Chapter 1

Introduction: East Asian Music as Intangible Cultural Heritage

Keith Howard

This volume examines the agendas for preserving music as intangible cultural heritage in China, Korea, Taiwan and Japan.[1] East Asia has a long history of legislating and setting up a mixture of preservation and promotion strategies to counter the loss of indigenous musical and other cultural forms. The pertinent Japanese legislation, the Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties (*bunkazai hogohō*), dates back to 1950, and the Korean legislation, the Cultural Properties Preservation Law (*Munhwajae pohobŏp*), to 1962; Taiwan followed in 1982 with the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act (*Wenhua zichan baocun fa*), although China has only in the last decade joined the preservation movement.

It was only in the years before and after the turn of the millennium that the global agenda shifted. There had to that point been a widespread distrust of attempts to preserve the intangible heritage, but this gave way to an awareness that, with the ever more rapid pace of change brought by globalization, much would be lost if there was no intervention. East Asia was well placed to provide models for action. The agenda shift, however, had much to do with UNESCO, notably with its appointment of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity in 2001, 2003 and 2005, and with the adoption in 2003 of the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.

In each of the three Masterpiece rounds, China, Korea and Japan were all successful in promoting genres of performance arts. In 2001, among the 19 Masterpieces appointed were Chinese *kunqu* opera, Korean *Chongmyo cheryeak* (Music for the Rite to Royal Ancestors; see Howard, this volume) and Japanese *nogaku* theatre. In 2003, among the 28 were Chinese *guqin* zither music (see Rees, this volume), Korean *p'ansori* (epic storytelling through song) and the Japanese *bunraku* puppet theatre (see Arisawa, this volume); in 2005, among the final 43 Masterpieces were the Korean *Gangreung Danoje* ([*Kangnŭng tanoje*], a spring

[1] Discussion of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea) is omitted here because an agenda for preserving music is absent; rather music and musical instruments are required to serve the present Socialist ideology (see Howard 1996a, 2011). In this volume, then, 'Korea' signifies the Republic of Korea. 'Taiwan' denotes the Republic of China and 'China' the People's Republic of China; we have not included considerations of Hong Kong and Macau.

rite and festival from the East Coast), Japanese *kabuki* theatre and, from the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region in China, the *Uyghur muqam* melodic and modal system. All nine of these genres incorporate music, indicative of the fact that East Asian music, as intangible cultural heritage, is ripe for investigation. In the following pages, we take specific genres of music from the East Asian musical canon to explore how preservation and promotion strategies have played out.

Preservation Agendas

In the last few decades, we have become accustomed to the concept of cultural heritage. We visit museums, where mausoleums of our shared social history reside.[2] If in the past museums were full of the monumental, they increasingly admit the vernacular (Hall 2009: 24), indicative of a shifting polemic and an ongoing reinterpretation of purpose. Museums have become highly contested sites, not least as they struggle to attract visitors against the spread of mass media and the rise of the Internet. Today, they must also keep at bay those who argue the imperative of repatriating 'looted' artefacts.

Today, we search out World Heritage Sites, which by 2011 had become the 936 'places to visit before you die' (Jansen-Verbeke 2009: 58),[3] where the legacy of human brilliance and natural design is written out in capital letters. However, as we travel the world on Boeing 747s and Airbus 380s, we do not just expect to find buildings and artefacts. The tourist gaze also falls on music and dance shows, and on souvenir shops that sell audio or video recordings of performances and local trinkets such as instruments (whether imitation or real). These have become vital parts of the economic imperative of tourism[4] and tourist brochures, accordingly, concentrate not just on the tangible cultural heritage, but on the intangible cultural heritage – local customs, costumes and cuisines, and local performance arts and crafts. The intangible heritage is placed centre stage, in settings, displays, and imagined, recreated or restructured presentations that seek to remind us of the way we once were.

Everywhere, it would appear, efforts are made to preserve and promote local cultural difference. We have conveniently forgotten how scholars once warned that preserving the intangible heritage in performance and creation without change was not an option as society evolved (Blacking 1978; 1987: 112; Nettl 1985: 124–

[2] After Theodor Adorno (1967). Note, however, that Andrea Witcomb (2003) critiques Adorno, also noting how Tony Bennett (1995, 1998) disagrees with the idea of a museum as mausoleum, though 'somewhat blindly' as he wavers between a museum as repressive and as a site for people's memory (Witcomb 2003: 173).

[3] The list is at http://whc.unesco.org/en/list (accessed 11 September 2011).

[4] See also Smith and Robinson (2006) and Jansen-Verbeke, Priestley and Russo (2008).

7; Nas 2002;[5] Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2004; see also Bohlman 2002: 63). Today, we tend to ignore the polemic against preservation, in which cultural traditions become 'frozen in time and space like a museum display' (Hesselink 2004: 407). So, despite the past being a foreign country where things were done differently (Hartley 1971: 7, as prominently echoed in Lowenthal 1985), and as scepticism towards government intervention wanes,[6] our contemporary zeitgeist has shifted to an acceptance of a past that is both alive and venerated (Bharucha 1993: 21). To square this particular circle, conservation – rather than merely preservation – movements for the intangible cultural heritage increasingly recognize the importance of creativity and development in order to 'revalorize … through new dimensions' (Jansen-Verbeke 2009: 57–8), to attempt to stimulate efforts towards sustainability (and, by referring to sustainability, the difficult word 'preservation' can be avoided),[7] or, at least according to UNESCO, to generate 'ownership … and constant recreation'.[8] Conservation, then, is increasingly held to require a mix of preservation and presentation.

Performance arts and crafts have become supporting actors in our exercises of collective memory and our efforts to retain memory as something alive. Alan Lomax, the late ethnomusicologist, recording engineer and archivist, in 1972 quipped that 'the world is an agreeable and stimulating place to live in because of its cultural diversity'. David Lowenthal's remark that loss and 'modernist amnesia', attenuated by the pace of change, threatens our identity and wellbeing (1985: xxiv) is often repeated.[9] Some would agree with Bert Feintuch, who

---

[5] Nas (2002: 144) cites Henri J. M. Claessen, to question why governments should 'pay people to sing incomprehensible songs that have long lost their meaning'.

[6] For discussions about the distrust of government intervention, see Bennett (1997) and Zimmer and Toepler (1999).

[7] Jeff Todd Titon's blog discusses issues of music and sustainability (http://sustainablemusic.blogspot.com/; accessed 11 September 2011), and an ongoing project to determine whether there are common policies that might enable the sustainability of traditional musics is currently hosted by Queensland Conservatorium: 'Sustainable Futures: towards an ecology of musical diversity', for which see http://musecology.griffith.edu.au/ (accessed 11 September 2011).

[8] http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=34325&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html (accessed November 2009).

[9] For related perspectives, see the papers in Layton, Stone and Thomas (2001). Queensland Conservatorium's 'Sustainable Futures' cites Anthony Seeger, who as former president of the International Council for Traditional Music was closely involved with the UNESCO 'Masterpiece' scheme, saying 'there's an active process in the disappearance of many traditions around the world. Some of them are being disappeared by majority groups … others are being disappeared by missionaries or religious groups … others are being disappeared by copyright legislation'. To this, the website adds decline to music traditions caused by technological developments, infrastructural challenges, socio-economic change, failing educational systems, and loss of prestige (http://musecology.griffith.edu.au/About/; accessed 11 September 2011).

notes how contemporary societies 'spark' their people to remember local life, to 'think about matters close at hand and close at heart' (1988: 1), or with the Czech novelist Milan Kundera, who wistfully laments that 'the struggle of power is the struggle of memory over forgetting'. Promoting a national culture can, we are told, balance the impact of globalization (Tomlinson 1999); or, according to UNESCO's eighth Director-General, Koichiro Matsuura: '[p]aradoxically, it is precisely in the context of increasing globalization that more and more peoples and communities of the world have begun to recognize the importance of their cultural heritage' (Matsuura 2005: 17).[10] Generations of scholars, musicologists and ethnomusicologists included, and other concerned individuals and groups, have sought ways, like Lomax (1972), to counter the perceived cultural grey-out, and to avoid the threatened loss of art and craft traditions. Erich von Hornbostel cited loss as a key reason for setting up the Berlin Phonogramm Archive at the beginning of the twentieth century; he argued the need to capture and compare traditional musics before they disappeared. However, although loss remains a common theme within conservationist interventions (Cleere 2001; Meskell 2002; Holtorf 2006; Rowlands 2007), performance arts and crafts have only been belatedly recognized as fully integral to local and global cultural landscapes; they were brought to the party of museumification rather late.

Myriad discussions of intangible cultural heritage now exist.[11] These record that efforts to preserve performance arts and crafts initially tended to mirror strategies already in place for the tangible heritage, notably with attention being placed on documentation and archiving. Some groundwork for this was done within the International Council of Museums (ICOM) and the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), and by similar bodies. Much as with the changing identity of museums, such efforts recognized to a greater or lesser extent that material culture becomes more meaningful when an understanding of the production and use of objects can be communicated (Vergo 1989; Woodhead and Stansfield 1994; Dean 1996; Hall 2009). This understanding emerged not least with UNESCO's World Heritage Sites in 1979, when the concentration camp at Auschwitz-Birkenau was added to the list – memorializing what had happened there more than the site itself. The list later inscribed the atomic bomb site at Hiroshima (in 1996) and the bridge at Mostar (in 2005). As this perspective bedded in, so the still contested

[10] Globalization and intangible cultural heritage was the theme of the conference at which Matsuura gave this comment, held at the United Nations University in Tokyo in August 2004. Papers from the conference illustrate many of the concerns with globalization, with titles that include 'Culture and globalization: calamity or cure?' (Souren Melikian), 'Cherishing diversity' (Seiji Tsutsumi), 'New challenges for local lives' (Antonio Arantes), 'Mitigating losses to intangible cultural heritage in a globalized society' (Kiyul Chung), 'Intangible cultural heritage: a global public good of a special kind' (Hans d'Orville). See Wong (2005).

[11] To take one recent year, see the edited volumes by Ruggles and Silverman (2009), Smith and Akagawa (2009), Lira and Amoêda (2009) and, tangentially, Weintraub and Yung (2009).

definitions of heritage came to be interpreted in terms of the values and attitudes of those who produced or used objects (Goulding 1999; Dicks 2000; Jewell and Crotts 2001; Breathnach 2003). However, while documenting and archiving the intangible cultural heritage has fed the preservationist ethos (Alivizatou 2009: 173), it has all too easily evaded questions about sustainability, about maintaining the activities of performance and creation that define artistic practice. It has done so by keeping the focus on artefacts emerging from the production of the intangible heritage. And, this has fed back into tourism and marketing, as objects have been reproduced for distribution and sale, and as festivals have been promoted at home and abroad (Jansen-Verbeke 2009: 61–5).

Archiving and documentation can also shift ownership, thereby devaluing the economic and social stakes of the people who create or produce the intangible heritage (Skounti 2009). Such activities impose measures of control or validation that tend to be enshrined in sets of guidelines, rules and regulations, and these, in turn, are policed by agencies of bureaucrats and scholars. Issues of rights and ownership emerge, issues that have long been associated with, for example, biomedical and mining companies, but can also be seen in terms of cultural appropriation (Ziff and Rao 1997). Such issues have the potential to harm a local community, to lead to negative effects on the integrity and identity of a group, and to situations where benefits may accrue to some to the detriment of others (Howard 2006a: 99–133; George 2009: 76). Economic interests arising from the reproduction of an intangible cultural commodity may then raise further issues about traditional knowledge and ownership that conflict with legislation in place at the state or international level for trademark regulation and copyright assignment (see Alaszewska and Kraef, this volume[12]).

Just as many museums have embraced the vernacular as well as classical, court, or literati/gentry arts, attempts have been made for performance arts and crafts that were formerly categorized within the often pejorative box of 'folklore' – a box associated with political and ideological agendas – to be recast as intangible cultural heritage (Seitel 2001, Nas 2002, De Jong 2007). Folklore has for a number of decades recognized the basic challenge in conservation as being the balancing of top-down and bottom-up activities. While the top-down approach is seen in the development of measures of control or validation,[13] harnessing local ownership and the enthusiasm of local consumers is to many folklorists considered an unassailable democratic principle (see Abrahams 1968; Bauman 1971; Ben-Amos 1971; Hymes 1975). As a result, to many, cultural conservation needs to be dynamic and hence centred on those who create or perform (see, for example,

[12] Also, in respect to the ownership of traditional music, see the articles by Feld, Zemp, Seeger and Mills in *Yearbook of Traditional Music* 28 (1996).

[13] Consider the top-down measures adopted in British folksong collection in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which included censorship of lyrics, adaptations to 'correct' modal patterns, and strictures about performance (Karpeles 1973: chapter 1; Harker 1985: 193–6; Porter 1991: 113–30).

Hufford 1994: 3). It can be conceived, then, as a way to organize 'the profusion of public and private efforts' that deal with 'traditional community cultural life' (Loomis 1983: iv) and which 'we together with our constituents, share in the act of making' (Hufford 1994: 5).[14] This has affinity with the critiques of Nettl and Blacking about preservation systems for the intangible cultural heritage, but has the potential to challenge an old paradigm of ethnomusicology, in which traditional music genres were conceived of in static ways, and analysed atomistically in terms of discrete elements.

Ethnomusicologists increasingly promote a dynamic approach, as in the following comment from the Geneva-based scholar, archivist and music promoter Laurent Aubert: 'The nature of tradition is not to preserve intact a heritage from the past, but to enrich it according to present circumstances and transmit the result to future generations' (Aubert 2007: 10).[15] This raises the challenge of authenticity (and associated concepts, such as the *wŏnhyŏng* archetype in Korea and *yuanshengtai* 'original ecology' in China; Rees, Gorfinkel, Howard, Maliangkay, this volume), and hence encourages top-down approaches to preservation and promotion, as decisions are taken as to what is deemed necessary to retain affinity with an inherited tradition of performance or creation. Top-down approaches also arise because of an increasing concern with cultural rights, where the cultural life of a community (and ownership by a community) may be deemed at least as important as an individual's right to artistic production and participation (Weintraub 2009: 2–5[16]). Top-down approaches have dominated the intangible cultural heritage discourse in East Asia.

To this, we need to add recognition that many approach cultural difference and the perceived loss of it with something of a Janus face. Not least, this reflects an acceptance – sometimes reluctantly – that most people appear to be satisfied with what was once called 'airport art' (Kaeppler 1977, 1979; for discussions of 'airport art' see also De Kadt 1979; O'Grady 1981; Moeran 1984; Hitchcock, King and Parnwell 1993). 'Airport art' can be found in the staged shows and souvenir trinkets for tourists, or in recordings made as 'tourist trinkets slapped together to make a quick buck' (Miller and Shahriari 2008: 56) – products and practices that, when repackaged for those from outside a given culture, have been

[14] The stream embraced here comes from the report on intangible cultural resources requested by the United States' Congress in preparation for amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act.

[15] The different approaches are set out neatly by Huib Schippers (2010: 27 and 124). See below for a note about the concept of 'tradition'.

[16] Weintraub notes that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights has been criticized for being Western-centric and prescriptive, and alludes to a growing awareness that it does not adequately fit with 'Asian values' (as noted by Bell, Nathan and Peleg 2001). He also notes the formulation by Krister Malm (2001) that human rights focus on individual rights whereas cultural rights call attention to group rights. Note that systems for preservation tend to be group centred.

usefully brought together by Guillermo Gómez-Pena (2001) under the term 'lite difference'. World music, as a genre, for instance, is expected to be 'sophisticated but not obtrusive, easy to take but not at all bland, unfamiliar without being patronizing' (Spencer 1992); its consumers engage in 'audio tourism' (Howard 2010, after Kassabian 2004), stripping sound from any meaningful socio-cultural contextualization, and thereby redefining aesthetic criteria in a way that potentially loses traditional knowledge (Weintraub 2009: 4). MTV creates its own 'world music' charts, feeding a shrinking recorded music industry and its stable of largely white, often middle-aged, pop icons, but thereby legitimizing Western music styles as universal in a manner that further downgrades local and regional variety.[17] Hollywood sucks in cultural difference to create flashy, shallow filmic displays that disperse cultural divides (Moretti 2001) and 'ventriloquize the world' (Shohat and Stam 1994: 191). Our hyper-real consumerism demands 'shoppertainments' and 'eatertainments' – giant shopping malls and food courts. All of these spin out from a pervasive Eurocentric capitalism that takes cultures from everywhere and recycles them around the world (Outhwaite 2008).[18] 'Lite difference' sits uncomfortably alongside appeals for localized identities and against disquiet over appropriation (as explored, for example, by Root (1995) and by the contributors to Ziff and Rao (1997)). But, it also reveals an uncomfortable zone, as the dynamics of preservation clash with the needs of promotion when a performance art or craft is taken from its locale and placed before national and international audiences. This is a theme that will be explored in a number of the essays in this volume.

Preservation Systems for the Intangible Cultural Heritage

The preservation of the intangible heritage takes different forms in different places. There is a common thread: a belief, or an awareness, that doing nothing will result in irretrievable loss. Efforts to preserve can be considered – though primarily by their critics – as a nostalgic appeal to hang on to the way things were,

---

[17] The 2005 Live8 concerts, as part of a campaign against poverty and hunger in Africa, illustrated this. In October 2010, on youtube.com, I entered 'Live 8' and the top hits were (in descending order) not to the African musicians one might hope for, but to the groups/singers U2, Pink Floyd, Robbie Williams, Paul McCartney, Annie Lennox, The Who, Madonna, Coldplay and the Pet Shop Boys. The first African group listed was in thirty-third place, Tinariwen.

[18] See also http://www.zmk.unifreiburg.de/EuropeanSocialStructure/SeminarvorlesungSS99/william_outhwaite.htm (accessed November 2008). Said's Orientalism, wherein the dominant culture is reinforced by matching the familiar to the exotic Other, would be a further reference point. For explorations of Said's Orientalism with respect to music, see Born and Hesmondhalgh (2000: 3–11) and Clayton and Zon (2007). Note though, that it is surely desirable, as Davina Tauber points out, to avoid fetishizing otherness in the globalized market (http://www.passionfruit.com/postmodern.htm; accessed November 2008).

or as a regionalist or nationalist effort to retain a local, regional or state identity against outside infiltration. Some would contend that cultural production exists in a mutually dependent relation with political power and political opposition (after Attali 1977), or note that regimes and states increasingly struggle to impose control because of the deterritorialization that – beyond modernization and Westernization – globalization brings (after Arjun Appadurai 1996). Preservation, then, can be championed as a way to counter the processes associated with modernization and Westernization. It can underpin a sense of belonging, a belonging that is conceived of in terms of forging social identity (after Cohen 1982; 2000). It can react to dissociation from the past. It may be argued in terms of repairing the damage done by colonialism or occupation, civil war or global conflict. However articulated, it would appear that, as the pace of change has accelerated, so the clarion call to preserve has grown louder.

In 1954, Egypt's proposal to flood the valley containing the Abu Simbel temples caused international concern that, coupled to a campaign to save Venice from flooding, led to the 1964 Venice Charter. From this, and following parallel efforts to safeguard nature by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and others, the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, adopted in November 1972 at the UNESCO General Conference in Paris, emerged.[19] While this convention had little to say about the intangible cultural heritage, it can be seen in terms of the emergence of a broader debate, for by this time concerns were already being voiced about the intangible heritage. In respect to music, following Simon and Garfunkel's 'El Cóndor pasa' cover on their 1970 album, *Bridge Over Troubled Water*, which took a Bolivian melody written 58 years earlier in 1913 that imitated folk music styles, the Bolivian president questioned whether UNESCO should not protect music.[20] In fact, from 1961, UNESCO had sponsored audio recordings of traditional musics from around the world, initially within an initiative of the ethnomusicologist Alain Daniélou through the UNESCO-affiliated International Music Council; by the time the project concluded in 2003 it had grown to 115 titles on five vinyl series and (mostly as reissues) five CD series.[21]

At the 1982 UNESCO World Conference in Mexico City, the intangible heritage was firmly embedded within a Statement on Cultural Policies. This included a set of articles that discussed cultural identity, development and democracy, as well

[19] Available at http://whc.unesco.org/archive/convention-en.pdf (accessed 12 September 2011).

[20] Simon added new lyrics. He says he was told by the composer of another cover, Jorge Milchberg, that the melody was by an anonymous eighteenth-century composer.

[21] LPs were issued under the series titles 'Musical Sources', 'Musical Atlas', 'A Musical Anthology of the Orient', 'An Anthology of African Music' and 'Anthology of North Indian Classical Music', while CDs appeared as 'Music and Musicians of the World', 'Anthology of Traditional Music', 'Traditional Music of Today', 'Celebration Collection' and 'Listening to the World'.

as heritage: 'the cultural heritage of a people includes the works of its artists, architects, musicians, writers and scientists, and also the work of anonymous artists, expressions of the people's spirituality, and the body of values which give meaning to life' (Article 23); 'social and cultural conditions must be established which will facilitate, stimulate and guarantee artistic and intellectual creation without political, ideological, economic or social discrimination' (Article 28). And:

> The cultural heritage has frequently suffered damage or destruction as a result of thoughtlessness as well as the processes of urbanization, industrialization and technological penetration. But even more intolerable is the damage caused to the cultural heritage by colonialism, armed conflict, foreign occupation and the imposition of alien values. All these have the effect of severing a people's links with and obliterating the memory of its past. Preservation and appreciation of its cultural heritage then enable a people to defend its sovereignty and independence, and hence affirm and promote its cultural identity (Article 25).[22]

This statement evolved into a corpus of operational principles, administrative and budgetary practices, and procedures that were designed to provide a basis for action (Baumann 1991: 22). Subsequently, a Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore was adopted at the twenty-fifth session of the General Conference in November 1989. This still mirrored policies for the tangible heritage. It encouraged member states to develop inventories and institutions for folklore, to archive documentation and to stimulate standard typologies that would allow better global promotion (Recommendation, 'Identification of Folklore', points 1, 2 and 3), and to train collectors, archivists, documenters and other specialists (Recommendation, 'Conservation of Folklore', points 2, 3 and 6). Four years later, in 1993, UNESCO's executive board announced a Living Human Treasures policy together with a set of preliminary guidelines (as 142 EX/18 and 142 EX/48). This shifted efforts to the creators and producers of the intangible heritage, at least at the national level, although the UNESCO secretariat was charged with compiling lists and materials that were to be assembled and disseminated as a world list, much as with the by then familiar World Heritage Sites.

Rules, issued as a further set of guidelines, came in 1996.[23] The introduction to the 1996 document, as revised in 2002, states that, better than archiving and collecting, ensuring 'the bearers of the heritage continue to acquire further knowledge and skills and transmit them to the next generations' is likely to be effective. For this, 'the holders of the heritage must be identified and given official recognition' (page

---

[22] http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/files/35197/11919410061mexico_en.pdf/mexico_en.pdf (accessed 12 September 2011).

[23] 'Guidelines for the Establishment of Living Human Treasures Systems'. The updated (2002) version, which I worked on for the Korean National Commission for UNESCO, is available at http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001295/129520eo.pdf (accessed 13 September 2011)

6). However, in addition to preserving, by allowing performers and craftsmen to continue to practice their art, the holders of the heritage should both train others and 'develop and expand the frontiers' of a given tradition ('Objectives', point 2.2). This aspect challenged the notion of maintaining historical authenticity and archival forms, using lessons from the study of oral traditions, including oral literature, and also made an appeal for the maintenance of creativity (as explored in Howard 2006b) that would allow 'permanent evolutions' of heritage. This reflected the perceived need to allow for the inclusion of hybrid cultural forms found in urban areas where different cultural streams overlapped or merged.

In 1999, UNESCO and the Smithsonian Institution organized a conference to assess the impact of the 1989 Recommendation ten years on. This led to an instrument designed to better protect folklore, the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, which was put to the UNESCO General Conference in Paris in 2001.[24] Much work was also being done in the background: five pilot projects were underway using the guidelines, and setting up networks of specialized institutions, in the Hué region of Vietnam, in Niger, in Hungary and Bulgaria, in Tunisia and in Mexico City; a set of regional workshops were run (four in Korea, and one each in Italy, Japan, the Philippines and the Czech Republic between 1998 and 2002) as well as policy meetings, which attracted representatives from around forty UNESCO member states (Howard 1996 and 2006a: 18); further revisions to the guidelines and rules came in 2002, the document for which incorporated a discussion of the ongoing work. In the same year, an additional document refined the UNESCO position on cultural diversity, *Cultural Diversity: Common Heritage, Plural Identities*.[25]

In 2003, the UNESCO General Conference agreed the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.[26] This began by stating the importance of the intangible as 'a mainspring of cultural diversity and a guarantor of sustainable development'. It recognized that globalization and 'social transformation' brought 'grave threats of deterioration, disappearance and

---

[24] http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13179&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html (accessed 5 October 2011).

[25] http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001271/127161e.pdf (accessed 5 October 2011). The International Music Council, founded in 1948 by UNESCO, has also actively explored how musical diversity can be protected. See, for example, *The Effects of Globalisation on Music in Five Contrasting Cases: Australia, Germany, Nigeria, The Philippines and Uruguay* (2003; available at http://www.mca.org.au/research/research-reports/research-reports/638-the-effects-of-globalisation-on-music-in-five-contrasting-countries-australia-germany-nigeria-the-philippines-and-uruguay; accessed 6 October 2011) and *The Protection and Promotion of Musical Diversity* (2006; available at http://www.imc-cim.org/images/stories/programmes/imc_diversity_report.pdf; accessed 6 October 2011).

[26] http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001325/132540e.pdf (accessed 13 September 2011).

destruction' to this same heritage. To enable efforts to protect the heritage, it set up the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, with members elected from states that signed up to the convention. Since 2006, 24 members have been selected to the committee from the six UNESCO electoral groups, in proportion to the number of state signatories to the convention within each group. In recent years the committee has met annually to evaluate nominations from states who have signed up. In 2008, 2009 and 2010 it inscribed, respectively, 90, 91 and 51 genres, as 'elements', to a Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. Twelve of these in 2009 and four in 2010 were put on a List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.[27]

The representative list subsumed proclamations of Masterpieces in the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity. Looking more closely, the 19 Masterpiece appointments in 2001 reflected both political expediency and extra-local support, from the Korean, Chinese and Japanese genres to the cultural space of the Semeiskie 'old believers' in the Russian Federation, Georgian polyphonic singing, the Garifuna language, and dance and music in Belize. In 2003, the 28 Masterpieces proclaimed ranged from the three East Asian genres to the melodic and modal system known as *maqam* in Iraq, Azerbaijan, and Tajikistan with Uzbekistan, and other appointments for arts and crafts from Europe, Africa, Southeast Asia, South Asia, Polynesia, South America and the Caribbean. The 43 Masterpieces proclaimed in 2005 included eight from Asia, nine from Africa, 11 from Europe, four from the Middle East, seven from Latin America and the Caribbean, and four that were multinational.[28]

The UNESCO Masterpiece programme, coupled to the guidelines and the convention, has effectively tamed scholarly critique: academics were employed both by local groups and state authorities to prepare candidacy files for specific intangible arts and crafts, and by UNESCO, through its affiliated organizations, to evaluate these same files. Each Masterpiece nomination process began with the submission of a candidature file. Each member state was allowed to submit a single national candidature (but was required to secure prior agreement from the community who owned the genre concerned), although additional multinational candidatures were also permitted. The files were required to show an action plan for preservation overseen by a national body, to identify archival resources and to outline strategies for promotion. Training methods for specialists and support mechanisms were expected, as well as ways that the intangible heritage would be disseminated through publications, workshops, festivals, exhibitions and school or training programmes. In addition to a written overview of the specific intangible heritage, additional documentation might include photographs and audiovisual

[27] Other recent pertinent UNESCO actions include the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, and the adoption by the General Assembly in 2007 of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

[28] These were selected from 32, 56, and 64 candidature files submitted in 2001, 2003 and 2005 respectively.

materials. UNESCO's affiliates then commissioned reports by experts, and an international jury scrutinized both the files and the reports.

As a result of UNESCO's activities, but also pre-dating them in some cases, national preservation schemes pepper today's globe. The four that are the focus of this volume – Korea, Japan, Taiwan and China – are well established. Others, though, must first be briefly mentioned.[29] Thailand launched its National Artists Project in 1985, with individuals appointed National Artists by King Rama IX on the recommendation of scholars, experts and their peers. By the beginning of 2002, 147 had been appointed, of whom 102 were still living. Appointments were made on the basis of individual merit rather than for specific arts within four divisions (visual arts, performance arts, literature, architecture). In France, the Minister of Culture appointed 20 'Maîtres d'art' in 1994 under the jurisdiction of the Crafts Council, another 12 being nominated in 1995. Nominations came from peers, and were again for people rather than genres. The Philippines has a National Living Treasures Award (*Gawad sa Manlilikha ng Bayan*) that began in 1988 and has been administered through the National Commission for Culture and the Arts since 1992; nominations have focused on folk culture, recognizing the need to embrace the many indigenous groups of the Philippines, joining 41 individual awards of National Artists for urban and Westernized forms that had been made by December 2000 (of which 12 appointees were still living) under the *Gawad Pembansang alagad ng Sining* programme. In 1991, the ASTRA Museum in Sibiu, Romania, assumed responsibility for the national intangible heritage, which led to the Association of Romanian Folk Artists, set up in 1992 with members from all regions and ethnic groups. Poland in 1994 implemented a programme to protect 'perishing professions', and 1996 saw the creation of a charitable organization by the Uzbek government, Golden Heritage (*Oltin meros*) to search out and support customs and arts (Khurshida Mambetova 1998: 87–8). In 1997, Latvia set up its National Endowment for the Arts, while the Lao People's Democratic Republic addressed the preservation of its heritage in Presidential Decree 03 (1997) and Prime Ministerial Decree 25 (1999). The Kyrgyz Republic adopted a law to safeguard cultural heritage in 1999, Lithuania re-established its Council for the Protection of Ethnic Culture in 2000 and the Republic of Vietnam ratified a law on cultural heritage in 2001. The Czech Republic in 2001 also adopted a resolution that established the title 'Bearer of Folk Crafts Tradition'.

Turning to East Asia, Japan passed the Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties in 1950. The immediate context in which this was drafted was a fire the previous year in the main hall of the Hōryūji temple (Negi 2001: 13; Alaszewska, this volume), but it came after a series of laws and plans designed to protect the tangible heritage that had begun with the 1871 Plan for the Preservation of Ancient Artefacts (*Koki kyūbutsu hozonkata*). By 1951, Japan distinguished performing arts from craft techniques, but it adopted an approach that aimed support towards

[29] Summarized from my earlier (2002) discussion at http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001325/132540e.pdf, pages 15–18 (accessed 13 September 2011).

classical or 'high' arts. In 1954, a revision introduced a new category for folk performing arts and crafts, and from 1975 a further revision allowed folk genres greater access to support (Tsuneaki Kawamura et al. 2002: 68–9; Arisawa, this volume).[30] Further revisions have followed, and these are complemented by regional systems and their attendant legislation (Gillan, this volume). The Japanese system has proved a model for other East Asian states, as well as exerting influence on a broader stage, not least through the Tokyo-based Asia-Pacific Cultural Centre for UNESCO (ACCU), which has supported cultural activities and even the building of facilities elsewhere.

The Republic of Korea, during the period of Japanese occupation (1910–1945), had regulations controlling the movable and immovable tangible heritage, including a Temple Act (*Jisatsurei*) of 1911; much of this was adopted from Japan. While these regulations largely remained intact after the end of the Pacific War, some largely ineffectual attempts were made either side of the Korean War, in 1950 and 1954, to implement new legislation. 1962 brought the promulgation of Law 961, the Cultural Properties Preservation Law, which brought together tangible and intangible cultural properties with folk cultural properties and monuments. The law incorporated much from the earlier Japanese equivalent, but at the outset it differed in giving equal status to folk and classical or 'high' performance arts and crafts (Howard, this volume). Indeed, this was required by its aim to strengthen Korean identity by evoking nationalism (*minjok chuŭi*) in a manner that would balance modernity and Westernization as well as inculcating pride in nationhood following both the recent colonialism and the earlier subservience to China (Maliangkay, this volume). Thirteen revisions were made between 1963 and 1995 that gradually tightened and adjusted rules, and which increased sponsorship and activities. Requirements that were introduced included periodic review and assessment and, in the case of the performing arts and crafts, a requirement to give annual performances or hold annual exhibitions. From 1968, funding was provided to support 'holders' (*poyuja*) of appointed intangible cultural properties; in 1986 greater recognition was given to preservation groups and individuals; from 1999, starting with Law 5719, a comprehensive overhaul was attempted that for the intangible heritage brought in variations to the performance and teaching requirements (Howard 2006a: 1–25, and Howard, this volume).

In 1982, Taiwan passed the Cultural Heritage Protection Act. This was revised in 2005 (Ying-fen Wang, this volume). The People's Republic of China has more recently played catch-up. It issued a law for the intangible heritage in 2003 and earmarked several million dollars for preservation programmes in 2004 (Tan 2009: 157). In 2006, it issued its 'First list of national-level intangible cultural heritage' (*Di yi pi guojiagi feiwuzhi wenhua yichan minglu*), containing folk music, dance, traditional opera and narrative song. This was followed by a second list in 2008 and a third in 2010, the three containing, respectively, 518, 510 and 349 items

[30] See below for a brief discussion on how terms such as 'folk' and 'classical' are used within this volume.

(Rees, this volume). This led to the Law Concerning the Intangible Cultural Heritage of the People's Republic of China (*Zhonghua renmin gongheguo fei wuzhi wenhua yichan fa*), which came into force in June 2011. Such has been the rapid expansion that concerns are being voiced that amongst the listed Chinese intangible cultural heritage items are genres and pieces more usually associated with neighbouring states – the Korean folksong '*Arirang*' and the Kyrgyz epic heroic poem '*Manas*,' for example.

Across the East Asian region, then, the preservation discourse is well developed. It is substantially related between each of the four states. This provides our stepping off point for this volume, as an exploration of how specific music genres as intangible cultural properties have been preserved and promoted, and how the producers and creators of these genres have interacted with local and national agencies.

East Asian Music as Intangible Cultural Heritage

This volume began in April 2010 as a symposium held at the Sydney Conservatorium of Music, University of Sydney. The symposium was supported by the Commonwealth through the Australia-China Council of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, by the Korean Ministry of Culture through the Consulate General of the Republic of Korea, Sydney, and by the Academy of Chinese Calligraphy. Within the University, the symposium received assistance from the Confucius Institute, the School of Languages and Cultures, and the Australian Centre for Asian Art and Archaeology. As International Manager of the Conservatorium, Elaine Chia put in countless hours, handling the administrative nightmares that come with any symposium of this kind. I thank all of these, and the scholars, performers, calligraphers and participants who contributed to the symposium to make it memorable. Some of the essays have been commissioned subsequent to the symposium; an internal research grant from the Conservatorium enabled Joseph Toltz to proofread and check the manuscript. Other essays from the symposium will form the basis of an additional volume that I am editing with Lauren Gorfinkel; my thanks to both Joseph and Lauren for their efforts.

From a personal perspective, this volume broadens discussion from my narrowly focused monograph, *Preserving Korean Music* (Howard 2006a), and from my earlier work for the Korean National Committee for UNESCO and the International Council for Traditional Music, as the agenda has evolved. It allows the contributing authors to collectively reflect on the considerable efforts made to preserve East Asian music, to chart parallels and differences in legislation and the operation of systems for preservation and conservation, and to critique the results of intervention.

Four chapters focus on China. Helen Rees's essay began as the keynote presentation for the 2010 symposium, and reflects on how attitudes towards local and traditional music have changed and evolved over her 25-year engagement

with Chinese music. Noting the legacy of Mao Zedong's 1942 'Talks at the Yan'an Forum on Literature and Art', in which artists were required to guide the masses, she explores how attitudes began to shift from developing and modernizing arts (including music) towards an acceptance that something needed to be done to encourage the performance and transmission of traditional music. She sets out the major official policies that have been enacted, and outlines the discussions and rhetoric that surrounds them. She then offers three case studies to illustrate practice on the ground, which lead her to conclude that the shift in attitudes can be put down to several factors that include nationalism and international competitiveness, the rise of the market economy in China, and the emergence of environmental and ecological agendas. Her first case study concerns ritual music in Yunnan, specifically the Dongjing associations (*dongjinghui*) of lay musicians and ritualists that have a documented history among Han Chinese and certain minorities stretching back some 450 years. In some areas these amateur groups are flourishing today, while in others they are on the decline. Rees explores the social and economic reasons for this and focuses on two groups and traditions that are being maintained, noting their historical depth as well as their close ties to place and their community cohesion. Her second case study concerns the Naxi ethnic minority, the majority of whose members live in Lijiang county, Yunnan. She considers the survival and use of folksong and folk dance, the revival underway in the training of young *dongba* religious specialists, and the grassroots use of the Naxi Dongjing tradition for tourism – initially local, but then showcased in international tours, and coupling to changed contexts for performance and pride in music as intangible cultural heritage. Her third case study moves to the world of the literati, and the music of the seven-stringed zither, *guqin* (or *qin*). Rees learnt the *guqin* at the Shanghai Conservatory of Music in the late 1980s, when it was marginal and had little presence within the institution; today it is a UNESCO Masterpiece, and many studios flourish in Beijing and Shanghai that teach and sell the instrument. Antique instruments are highly sought, and new instruments have over two decades multiplied in price some 60 or more times.

Catherine Ingram takes us to another of China's minority groups, the Kam (C: *Dongzu*), mainly resident in southeastern Guizhou Province and the bordering areas of Hunan Province and the Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region. Ingram explores the tradition of big song (Kam: *ga lao*; C: *dage*), and the tensions and potentials apparent in both its promotion in large-scale staged and broadcast performances and through its elevation as intangible cultural heritage. Based on extensive fieldwork between 2004 and 2009, including much performance alongside local singers, Ingram distinguishes the 'village tradition' of songs that have meaning for local groups from the repertoire usually performed in staged performances. The latter, she tells us, tends to have less geographic rootedness, each song typically being short and more subject to 'artistic processing'. She discusses the most common song featured in staged performances '*Ga numleng*/ Cicada song', which originated in the village tradition but is not considered important within that tradition since it lacks meaningful lyrical content. Ingram

demonstrates the role of cultural custodians, while noting that the performance formats that have emerged through regional and national promotion have recently begun to influence how those custodians regard transmission and the future of the genre. And, while the 'village tradition' is increasingly reliant on these new performance formats, the latter's influences have begun to lead to changes based on gender, age, standardization and aesthetic considerations.

Olivia Kraef's essay concerns the Nuosu-Yi of Liangshan Prefecture in Sichuan Province, a sub-group of the Yi minority. Her focus is the *hxohxo* mouth harp, an instrument elsewhere known as the jew's harp, jaw harp, *khomus* or trump (along with many other names). With a supposed history stretching back 8,000 years, the *hxohxo* emerged in the early years of the new millennium as a key item of Liangshan's intangible cultural heritage, featuring on many audio recordings and in film, and the subject of many articles that discussed its cultural and social significance. In 2008 it was appointed at national level as an intangible cultural heritage for the instrument and its tradition in one county, Butuo, with a select band of 'representative transmitters' constituting its designated cultural custodians. Kraef explores an unfinished documentary by Nuosu pop idol Jike Qubu, as well as detailing key players and their instruments and the way that these are portrayed in published accounts. On the basis of her interviews and research, she argues that the *hxohxo* functions as an important metaphor and catalyst for the promotion of Nuosu cultural heritage, linking both to tourism and to the efforts of a previously stigmatized minority to situate itself within China and beyond. However, she also signals that the promotion of the instrument may prove its downfall: the top-down preservation policy challenges local discourse, creating authorized functions and use but straitjacketing makers and players in a way that is accelerating the instrument's decline.

The role of the media is crucial in the creation of a single Chinese nation populated by many ethnicities. This is the subject of Lauren Gorfinkel's essay. Gorfinkel provides a detailed discussion of how local and minority musical traditions are given meaning by the media in a way that then sends messages about China's ethnic composition across China. She examines special programmes, including those surrounding the Beijing 2008 Olympic Games, as well as daily and regular music video and variety shows, and the weekday '*Min'ge Zhongguo*/ Folksongs China' on China Central Television (CCTV). She explains how political issues are influential in programming, and how constructions of multi-ethnic nation-state unity are tightly controlled in shows that feature what she terms an 'orthodox' format, whereby folksongs are developed and transformed in the context of modernization and state development. This is contrasted with the more subtle negotiations that take place between the local and national in programmes featuring the *yuanshengtai* 'original ecology' style (the term here is contested; it could also be translated as 'authentic'), a style that also reflects social and state concerns, but this time concerns for protecting the intangible heritage of colourful and exoticized minority traditions. Her conclusion is that distinguishing the two formats allows us to understand various cultural, political and commercial

pressures that apply both to the transformation and to the preservation of local and minority music.

Two chapters explore Korea. Keith Howard provides an overview of the legislation and the organization of the preservation system, starting with the 1962 Cultural Property Preservation Law, then zooms in on the preservation, maintenance and sustaining of related ritual music and dance at two settings in Seoul, the Royal Ancestral Shrine (*Chongmyo*) and the Confucian Shrine (*Taesŏngjŏn*). The ritual music and dance at the first was designated important intangible cultural property (*chungyo muhyŏng munhwajae*) 1 in December 1964, and that at the second as part of the complete Ritual to Confucius, the *Sŏkchŏn taeje*, as important intangible cultural property 85 in November 1986. Both have international significance, the first being appointed in the first round of UNESCO Masterpieces in 2001, and the second held up since at least the 1980s as a model for Confucian rituals elsewhere in East Asia.

While the historical tradition of the second tracks back to 1116, and the first to the fifteenth century, Howard's essay looks at the contested claims to authenticity that have been voiced in the last decade, which on one side feature the state and the state-funded National Center for Korean Traditional Performing Arts (the Kungnip kugagwŏn; now in the process of being renamed in English as the National Gugak Center), and on the other side increasingly powerful Confucian organizations and a university, Sungkyunkwan. The Confucian shrine sits within the campus of the university. The stakes are high: in recent years the rituals have become heavily politicized and the arguments have been rehearsed in print and through the media. Authenticity and authority is contested not least because ritual music and dance was restored during the Japanese occupation of Korea, and in post-liberation Korea was preserved by those who had trained at the National Center's forerunner during the occupation; challenges have been made which question whether the restoration was faithful to the ritual practice of earlier centuries or was influenced by the Japanese colonial administration. Howard critiques both sides of the debate, asking whether the intangible cultural heritage can have a tangible form beyond that which is performed.

Roald Maliangkay focuses our attention on a single repertoire, the Ritual for Paebaengi (*Paebaengi kut*) part of important intangible cultural property 29, appointed in September 1969. The complexity of this genre and its appointment relates both to geography – the genre originated in two provinces now in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea) but is meaningful to ageing migrants living in the Republic of Korea (South Korea) – and to a recognition that the person appointed to preserve the Ritual for Paebaengi since 1984, the nonagenarian Yi Ŭn'gwan, has developed his performance of it rather than maintaining the form as transmitted to him in his youth. Maliangkay situates Yi's current performance against the available literature from South Korea, North Korea and across the Chinese border in Jilin Province, and introduces alternative versions. He concludes that, since a prerequisite of cultural iconicity is recognition, the Ritual for Paebaengi has significance to the preservation movement because of

its diversity, its humour, and its memorializing of a lost rural life, but also because it functions as a northern equivalent of the highly valued southern tradition of *p'ansori*, epic storytelling through song, which is both a UNESCO Masterpiece and important intangible cultural property 5. And, Yi is key because of his long and distinguished career, in which he has become uniquely known for recordings, broadcasts and live performances, and in which he has brought the Ritual for Paebaengi to life before audiences both in Korea and beyond.

Ying-fen Wang takes us to Taiwan, exploring cultural policies that have affected the maintenance and use of music since the mid-twentieth century, and how the preservation movement has emerged and operated over the last four decades. Wang reinterprets Nationalist policies that promoted Chinese gentry culture to legitimize its government and to demonstrate Taiwan was the guardian of Chinese culture while introducing Western classical music in its quest to modernize. She focuses on amateur music clubs that have been an integral part of communal life in Taiwanese society, constituting the main vehicle through which traditional art forms have been transmitted from generation to generation. Among the traditional forms, and based on personal involvement, she considers the classical ensemble genre of *nanguan* (*nanyin*) that originated in southern Fukien province on the Chinese mainland but which has been the staple for several hundred music clubs in Taiwan. *Nanguan* stands out as one of the best supported of traditional forms due to its high social status, neutral political position, and academic value as recognized by both foreign and domestic scholars. State intervention in *nanguan* began in 1980 and gradually increased to a peak in the second half of the 1990s; it brought many resources to clubs but also contributed to the deterioration of the *nanguan* community both in terms of musical quality and in the integrity of community members as amateur musicians, as musicians competed for money and fame. She argues that state intervention has fallen short of its goal to preserve and transmit the genre because it failed to consider the nature of *nanguan* as a pastime for self-cultivation among amateur musicians. In recent years *nanguan* from Taiwan has also been showcased on the mainland at national events.

Although the three chapters in this volume on Japanese intangible cultural properties appear after our considerations of China, Korea and Taiwan, the legislation on which property appointments were based precedes that of the other East Asian states. Shino Arisawa and Jane Alaszewska provide overviews of the legislation and how it has operated. Arisawa looks specifically at the distinction and dichotomy between classical and folk traditions, while Alaszewska details some of the steps that led to the 1950 law, and how this law and its revisions have operated over time, listing the provisions governing intangible folk cultural properties under the law's Article 56. The considerations by Arisawa and Alaszewska complement those in the essays by Rees and Wang on China and Taiwan, and by Howard and Maliangkay on Korea, and take our reservations about the typical East Asian top-down approach to preservation further, identifying how it privileges scholarly and government criteria about artistic quality – as being the product of 'human technical artistry', and as being performed/created and

transmitted by professionals rather than by amateurs – and the evaluations and authorizations that stem from this understanding.

Arisawa puts the situation into stark reality by exploring *ningyō jōruri* puppet theatre traditions, of which *bunraku* has been designated an important intangible cultural property, but for which the local tradition on which it is essentially based, in Awaji Island, is designated only as an important intangible folk cultural property. She notes how the nineteenth-century performer Bunraku-ken Uemura moved from Awaji Island to Osaka, where his successor built a theatre and named it the Bunraku-za. Through interviews with scholars and performers, and by observing rehearsals and performances, she discusses the local island tradition and also the nearby Awa tradition, asking whether evaluations within the framework for protecting intangible cultural heritage should be based on contemporary values and performance contexts.

Alaszewska presents a detailed consideration of the Chichibu Night Festival in Saitama Prefecture, held annually at the beginning of December and having origins in an Edo-period silk market. Ensembles of musicians sit hidden from view inside six floats that parade, playing a *shinobue*-type flute, *kane* gong, *ōdaiko* large drum and four small *kodaiko* drums. Alaszewska notes that Chichibu sought property designation to raise prestige and awareness of the festival, and thereby to increase tourism, rather than to protect a dying tradition. The success of the strategy led to media recordings and staged performance opportunities, which were used by individual performers to strengthen teaching and guardianship activities. This resulted in the promotion of one style over another, and introduced changes in ensemble instrumental forces. Because in the festival musicians are hidden from the audience while on stage they are the focus of attention, changes in presentation also occurred. From an oral tradition, notations emerged, along with arrangements and reinterpretations, moving the music out of its local festival context. As public property, the local tradition is not protected by copyright legislation; however, published arrangements of it are, thereby potentially removing ownership from Chichibu itself.

Matt Gillan completes the volume, discussing with reference to Okinawa how legislation has both encouraged membership of the larger Japan and supported the development of a distinct regional identity, thereby articulating national and prefecture-level cultural and political discourse. During the years following World War II, when Okinawa was under American administration and was separated politically from Japan, local concerns for intangible cultural property articulated links between Okinawa and Japan but, in the case of the *sanshin* three-stringed plucked lute, also functioned as a locus around which to construct a distinctly Okinawan identity. This was used to link to diasporic communities and to encourage the collection and repatriation of instruments and other tangible heritage that had been removed abroad. Following the return of Okinawa to Japan in 1972, the national designation of Okinawan cultural heritage then underlined membership of the Japanese nation, conferring cultural legitimacy on Okinawan performance arts in a way that glossed over a history of separation. It also, however, built on distinct

regional identity in a way that situated Okinawan genres as key components of the tourist industry.

Terminology and Romanization

Across East Asia, terminology, particularly when encountered in English translation, differs. 'Intangible cultural properties' (J: *Mukei bunkazai*; K: *Muhyŏng munhwajae*) are rendered 'intangible cultural treasures' in some texts (particularly in Japanese materials) and 'intangible cultural assets' in others (as in the recent film about an Australian jazz percussionist's journey to meet a Korean East Coast shaman ritual musician, *Intangible Asset No.82*[31]). While for much of the 1990s and since, 'properties' has tended to be commonly used, a number of official documents from the Korean Cultural Properties Office (Munhwajae ch'ŏng) refer to 'intangible cultural heritages', a neologism most likely inspired by UNESCO's Masterpieces in the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity. In Japan and Korea, the term 'intangible cultural property' may have a prefix, 'important' or 'national' (K: '*chungyo*' and '*kukpo*' respectively), to specify genres designated as the most significant or to differentiate national properties from those appointed at the provincial or city level. Artists and craftsmen appointed for their intangible property skills are 'preservers' (J: *hogoshsa*), 'holders' or 'bearers' (K: *poyuja*; J: *hojishsa*) or 'representative transmitters' (C: *daibiaoxing chuanchengren*), commonly known as 'living national treasures' (J: *ningen kokuhō*), 'living human properties' (K: *in'gan munhwajae*) or 'living human treasures' (a designation favoured by UNESCO, as a translation from the French). Some variety is also evident in the way that the titles of pertinent East Asian laws are translated into English: Japan's Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties (*bunkazai hogohō*) is, for example, also known as the Cultural Properties Protection Law or the Cultural Properties Preservation Law.

A note about the East Asian concept of 'folk' – a term already used extensively in the previous pages. 'Folk', as the Little Tradition, is in East Asian usage separated from the court, aristocratic/gentry and literati 'high' or 'classical' Great Tradition (Bauman 1992: xiii–xxi).[32] This usage, embedded within all of the systems for preservation discussed in this volume, perpetuates a definition of 'folk music' shared by the early International Folk Music Council (see Karpeles 1955: 6–7; Elbourne 1976). In this, 'folk music' is (or was) the product of an orally transmitted tradition that has been selected and utilized by an identifiable community but which is likely to have local or individual variations and which is presented by amateur rather than professional musicians. There are, of course, myriad problems with this definition. There are also many problems with the term

[31] See http://www.intangibleasset82.com (accessed 10 September 2011).

[32] See also footnote 5 to Helen Rees's essay in this volume for a fuller discussion pertinent to Chinese music.

'tradition', a term which continues to have widespread – but regionally distinct – utility in East Asia, due not least to the region's long and distinguished historical legacy.[33] 'Traditional' may also apply to court and literati musics, but in respect to the frequent correlation between 'folk' and 'traditional', it is perhaps no accident that the International Folk Music Council changed its name to the International Council for Traditional Music at a meeting in East Asia – in Seoul – in 1981.[34]

Romanization conventions used in this volume are as follows: pinyin for Chinese terms and names, for both Republic of China and People's Republic of China discussions (with romanizations for the Republic of China based on Mandarin pronunciation), with Hanyu pinyin and Naxi pinyin (in Rees's essay) except for Kam (see footnote 2 to Ingram's essay) and Nuosu-Yi (in Kraef's essay); Hepburn for Japanese; McCune-Reischauer for Korean, using the 1988 modifications of the Korean Ministry of Education (including '*shi*' rather than '*si*' to reflect pronunciation). An exception applies to personal names: names given in Chinese, Japanese or Korean in published sources are rendered using the above romanization systems, without hyphenation and with family name first, but we respect preferred spellings of personal names where the publication is in English or another European language, where an author (or musician) is well known beyond East Asia, or where an author has communicated a clear preference.

[33] For which, see the articles in *Asian Music* 12/2 (1981) by Fang Kun et al. and Thrasher, which had their genesis in a discussion on 'tradition' in respect to performances by a 'traditional' orchestra from Shanghai at the 1979 Durham Oriental Music Festival in the United Kingdom.

[34] The late Nazir Jairazbhoy, at that meeting, suggested that 'IFMC' be retained, but that the name become the 'International Forum for Music in Culture'; this would have neatly avoided the difficulties now encountered in referring to 'tradition' and 'traditional'.