

Responses to the manifesto 'Heritage beyond the boundaries'

The manifesto 'Heritage beyond the boundaries', published in the previous issue of the Newsletter (#69, Autumn 2014, pp.22-23), was compiled by a team of MA students and PhD candidates enrolled in the Leiden University program *Critical Heritage Studies of Asia and Europe*. As a teacher, I supported this initiative, together with Ian Dull, an independent researcher working on the heritage of Southeast Asia.

Adele Esposito

FROM A PEDAGOGICAL PERSPECTIVE, I recognize two main positive contributions made by the manifesto: first, it has fostered the students' capacity to make a statement to the field of heritage studies, based on their individual research; second, the students enthusiastically engaged in this extra-curriculum activity. The limits between a formal class and a passionate debate were blurred, late-afternoons were spent with exchanges about the articles, critiques flocked, responses were given. The manifesto encouraged interactions with an academic field, 'heritage studies', which is a source of heated debates.

The responses to the manifesto published in this issue of the Newsletter, show how current and thriving these debates are. The students and I have been happy to receive the harsh criticisms that will help to deepen the knowledge of heritage, but also the theoretical and philosophical foundations of 'critical heritage' as a field of study. We have also been glad to read those contributions that have provided new perspectives on the values and the forms of heritage in the contexts of Asia. Finally, we have been keen to publish those contributions that adopt a position contrary to one article, or to the manifesto as a whole. These will help the students to question the validity of their arguments, and imagine the response they would give if the community of authors were physically present in a conference room. We can only wish that this will in

reality happen one day, in order to develop fruitful and hot debates about the politics of heritage.

Below is a selection of the responses sent to us. We would like to thank everyone who sent us their thoughts on this issue, and regret we could not publish everyone's contribution.

Adele Esposito, Research Fellow at CNRS/AUSSER; lecturer at LIAS/Leiden University and coordinator of the MA Program 'Critical Heritage Studies of Asia and Europe', IIAS/Faculty of Humanities, Leiden University.



Hong Kong street markets as living heritage

Maurizio Marinelli

IN MY WORK on urban redevelopment and gentrification in Hong Kong, I focus on the history of street markets and street hawking. Street markets and hawking are an organically constitutive part of Hong Kong's history, culture, and socio-economic development. Since the inception of the colony, when the name 'Hong Kong' (香港 Fragrant Harbour) became a synecdoche to refer to the whole collection of fishing villages, trading on riverbanks and around harbours, street markets have always played an integral role in shaping the landscape for population growth and urban development. Not only do they serve as localized and more cost effective alternatives to supermarkets for fresh produce, but they also provide their local customers with the chance to interact directly with the producers, the distributors, and ultimately, with each other. In this sense, markets are spaces of social inclusion, laboratories for collective experiences of public space and 'living heritage', and in addition to that, they have progressively become the testing grounds for bottom-up practices of democratization thanks to the community's battle to preserve this 'living heritage' against the profit-driven logic of *domicide* and *memoricide* (Porteous, Smith, 2001).

Since the 1970s, but even more so starting from 1989, the Government decided to take an active role in disciplining public space in Hong Kong. Street hawking was the first step up the Hong Kong economic ladder, especially for the new-comers from Mainland China. This led to a huge increase in the number of hawkers, from around 13,000 to more than 70,000 in the 1950s-60s. Therefore, in the 1970s the

Government decided to stop issuing hawkers' licenses, and then progressively turned the street markets into indoor public markets (1980s), in the name of progress and modernity, and, of course, for the sake of public health. The outcome has been the development of 'modern', more 'civilized' and 'hygienic' urban spaces, with the collateral damage of the annihilation of 'living heritage'.

In my work, I define living heritage as the complex of informal social activities and cultural practices, which characterize everyday life and co-existence in a specific locale. Therefore, my definition is very different from the UNESCO's attempt to subsume living heritage as part of the intangible cultural heritage (IHC), which refers to the immaterial heritage of different cultures. Going beyond the UNESCO's Cartesian definition's dichotomy, I argue that the citizens have a role in shaping and practicing heritage: therefore, living heritage is material, since it includes embodied social relationships and cultural practices which become meaningful thanks to their co-existence in the street market. I argue that the street market (as opposed to shopping malls or luxury goods stores) is a perfect example of the living heritage, which is constructed and based on a collective civic identity: maintaining the street market vibrant and alive is the *sine qua non* to continue to bring disparate social, ethnic, and generational groups together, engendering a sense of social aggregate of the residents as a community.

Maurizio Marinelli, Senior Lecturer in East Asian History, History Department, University of Sussex

Above:
Hong Kong Market.
Image reproduced
under a Creative
Commons license
courtesy of Jo Baron
on Flickr.com.

Cultural and natural heritage

Eric Jones

HERITAGE PARTLY CONSISTS of communal institutions used to allocate, conserve and harvest natural resources. Where humans have operated for millennia it is unhelpful to think of nature as independent of this traditional management. Yet these institutions are under threat. As Madhav Gadgil says, "the conservation of the rapidly diminishing pool of experience, a kind of cultural diversity, is as pressing as the conservation of biological diversity."

An appropriate theoretical framework envisages Asia's heritage as a continuum with Europe's experience; despite differences in timing both are shaped by economic growth. A model may be proposed like the familiar one where different waves of consumer goods are bought as successive thresholds of household income are crossed. Development likewise erases communal mechanisms for allocating resources. The model is mechanistic but is a first approximation; as usual in social science, deviations from its predictions are the greater interest.

Communal institutions for allocating resources are nearly extinct in Western Europe, ironically sometimes being ousted in favour of 'pure' nature conservation, despite the way specific ecosystems depend on historical practices. Two generations of development in East Asia, and population growth throughout Asia, have brought comparable effects. Environmental pressure has been externalised in part by importing forest products and seeking customary luxuries, like ivory, in other continents, not to mention in distant seas. But Asia itself has felt the effects, notably the commercialisation of exploitation where resources were formerly husbanded by local communities. Husbanded is the word: local people engaged in sustainable harvesting and it is their heritage of cautious management which is now, as Gadgil observes, under as much threat as wildlife itself.

An example is the exploitation of cave swiftlets in Borneo to make birds' nest soup. Small-scale management apparently existed in equilibrium for one thousand years, producing no 'tragedy of the commons'. However, Suharto's government replaced the system by annual auctions. Although this was logical, the resultant take was excessive. After Suharto's fall, reformers were frustrated by continued (human) population and income growth, which raised demand and hampered the restoration of previous means of allocating harvesting rights.

Not all growth-induced changes are negative since they provide money for national parks. In addition, not every seemingly archaic practice really is old: shorebird hunting in Thailand's coastal villages has emerged because nowadays fresh meat is affordable. Yet, generally speaking, the heritage of traditional management is being undermined by the forces of commercialisation.

Eric Jones, Professor; author of 'Revealed Biodiversity: an economic history of the human impact' (Singapore, 2014)

Stakeholders' motivations

Fang Xu

'A MANIFESTO - BEYOND THE BOUNDARIES' is a timely contribution to the topic of heritage for many Asian cities that are undergoing a radical transition in the process of urbanisation. Particularly, the critiques of institutional heritage practices highlight the problems of the current approach. Actually, in Asian countries such as China, the concept of heritage related to urban environment has been constantly shaped with ongoing change of content and interests. However, the institutional heritage practice remains a main avenue and is hardly challenged. As a designer and researcher involved in several large-scale urban renewal projects, I have witnessed this dynamic process in the past decade.

In China, the heritage-related exercise is far more than a technical issue, it is a systematic task that involves local government bodies, cultural relics protectors, developers, designers, and end-users or residents. As stakeholders, they play different roles based on their multiple interests, sometimes contradictory to each other. Government bodies seem more interested in the approach than is politically correct; developers only favour the potential commercial value that a heritage project can generate; cultural relics protectors merely focus on the conservation of heritage's physical features; designers try to turn the output of design into a personal mark and artistic statement; and residents are more concerned about potential impacts resulted from unpredictable changes.

Due to the dominant role of the government in the society and its top-down management system, government bodies are the most powerful stakeholders, while the voices of residents, although the largest group, are too weak to be heard. When doing research on heritage-related topics, the difficulty is not only dealing with all the challenges from stakeholders, but also constructing an exchange platform on which all stakeholders can equally share their different views.

My research is usually based on a specific practical project, and starts with studying the stakeholders. Examining the stakeholders' motivations underlying their different interests becomes a fundamental step to better understanding them. Meanwhile, the most vital part is to create a bottom-up approach, this grassroots-heritage practice offers many new possibilities for the exercise and adds an additional perspective and measurement to the institutional heritage approach. Hence, the integrated solution can emerge that can appropriately respond to the interests of all.

Fang Xu, Associate professor; coordinator of Environments/Spatial Design, UNSW Art & Design, The University of New South Wales

Critique without criticism?

Felix Girke

AS A SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGIST studying heritage practices in contemporary Myanmar, I have entered 'heritage studies' sideways, and am occasionally perplexed, less by the desire to apply one's insights to the betterment of the field, and more by the confidence that such interventions might in fact work. My puzzlement is professional ballast – the confidence that academics could improve the field they study suggests a modernist optimism many anthropologists have lost.

But I fully agree with the non-judgmental diagnosis that heritage itself is out of bounds. We are faced with a proliferation of applications of the term in Southeast Asia, Myanmar being a case in point. There, the term itself blots out even 'culture' at times, such is its current appeal. But I am not persuaded by the rationalist gestus of unmasking that emerges from the manifesto, namely, the seeming preference to deconstruct the "politics of significance" and to "undercut the invention of tradition inherent in it" at the national level, while respecting the subaltern's heritage efforts. This emancipatory drive is surely worthy, but do only the governmental heritage regimes and the national bias of global institutions prevent a true polyphony of heritages? Is there not also chauvinism from below? Maybe the key to this predicament is found in the little clause that heritage "as an institutional practice, is highly political and hierarchical" (my emphasis). Is it not always? Must not the yardstick remain the same?

Here, I want to invoke Christoph Brumann's recent call for "heritage agnosticism" as preferable to uncritical 'belief' and dismissive 'atheism', as the royal road towards

A condemnation of the condemnation of memory

David Tizzard



THE CONDEMNATION OF MEMORY – *damnatio memoriae* – is supported in the manifesto and implied that it may be a method in which a culture can begin to shape and control its own heritage. A proviso is given that it must be destroyed consciously rather than be the victim of an authoritarian deletion and the example specifically referenced is that of the Government General Building in the area of Kwanghwamun around Seoul. I worry, however, that this willing destruction and acceptance of it in order to control heritage brings about some rather serious problems: first, it denies a truth; second, it puts the subjective opinion ahead of the objective.

In terms of denying a truth, it surely cannot be supported that buildings, people, or ideas can be willingly erased from a history. Our vision and understanding is never infallible and, furthermore, it is only in hindsight and with the gift of perspective that we can often understand the true value of things. How many things would we have lost – or even have we lost – throughout the course of history if we were to simply begin collectively erasing things because of 'uncomfortable reflections on history and national traumas'. Korea, as an area which I research, is ripe for this and rather inconsistent in its approach. This inconsistency is the second point.

The subjective opinion being valued over the objective means that whilst one culture might certainly agree with the erasing of an object in order to promote its own heritage, this might be at odds with the views and values of another. Korea has continually lambasted Japan for not 'erasing' the memory of the Yasukuni Shrine and any visits to it made by Japanese politicians will make the news in the Korean media. They seemingly want, first, Japan to deny a historical fact and existence for the sake of their own peace. And yet, one of the biggest newspaper headlines in Korea is that of the 'comfort women' for which the country continually demands compensation from the Japanese: this issue has been decided will not be erased because it is of national 'benefit'.

Two devastating topics – war and prostitution – and yet I only include them to say that heritage does not exist in a singular vacuum but rather in a relationship with other heritages. Allowing distortions and subjective interpretations of history in favour of truth is, I believe, a dangerous path to follow.

David Tizzard, Professor at Seoul Women's University

Above: Yasukuni Shrine. Image reproduced under a Creative Commons license courtesy of CLF on Flickr.com.



Above: Pyu Ancient Cities (Myanmar): Myanmar's first site inscribed to World Heritage List. Image reproduced courtesy of the Department of Archaeology, National Museum and Library Myanmar.

a better heritage studies (<http://tinyurl.com/brumann2014>). The manifesto seems ambivalent in that regard, since to acknowledge the political nature of heritage (that it is put "to work") is to disavow the prime conceit of heritage – that it has intrinsic value.

A final point: While the shelf life of global idioms is usually limited, we have not crested that wave yet. Heritage remains a fantastic 'boundary object', as claims of heritage find worldwide recognition and yet remain endlessly malleable in emplaced rhetoric. Its use for local, national and global interventions is hardly exhausted. Again: Myanmar only now had its first UNESCO sites listed. Heritage fatigue is still a long way off, and considering the many interests that are entangled with heritage today, my prediction is that we will see hypertrophy before we see renunciation.

Felix Girke, Zentrum für Interdisziplinäre Regionalstudien (ZIRS), Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg

A new consciousness has emerged

Sheyla Zandonai

MY CURRENT RESEARCH examines the discourses and uses that have been tied to social, cultural, and political struggles to protect material heritage in Macau, China. I am interested in studying people's understandings and experiences of place in the advent of a global economy of gambling and mass tourism, and growing influxes of outsider populations, tourists and immigrant workers alike, who have no affective attachments to Macau. Once a vibrant port city, Macau's urban fabric attests to a diverse history of interethnic encounters, and the lack thereof, in which different periods of urbanization and architectural styles coexist. Following China's postcolonial program, part of Macau's Portuguese and Chinese material legacies has been recognized as World Heritage in 2005. While UNESCO's classification has been criticised for its top-down approach, and thus, not exactly representative of Macau's social history, I argue that it has, nevertheless, entailed a debate on heritage that did not exist until then. A new consciousness has emerged, *in spite of*. Different initiatives for heritage protection, from young and elder generations, are surfacing in tandem with UNESCO's ideas, but also evolving beyond it. Whereas incongruent interests, public and private, are at struggle, a multivocal claim for the right to heritage has been building up.

Now, beyond a call for 'heritage agnosticism' towards UNESCO's role in defining what heritage is (<http://tinyurl.com/brumann2014>), a reflection on what is being done on the ground once *Heritage* has entered the lives of people (from Macau), is also worth entailing. What heritage represents and to what extent it has been used to voice other concerns? I believe that in the case of Macau, it has given different *cultures* – local, Chinese, grassroots – a discursive and rhetorical tool that is being channelled into tangible agendas. It has been practiced as an instrument to voice resistance, to perform belonging and, ultimately, citizenship in a space, highly contested, in which the overwhelming impact of a political economy of gambling has been challenged by those directly affected by it.

Sheyla Zandonai, Laboratoire Architecture Anthropologie (LAA), France; Department of Anthropology, Trent University, Canada

Responses to the manifesto 'Heritage beyond the boundaries' *continued*



Embracing conflict, unleashing voices

MCM Santamaria

AS A STUDENT OF ETHNO-CHOREOLOGY, I will limit my comments to dance research and practice in the Philippines. Indeed, heritage as practice is 'political and hierarchical'. For instance, all Philippine national artists in dance have done much of their work or have been based in the National Capital Region: Francisca Reyes Aquino (University of the Philippines Folk Song and Dance Troupe); Leonor Orosa Goquingco (Filipinascas Dance Company); Lucrecia Urtula (Bayanihan Dance Company); Ramon Obusan (Ramon Obusan Dance Company); and Alice Reyes (Ballet Philippines).

Dance research has introduced me to great artists whose lives and works are largely known only in the periphery: Albani (Jolo-based dance master credited to have re-invented the popular *Dalling-Dalling* song-dance tradition); Ennura Deminggu (famed dancer of the Tariray bamboo-clapper dance of Sitangkai Island) and Mahail Hajan (Bongao-based dance master whose career spans more than 30 years of staging regional dances). Their marginalization is a function of lack of access to cultural capital and power. In a country with more than 70 major ethno-linguistic groups, how can 'imperial Manila' hold a monopoly of talent?

Recently, I have been engaged in a rather heated debate with another Manila-based scholar. This scholar is famous for her work on the Tausug *pangalay* dance tradition, which she claims to be the same (much to the disagreement of local informants) as the Sama-Bajau *igal* dance tradition.

Above: Kulintang at Asian Festival. Image reproduced under a Creative Commons license courtesy of Mr.TinDC on Flickr.com.

Her work in 'preserving' *pangalay*, which she claims to be the "temple of dance in Sanskrit", has been the subject of at least three documentary films. Her writings reveal a discourse on heritage preservation that revolves around notions of 'authenticity' and 'distinction'. Is it correct to attribute the preservation of a dance tradition to a single individual? Are the efforts of the people in the field not worth noting?

Finally, I would like to draw attention to a contemporary Sama-Bajau dance form called *igal pakiring*. Instead of being accompanied by a traditional knobbed gong *kulintangan* ensemble, this new form is accompanied by a singer and an electronic organ. Several Manila-based writers have dismissed this vibrant new form as "crass" or "an unacceptable morph of tradition". Are the people of the field not allowed to change their own traditions? Whose aesthetics ought to be privileged?

The issues I raise reveal the highly conflicted nature of heritage production. Perhaps, conflict should be embraced. This may allow the unleashing of multiple voices that can balance that of the privileged center.

MCM Santamaria, Professor of Asian and Philippine Studies, Asian Center, University of the Philippines Diliman.

Critical Heritage Studies and the importance of studying histories of heritage formation

Marieke Bloembergen and Martijn Eickhoff

THE CONCEPT OF 'COLONIAL DETERMINISM', coined by Susan Legêne, precisely labels one of the questions that initially guided us in our project on archaeological sites and heritage formation in colonial and post-colonial Indonesia: what made the archaeology of colonial times *colonial*? (<http://ghhpw.com/sbs.php>) Investigating how Hindu-Buddhist, Islamic, Chinese, pre-historic and colonial sites located in Indonesia transformed into heritage, we focused on site-related knowledge production, studying colonial sources in combination with local Malay and Javanese texts. Our findings made us realize that these sites are not primarily colonial, even when colonial relations shaped them profoundly.

The monument regulations on Java of 1840 and 1842, for example, were the result of knowledge exchange between the colonial government and various Javanese parties, village heads as well as royal elites. For these – mostly Muslim – Javanese, the 'Hindu-Buddhist antiquities' were part of a historical and religious-mythical landscape. Their conviction that it was better not to (re)move site-based objects, was taken seriously by the colonial authorities. The regulation of 1840 officially forbade the export of antiquities and it obliged local authorities to inventories the antiquities in their region. The following regulation of 1842 arranged that the Batavian Society could acquire archaeological objects for its museum, but with one restriction: the transactions should not interfere with 'indigenous' appropriations of these objects. Although many statues were still taken away, the colonial regulations do imply that Javanese subjects contributed to the development of (colonial) state-related heritage awareness in Java.

'Heritage beyond the boundaries: a manifesto' is a clear example of colonial determinism. The tone is set by the statement that notions of heritage worldwide are shaped by European cultural backgrounds, being disseminated by colonial powers and then organisations such as UNESCO. We consider this a dogmatic stance. It disregards how throughout colonial times, and worldwide, encounters and exchanges were pivotal for developing concepts of heritage. As our Javanese example shows, there were certainly colonial hierarchies at work. But recognizing them should not lead to the creation of false and essentialist dichotomies between the West and the Rest. It is more important to trace the complex interactions that affected heritage formation. Studying the histories of these interactions might help to develop a balanced understanding of the contemporary critical heritage discourse that, with its focus on communities and stakeholders, ironically enough, is often in the first place connected to top-down power structures in the post-colonial societies themselves.

Marieke Bloembergen, Cultural historian and senior researcher at KITLV (Royal Netherlands Institute of Southeast Asian and Caribbean Studies), Leiden, Netherlands.

Martijn Eickhoff, Cultural historian, senior researcher at NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies and assistant professor at Radboud University Nijmegen, Netherlands.

'Tradition' or 'traditionalism' as a Chinese way to understand heritage

Zheng Yan Min (Cathy)

It is widely acknowledged that there is no equivalent translation from one language to another in various circumstances, especially when two languages come from different systems, such as ideographic Chinese and phonetic English. In terms of heritage studies, the officially accepted translation of 'heritage' as 'yí chǎn (遗产)' does not properly reflect the Chinese attitude towards the past, since 'chǎn (产)' in Chinese means 'property or kinds of physical forms that can be constructed or produced', which neglects the spiritual side of people's efforts in preserving heritage. In order to solve such a dilemma in translation, I propose a pedagogical initiative to understand 'Chinese heritage' as 'Chinese tradition' or 'Chinese traditionalism'.

There are two reasons for doing so: firstly, the back-translation of 'tradition' or 'traditionalism' as two Chinese characters 'chuán (传)' and 'tǒng (统)' can help understand Chinese attitudes towards the past, which imposes a significant methodological implication for undertaking anthropological research in Chinese societies, since 'chuán (传)' means 'transmission, transferring, communication or spreading' and 'tǒng (统)' means 'governing, taking hold in restraint, exercising authoritative influence over and always being presented as an integral form'. In other words, Chinese heritages cannot only be observed from physical remains, but also from ordinary people's daily lives, since a great part of Chinese heritages have been internalised generation by generation. Chinese anthropological research epitomises the historiographic tradition (generation) in anthropological research.

Secondly, the separate consideration of one Chinese word into two or more Chinese characters also follows Chinese academic tradition in interpreting texts; as we know, the enrichments and refreshments of Chinese academic thoughts come from those interpretations of those ancient Chinese academic articles in different historical periods of time. By way of technology in modern times, texts of various languages become more and more penetrating in people's everyday life. Such interpretation can facilitate mutual appreciations by adjusting various perspectives of understanding, and for doing so, it is possible to open up a new territory in formulating institutional heritage-preservation initiatives by using the 'language-mentality' formation paradigm in its most original (etymological) form; such as English is an inductive language and Chinese is a deductive language.

Zheng Yan Min, PhD candidate at the University of Macau, researching non-resident workers' daily commute between Macau and Zhuhai.

Toward an anthropology of heritage practices

Taku Iida

I TOTALLY AGREE with the manifesto issued in 'the Newsletter #69', which problematizes Asian heritage after due consideration of local, national, and international actors' different views. Keeping its significance in mind, however, I would like to place more stress on local people's values and actions, which are our main concerns in the ongoing project "Anthropology of Heritage: Communities and Materiality in Global Systems" of the National Museum of Ethnology, Japan.

Our pursuit started with the 2011 East Japan Great Earthquake. In the beginning of the recovery process, national agencies were occupied with rescuing material heritage. Intangible heritage, contrarily, was beyond their scope. Therefore, it was surprising for non-sufferers to know that some sufferers began to organize dance ceremonies, originally religious and annual, as their own action for recovery. The sufferers gathered to have exercise from temporary housings, made trips wherever their audience is found, and even filed applications to get grants. Their intangible heritage was not only a symbol of local history but also one of few handy resources to recover their everyday life.

Sure, the people decontextualized, showed up, and sometimes commercialized their cultural resources; and also allied with national and international agencies. Heritage here is therefore a product yielded by plural actors with different views and memories. However, we should not overlook that some kinds of heritage are left in local people's hands. They can create, inherit, repair, repeat, copy, diffuse, appropriate, conceal, and neglect their own heritage. In addition to these instrumental practices, people also make social ones; cooperate, compete, compromise, and break with one another. Such instrumental and social processes, rarely documented in the conventional heritage studies, remain to be described and analyzed ethnographically. Empirical research of heritage practices is expected to clarify modes of cultural transmission and super-generational communication in a globalized world, and thus to contribute to general theories in sociocultural anthropology.

The wind is favorable. UNESCO began to pay attention to the people in 1994 when the Global Strategy started. In 1997, Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention recognized the involvement of 'stakeholders' as an element of effective management. In 2003, UNESCO's General Assembly adopted the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, where intangible heritage is supposed to provide 'communities and groups' with a sense of identity and continuity. Anthropological knowledge on local heritage practices is thus demanded by both local and international societies.

Taku Iida, National Museum of Ethnology, Japan.

On critical heritage studies

Mark Hobart

As a step towards rethinking cultural heritage, this manifesto is welcome, not least in stressing rival institutional interests and how local participants become marginalized. However the manifesto draws upon a surprisingly conservative epistemology, which replicates the hegemony it questions and so undermines its own aims. This may not be immediately obvious because the manifesto deploys the trendy language of critical theory (critique, authenticity) and post-structuralism (discourse, deconstruction), but ends up as vacuous because it ignores what both are about. Further, it does not explore, as would Cultural Studies' scholars, culture as a site (or moments) of struggle. Nor does it ask 'who gets to represent what as culture to whom under what circumstances?'. Instead conflict is treated at face value, such as between rival stakeholders' interests. If the authors fail to engage with the implications of the arguments that they side step, the manifesto risks becoming an exercise in theoretical evasion.

The problems are evident in the fashionable use of the adjective 'critical' without apparent recognition of its genealogy. So the authors uncritically adopt the language of contemporary consumer capitalism in writing about culture as 'stakeholders' 'assets' and 'plural views and dynamic struggles for power' in a 'politics of significance' (Herzfeld). Drawing on a well-established sense of critical theory, we could then inquire into the conditions of class and power under which culture comes variously to be represented, hypostatized or produced through the 'culture industries' of which heritage is one. Rephrased in Cultural Studies' terms, how do class, race (not just 'post-colonialism') gender, religion and generation impact on who gets to articulate heritage, how and when?

There is also a stronger post-Kantian sense of 'critical' (e.g., Deleuze, *Kant's critical philosophy*). This would require us to address not just who represents the object of study as what, but also to criticize our own categories of thought and styles of reasoning as themselves historically and culturally conditioned. Would it not be wise for the critique of so singularly European a concept as heritage to include a critique of the Eurocentrism which is constitutive of the whole argument? So perhaps the authors of the manifesto should reflect on what they mean by 'critical'? So doing might help to provide a theoretical framework worthy of the manifesto.

Mark Hobart, Emeritus professor of Critical Media and Cultural Studies, SOAS, University of London.

Cultural villages as a source for science, education, fun, and identity building

Gisela Trommsdorff, Hans-Joachim Kornadt, Roswith Roth and Dietrich Albert

THE MANIFESTO addresses important questions and topics regarding the concept of 'heritage', its realizations and side effects. We agree on most of the propositions from a common sense point of view. However, we have to question its scientific basis. Such a manifesto should be based on systematic research, on meta-analysis, and initiate research. Regarding the methodology a clear distinction has to be made between (a) observed facts and data, (b) their interpretation, and (c) the derived consequences, e.g., recommendations. In case of 'heritage', scientific evaluation methods should be used.

From our point of view targeting the concept of 'heritage' might be too narrow. Instead, the broader concept of 'culture' should be addressed in its many facets: e.g., scientific conceptualizations of culture, how and why which cultural artifacts should be preserved? Beyond heritages, a long tradition in preserving cultural assets exists, e.g., in Asia and Europe, like private collections, museums, libraries, archives, restoring of buildings, area rehabilitation. Heritages are only one type in the context of other measures for preserving culture. Because connecting the different types of preservation is very demanding it should be supported by using modern Information Technology (IT). Also, the reasons for preserving cultural artifacts are manifold. Four of them have been addressed in the title of this commentary.

The facets of preservation are part of the goal of 'meaning-making', e.g., clarifying scientific hypothesis about cultural development and evolution, better understanding the current cultural, religious, political differences, and conflicts, and for comprehending oral history respectively. An isolated view on certain cultural assets cannot elicit 'meaning'; the context in its different aspects has to be taken into account. Further, culture is a dynamic system undergoing changes while at the same time promoting some continuity.

Excellent examples of presenting cultural assets in their context can be seen in *cultural villages*, e.g., in Korea and Malaysia. They are excellent with respect to the above mentioned aspects, and they provide meaning-making. Cultural villages can give an insight into the indigenous cultural values possibly still relevant in the respective cultures while socio-cultural changes abound.

Accordingly, analyzing, comparing, evaluating and possibly generalizing the concept of cultural villages in different Asian and European countries should help to reduce ethnocentrism, and underline the need for scientifically based cultural heritages. This could be the basis for better understanding of indigenous cultures and for global recommendations aiming to save, document and present their great options for human mankind.

Gisela Trommsdorff, President of the German Japanese Society of Social Sciences (GJSSS), University of Konstanz, Germany.

Hans-Joachim Kornadt, Co-Founder and Honorary Member of the German Japanese Society of Social Sciences (GJSSS); Saarland University, Germany.

Roswith Roth, Past-President of the International Council of Psychologists (ICP); University of Graz, Austria.

Dietrich Albert, Chairperson of the European Japan Expert Association (EJEA); Graz University of Technology & University of Graz, Austria.



Traditional Indian Medicine (TIM) is not just Ayurveda

Maarten Bode

The manifesto in the Focus section 'Theorizing Heritage' (the Newsletter #69) gives me the opportunity to discuss the political nature of narrowing the many forms of contemporary Traditional Indian Medicine (TIM) to Ayurveda as India's national medicine. Indian nationalist politics affect the recognition, ownership, and management of the wide spectrum of traditional medicines in contemporary India. What is needed is a dialogue between two important stakeholders: the Indian state and local communities. Empirical data and theoretical perspectives of medical anthropologists and medical historians of the last two decades can constructively contribute to such a discussion. Their research shows that on the national level we see debatable, either unintentional or intentional, attempts at reification and ossification of the many forms of TIM practiced in India today. The suggestion is that Ayurveda as India's national medicine is a discrete medical system and that it provides the codified substrate for the many local forms of herbal based TIM practiced in India today.

There are approximately 500,000 state sanctioned practitioners of Indian medicine, who have at least a college degree in one of the systems of Indian medicine that fall under the Department of AYUSH (Ayurveda, Yoga, Unani, Siddha and Homeopathy). Approximately 450,000 of them have a bachelors or master degree in Ayurveda. However, it is estimated that 80% to 90% of these graduates practice western biomedicine. The large majority of practitioners of TIM can be found in India's heterogeneous folk sector. Here, around two million, often semi-legal, health care providers offer herbal based treatments for common and chronic diseases. Apart from these generalists we see specialists treating ailments such as jaundice, paralysis, skin disorders, eye problems, broken bones, poisonous bites, and psychosocial problems. Local midwives who look after the health of mother and child

are probably the largest group among them. These folk practitioners are an integral part of one of India's many local cultures. Their treatments are not standardized. On the contrary, they respond to local social-cultural and ecological realities. This probably increases their effectiveness.

It is common practice among Indian (health) authorities to conflate all forms of TIM with classical Ayurveda as it is represented by scholarly works of the first millennium. A case in point is the speech Prime Minister Narendra Modi held on the occasion of the Sixth World Ayurvedic Congress, held in New Delhi on 6-9 November 2014. Narendra Modi explicitly linked Indian folk medicine to Ayurveda and by denoting Ayurveda as *Panchamveda* [The fifth Veda], the prime minister tied TIM to India's Hindu past and to Brahmanism. In contemporary India this representation is both common and contested. Such 'politics of significance' beg to be deconstructed. The claim that all forms of Indian medicine fall under 'Ayurveda' and the notion that Ayurveda represents an unbroken tradition from the Veda's onwards, must be contested on two grounds. Firstly, Ayurveda is highly diverse. Processes of biomedicalisation and scientisation have made the Ayurveda promoted by the central Indian government very different from canonical Ayurveda. Secondly, local forms of TIM have their own logic, treatment procedures, and *materia medica*. To fixate Ayurveda and consider the term to be a synonym for the many local forms of TIM is a political act. It also denies the huge social asymmetries between the politicians and bureaucrats of the central government and local traditional healers and their patients.

Maarten Bode, Medical anthropologist, Anthropology Department, University of Amsterdam; Institute of Transdisciplinary Health Sciences and Technology, Bangalore.

Above: Morning Yoga. Image reproduced under a Creative Commons license courtesy of Alona Praslov on Flickr.com.

Protecting heritage as a whole

Chen Chunhong

HERITAGE IS AN IMPORTANT MEDIUM for the transmission of human civilization and human history. The people of any nation and country are willing to explore the significant events of the past. There is no doubt that rich historical information has travelled to the present from ancient times by means of the effective medium, heritage. For this reason we must protect heritages well; and not just the tangible material heritage, but also the intangible cultural heritage. In historic districts or traditional villages the two should be protected together.

Good heritage protection does not mean to enclose and isolate heritage far away from people's touch and use; on the contrary, possibilities of being used should be assessed in advance, and encourage people to appreciate their historical values.

Heritage should be protected as a whole: the buildings, surroundings and also those who co-exist with it, such as the people who make use of it. The most effective examples may be traditional villages: simultaneously protecting the village's architectural heritage, the people who live in villages, the traditional styles of living, the cultural content, etc.

Protection of heritage should be timely and appropriate, and not decided by rushed policies and regulations. Heritage evaluation systems should be developed alongside the different cultures involved. National heritage protection methods should not follow a unified theoretical framework. For example, we can't assess the protection methods of the wood material heritage built in Asia by using the rules for stone heritage. Wood heritage is not eternal, it is inappropriate to evaluate it using eternal theory.

Chen Chunhong, Tianjin University, China; IIAS Fellow.

For more information about the Leiden University program *Critical Heritage Studies of Asia and Europe* visit <http://tinyurl.com/CriticalHeritage> or contact Adèle Esposito (adelesposito@yahoo.fr)