

# Managing Cultural Heritage in Asian Cities



John H. Stubbs and Robert G. Thomson (2017). *Architectural Conservation in Asia: National Experiences and Practice*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, xviii + 598 pp., \$131.80 (hardcover).

Gregory Bracken (ed.) (2015). *Asian Cities: Colonial to Global*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 381 pp., \$129.17 (hardcover).

Rahil Ismail, Brian J. Shaw and Ooi Giok Ling (eds.) ([2009] 2016). *Southeast Asian Culture and Heritage in a Globalising World: Diverging Identities in a Dynamic Region*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, xvi + 173 pp., \$55.53 (paper).

Hsin-Huang Michael Hsiao, Hui Yew-Foong and Philippe Peycam (eds.) (2017). *Citizens, Civil Society and Heritage-Making in Asia*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, viii + 337 pp., \$44.85 (paper).

**Reviewed by:** William Logan, Deakin University, Burwood, Victoria, Australia

DOI: 10.1177/0096144219873341

## Keywords

Asian cities, cultural heritage, urban heritage, heritage conservation, heritage management

Any scholarly work purporting to deal with Asia immediately confronts the problem of that continent's sheer size and the amazing diversity of its communities in terms of their histories, cultural characteristics, and standards of living. We need to tread carefully in our representation of "Asian" heritage in this context of diversity and often of dissonance, and generalizations about Asian heritage thought and practice need to be carefully couched.<sup>1</sup> Is there such a thing as "Asian urban heritage"? Or is it just urban heritage in Asia? Is it naïve even to try to generalize? There are a number of books dealing with the history and heritage of individual cities or national situations, such as Howard Spodek's study of Ahmedabad,<sup>2</sup> my own biography of Hanoi,<sup>3</sup> or Ian Morley's recent book and review essay for this journal on the Philippines.<sup>4</sup> Very few seek to summarize for Asia. Four are mentioned here to set the works being reviewed in this essay into the ongoing discourse. All are edited collections bringing together chapters from across Asia, excluding West Asia/Middle East. What distinctive features of Asian urban heritage do these antecedent books highlight?

The first of these is my own book, *The Disappearing "Asian" City: Protecting Asia's Urban Heritage in a Globalizing World*, a set of commissioned papers published in 2002.<sup>5</sup> The inverted commas around the word Asian in the book's title highlighted the problematic nature of the concept and the persistence of the view held by many outside the continent that the "Asian-ness" of its cities was rapidly disappearing as a result of globalization and that Asian cities should be based on traditional local cultures. The book showed that, in fact, much of the drive behind economic and cultural globalization was coming from within Asia and a counter-tendency had clearly emerged in which traditional cultures were being more strongly recognized, valued, and

even reinvented. Globalization and localism were going hand in hand, presenting new challenges for urban management and conservation practice.

The continuity of traditional forms was the focus of *Asia's Old Dwellings: Tradition, Resilience, and Change* edited by Ronald G. Knapp and published in 2003.<sup>6</sup> It dealt only with one architectural type and it was not primarily concerned with heritage conservation practice, although it did allow for modifications to traditional architecture over time so that heritage management was at least implicit. Similarly, the third edited book, Patrick Daly and Tim Winter's *Routledge Handbook on Heritage in Asia*, paid little attention to technical aspects of heritage conservation practice or models of heritage management (p. 4).<sup>7</sup> Rather than being a handbook for practitioners, therefore, this book, published in 2012, aimed at offering alternative ways of thinking about the production, conservation, and governance of cultures in Asia through the exploration of the complex uses of heritage as a term, set of values, or concept. While all the contributors provided thought-provoking chapters, three-quarters of the contributors were non-Asian.

A more strongly Asian voice was heard in the 2013 collection edited by Kapila D. Silva and Neel Kamal Chapagain, *Asian Heritage Management: Contexts, Concerns and Prospects*.<sup>8</sup> It was also more clearly focused on heritage practice. The three chapters on Hindu, Buddhist, and Islamic worldviews are particularly valuable, spelling out their implications for conservation theory and practice and leading Chapagain to conclude that on the basis of these worldviews there could be "no expectation of material survival of buildings for a long period" (p. 17). Silva's Epilogue draws three important inferences from the collection. These are that (1) because of Asia's diverse philosophical traditions, long and complex history producing multilayered urban forms, Asian heritage management needs to break away from conventional conservation ideology, both in theory and practice; (2) this rethinking should be "grounded in local contexts in terms of figuring out whose heritage it is, what it means to them, how it is created, how it is taken care of, and what else is needed for its continuity"; (3) such rethinking is more effective when it develops from the ground up (p. 345). The separate operationalization of tangible and intangible heritage protection is an example where global conservation approaches such as those adopted and promoted by UNESCO (p. 347) do not suit Asian circumstances. Many Asian heritage managers, however, have fallen into line with this essentially Western dichotomization despite the two forms clearly working together in their cultural milieu to set the cultural significance of heritage resources.

## Heritage Conservation Practice—National and Global

Much has already been said about Asian urban heritage in these earlier publications. Are their observations still valid? What additional information or inflections do the four works being reviewed in this essay offer? The book edited by John Stubbs and Robert Thompson—*Architectural Conservation in Asia: National Experience and Practices*—takes up the practice-related ambitions of Silva and Chapagain. Theirs is the first comprehensive overview of architectural conservation practice in Asia. Like Knapp's compendium, it covers Asia country by country from Afghanistan to Japan, illustrating the rich diversity of the continent in terms both of the heritage and the approaches taken to protecting it. The General Introduction makes clear the authors' commitment: "to help make the conservation of historic resources in Asia as successful an endeavour as possible, and to aid the people interested in contributing to this goal" (p. 27). Using a historiographical approach, they draw out some Asian generalities in the introductory chapter and in concise introductions and conclusions to five regional parts covering East Asia, mainland Southeast Asia, insular Southeast Asia, South Asia, and Central Asia. The heritage conservation practices in each country are outlined, with supporting maps, photos, and extensive

footnotes and references. It is particularly pleasing to see such detail for the understudied Central Asian region.

Stubbs and Thomson are ideally equipped to undertake the book. It follows Stubbs's earlier works on global, European, and North American architectural conservation<sup>9</sup>—all enormous tasks. Stubbs was vice president for Field Projects at the World Monument Fund and is now preservation studies professor and international architectural conservation consultant at the School of Architecture, Tulane University, New Orleans. His collaborator meanwhile is a historical archaeologist and preservation planner based in San Francisco. Their text is complemented by a Foreword from A. G. Krishna Menon and boxes by various heritage experts working in Asia, such as William Chapman's "Architectural conservation training in Asia;" Ken Taylor's "The Historic Urban Landscape (HUL): a paradigm shift"; or Lake Douglas's "On the importance of the ordinary."

Intentionally, not all of Asia's urban heritage resource types are dealt with in this book. To be limited to architectural heritage, however, might reflect the practical orientation of the book but it is also an old-fashioned conception of the field. Architectural heritage does not even cover all of "built heritage," a term often but inappropriately equated with urban heritage. Since the 1960s, heritage has moved from a narrow focus on monumental structures and archaeological sites to embrace other types of tangible heritage such as vernacular buildings, historic precincts, cultural landscapes, and artifact collections as well as intangible forms of heritage such as skills and practices embodied in people. Taking a modern, holistic view of urban heritage means that all these types should be included. Stubbs and Thomson are well aware of this (pp. 15, 27) but, as mentioned, heritage conservation practice at the global and local levels remains locked into the tangible/intangible binary divide.

During the 1970s and 1980s, a debate raged in the sociology discipline about whether or not "urban sociology" was a meaningful subdiscipline, with Manuel Castell and others claiming that urban sociology was simply sociology that happened to be in an urban location and that urban location itself was not a causal factor explaining the sociological manifestations. The issue arises with regard to urban heritage, although it can be argued that bringing the various heritage elements into high-density geographical situations, such as cities, where economic development pressures are at their most intense, makes for heightened conflict over land and building usage. It is also through networks of cities that the forces of economic and cultural globalization operate and in cities that the effects are most clearly evident. However, many recent developments affect people globally, weakening the impact that urban location might have on life. Mass tourism and communication technology in the form of television, the Internet, and mobile phones enable local people everywhere to learn about the wider world—despite attempts in some Asian countries to censor and otherwise restrict people's access to such information.

These globalizing forces undercut to an extent the value of the national analytical framework adopted by Stubbs and Thomson. It is of course also true that national boundaries in Asia bear the stamp of the colonial period and often fail to respect the geographical location of preexisting cultural groups and their traditional heritage (p. 1). Nevertheless, it is also true that today's borders, governments, and institutions provide an "informative basis" for discussing heritage conservation practice (p. 1). Indeed, more than that, governments and institutions control the practice and conduct official conservation programs within their territories.

Over the last seventy years, heritage conservation has itself become a globalizing force and international heritage bodies such as UNESCO an agent of globalization (p. 28). As Stubbs and Thomson note, there are official heritage protection policies and programs in all Asian countries and there has been a homogenization of practice codes in large part due to the influence of UNESCO and its Advisory Bodies (p. 7).<sup>10</sup> At the same time, however, these global institutions have given strength to nation states in at least two significant ways. First, they have given Asia's nation states—or at least the leading ones, notably Japan and China—a "platform for the

codification, valuation and promotion of Asian approaches to heritage management as equivalent to those in the West” (p. 28). UNESCO’s adoption of the Nara Document on Authenticity (1994) is a prime example in which Japan was able to bring about a major shift in global heritage conservation practice.<sup>11</sup> Second, the key decision-making body in relation to the conservation of heritage places, urban, and otherwise, UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee has become increasingly politicized over the last decade, with many of the recommendations from the Advisory Bodies being overturned by coalitions of national states.<sup>12</sup>

Despite the universality of heritage regimes, both global and national, heritage places are increasingly endangered. The authors point to weak financial and technical capacity, inadequate coordination among stakeholders, and deficient management systems (p. 14). They see many concerns related to the health, welfare, and economic prospects of the inhabitants of Asia’s historic cities, towns, and other historic places (p. 14). Societies worldwide, however, have seen the balance between heritage conservation and modern development shift rapidly toward the latter over the last decade. This is not, of course, entirely new, being seen in the United Nations *Declaration on the Right to Development* which dates from 1986 and followed intense lobbying from Asian countries.<sup>13</sup> The shift is strongly reflected in recent declarations at the global level such as the 2016 *Quito Declaration on Sustainable Cities and Human Settlements for All (Habitat III)* and at the local level the 2017 *Hoi An Declaration on Urban Heritage Conservation and Development in Asia*. The former values heritage for its usefulness in achieving social, economic, and political goals rather than for its cultural significance and as the basis of community identity (see paragraphs 38 and 125). The latter represents a third iteration of a document that has moved toward development such that the term is now in the document’s title and most of the recommendations reflect concern about the negative impacts of uncontrolled urban development on Asian city heritage.

## Past, Present, and Future

Stubbs and Thomson see organized heritage protection in all Asian countries. Will these regimes be sufficient to keeping up with the economic and social change taking place in Asia cities? As Winter and Daly (2012) suggest, it is the speed and scale of change that sets Asia apart from many other regions (p. 6). Only Africa exceeds Asia in terms of urbanization rate. It is predicted that by 2050 Asia’s population will reach five billion and that its share of economic wealth will double to 52 percent.<sup>14</sup> The twenty-first century is now commonly referred to as the “Asian century,” although this is perhaps presumptuous only nineteen years into the century.<sup>15</sup> This global shift will eventually be fully reflected in the field of cultural heritage conservation as in other forms of cultural production. Consequently, we need to know more about the heritage places, site management projects, and conservation approaches belonging to the world outside Europe and North America. This makes the Stubbs and Thomson book very important at this particular time. However, Gregory Bracken, the editor of *Asian Cities: Colonial to Global*, is right to remind us that we cannot simply divide the world into urban and rural. As he says, the lives of people in many metropolises in India or China are far less urbane than those of farmers in Western Europe, and the urban environment includes rural villages and sleepy suburbs as well as dynamic city centers (p. 13).

Bracken’s book brings together papers from a seminar held in April 2013 at the International Institute of Asian Studies (IIAS) in Leiden, Netherlands, and was published in 2015. The chapters are organized in three sections: Part 1: Post-Colonialism; Part 2: Networks; Part 3: Cities and Buildings. Bracken’s introduction sets the theoretical context and asks some interesting questions, particularly what is it that enables some cities to emerge as global cities, and he seeks answers in geopolitics and colonial history. He refers to Ackbar Abbas’s 1997 work on Hong Kong which argued that colonialism pioneered ways of drawing racially, ethnically, and

culturally diverse societies into the world economy.<sup>16</sup> He also notes Manuel Castell's argument that those cities that successfully lodged themselves in imperial networks went on in the postcolonial period to become global cities. Bracken does not see the book as a straightforward historical reading of what enabled certain Asian cities to make the transition (p. 27). Building on Michel Foucault's genealogical approach, Bracken sees the aim of the chapters in the book as trying to explore the living links connecting cities to one another and to their pasts; that is, what he calls their "consanguinity" (p. 329). By this, Bracken envisages "a new way of thinking about the city: a vibrant, multidisciplinary approach that grows naturally out of the different academic disciplines represented here" (p. 329). Examples in the book include chapters on Hong Kong, Singapore, Hanoi, and Yangon.

Bracken points out that Foucault was essentially concerned with writing the history of the present and was not interested in the past except as a means of understanding the present (p. 329). In the heritage field, we also study places—cities and buildings—because we are interested in the impact that historical processes have had on urban physical and social fabric. Heritage places not only give us an entrée into understanding how the present society emerged but also by looking at why certain places are currently deemed significant, we learn much about society today and its values. That is, cities and buildings reflect cultural processes both past and present. Even heritage conservation itself—which has often been portrayed simply as a technical matter—is a process, a cultural process with a solid political basis revolving around the issue of who gets to determine what is to be considered heritage and what is not. The chapters on the Ramna area in Dhaka and on Taipei in Taiwan, where the colonial influence was Japanese rather than Western, demonstrate the political nature of conservation particularly well. This issue is also raised in the remaining two books under review.

The book edited by Rahil Ismail, Brian Shaw, and Ooi Giok Ling—*Southeast Asian Culture and Heritage in a Globalising World: Diverging Identities in a Dynamic Region*—offers another view of rapid transformation. Although looking broadly at cultural history and heritage in relation to the identity of communities and nations, the book is narrower in some respects than either Stubbs and Thomson or Bracken. Its contributors come from a single discipline, geography, and its focus is confined to Southeast Asia. Even here the representation is narrow: half of the chapters deal with Malaysia and Singapore and there is one chapter each on Indonesia, Laos, and Myanmar. Vietnam, Thailand, Cambodia, and Brunei are only mentioned in passing in Shaw's introductory chapter and Johannes Widodo's chapter on the evolution of the Southeast Asia's multicultural port cities and their morphology. Of all the contributors, Widodo addresses urban history most directly and his chapter should be essential reading for all Asian urban heritage scholars and practitioners. The book is thin on heritage conservation practice compared with Stubbs and Thomson or the earlier work by Silva and Chapagain.

This is a paperback reprint, having been published originally in 2009, with the papers apparently coming out of Southeast Asian Geography Association conference held in Singapore in 2006. The Foreword by S. Gopinahan of Nanyang Technological University refers to the papers looking "both backward and forward." Of course, because of the book's publication history, some of what was then forward is now backward. This is particularly true for Nancy Hudson-Rodd's chapter on Myanmar, which is an excellent summary of the repression and violence committed by the military regime on Myanmar's citizens since 1962 and the ethnic complexity of the Myanmar "nation." But the story needs updating to cover the important changes of the last ten years: the liberalization under President Thein Sein (2011-2016) and the national elections that brought Aung San Suu Kyi's NLD party to power (2016). There is almost no reference to the Rohingya in Rakine State and the Myanmar government's decades-long refusal to grant them citizenship and other human rights, culminating in what the United Nations has described as ethnic cleansing (2017). Shaw's introductory chapter has a section entitled "Good Fences Make Good Neighbours" in which he notes that the British conquest of Burma left out former areas of



Burmese influence beyond the border with India. The reverse is also true but not noted: Muslim communities lived along the Arakan (Rakhine) coast centuries before the British created Burma's boundaries. Shaw, I think, misreads Hudson-Rodd in ending his introduction to her chapter with words of hope (p. 15).

## Who Decides? The Politics of Heritage Conservation

The right to development theme permeates the Ismail, Shaw, and Ooi book. As mentioned previously, people want an improvement in their standard of living. This desire is entirely understandable and should be given top priority in terms of policy making and budget formation. While Asian governments generally seek to address this concern, they commonly put capital investment and building and infrastructure development ahead of community concerns. This is the subject of Rahil Ismael's chapter on the existential challenges facing a Malay-Muslim community in Singapore where a major development program includes the planned demolition of iconic cultural symbols and the resettlement of long-time residents. Often it is weak governance structures that allow negative impacts on the cultural identity of communities to occur. Inadequate urban management is also a problem, failing to enforce planning legislation so that, on one hand, developers impact negatively on local communities by ignoring regulations while, on the other hand, local community property owners get away with demolishing buildings to the detriment of heritage precincts and the cultural identity of the community.

The question of who has the power to deem things culturally significant and worthy of conservation is found in all of the works reviewed to varying degrees. Stubbs and Thomson see the heritage profession evolving from its earlier focus on the questions "how to conserve?" and "what to conserve?" to take in the more complex issues of "for whom?" and "why?" (p. 4). Oddly, the authors do not themselves dwell on the latter questions. They refer to the "democratization of heritage," defining this only partially as "meaning heritage is being shared and is benefitting more people than ever" (p. 5). They do note, however, that some communities, such as lower castes in India, continue to be excluded from such sharing, while other sites provide activities for tourists with local people excluded. They rightly indicate that such exclusion invokes human rights and social justice problems but this is not elaborated in the text, nor are references or entries included in the book's Index. The result is that the book leaves a rather apolitical impression. They may have felt it wise to skirt discussion of these matters to ensure their book will be available for use by practitioners in countries where authoritarian governments are unable to accept criticism.

Although the framework-setting introduction in Bracken's book is mostly concerned with general factors operating in postcolonial situations, some of the chapters focus on specific instances of urban heritage-making (and unmaking). Elmo Gonzaga's chapter on the Pasam Malam in Singapore, for instance, picks up on the attitudinal shift toward development that is impacting on government and corporate interventions in urban heritage areas. The bazaar's culture and history are now seen as commodities that can be "acquired and exchanged, . . . their heterogeneity and complexity . . . domesticated and customized for public consumption[,] . . . recycled and refashioned for the purposes of increased profit" (p. 66). In turn, in their book, Ismail, Shaw, and Ooi see the Southeast Asian countries that gained their independence since World War II as being distinguished by their efforts to identify heritage and forge national identity from above, regardless of their political persuasion (p. 10).

The collection of papers edited by Hsin-Huang Michael Hsiao, Hui Yew-Foong, and Philippe Pécayac is, as its title *Citizens, Civil Society and Heritage-Making in Asia* suggests, the most centrally concerned with the "who decides?" issue. The papers come from the second of a series of three conferences focusing on the various sets of actors involved in heritage-making—state, local, and international. This book looks at the way local players operate at the grass-roots level

and aims to find “the grain of heritage politics.” It focuses on heritage practice on the ground, how local actors define and position themselves, and the sort of socio-political space they construct and operate in. By local players is meant citizens and civil society. The editors note that as conceptualized in the West, citizenship and civil society are seen in relation to the modern nation-state. This relationship has often been adversarial, indeed prompting human rights concerns and the development of human rights declarations and legislation.

But the editors also ask what happens in contexts where the nation-state is not the overriding element in the local actors’ frame of reference; that is, they seek to “de-nationalize” the process of heritage-making. Borrowing Henri Lefebvre’s term, they define heritage as “what local actors do when they relate to the past and discover meaning for the past in the present . . . within their ‘lived space’” (p. 4). This, they observe, can be instrumental where citizens use heritage as part of their economic strategy to improve their social position, or non-instrumental where, in a more passive way, they simply enjoy what they have inherited as part of the environment in which they live. With the exception of Laurajane Smith’s opening theoretical contribution, the chapters demonstrate the variety of situations in which heritage practice operates in East and Southeast Asia—the different kinds of communities, different forms of heritage, different tactics for coping with other actors, or, as the editors put it, “from the symbolic centres of nations to peripheries, among the urban poor, rural communities, regional vernacular communities and the Chinese diaspora, and of course, in Taiwan, where the conference that inspired this volume was held” (p. 5).

Most of the chapters deal with Chinese heritage, four in Taiwan and one each in Macau, Singapore, and Yangon. Political sensitivities are immediately invoked. While readers in most of the world may regard the four Taiwanese case studies as providing fascinating insights into heritage-making and protection, any suggestion that this heritage belongs to the Taiwanese as an independent nation or state will not be well received in Beijing. The editors are careful to avoid directly confrontational language, although they do refer in several places to “Taiwan’s collective memory.” Nevertheless, the chapter on civil society’s engagement in heritage policy formulation by Min-Chin Chiang, Li-Ling Huang, Shu-Mei Huang, and His-Huang Michael Hsiao refers to Taiwan as a relatively new democratic country (p. 248). They trace the evolution of heritage policy since the 1980s from being principally aimed at bolstering Chinese culture to recognizing and promoting multiculturalism (p. 245). Li Yi’s chapter on intangible heritage maintenance by the Chinese diaspora community in Yangon shows how, through the activities of Chinese poetry and library groups, the “cultural umbilical cord was maintained with the Chinese ‘homeland’” (p. 10). Although Yi is concerned with the suppression of Chinese language in commerce, schools, and the media under the Ne Win military regime in the 1960s, the chapter may raise in some readers’ minds questions about possible links between cultural and political influence beyond China’s borders.

More broadly, a key question for the future is whether the kind of local civil society and citizen activism in urban heritage protection outlined in these four books will survive the rising tide of nationalism and authoritarianism currently being seen in large parts of Asia. This is already the subject of new books<sup>17</sup> that will require another review essay down the track.

## Notes

1. Zeynep Aygen and William Logan, “Heritage in the ‘Asian Century,’” in *A Companion to Heritage Studies*, eds. William Logan, Máiréad Nic Craith and Ullrich Kockel (Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2016), 410-25.
2. Howard Spodek, *Ahmedabad: Shock City of Twentieth-Century India* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2011).
3. William Logan ([2000] 2010). *Hanoi: Biography of a City*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press and Seattle: University of Washington Press (Republished in Vietnamese as *Ha Noi: Tieu Su Mot Do Thi*. Hanoi: Hanoi Publishing House).

4. Ian Morley, *Cities and Nationhood: American Imperialism and Urban Design in the Philippines, 1898–1916* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2018).
5. William Logan, ed., *The Disappearing “Asian” City: Protecting Asia’s Urban Heritage in a Globalizing World* (Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 2002).
6. Ronald G. Knapp, ed., *Asia’s Old Dwellings: Tradition, Resilience, and Change* (Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 2003).
7. Patrick Daly and Tim Winter, eds., *Routledge Handbook of Heritage in Asia* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2012).
8. Kapila D. Silva and Neel Kamal Chapagain, eds., *Asian Heritage Management: Contexts, Concerns, and Prospects* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2013).
9. John H. Stubbs, *Time Honored: A Global View of Architectural Conservation: Parameters, Theory & Evolution of an Ethos* (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley, 2009); John H. Stubbs and Emily G. Makaš, *Architectural Conservation in Europe and the Americas: National Experiences and Practice* (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley, 2011).
10. The World Heritage Convention (1972) identifies three Advisory Bodies: the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites), and the International Center for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM).
11. Natsuko Akagawa, *Heritage Conservation and Japan’s Cultural Diplomacy: Heritage, National Identity and National Interest* (London: Routledge, 2011).
12. Lynn Meskell, “UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention at 40: Challenging the Economic and Political Order of International Heritage Conservation,” *Current Anthropology* 54 (2013): 483-94.
13. William Logan, “Collective Cultural Rights in Asia: Recognition and enforcement,” in *Cultural Rights as Collective Rights: An International Law Perspective*, ed. A. Jakubowski (Leiden and Boston: Brill Nijhoff, 2016), 180-203, 186.
14. Harinder S. Kohli, Ashok Sharma and Anil Sood, eds., *Asia 2050: Realizing the Asian Century* (London: Sage, 2011).
15. Aygen and Logan, “Heritage in the ‘Asian Century,’” 411.
16. Ackbar Abbas, *Hong Kong: Culture and the Politics of Disappearance* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997).
17. Jeroen Rodenberg and Pieter Wagenaar, eds., *Cultural Contestation: Heritage, Identity and the Role of Government* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018).

### Author Biography

**William Logan** is Professor Emeritus at Deakin University and fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences in Australia. He was formerly UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization) Chair of Heritage and Urbanism at Deakin, member of the Heritage Council of Victoria, and president of Australia ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites). He is coeditor of the Routledge *Key Issues in Cultural Heritage* book series (2009) and the Wiley-Blackwell *Companion to Heritage Studies* (2016). His research interests include World Heritage, heritage and human rights, heritage and sustainable development, and Asian heritage, especially the urban heritage of Vietnam, Laos, Myanmar, and China.