservation management or related fields. In this volume, we use the term ‘heritage management’ as an umbrella term to include local traditions and informal practices as well as formal policies pertaining to the protection of historic and cultural heritage in Asia.⁴ Our use of the term refers to both the formally trained professionals’ domain of management, as well as the informal and traditional ways of managing heritage in Asian contexts, which often takes place without a formally drawn management plan. It is important to recognize the shift here, particularly as it relates to the Asian context, because this is what complicates heritage management in this context. In a typical Asian way of managing important heritage sites, an old structure may receive significant improvements and additions of other facilities; yet such practices may be termed ‘vandalism’ by international agencies (Wijesuriya 2001). As the two chapters by Tara Sharma and Vibha Bhattacharai-Upadhyay in this volume also recognize, unique local practices do exist in many traditional communities; however, these practices often conflict with the internationally proliferated practices as espoused through the Venice Charter and similar documents.

The conventional international practice of conservation – as espoused and promoted by global institutions and professionals – has its philosophical origins in the European context (Jokilehto 1999). Through colonial influences as well as through the efforts of international organizations, the modern idea of heritage management has now spread across the world. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, colonial regimes in South and Southeast Asia introduced systems of archaeology-based conservation practices which still form the backbone of contemporary heritage legislation in both former colonies as well as those locations which were never colonized. For example, India inherited the British established Archaeological Survey of India and the Ancient Monuments Preservation Act, whereas Nepal, which was never a colony, mostly imitated neighbouring India for her own policy formulations. In addition to colonial legacies, Asian countries have also adopted much of the modern heritage discourse from global institutions like UNESCO and the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), particularly in the World Heritage programme.

The World Heritage designation and enforcement of its operational guidelines are primarily the domain of UNESCO and its World Heritage Centre, but they are ‘imposed’ only when its member states seek to do so. While UNESCO is an active agent of contemporary globalization of heritage, the member states are the ones who pursue their desire to participate in the global discourse of heritage. On the one hand, the instruments like the World Heritage Convention are constantly used and manipulated to achieve nationalistic agendas by individual states (Askew 2010). For example, Askew (2010) discusses governments in China and Morocco using the World Heritage nomination process to selectively justify their

political agendas. On the other hand, not every country nominates heritage for the World Heritage List. For example, Bhutan, Maldives, Qatar, Kuwait, and Myanmar do not have any sites on the World Heritage List despite the fact that there are many heritage sites in these countries, which are no less significant than any other World Heritage sites.⁵ Michael Di Giovanni (2010) elaborates on the global influence of UNESCO and the World Heritage Convention as resulting in creating a universal heritage landscape that he calls 'heritage-scape'. While the creation of 'heritage-scape' itself is not a problem, it does raise some questions with regards to management of these heritage sites at fundamental levels; why, how and for whom should these sites be managed? A member state generally does not nominate a site for the tentative list of World Heritage until it can ensure that its management can be done in par with the World Heritage operational guidelines. Obviously, therein lays a dilemma that many Asian countries face, where the global and indigenous philosophies may not necessarily match. With the desire to promote national heritage in the international arena, often for global tourism, most member states do comply with the World Heritage operational guidelines, even if that means ignoring their own traditional practices (Chapagain 2008; see also the chapter by Bhattarai-Upadhyay in this volume).

Nevertheless, UNESCO itself is a dynamic institution that constantly revisits its own strategies and promotes new vocabularies and approaches. Reading the heritage charters and conventions, primarily those sponsored by UNESCO and ICOMOS, we can discern that the notion of heritage has been gradually broadened up; the monumental notion of heritage in the 1972 Convention was expanded to include cultural landscapes in 1992, and intangible cultural heritage received a distinct status through the 2003 Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage.⁶ The 2003 UNESCO convention explicitly considered the innate interdependence between intangible cultural heritage and tangible cultural and natural heritage (UNESCO 2003). However, the focus on intangible heritage conservation as a distinct instrument within UNESCO's heritage system has raised questions in terms of fuelling a divide between tangible and intangible, rather than positing the tangible and intangible as equal parts of the entire heritage discourse (Silva 2010; Smith and Akagawa 2009). As a matter of fact, Asian countries like Japan and South Korea had recognized the importance of intangible heritage long before the discussion ensued in the global forum. Moreover, it is important to recognize that it is intangible heritage that plays a significant role in defining Asian heritage in general. Howe and Logan (2002: 248) rightly argue that Asian cultural heritage 'is shaped by philosophies and religious systems that emphasise the intangible rather than the tangible' and hence 'Asian views of cultural heritage mean that priority in many countries is given to conserving the intangible heritage and religious sites rather than to conserving the urban built environment'.

Despite the widespread influence of international norms in national legislations in Asia, there are instances where indigenous approaches based on intangible cultural values are still preferred in place of the conventional 'material-centric' approach. Discussing several examples from the Chinese context, including the

Confucius Temple complex in Qufu, Wei and Aass (1989) elaborate that the commonly observed management practices of rebuilding, enlarging and restoring clearly imply an emphasis on the spirit of the place rather than the physical details of architecture as one would typically see in Western heritage management practices. Another example comes from Thailand, where the government explicitly defied international norms of conservation (as promulgated through Venice Charter) in a UNESCO funded project as early as the 1980s, which actually led to the formation of what is called the Bangkok Charter (Byrne 2004). The chapter by Tara Sharma in this volume about the community perspective on their heritage and its management in Ladakh, India, further adds to this argument of intangible aspects being an integral part of the Asian heritage discourse (including the tangible/material aspects), and clearly demonstrates the need for drawing upon such approaches practiced by Asian communities. In fact, Asian heritage concepts and management approaches have already influenced international practices; for example, the tradition of the Ise Shrine reconstruction in Japan provided the momentum leading to the invocation of the Nara Convention and the Nara Document on Authenticity.

Tara Sharma's chapter highlights another important point too: the community in Ladakh perceives their heritage not only in terms of certain built structures, but also with reference to the village landscape as a whole. In their perception of culture and heritage, history and materiality are not so important, but the landscape features and the local meanings associated with them are. The essay by Syed Iskander Ariffin also emphasises the Islamic perspective in which the larger ecological context is considered an integral part of cultural heritage. Therefore, along with the emphasis on the intangible as an essential part of the overall heritage, Asian cultures also highlight the interconnections between what are often distinctly considered as natural heritage and cultural heritage. Such concepts that long existed in Asia have now also become important ingredients of modern heritage discourse, through the introduction of the concepts of cultural landscape and intangible cultural heritage. The chapters by Ken Taylor and by Amita Sinha in this volume discuss how the idea of cultural landscape has long been an essential component of Asian heritage, without the use of such an explicit construct. This is another important aspect for heritage management practice in the Asian context, where everything needs to be understood in its totality and as a continued process rather than being representative of a particular objective style and time period. Herein lies the fundamental conflict between modern heritage management approaches, coming primarily from the European context, and many indigenous Asian approaches to heritage management.

The inconsistencies between Asian and the Western (European or international) approaches towards heritage and management have been pointed out by several authors (Byrne 2004; Chapagain 2011; Chung 2005; MacKee 2009; Menon 2003; Wei and Aass 1989; Wijesuriya 2003). These inconsistencies emerge from the fact that Asian heritage is valued for its spiritual significance rather than historical and material significance. In that context, most of Asian heritage is constantly maintained and even uplifted by people without much

concern for the material authenticity. Hence, heritage management cannot be meaningful without people's involvement. Often when a foreign concept of management is endorsed through heritage legislation, heritage management encounters negative consequences and resistance from its own citizens. Lack of civic engagement in heritage management has been a major concern in many Asian countries. My personal observations of management issues at the World Heritage sites in Kathmandu Valley in Nepal attest to this argument (Chapagain 2008).

As a response to the need of national contexts, specific heritage principles for individual countries have also been devised (i.e. the China Principles proposed by the Getty Conservation Institute (Agnew *et al.* 2002)) and the Indonesia Charter for Heritage Conservation issued in 2003 by the Indonesian Network for Heritage Conservation and ICOMOS Indonesia (Engelhardt and Rogers 2009). To account for the diversity of cultural heritage in India – many of which have gone unprotected – the Indian National Trust for Art and Cultural Heritage (INTACH) has adopted a charter for unprotected cultural heritage in India (INTACH 2004). UNESCO Bangkok office has attempted to embed heritage practices in the context of Asia, most notably through the issuance of the Hoi An Protocols in 2001.⁷ The Hoi An Protocols provide a prescriptive reference (instrument, in UNESCO's terminology) for heritage practitioners in Asia, and attempt to (re) interpret and to contextualize the internationally espoused concepts of conservation for the Asian context, following the precedence set by the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter and the Nara Document on Authenticity. The protocols appropriately emphasise intangible cultural heritage (even before the UNESCO Convention on the Intangible Cultural Heritage came into force) and cultural landscapes, among other aspects of heritage. Many chapters in this volume address these issues as well.

The UNESCO Bangkok office has also been administering UNESCO Asia-Pacific Heritage Awards for best practices in public-private initiatives on conservation of built heritage in the Asia-Pacific region since 2000. Reflecting on the experience of these awards in the first five years, an official publication (Engelhardt 2007) articulates five principles as 'the first principles' of heritage conservation for the Asia-Pacific region and beyond. The 'first principles' appropriately recognize collective mapping of cultural space, authenticity based on cultural contexts, interrelationships between tangible and intangible heritage, recognition of traditional knowledge, and, most importantly, the negotiation process as key principles of successful conservation management. Though these are drawn from the Asian context, the 'first principles' can in fact enrich heritage management practices around the world. We can argue, therefore, that the Asian context has not only been influenced by global conservation discourse, but the Asian context has also inspired important revisions in the global heritage discourse.

It is evident that contemporary discussion on Asian heritage management must draw from global discourse as well as regional and local discourse. Asian heritage management is not confined to either global or local issues, but it is at best a

‘glocalized’ process – to draw upon the idea of ‘glocalization’ (Robertson 1995). Such interaction between the global and the local is further visible in management practices involving a number of international groups, such as the cases of Angkor and Lumbini (see the chapters by Chapman and Weise in this volume). Another layer of global and local interface is seen in the context of tourism, which is generally perceived as an important economic opportunity for sustaining heritage management. However, tourism may turn counterproductive to the very idea of heritage conservation and management if not managed properly. It is in such contexts that national policies and charters, and international conventions have important roles to play. While prescriptive documents like the Hoi An Protocols are a welcome addition to evolving practices, further discussion and reflection are needed to delve deeper into the nuances of managing heritage in an Asian context. In this regard, conversations and publications focused on Asian heritage have already begun on various fronts. While many individually authored articles have appeared in various conferences and journals, there are not many collective book-length publications dedicated to the Asian heritage management. Before delving into the contents of the current volume, a handful of noted events and publications of such nature is worth mentioning here briefly.

Some precedents to this volume

Several conferences and symposia have been organized to discuss the issues of Asian heritage management, some of which go unnoticed, whereas others draw attention through the resultant publications. In 1991, a symposium on *Cultural Heritage in Asia and the Pacific: Conservation and Policy* was organized at Honolulu, Hawai‘i, by ICOMOS – USA and the Getty Conservation Institute. The symposium, through its plenary discussion, provided some recommendations for the governments in the Asia-Pacific region, to focus on education, policy making and networking. However, not much critical (re)thinking of heritage in Asian context was demonstrated as compared to a later conference in 1995. The Getty Conservation Institute, in collaboration with the Asia Society and the Siam Society, organized another conference on *The Future of Asia’s Past: Preservation of Architectural Heritage of Asia* in Thailand that year. Drawing case studies on heritage management from 13 Asian countries, the conference deliberated on the themes of policy, cultural tourism, vernacular architecture, colonial legacy, public-private partnerships, and threats to heritage sites. Through case studies and panel discussions on these thematic issues, the conference concluded with several recommendations including the recognition of the living nature of Asian heritage, the emphasis on traditional craftsmanship, and concerns related to rapid economic progress, among others.

An international conference titled *Asian Approaches of Conservation* was organized by the Asian Academy of Heritage Management in 2006, the proceedings of which are neither widely circulated, nor do they really delve into an in-depth discussion deserved by the conference’s title. Being an international conference with such an important thematic focus, the conference evidently

missed a very important yet ambitious opportunity of critiquing existing approaches and articulating relevant approaches of heritage conservation in Asian contexts. The National Research Institute for Cultural Properties in Tokyo (Japan) has organized a series of seminars on the conservation of Asian cultural heritage, focusing on different themes each time; however, the published proceedings are not widely distributed.

Out of these efforts, two publications so far have emerged as important books. A series of symposia and meetings in South Korea and Australia culminated as a book titled *The Disappearing 'Asian' City: Protecting Asia's urban heritage in a globalizing world* (Logan 2002). This, too, points out that Asian urban heritage management needs to be situated with due reference to both global and local contexts. Through the case studies of a number of Asian cities, the book questions the 'Asianness' of Asian cities – both in terms of their unique features as well as their evolving nature. Another conference held in 2009 at the National University of Singapore's Asia Research Institute has been a catalyst for the recent publication, *Routledge Handbook of Heritage in Asia* (Daly and Winter 2012). This is a significant publication as it brings together contributions from different disciplinary perspectives on heritage in Asia. The book adds to the much-needed discussion of heritage in larger socio-economic, political, as well as environmental contexts.

This current volume is intended to contribute to this increasing knowledge base and discussion on Asian heritage management. It is by no means comprehensive, yet we bring together a wide range of topics from a diverse group of contributors. The contributors include both academics and practitioners (many falling into both categories) representing different cultural backgrounds from within and beyond the Asian continent. Altogether the volume represents the diversity of heritage and the professionals involved in the Asian heritage landscape; we have not attempted to maintain a consistent viewpoint throughout the volume, but have acknowledged and kept intact the viewpoints expressed by each author. An overview of the contents of this volume shall help to highlight some of the recurring themes in Asian heritage management today.

Contents of this volume

The chapters in this volume are organized into three sections: contexts, concerns and prospects. By doing this, we have attempted to emphasise that (i) Asian heritage must be understood in its own context(s) including the historic/traditional and contemporary; (ii) that there are challenges and concerns owing to both global and local circumstances; and (iii) that Asian heritage management needs contextualized approaches either rooted in Asian traditions or those that respond to the specific concerns that have emerged in Asian contexts. The contexts, concerns and prospects of Asian heritage management are interconnected and so are our chapters. Despite their placement into a certain part of the volume, the chapters are by no means limited just to their assigned section: each chapter offers insights into contexts, concerns as well as prospects for heritage management in Asia.

The categorization of chapters into one part, therefore, does not preclude their relevance for the other thematic sections.

Part I: Contexts

The first part of the volume brings together contributions that discuss the major worldviews that have influenced the making and maintenance of the majority of heritage in Asia. Though they may not have explicit reference to heritage management as such, they provide conceptual principles behind a variety of heritage expressions including art, architecture, festivals, rituals, everyday practices and their regulatory norms. In addition to the worldviews, the ‘contexts’ for Asian heritage also include contemporary policies and regulations adopted by individual countries and their administrative divisions. These policies are often derived from national political contexts as well as their affiliation with international conventions and guidelines, yet they also sometimes reflect the local contexts at individual community levels. The chapters included in this section dwell on these two major issues: Asian worldviews and policy frameworks.

Asian worldviews on heritage conservation

Much of the Asian cultural landscape is influenced by different religions and associated traditional practices; hence, the volume starts with an exploration of worldviews based on some of the major religious traditions of Asia. The first three chapters discuss Hindu, Buddhist and Islamic perspectives on heritage conservation. There are further variations and interpretations within these larger worldviews too; for example, Buddhist practices in Sri Lanka may differ methodologically from those of Japan. Similarly, the word ‘Hindu’ is a collective term given to a diverse group of religious traditions found in the Indian sub-continent, and thus is a religious system that flourished in South Asia, which later influenced some parts of Southeast Asia as well. Islam is another major religion practiced in many countries of Asia and therefore is an equally important aspect of the Asian cultural landscape. Discussion of these worldviews is a crucial starting point for this volume, as it emphasises some of the foundational concepts underlying the existence of Asian heritage.

Drawing upon the traditional treatises in South India, Binumol Tom brings to the fore a Hindu perspective on conservation, known as *jiirnnoddharana*. The key concept and approach of *jiirnnoddharana* is evident in the terminology itself – ‘uplifting of the weakened one’. This uplifting or improvement is more akin to restoration with possible enhancement than to the mere preservation⁸ of what existed. In the chapter on Buddhist perspectives on conservation, Neel Kamal Chapagain highlights the three key ontological concepts in Buddhism – the cyclical nature of existence and the notions of impermanence and insubstantiality of material form – which may be helpful in interpreting conservation in a Buddhist context. These Buddhist concepts are fundamentally contradictory to the notion of material authenticity that has been the core idea of current

conservation practice. Chapagain argues that such a contradiction does not preclude us from interpreting the idea of conservation in the Buddhist context; instead, it allows us to refine the practice of conservation, particularly in relation to non-material aspects of heritage and its relation to nature and ecology. Writing about Islamic perspectives, with specific reference to the Malay culture, Syed Iskander Ariffin interprets heritage conservation in light of the Qur'an and *Hadith* (the Prophetic tradition), the two fundamental sources of Islamic teachings. He points out that 'protection of cultural diversity is not a choice but a natural way of living in accordance with the teachings of Islam' because '... the earth we live on is a sacred place and has to be looked after by us with utmost care'. Ariffin draws parallels between Arabic words used in the Islamic texts and terms like conservation and preservation. For example, the word *muhafazah* is close to the word 'conservation' whereas '*hafz*, *muha-fazat*, and *muhafazat* are used interchangeably for both conservation⁹ and preservation;¹⁰ their use differs at times depending on the context of application'. Furthermore, Ariffin argues that the idea of preserving cultural artefacts is foreign to the Malay culture, which could at best associate symbolic memory as the focus of conservation, other than material authenticity.

While some terms equivalent to maintenance, repair and upkeep appear in these religious worldviews, it is important to recognize that they do not emphasise the material authenticity of heritage, which has been a key idea in conventional conservation thinking. All three religious worldviews consistently emphasise spiritual and symbolic aspects rather than physical and material aspects of cultural heritage. In an architectural context, this is also ascribed to the nature of the built environment which was often made of perishable materials. Thus, there is no expectation of material survival of buildings for a long period. We must also note that similar emphases on spiritual concepts are found in other non-Asian contexts as well, for example in Africa and the Pacific Islands.

Management frameworks

The second section in [Part I](#) deals with contemporary management frameworks established at national and international levels. The chapter by Anila Naeem explains how the constitutionally declared national identity of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan conflicts with the socio-cultural reality of the diverse heritage landscape that includes other religious and ethnic expressions, not just the Islamic ones. Present-day Pakistan contains some sites belonging to ancient civilizations, with many sites belonging to diverse cultural groups other than Islam. Recognizing non-Islamic heritage has been a challenge for a young country which was founded on the basis of the Islamic majority of its population when it emerged as an independent nation from British-occupied India. Reflecting on her own experiences in heritage policy making, Naeem discusses some recent efforts underway to bring such cultural diversity to the forefront, both in legislation and in practice.

In contrast with the case of Pakistan, the cases presented in the chapter by Fred Lee and Hilary du Cros highlight the diversity of heritage management

approaches in three cities in Southern China – Guangzhou, Hong Kong, and Macau. Even though these three cities are located within one small geographic region – the Pearl River Delta in Southern China – they ‘have developed very different political-administrative systems as a result of distinctive historical trajectories: British-colonial derived in Hong Kong, Portuguese-colonial derived in Macau, and socialist-regime-in-transition-toward-market economy in Guangzhou, the capital of China’s southern province of Guangdong’. The chapter elaborates the impact as well as the strengths and weaknesses of the distinct heritage management policies in these three cases. What emerges from this discussion is that the colonial legacy still survives at large in various Asian contexts, and that it influences the development of diverse conservation approaches even among similar geo-political situations. More importantly, the authors also recognize that lately ‘the public’s changing perceptions of cultural heritage and their aspirations for more proactive and inclusive heritage conservation efforts in these three cities have outpaced government measures for the review and amendment of the original legislation and regulatory frameworks’. Increasing public interest provides an important prospect in Asian heritage management because it will certainly help to bridge the gap between the fundamental basis of heritage and the conventional expert-led conservation approach.

Kai Weise’s chapter on the World Heritage site of Lumbini, the birthplace of the Buddha, discusses yet another complexity in the Asian heritage management context. On the one hand, the importance of Lumbini to a global community invites international participation, while on the other hand its everyday management is subjected to the national policies and legislation of Nepal. While international assistance and monitoring is important, Weise also points out the fact that sometimes conflicting recommendations from international expert groups add to the already paramount confusion in managing such sites. Moreover, Lumbini is both an archaeological site of global importance and a living site of religious reverence for contemporary Buddhist communities across the world. The question then becomes how to strike a balance between these different sets of needs and significance which sometimes seem to conflict in practice. Drawing from his own experience of creating an integrated management plan for Lumbini, Weise describes the process undertaken to ensure an efficient and appropriate management plan that attempts to cater to the needs of both historic preservation as well as spiritual practices at Lumbini.

Part II: Concerns

Part II of the volume brings in seven essays highlighting two key concerns about heritage management in Asia. The first theme of these concerns points out the fact that heritage is much more than just monuments. As is evidenced by the recent fanfare with the UNESCO’s Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention in the last decade, the heritage conservation community, until recently, was primarily engaged with heritage in a tangible or physical sense. As discussed earlier, some Asian countries like Japan and South Korea had long recognized intangible

practices as key aspects of cultural heritage and had their policies address these intangible aspects long before any international convention paid attention to such matters. Implicitly though, such measures had existed in the form of many traditional practices in other parts of Asia as well. Along the same line, various communities have regarded features of their natural environment as integral parts of their cultural heritage; for example, mountains, forests, and water bodies have traditionally been considered sacred sites and are integral parts of religious and folk stories. In many cases, such spiritual values associated with environmental features have contributed towards the preservation and management of natural landscapes as well. These points are further illustrated by the chapters included in the 'Beyond monuments' section.

Beyond monuments

Yushi Utaka's chapter illustrates the historic survival of the Himeji Castle in Japan and how it has become a revered landmark in people's memory as a guardian of the community. But the failure to capture this spirit in recent preservation efforts has raised some concerns about the potential detachment of the Castle from the community's mental landscape. Looking at the history of conservation interventions at the Himeji Castle, the chapter presents the evolution of conservation thinking and policies in Japan. Despite Japan's recognition of being in the forefront of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, the case of the Himeji Castle's conservation indicates the adoption of 'material based' and 'monument-centric' conservation approach, instead of highlighting the spirit and memory based values the Himeji Castle represents. A similar situation is given in Vibha Bhattarai-Upadyay's chapter that reviews the heritage management practices in the Kathmandu Valley in Nepal. It focuses on the contemporary conservation activities at the Pashupatināth Temple in Kathmandu. The failure to incorporate traditional beliefs and practices and community associations with the Temple in its current heritage management plans has faced sheer resentments from the local resident community as well as the Hindu religious community at large. Bhattarai-Upadhyay points out a dilemma of a country trying to keep abreast of international norms and recommendations while ignoring its own rich traditions and community ownership of heritage management. In fact, it has been argued that Nepal's cultural heritage policies and government agencies' practices have been responsive more to international agencies like UNESCO rather than to its own people and their expectations (Shrestha 2002; Chapagain 2008).

Amita Sinha addresses the concern that much of the heritage discourse has not made a working connection between the tangible and intangible dimensions of cultural heritage. She suggests that cultural landscapes could provide clues to make such a connection because they are 'repositories of cultural heritage understood holistically, interwoven with folk beliefs, ways of seeing, prescribed patterns of movement and other forms of ritual behaviour, and aestheticized expressions of feeling in devotional poetry, dance, drama, and songs'. As Sinha points out, current heritage legislation in India has not yet recognized cultural

landscapes as a distinct heritage designation similar to archaeological sites, protected monuments or even protected wildlife and sanctuaries. Sinha further argues that the entire South Asian region does not yet have a successful cultural landscape conservation model; her essay offers a potential model based on her design and planning proposals for the sacred site of Govardan hill in Braj, India. Emphasising cultural landscapes and traditional ritual practices, Sinha's model 'acknowledges the temporality of landscapes, recognizes site making as an evolving process of human interaction with nature, and the interdependency of tangible and intangible forms of heritage'.

Taking the notion of intangible cultural heritage and cultural landscape concepts in a broader Asian context further, Ken Taylor revisits how the international heritage discourse, through various conventions in the past century, has gradually acknowledged the construct of cultural landscapes as a viable framework. The construct is very important for an Asian context where a dynamic relationship between people, nature and traditions is what forms the core of most of the sacred heritage sites as well as everyday cultural landscapes. In that light, Taylor emphasises that the cultural landscape approach facilitates people's engagement in broader heritage management by acknowledging their connections with the landscape, their values, and their needs.

Globalizing local heritage

In addition to recognizing the importance of intangible and 'living' aspects of heritage in Asia, there are other concerns related to the dynamics of globalization that are reshaping the heritage management discourse in the Asian context. It can be argued that the spread of the modern idea of conservation itself is an outcome of globalization which has nonetheless helped spur a certain degree of 'glocalization', a mix of globalization and localization (Robertson 1995). Globalization itself is not necessarily good or bad, but the process and route it takes may be either problematic or productive. Here we explore two specific concerns of globalization associated with heritage. First, globalization in Asia is associated with the history of colonization, which has also influenced heritage management practices in Asia, ramifications of which still continue in the heritage-scape of Asia. Second, cultural tourism is another outcome of 'glocalization'. It provides much-needed economic support to heritage management which might otherwise be suffering from a lack of resources. Yet, it is tourism that may be a key driving factor behind the 'museumification' of living heritage sites as well as the gentrification of the historic towns once economic forces become stronger than traditional communal life. Three chapters in the second section of [Part II](#) highlight these issues.

William Chapman's detailed exploration of the processes and players in the conservation of sites at Angkor in Cambodia addresses perhaps the most-noted example of globalization of heritage. The placing of Angkor on the global stage for conservation occurs at multiple fronts. First, it started from the 'discovery' of Angkor by the French expeditions to document, preserve and publicize Angkor

often as a colonial legacy of the French. Second, involvement of other countries demonstrate their interest and expertise on dealing with complex sites like Angkor while allowing them to experiment in their expertise on heritage conservation. Third, politically and economically struggling Cambodia tapped into international support to preserve one of its national icons. Finally, despite the initial detachment of the local population from their everyday site, the process has lately started to create a local management base that is rooted to the national context. Yet many concerns still remain, as Chapman succinctly points out in his concluding paragraph, that include threats from increased tourism, increased urbanization and modernization of settlements in and around the heritage sites, and, most importantly, the limited involvement of the local people in heritage management.

With globalization, local monuments have not only become the experts' domain but also sites for popular consumption. Despite the economic lure that tourism and globalization bring, serious concerns are being raised about the truthfulness of what is presented: unwanted over-commercialization of rituals as opposed to 'rituals' for rituals' sake, interference on everyday activities of the local community, and so on. Exploring the issue of commodification of intangible cultural heritage in East and Southeast Asia, Wantanee Suntikul highlights two specific cases of heritage commodification. First is the case of Hong Kong's Bun Festival, which was once banned, then re-opened, commoditized, and redesigned with fake traditions by the tourism authority of Hong Kong in response to what they saw as the needs of global consumers. The second case is the town of Luang Prabang in Laos which is an increasingly popular tourist destination as well as an important centre of Theravada Buddhism in Southeast Asia. In the first case, the concerns are associated with the government's efforts of commodifying heritage for tourists that not only distort the traditional characteristics of the festival but also turn the festival into a show rather than a community practice. The second case highlights how tourists' interest in observing, and even participating in, local cultural practices are gradually becoming problematic. This occurs both through tourists' behaviour as intruders in everyday activities of the local community, and also through some locals' temptation towards the economic opportunity presented by tourism. Examples of the latter include selling cultural artefacts to the tourists, preferring tourism related jobs over their traditional professions, and converting traditional housing into tourism-related service spaces, thereby triggering gentrification. Evidently, both global and local agencies share interests and participation in these transactions. Hence, Suntikul suggests we view such commodification practices within the larger socio-political and ideological structures that enable such transactions.

Dealing with the issues pertaining to the relationship of tourism and heritage from a heritage management perspective, Sharif Shams Imon discusses the challenges of making cultural tourism a sustainable activity in heritage sites in Asia. Imon draws attention to the sustainability of heritage tourism in Asia for three reasons: the 'tourism growth rate in Asia is the fastest in the world, ... tourism development in most countries in Asia is still in its early stage, ... and there is a

growing concern about the sustainability of the current heritage-based tourism development in less developed countries'. Though heritage management and tourism may often conflict in terms of values and priorities, the reality is that heritage management in many sites severely lacks economic resources, for which tourism seems to be a solution. Despite all the challenges there must be a way forward; Imon suggests approaches towards sustainable tourism to maintain a balance between cultural resources and their consumption. Furthermore, he emphasises the usefulness of the concepts of cultural capital and social sustainability. Imon argues that the concept of cultural capital can render heritage-based tourism programmes socially and environmentally sustainable by integrating cultural values into the project planning process.

Part III: Prospects

Following the discussions on contexts and concerns pertaining to heritage management in Asia, the final section brings forward some prospects that are emerging out of the ongoing theoretical and practical discourses within the Asian context. These are only representative concepts and processes, with some further thoughts included in the Epilogue at the end of this volume. The four chapters in this section offer a glimpse of an immense body of knowledge, activities, and possibilities of contextualizing heritage management approaches within Asian situations.

Drawing from her extensive work with communities in Ladakh, India, Tara Sharma shares with us a community-based approach to heritage management that transcends conventional notions and processes of heritage identification, documentation and conservation responses. The approach starts with a process of identification that questions what is heritage, followed by a question on what should be done. In Tara's words, '(t)he gap between traditional conservation approaches and contemporary conservation practices stems from the very definition of what constitutes heritage'. Accordingly, the approach begins with community engagement right when their heritage is identified, documented and prioritized for conservation interventions. The operational scale is a village level, where the natural features and associated folklores, as well as names of various locations including that of the village itself, provide references as to what actually constitutes the village in both physical and spiritual terms. In the process, people's perceptions and memories determine the importance of any identified heritage, rather than basing its value on its objective history and design features. Furthermore, instead of starting with what needs to be done in terms of conservation from the experts' point of view, the process starts with learning how the communities have maintained their heritage. This includes knowledge of which religious and cultural rituals would need to be followed, for which the local experts, in this case, the Buddhist monks, are consulted. The chapter also points out that the relevant concepts from religious beliefs should be brought into the heritage management approach. Similarly, the values and significance could be related to the spiritual meaning and symbolism instead of the form and aesthetics

of the preserved monuments. This experience in Ladakh provides a strong approach to be considered, not only for Asian but also for other heritage contexts.

Moving from the rural context of Ladakh to the urban context of Malacca (Melaka) in Malaysia, the chapter by Syed Abidin Idid and Dilshan Ossen proposes the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) as a potential tool for urban heritage management. Recognizing that heritage conservation does not exist in isolation but in a larger urban design and planning context, Idid and Ossen emphasise a planning-based approach for conservation, for which HIA could be a tool, just like the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been widely used for general development projects. Idid and Ossen point out that the processes for HIA are similar to those of EIA; yet, HIA draws explicitly from heritage management points of views and the notion of Outstanding Universal Value, as defined by the World Heritage Convention. While this is not uniquely emerging out of the Asian context, the approach is useful in heritage management in urban contexts in Asia where the planning processes in general suffer from the lack of competent heritage assessment systems.

Apart from these methodological processes, the prospects for managing heritage in Asia also require new theoretical frameworks. The need for new theoretical approaches is articulated in the question Jamie MacKee raises in his essay: 'How would the rich and unique cultural built heritage of Asia be interpreted and conserved if the theories and guidelines that were to underpin it were based on the cultural and philosophical traditions of the region?' In an attempt to answer this question, MacKee explores the potential connections between Buddhist philosophy and Systems Theory as a way to theorize the management of Buddhist cultural heritage, particularly in the South and Southeast Asian context. MacKee draws from his experience and observations in South Asia to theorize conservation from an established worldview which does not have an explicitly articulated response to the conservation and management of its heritage. MacKee suggests that the three principles of Buddhism, i.e. universal interconnectedness, radical interdependence, and mutual conditioning 'provide strong links with Systems Theory' and thus 'provide the methodology for describing intra- and inter-systems relationships that would be the basis for determining what is important about non-secular built heritage, why it is important, and how it could be conserved'. MacKee further illustrates the applicability of the framework by developing potential scenarios for the conservation of *Abhayagiri Stupa* in Sri Lanka.

The chapter by Kapila Silva suggests another potential framework for identifying heritage dimensions in inhabited historic towns in Asia, wherein achieving a balance between the needs of urban conservation with that of urban development is critical. Silva uses Kevin Lynch's concept of imageability of place as a potential theoretical framework to conceptualize a heritage site and its constituent heritage dimensions. The notion of place imageability is defined as the capacity of a place to be able to evoke mental images in the minds of people who experience it. Silva points out that place imageability is formulated together by physical and symbolic characteristics of a place. In that sense, a heritage site, for example,

with strong imageable capacity, offers a lasting impression of its sense of place and memory in people's minds. Therefore, heritage management could attempt to manage the imageability of a historic place which, in turn, facilitates maintaining an enduring memory of the place. Silva argues that correctly identified and managed imageability dimensions would help to determine what to sustain and what to change in the integrated conservation and development efforts of an historic town. Such a framework in fact is useful not only in the Asian context but in any historic urban context as well. Silva observes that this approach could offer a coherent theoretical framework for heritage management, as it clarifies and connects some concepts used in global heritage practice. Following the chapters in the 'Prospects' section, Silva concludes this volume with an Epilogue wherein he further reflects upon other aspects of prospects for Asian heritage management.

What is covered in this volume is only a representative set of contexts, concerns and prospects of Asian heritage management. What can be discerned from the chapters to follow is that Asian heritage management is situated within some unique and some typical contexts, including a set of diverse worldviews and practices. These philosophical traditions and methodological practices perceive heritage and its management in unique ways – more in mental or spiritual essence than in material appearance. On the other hand, what we regard as the field of heritage management has its origins in European contexts, but has since gained a global currency through international institutions and professionals' network. Therefore, some of the primary concerns in Asian heritage management come from mismatches of philosophical understandings of heritage as well as the institutionalization of management practices. While different approaches have their own merits and uses, what is indeed needed is a conscious approach of contextualizing heritage management in a way that integrates specific cultural norms while also acknowledging global discourse. Another set of concerns come amidst the interaction of the global and the local agencies, where again the concern is to ensure mutual acknowledgement and balanced relationships. One way to tease out such working relationships, at least in the Asian context, is to consider 'people' as an integral part of the 'heritage' discourse so that cultural beliefs and practices are appropriately brought into heritage management. The reference to people also helps management practices create a balance between the spiritual and the material, between objective reality and subjective differences, between the global and the local, and to integrate the dichotomized discourses of the tangible and the intangible, as well as cultural and natural heritage management together. As I mentioned in the opening paragraph, Asian heritage begins from and dwells around its 'people'. People or local communities continue the traditions created by their ancestors, devise new practices, build collective heritage, maintain as well as modify, erase and even re-create heritage. They provide the necessary context to heritage – as creators, followers, managers, users and consumers. Another set of people – the academicians, researchers, professionals and the like – can study and incorporate such contexts in contemporary theorising, policy making, and devising practices at both local and global levels. This discussion is,

in fact, relevant for heritage management in other continents too, as the Asian cases included in this volume have added rich and meaningful stimuli to expand the theories and practices of heritage management in Asia and beyond.

Notes

- 1 Also see Wang H.L. (2012) 'War and revolution as national heritage – 'Red Tourism' in China' in the *Routledge Handbook of Heritage in Asia*; and Hevia J. L. (2001) 'World Heritage, National Culture and Restoration of Chengde', *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique*, 9: 219–43.
- 2 See Wariko K. (ed.) (2001) *Bamiyan: Challenge to World Heritage*, for a collection of essays on various topics regarding this.
- 3 In her essay in this chapter, Wantanee Suntikul points out that the Indonesian government promotes Borobudur as a cultural heritage for tourist attraction rather than a religious site, thus making it a must-see stop on the Indonesian tourism circuit rather than a sacred place. The efforts taken to protect the site and the on-going discussion of reconsidering the site as a part of a larger cultural landscape should be appreciated, nevertheless.
- 4 Terms like 'preservation' and 'conservation' have their own specific connotations, yet they are used interchangeably as well. Moreover, what 'preservation' means to a US practitioner is often equivalent to 'conservation' elsewhere. Similarly, 'restoration' and 'renovation' are used interchangeably despite their specific meanings in technical conservation terminology. This volume includes discussions dealing with philosophical questions, methodological responses in documentation and intervention, policy making and implementation, politics of involvement in heritage sites, and so on. Some of the chapters have evolved from intense academic discussion, whereas some of them come straight from practice with less engagement in academic discourses. Hence, for the lack of a better alternative, we have used 'heritage management' as a generic umbrella term to encompass all different aspects pertaining to the study and practice of heritage in Asia.
- 5 As of July 2012, at the end of the 36th General Assembly of the World Heritage Committee, the UNESCO World Heritage List contains 277 heritage sites from the Asian continent, including the cultural, natural and mixed categories. The way UNESCO's statistics group the world regions should be noted. For example, it has combined Asia with the Pacific region, while the Arab states are listed as a separate region. Thus, the official statistics appear as follows: the Asia Pacific region has 151 cultural heritage sites, 55 natural heritage sites and 10 mixed (both cultural and natural) heritage sites.
- 6 Article 1 of the 2003 UNESCO Convention defines intangible cultural heritage: 'The "intangible cultural heritage" means the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. For the purposes of this Convention, consideration will be given solely to such intangible cultural heritage as is compatible with existing international human rights instruments, as well as with the requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sustainable development' (UNESCO 2003).
- 7 It is officially called 'Hoi An Protocols for Best Conservation Practice in Asia: Professional Guidelines for Assuring and Preserving the Authenticity of Heritage

Sites in the Context of the Cultures of Asia’, developed from an international experts’ workshop on *Conserving the Past – An Asian Perspective of Authenticity in the Consolidation, Restoration and Reconstruction of Historic Monuments and Sites* organized in Hoi An, Viet Nam from 15 February to 3 March 2001. The document was adopted by the Asia-Oceania Region at the ICOMOS General Assembly in Xi’an, China in 2005.

- 8 *Restoration* implies intervention on a degrading or decaying object or building so as to reinstate its ‘original’ form. *Reconstruction* is similar to restoration but it differs in intent – restoration intends to bring back the original form and thus may not intervene on parts that seem structurally fine. Reconstruction, on the other hand, is the complete overhaul of the structure. In between, there is another term ‘anastylosis’, which is used to indicate a reconstruction but aimed to restore the original form precisely. In anastylosis, all the parts are dismantled and re-constructed, using the same parts in the same original/extant fashion. *Preservation* is the approach of keeping everything intact with less intervention. *Conservation* is often used interchangeably with preservation, which is a term used mostly in the United States where the term conservation is not used in historic preservation but usually in the fields of nature and ecology only.
- 9 ‘The aim of conservation is to retain the cultural significance of a place and must include provision of its security, its maintenance, and its future’ (Art. 2, *Burra Charter*).
- 10 ‘Preservation means maintaining the fabric and place in its existing state and retarding deterioration’ (Art. 1.6, *Burra Charter*).

References

- Agnew, N., Demas, M., and Getty Conservation Institute (2002) *Principles for the conservation of heritage sites in China*, Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute.
- Ai, J. (2012) ‘“Selecting the refined and discarding the dross”: The post-1990 Chinese leadership’s attitude towards cultural tradition’, in P. Daly and T. Winter (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Heritage in Asia*, London: Routledge, 129–38.
- Anand, S. (1988) *The Asian identity: Studies in Asia’s Cultural Heritage*, Chandigarh: Sameer Prakashan.
- Anderson, B. (1991) *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*, London: Verso.
- Appadurai, A. (1996) *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- (2001) *Globalization*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Askew, M. (2010) ‘The magic list of global status: UNESCO, World Heritage and the agendas of states’, in S. Labadi and C. Long (eds.) *Heritage and Globalisation*, London: Routledge, 19–44.
- Australia ICOMOS (1999) *The Burra Charter (The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance)*. Online. Available HTTP: <http://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/BURRA-CHARTER-1999_charter-only.pdf> (accessed 15 June 2012).
- Beeson, M. and Stubbs, R. (2012) ‘Introduction’, in M. Beeson and R. Stubbs (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Asian Regionalism*, London: Routledge, 1–7.
- Byrne, D. (2004) ‘Chartering heritage in Asia’s postmodern world’, *Conservation: The Getty Conservation Institute Newsletter*, 19(2), 16–19.
- Chapagain, N. K. (2008) ‘Heritage Conservation in Nepal: Policies, Stakeholders and Challenges’, *Himalayan Research Papers Archive*, University of New Mexico. Online. Available HTTP: <<http://hdl.handle.net/1928/6939>>.

- (2009) 'Examining the notion of participation in Urban Conservation: Implications for (South) Asian Cities', in *Asian Cities: Legacies of Modernity*: Proceedings of the 7th mAAN International Conference, New Delhi, India; Modern Asian Architecture Network.
- (2011) *Rethinking cultural heritage conservation at historic settlements: The case of Lomanthang, Nepal*, unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.
- (2012) 'Rethinking participatory process in Heritage Conservation: Situating Professionals in the Process', *Journal of Science and Engineering*, 1: 43–51.
- Chung, S.-J. (2005) 'East Asian Values in Historic Conservation', *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, 11(1): 55–70.
- Cody, J. W. and Fong, K. L. (2012) 'Beyond band-aids: The need for specialized materials conservation expertise in Asia', in P. Daly and T. Winter (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Heritage in Asia*, London: Routledge, 98–110.
- Corzo, M. A. (ed.) (1995) *The future of Asia's past: Preservation of the architectural heritage of Asia*, Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute.
- Daly, P. and Winter, T. (eds.) (2012) *Routledge Handbook of Heritage in Asia*, London: Routledge.
- Di Giovanni, M. A. (2009) *The heritage-scape: UNESCO, world heritage, and tourism*, Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Engelhardt, R. A. (ed.) (2007) *Asia Conserved: Lessons Learned from the UNESCO Asia-Pacific Heritage Awards for Culture Heritage Conservation (2000-2004)*. Bangkok: UNESCO Bangkok. Online. Available HTTP: <http://www.unesco.org/ulis/cgi-bin/ulis.pl?catno=155754&set=50039734_3_377&gp=1&lin=1&ll=1> (accessed 18 February 2012).
- Engelhardt, R. A. and Rogers, P. R. (2009) *Hoi An Protocols for best conservation practice in Asia: Professional guidelines for assuring and preserving the authenticity of heritage sites in the context of the cultures of Asia*, Bangkok: UNESCO Bangkok.
- Graham, B. J., Ashworth, G. J., and Tunbridge, J. E. (2000). *A geography of heritage: Power, culture, and economy*, London: Arnold.
- Hewison, R. (1987) *The heritage industry: Britain in a climate of decline*. London: Methuen London.
- Howe, R. and Logan, W. S. (2002) 'Conclusion – Protecting Asia's urban heritage: The way forward', in W. S. Logan (ed.) *The Disappearing 'Asian' City: Protecting Asia's urban heritage in a globalizing world*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 245–56.
- Indian National Trust for Art and Cultural Heritage (INTACH) (2004) *Charter for the Conservation of Unprotected Architectural Heritage and Sites in India*, Online. Available HTTP: <<http://www.intach.org/about-charter.asp?links=about3>> (accessed 20 June 2012)
- Jokilehto, J. (1999) *A history of architectural conservation*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Labadi, S., and Long, C. (eds.) (2010) *Heritage and globalisation*, London: Routledge.
- Logan, W. S. (ed.) (2002) *The disappearing "Asian" city: Protecting Asia's urban heritage in a globalizing world*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Logan, W. and Reeves, K. (2009) 'Introduction: Remembering places of pain and shame', in W. Logan and K. Reeves (eds.) *Places of pain and shame: Dealing with 'difficult heritage'*, London: Routledge, 1–14.
- Long, C. and Reeves, K. (2009) "'Dig a hole and bury the past in it': Reconciliation and the heritage of genocide in Cambodia', in W. Logan and K. Reeves (eds.) *Places of pain and shame: Dealing with 'difficult heritage'*, London: Routledge, 68–81.

- Lowenthal, D. (1998) *The heritage crusade and the spoils of history*, Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press.
- (2004) 'The heritage crusade and its contradictions', in M. Page and R. Mason (eds.) *Giving preservation a history: Histories of historic preservation in the United States*, New York: Routledge: 12–29.
- Luxen, J.-L. (2004) 'Reflections on the Use of Heritage Charters and Conventions', *Conservation: Getty Conservation Institute Newsletter*, 19(2): 4–9.
- Mac Lean, M. G. H. (ed.) (1993) *Cultural heritage in Asia and the Pacific, Conservation and Policy*, Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute.
- MacKee, J. (2009) *Conserving cultural built heritage in South and Southeast Asia: A conceptual framework for the conservation of non-secular built heritage based on the philosophical and cultural experiences of the region*, Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.
- Mehrotra, R. (2007) 'Conservation and Change: Questions for Conservation Education in Urban India', *Built Environment*, 33(3): 342–56.
- (2012) 'Backwards into the Future: Reflections in Conservation in India', *India Studies Lecture*, given at the University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign, 6 April 2012.
- Menon, A. G. K. (2003) 'The case for an Indian charter', *Seminar*, 530. Online. Available HTTP: <http://www.india-seminar.com/2003/530/530_a.g.krishna_menon.htm> (accessed 01 April 2012).
- Nwe, T.T. and Philp, J. (2002) 'Yangon, Myanmar: The re-invention of heritage', in W.S. Logan (ed.) *The Disappearing 'Asian' City: Protecting Asia's urban heritage in a globalizing world*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 147–65.
- Rii, H. U. (2002) 'Seoul, Republic of Korea: Removing the Reminders of Colonialism', in W.S. Logan (ed.) *The Disappearing 'Asian' City: Protecting Asia's urban heritage in a globalizing world*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 74–87.
- Robertson, R. (1995) 'Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity – Heterogeneity', in M. Featherstone, S. Lash, and R. Robertson (eds.) *Global Modernities*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 25–44.
- Shrestha, S. (2002) 'Sampada samrakshan, samlagna sanstha ra dekhieyeka samasya haru' (In Nepali; *tr.* Heritage Conservation, Involved Institutions, and Observed Problems), *Ancient Nepal*, 149: 54–9.
- Shridharan, R.K. (1988) 'Foreword', in S. Anand, *The Asian Identity: Studies in Asia's Cultural Heritage*, Chandigarh: Sameer Prakashan, iv–vii.
- Silpacharanan, S. and Campbell, J. (eds.) (2006) *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Asian Approaches to Conservation*, Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University.
- Silva, K. D. (2010) 'Tangible and Intangible Heritages: The crisis of official definitions', *Housing and Building Research Journal*, 6(3): 12–18.
- Silverman, H., and Ruggles, D. F. (2007) 'Cultural heritage and human rights', in H. Silverman and D.F. Ruggles (eds.) *Cultural heritage and human rights*, New York: Springer, 3–22.
- Smith, L. (2006) *Uses of heritage*, London: Routledge.
- Smith, L., and Akagawa, N. (2009) 'Introduction', in L. Smith and N. Akagawa (eds.) *Intangible heritage*, London: Routledge, 1–9.
- UNESCO (1972) *Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage 1972*, Paris, UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Online. Available HTTP: <http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13055&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html> (accessed 12 April 2012).
- (2003) *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, Paris, UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Online. Available HTTP: <<http://portal.unesco.org/>

- en/ev.php-URL_ID=17716&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html> (accessed 12 April 2012).
- Wang, H. L. (2012) 'War and revolution as national heritage: 'Red Tourism' in China', in P. Daly and T. Winter (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Heritage in Asia*, London: Routledge, 218–33.
- Wariko K. (ed.) (2001) *Bamiyan: Challenge to World Heritage*, New Delhi: Bhavana Books and Prints.
- Wei, C. and Aass, A. (1989) 'Heritage conservation: East and West', *ICOMOS Information*, 3: 3–8.
- Welty, P. T. (1966) *The Asians, their heritage and destiny*, Philadelphia: Lippincott.
- Wijesuriya, G. (2001) 'Pious vandals': Restoration or destruction in Sri Lanka?', in R. Layton and J. Thomas (eds.) *Destruction and conservation of cultural property*, London: Routledge, 256–63.
- (2003) 'Restoring destroyed historic sites', *Seminar*. Online. Available HTTP: <<http://www.india-seminar.com/2003/530/530%20gamini%20wijesuriya.htm>> (accessed 25 March 2012)
- (2005) 'The past is in the present: Perspectives in caring for Buddhist heritage sites in Sri Lanka', in H. Stovel, N. Stanely-Price and R. Killick (eds.) *Conservation of Living Religious Heritage: Papers from the ICCROM 2003 forum on living religious heritage: Conserving the sacred*, Rome: ICCROM, 31–43.
- (2007) 'The restoration of the Temple of the Tooth Relic in Kandy, Sri Lanka: A post-conflict cultural response to loss of identity', in N. Stanely-Price (ed.) *Cultural Heritage in Postwar Recovery: Papers from the ICCROM 2003 forum held on October 4–6, 2005*, Rome: ICCROM, 87–97.
- Winter, T. (2010) 'Heritage tourism: The dawn of a new era?' in S. Labadi and C. Long (eds.) *Heritage and Globalisation*, London: Routledge, 117–29.
- Winter, T., and Daly, P. (2012) 'Heritage in Asia: Converging forces, conflicting values', in P. Daly and T. Winter (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Heritage in Asia*, London: Routledge, 1–35.

