

The heritagization of cultural politics: anthropological research on Chinese cultural heritage



Xing Zhou¹ · Jie Huang²

Received: 27 June 2024 / Revised: 27 June 2024 / Accepted: 9 July 2024 /

Published online: 22 July 2024

© The Author(s) 2024

Abstract

Since the beginning of the twenty-first century, in alignment with globalization and the megatrend within the international socio-cultural sphere, China has initiated a large-scale “intangible cultural heritage (ICH) protection movement” through its proactive leadership and management of cultural heritage administration. As a significant component of Chinese cultural politics, this movement has profoundly influenced the cultural lives of Chinese society and its citizens and is poised to continue doing so. Some Chinese anthropologists have also participated in and significantly contributed to this movement in various ways. This paper comprehensively and meticulously examines these fundamental ways. Building upon this analysis, this paper further provides an overview and assessment of the research outcomes of anthropological research on Chinese cultural heritage, both domestically and internationally. The author posits that the paramount contribution of anthropologists, both domestically and internationally, to Chinese cultural heritages and the related protection endeavors lies in their academic research outcomes being predominantly based on their respective fieldwork practices. These outcomes, shaped and realized through on-the-ground fieldwork, hold exceptional value for cultural heritage administration and national cultural policies, as they effectively provide cultural criticism and dissenting perspectives.

Xing Zhou and Jie Huang are co-first author.

✉ Xing Zhou
ft102067pg@jindai.jp

✉ Jie Huang
huang.jie.w0@f.mail.nagoya-u.ac.jp

¹ Graduate School of History and Folklore Studies, Kanagawa University, 3-27-1 Rokkakubashi, Kanagawa-Ku, Yokohama 221-8686, Japan

Keywords Chinese cultural heritage · Protection movement · Cultural heritage administration · Heritagization · Anthropologist · Dissent

Abbreviations

ICH Intangible cultural heritage
UNESCO United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
NCHA National Cultural Heritage Administration (of China)

1 Introduction

Haidy Geismar (2015) analyses certain assumptions underpinning contemporary national heritage regimes, aiming to unveil the intricate nexus of heritage, rights and regime, resources and property within the framework of modern nation-states. One of the assumptions is that “heritage regimes” emerge from power relations acknowledging political legitimacy. The concept of “heritage regimes” expands the understanding of heritage beyond merely defining tangible or intangible entities; it incorporates governance and politics, reflecting the heritage politics of governments and the experiences of its local citizens. Therefore, heritage is not only an analytic term and a governance tool but also a fundamental category of political economy. This review poses two main questions: first, how does heritage legitimize its identity by establishing specific ownership of the past, and second, what are the appropriate ways to govern this ownership, questioning how heritage, as a resource, should be managed, circulated, and consumed? Geismar examines the explosive development of the definition of “heritage” and the various forms of the new concepts it has engendered, discussing the tension between heritage as a tangible resource and the governance authority to it. Clearly, the concept of heritage has evolved beyond mere material culture to encompass a diverse collection of subjects, objects, processes, and practices. Consequently, the range of objects in these regimes has broadened significantly (Geismar 2015). While Geismar’s review barely touches on China, we can still draw inspiration from her insights. This paper aims to review the academic achievements of “anthropological research on Chinese cultural heritage” and, based on preliminary reading and understanding, provide a concise evaluation to lay a foundation for further synthesis and enhancement.

2 Research methodology

This paper reviews anthropological researches on Chinese cultural heritage, encompassing relevant significant literature in Chinese, Japanese, and English. Over the past two decades, the author has been continuously involved in various ways in the ICH protection movement that has emerged in China since the early twenty-first

² Graduate School of Humanities, Nagoya University, Furo-Cho, Chikusa-Ku, Nagoya 464-8601, Japan

century. This involvement includes participating in academic seminars on various topics, translating relevant theories, methods, and experiences regarding cultural heritage protection from overseas, lecturing and exchanging ideas at Chinese universities, conducting field study, interviewing some anthropologists, and so on. Therefore, while the research methodology of this paper primarily falls under literature research, it also has an empirical basis rooted in “participant observation.”

3 Results and discussion

Through a detailed analysis of the intricate and multifaceted content and various classifications within the “cultural heritage” category, The outcome of this study confirms that different types of cultural heritage in China correspond to distinct administrative departments responsible for cultural heritage management. This arrangement facilitates the government’s cultural heritage policies to easily incorporate cultural heritage into the framework of national cultural politics, characterized by a tone of “cultural nationalism,” through the process of “heritagization” (selecting and certifying various cultural heritage projects). This implies that anthropologists who have participated in China’s ICH protection movement in various ways inevitably become involved in the operational aspects of China’s cultural heritage politics.

It is pertinent to discuss here that while some anthropologists’ involvement in the ICH protection movement presents opportunities, it also poses challenges. In the various scenarios of the government-led ICH protection movement, the actual operation of culture, especially the practices of various cultures being “heritagized,” differs significantly from the relatively simple cultures encountered in anthropologists’ customary fieldwork. “Heritagized” cultures consistently face more frequent and complex human interventions, thus becoming targets of national cultural heritage policies influenced by ideology. Thus, anthropologists can observe the process and mechanisms of cultural change, which are far more complex than those in relatively homogeneous communities or ethnic groups. Anthropologists, based on their respective fieldwork, engage in cultural heritage critique, particularly emphasizing the significance of local residents’ cultural practices. This perspective enables them to raise specific objections to government cultural heritage policies, which is a significant contribution they can make. Such experiences of anthropologists are constructive for their understanding and grasp of the cultural and political processes within a super-large country. However, at the same time, anthropologists have to grapple with the relationship between their investigative research and state administrative power, as valuable cultural heritage critiques require academic outcomes that are independent and not influenced by power and ideology. Therefore, anthropologists need courage and awareness to reflect further on the potential problems arising from their involvement in the government-led “heritagization” process.

3.1 Cultural heritage and cultural heritage administration

The implications of “cultural heritage” are various and complex. In contemporary Chinese academic discourse, narrowly speaking, it consists of two major parts:

- (1) Cultural relics, including underground relics and sites discovered through archaeology, ancient objects passed down from various dynasties, and existing immovable remnants such as ancient buildings on the surface. The term “cultural relics” can be translated into Japanese as “buried cultural properties”, “tangible cultural properties”, and “tangible folk cultural properties”, among others. Within the specific context of China, cultural relics can be further classified into unearthed cultural relics, underwater cultural relics, historical cultural relics (handed down through generations), revolutionary cultural relics, ethnic cultural relics, and folk cultural relics, among others. China’s cultural heritage administration has been striving to expand the scope of protection in the field of cultural relics, and the category of cultural relics continues to expand. This can be observed through the successive revisions of the *Law on Protection of Cultural Relics* and the expansion of the list of the Major Historical and Cultural Site Protected at the National Level over the years.
- (2) ICH mainly refers to the cultural heritage defined by the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* led by UNESCO and adopted in 2003, as well as the *Intangible Cultural Heritage Law* passed and implemented by China in 2011. The definitions according to the above two laws are broadly similar, with a significant overlap. The latter is an adapted definition based on the influence of the former and the reality of Chinese society and culture.

These two major components of cultural heritage generally correspond to the “World Heritage” and “Intangible Cultural Heritage” programs operated successively by UNESCO. From the 1972 *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* to the 2003 *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, this progression reflects the global trend in cultural heritage protection shifting from tangible to intangible and material to immaterial. Influenced by these conventions, China’s domestic efforts in cultural heritage protection and research have largely followed a similar evolutionary trajectory. Nevertheless, Chinese perspectives on cultural relics and heritage have primarily developed within their societal and cultural context, embodying unique characteristics resulting from distinct Chinese practices (Bi 2016). Intending to showcase cultural soft power and being recognized as a major country holding and protecting cultural heritage, the Chinese government actively submits applications for inclusion in the World Heritage and Intangible Cultural Heritage lists (An 2017). Moreover, China has proactively adopted and incorporated international concepts and mechanisms of cultural heritage protection, facilitating the practice of cultural heritage protection with distinct Chinese characteristics while transitioning its cultural policies (An 2017). Currently, China has established a multi-level system of cultural relic

protection sites nationwide, including at national, provincial, municipal and county levels, alongside a multi-tiered system for the protection of ICH.

The cultural heritage administration related to the two essential components of cultural heritage in China is mainly undertaken by different departments under the Ministry of Culture. Cultural relics are primarily managed by the National Cultural Heritage Administration (NCHA), along with its subordinate cultural heritage management committees, cultural relic protection institutions, and museums. Meanwhile, ICH is predominantly overseen by the Department of Intangible Cultural Heritage of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, as well as provincial, municipal, and autonomous region cultural departments' centers for ICH, and cultural bureaus, cultural centers, or cultural rooms within local districts, counties, and townships. These entities operate within distinct administrative systems, and in normal circumstances, they operate independently unless coordinated by higher-level mechanisms such as those led by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, the Publicity Department of the Communist Party of China, or even the State Council.

According to the basic principles of the modern state administrative power system, cultural heritage administration should be part of the government's daily work. However, in recent years, the protection and recognition of ICH have evolved into a social and cultural movement involving the participation of the entire population in China. Since Kun Qu Opera was announced by UNESCO as one of the Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity in 2001, the somewhat awkward term "ICH" has quickly become popular in Chinese society within a few years. Moreover, it has evolved from news terminology to operational language in cultural heritage administration, and further, through joining international conventions and promoting domestic legislation, it has become a legal term.

Since 1949, the Chinese government has gradually formed and become accustomed to employing a nationwide mobilization approach when promoting certain tasks deemed critically important. This method, which aims to achieve set objectives through a nationwide system, boasts high efficiency and often leads to extensive social participation, attracting global attention. However, it is undeniable that this approach comes with extremely high administrative costs. It can sometimes be excessive, disrupting the daily administration of other sectors or domains, and may even lead to waste and confusion. Since the initiation of the reform and opening-up policy in 1978, there has been a tendency for this governance approach, which propels central tasks through "movements," to diminish somewhat. However, it still sporadically reappears because it yields immediate results and is can bring about rapid effectiveness. The fundamental mechanism underlying the rise of the ICH protection movement in China during the first and second decades of the twenty-first century lies in this approach.

China has achieved notable success in significantly adjusting its domestic cultural policies within a relatively short period by joining international conventions led by UNESCO. This approach, utilizing external pressure to drive internal reform, has proven highly effective as it bypasses or diminishes the longstanding controversies and difficulties surrounding domestic cultural policies, which have been heavily influenced by ideology. The increased public awareness of ICH, the establishment of representative lists of ICH at all levels, the recognition of inheritors of ICH, the

designation of Cultural and Natural Heritage Day, and particularly the enforcement of the *Intangible Cultural Heritage Law* have provided the government with a societal foundation and legal framework for administering ICH in accordance with the law. This social and cultural movement, under extraordinary circumstances, is currently entering a phase of gradual decline, and the focus should shift towards integrating the administration of ICH into the government's daily operations.

3.2 The participation of anthropologists

In China, a portion of anthropologists have participated in and contributed to the government-led efforts to protect ICH.

Firstly, anthropologists and scholars from other fields, such as folklorists, have collaborated to interpret relevant UNESCO documents, introducing the internationally recognized concepts of “culture” and “cultural heritage” into the discourse of Chinese society and intellectual circles (Gao 2008, 2013, 2017; Gao, Zhang and Long, 2017; Peng 2018, 2023). Since protecting ICH in China represents a process of gearing to and engaging in dialogue and communication with the international community in cultural policy, the interpretation of UNESCO documents by anthropologists (alongside scholars from other disciplines such as folklorists and legal experts) holds significant importance. This interpretation not only provides intellectual resources for domestic cultural heritage administration but also helps assess the successes and shortcomings of existing policies. Anthropologists, when interpreting international conventions, often emphasize the recognition and respect that these conventions afford to various primary-level communities and even individuals' ICH. In China, influenced to some extent by the May Fourth New Culture Movement, which rejected traditional Chinese culture in favor of embracing “science and democracy”, everyday cultural practices of ordinary Chinese people—such as culinary traditions, various forms of folk art, oral traditions, local cosmologies, rituals, interpersonal interactions, and personal interests—were not adequately valued before the rise of the ICH protection movement. As practitioners and custodians of culture, they often did not receive proper recognition in the public sphere. The definition of “ICH” in these conventions is quite broad, encompassing not only nationally led culture but also the cultural holdings of communities, groups, and even individuals, particularly recognizing grassroots cultures. These concepts, as they entered China's official public discourse through the conventions, profoundly increased the attention that Chinese society and the intellectual community now give to these previously overlooked aspects of everyday cultural life.

Secondly, substantial efforts have been made to introduce academic achievements from overseas cultural heritage research and the prior experiences of cultural heritage administration and legal protection from various countries, providing abundant resources for reference and guidance in domestic ICH protection efforts. Through these endeavors, many academic viewpoints and heritage concepts from abroad have been shared among China's intellectual community, some of which have had a widespread impact. Peng (2008, 2012) has provided a systematic introduction to the theories and critiques involved in Western “heritage studies,” suggesting that what

is commonly referred to as cultural heritage in today's world is also a form of social practice, a series of products with distinct "discursive" features. They manifest not only as property or wealth but also as symbols of power. Such heritage incorporates traces of industrialization, the means of technicism, the exchange attributes of commodity society, the subjects of modern media representation, and the management methods of public affairs. Politicians and administrative bodies often use it as capital to showcase their political achievements.

Thirdly, some anthropologists such as Shuhua Song, Qingfu Qi, Bingzhong Gao, Lili Fang, and Zhaorong Peng have engaged in various forms of participation in expert committees for cultural heritage protection established by national and local governments or work commissioned by cultural heritage administrative bodies, establishing good working relationships with cultural heritage administrations. Some of these scholars serve as members of the Asia-Pacific Centre for UNESCO or as consulting experts for the National Commission of the People's Republic of China for UNESCO, participate as members of the Chinese government delegations in meetings of the UNESCO Intergovernmental Committee, or engage as Chinese scholars in international forums or academic conferences related to ICH.

Fourthly, through their research findings on cultural heritage, anthropologists continuously provide cultural concepts and research methods derived from anthropology to the Chinese intellectual community and the broader society, promoting the formation and popularization of the concept of cultural pluralism in Chinese society, thereby directly or indirectly influencing cultural policies typically dominated by official ideologies. For instance, the China Society for Anthropology of Arts, established at the end of 2006 under the support of Fei Xiaotong, regarded ICH as its central research focus. By introducing anthropological theories and fieldwork methods into the field of Chinese art research, it has significantly changed the discrimination and prejudice of elite refined art against folk grassroots art, thereby fostering a pluralistic view of art and achieving mutual enrichment. The acceptance of Fei's thought that "beauty represents itself with diversity and integrity" and his theory of unity in diversity by the national leadership is also a typical example. The anthropologists discussed earlier speak on various occasions, including within expert committees established by the state, where they introduce certain anthropological concepts that, to some extent, influence cultural policy. For instance, research on China's festival system jointly conducted by anthropologists and folklorists has positively impacted on policy adjustments related to the national holiday system. While it's difficult to establish a direct causal link between anthropological advocacy and official policy-making, the influence of their insights is evident. The cultural values of the whole Chinese society become increasingly diversified, partly due to the efforts of anthropologists. They advocate for reevaluating grassroots, community-based, folk, and everyday cultural practices, proposing improvements to long-standing cultural discrimination or biases at the academic level, thereby promoting profound changes in China's social and cultural life.

Regarding the fourth point mentioned above, several vital arguments have emerged, reflecting significant contributions from scholars in the field. For instance, Gao (2008) conceptualizes ICH as public culture, delineates the evolving relationship between everyday cultural forms and public culture from exclusion to

integration, and argues that the social naming of heritage is precisely the mechanism through which ICH becomes public culture. He asserts that the principle of cultural heritage protection lies in mutual respect and recognition among different communities, resulting in a mechanism of cultural sharing that departs from past mechanisms of using cultural differences to create social division and exclusion. The multi-tiered system of representative lists facilitates the sharing of cultural heritage and ensures that cultural exclusivity and sharing are not mutually exclusive but rather interchangeable. Consequently, the representative list becomes a consensual culture embraced by the entire society, serving as a cultural safeguard for a shared cohesive force.

Moreover, Ma and Zhu (2019) apply certain anthropological concepts and theories, such as “self and other,” “great-tradition and little-tradition,” “holism,” as well as cultural “expressions and grammars,” “centers and margins,” “production and reproduction,” to discussions on cultural heritage. They also emphasize the importance of summarizing and synthesizing experiences related to current ICH practices, and incorporate categories such as cultural administration, protection methods, and cultural creative industries into the scope of anthropological exploration. Ma and Zhu propose the concept of “socialist new traditions” and argue from three perspectives: cultural reconstruction under the revolutionary discourse, national consciousness and the choice of folk culture, and the resurgence of cultural traditions in the new era. They suggest that many currently recognized ICHs vividly document and reflect the processes of influence and transformation exerted by revolutionary discourse and state power on local cultures. They contend that the ICH protection movement, in a sense, is also oriented towards the formation of new social and cultural traditions within the socialist discourse system (Ma and Zhu 2018).

Most anthropologists do not directly engage in the specific work of cultural heritage protection. Still, they have offered academic insights on cultural heritage-related issues from their respective academic perspectives, exerting varying degrees of influence on the Chinese intellectual community and the general public. Fan (2008) interprets the phenomenon of China’s “applications for World Heritage” within the context of globalization, attempting to reveal the implications of such phenomena for “tradition reproduction” and its significance in local identity construction. Weng (2013) believes that the context of cultural heritage protection in China is characterized by multidimensionality, encompassing diverse ethnic groups, languages, religions, and other backgrounds; the mixed landscape of cultures prompts varied directions and meanings in cultural heritage protection practices across China. This multidimensionality of context also manifests as the diversity of subjects. He believes that advocating for respect towards the cultural heritage of different ethnic groups or religions is an important task of cultural heritage protection in China. It is crucial to respect and encourage diverse entities, particularly active participation from diverse local entities.

3.3 Heritage politics

Given the pivotal role of administrative power in Chinese cultural heritage protection, the study of heritage politics by anthropologists is crucial in engaging with the four modes of cultural heritage protection. In recent years, Chinese and international anthropologists have extensively researched on China's cultural heritage politics, primarily understanding heritage as a dialogical process of cultural and political practice. They have predominantly focused on the relationship between heritage and the myriad challenges faced by contemporary China in its social, economic, environmental, and political spheres, thereby affirming the political role heritage plays in China. Consequently, they regard the examination of the process of heritagization practice as a means to comprehend China's current political and social forms.

Gao (2013, 2017) offers distinctive views on the relationship between cultural heritage and the evolution of the Chinese domestic cultural political system. His view that the protection movement for ICH signifies the complete cessation of the "Cultural Revolution" deserves attention. Although the "Cultural Revolution" ended in 1978, the logic of the cultural revolution established by the New Culture Movement that traditional culture was targeted as the object of criticism continued to exert a long-term influence. The legitimacy of folk cultural revival after the reform and opening-up is still not recognized in the public domain but primarily exists in informal occasions, deemed ideologically "incorrect" and institutionally "illegitimate." However, any community or group can and is encouraged to apply for recognition of their own ICH projects now, with communities, groups, and associations deciding for themselves which heritage is important to them. For Chinese society, which has long been characterized by negation and exclusion of traditional Chinese culture, this represents a profound transformation. This social movement has changed, terminated, and even overturned the concepts and logic of the cultural revolution prevalent in modern times. Similar views are echoed by Zhou (2009), who believes that the ICH protection movement in China signifies a complete shift in "revolutionary" cultural policy, marking the end of ideological control over culture. It signifies that China has regained cultural confidence, shedding a century-old cultural inferiority complex and forming a "new cultural perspective" in China that values grassroots, folk, popular, living, non-textual, and intangible culture due to this movement.

In *Heritage Regimes and the State* (Bendix et al. 2012), Bodolec (2012) provides a case study from China, suggesting that ICH is perceived as a manifestation of China's international cultural "soft power." The transformation of UNESCO's concepts into China's cultural laws has led to changes in the administrative structure of China, profoundly impacting all elements of ICH. The government has mobilized numerous concepts to integrate past cultural policies, interpreting and explaining the principles of the conventions in terms of state ideology.

Asian Ethnology, edited and published by the Anthropological Institute at Nanzan University, launched a special issue on *Intangible Cultural Heritage in Asia*, with You and Hardwick as guest editors. The issue features multiple cases from countries such as China, India, Japan, and Malaysia. These cases share or have similar themes, primarily focusing on the Asian paradigm of protecting ICH, the listing of ICH, nationalism, and the process of concretization, as well as the dialogue

and communication between ICH and communities. It can be said that they provide local community perspectives on tradition and heritage (You and Hardwick 2020). Matsuda and Mengoni (2016), among others, focus on examining how the concept of cultural heritage is continually constructed in the three East Asian countries of China, Japan, and South Korea. This concept has received endorsement from cultural politics and social capital in East Asia, but how its past and material manifestations are perceived, conceptualized, and experienced in the contemporary world, and what impacts these related ideas have on current local customs and identities, are topics that scholars should carefully explore.

Shepherd and Yu (2013) delve into heritage management and sustainable development in China, providing an in-depth analysis of its current cultural resource management, archaeological heritage management, exhibition practices, and policies. They address a series of critical topics in the heritage field, including heritage policies and politics, constructive engagement with local communities, and the development and protection of cultural diversity and characteristics. Zhu and Maags (2020) focus on the impact of Chinese heritage policies and discourses on the nation and society, seeking to reveal how heritage policies have transformed narratives about the past and cultural practices to serve present-day interests. The authors analyze the role of cultural heritage in Chinese politics, suggesting that the manufacturing or construction of heritage aligns with international, national, and local values, facilitating its transformation into public goods suitable for commercial development.

Researchers have produced ethnographic reports on Chinese archaeology and heritage production using the Anyang YinXu workstation of the Institute of Archaeology as an example. They examine the social and political context behind the construction of Chinese archaeological site parks and reveal the inscription of heritage and archaeology in China's nation-building efforts in the twentieth century. The research also offers a new study perspective on China from the viewpoint of space, landscape, and the construction of heritage (Wang 2013). Similar research includes attempts to explore the political significance of heritage in contemporary China by examining the Grand Canal heritage site. For a long time, the Chinese government has been committed to improving the management of heritage sites, designating them as national assets, which requires selecting and evaluating cultural sites of specific political significance based on historical, aesthetic, or scientific values. Through an examination of the process of the Grand Canal's inclusion in the World Heritage List, researchers have explored the multiple meanings of "heritage" in China and within local communities, focusing primarily on the political significance of heritage practices conducted by the government that consider social benefits, as well as the incorporation of local community understandings into heritage (Wei 2018).

In *Cultural Heritage Politics in China*, scholars from China's mainland and Hong Kong, Australia, Europe, and the United States explored various interconnected topics related to Chinese cultural heritage concepts and policies, such as "national and world heritage tourism," "cultural heritage tourism in undesignated sites," and "cultural politics of museums and collections." The studies covered a wide range of interdisciplinary cases across China, involving heritage tourism, traditional environments of historic towns, ethnic tourism, scenic tourism, pilgrimage tourism, border heritage, and the actual governance and management of museums and sites.

Researchers found that in countries committed to designating cultural heritage, cultural heritage politics is a highly significant topic. During rapid economic growth, governments are increasingly inclined to uphold their cultural soft power, even beyond their borders (Blumenfield and Silverman 2013).

Maags and others, from the perspectives of individuals, regional groups (communities), religious organizations, and heritage experts, have concentrated on discussing the making of Chinese heritage and related controversies. They point out that the Chinese government integrates cultural heritage with political and economic targets and views heritage as a basis for the legitimacy of power. Heritage discourse, through the practices of actors related to the protection and inheritance of cultural heritage, promotes the presence of traditional culture in Chinese society (Maags and Svensson 2018). Additionally, research by Sofield and Li suggests that as China actively advances modernization, the tension between traditional conservative views and rapid economic development has become a significant issue. However, by utilizing cultural heritage for product development, the tourism industry not only contributes to modernization, but has also to some extent alleviated these tensions (Sofield and Li 1998).

Overseas scholars have shown considerable interest in issues related to the cultural heritage of China's ethnic minorities. Pieke (2014) points out that commercial performances of ethnic cultures constitute a crucial aspect of ethnic tourism, serve as significant sources of income and promote the development of the ethnic-minority regions. The Chinese government has adopted UNESCO's discourse on "cultural heritage" to promote tourism development, mitigate environmental issues, and counteract the negative impacts of urbanization. Through heritage tourism, efforts are made to improve the environment of tourist destinations and visitors' concern for rural areas, thus providing a degree of solace for the cultural nostalgia induced by urbanization. Local authorities have gained greater freedom and creativity in constructing and developing local cultures as "ICH." Shepherd (2009) examines the shift in China's national policies from the "modernization" of minority ethnic groups to state-led cultural protection. He observes that over the past two decades, the Chinese government has strongly supported UNESCO's cultural heritage conservation efforts in China, including in ethnic-minority areas such as the Xizang Autonomous Region. Government policies implemented in Xizang have served development in various ways, promoting historical and cultural connections between Xizang and other parts of China and fostering rapid development of the domestic tourism industry in ethnic-minority regions. This, in turn, reinforces the state's political claims over Xizang and can be seen as an actively promoted cultural heritage practice driven by the government's political and developmental needs.

3.4 Cultural heritage critique

Since the beginning of the new century, achievements in international heritage studies have been mainly in the field of "critical heritage studies." Chinese anthropologists have also engaged in corresponding cultural heritage critiques based on their fieldwork, offering various constructive criticisms and comments. Key points

include: (1) viewing heritage as a process of cultural and social practice, where heritagization means heritage production, thereby reevaluating actions, power dynamics, and thinking within the heritage-related practices; (2) considering heritage as a public cultural resource, enabling further examination of the multifaceted relationships between heritage and contemporary society, including its economic, political, environmental, and community engagement aspects¹; (3) deconstructing and critiquing authoritative heritage discourse to examine the multifaceted interactions and agency among different actors or interest groups involved in the constructive process of heritagization.

Within these critical cultural heritage studies, there are also discussions related to Chinese circumstances. Yutaka (2015) conducted a thorough study of Chinese cultural heritage policies, suggesting that these policies are linked to cultural nationalism within China, serving as a path for national integration while also being connected to the tourism industry as a tool for economic development. As government cultural heritage policies are further reinforced at the local level, they affect the specific individuals who bear the culture, leading to various discrepancies in heritage protection practices on the site. Research by Lincoln and Madgin (2018) found that local officials and villagers in Zhejiang Province have reconceptualized heritage to transform local historical heritage and feature industry into what aligns with the government-promoted “Beautiful Countryside Construction” standards, namely “cultural ecology heritage”. Through an examination of the grassroots heritage production process, they argue that in addition to ordinary residents. Officials at various levels of local government have also played an active role in cultural heritage practices. Such practices in China reflect the inherent malleability of heritage, indicating a phenomenon of continuous expansion and proliferation of cultural heritage in contemporary China.

Abe’s research on the Honghe Hani Rice Terraces deserves mention. The Hani Rice Terraces are a cultural landscape created and maintained by local villagers. However, the inscription of this heritage and its subsequent tourism development are not based on the opinions of local residents but rather orchestrated by cultural intermediaries familiar with UNESCO’s discourse on cultural heritage. These intermediaries include ethnologists with local backgrounds, local governments, and China’s central government. They collectively manufactured a new Hani culture, of which traditional Hani villages are merely a component. The rapid reconstruction of village landscapes and cultural display facilities following the successful inscription onto the World Heritage List may not be readily understood or accepted by local Hani people (Abe 2017).

Kaneshige (2017) conducted a detailed analysis of the intangible cultural heritagization process of the Grand Song of the Dong ethnic group. The Grand Song of the Dong ethnic group in Liping, Guizhou Province, was inscribed as a UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2009. In contrast, the Grand Song of the Dong

¹ The above two points reflect the varying cognitive perspectives of different scholars. However, their correlation lies in the fact that heritagization, despite being a complex human-made process, aims to generate new public cultural resources.

ethnic group in Sanjiang, Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region, is designated only as a national-level ICH. This distinction of levels raises the question of whether the subject of cultural heritage is ethnic groups or geographical regions. According to Kaneshige, due to the cross-provincial and cross-border distribution of ethnic and cultural groups, competition and negotiations arise between different administrative regions. The trend of presenting ethnic culture as regional cultural resources involves complex relationships between regionalism emphasizing regional entities and ethnicism emphasizing ethnic groups.

Han (2015) has conducted a detailed study on the cultural heritagization process of the “Xiang Yu Sacrificial Rites.” Wujiang Town is believed to be the place where the Chinese general Xiang Yu² committed suicide. However, the academic discussions concerning regional historical facts involve official and scholarly cooperation, and therefore are closely related to motives such as cultural heritage inscription, historical and cultural resource utilization, or the construction of local cultural soft power, rather than purely academic research. The local San Yue San Temple Fair in Hexian County became a provincial ICH in 2007 under the name of folk categorization of ICH. However, for local residents, the temple fair is seen as a traditional custom rather than a heritage. In recent years, government management of the sacrificial sites has led to an increase in entertainment aspects of the fair, attracting participation from a wider age range. However, this has also resulted in a separation between sacrificial rituals and folk art performances due to commercialization, potentially diminishing the original significance of the fair as a cultural space for worship.

In addressing the legitimacy issues surrounding folk beliefs in contemporary Chinese society, in addition to the paths of “religiousization” (associating with officially recognized religions such as Taoism or Buddhism) and “folklorization” (e.g., presenting feng shui as folk culture), there is now a new path of “cultural heritagization” (Zhou 2017), leading to the emergence of “belief-type” ICH. Through cultural heritagization, certain aspects of folk beliefs obtain legitimacy, resulting from a sort of “joint operation” between local governments and various parties involved in folk beliefs. The heritagization of folk beliefs has effects such as “purification” (e.g., weakening certain ‘superstitious’ elements), “hierarchization” (classifying folk beliefs into national or local levels), “institutionalization” (once listed, they must adhere to necessary norms and management, with certain aspects prescribed as unchangeable), “utilization” (becoming targets for cultural industry development), “standardization” (complying with uniform listing criteria), and other transformations. The ultimate outcome is often a departure from the original form of these beliefs. Given the distinct categories and logics of ICH and folk beliefs, the folk beliefs included must have undergone selection or necessary modifications (Zhou 2013).

Zheng’ai Liu (2013) has raised questions about the cognitive biases present in the movement to protect ICH. The “culture” included within the scope of protection is more often defined by scholars and acknowledged by governments, creating

² Xiang Yu (项羽, 232 B. C.– 202 B. C.), was a Chinese imperial general in the third century B.C.

a distance from the culture of cultural practices practitioners themselves. On the basis of summarizing the relationship between the narrative of entropic and cultural essentialism, and the relationship between the narrative of emergence and the objectification of culture, Liu argues that breaking through the above paradoxes and related cognitive challenges requires transcending dualism, approaching the issue with rational thought, and returning to the historical context of cultural creation. This also implies a return to daily life, return to life practice.

Anthropologists have criticized several nationwide issues including excessive packaging, such as staging, grading, and museumization of ICH, and subsequent coping with inspections. In terms of the tendency of “de-subjectification” in the ICH protection, which refers to insufficient involvement of local residents and the absence of cultural heritage stakeholders, scholars have voiced numerous criticisms. Many argue that it is essential to respect the local people, who are cultural custodians, by recognizing their rights to represent and express cultural heritage. Anthropologists’ cultural heritage critiques, informed by firsthand fieldwork and empirical analysis of specific cases of cultural heritage protection, carry substantial persuasiveness. Due to the emphasis of anthropological heritage field studies on valuing local perspectives, cultural heritage critiques from anthropologists possess dissenting attributes against top-down cultural heritage practices dominated by governments and external knowledge elites.

3.5 Heritagization and cultural change

Researchers have found that when a cultural project from a community or locality enters the lists of national cultural heritages, i.e., becoming “heritagized,” it undergoes many changes. Among all these changes, some are notably extreme, even resulting in detriment, and some present new opportunities for development. Anthropologists pay close attention to the cultural changes brought about by “heritagization.” For example, cultural arts that were initially local or unique to specific ethnic groups now become heritages that can be shared by more people publicly. They may also become resources for the cultural industry, objects targeted for government development efforts, or tourists attractions, among other possibilities.

Wang (2018) conducted an in-depth study of the Changshan War Drum, a traditional folk percussion art in Zhengding, Hebei Province, known for its competitive nature (drum battles). Wang was particularly interested in its changes before and after it became part of the second batch of national ICH in June 2008. Previously, the Changshan War Drum was used for various purposes in the local area, such as during the twelfth lunar month and on the sixteenth day of the first lunar month, as well as at the City God Temple Fair on the seventeenth day of the fifth lunar month, where the temple fair drum was used for both religious and entertainment purposes. Field surveys revealed that the performance of traditional drum teams for the City God Temple Fair had transformed into public entertainment in the form of plaza art. After being designated as ICH, the methods of inheritance also began to change. Apart from village inheritance, there was also a shift towards school-based inheritance.

Xiong (2018) conducted fieldwork on the Hakka Round-dragon House (*weilongwu*) in northeastern Guangdong, concluding that the shared spaces of *weilongwu* have experienced and are inevitably declining. This leads to the viewpoint that community-based cultural heritage cannot sustain substantial continuity. The author focuses on the transformation of the clan system and its associated Patriarchalism to explain the current state of hollowing out and obsolete of such vernacular architecture. As a form of social heritage, *weilongwu* has gradually become obsolete due to the decline of clans and their traditions. Consequently, it has become a cultural heritage that is challenging to revive and protect substantively. Therefore, shifting focus to its material heritage attributes may be an inevitable direction for the future.

Kawai's (2017) research deeply reveals the creative construction of "original home" of modern Hakka in Meixian, Guangdong Province, through the production of "Hakka space," focusing on the significance and symbolism of Hakka *tulou* (土楼) and *weilongwu* (围龙屋) as cultural heritage. In the process of constructing the urban landscape of "Hakka space," local unique *weilongwu* architectural forms were overlooked, deliberately opting for the *tulou* style recognized as a world cultural heritage in neighboring provinces due to its higher visibility compared to the former. This choice was opposed by some local clan members, leading to efforts to rediscover the value of *weilongwu* as a cultural heritage. Kawai's research illuminates the intricate process of rediscovering local cultural heritage.

Research related to the commodification of tourism resources of Chinese cultural heritage from the perspective of tourism anthropology is exemplified by Zong's (2006) study on the objectification of tourism of Lijiang's World Heritage Site. Zong extensively investigates the protection and development of Dayan Old Town of Lijiang, delineating distinct phases such as the period as a historical and cultural city, the period of application of world heritage, and the period following the successful application. Her description vividly portrays the cultural transformations of Dayan Old Town of Lijiang against the backdrop of heritage protection and tourism development. She highlights that, alongside a significant outflow of local residents, a growing commercial atmosphere, and gradual changes in the spatial structure of the old town, the town has undergone a facelift and a functional transformation. For Lijiang to achieve sustainability by relying on world heritage tourism, critical issues must be addressed, including how to retain local residents, rebuild the local identity of town residents amidst an influx of outsiders, and sustain local culture. Zong (2019) conducted a longitudinal study on the changing image of tourism in Lijiang spanning over 20 years, revealing how cultural heritage has been excessively developed and consumed during this period, and the various impacts that have resulted from this process.

Su and Teo provide an innovative understanding of China's political dynamic during its transitional period from the perspective of heritage tourism politics. Their book examines the cultural-political environment behind China's development of heritage tourism projects in Lijiang, revealing the underlying logic of the tourism industry by studying the cooperation and competition among international standards, domestic capital, state entities, tourists, and local residents within tourism development settings (Su and Teo 2009). Yosuke's (2015) detailed comparative

study of ethnic tourism in Lijiang, Yunnan, and among the Torajan people in Indonesia aims to explore the correlation between ethnic tourism and cultural heritage. He investigates how tourism protects cultural heritage and why such protection is necessary. Yosuke points out that while local residents may benefit economically, this may adversely affect the local community, as they can no longer return to their previous cultural state (Yosuke 2015).

Bodolec's ethnographic study on the *yaodong* cave dwellings in Shaanxi Province reveals changes in the actions of local performers and ordinary villagers after these vernacular dwellings were constructed as ICH. She points out that cave dwellings, as houses, involve numerous symbolic, ritual, technical, and economic activities, including *feng shui* and ritual relationships among hosts, artisans, and carpenters, all of which constitute part of China's ICH. Based on this understanding and its relationship with other aspects of culture in northern Shaanxi, some local performers have established grassroots organizations to promote it and even set up museums of folk traditions, advocating for initiatives to encourage villagers to participate in this new form of local cultural development (Bodolec 2010).

4 Conclusion

Overseas Chinese scholars and foreign scholars have reached a consensus in their research on Chinese cultural heritage, namely that the practice of constructing cultural heritage has become an important process and factor affecting various levels of governance in China, including the politics, culture, economy, modernization, and democratization of Chinese society. Therefore, heritage or heritagization construction is often regarded as a research pathway for understanding contemporary Chinese society. In the English-speaking world, studies on heritage theory and practice often do not clearly differentiate concepts such as "cultural relics," "ICH," and "world heritage." Instead, "ICH" is often viewed as an extension or complement to "cultural heritage," with cultural heritage criticism focusing more on societal and cultural phenomena. Such criticism emphasizes that cultural heritage is situated within multiple power relations and is the result of interactions or negotiations among various actors. In contrast, Chinese anthropologists approach the study of domestic cultural heritage from different backgrounds and contexts, needing to contextualize their work within the broader framework of contemporary Chinese society and cultural politics.

Anthropological research on Chinese cultural heritage can be summarized in several key aspects:

Firstly, anthropology emphasizes examining cultural heritage-related issues from the perspective of local residents. Local residents refer to people living in the area where cultural heritage is located or belonging to specific communities, including ordinary inhabitants and stakeholders of cultural heritage. The composition of local residents is actually quite complex and requires specific analysis. Indeed, regional or grassroots communities have multiple structures, including indigenous residents, recent migrants, and retired cadres returning to spend their later years in their hometowns. They may be either villagers or urban community members. The

anthropological approach helps empower local residents, especially heritage holders or bearers, to gain a certain degree of agency in relevant contexts. Anthropologists, by respecting the perspective of stakeholders in cultural heritage, help convey voices from local stakeholders, which is a significant contribution.

Secondly, anthropologists emphasize the efficacy of the concept of cultural heritage “practice,” the assertions and practices of cultural heritage stakeholders from fieldwork sites, and the cultural heritage protection and inheritance based on repeated practices. These arguments slightly diverge from past or other scholars’ cultural heritage studies. Anthropologists observe that culture and cultural heritage are not static but continuously in a state of practice. Through case studies, anthropologists discover that local residents have many claims based on life practices. From an anthropological perspective, one should question the view that a fixed relationship exists between stakeholders and their heritage.

Thirdly, anthropologists readily recognize the “presence” of the state in fieldwork, but at the same time, they inquire about who represents the government, who can speak for the state, and who explains the state’s stance to local residents in cultural heritage practices. Being able to maintain a certain distance and independence from cultural power, being able to question the relationship between cultural heritage and cultural politics, and being able to offer recommendations, dissent, and critiques concerning policies involving cultural heritage, it is what makes cultural anthropology most respectable in the study of cultural heritage.

Fourthly, the traditions and spirits of anthropologists’ self-reflection enable them to effectively navigate various relationships in fieldwork settings. Anthropologists are conscious of the changes triggered by their involvement and should engage in introspection regarding their varying degrees of participation in the “knowledge production” process related to ICH. Anthropological studies of cultural heritage also have limitations. Anthropologists prefer to discuss macro issues from a micro perspective and tend to seek universality through case studies. However, the field and individual cases of cultural heritage practices often contain aspects difficult to explain and understand solely at the community level or in specific circumstances. Faced with complex fieldwork, anthropologists should be aware of their limitations.

Fifthly, anthropologists need to contemplate the significance of encountering cultural heritage in fieldwork. Many rituals and life practices studied by anthropologists inadvertently become ICH, making it almost unavoidable for anthropologists in China to engage with narratives about cultural heritage (Liu 2016). On the one hand, as Tamura pointed out, there is an increasing divergence between the cultural concepts and discourses in heritage practices and those typically considered by anthropology (Tamura 2018). Anthropologists are facing a situation of this cultural inflation, including various external forces intervening in local folk life through the term “culture,” which makes it difficult for anthropologists to describe culture. How to think about the differences between different understandings and concepts? How anthropologists can distinguish themselves from various types of “cultural experts”? Tamura suggests a return to the lifeworld, emphasizing the study of “people,” describing human life and processes, of which cultural heritage practices are just a tiny part. That is, to let anthropology, which is trapped in the discourse system of heritage, return to anthropology itself. On the other hand, encountering cultural

heritage in the field should be viewed as an opportunity for anthropologists, as they can observe how familiar rituals and life practices are reproduced during cultural heritagization, how they adapt while continuing after becoming ICH, which allows anthropologists to access to premises different from the administrative presuppositions of cultural heritage, and come closer to revealing the reality of heritage practices in the fieldwork and asserting the independence of academic discourse.

Finally, it must be noted that cultural heritage is by no means an exclusive domain of anthropology; therefore, collaboration with other disciplines is necessary. In fact, many publications on cultural heritage issues are co-authored by experts from multidisciplinary, including archaeology, folklore studies, history, musicology, art studies, religious studies, and museum studies, alongside local practitioners of cultural heritage and experienced administrators. Anthropological participation in these endeavors helps overcome its limitations and narrowness.

Acknowledgements Not applicable.

Authors' contributions The authors contributed equally to this work and should be considered co-first authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials Not applicable.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate Not applicable.

Consent for publication Not applicable.

Competing interests I have no competing interests.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

References

- Abe, Tomohisa. 2017. 生活の中に見出された世界遺産—紅河八二棚田群の文化的景観. In 文化遺産と生きる, ed. Lida Taku, 263–286. Kyoto: 臨川書店.
- An, Deming. 2017. 非物质文化遗产保护的中國实践与经验 (Chinese practices and experiences in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage). *Folk Culture Forum* 4: 17–24.
- Bendix, Regina F., Aditya Eggert, and Arnika Peselmann. 2012. *Heritage regimes and the state*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.

- Bi, Lingling, Dominique Vanneste, and Jan Van Der Borg. 2016. Cultural heritage development in China: a contextualized trajectory or a global-local nexus? *International Journal of Cultural Property* 23 (2): 191–207.
- Blumenfeld, Tami, and Helaine Silverman. 2013. *Cultural heritage politics in China*. New York: Springer.
- Bodolec, Caroline. 2010. Houses as local culture identity: The case of Yanchuan District, Shaanxi. In *Along the Great Wall. Architecture and identity in China and Mongolia*, ed. Eric Lehner, Alexandra Harrer, and Hildegard Sint, 223–232. Vienna: Institute for Comparative Research in Architecture (ICRA).
- Bodolec, Caroline. 2012. The Chinese paper-cut: From local inventories to the UNESCO representative list of the intangible cultural heritage of humanity. In *Heritage regimes and the state*, ed. Regina F. Bendix, Aditya Eggert, and Arnika Peselmann, 249–264. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.
- Fan, Ke. 2008. “申遗”: 传统与地方的全球化再现 (“World cultural heritage application”: Representation of tradition and locale in the context of globalization). *Journal of Guangxi Minzu University (Philosophy and Social Science Edition)* 5: 46–52.
- Gao, Bingzhong. 2008. 作为公共文化的非物质文化遗产 (The legacy of immaterial culture as public culture). *Literature & Art Studies* 2: 77–83.
- Gao, Bingzhong. 2013. 中国的非物质文化遗产保护与文化革命的终结 (China’s intangible cultural heritage protection and the end of cultural revolutions). *Open Times* 5: 143–152.
- Gao, Bingzhong. 2017. 《保护非物质文化遗产公约》的精神构成和中国实践 (Spiritual composition and Chinese practice of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage). *Journal of South-Central Minzu University (Humanities and Social Sciences)* 4: 56–63.
- Gao, Bingzhong, Juwen Zhang, and Bill Long. 2017. The social movement of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and the end of cultural revolutions in China. *Western Folklore* 76 (2): 167–180.
- Geismar, Haidy. 2015. Anthropology and heritage regimes. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 44: 71–85.
- Han, Min. 2015. 中国社会における文化変容の諸相—グローバル化の視点から—. 153–175. Tokyo: 風響社.
- Kaneshige, Tsutomu. 2017. 遺産登録をめぐるせめぎあい—トーン族大歌の事例から—. In 文化遺産と生きる, ed. Lida Taku, 97–129. Kyoto: 臨川書店.
- Kawai, Hironao. 2017. In 創造される文化的景観—客家地域の集合住宅をめぐる文化遺産実践. In 文明史のなかの文化遺産, ed. Lida Taku, 151–176. Kyoto: 臨川書店.
- Kawai, Hironao. 2020. <<客家空間>>の生産—梅県における「現郷」創出の民族誌一—. 185–216. Tokyo: 風響社.
- Lincoln, Toby, and Rebecca Madgin. 2018. The inherent malleability of heritage: Creating China’s beautiful villages. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 24 (9): 938–953.
- Liu, Zhengai. 2013. “谁的文化, 谁的认同?——非物质文化遗产保护运动中的认知困境与理性回归 (Whose culture, whose identity: Cognitive dilemma and rational return in the intangible cultural heritage protection movement). *Folklore Studies* 2: 10–18.
- Liu, Zhengai. 2016. 在田野中遭遇“非遗” (On intangible cultural heritage afield). *Journal of Shihezi University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)* 3: 56–64.
- Ma, Guoqing, and Wei Zhu. 2018. 社会主义新传统: 非物质文化遗产的新向度 (New socialist traditions: New directions for intangible cultural heritage). In *Art writing*, ed. Lili Fang, 485–503. Beijing: Culture and Art Publishing House.
- Ma, Guoqing, and Wei Zhu. 2019. 文化人类学与非物质文化遗产 (Cultural anthropology and intangible cultural heritage), 117–146. Beijing: SDX joint Publishing Company.
- Maags, Christina, and Marina Svensson. 2018. *Chinese heritage in the making: Experiences, negotiations and contestations*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Matsuda, Akira, and Luisa Elena Mengoni. 2016. *Reconsidering cultural heritage in East Asia*. London: Ubiquity Press.
- Peng, Zhaorong. 2008. 遗产学与遗产运动: 表述与制造 (The science of inheritance and the inheritance movement: Enunciation and fabrication). *Literature and Art Studies* 2: 84–91.
- Peng, Zhaorong. 2012. 文化遗产学十讲 (Ten lectures on cultural heritage). Kunming: Yunnan Education Publishing House.
- Peng, Zhaorong. 2023. 文化遗产与当代世界 (Cultural heritage and the contemporary world). *Guizhou Social Sciences* 8: 85–90.
- Peng, Zhaorong, et al. 2018. 联合国及相关国家的遗产体系 (Heritage systems of United Nations and related nations). Beijing: Peking University Press.

- Pieke, Frank N. 2014. Anthropology, China, and the Chinese century. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 43: 123–138.
- Shepherd, Robert. 2009. Cultural heritage, UNESCO, and the Chinese state: Whose heritage and for whom? *Heritage Management* 2 (1): 55–79.
- Shepherd, Robert, and Larry Yu. 2013. *Heritage management, tourism, and governance in China: Managing the past to serve the present*. New York: Springer.
- Sofield, Trevor HB, Mei Fun, and Sarah Li. 1998. Tourism development and cultural policies in China. *Annals of Tourism Research* 25 (2): 362–392.
- Su, Xiaobo, and Peggy Teo. 2009. *The politics of heritage tourism in China: A view from Lijiang*. London: Routledge.
- Tamura, Kazuhiko. 2018. “非遗”时代的自文化研究——试论固化的“遗产”观念与面向未来的开放的“生”的记录 (A study of self-culture in the age of “intangible cultural heritage”: Concerning the static “heritage” idea and dynamic ways of “living”). In *Anthropological perspectives on history, culture and museum: Theoretical practice in Japan and China*, ed. Min Han and Yin Se, 187–197. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Wang, Shuli. 2013. *The politics of China's cultural heritage on display: Yinxu archaeological park in the making*. Diss: UCL (University College London).
- Wang, Yongjian. 2018. 走进艺术人类学 (*Into art anthropology*), 116–132. Beijing: Beijing Times Chinese Press.
- Wei, Qiaowei. 2018. Negotiation of social values in the World Heritage listing process: A case study on the Beijing-Hangzhou Grand Canal. *China Archaeologies* 14 (3): 501–526.
- Weng, Naiqun. 2013. 在多重语境中保护中国文化遗产 (*Preserving Chinese cultural heritage in multiple contexts*). China Folklore Network. <https://www.chinesefolklore.org.cn/web/index.php?NewsID=11409>. Accessed 20 May 2024.
- Xiong, Huan. 2018. 空间生产视域下的乡土建筑遗产研究——以广东上长岭村围龙屋为中心 (On vernacular architectural heritage in the perspective of spatial production: Focusing on the weilongwu in Shang Chang Ling Village, Guangdong Province). In *Art writing*, ed. Lili Fang, 367–387. Beijing: Culture and Art Publishing House.
- Yosuke, Fujiki. 2015. エスニックツーリズムと文化遺産—麗江とタナトラジャ。In *アジアの文化遺産—過去・現在・未来—*, ed. Suzuki Masataka, 223–268. Tokyo: 慶應義塾大学東アジア研究所.
- You, Ziying, and Patricia Anne Hardwick. 2020. Intangible cultural heritage in Asia: Traditions in transition. *Asian Ethnology* 79 (1): 3–19.
- Yutaka, Suga. 2015. 中国における『遺産』政策と現実の相克—ユネスコから『伝統の担い手』まで。In *アジアの文化遺産—過去・現在・未来—*, ed. Suzuki Masataka, 269–307. Tokyo: 慶應義塾大学東アジア研究所.
- Zhou, Xing. 2009. 非物质文化遗产与中国的文化政策 (Intangible cultural heritage and China's cultural policy). In *Chinese studies (Tenth series)*, ed. Xiaohong Zhou and Shuguang Xie, 210–223. Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press.
- Zhou, Xing. 2013. 民间信仰与文化遗产 (Folk beliefs and cultural heritage). *Cultural Heritage* 2: 1–10.
- Zhou, Xing, et al. 2017. Folk belief and its legitimization in China. *Western Folklore* 76 (2): 151–165.
- Zhu, Yujie, and Christina Maags. 2020. *Heritage politics in China: The power of the past*. London: Routledge.
- Zong, Xiaolian. 2006. 旅游开发与文化变迁——以云南省丽江市纳西族文化为例 (*Tourism development and cultural change: The case of Naxi culture in Lijiang Naxi autonomous county, Yunnan Province*), 73–98. Beijing: China Travel & Tourism Press.
- Zong, Xiaolian. 2019. 20年间丽江旅游形象变迁的研究 (Study on the change of Lijiang's tourism image in 20 years). 愛知大学国際中国学研究センター『新時代の日中関係と中国研究の方法』3: 191–205.

Comments

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.