

bifurcation of interests among specialists based in East Asia and their (much less numerous) colleagues in Europe, Australia, and North America? Are the former still bogged down by the hard work of philology, freeing the latter to cherry-pick issues that relate to the broader themes of current concern to the Western humanities? Are we, in other words, witnessing a disjuncture—or an emerging pecking order—between the erudite and the sophisticated? This situation, if real, obviously cannot be blamed on Leung, but it may call for some intellectual bridge-building in the future.

In any event, if a book like this one were to aim at making an effective contribution to the wider discourse in the Humanities, it would help if it were explicitly comparative. Leung, to his credit, gives the reader numerous

pointers (mostly in footnotes) in such a direction, but, perhaps due to the time constraints of dissertation writing, does not follow up on them. Here, as well, remains a challenge to future scholarship.

Although it is too narrowly focused to be suitable for ordinary undergraduate-level teaching, the book deserves a careful reading by China specialists of all stripes. It is also of potential value to scholars interested in comparative historiography. To profit fully from Leung's insights, the reader will need some previous acquaintance with the texts under discussion and with the basics of early Chinese intellectual history. Fortunately, such background knowledge is relatively easy to acquire today, even for the nonspecialist, since the relevant texts are all available in decent English translations.

World Heritage and Human Rights: Lessons from the Asia-Pacific and Global Arena. Edited by Peter Bille Larsen. London and New York: Routledge, 2018. xxii + 325 pp., 26 figures, 2 tables. Paperback US \$43, ISBN 978-1-13822-422-3; Hardback US \$124, ISBN 978-1-13822-421-6; E-book \$27, ISBN 978-1-31540-278-9.

Reviewed by Michael HERZFELD, Department of Anthropology, Harvard University

Heritage and rights, ethical domains that sometimes overlap like Venn circles, also often erupt into discord, pitting local cultural values against a universalism born of colonial domination and still embedded in the lofty presumptions of what UNESCO recognizes as “Outstanding Universal Value.” Regional (Asia-Pacific) coverage is necessarily uneven both because the record is itself highly variable and because authors are treading on political eggshells. That much is clear from the nine case studies and five legal reviews laid out in this cautiously optimistic volume. Amid multiple contradictions in legal writ and practice, several important common themes emerge. Consent, participation, and prosperity, along with a near-worldwide commitment to according dignity to all, loom large as

rights, including the right to heritage, but also the right to ask, “Whose heritage?” Ownership itself is a conceptual quagmire for socialist societies or where land and material objects are not culturally viewed as individual property.

Micro-histories of struggles for recognition challenge the triumphalism of national and international heritage regimes. Larsen argues that the UNESCO World Heritage program's “original sin” (p. 7) is reflected in the absence of people from narratives of success; Alexander H. E. Morawa and Gabriel Zalazar call for “cross-referencing” (p. 198), allowing local groups and the international bureaucracy to learn from each other. As Larsen suggests (p. 16), “vague win-win language” can mask a variety of damaging concessions to economic

power and cultural insensitivity. The ethnographic methods he and Kristal Buckley advocate can only partially redress this imbalance, given the capacity of the powerful to camouflage their actions. Some significant breaches have nevertheless now broken the silence of complicity among states, corporations, religious authorities, and international organizations, as in the recognition (reported by Jonathan Liljeblad) of fragile, unofficial, Hindu-derived rituals performed by self-professed Buddhists in Sambor Prei Kuk, Cambodia (pp. 74–76); danger still lurks with the prospect of World Heritage listing, which threatens these highly localized religious practices with official reabsorption as “culture.”

Human rights demand a shift of focus from the inaccessibly abstract and universalist to the fragile and specific. Law, while rhetorically abstract and generic, in practice is always case-specific. The language of “community” may nevertheless still mask internal inequality and intrusive exploitation. While the contrast drawn by Amran Hamzah (p. 115) between “Western” and “indigenous” understandings of good governance reproduces a dichotomy redolent of such official thinking, he is right to insist on the intellectual capabilities and knowledge of local actors. Binaries, by contrast, tend to support nationalist and regionalist generalizations. Thus, the Vietnamese instrumentalization of “Asian values,” as Larsen shows (p. 185), does not automatically entail respect for local values, although official acceptance of activists’ calls for remedial action is encouraging. Elsewhere, as Buckley, Ian Lilley, and Helena Kajlich demonstrate for Australia (against the complex legal background usefully detailed by Ben Boer and Stefan Gruber), it has not been easy to establish respect for indigenous negotiation methods and concepts of collective identity. Moreover, as Anne Laura Kraak demonstrates for Bagan, *internal* differentiation also requires attention; local factionalism and class hierarchy may filter policy impact. The case of Vigan (described by Sara Dürr, Malot Ingel,

and Bettina Beer), for example, shows that anti-poverty policies work selectively, their trajectories overdetermined by the influence of unequally distributed wealth and power. Bipin Adhikari’s historical and legal survey of Nepal’s evolving heritage policies shows why, before democratization, one dominant area—the Kathmandu Valley, itself an area where “social complexity” today impacts heritage conservation efforts (Sudarshan Raj Tiwari, Pranita Shrestha, and Hans Christie Bjonness, p. 147)—received almost exclusive attention.

Overly generic policies often spring from convenient assumptions, as when Southeast Asian officials treat swidden agriculturalist minorities as ecological threats. Nuance, however, may supervene. The Aren people of Phong Nha Khe Bang, studied by Larsen, are allowed to follow traditional agricultural practices because the anticipated impact is minor in relation to the probable political fallout from suppression (p. 177). As Harald Høyem (p. 89) asks, is drastic action—in this case, forced urban relocation—always necessary? Sometimes, as in his Xi’an examples, even authoritarian governments are more willing to hold back when sensitive minorities are involved. Indeed, a clear virtue of this book lies in the contributors’ principled rejection of generalizations, especially in the form of simplistic contrasts between “Western democracies” and “Asian authoritarianism.” Against the uneven Australian record, for example, both the Philippines (discussed by Lucille Karen E. Malilong and Mary Grace Ellen S. Villanueva) and Vietnam (discussed by Nguyen Linh Giang) offer promising legal resources for the disadvantaged.

Overall, the book addresses the seemingly intractable task of integrating multiple forms of understanding at and between multiple scalar levels. It will be a major resource for further thought and action and will sensitize archaeologists and conservators to the complex ethical and legal issues attendant on the recognition of any inhabited or other socially used space as heritage.