Heritage Management in Korea and Japan: The Politics of Antiquity and Identity, by Hyung Il Pai. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2013. 312 pp., US$ 30.00, ISBN: 978-0-295-99305-8 (paperback)

Ideas of heritage are deeply intertwined with the development of nationalism, imperialism, post-colonialism, and tourism. As such, heritage management is never neutral but influenced by politics and business. This book was written in this spirit. The author, Pai, rightly points out that most of the previous heritage studies are confined to the cases of European countries and their former colonies. This realization leads her to problematize heritage management in Korea and Japan from a political point of view. As a consequence, she finds that Japanese heritage management policies, associated with ideologies of nationalism, mercantilism, and imperialism, determined the fate of art and archaeological remains not only in Japan but also in Korea. Throughout this book Pai argues that such heritage-related practices and knowledge are far from neutral as "the selection process of designating national treasures, ethnic categories, and tourist destinations in Japan and Korea" was "driven by overlapping and competing political, social, and economic imperatives such as nation building, territorial claims, civilizing missions, curatorial schemes, and the promotion of diplomacy, trade, and commerce" (xxxv). To support her argument, she provides social and historical contexts implicated in heritage management and heritage-related knowledge production in Korea and Japan. Starting with recent issues in Korean heritage management practices, she traces back the genealogy of such practices to the Meiji era and the Japanese colonial era.

In the introductory chapter Pai presents the Cultural Heritage Administration, formerly the Office of Cultural Properties, as a key heritage management institution in Korea. Characterizing the heritage-management style of the Office of Cultural Properties as a top-down authoritarian one, Pai specifies two sources of that characteristic. She spells out that such style stemmed from the harsh government censorship under military rule on the one hand, and the elitist nature of the committee membership of the Office of Cultural Properties on the other. This authoritarian characteristic is then contrasted with the changed atmosphere in the area of heritage management with the arrival of

a working democratic government. Highlighting the active engagement of the public with heritage management policies, she gives three headline-grabbing instances. For the first case, she cites the resignation of the head of the Cultural Heritage Administration under media pressure after the incident of South Gate burnt down by arson in 2008. She then moves on, for the second example, to the media debate between 1996 and 1997 about cultural properties which were designated during the Japanese colonial era and, after the liberation from the colonial era, criticized as colonial relics. This second case attests to how difficult it is to scrape the vestiges of Japanese imperialism from Korean heritage, in spite of the full awareness of those vestiges and every effort to eradicate them, once such Japanese relics were codified into and thereby constituted part of Korean heritage. In contrast, the first case or the burnt South Gate incident seems to be too extreme an example to represent general characteristics of recent heritage management in Korea. A similar problem is noted with the third case in the following respects.

As the last case exemplifying recent heritage management practices in Korea, Pai takes conflicts of interest over buried cultural remains involving developers, local governments and residents, and archaeologists. With the economic pressure to make room for industrialization and urbanization projects, according to Pai, "the typical Korean excavation is still a salvage project carried out during a short two-month summer-vacation period and conducted haphazardly without adequately trained staff or sufficient funds. Considering the daunting task facing many Korean archaeologists, it comes as no surprise that only the most urgent, media-grabbing, or highly visible sites are investigated in any systematic manner" (24). She goes further to assert that "under the present systems systematic site surveys were not required prior to excavation," and that "the pressure of keeping under budget obstructed creativity and research" (26). As evidence of this problematic situation Pai quotes the increase of rescue excavations in number, from 30 cases to 1,108 ones between 1991 and 2011. Contrary to her assertion, however, the number of rescue excavations has increased, not because the number of excavations carried out unsystematically and haphazardly has increased, but because legal regulations and requirements about excavations and buried cultural remains have got more refined and strict over time. As Pai well recognizes, it is not easy to resolve the conflicts of interest between different parties over buried cultural remains. It is also true that the dilemma between economic development and cultural preservation exists not

only in Korea but also in many different parts of the world. Then, in order to situate the above-mentioned problems in broader contexts and at the same time stimulate constructive discussions about these, Pai could have suggested some future directions with reference to alternative forms of heritage management, say, in European countries where sophisticated heritage management policies have long been established. Without such endeavor, her criticism of current heritage management practices in Korea appears rather void. In particular, it is unfair for her to use such a provocative expression as "bulldozed" or "dynamited" heritages without taking into enough consideration sustained efforts Korean archaeologists have made against all odds since the independence from Japanese rule.

In the succeeding chapters Pai addresses historical processes through which European ideas of heritage were introduced to Meiji Japan and then heritage management policies and institutions formed afterwards in Japan and Korea. While doing so, Pai writes about personal situations and motivations of figures who played an important role in the said processes. Pai directs our attention to how ancient Japanese arts were used to promote the imagery of Japan as a cultured and civilized nation with an illustrious past on par with European countries. She then turns to how heritages in Japan and its former colonies were mobilized for the purposes of Japanese nation building and emperor myth making. It was in the middle of these processes, according to Pai, that archaeological data from the Korean peninsula were appropriated as "scientific" evidence to delegitimize Korean people by Japanese authorities. Amongst such delegitimizing scenarios was, she goes on to indicate, the master racial narrative that Koreans have an innate mentality of dependency on foreign superpowers, which made Koreans degenerate into an ineffectual people by the time of the late Yi dynasty. Simultaneously, Pai maintains, the travel industry and print media played another critical part in representing Koreans "as Japan's long-lost poor country cousins who had been salvaged from the Dark Ages by the timely return of the superior Japanese" (162-63).

It must have been hard work to construct this coherent genealogy of heritage management in Korea and Japan, out of the heterogeneous, fragmentary data extending over a wide range of period from the Meiji era to the present day. The author definitely deserves credit for this. It is especially so in that this book is the first attempt to interpret the said genealogy from a long-term political perspective. Having said that, it is also here where an intrinsic

weakness of this work is observed. Pai could have made her arguments more thought-provoking by presenting the genealogy in the form of a contested rather than consensual one, by having different perspectives and interpretations of the same subject matter play off against each other instead of putting together bits and pieces of information into an overarching narrative. In the concluding chapter, for example, Pai focuses on the issue of the plunder of Korean heritages by the Japanese in the twentieth century. As a conclusion she writes, "[c]ontrary to the former claims of many Korean scholars and lawyers, at present scant evidence exists that the CST [Government General of Korea]-employed specialists were the culprits who were motivated to dig only for personal gain, fame, and profit" (181). Yet she never mentions what "the former claims" are, let alone who made such claims and on what grounds. As much as this is an unresolved, politically sensitive problem between Korea and Japan, it is hard to understand why she stops short of explicating the dispute. In the same vein, Pai could have paid more attention to diverse positions and roles of consumers in heritage or tourism industry. As recent studies about the agency of consumers reveal, it is unwise to presume that consumers are passive recipients of ideologies promoted by heritage and tourism industries. To borrow A. J. Horning's (2010, 545-46) terminology, overly simplistic incorporation of contested interpretations of past societies and diverse positions of past agents into a present narrative can keep us from any critical engagement with the complexities of past societies and lives.

Reference

Horning, A. J. 2010. "Cultures of Contact, Cultures of Confilict?" In *Contemporary Archaeology in Theory,* edited by R.W. Preucel and S. A. Mrozowski, 534-49. Oxford: Blackwell

WOO Jung-youn
The Academy of Korean Studies