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Japan created the Living National Treasures (LNT) program to protect intangible heritage practices in 1945 following World War II. Since South Korea proposed the program to UNESCO in 1993, this heritage protection system has spread to various countries over the world. The system's purpose served as part of an effort to protect intangible cultural heritage (ICH) from the destruction caused by war and cultural assimilation from imperialism. Despite how universal the LNTs program became, many cultural and heritage studies focus primarily on Japan and its influence on Japanese heritage. Few scholars have sought to examine the program's goals and ways other Asian countries utilized it, where similar programs exist. This thesis examines the LNT programs and their structures in some East-Asian countries: Japan, Korea, China, and Mongolia. As Japan and China historically held sovereignty over Korea and Mongolia respectively I explore whether the ruling states’ ICH management and LNT programs are reflected by their former dominions.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Living National Treasures (LNTs), an informal term certified by the Japanese Agency for Cultural Affairs (ACA) in 1954, are selected people or groups of individuals who excel in specific crafts and performances and are responsible for preserving Japan’s intangible culture. The ACA, an agency within the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) that regulates the cultural arts, bears the responsibility for the quality and representation of Japanese culture. It appoints qualified LNTs to a designated category called Important Intangible Cultural Property, thereby creating a class of experts specialized in Japan’s significant intangible cultural heritage (ICH). The LNTs pass on their knowledge of ICH practices to their apprentices, receiving yearly grants from the government for the training and other fulfilled responsibilities. The success of the LNT system has expanded outside Japan to the rest of the world with similarly-named programs, likely due to South Korea introducing a proposal in 1993 to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to establish an international LNT system. Thus, the program became available to countries, such as China and Mongolia, to adopt for heritage preservation and protection purposes. Although the program was created for the preservation and protection of ICH, there are economic advantages; for example, China uses the LNT program for economic advantages, while Mongolia seeks to revive their suppressed ICH. For this thesis research, I am conducting a comparative analysis of the LNT system and ICH systems of Japan, China, Korea, and Mongolia. Since Japan and China historically held colonial sovereignty over Korea and Mongolia respectively, I intend to determine whether the ruling states’ ICH management and LNT programs are reflected by their colonial history and relationships.
A review of scholarly and UNESCO literature concerning Japan’s LNT designation and program reveals that Japan and South Korea are the most prominent LNT system leaders in the world (Cang 2007; Zoric and Sang Hun 2014). Whereas Japan created the system for its own national purposes in the period 1948 to 1950, South Korea approached UNESCO to develop an international convention for ICH, starting as Living Human Treasures in 1993 and eventually leading to the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (UNESCO n.d.a). Documents and reports supplied to UNESCO by national cultural heritage and preservation agencies illustrate the national differences in the documentation of selected LNTs and the establishment of the LNT system. The creation of the LNT system is still new, more so in those countries that adopted it within the past 20 to 30 years, such as South Korea, China, and Mongolia. As I explore the topic from an economic and political viewpoint, and with an eye to colonial relationships and history impact specific LNT programs in Asia, I aim to highlight how the LNT program is operated in countries that hold different ambitions for cultural heritage.

**Brief Introduction to UNESCO’s Living National Treasure Systems**

UNESCO defines ICH as encompassing oral traditions, craftsmanship, performing arts, rituals, festive events, and social practices that survive with the skills and knowledge people have mastered or learned (UNESCO 2003). UNESCO incorporates intangible preservation into their programs, such as the Guide to the Living Human Treasure System and the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the ICH. However, the Guidelines for the establishment of Living Human Treasure Systems were discontinued in favor of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the ICH (UNESCO n.d). Before these programs were put in place, UNESCO already had prior experience with safeguarding ICH, such as the 1972 Convention for the
Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage (Kurin 2018). While the 1972
convention oversaw the restoration, conservation, and preservation of tangible
monuments, sites, and landscapes, countries such as Bolivia suggested also addressing
oral traditions (Kurin 2018).

The 1989 Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and
Folklore resulted from these efforts. Although this program was created to safeguard,
preserve, and recognize intangible practices in all countries (UNESCO, 1989), only
the governments of a few countries enforced it (Kurin 2018). The 1993 Guide was not
the only intangible cultural heritage program to be developed, as UNESCO’s Japanese
diplomat Koichiro Matsuura instituted the Masterpieces of the Oral and ICH program,
which ran from 2001 to 2005 (Kurin 2018). The Masterpieces program was similar to
the 1989 Recommendation in that it sought to raise awareness of ICH. Still, it
implemented a list-making process of oral and ICH, encouraging its members to
participate in establishing national inventories (Kurin 2018). This list-making process,
and the participation of traditional artists and local practitioners, were used in the

The 2003 Intangible Cultural Heritage convention prioritizes the following
objectives: identification and inventorization; awareness-raising and promotion;
research and documentation; education; and the recognition of Living Human
Treasures within ICH (Blake 2014). The convention has one chapter relevant for this
comparative study: safeguarding ICH at the national level (UNESCO 2003). State
Members have a responsibility, as stated in article 11 (item. a and b) to “take the
necessary measures to ensure the safeguarding of the ICH present in [their] territory
[...] [and to] identify and define the various elements of the ICH present in [their]
territory, with the participation of communities, groups, and relevant
non-governmental organizations” (UNESCO 2003). These measures would include articles 12 and 13, addressing Inventories and Other Measures for Safeguarding, respectively. Article 12 commits members to keeping a regularly updated inventory list with the LNT system that fits the country's political, cultural, and economic goals in regards to ICH. When the country submits this list to the Committee, it must provide relevant information on these inventories (UNESCO 2003). Article 1 subsection b refers to the designation of one or more bodies to ensure safeguarding in the country's territory (UNESCO 2003). While the 2003 convention has shown that ICH development has begun in many countries, setting itself apart from other cultural heritage preservation instruments, it has not been fully implemented or appropriately used for cultural heritage (Blake 2014).

**Literature Review**

This thesis builds on existing scholarship on East Asian heritage management and ICH protection in East Asian countries. Studies have sought to examine how East Asian heritage management changed as colonialism and war led to the destruction of cultural properties and shifting identities. ICH protection and heritage management systems are often developed due to situations in which cultural assets, properties, and institutions may be mishandled, stolen, or simply destroyed if there are no heritage protection or heritage management systems already in place to address issues of threat or risk. While heritage management is in place to protect, preserve, and conserve heritage, countries have used it for other purposes such as tourism or political exposure in the cultural domain.

**Cultural Heritage Management Systems in Japan**

After World War II, scholarship examining the historical shift in Japan’s political status and social environment began to emerge. In this period, heritage preservation
and protection resources were also developed that explore Japan’s cultural heritage trajectory from the prewar to postwar era (Trifu 2017; Scott 2003; Noriaki 2015). While these resources touch on heritage management, ICH is less frequently discussed, scholarship emerging only when Japan began to preserve ICH through its management systems (Hafstein 2009; Asakura 2016; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2004).

Scholarship interest on Japan's and South Korea’s heritage management systems seem to be abundant digitally, while detailed discussion on heritage management systems in other East Asian nations such as China and Mongolia seem to be scarce as of the time of writing of this thesis (Rossi 2018; Aikawa-Faure 2014; Dronjic 2017). The nations, Japan, China, South Korea, and Mongolia have complex colonial histories. Japan and China have been colonizers, and South Korea and Mongolia were colonized. While the colonial era has passed, its legacy continues to live on through the continuing post-colonial influence of Western heritage management systems.

Historical studies indicate that pre-WII Japan was once as a nation that best profited upper-class citizens, who disproportionately controlled luxuries, such as the arts (Noriaki 2015, 80; Kakiuchi 2016). The ability to participate in the arts, such as calligraphy or painting, represented wealth as only the rich could afford the arts or practice within the field. Japan itself did not start heritage management until the Meiji administration began to modernize the country after Westernization (Noriaki 2015: 80). Many of these studies (Noriaki 2015; Miyata 2012; Ogino 2016; Kakiuchi 2016) look at heritage management through the emergence of preservation laws, which often cover tangible heritage, such as historical buildings and natural landscapes. While these preservation laws are relevant to explain heritage management, studies often fail to show how they fit into Japan’s current model of ICH heritage management.
Noriaki’s (2015) study of modern-day Japan’s heritage management reveals there is much societal debate about what national heritage is most in need of protection (88). Noriaki acknowledges that, according to the list of laws that target preservation and natural parks, cultural properties and natural preservation are seen to be most urgent (Noriaki 2015, 88). The responsibility for tangible preservation, and currently all preservation, lies with the central and local governments (Noriaki 2015, 88; Kakiuchi 2016). While no new laws protecting ICH have been passed, there have been multiple amendments to the LPCP. These amendments suggest that although the protection of ICH is essential, heritage management has become more about economic development (Kakiuchi 2016; Zoric and Sang Hun 2014).

Documentation, often referred to as list-making in some studies, is used to keep track of cultural property and functions to some extent to promote the protection of cultural property (Miyata 2012). Scholars often discuss documentation of intangible heritage and list-making, but lack detailed descriptions of the process from reliable sources. The ACA website possess only one page dedicated to LNTs (Scott 2003: 318). While the scarcity of resources does not justify the lack of information of LNTs, it explains the difficulty of finding government documentation for the subject of ICH (Scott 2003, 318). While contemporary heritage management often lacks depth when discussing the preservation of ICH and documentation, the subject of ICH is broad enough to cover essential preservation techniques and concerns.

Intangible Cultural Heritage in Japan and Korea

Although Korean ICH policies emerged during the period of Japanese colonization, scholarship shows that Korea used Japanese colonial policies as foundations toward creating policies that fit its national identity and need for safeguarding its cultural heritage (Maliangkay and Frederick and Frederick 2017;
Regardless of how intangible preservation in the two countries developed, the two countries are primarily responsible for developing ICH preservation practices globally (Akagawa 2016; Kono, 2019; Hafstein 2018). The scholarly literature on this topic focuses on two prominent ICH laws: Japan’s 1950 Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties (Hafstein 2018; Scott 2003) and South Korea’s 1962 Cultural Property Preservation Law (CPPL) (Hafstein 2018; Kim al et 2012). Scholars (Noriaki 2015; Aikawa-Faure 2014; Zoric and Sang Hun 2014) often reference these laws, as they discuss relevant ICH practices and concerns with regard to intangible cultural properties, showing the importance of their function for ICH legal preservation in heritage management (UNESCO 1950; Rossi 2018; Scott 2003). Laws such as the Law for the Promotion of Traditional Craft Industries of 1974 exist, but their presence is not as acknowledged in most scholarship on Japan, possibly due to their failure to improve traditional craft industries (Kakiuchi 2016, 23). Compared to Japanese ICH management, Korea has been continuously working on adding new laws for ICH safeguarding, such as the Act on the Safeguarding and Promotion of Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2015 (Rossi 2018, 92), still relatively new at this time.

Scholars of Japanese ICH literature focus on three categories covered under the LPCP: intangible cultural property, intangible folk cultural properties, and preservation techniques for cultural properties (Miyata 2013; UNESCO 1950; Cang 2007: 47). Similarly, Korean ICH literature focuses on different categories covered by ICH. Under the CPPL, there are four categories: Tangible Cultural Property, Intangible Cultural Property, Monuments, and Folklore Cultural Property (UNESCO 1950). Intangible Cultural Property and Folklore Cultural Property are the two main categories that will be based on this thesis. Intangible Cultural Property is defined as encompassing the performing arts, music, certain types of dances, ceremonies, and
applied art techniques (Kim et al. 2012, 24; Cang 2007, 47). Folklore Cultural Properties are customs regarded as necessities for an individual’s lifestyle, including annual events concerning religion and lifestyle, and daily necessities such as clothing, utensils, food, and houses (Kim et al. 2012, 24; Cang 2007, 47). The two categories are approached differently by the national government as the practices involved are not the same. For example, pottery techniques and music fall under intangible cultural property, and religious rites and festivals are considered part of Folklore Cultural Property (Cage 2007, 48).

Living National Treasures, or Living Human Treasures, fall under the intangible cultural property category within each country’s safeguarding system. Studies that focus on comparisons between the two systems examine how the main intangible categories are similar, though their designation processes differ. Research has noted that Japan placed a set budget that dictates the number of possible state-designated holders (Rossi 2018, 116; Aikawa-Faure 2014, 43), which leaves ICH practices neglected if the capacity is filled, but the designated ICH element still needs a holder. By contrast, the Korean system acknowledges various individuals or groups by awarding titles such as “honorary holders” and “training successors”, who receive benefits similar to LNTs (Rossi 2018, 116-117). As the number of Korean LNTs is unlimited, this allows South Korea to fill all designated ICH elements, unlike Japan. Rossi (2018) notes that some ICH practices will end up neglected due to limit on the total number of LNTs allowed in Japan (118). Two factors exacerbate this decision. One is the low budget given to successors and their training (ACA 2020, 10). Since Japanese LNTs receive an annual salary, the ACA keeps the capacity of 116 to stay within the budget (Aikawa-Faure 2014). In South Korea, budgets are not an issue as they receive monthly payments and this allows for new LNTs to be selected if needed
The second is due to the fact that LNTs cannot have their title withdrawn once it has been assigned, with the exception of death or resignation, which rarely occurs (Aikawa-Faure 2014). However, Japan and Korea have their LNT systems designated to properly manage their heritage and fulfill their own needs, which may be economic, political, or a combination of both.

**Economic and Political Benefits and Issues Regarding ICH Management**

Scholars often allude to the economic and political advantages brought by tangible heritage and ICH. As the scope of scholarship on ICH within East Asia is limited, these studies observe various UNESCO state members’ economic and political motivations. State members use cultural assets to their advantage by nominating these assets for UNESCO lists to attract tourist and tourism revenues, using their culture to further their economic goals and needs (You and Hardwick 2020, 13-14; Di Giovine 2009, 52-53). Heritage lists, such as UNESCO’s World Heritage and Proclamation of Masterpieces, contribute significantly to the increasing economic and political power of state members by using cultural assets to bolster national pride as well as needed financial income (You and Hardwick 2020, 14; Logan et al. 2015). While scholars recognize issues with the nominees for Heritage Sites and Masterpieces, such as disregard for human rights and indigenous communities, they agree that the advantages nominated cultural assets bring to specific communities mitigate the risk of disappearance of tangible heritage and ICH (Hafstein 2009; Logan et al. 2015).

ICH activities are one of the forms of tourism that countries advertise, whether through their cultural government pages, such as the World Heritage list and Japan’s ACA. Studies by Blake (2018) and Scovazzi (2019) detail how more hands-on activities, such as handicrafts and community intangible practices, often align with
tourist activities to achieve economic growth. Achieving economic growth is, at present, an interest shared by the majority of Japanese citizens (Noriaki 2015, 88; Kakiuchi 2016). Multiple scholars have described tourism as a significant factor in governments using cultural heritage to achieve economic growth and promote their heritage internationally (Blake 2018, 5; Frey and Steiner 2010, 9; Di Giovine 2009, 57, 124-125). Countries such as Japan benefited after World War II from using tourism and heritage to improve their economic growth and gain economic power, especially by financially supporting UNESCO (Akagawa 2016, 72; You and Hardwick 2020, 6).

However, scholarship also reveals the negative consequences of tourism for local communities despite the economic growth it brings to the country. When tangible heritage sites and natural landscapes face increased tourism and pressure to meet tourist needs, local communities are placed in situations in which they begin to lose their contemporary lifestyles and culture practices to become leisure activities for foreigners. Silverman and Bluemfield’s (2013, 10) study of local communities shows that details of these communities are on display for others, shifting their cultural identities to an outsider’s perspective. Another means of examining the exploitation of local communities is by investigating folklore, once a tool to reassert colonized people’s spiritual heritage and status against their oppressors (Logan et al. 2015, 9). ICH and Folklore traditions end up as tourist attractions due to the economic advantages they carry, making them a political benefit for the country while it shows off its heritage values (Hanani et al. 2013, 449).

Scholars and critics reflect that political power, while benefiting national leaders and politicians, hinders individuals that may be bearers, holders, or volunteers, from receiving proper recognition and disconnects ICH from communities of origin
While this can be an issue for local communities, as mentioned above, scholars acknowledge that communities engage themselves in shifting personal, historical, political, and religious fields according to the context they are facing. Due to this situation, they intentionally transform their art, passing it onto the next generation (You and Hardwick 2020, 14).

Thesis Methodology

In this thesis, I examined the differences and similarities in creating and managing cultural heritage systems in Japan, South Korea, China, and Mongolia. The results of these examinations were used to determine whether the similarities originated from Japan and whether the differences point to the uniqueness that the countries had their own part in ICH policies. This study also considers the role of colonial history and post-colonial relationship in the way that they may impact the development of national LNT systems in Asia. To determine the difference between Japan’s and China’s influence and how South Korea and Mongolia conducted themselves beyond their previous suppressors influence, I also investigated East Asia’s ICH climate. Topics were of interest in my research include: the governance and politics of cultural heritage; cultural gender roles in the arts; preservation issues and their management; and list-making procedures of LNTs to determine how individuals and groups are categorized to the requirements set by the government.

Given the current pandemic, I depended mainly on secondary sources from academic scholars and historians to answer my research questions. Due to language barriers and the inaccessibility of physical documents, most of the secondary sources are academic papers and books. The sources touch on various fields such as governance and politics, preservation, heritage studies, East Asian studies, and cultural property. The fields gave my analysis insight into each East Asian nation and
into how each country incorporated the LNT system to benefit its heritage needs. Furthermore, these fields provided the foundation of the thesis, as my comparative analysis examined the literature closely to identify commonalities. My primary sources were government documents and first-hand observations from news media archives and first person accounts regarding the intangible cultural policies and historical events. These documents come from the Japanese, Chinese, Korean, and Mongolian government website pages, Internet archives, and newspaper articles.

My analysis compared Japan to South Korea and China to Mongolia, focusing on Japan’s and China’s influence on the cultures of the respective countries they are compared to. My analysis compared the following attributes for each country: what brought the LNT program to the government; their LNT program structure; whether these countries had previous experience with ICH management; and how the program may have created or changed their way of managing heritage. Although the LNT programs took place after WWII, this thesis touches onto pre-WWII history in order to study the post-colonial relationships that could have influenced the LNT development in the countries. These relationships include Japan’s occupation of Korea that lasted from 1911 until 1945. Japan suppressed the majority of Korea’s cultural heritage and tried to force on a new national identity to the colonized country. Japan's attempt to assimilate Koreans into adopting Japanese culture may have destructed or altered Korean culture in the past. While Japan had colonized Korea, the Japanese Empire continued its expansion into further territories including China. This expansion eventually resulted into the second Sino-Japanese war. Although China had advantages of a large territory, Japan invaded Nanjing in 1937, resulting in the Nanjing Massacre. Japan and China’s relationship since opposing each other in various wars, WWII and the Cold War, still resembles that of rival imperialist leaders.
Only now, they focus on geopolitics and soft power by using heritage. Before Japan and China engaged in war against each other, China was preoccupied with Mongolia. In 1911, Mongolia, known as Outer Mongolia then, separated from China to claim their independence. In order to avoid China reclaiming them, Mongolia allied with the Soviet Union which had enough military power to defend the smaller country. Although China never had the chance to reclaim Mongolia due to damages inflicted by Japan and the agreement to free them after WWII, Mongolia still depends on China for economic comfort despite tensions of war between the two countries. China’s imperialist attitude still exists over Mongolia to a certain extent that China often exerts pressure on Mongolia to make decisions that suit the Chinese political agenda.

This thesis focuses on the government websites of Japan, China, and Mongolia to identify information on ICH and LNT programs and their management. I reviewed agency reports covering the period from 1900 through 2020, focusing on ICH laws, heritage management and required responsibilities, and relevant information on the LNT program. The scholarly literature that I focus upon is primarily in English. I used websites including Google Scholar, Academia, Research Gate, and Jstor to find my secondary sources. I used the Wayback Machine website to find archived government pages, documentaries, and national archival material. Since archival research for LNTs is difficult to conduct due to limited resources, I focused upon UNESCO’s digital library, the National Archives of Japan, South Korea, and China, the Japan Center for Asian Historical Records, the World Digital Archive, and the Internet Archive.
Chapter Two: Japan

Heritage management in Japan has gone through drastic changes since the end of WWII. The development of heritage preservation and conservation appeals to Japan's past and present concerns while also intending to preserve modern culture. An important factor in the development of ICH management was a collaboration with the Allied Forces during the Allied occupation (1945-1952). While the Japanese government still had authority to make heritage preservation and protection decisions, many of these decisions were done with the input of the Allied government. A positive result of the Allied occupation for ICH was the LPCP, including the LNT program. The LNT program fosters an appreciation of the people who produce works of art and ensure the continuity of heritage and practices and practitioner lineages under threat of disappearance. To grasp the significance of why the LNT program is important and how it contributes to ICH requires an examination of Japan’s post-war history. Since the Allied occupation, Japan has sought to reshape its international image from a brutal militant imperialist force into a cultured nation. The development and implementation of cultural heritage policies has played a significant role in that image.

In this chapter, I will build the foundation of how Japan started preservation practices for ICH and how it grew from an emergent concept to one that would be a significant part of their culture. During Allied Occupation, American and European officials worked with the Japanese government to save their threatened heritage to develop solutions for preserving ICH. I will also discuss the LNT designation program and procedure in Japan and examine the ways in which Japan’s system influenced UNESCO’s LNT development. As Japan worked along with UNESCO on
ICH management, I will also make observations in how Japan benefited from the collaboration.

A Brief History of Postwar Japan and the 1950 Law

Japan’s entry into World War II resulted in US air raids on major Japanese cities, with the US dropping atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. These military activities significantly damaged Japanese heritage places and practices. When Japan attacked Pearl Harbor in 1941, the US retaliated quickly by taking the battlefield to Japanese soil (Fedman and Karacas 2012). The war took thousands of lives, destroying multiple significant cities such as Tokyo, Hiroshima, and Nagasaki. During the air raids, the US forces destroyed many historic buildings and structures, most prominently several temples, such as Senso-ji and Zojo-ji, in Tokyo (Trifu 2017, 212). Smaller cities of low strategic value, such as Nara and Kamakura, survived and kept their historical buildings intact (Trifu 2017, 212; Noriaki 2015, 82-83). This does not mean, however, that these areas may not have faced other preservation issues.

While culturally-significant areas like Nara and Kamakura were not bombed, intangible cultural assets, such as traditional craftsmanship, faced the threat of disappearing. This danger was due to several factors. First, Japan suspended most of its preservation policies in order to allow art objects to be mined for materials and repurposed for the war effort. Second, the retirement and death of skilled artisans also accelerated the threat of the loss of heritage (Trifu 2017, 212; Scott 2003, 45 and 351; Noriaki 2015, 82). Third, the recruitment of Japanese soldiers and the aging population of artists and performers led to fewer individuals who would continue working in the arts during, and after, the war.

The desire to salvage and protect Japan’s cultural properties and traditions, specifically ICH, from such wartime destruction led to the creation of the LNT
program through the passing of the Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties (LPCP) in 1950. This bill was drafted in 1949 by the Sub-Committee of Cultural Affairs, part of the Education Committee of the House of Councillors, and the United States, which occupied Japan after the war until 1952 (Trifu 2017, 224; Scott 2003, 380). The bill expanded Japan’s cultural focus from tangible heritage and preservation techniques to include safeguarding its ICH by designating as LNTs a wide range of individuals and groups in charge of the preservation of designated crafts, such as the arts of ceramics, dance, textiles, and music.

The Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP), a civil organization, took charge of Japan’s occupation administration in 1945. This organization was almost entirely staffed by American officials, who worked primarily with the Japanese government (Trifu 2017, 206). General Douglas MacArthur, who was serving already as part of the Far East Commission (FEC) which served as a high policy-making body, was selected to perform a dual command role within SCAP. In this position, General MacArthur declared the official protection and preservation of historical, cultural, and religious objects and installations (Scott 2003, 353). He and other US officials of the Allied forces worked alongside the Japanese government under occupation for particular causes, such as the demilitarization and democratization of Japan and the restoration of Japan’s cultural preservation after years of inactivity. While conflicts did occur due to Japan’s occupational control and its management of the occupied reform programs (Trifu 2017, 206), the two forces worked together on heritage protection.

During the Allied occupation, tensions began to arise between the United States and Soviet Union known as the Cold War (1947 - 1991). Although this geopolitical conflict was between the United States and Soviet Union, many countries were caught
within the tensions and alliances were forming quickly (Leeds and Mattes 2007, 188, 194). While the majority of American personnel that occupied Japan were US officials, there was no official alliance during the standoff (Schaller 2010, 156). The U.S. had concerns for Asia as the continent was within the sphere of communist influence, making Japan's role important. Plans to set up an American military outpost in Japan began in 1947, but in 1949 Japan was proposed by the US to play as part of an ‘island chain’ that would be part of the security and military power against the Soviet Union (Dower 1993, 180). This became an issue as the Korean War broke out in 1950, prompting the U.S. to determinedly build up their military power on Okinawa and four main islands of Japan (Dower 1993, 180).

It was unpredictable whether Japan would remain democratic or be fully onboard the anticommunist cause. The U.S. during the Occupation supported Japanese citizens, such as providing meals as the country was in a food crisis (Kida 2012, 381). The trade worked with the U.S. providing food and Japan exported craft products, worth millions of yen, to the U.S. (Kida 2012, 381). Craft products were ideal forms of payment since Japan had easily obtainable resources and the U.S. economically benefited from the demand Americans had for Japanese products (Kida 2012, 381). The craft trade with the U.S. became an important connection between the U.S. and Japan. Despite concerns Japan may become communist, the U.S. allowed Japan to repay them with crafts for years and gave direction for what American people wanted to see (Kida 2012, 382). The project of the craft-for-food production reassessed what was ‘tradition’ in crafts, according to ‘Japaneseness’ (Kida 2012, 384). These crafts began as industrial handicrafts with a simple Japanese design, but later changed to represent everyday life of the Japanese (Kida 2012, 383-384). Americans wished to see products that the Japanese used or designs that were unique in Japanese culture
The appreciation of the revival of traditional crafts by SCAP and Japan’s cultural policy with the U.S. were what the U.S. wished for to divert Japan’s attention from communism (Kida 2012, 384). The unpredictable circumstances induced ideas of a future peace treaty or extension of the Occupation with Japan until further notice. However, Japan was given their independence back in 1951 when the Allied Occupation came to an end and a majority of American troops were leaving (citation). Although the Occupation came to an end, the U.S. still held concern over Japan’s state of security. The U.S. wanted Japan to increase their military and restrict who they traded with, mainly communist nations like the Soviet Union and China (Schaller 2010, 157). Japan opposed any rush to rearm, and was fine with the US’s handling of Japan’s security issues (Schaller 2010, 157). The U.S. eventually backed down due to Japan’s economic issues at the time.

While SCAP was in Japan, they were involved with heritage protection that began when the Ministry of Education resumed its preservation activities and assessed the state of historical buildings and objects damaged by the war (Trifu 2017, 212 and 214). General MacArthur enforced the Allied military officers’ duties to protect “recognized” Japanese cultural heritage. The directive ordered a survey to assess war damages and any risks that Japan’s cultural objects and historical sites faced (Trifu 2017, 216). Professor Langdon Warner and U.S. Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson were two prominent figures who also focused on the protection of Japanese culture before the occupation. They advocated for the protection of Kyoto and Nara to be spared from bombing (Scott 2003, 356; Trifu 2017, 212). Though Kyoto, Nara, and Kamakura did not face any destruction from bombing, Nara had a termite infestation and mildew problem. At the same time, Kyoto’s National Treasures Preservation Association could not afford the proper preservation of national treasures (Scott 2003,
National treasures differ from LNTs as the first consists of tangible elements while the latter are people. The issues for preservation of national treasures would eventually fall under the remit of the SCAP’s Religion and Cultural Resource Division, formerly two separate divisions (the Religion Division and Cultural Resource Division) (Scott 2003).

Much of the responsibility for the initiation and recommendations for the management and funding of cultural properties was undertaken by the Arts and Monuments (A&M) branch of the Religion and Cultural Resource Division (Scott 2003, 353; Trifu 2017, 216). Along with the SCAP, the A&M was influential in guiding the Japanese government toward the subject of cultural property (Scott 2003). The influence of the A&M is shown by how it overcame early difficulties with cooperation from the Japanese government. The branch asked the Ministry of Education to compile a register of treasures for the 1929 Law for the Protection of National Treasures. However, Japanese officials had already burned such registers at the time of surrender (Scott 2003, 361). While some records survived, that action pushed the A&M to take stronger action when necessary (Scott 2003, 362). Despite the A&M possessing authority, it still encountered repentance when it imposed key a revision for the National Treasure Law. The revision created a new category, Important Cultural Property, that designated important art objects into one of two categories: National Treasures and Important Art Objects (Scott 2003, 362). Within each of these categories, entries would be assigned to two or more classes according to their degree of importance (Trifu 2017, 222). Although this reason was originally planned for the National Treasure Law, it would eventually lead to the two-class system incorporated into the LPCP. By 1949, the drafting process for the LPCP had begun, largely due to the shock of one of Nara’s temples, Horyu-ji, burning in a fire
Various other concerns, such as the Japanese tax scheme, theft, the risk of fires, and perceived Japanese perspectives, also led the drafting of the bill to be more successful than previously rejected attempts (Trifu 2017; Scott 2003).

Other preservation laws existed in Japan before the LPCP. These included the Places of Scenic Beauty and Natural Monuments of 1919, 1929 National Treasure Law and the Law for the Preservation of Historic Sites, and the Law for The Preservation of Important Art Objects of 1933 (Scott 2003, 346). However, these laws did not anticipate ICH properties later at risk after World War II. The drafting process saw various bill changes from the A&M and the Ministry of Education that shared similar interests in emphasizing a sound cultural property law (Scott 2003, 380). This progressed with only minor modifications concerning private property rights and government interference with the crafts (Scott 2003, 384-385). Passing these concerns, the Bill passed the House of Councilors on May 30th, 1950, and became effective by the end of August (Scott 2003, 386). Since its creation, the LPCP bill’s scope is to preserve and protect Japan’s cultural properties based on their historic and artistic value for heritage (Trifu 2017, 210 and 225; Scott 2003, 385). Since 1950, the LPCP underwent few revisions to include or change aspects of the law to improve its efficiency for Japanese heritage. In 1954, the Japanese government added “Important Intangible Cultural Property” designated according to artistic and historical values to the LCPC. This new article included intangible practices and individuals or groups to ensure these practices were passed onto future generations (Aikawa-Faure 2014, 41). This system eventually became more popularly known as the Living National (or Human) Treasures program.

The LNT Program Procedure
The government agency that manages Japan’s LNT program is known as the National Commission for the Protection of Cultural Properties (NCPCP). According to Adachi (1978), for an individual person or group to qualify as a living treasure, they must display specific characteristics in its place balance of artistry, technique, historical position, and specific individual qualities that revolve around their personal lives and attitude. The agency then follows up with an investigation according to the Committee for the Protection of Cultural Properties’ proposal, relying on advice from the Committee of Examining Experts. The final decision comes from the Minister of Education, who presents a list of qualified individuals and groups for approval before a full cabinet (Adachi 1978; Miyata 2011). These candidates become officially known to the government as bearers or holders, distinguished from honorary bearers or holders (UNESCO 1950; Cultural Heritage Administration 2015a). Recent candidates have included Maeta Akihiro for Hakuji pottery and Fukushima Zenzo for Koishiwara-yaki pottery (Gallery Japan n.d.; Gordenker 2019; ACA 2020, 8).

Candidates receive national honors and are held responsible for students’ education in craft, methods, and style. The training process is not clear in Japan as it seems left up to holders as to how they use the special grant for training potential successors (Kikuchi 2011, 16). The Japan Craft Association, an organization that is dedicated to specialized fields of traditional crafts centered on LNTs, conducts study sessions and workshops for different branches of the organization nationwide (Japan Kogei Association n.d.). This organization also hosts the annual Japan Traditional Crafts Exhibition, which showcases the work of LNTs (Japan Kogei Association n.d.). However, the association does not come up often in scholarship that mentions the training of LNTs successors (Kikuchi 2011; ACA n.d.a,b), but the association is occasionally mentioned as having become part of LNTs (Kida 2019, 200). Arnove
and Matsuda (2009, 47 and 51) discuss apprenticeships as they apply to LNTs, mentioning that it is common for successors to come from family members who became professional artists, though not always by choice. Apprenticeships in all art forms, whether in craftsmanship or the performing arts, require extensive amounts of time to work on the craft (Arnove and Matsuda 2009, 47). There is often a hierarchy among the apprentices, where more senior apprentices work with younger ones and even teach them (Arnove and Matsuda 2009, 47). An apprentice should thoughtfully choose their teacher as their chosen teacher would be their only master for as long as possible (Arnove and Matsuda 2009, 48; Cang 2007, 52). Teaching begins when potential successors are six years old and tend to be extremely strict, resulting in methods, which range from scoldings to physical apprehending. It would not be uncommon for a master to slap an apprentice in the face or throw training instruments at a disobedient student. Such behavior is normal as it is part of the lesson of learning from mistakes (Arnove and Matsuda 2009, 48). Styles of teaching vary by teacher, as some may concentrate on teaching basic techniques while others cultivate the artistic sense, and creative freedom that is permitted once students reach a more advanced level (Arnove and Matsuda 2009, 49).

The ACA categorizes the Japanese LNT list within the inventory for “important intangible cultural properties.” They label these cultural properties “important” as the Agency designates them according to the historical or artistic value they hold. Unimportant intangible cultural properties do not receive protection but are recorded for documentation and public display. They are placed under a category as ‘Intangible Cultural Properties requiring documentation and other measures’ (ACA n.d.a, 10; ACA n.d.b). Although the ACA does not properly mark what these unimportant Intangible Cultural Properties are and leaves it to the assumption they could be older
practices like Falconry that is more for entertainment now. The documentation is carried out by the government and funding provided for documentation projects, to both local governmental and nongovernmental organizations (NGO) (ACA n.d.a, 10). The list of important intangible cultural properties focuses on bearers, recognized individuals or organizations, who possess advanced skills in a specific traditional practice.

There is a three-step process for the nomination of individuals or groups for Japan’s LNT designation. First, the ACA produces a list of candidates, including past and present individuals, known as holders. Along with these candidates, they also consider their possible successors. Second, the list is narrowed down by MEXT according to two categories: new holders and existing holders (UNESCO 1950; ACA 2018). The ACA does this according to the annual budget that the government provides for grants for LNTs. To stay within the budget, it sets a maximum of 116 potentially recognized individuals (Aikawa-Faure 2014). For an individual or cultural property to be recognized as “important”, they are designated by the MEXT and judged by an “importance” requirement that relies on value judgment (Kono, 2019). According to the 1950 LPCP in Chapter 27 of article 71, the value judgment states that the MEXT will recognize the bearer or bearing body of intangible culture property formally as “Important Intangible Cultural Property” (UNESCO, 1950).

In addition to the budget, the list is narrowed down based on the number of empty positions from delisted holders, who are commonly delisted due to death or resignation (Aikawa-Faure, 2014). Once narrowed down, the ACA determines which candidates are appropriate for the vacant positions. Last, the documents for the chosen candidates are submitted to the Sub-Committee of Cultural Affairs, where a panel of specialized experts in cultural properties are assigned to the Council for Cultural
Affairs (Miyata 2012). Experts investigate the individuals to determine their artistic and technical skills and overall quality as an individual or group (Aikawa-Faure 2014; Adachi 1978). “Overall quality”, in terms of the investigation, is determined by the following factors listed by Aikawa-Faure (2014): the state of an individual’s health; any previous awards; the number of their successors; their position or status within their specific craft community; and, lastly, their personalities and abilities. While the expert panel investigates candidates, the sub-committee releases the documents’ content to the public through media organizations such as the Official Gazette (UNESCO, 1950) and The Japan Times.

**Current State of the LNT System and Heritage Management**

Scholars have not noted any significant changes within the LNT system since its initial implementation. However, smaller incremental modifications are worth noting. The LPCP was last amended in 2018 (ACA 2019, 5) with the amendments, officially going into effect April 1st 2019 (Shimada 2018). Although UNESCO’s latest version was last amended in 2007, on the recent pamphlet provides a timeline of various modifications to the LPCP made since 2019. These recent amendments added on two things: they established a planning system for cultural property protection and utilization, and they developed a structure to accommodate participation of diverse inheritors (ACA 2019, 5). This focused on a certification system for prefectural principles and municipal regional plans, the latter a designation system for Cultural Property Protection and Utilization Support Organizations. The new amendment predominantly aimed to create a system for owners of cultural properties and private sectors in the support organizations. According to legal scholars (Shimada 2018), the amendments gave owners of cultural properties certain functions along with private sectors to protect and utilize cultural property. Owners create a protection and
utilization plan that goes to the government for approval. If the plan is approved, the private sector will protect the property and offer the owners assistance and advice regarding the proper utilization of the property to ensure its preservation. Lastly, an education council in the municipality will draw up a plan, if consulted by the Support Group or private sector, similar to the owners, but for its regional jurisdiction for the central government to approve (Shimada 2018). The new addition to the law utilizes local cultural properties for tourism and regional development, and offers a growing plan of how countries like Japan use their heritage to benefit the country.

A number of ideas for the LNT program have been suggested by the ACA, primarily as a way of expanding the range of crafts recognized by the LNT program. At the present time, only traditional craftsmanship and performing arts are eligible to be recognized as LNT’s (UNESCO 1950). In the future, culinary may be considered as traditional food has become increasingly significant in Japan (Kyodo News, 2020). In 2013, Japan nominated Washoku, a traditional dietary cuisine, for the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (UNESCO 8. COM 8.17 2013). According to the filing, Washoku’s cultural significance is tied to its importance in rituals connected to the celebration of the New Year, during which deities of the incoming year are welcomed with dishes posing special meaning. Some countries, including Turkey and France, have added cuisine or specific dishes to the Representative List (“Washoku Designated UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage” 2014). Likewise, Japan defined Washoku in their nomination as “a social practice based on a set of skills, knowledge, practice and traditions related to the production, processing, preparation and consumption of food” (UNESCO 2013). Food can be recognized as ICH since the practice strengthens family and community social structures. With relationships across generations within families, food encourages
engagement between different communities and encourages healthy eating (UNESCO 2013) to combat the higher consumption westernized meals and poor eating habits ("Washoku Designated UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage" 2014). At the same time, an article from the Kyodo News (2020) reveal that the government push to classify Washoku, or food, as a LNT classification also listed the practice for designation to encourage tourism and exports. If culinary is to be added to the program, it will take time for the designation to be come forward as the ACA will have to determine proper criteria as the category of food, food practices, and culinary arts can be complex compared to traditional arts (Kyodo 2020). Both the decision to add food and the determination of how it applies to ICH will be a discussed in relation to the other countries discussed in this research (China, South Korea, and Mongolia) to see how they engage in this topic and if they will follow Japan since they announced the news.

Engagement between LNT’s and apprentices has been going through changes in recent years, though it is generally the same concept as previously described. The primary change has been the creation of an official successor system, which is a training program for first-rate artists and LNT’s to teach interested high school graduates the arts (Arnove and Matsuda 2009, 52). These graduates would come from families that do not have connections to any schools related to the arts. Thus, the program enables the students to study from a variety of various teachers (Arnove and Matsuda 2009, 52). Another issue with designation of candidates is the role of gender in the arts. Japanese women, while the most active members in the Japan Craft Association (McDowell 1999, 20), often face discrimination toward their skills or after in jobs and apprenticeships that do not give recognition to their participation (McDowell 1999, 12). Jennifer McDowell (1999, 12) noted there were only several
women named LNT’s. While there is not a comprehensively official list or early assembled data base online for comparisons today, the lists that are currently available make it clear that men often outnumber women in the LNT program (ACA n.d.a, 8). While opportunities for women in the arts has increased since pre-WWII, there are still restrictions for women in the arts, for example, in the male-dominated are kabuki and noh (Arhive and Matsuda 2009, 52). Involvement of women in male-dominated arts, such as pottery, increased before the beginning of the 20th century (Walton 2013, 16). Ōsumi Yukie was the first to break the standards of male-dominated fields when she became the first female LNT designated in metalwork (Greenbaum 2017, 3). While her talents do not rely on her gender, she represents women in a craft that would typically would be a forbidden domain.

As Japan maintains the LNT system for specific situations, such as the need for designation once a spot opens, heritage management focuses on the preservation of intangible heritage through list-making and tourism. Although tourism only recently became tied to the strategy of clarifying LNTs, list-making has been relevant since the Allied Occupation when they initiated the 1950 law (Scott 2003; UNESCO 1950). The Masterpieces of Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity — though technically UNESCO’s — and Important Cultural Properties are two lists that fall under heritage management for Japan. The UNESCO ICH list is a universal list that works in Japan’s favor as an extra measure of preservation and claiming their heritage. By adding ICH techniques or activities to this list, Japan is also increasing international interest in their cultural tourism. Many countries do the same with lists, along with the World Heritage List, to promote international tourism for the attention and protection of their culture (Frey and Steiner 2010, 5-6). List-making in Japan has undergone designation to become part of the 1950 law as part of Important Intangible Cultural Properties.
(UNESCO 1950). As the performances or craftsmanship depend on the artists to fulfill them, these lists typically rely on the LNTs. However, the 1950 law and the adopted 2003 Convention are the only two legal documents that focus on ICH preservation and protection (ACA 2019, 4-5, 12). While these lists do bring attention to the need to preserve ICH and use the LNT as the means for it, the lists also serve the purpose of encouraging tourists to visit heritage sites and become interested in the nation's culture.

The Tourism National Promotion Basic Law was revised entirely in 2006 to improve measures to attract international tourism (Kakichi 2014, 7). The government created other laws such as the Visit Japan Campaign and Japan Tourism Agency within the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport, and Tourism. These laws are two examples that utilize local cultural assets to promote tourist attractions (Kakichi 2014, 7). Two local cultural assets that fall under these laws are traditional industries such as the craft industries and National Theaters, which promote ICH activities. Tangible cultural properties like theaters that house ICH activities, such as kabuki, serve as venues for protection and entertainment (Konagaya 2020, 51). ICH preservation grew from the maintenance of local traditions to the international promotion of national culture.

**Japanese Involvement with World Heritage**

Japan has been a member-state of UNESCO since 1951 and is one of its largest financial contributors (Kono 2019, 55; National Archives of Japan n.d.). Just a year after it joined UNESCO, Japan opened the Japanese National Commission for UNESCO in Tokyo that cooperated with the UN organization (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) n.d.). Cooperation with UNESCO relied on the organization to coordinate UNESCO-related activities with the Japanese
Government and civil society organizations (MEXT n.d.). UNESCO’s involvement in Japan before the country officially joined was motivated by two goals: renouncing the war and becoming a cultured nation through concerns of domestic and international heritage (Saikawa 2016, 117). While UNESCO looked for remorse within Japanese citizenry and their rejection of the image of war, Japan looked to become a “nation of culture”, leading a peace movement that showed Japan was leaving militarism behind for democracy (Saikawa 2016, 117). Although UNESCO had its motivations for cultivating Japan’s cooperation and gestures towards peace, Japan aimed to restructure its domestic cultural policy and reintegrate into international society (Saikawa 2016, 117).

Despite the fact that UNESCO’s private engagement with Japan began in 1947, the organization’s public investment did not expand to include it until China submitted a general resolution for UNESCO to include Japan in 1951 (Saikawa 2016, 117). Although China and Japan did not have good relations due to the Nanjing Massacre in 1939-1940, China did not want Japan to remain under SCAP’s influence. According to Saikawa (2016, 120), it was possible that China wanted to ensure that they held influence over Japan during the Allied Occupation by using UNESCO. While Japan and UNESCO held an equal interest in each other, SCAP held little interest in UNESCO until the organization’s growth in Japan. UNESCO sent a Chinese diplomat to collect information from SCAP after the general resolution was approved in 1948, preceding a multitude of meetings with SCAP and Japanese officials (Saikawa 2016, 118). Thus, SCAP determined whether UNESCO’s objectives and potential outcomes could be potentially good for the country (Saikawa, 2016: 118). China’s representative determined that SCAP’s influence over Japan hindered UNESCO from extending its work and that instead, the Far Eastern
Commission should be the highest decision-making body in terms of the occupation (Saikawa 2016, 118). UNESCO accepted this suggestion and appointed the Far Eastern Commission as the official liaison between UNESCO and Japan’s UNESCO activities and plans to reeducate the Japanese population (Saikawa 2016, 118). By removing SCAP from the communication, Japan was brought back into the geopolitics of East Asia through UNESCO, eventually shifting UNESCO’s standards away from eurocentrism.

Japan was also the first member permitted to join UNESCO after WWII (Kono 2019, 55). The Japanese National Commission that was formed soon after followed the following procedure of establishment, according to Kono (2019): “...no more than 60 members...one president and two vice presidents. The Commission consists of six committees, i.e. management, selection, education, natural science, humanities and social science, cultural activities, communication, and public relations.” (56). The National Commission would be responsible for carrying out analysis and research for advancing major projects and evaluating the impact of UNESCO’s activities (MEXT n.d.). One of these projects included UNESCO’s LNT program. While Japan did not start the LNT project nor was named on the 1993 proposal (with credit going to the the ROK with support from Pakistan, the Philippines, Argentina, China, Thailand, and Turkey), Japan did contribute financial support (Aikawa-Faure 2014, 47). The LNT program was eventually moved to the 2003 Convention, involving a similar concept to Japan’s LNT designation process (Kurin 2007, 16). As Japan was the first country to establish the system, it led discussions and steps for the creation of the convention (MOFA 2021). This is likely why UNESCO chose Japan as a member for the Intergovernmental Committee in the first official period that the Convention went into effect (MOFA 2019). Japan continued to lead in the convention as an influential
country. Japan hosted the 2nd session of the committee in 2007 and was a committee member from 2010-2014 (MOFA 2019). The respect for Japan's contribution and influence in the development of ICH preservation is acknowledged by UNESCO by allowing Japan to be in the first committee for the development of the new ICH preservation convention.

**Conclusion**

It is critical that ICH be protected, not only for the preservation of cultural practices, but also in the event of war. Post World War II, Japan acknowledged the importance of ICH for the continuation of national cultural practices as well as maintaining its sense of cultural identity within generations of families that may be involved in the traditional arts, performing arts, or folk culture that might lose touch with their history and their ancestors if practices are lost. While younger generations may not be as concerned with the past, especially as globalization and westernization has strongly impacted Japan, it is also clear that younger Japanese citizens still have an appreciation for traditional cultural practices and a concern for their protection. The LNT program ensures that the art forms of the past will not disappear and will continue to be passed down for generations through families or interested students. Along with the contribution that Japan has made to heritage management within the country, newer methods of preservation and conservation for heritage appear overall. The LNT program in Japan marked the official beginning of formal ICH preservation by using individuals or groups to handle the responsibilities of passing traditions onto the next generation and keeping the ICH element alive. Japan’s success on the LNT program is measured by factors such as international recognition for the LNTs, manageable capacity of designated holders and ICH properties, and its economic advantages for the country. In terms of ICH preservation, Japan takes pride in the
work it has accomplished with SCAP, their own government, and alongside UNESCO. The foundation Japan has built is sturdy, and the country is finding ways to improve heritage protection in the face of national disasters, such as earthquakes, tsunamis, and now, COVID-19, which at the time of this writing continues to challenge most in-person activities. In the next chapter, I will discuss the comparative analysis with the Republic of Korea, a former colony of Japan that remains strongly influenced by it.
Chapter Three: Republic of Korea

From the time of its colonization by Japan and the Cold War and Korean War that followed, the Republic of Korea’s relationship with its past has been shaped by geopolitics. South Korea, or better referred to as the Republic of Korea (ROK), created a international presence through UNESCO for their ICH in the mid-20th century after Japanese occupation (1910-1945), the Korean War (1950-1953), and westernization by the United Nations (UN) (Yim 2002; Chang-Il 2010). As discussed in Chapter 1 and 2, Japan exerts a strong cultural, political and economic presence within East Asia, despite this presence being mostly attributable to tangible heritage (Trifu 2017). The ROK and Japan share a long history of conflict before the occupation, but Japan's attempt to colonize Korea permanently changed the way the two interact. In this chapter, I will be investigating the shared history of ROK and what led to the foundation of the Cultural Property Protection Law (CPPL) and the later creation of the ROK LNT program. I will also include other factors which impacted the ROK’s national identity, such as the Korean War and brief westernization from the UN and contact with the Cold War.

Colonization of Korea to the Decolonization of ROK

The Japanese colonization of Korea in 1910 strongly influenced both its approach to ICH management and the implementation of the LNT program in the country (Kleiner 2001). Not only did Japan’s control over Korea greatly impact Koreans’ sense of national identity, but the later Korean War in 1950 also played a part in the investment of cultural heritage preservation programs. Japan’s motivations for seeking to colonize Korea were driven by trade interests and concerns about national security, as, at the time, both China and Russia were attempting to assert their
political influence in Korea (Kleiner 2001; Lee 2000, 125). In efforts to justify the exertion of power, the Japanese engaged in an imperial project of rewriting Korean histories. They described contemporary Korea as not yet having achieved the levels of modernity that Japan had entered into during the Meiji era (1868-1912), and they cast Koreans as their ‘primitive’ selves (Atkins 2010, 55–56). In the name of modernization, the Japanese implemented policies that dismantled Korean traditions and rituals and that sought to transform distinctively Korean ways of life and cultural habits (Maliangkhay 2017). A good example can be seen in the realm of folk religion. In Korea, shamanism had long been embedded in the performing arts to communicate spiritually. However, according to Japanese scholars at the time, this religious practice was considered part of a primitive culture that refused to modernize (Atkins 2010, 117). The Japanese perceived aspects of Korean folk culture as primitive, both in the sense of unsophisticated and unchanged from the past, and in their assumed need for Japanese help to enter the modern age.

Following the Japanese annexation in 1910, the first decade of Japan’s colonial presence was one of coercive military rule. (Kang 2016, 383; Atkins 2010). The Japanese imperial suppression sparked anti-Japanese resistance movements such as the March First Independence Movement of 1919, the first public display of Korean resistance (Lee 2000, 120). Despite their failures to achieve independence, these movements sparked unity and nationalist sentiment in Korean citizens (Kang 2016, 384; Lee 2000, 131). The Japanese command over Korea was overseen by a government set up specifically to oversee colonial affairs, known as the Government-General of Chōsen (GGC). While the GGC oversaw control of Korea for the entire occupation (Maliangkay and Frederick and Frederick 2017, 26), the focus here will be on its control over cultural policy and treatment of Koreans’ lifestyles and
representation of themselves. The lifestyle for Koreans changed and, in some respects, Japanese individuals that chose to live in Korea led better lives as they were wealthier (Hwang-Hyeon 1971; Nambuk 1928) and lived their traditional lifestyles (Atkins 2010; Maliangkay and Frederick and Frederick 2017). While the Koreans faced difficulties during Japanese colonization, Korean nationalism was a factor that kept citizens from giving into their rulers.

Since the Japanese government had no hope in the Koreans’ capacity to preserve their own culture, it took this matter into its own hands with one of the reforms it enacted. In actuality, this was part of the imperial rhetoric that Japan followed as it placed itself in a position of control over the colony. The GGC imposed authority and control over management of Korean culture as a way of integrating Japanese culture across Korea. While on the surface it appeared that the GGC aimed to preserve as much of Korea’s culture as possible to conserve and understand it, it also disregarded much of it. This can be seen in various forms of symbolic violence during the early colonial period, such as the construction of the GGC headquarters on the site of the demolished Kyŏngbok Palace complex (Atkins 2010, 122). Furthermore, the Japanese government continued to remove significant buildings near the palace and replace several sites with Shinto shrines, office buildings, and even a zoo in place of the Changgyong Palace (Atkins 2010, 122). While these historical Korean locations were removed and replaced, the process of historical erasure extended to physical objects from archaeological grounds and the palaces (Maliangkay 2017, 25). Korean artifacts and objects, despite their religious functions, were placed into Japanese museums built on Korean palace grounds (Maliangkay 2017, 25). Before the occupation, the Japanese had already opened tombs and sent thousands of pieces of Korean pottery back to Japan (Maliangkay 2017, 29). This transference of the
colony’s ‘treasures’ to the home-country of the colonial power is typical of colonialism, with the objects typically losing their true purpose and political contexts in the process. As these objects were wrongfully removed from Korea, Japanese curators may not have been fully aware of, or may even have willfully erased, the objects’ original meanings in the tombs, redefining them as simple objects of admiration.

Traditional Korean folk culture such as village festivals, folk songs, folk craft, and folk theater also faced suppression under the GGC’s control (Atkins 2010, 94–95). An example of suppression was the tactic the Japanese used against Korean folk crafts. Part of the esteem for Korean ceramics declined during the Meiji period, but it revived during the colonization as men like Yanaji Muneyoshi saw the aesthetic appeal of the Korean methods (Atkins 2010, 110). However, despite the appeal, Korean ceramics was a collapsing industry as the Japanese transported materials like clay to Japan for their own ceramics, a reflection of Japan’s concern for the preservation of the old rather than innovation (Atkins 2010, 111–112).

Emerging due to the suppression caused by the Japanese imperial presence and actions in Korea, ch’angguk used older performing traditions as a form of rebelling against the forced upon Japanese identity and modernization (Killick 2002). However, the GGC was more concerned with indecency than the political message of ch’angguk/these folk performances. (Atkins 2010, 117–118). Ch’angguk is a type of opera that emerged during the beginning of the 20th century. It is closely related to p’ansori, a form of musical story-telling, although speculated to be the same with a different name (Killick 2003, 45-46). Ch’angguk came to represent tradition, as when Korean theaters would perform “new-school” dramas from the Japanese model, p’ansori singers tried to appeal to tradition and switched to “old drama” (Killick 2001,
Although this first stage of folk performance was seen more as “old fashion” than traditional, it was only the first stage of ch’angguk. The second stage came during the mid-1930’s through a strong revival of the performance. During this time, there were traditional Korean ideals that ch’angguk should represent its own unique form of drama and presentation of Korean folk culture (Killick 2001, 61-62). This indicates that although the GGC was probably aware of the defiant connotations of the performances, they were not concerned that Koreans would overpower the Japanese empire or suppress their efforts to establish a Japanese national identity in Korea. Surprisingly, though, despite the GGC’s advocation of a Japanese national identity, it often changed its stance. For example, it banned songs and dancing at night without permission in 1911, but in the 1920s holiday events and folk-art performances were allowed on a limited scale with prior approval for Japanese scholars to study them (Atkins 2010, 120). While Japan tried to portray its annexation of Korea to the world as for the benefit of the uncivilized Korean culture, scholarly research shows that it instead aimed to benefit Japan and satisfy its imperial aspirations of territorial and political expansion.

Japan’s colonization of Korea extended through its involvement as a major Axis Power during World War II. When the war came to an end in 1945, Japan surrendered and was placed under Allied Occupation, and specifically under the authority of the United States (Trifu 2017; Scott 2003). This turn of events brought about both the mass migration of individuals between the two countries. For the most part, Japanese individuals residing in Korea returned to Japan. However, the majority of Koreans who had been resettled in Japan were forced to remain (Babicz 2013, 206).

One motivation for the Japanese decision to surrender to the U.S. forces through the United Nations (UN) was Japan’s desire to avoid being overtaken in Korea by the
Soviet Union. Since the Soviets entered from the North, the U.S. were concerned that they would not be able to stop them from completely taking over Korea as they were closer to the South (Chang-II 2010, 21–22). In 1945, the decision to split Korea at the 38th parallel, based on the only map available to the U.S. in one of the colonels’ offices was undertaken to prevent further Soviet advancement into the colony (Chang-II 2010, 22; Campbell 2014, 3). Consequently, this decision had both geographical and political impact. Geographically, it split up natural waterways, man-made roads, and even someone’s home; politically, the ideology of each side gravitated toward its occupational leaders (Chang-II 2010, 22–23). The North would be left to the Soviet Forces and the South to the US forces. General MacArthur, Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Forces, received approval from the President for this idea and added it to the instructions communicated to British allies and the Soviet Forces (Kleiner 2001, 49). The Soviets and the U.S. stayed in Korea, refusing to relinquish control in fear the other side would not leave (Campbell 2014, 5). Thus, the Koreans were placed in the middle of what would eventually become the Cold War in 1947 to 1991 and, later, the Korean War from 1950 to 1953.

The Korean War displaced citizens from their familiar society and commonly their families. The division of Korea marked a cultural mixture between the North and the South often at level of the family. For example a semi-autobiographical novel, *The Father of a Son* (2011), highlights the forcible separation of a nameless father from his home (Won-Chung 2015, 3). He visits his family in a town just across the line to the North and is forcefully drafted into the North Korean army. He later joins the South Korean Army when he is captured by the UN forces but experiences emotions of yearning for freedom and mobility, as did Koreans exiled to the South. The nameless father in the novel exemplifies the larger plight of Koreans during the war
who could not see their families again, a situation left them in a state of wishing for freedom and depending on the nostalgia of memories to cope. As the North became communist and socialist due to the Soviets’ control, the South became capitalist and embraced democracy (Yim 2002, 39; Vierthaler 2020, 3; Campbell 2014).

While the Koreans were free from Japanese occupation, the UN, with the help of the U.S. government, eventually increased the cultural and political divide within Korea by prolonging their encampment in what became the Republic of Korea (ROK) (Yim 2002). To a certain extent, the UN’s presence controlled how the new Korean government operated and promoted the influence of westernization on an already changing culture (Rossi 2018). The Korean nation’s traditions and customs disorient from traditional Korean ideals as the North’s artistic activities became more socialist, moving further away from arts based on capitalism and western democracy (Yim 2002, 39).

Cultural Policies under Japanese Control

The GGC’s control of cultural preservation and heritage management led to the creation of museums for Korean relics and the development of sites for historical tourism, as well as the reformation of folk culture. In 1916, the GGC formed the Investigation of Korean Antiquities, whose committee members were individuals from the GGC bureaucracy (Atkins 2010, 99). The 1916 law pertaining to the Regulations for the Preservation of Ancient Remains and Relics focused on the following actions: archaeological documentation, the writing of the discovery reports, any necessary removal, repair, or disposal of discoveries, and the provision of appropriate preservation techniques for relics and remains (Atkins 2010, 99; Maliangkhay 2017, 31). The GGC took control over archaeological and preservation activities and deemed whether these objects or national treasures were worth the
protection. By controlling the preservation of historical landmarks and relics, it was controlling what would remain of Korean national identity.

By 1933, the Regulations for the Preservation of Ancient Remains and Relics were replaced with the Law for the Preservation of Natural Monuments, Places of Scenic Beauty and Historic Interest, and Treasures in Korea (Malianghkay 2017, 32). As the 1916 law neglected to define national treasures properly—indeed, the term itself was absent from Korean laws despite its use in Japan (Malianghkay 2017, 33)—the 1933 law expanded the definition of what was classified as treasures (Atkins 2010, 100). Along with this definition, the new law expanded on the concept of the cultural properties it would preserve and included preservation methods for archaeological purposes (Malianghkay 2017, 32). Although Japan’s rhetoric emphasized that its policies were for the benefit of the Korean citizens, it is clear that the Japanese were motivated by their political agenda (Malianghkay 2017, 33). The reinterpretation of Korean history, destruction of national landmarks, and reshaping of folk culture were for the interests of personal groups that viewed Koreans as colonial subjects. For decades until 1945, the Japanese empire benefited from leaching Korean resources and culture for Japan’s own benefit.

The 1962 Cultural Property Protection Law (CPPL) is the most notable law to appear in South Korea from Japan’s occupation of Korea. The CPPL was based on the LPCP but with numerous amendments that made it unique to the Koreans’ situation. However, the LPCP laid out the foundation of the legal system that would protect cultural heritage in the ROK. The CPPL, like the LPCP, does not only focus on ICH, but also the different aspects of heritage provision needed and various sorts of cultural properties (Rossi 2018, 89). Although the CPPL aims to improve cultural preservation for the people, the focus is on the nation itself to constantly make social developments
and achieve new advancements. While this objective is supposed to be achieved without losing Korean cultural traditions specificity, the Park administration disregarded many traditional cultural practices such as Shamanism when the law first came out (Rossi 2018). The CPPL sought modernization parallel to Japan rather than continuing with traditions that they deemed as encumbrances to Korea from achieving scientific, economic, or diplomatic advancements. Regardless of following the Japanese heritage management model, the CPPL sought to concentrate on four categories of properties: tangible, intangible, monuments, and folklore materials (Rossi 2018, 89; Cultural Heritage Administration 2015b).

In 2015, the Act on the Safeguarding and Promotion of Intangible Cultural Heritage branched off from the CPPL. While the CPPL mentions ICH protection and preservation, the new act focuses on safeguarding ICH and the importance of intangible heritage in the ROK (Rossi 2018, 92). This act diverts from the LPCP in a sense as it draws from the 2003 Convention that the ROK and Japan, along with other state members, developed with UNESCO (Rossi 2018, 93). The 2015 Act contrasts with the CPPL, which was oriented more around the nation (Rossi 2018, 94). Its purpose statement details the desire for “the citizens to utilize such traditional culture through the safeguarding and promotion of intangible cultural heritage” (Cultural Heritage Administration 2015a). The emphasis on “citizens” marked a significant shift in rhetoric which previously been disregarded for the state of the nation, placing the nation’s people first as they are the key to the preservation of ICH. The mindset of the Japanese occupation, as well as the regime under the Park Administration with the UN, hindered the potential of a proper revival of national identity. Furthermore, the CPPL replicated the LPCP on the LNT procedure, though since then the new act has
made the different titles clear and emphasized how the system works for them (Cultural Heritage Administration 2015; Rossi 2018, 94).

Following the introduction of the Safeguarding and Promotion Act, many cultural heritage policies adopted by different government administrations have focused on economic and social development. These plans often overlooked ICH unless it offered the possibility of improving the economy, through craft industries and tourism (Park 2016). Recently, within the 21st century, digitization has been becoming more of a priority for preservation as it becomes more widely adopted by modern society (Park 2016), leaving ICH vulnerable to disappearing as skill and artisanship may not be digitized. To return to ICH and folk heritage, the ROK has done more than the Japanese and moved far from the foundation for heritage management they settled on. As Maliangkay and Frederick (2017, 50) observes, the ROK’s national heritage preservation is founded on the Japanese system but has developed significantly over time, such that it clearly stands on its own and can now be distinguished from the Japanese system. Indeed, while the Japanese do workshops for ICH preservation, they have not made any national legislation for ICH like the ROK.

**LNT Creation and Procedure**

The LNT program in the ROK was created in 1962 as the country adopted the CPPL, introducing protection for ICH and the rise of Korean nationalism (Rossi 2018, 73). The CPPL’s creation could have been a controversial decision at the time as it was made during Park Chong-Hui’s dictatorship. Part of his reign oversaw the creation of a new republic that eliminated any political propaganda against the Park Administration (Rossi 2018). Shamanic rituals were used by college students to protest the government’s suppression of traditional and democratic ways (Rossi 2018). Going against the CPPL, the New Village Movement (1971–1973) sought to bring
modernization and discourage traditional costumes, further suppressing the religious and cultural expressions that were part of Korean social customs (Rossi 2018). Although the movement focused on community development, such as modernizing villages and roads, it emphasized on mental revolution (Sonn and Gimm 2013, 26-27). Abandoning superstitions, focusing on family planning, and dressing in everyday attire were a few examples of these mental revolutions that supposedly helped modernize Koreans as capitalist workers (Sonn and Gimm 2013, 27). Koreans were discouraged from reverting to traditional customs (Sonn and Gimm 2013, 27). The Park government assigned leaders that demonstrated extensive knowledge and sacrifices for the sake of convincing the villagers to accept modern ways of living (Sonn and Gimm 2013, 28-29). What was already suppressed during the Japanese occupation only made the matter of traditional culture worse. Although the CPPL was created during Park’s dictatorship and went against his own views of the West, it functioned as part of his portrayal of himself as a nationalist to distract from the removal of freedom and democracy (Rossi 2018, 76; Howard 2002, 2). This also explains the similarities of the CPPL to the Japanese LPCP as Park was enrolled in the Manchukuo Military Academy during the Japanese occupation and later became a second lieutenant in the Japanese army (Rossi 2018, 76). While the Japanese LNT program was amended a few years after the creation of the LPCP (Trifu 2017; Scott 2003), the CPPL immediately created a similar one. Despite the anti-Japanese sentiment still prevalent among Korean citizens, Park harbored a close relationship with his previous suppressor and, as dictator, he reestablished the ROK’s economic relationship with Japan (Rossi 2018, 76–77).

The ROK, UNESCO, and many countries use term ‘Living Human Treasure’ (LHT) opposed to ‘Living National Treasure’. The term may reflect how the ROK felt
it needed to reestablish its national identity through its traditional culture and cultural practices. This is further demonstrated by comparing the two laws’ purposes: the LPCP states that “the purpose of the present law is to preserve and utilize cultural property objects so that the cultural quality of the nation can be enhanced, thereby contributing to the evolution of world culture” (UNESCO 1950, 1); in contrast, the CPPL attempts to “contrive the cultural progress of the people and to contribute to the development of human culture…” (Howard 2002, 2). While both seem similarly worded, the Korean act focuses on social customs that are emphasized through folk culture (Howard 2002). While the CPPL is still in use today, it has gone through multiple amendments, one being the movement of the LNT designation process to the Act on the Safeguarding and Promotion of Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2015 (Dronjic 2017, 13).

The procedure starts when an ICH item is designated and announced by the Official Gazette, which leads the Cultural Heritage Administration (CHA)—the adjunct organization of the Minister of Culture, Tourism and Sport—to designate a holder (Rossi 2018, 431). These designations come from the submission of applications from local organizations of potential holders (Aikawa-Faure 2014, 45). The CHA, while in charge of designating individuals or groups, works alongside the Cultural Properties Committee (Aikawa-Faure 2014, 45). This committee is made up of sixty members that are experts in potentially beneficial fields for selection, such as folklore, anthropology, history, religion, and architecture (Jong-Sung 2004, 183). For a holder to be designated, an ICH item that also falls under the responsibility of the committee must first be designated. Fifty of the sixty members of the committee are considered technical members responsible for investigating and researching all materials relevant to a specific valuable ICH, which they then report to the whole
committee (Jong-Sung 2004, 183). Once the item is designated and considered of importance, the committee moves to consider potential individuals or groups that fall under a developed hierarchy system (Dronjic 2017, 15). Holders and group holders assume the role of LNTs if they pass the investigation and examination by the committee (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2008). After deliberation once more on whether the recently designated ICH will have a bearer, they announce once again through the Official Gazette their decision on a holder (Aikawa-Faure 2014, 45; Cultural Heritage Administration 2015a). Not only does the holder or group holder receive the notification that they are LNTs, but honorary and assistant instructors are also notified that they have received the special honor (Cultural Heritage Administration 2015a).

The procedures for the ROK’s LNT designation are almost identical in terms of the qualifications sought in bearers to other East Asian systems. However, the ROK does show clear differences in the positions that can be filled, the number of potential bearers that can be designated, and even the benefits or consequences designated individuals may receive. Conversely, the Korean LNT hierarchy system does not only designate LNTs but also potential individuals or groups that could educate others alongside LNTs. According to the Act on the Safeguarding and Promotion of Intangible Cultural Heritage (2015), the Korean LNT hierarchy system defines specific terms such as holder, group holder, assistant instructor for successor training, certified trainee, successor, and honorary holder.

Each individual or group is organized into three stages for training under Living National Treasures in their respective fields. According to Yim (2004, in Lupu, Tanase, and Tudorache 2016) and Park (n.d., 5), in Korea, the training stages are beginners, advanced, and assistant instructors. As beginners, LNTs provide recruits
with induction training, and those that have more potential than others have the opportunity of becoming ‘successor scholarship recipients’ (Dronjic 2017, 15; Park n.d., 5). After at least five years of training, trainees or recipients of certificates of completion can move onto the advanced level (Dronjic 2017, 15; Park n.d., 5). For this to happen, recruits need to pass a test led by one or more LNTs in their respective area and become better known as students by this point. The last position these students and former trainees can reach is that of assistant instructors, which requires the demonstration of outstanding abilities. The students must be selected by the LNTs, as they will assist in structuring and implementing the previous training (Yim 2004, in Lupu, Tanase, and Tudorache 2016) and receive recognition from the Korean Administrator of the Cultural Heritage Administration (Cultural Heritage Administration 2015b). The assistant instructors then work with the LNTs to train other trainees and advanced students (Park n.d., 5). These apprentices have the most opportunity to become successors to their mentors as they work to attain the same level of expertise (Dronjic 2017, 15). Those that do not participate in the training, the honorary holders, are simply individuals that lost their place because they were deemed unfit (Dronjic 2017, 16). This can be due to a physical or mental disability or old age, and the title of honorary holder leaves these individuals with dignity (Park n.d., 6). Were an LNT to pass away with no successor in place to continue the craft, the important ICH property, a category of designated ICH elements with higher preservation priority, would lose its designation as well (Aikawa-Faure 2014, 44).

While the LPCP does state that an LNT could lose their position in the event of death, for mental or physical reasons, or when an ICH property is annulled, this rarely happens except in the case of death (UNESCO 1950, Aikawa-Faure 2014, 44). Although the same could be seen in the ROK, the emphasis on the education that
LNTs provide for possible successors and the designation of annulled LNTs as honorary shows the commitment to ICH preservation. The LNTs in the ROK are also given financial support monthly, as well as assistant instructors, successors, and honorary holders (Dronjic 2017, 16; Cultural Heritage Administration 2015a). In addition to these monthly expenses, they also receive financial support for medical insurance and funeral expenses (Dronjic 2017, 16; Rossi 2018, 105). Another minor concern that arises occasionally in the literature is the age of LNTs. Typically, an LNT is older when they are designated or remain designated despite their age or lack of activity (Aikawa-Faure 2014, 44; Maliangkay and Frederick 2017, 49). However, since the 1990s the ROK has begun to appoint younger candidates as LNTs because some ICH activities require athletic strength or stamina to perform in certain circumstances, such as theater, dance, and singing (Maliangkay and Frederick 2017, 49). Younger candidates do not prevent older candidates from becoming LNTs, rather they represent the fact that certain qualifications are more beneficial for the preservation of ICH than the experience of age alone.

**Important ICH properties under the ROK**

The ROK focuses on important ICH properties in terms of craftsmanship, theater, rituals, and, in some instances, food. The ROK leaves the number of possible designations indefinite; according to Choi (2014) 180 active holder’s listed and 570 holders in total. The ROK focuses on folk traditions and practices that involve rituals, whether for religious or ancestral purposes or in relation to storytelling. Examples of these, respectively, are the Gangneung Danoje Festival, the Royal Ancestral Ritual in the Jongmyo Shrine and its Music, and the Pansori Epic Chant (UNESCO 2008, 7). The Royal Ancestral Ritual in the Jongmyo Shrine and its Music was indeed the first on Korea’s national designation list for important ICH properties in 1964 (Soul 2014).
These practices were disregarded or prohibited during the Japanese occupation and the Korean War divided the country’s cultural and traditional identity. However, once the CPPL was created and the ROK began to manage its own preservation practices, working alongside UNESCO, it started to reclaim its heritage and establish its ICH. The decision to primarily focus on Folk Cultural Heritage is certainly due to the Japanese occupation and the events that followed it, especially as the LPCP did not add Folk Cultural Heritage until 1975 (Rossi 2018, 90). Both South and North Korea shared similar traditions and customs before the events of the Japanese occupation, the Korean War, and the UN’s stay in the ROK. The similar traditions and practices include designation and focus on folk culture are relevant to these cases, especially for individuals that can still remember those moments in their life or have heard them passed down through generations.

**Conclusion**

The impact that Japan had on the ROK’s cultural heritage, and specifically on their ICH and national identity, is the influence that drove ROK to start their heritage management system; this led to the creation of the CPPL and eventually the LNT program. Arguably, Japan forced its influence upon Korea and altered the occupied nation’s cultural heritage. Traditions were suppressed or changed to appeal to tourism and more Japanese-oriented ideologies. While Japanese scholars and historians were record-keeping Korean culture and traditions out of personal interest and preservation, the governing powers were disinterested in preservation. Furthermore, the CPPL law was influenced from the LPCP and previous Japanese laws enforced from the occupational period. Japanese influence exists within the ROK’s ICH preservation, but the ROK moved further away as a result of the creation of the CPPL and developed their own policies such as the 2015 Safeguarding and Promotion of ICH
act. The act gives further information on the progress of the LNT program, as well as the Ministry of Culture, Tourism, and Sport dedicating more information than the ACA’s website. The Japanese influence may not now be evident in the ROK’s ICH system, but it clearly served as a part of its foundation. In the next chapter, I consider Japan’s heritage politics in relation to China and its ICH management. I will be looking at how an earlier colonizer like China uses cultural heritage and whether the LNT program fulfills their goals of ICH preservation.
Chapter Four: China

Whereas Chapter Three examined Japan’s role in establishing a foundation for ICH practices in Korea, this chapter turns to the development of ICH programs in China, known now as the People’s Republic of China (PRC). I explore China’s historical relationship with ICH. I will make contextual comparisons regarding how each treats its heritage and whether the treatment reflects previous imperialist strategies used. I will make observations on China’s and Japan’s relationship as a soft power in heritage. I will also explore China’s heritage management and analyze the PRC’s LNT program, its structure, and relationship with society, and compare it to Japan’s program. By making this comparison, I am setting apart likely differences and showing how China implements the program for their country.

As a whole, the PRC’s relationship with ICH preservation is both complicated and controversial. On the one hand, the Chinese LNT program carries both the weight of preservation for ICH as well as the Western concept of national recognition, which does not align with the political ideology of the PRC (Maags 2018, 2). On the other hand, tourism has played a troubling role in shaping both ideas of authenticity and the actual form of China’s ICH art and performances (Blumenfield and Silverman 2013, 9; Maags 2018).

Historical Relationship between The People’s Republic of China and ICH

The PRC relationship with ICH can be traced back to the early 1950s, during Cold War era. The PRC played a pivotal role during the cold war, standing in between the United States and the Soviet Union. Primarily due to its size and large population, the PRC became a target of influence and enmity for the two rivals (Chen 2010, 2). One of the potential influences of China during the start of the cold war was the
communist propaganda that was slowly globalized. An example of this is the drama creation *Dagger Society*. *Dagger Society* premiered in 1959 in Shanghai in honor of the tenth anniversary of the PRC's founding (Wilcox 2019, 105). *Dagger society* is the story about a group known as the Dagger Society that are confronted a local Qin official and his Western imperialist supporters (Wilcox 2019, 112). The tale is inspired by local revolutionary history and a product of the Great Leap Forward cultural policy (Wilcox 2019, 105, 112). The makers of *Dagger Society*, while inspired by local revolutionary history and accounts from local communities, took artistic liberties to fit their ideological message (Wilcox 2019, 114). The ideological message focused on the Chinese communist revolution of "common-led rebellions against the double oppression of imperialism and the feudal court" (Wilcox 2019, 114). A critic compared the conflict depicted in the *Dagger Society* to the Cold War, as the former represents common people rebelling against Western imperialism, while the latter was a period of struggle for the Chinese people against American Imperialism (Wilcox 2019, 114). *Dagger Society* was one of influences that led to the preservation and survival of the performing arts during the Cultural Revolution.

The Cultural Revolution (1966-1976) could be seen as a turning point for China’s stand in the Cold War as they rose in power, and a significant change in Chinese cultural heritage that negatively impacted the country. The Cultural Revolution was started by Mao Zedong, the founder of the People’s Republic of China and chairman of the Communist party (1943-1976) and the advocate of the Great Leap (1958-61) (Ramzy 2016; Brugger 1978, 18). The Great Leap were horrible years for Chinese citizens as Mao pushed for the movement to achieve his goals of a Communist utopia and reasserting his authority over the Chinese government (Brown 2012, 31). In order to achieve this goal, the authorities in charge of the Great Leap implemented the
collectivization of agricultural and industrial output which was a pending catastrophe for farmers (Ramzy 2016; Brown 2012, 32). Quotas for tasks were unrealistic and though farmers knew this, they occasionally obeyed and followed suggestions from authorities. The consequences of disobeying these suggestions and the risk of being labeled a ‘rightist’, intellectuals in favor of capitalism and against collectivization compelled local leaders of the communes to follow the quotas (Brown 2012, 32). The quotas were unrealistic as the authorities wanted farmers to overcrowd crops and over-fertilize, ruining many harvests and yielding little crops (Brown 2012, 32). The Great Leap continued, famine became widespread and left about 45 million dead (Ramzy 2016). Ways Chinese citizens kept their families alive involved selling siblings or begging on the streets (Robinson 1968, 221).

Despite the preventable tragedies occurring, Mao continued to push his agenda for the Communist party. Part of his agenda for the Cultural Revolution was to remove those that threatened his plans. He targeted those labeled as his enemy, mainly being intellectuals or rightist. In 1966, Mao encouraged young students between middle school and college to form Red Guard groups to attack their perceived enemies (Wang 2021, 466; Ramzy 2016). The Red Guard groups not only attacked their teachers and authority figures, but also their families and friends in the name of Mao (King and Walls 2010, 8). This phase of the Cultural Revolution included a purge of intellectuals. In addition to the deaths of Chinese citizens, other issues arose during the revolution such as power struggles between Mao and his designated successor, Lin Biao (Spence 2001, 2-3). Mao turned to China’s premier, Zhou Enlai, for assistance who ended up taking most of the control over the government especially when Lin Biao died escaping to Mongolia (King and Walls 2010, 14). However, the Cultural Revolution’s end began once Mao suffered from a
stroke and Zhou was diagnosed with cancer (Spence 2001, 3). The two leaders decided to put their support on Deng Xiaoping, an individual who was once banished out of Mao’s inner circle, as the successor. This did not please Jiang Qing nor her allies that formed the Gang Four (King and Walls 2010, 14). In 1976, a few months before Mao’s death, the Gang Four convinced Mao to remove Deng from power, but later the Gang Four were arrested and officially ended the Cultural Revolution (Spence 2001, 3; Wang 2021, 467; Ramzy 2016).

During the 1990s, the country became more involved in cultural heritage policy making and planning (Wang and Rowlands 2017; Zhu and Maags 2020, 11). This period was the beginning of the PRC’s “heritage fever” (Zhu and Maags 2020, 12; Nitzky 2013, 210), a political and economic strategy that has enhanced the legitimacy of the PRC government and provided soft power on the international stage (Blumenfield and Silverman 2013). Soft power can be derived from how a country is viewed by the international community through the attractiveness of its cultural and political values as compared to other nations (Nakano and Zhu 2020, 2). Since the beginning of heritage fever, the PRC has added 55 sites to UNESCO’s World Heritage List (UNESCO 2021) and 42 ICH entries to UNESCO’s Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (Ji, Dong, and Yuche 2020). Compared to Japan’s 22 inscribed ICH entries, China leads in this element of soft power (Ji, Dong, and Yuche 2020). While this political and economic strategy involves portraying the PRC as a harmonious society of equality (Zhu and Maags 2020, 12), China’s political structure has already created inequalities within the large minority population (Silverman and Blumenfield 2013, 7-8). While the 1990s were a time of new museums and heritage sites, it was not until the PRC ratified the 2003 Convention and joined it in 2004 (Ji, Dong, and Yuche 2020; Office of International
Standards and Legal Affairs 2004) that marked these sites’ inclusion in intangible heritage.

Although the PRC modified the 1982 Cultural Heritage Preservation Act in 2000 to include ICH, the induction to the 2003 Convention adjusted and expanded the meaning of heritage (Wang and Rowlands 2017, 268). These meanings were derived from UNESCO and expanded to include not only ICH but tangible heritage as well (Wang and Rowlands 2017, 268). In 2004, the PRC issued a “Chinese folk culture protection plan” that established the first national folk cultural protection list (Ye and Zhou 2013, 497). In 2005, the State Council issued an official document titled “Recommendations of the Strengthening of the Safeguarding of China’s Intangible Cultural Heritage”, along with other ideas such as the “Representative Transmitters” and making the second Saturday of June “Cultural Heritage Day” (You and Hardwick 2020, 7).

While the purpose of heritage fever was to enhance ruling legitimacy, there were problems that arose during the process. Though there were participants pleased with the state-led results that brought traditional life back to the present, others were displeased with actions stemming from the process of heritage-making (Zhu and Maags 2020, 13). As heritage fever was a political strategy, the government evicted ethnic minorities from areas in which they and their families have lived for generations. These actions sparked anger, resulting in friction, negotiations, and even local resistance to these processes (Zhu and Maags 2020, 13-14).

These problems did not stop the state as it continued its ambitions toward ICH identification and listing. The Ministry of Culture (MOC) established projected lists for the years 2006, 2008 and 2011. These lists have continued to track the development of ICH through five batches of lists. There are lists for the national and
provincial levels, and eventually the Representative ICH Inheritors that track the number of people inheriting an specific art at the time (Ye and Zhou 2013, 498-499). The PRC was adamant about creating laws, lists, and, eventually, organizations dedicated to ICH. The country shifted rapidly from little concern for ICH to passing stringent laws such as the Intangible Cultural Heritage Law (ICH Law) created to enforce legal protection for ICH. However, while the PRC has come a long way from the 1990s to 2021, there does not appear to be evidence suggesting that Japan influenced these developments.

China has demonstrated a capacity to also achieve soft power status in a shorter time-frame (Nakano and Zhu 2020, 7-8). Japan is much smaller in size, it has utilized its national resources to project military power. On the contrary, China was able to resist Japan’s imperialism with its massive territory and abundant workforce (Iriye 1990, 624). Japan had imperial objectives in China and elsewhere since 1885 and only gave up these ambitions once it was occupied in 1945 (Iriye 1990, 624), losing many resources, colonies, and full governmental control (Office of the Historian n.d.; National Archives 2015). Although Japan was demilitarized and lacked resources after WWII, China was unable to retaliate due to its ongoing civil war (Iriye 1990, 624). The two countries, each in opposing alliances, rebuilt their militaries during the Cold War without any military skirmishes (Iriye 1990, 625). As members of their respective alliance systems -- the PRC with the Soviet Union and Japan with the United States -- they tried not to engage each other (Iriye 1990, 626). Japan eased itself away from the United States around 1954 to pursue a neutral stance in Asia with China’s encouragement, though this defense posture did not last long, as by 1958, Japan sought security ties with the United States (Iriye 1990, 626-627). China did not trust Japan’s security relationship with the U.S., seeing it as a Japanese strategy to
extend its own power toward American allies (Iriye 1990, 627). However, in 1971, the U.S. served as the bridge between Japan and China as Beijing and Tokyo began to reassess their security policies (Iriye 1990, 628). Eventually, by 1978, the two Asian countries signed the Chinese-Japanese Treaty of Peace and Friendship that eased tensions (Iriye 1990, 629).

The two nations have cooperated with each other since 1982, about over 30 years now, on heritage matters such as the preservation of the Duchung Caves and Youth exchange programs to experience each others culture through everyday life (外務省 / MOFA 2018; The Japan Foundation China Center n.d.; Akagawa 2016, 128). The cultural exchange between the two countries seems to be focused on conservationism and technological development, such as learning better ways to preserve China’s Duchung Caves which contain ancient wall murals (MOFA 2018). However, Japan could have influenced the PRC in its rise to become a soft power. Japan was admitted into UNESCO during the Allied Occupation and encouraged by UNESCO to change its image to that of a cultural-oriented nation (Nakano and Zhu 2020, 5; Saikawa 2016, 117). The PRC only came to care more for cultural policies during the 1970s as the country improved economically (Nakano and Zhu 2020, 7). The PRC used heritage as part of its political and economic strategy as a soft power (Nakano and Zhu 2020, 7). The increasing number of Chinese World Heritage sites and ICH items added to the Representative List attracted global attention, and like Japan, portrayed China as a cultural-oriented nation than territorial imperialist (Nakano and Zhu 2020, 7). Japan may have influenced China as Japan’s power in UNESCO and cultural affairs grew. During the 1990s, Japan strove to challenge UNESCO’s Eurocentric bias that existed in the concepts and norms of heritage (Akagawa 2016, 132-133). As Japan had success in its heritage legislation and policies, Japan had the advantage in UNESCO
to change the Eurocentric views on heritage (Akagawa 2016, 133). It should also be noted that the UNESCO Convention for Safeguarding ICH was finalized with Japanese government support and under Japanese Director-General Matsuura Koichi (Akagawa 2016, 133). Japan increased its influence and international attention, particularly during the growth of China’s heritage fever. While the sudden attention to heritage politics could have occurred due to overall rising concern for heritage, the two countries may have been purposefully competing against each other on the international political stage.

The power dynamic and relationship of China and Japan is not only explained through their relationship of heritage politics, but imperialist ways that lead the two to come into conflict. In 1931, the second Sino-Japanese war began, with the escalation of violence peaking in 1937. Personal accounts during this time recall the brutality of the Japanese soldiers during this war. Searle Bates often wrote letters to his wife of his personal accounts of the events or notes that account the events that took place. His notes from December 1937 detail the gruesome events that citizens went through. Bates recalls when the Chinese soldiers left Nanjing December 10th, the Japanese arrived and began the six weeks of destruction known as the Nanjing Massacre. He recalls women being raped, civilians used as target practice or shot for no reason, and homes looted as a few of the war crimes committed (Bates 1937, 1). Although citizens were assured by Japanese officials that the days would improve, they would progressively get worse as the Japanese soldiers plundered the city of its resources and the livelihoods of citizens. Another account of the events came from the Chairman of the Emergency Committee at the University of Nanking (1937, 1) that written to the Japanese Embassy, “Last night soldiers repeatedly came to our Library Building with its great crowd of refugees, demanding money, watches, and women at
the point of the bayonet”. From 1938 to 1945, China resisted the Japanese army with eventual assistance from the Allied Powers that saw Japan, along with the Axis Powers, as the enemy (Jewish Virtual Library n.d.). The second Sino-Japanese War did not come to an end until Japan faced defeat in WWII, thus removing Japanese forces from all territories they previously claimed and wars they were currently participating in.

In 2014, China nominated the documents of the Nanjing Massacre to be inscribed into the Memory of the World Register by UNESCO which occurred in 2015. The acceptance of the nomination sparked outrage in Japan, with Japan withholding funding for the UN heritage body in the response (Reuters Staff 2016). Documentation submitted by China claims between 200,000 to 300,000 Chinese were killed (UNESCO 2014, 9). Furthermore, the nomination points out that points that the Japanese “brought a standstill to China’s political, economic and cultural development, severely damaged the historical cultures of a city with over a 1,000-year history” (UNESCO 2014, 9). While these events have official witnesses, including Chinese citizens, foreign visitors, and Japanese perpetrators, Japan questioned the authenticity of the documents submitted (UNESCO 2014, 9). There were, and likely still are, conservative Japanese politicians and scholars that deny the massacre took place (Reuters Staff 2016), despite accounts and evidence of Japanese burning documentation before the US invaded Nanjing (Drea 2006, 9). While China is historically an imperial power that built up an empire with significant political and economic power, Japan demonstrated their capability to be an imperial, political, and economical opponent in the geographic environment of East Asia.

The Heritage Management Systems of the PRC
ICH management in China began in the mid-20th century and became increasingly popular in the 21st century, later than its neighbors Japan and South Korea. The PRC had dedicated itself to the preservation of heritage in the 1950s with the implementation of additional preservation laws, increasing heritage preservation by the 1990s (Anying 2019). During the Cultural Revolution in 1966, while Mao enforced his plan of keeping China Communist through his political ideology, his wife, Jiang Qing, participated mainly in the cultural realm. Mao and his wife focused on destroying the arts and traditional culture by reestablishing cultural traditions and policies. Mao viewed many literature and art works as “harmful bourgeois influence and unhealthy phenomena” (Bridgham 1967, 9). In order to reestablish what he defined as Chinese culture, the campaign ‘the Four Olds’ was created. ‘The Four Olds’ were defined as old ideas, culture, customs, and habits that were corrupting the masses (Andrews 2010, 33). Although ‘the Four Olds’ were traditionally Chinese culture, they were associated with the traditional elite or Western culture (Andreas 2002, 478). The Red Guards were responsible for destroying many temples, works of arts, and buildings in the name of the revolution and Mao (Spence 2001, 2). The destruction of the old arts allowed Jiang Qing to campaign for newer forms of art that focused on revolutionary and communism propaganda (King and Walls 2010, 3). Jiang Qing was a stage and screen actress before she met and married Mao. She adopted her political beliefs from Mao, which was advantageous for him as she acted as a leader in the art world (King and Walls 2010, 6-7). Jiang Qing's major contributions to the arts primarily involved the performing arts such as the jingju (Fan 2018, 46). Jingju, or Peking Opera, is a type of theater that uses speech, song, dance, and combat with suggestive moments that emphasize the grace and beauty of the movements (Jingju (MIT Global Shakespeares n.d.). Jingju has been around since the
late 18th and early 19th century, going through redevelopment during the Cultural Revolution to match Communist ideology (Li 2019). During the 1960s, Jiang oversaw jingju productions by picking the appropriate scripts, sending them to jingju companies, and supervising rehearsals by giving suggestions for revisions (Fan 2018, 67). By involving herself closely with the performances, she was able to oversee that they were done correctly and according to communist ideology.

While Jiang oversaw various forms of the arts, Mao’s influence over the young generation, which would form the Red Guards, pushed them to take action among themselves. In 1966, as schools and universities remained closed, students involved in Red Guard factions participated in forming an exhibition of works they wished to expose for public humiliation (King and Walls 2010, 9). The Red Guards also burned teaching materials and paintings at the fine arts academy, forcing the teachers to witness the destruction (King and Walls 2010, 9). Teachers, artists, and intellectuals within the faculty were beaten in front of an audience of peers and confined into cells and rooms (King and Walls 2010, 9; Andrews 2010, 36). New forms of art that served the Communist Party’s agendas were immune to humiliation. Red Guards had many talented artists within their factions that created Cultural Revolutionary art in the form of caricatures and propaganda (King and Walls 2010, 9). The popularity of an art work and style was often determined by Jiang Qing, holding influence over the Cultural Revolution’s art movement (Andrews 2010, 30). The forms of art that were approved would show support for Mao and the Cultural Revolution, often displaying him in greatness or propaganda against intellectuals (Andrews 2010, 34). Mao’s image would be depicted as a father surrounded by children, a wise statement, or as a military leader depending on the artist and cause (Galimberti, Garcia, Scott 2019). The style often reflected a cartoon style to realism, focusing on propaganda themes
that represented Mao’s greatness or supporting his ideology (Andrews 2010, 35). An example of this would be *Chairman Mao’s Heart Beats as One with the Hearts of the Revolutionary Masses* (1967) that depicts Mao and fellow leaders crossing a bridge to meet a large crowd of young people excited to see their leader. The author of the painting is unknown, but possibly due to the fact that large paintings such as *Chairman Mao’s Heart Beats as One with the Hearts of the Revolutionary Masses* had to be done on a short deadline and required a group of young artists to collaborate together (Andrews 2010, 35). By 1968, the art movement shifted from iconoclasm of the Red Guard movement to the production of icons, seen in Liu Chunhua’s *Chairman Mao Goes to Anyuan* (1967) (Andrews 2010, 44). The painting depicted Mao as a young, heroic figure for the young generation to admire and aspire (Andrews 2010, 44). These types of works helped to reassure China’s citizens of the positive accomplishments under Mao’s control (Andrews 2010, 44). As the Cultural Revolution began to reach its end with the death of Mao and arrest of the Cultural Revolution leaders, the art movement is now remembered differently. Many former Red Guard artists look back on the revolution with nostalgia and fondness, while the older generations remembers the cultural tragedies they witnessed and survived (Andrews 2010, 56).

Following the Cultural Revolution, cultural heritage discourse removed focus on the revolutionary heritage narrative. In the 1990s, the focus was on the discovery and celebration of more diverse heritage, and recently in the 21st century it is focusing on the concept of ICH (Svensson and Maags 2018, 18). The government operates cultural heritage related operations through multiple organizations and departments. The State Administration of Cultural Heritage (SACH) oversees cultural relics and tangible cultural heritage, while the MOC is in charge of the ICH Department that
safeguards ICH, similar to the job of the Agency of Cultural Affairs (ACA) (Svensson and Maags 2018, 19). The ICH administration is larger than that of the tangible cultural heritage department, as there is more than one department for each level of government. While the ICH department administers the program at the national level through the MOC, the ICH Protection Centre of China is administered through the Chinese National Academy of the Arts. Below each department and center are single departments at the Provincial, Municipal, and County levels (Kuah and Liu 2017, 4). A department and center for each authority level makes managing ICH in each location easier. Though the number historic tangible objects and buildings is enormous in China, the task of keeping track of individuals and LNT practices can be more complex. As a result, in 1979, the MOC, National Ethnic Affairs Commission, and the China Federation of Literary and Art Circles began a 30-year program to compile a list of the ICH throughout the PRC. This list classifies ICH into 10 groups including folk, ethnic, and regional, with an emphasis on folk culture (Anying 2019; Lin and Lian 2018, 5). Heritage management in the PRC is an example of the power of Chinese culture, as the country uses its heritage as a source of economic enrichment, soft power, and suppression of any threats to the goals of modernization (Silverman and Blumenfield 2013; Zhu and Maags 2020, 12). The PRC promotes, specifically to UNESCO, the traditions and arts practiced by Chinese ethnic minorities to achieve an international semblance of diversity. This tactic is commonly used by other nations, such as Korea, evident in the previous chapter. While diversity is promoted internationally, many Chinese ethnic groups experience rejection of the practice of their traditions. In some cases, heritage management programs promote cultural diversity to increase tourism in China yet disregard heritage sites where
tourism would benefit regional economies of ethnic minorities (Silverman and Blumenfield 2013, 8).

Chinese ICH management falls under the law including CHPA, UNESCO’S 2003 Convention (adopted in 2004), the Development of Cultural and Creative Industries Act (2010), the ICH Law (2011), and intellectual property rights (IPRs) (since 1980s) (Lin and Lian 2018; National People’s Congress 1982; MOC 2010, Hu 2011). The laws of the PRC and Japan differ, as in some ways China’s are more progressive and others more controversial. IPRs are used to protect intangible heritage by Patent Right Protection, Copyright Protection, Trademark Right Protection, Geographical Indication Protection, and Trade Secret Protection (Lin and Lian 2018, 8). Despite having legal frameworks for protection of intellectual property, Japan lacks standalone legal protection for ICH properties. It is unclear whether ICH properties are covered under this framework (MOFA n.d.) and only UNESCO’s ICH list, which trademarks a country’s ICH properties through the registration process and acceptance to the list (CIPRI 2019), protects ICH properties in Japan. While Japan’s Law for Protection of Cultural Properties (1950) sets grounds for the protection and preservation of ICH (UNESCO 1950), the law still lacks dedicated enforcement. ICH does fall under the care of international projects and movements such as Intellectual Property Issues in Cultural Heritage (Intellectual Property Issues in Cultural Heritage n.d.) and Cultural Intellectual Property Rights Initiative (CIPRI 2019). Although these cultural projects and movements aim at containing the legal rights that ICH should hold, the PRC already includes enforcement of these in its framework outside the CHPA, LPRCICH and the 2003 Convention.

The UNESCO 2003 Convention is considered one of the turning points for ICH in the PRC as it changed the previous attitude relating to its management and
protection of oral heritage and performing arts (Zhu and Maags 2020, 46). Massing (2018, 2) emphasized this change in attitude of heritage as “heritage that is embodied in people rather than inanimate objects”. The international framework in the 2003 Convention inspired the PRC to safeguard and promote ICH (Massing 2018, 2), which manifested in future ICH laws adopted by the PRC that included ICH preservation or were specifically created to safeguard these inanimate items. While the 2003 Convention was implemented in the PRC, the UNESCO guidelines have not been followed precisely. Article 15 states that the “State Party shall endeavour to ensure the widest possible participation of communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals that create, maintain and transmit such heritage, and to involve them actively in its management’ (UNESCO 2003, 10; Massing 2018, 2).

During the PRC’s period of modernization, which started in 1978-9 with three stages of society modernization, it pressured 55 ethnic minorities to become more like the Han majority (Massing 2018, 3; Dari and Oyuna 2015, 671). The Han majority is seen as superior and sophisticated while ethnic minorities are seen as uncivilized and backward. Further, the state decides how to interpret the minorities’ cultures through the PRC’s narratives and stereotypes that could be harmful, especially as the nation projects an image of unity on the international stage (Massing 2018, 3). However, beyond ethical issues, the 2003 Convention and the LPCP work similarly in how they preserve and safeguard heritage. Those procedures are can be seen in the two PRC heritage laws, the CHPA and ICH law.

The CHPA did not originally include ICH-related preservation, which was added in 2000 during the ICH heritage fever era (MOC 1982; Zhu and Maags 2020, 10-11). Similar to the LPCP, the Act is a broad law that ensures preservation and the promotion of cultural heritage (MOC 1982). The Act defines the types of ICH and
establishes the roles and tasks of departments and officials at national or regional levels (MOC 1982). Chapter 7: Intangible Cultural Heritage only addresses five articles that primarily establish the proper role of authorities. The authorities oversee the review, recording, and tracing of ICH for preservation, and keep updated files on the investigations, collections, research, and promoting of ICH. Other responsibilities include management of designated inheritors or revoked designation processes, and the procedure for designation of holders (MOC 1982).

The LNT program, but not the process beforehand, is briefly mentioned in regard to the procedure for the acceptance or revocation of a designation. The ICH Law covers the LNT procedure, as it oversees the preservation for various forms of ICH. The law addresses three ways to nominate and safeguard ICH items: a survey system, directory system, and transmission system (You and Hardwick 2020, 7; Ye and Zhou 2013, 498). Compared to the LPCP, the law is shorter but direct, as it is solely concerned with ICH. The law is similar to the process of selection of ICH items and individuals and the responsibilities of the holders or inheritors (Hu 2011). Although the law is similar to the LPCP, the results of the LNT program in the PRC are not necessarily the expected similarities with the outcomes of the LNT systems in Japan and the ROK. Unlike Japan's and Korea's LNT systems, China's LNT system lacked proper recognition for holders and was used by the PRC as an economic instrument.

Establishment and Use of the LNT program

Maags states that “while the Chinese ‘Representative ICH Inheritor’ program has been discussed in Chinese domestic media, official documents and academia, the program itself and its socio-cultural effects have received little international attention” (2018, 3). While scholarship focusing on the Japanese and South Korean LNT programs is more extensive, the PRC’s program does not have many accessible
sources as they are unaccessible or unable to translate what was available. Of note, Maags includes anonymous comments from individuals involved in ICH and LNT programs that are important to understanding the usage of the program and treatment of ICH. While scholarship on the Japanese and South Korean LNT programs references names of individuals and their experiences, anonymity is preferred by Chinese LNTs for fear of possible consequences from government authorities.

As Japan started the LNT program in 1950 and the ROK replicated it in 1964, the PRC inherited the country-specific program in 2005 under the name “Representative ICH Inheritors” through the MOC. The establishment of the LNT program could have been motivated by the fact that the PRC adopted the 1998 Proclamation of the Representative Work of Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity and ICH Convention in 2003 (Maags 2018, 3; China Intangible Cultural Heritage Network 2003; China Intangible Cultural Heritage Network 2010). These policies could have spurred the government to continue to take action on improving the preservation of ICH and use the LNT system that had been successful in Japan and the ROK. While the 2003 Convention covers how the LNT program would be established in nations that adopt the policy, the PRC’s LNT program differs from the convention. Cultural practitioners in China themselves submit an application to the ICH Department that oversees the declaration and assessment of national ICH (Maags 2018, 5; Chinaculture.org 2015). The application is overseen by a team of experts comprised of authority figures in various fields (Maags 2018, 2; SC 2005). If the application is approved, the MOC declares the practitioner an inheritor (Maags 2018, 5; SC 2005). In order to keep LNT individuals manageable, designated individuals are placed into one of four regional levels according to their skills (Maags 2018, 6).
In China, inheritors fall into levels including national, provincial, city, and county (SC 2015; Maags 2018, 5). While this allows for individuals to continue to improve their skills to improve their placement, the Chinese hierarchy of levels creates competitiveness among the LNTs (Maags 2018, 5). The PRC inheritor system created conflict as inheritors want to receive recognition (Maags 2018, 5). For example, certain inheritors receive monetary and recognition advantages, including those that first joined the program when it started. In its early stages, the program did not fully implement levels which led to early inheritors initially filling higher positions while current ones must climb from the bottom of the hierarchy. These inheritors who were in higher level positions passed on that benefit to their descendants (Maags 2018, 130-131). Their children or grandchildren would have a connection to the program, inside information that others would not have without their own connections, and the ability to receive a high-level position (Maags 2018, 131). While potential inheritors with family as inheritors hold advantages, others must find connections in different ways to hold an advantage in the program (Maags 2018, 138). As there are no limits on how many individuals can be appointed, the program has already appointed approximately several thousand inheritors (Maags 2018, 6; Zh 2019). The inheritors can be promoted to a higher level during the bi-annual performance evaluation. Furthermore, while inheritors can receive annual stipends, the stipend depends on which province they live in. In the PRC three provinces, Jiangsu, Jiangxi, and Yunnan, run their own ICH programs that provide different benefits to their inheritors (Maags 2018, 5; State Council (SC) 2005).

Local communities have asked that their local practices be presented through the selection of inheritors, but the ICH government leaders may be swayed by personal career ambitions (Maags 2018, 132-133). These ambitions typically fall under
branding the location of and increasing tourism to a specific place, as China often uses heritage for the purpose of tourism (Nakano and Zhu 2020, 8; You and Hardwick 2020, 10). Even the local communities take advantage of tourism for financial gain, as they can sell products or performances, relatively common for a cultural resource being exploited (Blake 2009: 64). Financial benefits of tourism are often used in many communities, especially those not well off. While some ICH inheritors strive to become known on a national level, others are satisfied if they are known regionally and can bring attention to where they come from (Maags 2018, 125). While tourism can be a tactic of promotion and preservation of heritage itself, it can also be harmful. Preservation allows governments to promote traditional culture for domestic and international audiences (You and Hardwick 2020, 13). Practitioners from more famous areas subject to higher volumes of tourism have an advantage as they represent a more marketable ICH practice (Maags 2018, 8). For example, a pottery inheritor may speculate that her acceptance into the program relied on her meeting an official who saw pottery as an ideal product for representing the Pu’er municipality (Maags 2018, 9). Inheritors in certain localities may be discouraged at the lack of recognition for their work or being stuck at a regional instead of national level, potentially leading to resignation or inheritors competing against each other (Maags 2018, 11).

Conclusion

China's dedication of funding and administrative resources towards ICH preservation since the 1990's does not seem to be influenced by Japan with two possible exceptions: Japan's emergence as a soft power in cultural heritage, and Japan's influence over the creation of the 2003 UNESCO ICH Convention. However, China and Japan, former imperial powers, retain a similar mindset to maintain power.
China built their LNT program with UNESCO's guidelines, independent of the original Japanese preservation methods. China’s motivation to preserve and control their ICH seems to stem from beneficial opportunities to exploit other ways of political control of the nation, particularly the ethnic minorities, and gain economic advantages. Although tourism is a byproduct of the LNT program in other countries, the purpose of the Chinese LNT program seems to be focused on tourism and recognition rather than preservation. While the LNT program is beneficial to plenty of individual cultural practitioners, there are disadvantages to others that do not make the program worthwhile for them, resulting in their resignations. As discussed in Chapter 2, the Japanese program rarely sees resignations and only removes LNTs due to death, while removal of titles of undeserving holders is rare. Chapter Five next examines Mongolia’s LNT program and questions whether China, as a former imperial power and current communist state, has influenced Mongolian ICH heritage preservation and management.
Chapter Five: Mongolia

Mongolia established its LNT program in 2007 with the assistance of the ROK. The history of Mongolia’s approach to cultural heritage was shaped by its relationship first with China, which held control over its land until 1945 (Green 1986, 1342) and then with the Soviet Union (1921-1991), with whom Mongolia sought allegiance to order to ward off China’s imperialist efforts to reintegrate them back into the nation (Paddock and Schofield 2017, 8). The Soviet influence on Mongolia led to a change in Mongolian cultural heritage policy, endangering many traditions and art forms that were at risk of disappearance. For example, Falconry and Mongolian Tuuli were losing their place in traditional culture as they became less relevant in the growing modern age. Today, Mongolia is developing its ICH management with the assistance of UNESCO while receiving funding from China. Mongolia is the last country to implement the LNT program among East Asian countries that have adopted it. They adopted the program about 4 years after China, possibly due to the political environment around heritage growing in Asia. Mongolia has been under political control by two overruling forces, China and the Soviet Union, that shaped their heritage to what it is today.

In this last case study of Asian LNT programs, I will discuss the historical road Mongolia took as they started their heritage preservation protection and management programs under a Socialist regime. As I discuss how Mongols manage their heritage after they invoked ICH protection programs, I will identify the influences that the country was subject to. Lastly, I will discuss the LNT program, its structure, and the influences it faced.

Early Intangible Heritage Management in Mongolia
In 1911, Mongolia declared independence from the Chinese empire once the Qing dynasty fell (Tachibana 2014, 69). The dynasty had split Mongolia into “Outer Mongolia” and “Inner Mongolia” (Atwood 2004, 245). While Outer Mongolia was able to declare independence, Inner Mongolia could not remove itself from Chinese oppression; it remains part of China today (Atwood 2004, 245). For Outer Mongolia to declare independence, the leader of the nation, the Bogd Khan, formed political ties with the Bolsheviks and Red Army (Ginsburg 1995, 460), both part of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic. This alliance resulted in Outer Mongolia, now known as simply “Mongolia,” having close political ties with the Soviet Union a decade later (Nichols 2014, 35). The Soviet Union’s militarist and monetary support benefited Mongolia after the passing of the Bogd Khan, when the country declared its status as the independent Mongolian People’s Republic (Altangerel 2020, 244; Nichols 2014, 35). This political status separated Mongolia from the People’s Republic of China (PRC). Mongolia was fully recognized after WWII when the PRC allowed Outer Mongolia to hold a referendum in 1945 (Nichols 2014, 38). Although Mongolia received official recognition, they remained under Soviet control during the Cold War and acted as a buffer state between the USSR and China. Mongolia was similar to other Communist countries as the Soviet forces established an ideology-dominated political system (Janar 2016). The reformed political system allowed the Soviet Union to further dominate the country and make it the front-line protection against China after Moscow and Beijing concluded the 1966 bilateral treaty (Batbayar 1998, 38). Mongolia firmly sided with the Soviet Union, acting as their front line up till the end of the 1980’s (Basu 2018, 48). The Soviet Union used Mongolia as a front-line against China by setting up military bases and Soviet Troops(Basu 2018, 48; Batbayar 1998, 38). Mongolia benefited from the Soviet
Union as they provided protection and economic growth. With the Sino-Soviet relations undergoing, Mongolia’s leader Tsedenbal was able to receive an extensive amount of economic assistance from the Soviet government. As Tsedenbal was anti-China oriented, the conflict worked in his favor for Mongolia’s economy. However, once Sino-Soviet relations began to improve in the early 1980s Tsedenbal ended up ousted from office as his anti-China propaganda was no longer approved (Batbayar 1998, 39). The Soviet side began to reopen relations with other nations through the 1980s, such as with the U.S, China, the republic of Korea, and Japan (Batbayar 1998, 39-40). As the Cold War came to an end by 1991 and the Soviet Empire collapsed, Mongolia became fully independent.

During the early 1900s, Mongolia ruled through socialist-style modernization initiatives that used the arts and culture as tools to prevent moving backwards or returning to a feudalistic society (Altangerel 2020, 245; Mongolian National Commission for UNESCO [MNCU] 1982, 14-15). Cultural centers began to emerge in districts that were becoming defined within provinces. These centers provided working classes with access to an education and contributed to the promotion of creative labor (MNCU 1982, 13). By the 1990s, cultural heritage became a significant component in the Mongolian government (Nichols 2014, 4 and 40), as the Ministry of Culture (MOC) ensured that the cultural policies of the ruling party were implemented in each province (Nichols 2014, 36). The MOC used unions to control and monitor artistic and cultural practices. The unions included the Union of Mongolian Artists, the Union of Mongolian Writers, and the Union of Mongolian Composers (Nichols 2014, 36). These unions and policies, while useful for raising popular awareness of Mongolian cultural heritage and the arts, worked as another form of cultural suppression, particularly against rural Mongols (Nichols 2014, 36-37). These
populations lived more traditionally and often lacked modern resources, and thus became viewed as culturally backwards (Nichols 2014, 37).

Despite this situation, Mongolia determined in 1990 to restore and safeguard its traditional pride and heritage (Park 2013, 123). These traditions included oral literature, folk arts, traditional rituals, customs, knowledge, and technologies that had been neglected since independence (Park 2013, 123–124). The collapse of the socialist regime in 1990 may have influenced this pivot to restoring traditional heritage (Paddock and Schofield 2017, 8), which allowed more freedom to suppressed groups and facilitated regrowth of suppressed traditions, religions, and holidays (Bumochir and Munkherdene 2019, 84). Other factors may also have been at work, as socialism had not fully suppressed all traditions, and alternative and underground art movements existed before the regime change (Bumochir and Munkherdene 2019, 85–86). Developments in the Mongolian environment, society, and culture demonstrated the emerging thirst for cultural revival (Bumochir and Munkherdene 2019, 85). Two organizations, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and UNESCO (Bumochir and Munkherdene 2019, 87), were significant forces behind these changes. Although the EIA safeguards environmental issues, the EIA also details societal and cultural impacts (Bumochir and Munkherdene 2019, 87). The UNESCO 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, along with other conventions such as the 2005 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, both directly address the protection of cultural heritage and specifically intangible cultural heritage (ICH). UNESCO definitions of cultural heritage and related concepts, along with its implementation of state members’ conventions, reshaped Mongolia and its conceptual
definitions over the following decades (Bumochir and Munkherdene 2019, 89; Altangerel 2020, 245).

In 1945, Mongolia and China started equal relations as separate nations when China relinquished their legal claim to Mongolia (Green 1986, 1342). By 1951, the two nations began cultural exchanges which were primarily conducted in the late 19th to early 20th century. It is important to discuss the potential objectives of maintaining diplomatic relations between China and Mongolia since their relationship is only a century old. Ponka et al. (2019, 1103) states five reasons for bilateral relations: geographical proximity, the rapid growth of Chinese economy and their consumer market, complementary nature of the neighboring territories, Chinese policy aimed at supporting Mongolia domestic business, and the factor that China is the bridge between the MPR and Inner Mongolia. Primarily, China's interest in Mongolia seems to stem solely from a desire to obtain economic advantages while Mongolia wishes to maintain good relations due to territorial borders with both China and Russia, both which have militaries (Ponka el at. 2019, 1102-1103).

Starting in 1994, Mongolia and China met to sign the Cultural Cooperation Agreement. This agreement was followed by multiple cultural diplomacy visits between the two countries (fmprc.gov.cn 2010). In 1998, both sides signed the 1998-2000 Executive Plan for Sino-Mongolian Cultural Exchanges, which has been signed various times, including in 2001 for the 2001-2003 Executive Plan for Cultural Exchanges and Cooperation and 2010 for the 2010-2013 Plan (fmprc.gov.cn 2010). Within the 21st century, mutual cultural events have been performed in each country to promote good relations. These events have included Mongolian Culture Days held in China and 2018, the “Feel China” Culture and Tourism days held at Mongolia’s Capital (Ponka el at. 2019, 1103). During Culture and Tourism days, Mongol and
Chinese artists from various fields participate in activities that represent their nations. During these events, tourists receive free medical examinations from Mongol doctors, or watch friendly matches of national teams of China and Mongolia in basketball (Ponka et al. 2019, 1103-1104). Although cultural diplomacy between China and Mongolia has been a positive effort to socially unite the countries, China continues to see Mongolia on less-than-equal ground.

While China and Mongolia benefited from the various exchanges to connect their cultures together, issues that represent the strain that may have lingered between the two nations since Mongolia claimed independence in 1911 have risen. In 2016, the Chinese government was opposed to the visit of the Dalai Lama XIV in Mongolia (Ponka et al. 2019, 1103). China has opposed the Dalai Lama's visits to Mongolia in the past and has repeatedly demanded that Mongolia cancel his visits (Radchenko 2016). The issues stem from the Chinese view of the Dalai Lama as an ‘anti-Chinese separatist’ while Mongols viewed the Dalai Lama’s visits as religious (Radchenko 2016). While Mongols view the 2016 visit still proceeded despite unsaid consequences from the Chinese government, the Foreign Minister of Mongolia expressed regret over the negative impacts, such as growing tension and threats of withholding funding (Radchenko 2016; Ponka et al. 2019, 1103). A more recent issue pertains China’s decision to suppress Mongolian culture in Inner Mongolia. As China represents the bridge for the separated Mongol population, Mongol citizens in Mongolia felt outraged by an implemented policy in China that required elementary and secondary schools in Inner Mongolia region to use Chinese language, politics and history as part of the national education curriculum (Reuters Staff 2020). Although Mongol citizens expressed their outrage over the suppression of their culture, the Mongolian government has not made any official statements concerning this situation.
This may be due to the delicate political relationship that they tread on with China since they depend on the powerful nation for economic support. In situations such as this, China still holds influence over Mongolia as they continue to use them for resources, such as fulfilling the demand for Mongolia’s coal and exports (Reuters Staff 2020). The Mongolian government, despite having freedom to govern their own country, show tendencies to remain reluctant to oppose their previous colonizer.

**Mongolia’s Heritage Management Systems**

While the Soviet regime positively impacted the protection and management of Mongolian heritage through its cultural organizations and opportunities for involvement in the arts, it also suppressed Mongolian traditions and arts that were contrary to socialist ideals (Bumochir and Munkherdene 2019, 85). After the socialist regime collapsed in 1990, heritage management begun to change as the Mongolian government found that school children were not encouraged to learn traditional customs and other cultural practices anymore (Shagdarsuren 2012, 4). The protection of Mongolian tradition was hindered until the fall of socialism (1990) and the later establishment of ICH policies in the 1990s. Most of these heritage laws were established before Mongolia became a member of UNESCO for heritage protection, although the country has been a UNESCO member state since 1962 (Park 2013, 124). Mongolian heritage laws that influenced cultural policy include: The Constitution of Mongolia (1992), Law on the Protection of the Cultural Heritage (1996), Law on the Culture of Mongolia (1996), State Policy on Culture (1996), Law for the Official Language of the State (1992), Law on National Naadam Festival (2003), and the Decree by President of Mongolia on inheriting and promoting Long songs (2004) (Park 2013, 124). In 2005, Mongolia ratified and enacted the UNESCO 2003 ICH Convention (Park 2013, 197; Altangerel 2020, 245). With the assistance of UNESCO,
Mongolia continued work to preserve its heritage, creating laws and establishing programs, including, beginning in 2007, the LNT program (Park 2013, 197).

UNESCO influenced many of Mongolia’s recent heritage management methods, such as organizing events oriented around safeguarding ICH, including the National Workshop on Urgent Problems in Conservation of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Mongolia (2005) (Park 2013, 126). The organization also incorporated lists, such as the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity and List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, that countries have adopted to claim specific art forms or traditions as their own. Although Mongolia created its own heritage laws before collaborating with UNESCO, these lists provided a way for Mongolia to reclaim and revive its long-established customs and arts (Altangerel 2020, 246). As of 2019, the Representative List of the ICH of Humanity recorded eight ICH elements. Seven ICH elements are on the List of ICH in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, including Mongolian traditional practices of worshiping the sacred sites and the Mongolian Tuuli, a Mongolian epic (UNESCO n.d.b). The importance of these traditions, such as the Mongolian Tuuli, is that they are a revival of old practices that pass knowledge and values onto each generation that strengthen their national identity, pride and unity (UNESCO n.d.). As these practices were strongly discouraged before the UNESCO lists allow Mongolia to internationally claim heritage that represents its national culture, which also brings in benefits such as tourism and national recognition. In Mongolia’s State Integrated Registration Database of Cultural Heritage, the 2017 report listed 177 ICH elements along with a total of 8066 bearers (UNESCO 2017, 11). Although Mongolia monitors and maintains its heritage through laws that involve community and organizational participation, UNESCO works as an international organization that ensures
Mongolia’s heritage will not disappear. In a way, UNESCO provides Mongolia with international attention that it had previously lacked (Nichols 2004, 38). The Mongolian Government also had worked out a strategy to develop and recover epic art and increase interest in the element, particularly in locations it had developed well (UNESCO 2014). Urianhai epic storytellers E. Baatarjav, A. Baldandorj and B. Bayarmagnai are a few individuals who promoted Mongolian epic in the country and overseas (UNESCO 2014). In 2020, A. Baldandorj was one of the individuals awarded as Mongolia’s Best Intangible Cultural Heritage Bearer of the year 2019 (Andudari 2020). The recognition represents the hard efforts of his work to promote Mongolian epics and encourage future generations to participate in the traditions of their culture. It should be noted while UNESCO and Mongolia have made great strides to ensure the preservation of traditional Mongolian heritage, it is not perfect nor fully possible in certain circumstances. In Mongolia’s 2014 report on Tuuli, it is noted the last inheritor of Zakhchin epic story, T. Enkhbalsan, died in 2006 with no one in the next generation continuing this role (UNESCO 2014). While this is a unforeseen circumstance of when a bearer will pass, it is also a large concern of what to do when it happens as ICH relies primarily on people to live in the future.

Traditions and customs that were once part of the nomadic society and legacy of the country were slowly dying as Mongolia’s ideals shifted toward modernity (Gardelle and Zhao 2019, 365). For example, falconry, although not unique to Mongolia, was a common hunting practice for centuries (Soma 2012, 105). It is now more of an entertainment sport, but minority communities such as the Altai-Kazakh continue the practice for hunting (Soma 2012, 105). Unfortunately, although falconry is part of the Representative List, no reports have been published for its preservation and safeguarding (Soma 2012, 105). UNESCO requires periodic reporting on
nominations to ensure the practices are being maintained, but Mongolia’s falconry report is not due until 2024 and thus remains to be written. In 2020, a tourism company called Nomadic Expeditions funded a new research initiative with the Wildlife Science and Conservation Center of Mongolia (WSCC) to support golden eagle conservation and cultural heritage preservation (“Nomadic Expeditions” 2020). Falconry’s ethnic identity is centered in the Altai-Kazakh community, yet due to the lack of preservation efforts, the hunting practice remains in decline. Soma (2012, 109) found that while twenty-four people in Mongolia were eagle falconers, only two to four actually participated for hunting purposes, which is the traditional form of falconry. While Mongolia established its own cultural programs along with those from UNESCO, such as the second phase of the Law on Protection of Cultural Heritage (Altankhuyag 2014), some traditions like falconry still lack established management and heritage protection programs.

More recently, Mongolia established the National Program for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage, which was approved on February 13, 2019. The program is expected to run from 2019 and 2023 in six parts (Enkhbat and Tsolmon 2019). The objective of the national program “is to identify ICH elements of ethnic groups in Mongolia and to research, register, document, safeguard, transmit, and disseminate the ICH elements abroad and nationally” (Enkhat and Tsolmon 2019). While the country has similar legal actions in place, such as the 2003 Convention and the Mongolian Law on Protecting Cultural Heritage, the program will focus on other domains that were not included in previous programs (Enkhat and Tsolmon 2019). Although Mongolia focuses on different elements of ICH, more attention is moving toward folk-related culture. This may come from an environment of growing modernization due to the maintenance of society standards (Paddock and Schofield
The previous risk of traditions disappearing due to suppression has been replaced by a lack of interest and purpose, particularly among younger citizens, politicians, and scholars (Altangerel 2014, 247; Paddock and Schofield, 5).

**Establishment of the Living National Treasure System**

The LNT program in Mongolia implemented UNESCO objectives of protecting, maintaining, and encouraging ICH through bearers as written in the 2003 Convention (UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage Centre for Asia and the Pacific [ICHCAP] 2008, 8). Recognized ICH elements in Mongolia are categorized as ICH forms expressed in Mongolian language and performing arts, along with forms, social practices, rituals, festive events, knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe, and traditional craftsmanship (UNESCO ICHCAP 2008, 11). The Cultural Heritage Bearer program is jointly developed with the ROK and 2003 Convention in mind, and it has more connections toward those LNT programs (Nichols 2014, 168; UNESCO ICHCAP 2008). The literature lacks the investigation and analysis of the success of the Mongolia program, which was formed jointly with the ROK.

In Mongolia, the nomination of bearers works the same way as the ICH designation. Applicants who wish to become “Heritage Bearers” follow a procedure with deadlines for submissions. When a person applies to become a heritage bearer, they need to submit their application to the Culture and Arts Committee before April 1 each year (UNESCO ICHCAP 2008, 34). The Culture and Arts Committee involves the public, as it announces detailed information on the applications to identify and select potential heritage bearers by May 1. Once the announcement is made, the Culture and Arts Committee moves forward with sending applications for registration to the National Council (UNESCO ICHCAP 2008, 34). The responsibility for nominating and registering ICH falls under the National Council for Identifying and
Registering ICH, decreed by the Minister of Education, Culture, and Science (MECS) (UNESCO ICHCAP 2008, 33). The National Council consists of representatives from scholars, researchers, and non-government organizations (NGO) in relevant fields. The National Council includes an advisory body with a Chairperson, Duty Chairperson, secretary, and 20–22 members (UNESCO ICHCAP 2008, 38). Under the council are six expertise teams that consist of four to ten members; each team group specializes in some form of cultural heritage (UNESCO ICHCAP 2008, 39).

The duty of the National Council is to investigate ICH and bearers with cooperation from governmental and non-governmental organizations, educational and academic institutions, partnerships, and scholars (ICHCAP 2009, 33). As they investigate ICH and possible bearers, the National Council deliberates further on the list with the Culture and Arts Committee, Cultural Heritage Center, governmental organizations, and NGOs. While these organizations and committees assist in the investigations, the National Council writes up a report with comments and other documentation that is relevant to the ICH and bearers (UNESCO ICHCAP 2008, 33). The applications that the National Council receives have been revised by the Culture and Arts Center, leaving the council to review potential honorable bearers and send their decision to the MECS by June 15. The National Council decision comes from a careful review of each applicant and the materials from the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage (UNESCO ICHCAP 2008, 34). The materials provide confirmation of applicants’ talents and skills to determine if they are eligible to become part of the MECS. Lastly, the MECS receives the “List of ICH” from the National Council. It may request expert analyses on certain issues or areas before approving the list (UNESCO ICHCAP 2008, 33). If the MECS approves the applicants from the National Council, the List will be amended by August 1. The Culture and Arts Committee informs the
applicants of their approval and bestows them with certificates on the “Culture and Arts Practitioners” Day of Mongolia’ (UNESCO ICHCAP 2008, 34).

The criteria for selecting bearers includes outstanding performance level and integrity of original features, patterns, and style. Priority is given to heritage sites in danger of disappearance, and the heritage element needs to have “outstanding values and quality” to be classified as one of the three categories under the Law on Protecting Cultural Heritage of Mongolia. The bearer needs to be known and respected by their local community and region, must have the ability and experience to conduct training, should be linked to the surrounding environment and cultural heritage, and ought to maintain specific quality patterns (UNESCO ICHCAP 2008, 44).

Once an individual or group becomes a heritage bearer, they must follow the associated responsibilities. These include transmitting their own skills and talent to the next generation, especially for heritage learners, and becoming their mentors in preparation to apply to become a bearer (UNESCO ICHCAP 2008, 35). Bearers also have responsibilities to submit annual reports to the Culture and Arts Committee and to demonstrate their skills during their annual reporting period to the MECS, National Council, and Culture and Arts Committee. If death, disability, or other emergent situations befall the heritage bearer, they or their representatives must inform the Culture and Arts Committee within 14 days (UNESCO ICHCAP 2008, 35). Compared to the Japanese LNT program, the joint Mongolia–ROK version does not specify certain details or neglect responsibilities such as the preparation of annual reports (UNESCO 1950).

The government’s responsibilities are set up to publicly promote bearers, along with preserving cultural craft and providing bearers with benefits for their deeds. The
responsibilities that fall onto the MECS, Cultural and Arts Committee, Cultural Heritage Center, and many other institutions and organizations specifically include communication with bearers and assistance with their activities, facilitating transmission of ICH to the next generation, advertising and introducing bearers to the public, and rewarding recognized bearers for their accomplishments (UNESCO ICHCAP 2008, 36). The Culture and Arts Committee holds many responsibilities over the heritage bearers, such as regulating and monitoring the terms of conditions of agreement; reviewing financial support proposals; working with the MECS, Cultural Heritage Center, and other organizations to enforce and regulate activities related to the bearers’ reports and their participation; and publicly releasing any information on changes to the bearers (UNESCO ICHCAP 2008, 36). The Mongolian LNT program demonstrates fully capable measures and procedures to safeguard ICH through governmental organizations and NGOs, along with heritage bearers as its main representatives. The program details specific ICH forms, rules of conduct, and responsibilities. Based on this material, it is clear that China has not influenced the program.

UNESCO’s influence is present in the Mongolian LNT system, although the 2003 Convention mostly offers an outline for how to set up the program and roles. Similarly, in the Mongolian LNT proposal, the 2003 Convention “ensure[s] the participation of the citizens and the public in identifying the cultural heritage bearers, [and] applications are accepted from both individuals and communities” (UNESCO 2017, 10). As previously mentioned, part of Mongolia’s process ensures that applicants’ information is announced and that the Culture and Arts Committee receives feedback from the community (UNESCO ICHCAP 2008, 34). Although the program is too new for scholarship on its management and success, the program is
strictly structured on reviving the ICH elements. Mongolia’s program establishes a national role and requires annual examination to ensure the bearers are still demonstrate mastery at their craft. Mongolia’s LNT program aims to reestablish their national identity after decades of cultural suppression and alterations under the Soviet Union.

**Conclusion**

As Mongolia gained their independence in 1911, they found themselves able to achieve absolute freedom only by entering a diplomatic relationship with the Soviet Union. By the end of the 20th century, we see the start of democracy. Mongolia’s independence from China brought them under similar circumstances of a controlling allied relationship with the Soviet Union to fight against their oppressor. While under the Soviet Union, Mongolian cultural institutions and programs were created that involved the working class. It was when the Soviet Union collapsed that Mongolia was able to start reclaiming their cultural identity. The Mongolian government, along with the ROK’s and UNESCO’s assistance, were able to establish a cultural heritage management network. Although they were successful in implementing cultural heritage policies and the LNT program, there have been troublesome downsides with traditions such as the Tuuli without a successor. As UNESCO receives documentation from the respective government agency for the preservation duties of a tradition every few years, there is no current documentation to tell how successful the LNT program is or how Mongolian traditions are surviving.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

This thesis has analyzed four East Asian countries’ histories of ICH with a particular interest in how Japan and the Republic of China (PRC) may have influenced ICH within their old colonies, the ROK and Mongolia respectively. Although the LNT program initiated by Japan has proven suitable to different countries’ needs, and portions of it remained embedded in long-term approaches to ICH, the ROK and Mongolia’s LNT programs came to take on new forms after decolonization. Although I used the LNT program as the main example of ICH preservation, I also made observations in other areas. One of these areas was the topic of heritage management, including how each country conducts ICH management in general and what led to the development of their LNT programs. Each East-Asian country took interest in ICH due to political, cultural, and economic factors that showed some influence from their previous colonizers.

Although Japan altered Korea’s tangible and intangible culture, Japan also suffered losses and changes from World War II. The numerous deaths of both Japanese civilians and military personnel devastated Japan's cultural heritage as it loss potential successors to ICH arts. There were preservation policies established and enforced, but they came to a halt due to the priorities of war efforts and focused on tangible heritage. After WWII, the Allied Occupation helped the Japanese government resume cultural heritage preservation, but at the cost of primarily having control over the country itself. The Allied occupation is analogous to the Japanese occupation in Korea, controlling how cultural heritage operated and official government operations. Korea has a long history of colonization by Japan that heavily impacted Korea’s tangible and intangible culture. Japanese occupation of the country and exploitation of its resources led to the exertion of Japanese culture onto the
Korean citizens. Despite Japan’s efforts to fully influence Korea, the Koreans rejected Japanese influence after gaining freedom from Japanese occupation in 1945 and began to form two opposing identities during the Korean War. However, the ROK’s LNT program still shows the remains of Japan’s influence (Rossi 2018). As we recount, the ROK LNT program used Japan’s LNT program as the model to follow; as well as previous Japanese laws from the colonization period to build the ICH foundation (Maliangkay and Frederick 2017, 50). While the two LNT programs follow similar procedures for designating a holder, there are differences in how the two explain the process (Aikawa-Faure 2014). The LNT selection procedure in the ROK is more transparent than its Japanese counterpart, which is more secretive about the process. This is not to say that the ROK details specific procedures. Rather, it is clearer on finer details such as the qualifications of supervisors overseeing the procedures. Information regarding the qualifications of the committee members for the ROK’s LNT designations are clear, whereas literature on Japan’s LNT designation suggests that its committee members’ qualifications are not justified. The hierarchy system is not clear in the Japanese LNT system as they only have individuals and groups known as designated holders or LNTs, and successors that are individuals or groups with the potential of being a designated holder (UNESCO 1950). Whereas in the ROK, they define the hierarchy into different categories (Dronjic 2017, 15).

Furthermore, when it comes to ICH laws Japan does not have any separate laws for ICH, not including the UNESCO 2003 convention that many countries also adopted. Although Japan’s establishment of the LNT system is the model for the ROK’s, the ROK seems to consistently try to improve upon the efficacy of its ICH preservation. Using the 2003 Convention for examples of designated practices, most of Japan’s designations are oriented around theater and crafts with few rituals whereas
the opposite is true for the ROK (“Browse the Lists of Intangible Cultural Heritage” n.d.). The ROK focuses primarily on social customs that are seen through folk culture (Howard 2002, 2). The two nations face different interests in the preservation of ICH. As Japan recovered from the war and Allied Occupation, they soon reestablished diplomatic relationships with other countries. The ROK protected their culture from not only Japanese colonization but also the Korean War that separated Korea into two. While Japan’s colonizer policies built the foundation, the ROK established their own ICH policies and determined what their national identity is for themselves.

Similar to Japan colonizing Korea, China ruled over Mongols until Mongolia became separated into two geographical regions, Inner and Outer Mongolia. However, only “Outer Mongolia” was able to claim independence with the help of the Soviet Union and became known as ‘Mongolia’. As Mongolia was occupied by the Soviet Union from 1911 to 1990, China was unable to play a significant role in how Mongolia began ICH preservation practices. However in 1945, Mongolia and China were able to establish relations that rekindled their former relationship despite Mongolia wanting to be seen by China (Green 1986, 1342). It was not until 1994 that Mongolia and China started cultural diplomacy visits and exchanges (fmprc.gov.cn 2010). However, comparing their LNT programs that reflect their ICH management shows that China scarcely had influence over Mongolia in a cultural sense.

Mongolia’s LNT program used the ROK program, as well as the 2003 Convention, as its primary models (Park 2013, 127), with a primary focus on folk traditions such as oral stories, rituals, knowledge, and practices concerning nature and the universe (UNESCO ICHCAP 2008, 23–24). China used the 2003 Convention as the foundation, but changed the LNT program to accommodate their needs for revenue and established soft power in cultural heritage. Similarly, Mongolia’s LNT program was
created with the assistance of the ROK and designed to preserve what remained of their heritage (ICHCAP 2008, 8). However, unlike Mongolia, China's LNT program does not incorporate public opinion and may take in potential inheritors if their art form is exploitable in terms of tourism revenue (Nakano and Zhu 2020, 8; You and Hardwick 2020, 10). Mongolia’s LNT program is too new to have scholarship on its management and success, by comparison to the LNT program in China, it is strictly structured on reviving ICH elements. While inheritors compete to establish recognition in China or resign due to lack of recognition, Mongolia’s program establishes a national role and requires annual examination to ensure the bearers still demonstrate mastery at their craft (Maags 2018, 5; UNESCO ICHCAP 2008). As China uses the LNT program for beneficial purposes of the country as well as a strategy to control national identity through heritage programs, Mongolia’s LNT program aims to reestablish their national identity after decades of cultural suppression and alterations under the Soviet Union.

Outside of the LNT program, the two countries had internal affairs that impacted how they managed cultural heritage. In 1966, China’s Cultural Revolution began and what was considered part of ‘the Four Olds’ were meant to be destroyed (Andrews 2010, 33). The Red Guards movement did not only target traditional Chinese arts and Western culture, but also individuals considered ‘rightist’ and intellectuals (Andreas 2002, 478; King and Walls 2010, 8). These individuals were artists, teachers, or even family and friends of the Red Guards. Art works were burnt along with literature and temples were destroyed (Spence 2001, 2). Those that were not killed by the Red Guards may have died from chronic malnutrition due to the famine that occurred. The Cultural Revolution changed China’s culture and the lives of citizens for years to come, still remaining in those that are still alive today. Though
free from Chinese rule, Mongolia became dependent on another more powerful nation, the Soviet Union, while under their protection. However, while Mongolia was under the protection of the Soviet Union their culture was in the hands of another ruling authority. The Soviet Union saw parts of Mongolian traditional culture as backwards and feudalistic. (Altangerel 2020, 245; Mongolian National Commission for UNESCO [MNCU] 1982, 14-15). The Ministry of Culture (MOC) used unions as a form of control and monitoring over artistic and cultural practices (Nichols 2014, 36). Rural Mongols were impacted the most, being treated as backwards and uncivilized, by the MOC's control due to their lack of modern resources (Nichols 2014, 36-37). It was not until 1990 when the Soviet Union collapsed that Mongolia started to restore their traditional cultural heritage independently. Mongolia’s case for the protection and management of ICH relates to their wish from freedom from Chinese rule and establish their political independence where they can freely live the way they want.

However, under the Soviet Union, they went through modernization and almost lost many traditions that defined who Mongols were for centuries. China’s presence in Mongolia today plays more of a factor toward Mongolia’s ICH than it did in the past. Mongolian culture is closely related to traditional Mongolian culture that exists in China today. However, the Mongols that face suppression of their culture are those that remain in Inner Mongolia. Despite not being part of China anymore, Mongolia’s relationship with China represents familiar dynamics between a colonizer and colony. China’s presence and threats of removal financial support toward Mongolia reflects on their imperialist behavior that never vanished. The threat of retaliation is possibly high, making Mongolia appear submissive and blind to various actions that could hurt the Mongol community such as the education policy that China's implementing in Inner Mongolian lower-level schools (Reuters Staff 2020). Despite the pressure that
China holds over Mongolia, Mongolia's ICH protection and management policies do not reflect China’s. China ICH management follows UNESCO's standards of defining what ICH is and what it preserves in Chinese society, but the preventive actions are not demonstrated in their LNT program. Mongolia’s LNT program demonstrates Mongolia’s need for reviving suppressed culture.

I used the LNT program as a sub-case study to further examine how each country uses the program, originally from Japan, to preserve their ICH. Each country was found to have similar structures, with their own guidelines overseen by ministries. Although each LNT program’s guidelines are unique to the country in terms of standards, management, and benefits, I found fewer similarities to the Japanese program than I expected. While the programs follow similar procedures for designation they include their own procedures or a few altered steps. Other East Asian countries’ programs shared more similarities with each other than with Japan’s or UNESCO’s, perhaps due to their similar experiences of suppression or sudden interest in ICH beginning in the 20th century. Beyond the LNT program, each country has multiple laws or programs to preserve ICH. By contrast, Japanese policies have been based solely on the LPCP since its creation in 1950. While the ROK adopted the LNT program from Japan, they focus primarily on folk lore aspects of ICH. Other countries, such as China and Mongolia, have created more than one law to address specific situations related to ICH needs.

One of the greatest difficulties in conducting research for this thesis was the inability to access archives due to the circumstances of COVID-19. While some countries have digital libraries, not all of these are accessible to Westerners. Furthermore, some of the digital libraries did not contain documentation relevant to cultural heritage policies. Countries such as China and Mongolia do not have
easily-navigated websites and digitized archives as do Japan and the ROK. I also
found that within these archives, I could not find any documentation directly related
to LNT programs, making the research process primarily secondary. Archival
research without the means to travel is a less than desirable methodology for this
thesis. If I could have accessed physical documentation and traveled to certain
agencies within these countries, my research could have focused more clearly on LNT
participants and processes.

This thesis reveals the significance of ICH in any given country. Many of these
countries came to prioritize ICH preservation due to the decline of traditions, customs,
skills, etc. that once represented a culture’s identity. The destruction of wars,
colonization, and time serve to change ICH practices, resulting in a sense of losing a
link to the past for future generations. In Japan’s case, they became an early example
of how to fulfill the needs of ICH management. China used the LNT program to
preserve heritage while focusing also on the economic benefits of tourism the
program provides. The ROK and Mongolia’s programs linger on the revival of
suppressed ICH traditions that define their national identity. Japan and China show
that in a form of power, they do have influence over their former colonies. The power
China and Japan hold over their former colonies have come through in forms of
heritage soft power, economical relationships, and former war relationships still
present.
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