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Authorised Heritage Discourse? — A Critical Discourse Analysis to understand the Valorization of Built Heritage in Hong Kong

SYNOPSIS

This research aims at investigating heritage discourse in Hong Kong from 1970 to 2016. With reference to Laurajane Smith’s notion of Authorised Heritage Discourse (AHD), this paper will examine firstly, the extent of extrospective-ness in the heritage policy of Hong Kong; secondly, whether professional discourse have contributed to the heritage valorization in Hong Kong; thirdly, what kinds of subaltern and dissenting heritage discourse are depicted in Hong Kong; and fourthly, the power dynamics between the authorized and subaltern/dissenting discourse. By conducting a critical discourse analysis on government records and diversified online and offline channels of published news, interviews and public opinions, this study aims to deepen our understanding towards heritage valorization process—how the threshold of significance is stipulated in various heritage discourses and how such discourses have created ramifications on the society’s perception on the built historic environment.

I. INTRODUCTION

My interest on this topic was started off by the Hong Kong Government’s initiation in studying “Industrial Heritage” in the Kowloon East back in 2012. The Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO), an auspice of The Development Bureau of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) commissioned a study to document the “industrial heritage” in the Kowloon East and to use industrial heritage to develop a heritage trail or “culture map” for tourist, and to derive urban design strategies and guidelines with an objective to preserve the character of the district as it transforms from industrial to business area. However, the EKEO has been clear that it is not the government’s intention to intervene the pace of urban
transformation or preserve any tangible industrial remains. The “conservation” of the industrial heritage character is evidently out of social and cultural considerations, as stated explicitly in the project brief. EKEO describes industrial heritage as “an inspiring theme for public art” and “a sensational link for the past, present and future in the pace of rapid urban transformation,” which also serves to manifest the “Hong Kong’s can do spirit” and to express Hong Kong identity by honouring the industrial past. Industrial heritage is deployed as a design strategy. Without preserving any industrial remains, the “idea” of industrial heritage is displayed, at the same time being displaced for social, cultural or development purpose. Even though the industrial buildings have witnessed the rapid industrialization and de-industrialization in Hong Kong, they are not old enough to be recognized as heritage, nor do these buildings possess high aesthetic value. There are also practical reasons for not grading industrial buildings in Hong Kong, for example, majority of the industrial buildings in Hong Kong are flatted factories and the ownership is complicated; the industrial districts are also too messy and polluted to be aligned with urban design standards. However, the government’s initiative in recognizing the heritage value of the industrial remains or industrial culture shows that the government hesitated to be totally indifferent to the rapid and drastic changes in the urban built environment. The attempt to extract the character, or the intangible quality, from the disappearing built form can be viewed as a radical effort in utilizing the concept of heritage. The disregard of the materiality of heritage on one hand, and the embrace of the heritage concept and its uses on the other hand, present a paradoxical heritage conception.

The interpretation of this situation as a paradox actually stemmed from the understanding that

---

1 Industrial districts like Kowloon East are rapidly changing into business areas since the introduction of “The Revitalization of Industrial Building Policy” by the Development Bureau in 2009. The establishment of the EKEO also expedited the transformation in Kowloon East. The pace of development and rise in rental prices has provoked public outcry especially from the arts and cultural community which has settled in Kwun Tong since 2000. Since the industrial buildings in Hong Kong are too young to be declared as monuments or historic buildings, many features of industrial remains were being wiped out or replaced by shiny curtain walls.

heritage has to be based on certain materiality of either historic or aesthetic interest, be it historic buildings or relics. Laurajane Smith argues that this conventional notion of heritage is the result of, what she calls, the “Authorised Heritage Discourse” (AHD). Smith argues that AHD naturalizes the heritage practice of selecting what ought to be preserved, and ultimately promotes a certain sets of Eurocentric “western elite cultural values as being universally applicable”; at the same time, it undermines alternative and subaltern ideas about heritage.3

The characteristics of AHD, as defined by Smith, are firstly, 1) assuming authority to define the “legitimate spokespersons for the past,” i.e. inviting experts such as architects, archeologists and historians to judge if the past is valuable to protect; 2) treating the idea of heritage as innately valuable – “all that is good and important about the past” is contributing to the development of the “cultural character of the present.”4 The AHD appears as a lens to “see” heritage. It shapes our mind when we consider what is valuable to be preserved. As Smith argues, the formation of AHD relies heavily on 1) the rise of professional discourse in late 19th Century that empowers or canonizes “expertise and aesthetic judgement;”5 2) the grand narratives of nation and class with a root in the imperialist past,6 and 3) the international organizations—“the authorizing institutions”—to achieve universal dominance.7

Smith emphasizes that the AHD is a set of self-referential narrative with a particular set of consequence.8 As shown in her research, one of the consequences is the inability of the general public to recount their heritage experience outside the AHD discourse.9

In view of the recent initiative of the government, though not directly from Antique and Monument Office (AMO)—the government department that looks after heritage issues, heritage discourse in Hong Kong seems to have, paradoxically, bound by and liberated from the Smithian AHD at the same time. In the case of industrial heritage in Kowloon East,

---

4 Ibid., 29.
5 Ibid., 11, 19.
6 Ibid., 17, 21.
7 Ibid., 87-106.
8 Ibid., 11.
9 Ibid., 135.
discourses agree to the AHD by seeing historical buildings should be innately valuable, therefore, industrial buildings without architectural merits or age value should not be preserved. However, the heritage value is recognized and emancipated from materiality, being passed on in the most abstract and intangible form which appears to have freed itself from the restraining AHD. It shows that the concept of AHD alone is inadequate in helping us make sense of our government’s decision on heritage.

II. RESEARCH QUESTION

The approach adopted by HKSAR towards the industrial heritage in Hong Kong led us to ponder again the ontology of the heritage concept, and how we have come to consider what is valuable for being passed on to the future generation. This research will explore, in the particular context of Hong Kong, whether our ways of understanding heritage is framed by the AHD; if AHD is not the sole influence as demonstrated by the case elaborated above, what other factors are at play in framing our understanding?

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

i. OVERVIEW

Positioning in the constellation of studies

There is a great wealth of literature on heritage that can lay the ground for further exploration. Emma Waterton and Steve Watson’s book *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research* tries to present an overview on heritage research in the past and at present as it embraces “diverse interest, disciplines and perspectives.”10 The authors identified some strands or trends in heritage studies, e.g. the early study of heritage interpretation in 50s (Tilden’s *Interpreting Our Heritage*), the study of heritage protection (Cleere’s

Archaeological Heritage Management), the study of heritage industry, commodification and tourism in 80s (Wright’s On Living in an Old Country; Lowenthal’s The Past is a Foreign Country; Hewison’s The Heritage Industry), the study concerning the operational issues (Swarbrooke’s The Development and Management of Visitor Attractions; Hall and McArther’s Integrated Heritage Management; Leask and Yeoman’s Heritage Visitor Attractions), the study of community heritage and identity (Leone’s “Towards a critical archeology”; McDavid’s “From ‘Traditional’ Archaeology to Public Archaeology to Community Action”), and the discursive formulation of heritage at the turn of the century (Tunbridge et.al.’s A Geography of Heritage : Power, Culture and Economy; Smith’s Uses of Heritage). As disarranged as it may seem in terms of theory and methodology, this tracking exercise is helpful in understanding heritage study as a myriad of studies.\textsuperscript{11} Waterton and Watson agree with Tunbridge et.al. in pointing out that “an increasing focus on discursive formulation of heritage have now become ‘the compelling direction of progress in [the field of heritage studies]’”.\textsuperscript{12}

In another journal article presented by the Waterton and Watson, it argues that current theoretical debates could be categorized into theories in, theories of, and theories for heritage (italics in the original). Theories in the heritage concern mainly the “good practice” of heritage management—identify issues and problems to be resolved by better practice; theories of heritage adopts a “historicing frame” to put heritage in its social and cultural context, with an aim to understand “the whole phenomenon” and is equipped with “an awareness of its ideological underpinnings”; theories for heritage fueled by the development in representational theories, it examines the “physical, discursive or affective” effects of heritage at the personal level, the ordinary and the everyday; it presents a more speculative

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 3-9.

ends of heritage studies.13 Such categorization of heritage theories is useful in helping readers to amass the heritage studies that are disparate in scope, subject matter, theories, and methodology. However, by acknowledging the theories for heritage, possibilities for heritage studies become infinite. As the authors also admit that the theories for heritage should not only be interpreted at a personal level, and is problematic to assume homogenous personal engagement with heritage.14 If the “theories for heritage” is a valid category, I would argue that we should take it with caution and be critical as to where to draw the line of what is about heritage and what is not. In light of this categorization, this research positions itself within the realm of theories of heritage with an aim to identify the theoretical underpinnings of the heritage concept, and how it is formulated within the wider historical, geo-political, social and cultural context in Hong Kong. Is there such thing as “orthodox view” of heritage? Or is it mere practice? Is the heritage value be readily debated across different economic, social and political agenda? It is therefore neither a study of heritage practice (theories in heritage), nor a study on the subjective experience of heritage (theories for heritage).

The idea of “ontological politics” of Mol cited by Waterton and Watson in “The Ontological Politics of Heritage; or How research can spoil a good story” is particularly useful in helping us comprehend the multilayered readings of heritage offered by the heritage studies coming from various disciplines and research methodology.15 Mol argues, in her “Ontological Politics, A word and some questions,” that different health care practices create different realities,16 namely, not different versions of realities but different realities. With reference to the example of anemia that Mol used, the performance of anemia is different in clinical, pathophysiological and statistical (laboratory) methods and the objects may not overlap with each other, meaning that a patient is diagnosed clinically as suffering from anemia may go

---

14 Ibid., 556.
undetected in pathophysiological or statistical methods. All these realities co-exist and are equally valid, the existence of one do not challenge the legitimacy of the other. Ontologies, a word in its plural form, is different from perspectivalism in the sense that ontologies presents multiple realities while for perspectivalism, only the eye of the beholder multiplies but not the reality. Unfortunately, Waterton and Watson only borrow Mol’s concept of “ontological politics” to string up various research in heritage studies without giving much substantiation or critical reflection on the use of the word “ontological politics.” For example, in the same paragraph that Waterton and Watson cited Mol’s concept, they write:

While the ontological politics of heritage is not univocal and encompasses both conventional and critical accounts, our intention in this chapter is to suggest that it gives us not only the firm basis for a critique of much existing research in heritage but also the momentum to move it to a different level and provide additional perspectives (my emphasis)

The use of the word “perspectives” shows that the authors were insensitive to the differentiation between “ontology” and “perspectivalism” that Mol carefully articulated in her research. To move beyond a casual borrowing of terms, this research will attempt to consider these philosophical reflections in the understanding of heritage concept, in the particular context Hong Kong. The concept of “ontological politics,” when applied to heritage studies, probes us to think whether there exists a monopolistic or orthodox version of heritage? Do alternative discourses draw up pluralistic realities that are equally legitimate? Is it possible at all to reflect such philosophy in heritage policy?

ii. HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF CONSERVATION

The idea of Modern Conservation Movement

To understand the ontology of heritage, one has to put it into historical context and see how it
has evolved. While many scholars identifies heritage as a relatively contemporary concept that emerged in Europe in 19th Century modernity, David Harvey argues that view is restraining heritage studies in what he terms as “present-centred professional terrain” actually lead to the impasse (author’s emphasis) in systematically understanding heritage, and leaving the field with “little more than a morass of case studies,” he quotes Terry-Chandler. 19 Harvey proposes that heritage and its effect over identity construction and enforcing or subverting social relations has simultaneously existed in human condition and hence, not of a cause-and-effect relationship. 20 By providing evidence of early representation and interpretation of historical events and sites before the modern era, Harvey proposes to situate heritage studies in a longer temporal framework and treat heritage as a cultural process. 21 The idea of heritagization as a cultural process will be explored further in later sections of this literature review.

Laurajane Smith, however, argues that Harvey’s point of view fails to provide insights to the significant development in the heritage discourse in late 19th Century Europe, how it emerged as a professional discourse that generates a particular sets practices; why and how such discourse had “achieved dominance as a ‘universalizing’ discourse in the twenty-first century.”22 The idea of “dominance” and “universalization” are expressed in the form of legal decree and the wave of adoption or mutual referencing of such decrees in various jurisdictions, and ultimately culminated as charters with international influences such as the Athens Charter in 1931, the Venice Charter in 1964, World Heritage Convention in 1977 and Burra Charters


20 Ibid., 335-336.

21 Ibid., 335-336.

22 Smith, Uses of Heritage, 17.
in 1979.

Smith notes that although the first legal decree to protect national antiquities dates back to the 17th Century in Sweden, the surge of the development of legal instruments in protecting monuments do not appear until the second half of the 19th Century. These legal instruments include Ancient Monument Protection Act 1882 (England), The Federal Antiquities Law of 1906 (America), The Regolamento of 1909 (Italy), The Oldenburg Monuments Protection law of 1911 (Germany), The Loi du 31 Decembre 1913 sur les Monuments Historiques of 1913 (France) and First Nature Conservation Act of 1937 (Denmark), and hence, the legalization of heritage protection, if not the heritage concept itself, is by large a modern development. Jukka Jokilehto has also acknowledged this turn in the development of conservation practice. In *A History of Architectural Conservation*, Jokilehto traces the development of conservation practice and theory throughout the European history in meticulous details and he distinguishes the conservation practice in the modern era from those in the ancient times and calls it “modern conservation movement.”

Jokilehto explains that this modern conservation movement has found its first expression in 18th Century Europe as a result of developments in the Age of Enlightenment. The modern conservation movement is characterized by its sharpened sense of historical consciousness, the awareness of the pluralized culture and the question of values. Jokilehto quotes Foucault to express the changes in value perception in the modern era, “Value can no longer be defined, as in the Classical age, on the basis of a total system of equivalences, and of the capacity that commodities have of representing one another. Value has ceased to be a sign, it has become a product.” The modern conservation movement and within it, the arguments around the heritage practice, reveals the destabilized link between the act of conservation and the value created. When the “restoration fury” encounter increasing criticism in the second half of the
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23 Ibid., 19.
19th Century, various discourse or polemics appeared over how things ought to be preserved and what values are generated. It demonstrates the subtle yet fundamental shift of the heritage concept, from a practice of “how” in the repair and restoration of historical things and buildings, to a value-loaded movement to discuss both “what is to be preserved” and the “how” informed by “what.”

Jokilehto situates such shift in heritage protection against the background of the Age of Enlightenment which is qualified by the interrelated strands of political, intellectual, economic and social development. Politically, the age of Enlightenment is delimited by the changes from aristocracy rule to the French Revolution, through which the idea of democracy and national identity underwent rigorous investigation; intellectually, the scientific and technical advancement had led to the prevalence of positivism and objectivism, and hence a quest for scientific proof for knowledge production; economically, industrialization and the mass production has heightened the debate over originality and authenticity; socially, industrialization and urbanization has led to the rise of mercantile class, and the unsettling social structure and identity. It is against such background that the heritage conservation practice was being considered from a renewed perspective to find ways to legitimate itself in the destabilized social structure. Similarly, Hobsbawn addresses the issue of how the changing society demands something “ancient.” He attributes the “invention of tradition” to the rise of mercantile class in late 19th Century, and traditions were deployed as “new devices to ensure or express social cohesion and identity and to structure social relations.”

---

26 Jokilehto used the term “restoration fury” to describe the time when positivism and the development of sciences had encouraged a wave of restoration, heightened by the policies of Ecclesiologists in England and the governmental guidelines on restoration in France after 1830s. Jokilehto, *A History of Architectural Conservation*, 18.


of identity is intertwined with the idea of heritage in many ways and is elaborated by many scholars, this part will be elaborated in latter session in this literature review.29

The Development of Professional Discourse

Smith argues that professional architects and the newly emergent discipline of archaeology back in 19th Century were significant in the institutionalization of heritage, i.e. the development of legislation. This is why, Smith argues with the support of her discourse analysis of major international charters, that the AHD is fundamentally reliant on the professional discourse or expertise over material culture. This part of the literature review will look at whether there is any direct relationship between the development of professional discipline and the legislation.

In the Uses of Heritage, Smith does not explain in depth how the profession of archaeology had led to the legislation of heritage protection, but she has cited John Carman’s Valuing Ancient Things: Archaeology and Law to support her views. However, a closer look on John Carman’s work reveals that Smith’s reading might have oversimplified the issue. Carman’s work explains that the archaeologists have been appropriating laws for the development of the field, e.g. James Talbot had proposed a parliament bill in 1858 to appropriate the Treasure Trove, a royal prerogative started from the end of middle ages, to build national collection of antiquities, but the bill did not get passed. Carman’s research shows that the later success in passing the Ancient Monuments Protection Bills in 1882 was very much the effort of Sir John Lubbock, who was not only an archaeologist, but was also famous as banker and politician of the Liberal Party. The struggle between Ethnological Society which is led by Sir John Lubbock, and Anthropological Association which is led by Tories, was predominantly political; and Lubbock’s attempt in archaeological legislation was very much driven by his

29 For example, Lowenthal discussed the idea of heritage gives us a collective identity and hold citizens responsible for the collective past. David Lowenthal, The Past is a Foreign Country Revisited (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 604-610.
liberal political vision to include Ireland in the scope of protection. Therefore, one can hardly generalize that the legislation of heritage protection was driven by the development of archaeological profession. Instead, it shows that the legislation of heritage protection indeed requires a contextualized reading against its social and political background and the context of legislation may vary from one jurisdiction to another.

The relationship between the professional discipline of architecture and the legislation is even more obscure. Again, set against the background of England, Smith identified that John Ruskin’s *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* is indicative towards future conservation practice, and William Morris being the founder of Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), wrote Ruskin’s philosophy into the SPAB manifesto in 1877. Smith claims that the SPAB has functioned to “lobby and educate government and society at large about ‘proper’ conservation principles,” and hence, the modern conservation practice, such as the “Public Planning Guidance 15” in England heavily quoted William Morris and SPAB as a sign showing that the architecture discipline or discourse has informed the legislation or the “institutionalization” of heritage protection. However, such reading is problematic because of the following reasons. First, Sir John Lubbock first proposed the Ancient and Monument Protection Bill in 1873, that was before the establishment of SPAB in 1877, no evidence could show that SPAB has participated in the initiation of the legislation. Second, even one could argue that SPAB might have influenced public opinion so to favour the passing of the Bill in 1882, a detailed study on the bill would challenge the validity of such interpretation. The Bill and the subsequent legislation were carefully designed by Lubbock to specifically exclude the medieval monuments which SPAB strived to preserve. Although Lubbock was also one of the founding members of SPAB, as noted by Chippindale, he was in favour of
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32 Ibid., 19-20.
33 Carman, *Valuing Ancient Things*, 86.
interventionism while Morris opposed to any form of state authority or intervention. 34 Therefore, the concern over conservation principles promoted by SPAB has no direct relation with the Ancient and Monument Act in 1882. Third, the extent of influence of Ruskin and Morris on the architectural practice is questionable, at least in their times. They fought hard against the mainstream architectural practice within and outside the architectural institution, despite the fact that neither Ruskin nor Morris was architect. 35 In 1874, Ruskin refused the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) Gold Medal, the first person ever to do so. In 1877, SPAB under the leadership of Morris also assumed an antagonistic position against the established profession. SPAB initiated a public campaign to denounce the architectural practice at consecutive meetings of the RIBA itself. 36 The media Builder and Building News were skeptical towards the “confrontational approach” adopted by SPAB. 37 The architects were also disinterested in following Morris’ dogma. There were a large number of castle ruins under reconstruction between 1890 and 1930, the architect Martin Conway said, when he began to rebuild the ruin of Allington Castle in Kent in 1905,

We set at naught the theories of the so-called antiscape school [of William Morris].

According to them we ought never to have replace old work by new of the same design…Just as the Wyatts, in the time of Henry VIII, had done just what they pleased to bring the old house into habitable and beautiful harmony, so could we act in our day and generation. 38

Therefore, it is problematic to assume that there was a univocal narrative from the architectural practice towards the “proper” conservation as advocated by SPAB. There is,

35 Unlike his French counterpart Viollet-le-Duc. See Pendlebury, Conservation in the Age of Consensus, 16.
37 Ibid.
however, a gap in understanding how the conservation ethics promoted by Ruskin and Morris had gradually gained recognition amongst all other voices, and how it influences and informs current heritage practice, within and outside England.

Having mentioned that, it is not to deny the interrelations between professionalization and the wave of legislation over heritage protection. As it clearly is one of the missions for Sir John Lubbock to fight for the rise of the professional class, under the leadership of the head of the Liberal Party, Gladstone, as against the aristocratic Tory in 1870s.\textsuperscript{39} Perkin’s \textit{The Rise of Professional Society: England since 1880} delineates there emerged a form of “professional ideal based on trained expertise and selection by merit which emphasized human capital.”\textsuperscript{40} It is also against such background noted a rapid increase in the public domain – the creation of national education service in 1870, followed by the compulsory elementary education in 1880 and the abolishment of fee for Board School education in 1881. The 1870s and 1880s also demarcate the period of the surge of legislation, e.g. the Public Health and Artisan’s Dwellings in 1875, the Licensing Bills in 1871, Bills for Public Health in 1872, the Ten hours Bill for female shopworkers in 1873, The Employers and Workmen Act of 1875, the Merchant Shipping Act of 1876, the Bankers Book Evidence Bill in 1870s, Employer’s Liability Act in 1880, the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Act of 1883, etc.\textsuperscript{41} A professional society, has a number of characteristics, as defined by Perkin. One of the characteristics is that the concept of professionalism reaches “well down the social ladder” and is not just another ruling class.\textsuperscript{42} There appeared to be a “professional control of the market for a particular kind of expertise” in search for status and power.\textsuperscript{43} The professional society has subverted and superseded the aristocratic society, thus, people gain power by becoming an expert not by owning lands. It would be interesting to see how this kind of professionalism is being translated in our understanding of the heritage protection legislation, if it has, as Smith

\textsuperscript{39} Carman, \textit{Valuing Ancient Things}, 87.
\textsuperscript{42} Perkin, \textit{The Rise of Professional Society}, 3.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 4,7.
argues, formulated the AHD. How professionalism is being changed or challenged across different time, social and cultural context? Other than expertise over material culture such as architecture and archaeology, what other professions are working its way into the heritage discourse? What is next after professionalism that can subvert the inner logic like how meritocracy subverted aristocracy?

Heritage as a European or Eurocentric Concept?

Both Jokilehto’s and Chaoy’s work have demonstrated the long history and origin of historic conservation in the Western society. Choay points out that the notion of heritage and the conservation practices associated with it is European as she clearly demarcates a point in 1870s when the concept of historic monuments “went to” Japan while Meiji opening to the West. 44 Also acknowledged by the Nara document on Authenticity, Choay said the Japanese notion of monument conservation — to keep the building in “a perpetual state of newness through ritual reconstruction”— is different from the European notion. 45 In the context of China, Liang Sicheng wrote in the discussion of Jixian Dule-si Guanyin-ge Shanmen Kao in 1932, that whenever there was a change of political sovereignty in Chinese history, many rulers followed what Xiang Yu did in late Qin to set fire in the city in order to proclaim his power. 46 Therefore, people in China rarely know the value of historical buildings, nor do they have the capacity or the specialized knowledge to conserve the buildings. Then he urged for the legislation over the protection of heritage. 47

45 Ibid.
It is not to say that, however, that the Chinese do not have the practice of conservation. As for the conservation of relics, antiquarianism has a long history in China and was popular as early as in Song Dynasty, but Bruce Trigger points out that the practice of antiquarianism mainly serves the purpose of historiography and is far from the modern notion of archaeology as Chinese scholars made no effort to recover data by carrying out excavations.48 Pierre Ryckmans writes in the article “The Chinese attitude towards the Past” that there is a “spiritual presence and physical absence of the past” in China. Educated visitors who travelled to China would encounter the past in all forms of history and memories but not in its monumental sense.49

Therefore current institutionalization of heritage that treats heritage as a common asset of the humanity might have a European root as Choay demonstrates. Choay’s book on The Invention of the Historic Monument explains that Ruskin was the first to conceive the protection of historic monuments at an international scale. Ruskin proposed the creation of a European protective organization, independent of the state mechanism and funded by its members, to buy back the “European asset” if they are on sale or lease and to take care of the conservation of the building.50 Morris also showed concerns for ancient buildings in territories beyond his national boundary in Naples, and even the European boundary in Turkey and Egypt.51 One could argue that it might have inspired the future establishment of the international charters. However, Ruskin’s dream did not come true until exactly 100 years later in 1954 with the...
The creation of the Convention culturelle européenne du Conseil d’Europe. The gap of 100 years in between these happenings actually renders such interpretation on the more speculative end.

The origin of the idea of international collaboration in heritage protection may or may not be Ruskinian, the basis of such collaboration would inevitably resulted in a consensus over what should be protected. The creation of the World Heritage List in 1972 in the Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage (better known as World Heritage Convention) and its introduction of the basic criterion of “outstanding universal value” for the selection is being criticized as “universalizing” the European cultural values. Cleere argues that, in reality, the idea of true universality may not exist and the conjecture of the idea of universality is a hegemonic invention to impose the European value on the rest of the world. In an article published 5 years later, Cleere acknowledges that the global strategy of 1995 adopted by World Heritage Committee tries to revisit the criterion “outstanding universal value” in a more holistic manner. Actually, the critique of Eurocentricism is not only limited to the World Heritage Convention, but to the earlier Charters on the conservation principles as well. Therefore, it is one of the ICOMOS agenda in the general assembly in 1990 to evaluate how Eurocentric are the ideas in the Venice Charter.

Eurocentrism is a topic that sociology and historians have dealt with within the realm of postcolonial studies. According to Bhambra, Eurocentrism refers to “the belief, implicitly or otherwise, in the world historical significance of events believed to have developed endogenously within the cultural-geographical sphere or Europe.” Even though Chakrabarty does not explicitly used the word “Eurocentric,” he argues that the thought of

---

54 Denslagen, Architectural restoration in Western Europe: controversy and continuity, 237.
Europe is indispensable when considering issues in the “far east.” He observes that, “the phenomenon of ‘political modernity’… is impossible to think of anywhere in the world without invoking certain categories and concepts, the genealogies of which go deep into the intellectual and even theological traditions of Europe.”

Heritage is one of the phenomena of political modernity. Chakrabarty argues that “historicism” is embedded in the understanding of the political development of the colonized. “Historicism” refers to the “first in Europe, then elsewhere” type of global historical view where cultural difference between the west and non-west, the colonizer and the colonized, is measured by historical time; and ultimately the non-western would follow the footstep of the West, only “replacing Europe with a locally constructed centre.”

Chakrabarty quoted John Stuart Mill as a representative of the historicists who argued that the Indian are not civilized enough to self-rule and urged them to wait until majority of the population are literate or educated, while the subsequent universal adult suffrage in India actually proved the opposite. Therefore, Chakrabarty argues that the totalizing thought of the Europe is although indispensable, it is inadequate at the same time, and proposes to follow the hermeneutic tradition of Heidegger to write difference into history by conducting subaltern studies.

The discussion of values and significances is pivotal of heritage practice. Atkinson and Bridge challenge that, in the post-colonial world, ideas of aesthetic value and historical significance of preservation are based on those of white people and the new middle class. In terms of museum practices, Christina Kreps also notes that Eurocentrism is consciously fought against. She argues that there are “localized and non-Eurocentric practices in the non-Western context that are invested not only in restoring a people’s right to and control over the

---

57 Ibid., 7.
58 Ibid., 8-10.
59 Ibid., 16.
management of their cultural heritage but also in liberating people’s thinking from a Eurocentric view on museum practices.  

**Relationship between Heritage Conservation and Imperialism**

Bruce Trigger suggests the Darwinian evolution theory and its latent imperialist forces has informed the critical development of archaeology, and hence, indirectly justified the British colonialization.  

Sir John Lubbock, who grew up as a neighbor of Charles Darwin, was an advocate of the Darwinian unilinear cultural evolution and he viewed the inferiority of non-European in culture as a result of their limited natural abilities. Lubbock’s thoughts were written into his books *Prehistoric Times* and *The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man*, were the most influential work in archaeology published in the late 19th Century and early 20th Century. The fact that the Ancient and Monument Protection Act 1882 attributes to Lubbock’s efforts shows that such synthesis between archaeology, imperialism and colonization are much more solid then one would imagine. Trigger even called Lubbock’s study as “imperialist archaeology.” In light of Darwinian influence on archaeology, the colonizers who were interested in the native people and culture often see it as a “living museum of the human past.” Some colonizers instructed early archaeological survey in the colonies. For example, in 1902, Lord Curzon, the British Conservative statesman who was appointed as Viceroy of India in 1898, carried out the first Archaeological Survey of India (ASI).

---

63 Ibid., 115-16.
64 Ibid., 129.
65 Ibid., 129.
It is noted, however, other than initiatives from within the colonial government, the non-governmental organization from the colonizing country also played an important role in early studies of the indigenous cultures. For example, it was the Royal Asiatic Society of the United Kingdom that suggested the Government of India to employ some talented officers to obtain copies of paintings of Indian caves and to preserve the caves from dilapidation. Since both India and Hong Kong were British colonies, though of various time spans, the study on Indian conservation is suggestive as to the possible source of information that could elucidate the conservation history in Hong Kong.

The Rise of New Profession in the Colonial Context

Robert Home’s book *Of Planting and Planning* describes the various rationales behind the making of British colonies. In lieu of the rising of new profession in the home country, the role that various professions, such as architects, planners, surveyors, etc. can play was relatively limited in the colonial administration. Within the colonial bureaucracy, professionals were often “on tap but not on top.” This phenomenon has rendered heritage valorization in the colonies enigmatic and at odd with the AHD: on one hand the valorization of AHD is predominantly shaped by the development of professional discourse and the experts played an important role in identifying valuable objects, one the other hand, professionals were by large limited in delivering professional judgement in the colonial administration.

This part of the literature review examines the historical development of the conservation practice. The following part will discuss various topical issues that informed the development of heritage discourse.

---

iii. POWER DYNAMICS IN HERITAGE VALORIZATION PROCESS

Heritage/ heritagization as a selection process

Scholars have identified that heritage is not only about material remains of the past, it is a process of selection of the past to be appreciated by the present and future generations. Hewison defined heritage as “that which a past generation has preserved and handed on to the present and which a significant group of population wishes to hand on to the future.” 69 As neutral of such passing on as it sounds, Hewison’s definition implies that there is a process of selection as to what should be preserved, and such value is pertinent to the “significant group of population.” Tunbridge & Ashworth also defines heritage as the passing on process — as the present that “selects an inheritance from an imagined past for current use and decides what should be passed on to an imagined future.”70 While Hewison does not specify why the significance group of population would wish to hand on certain things to the future, Tunbridge & Ashworth’s definition on heritage gives an insight on the motives of selection — for “current use.” Tunbridge & Ashworth’s definition of heritage echoes with Hewison’s on the dualistic nature of heritage. Heritage is not only about the material remains of what is inherited from the past generation; it is also about the selection, which is highly charged with agenda of the present days. From these definitions, the intrinsic value of the material remains and instrumental value of heritage are two sides of the coin. Heritage is a subject matter as well as a practice. Lowenthal’s view on heritage practice that it “clarifies pasts so as to infuse them with present purposes,” further elaborated on how heritage could be put to use, that is by clarifying the past.71

Heritage is a process, not history

Henceforth, as it differ from what the Romantics think, history is not heritage. William Morris as a Romantic, believes that the idea of heritage is to invoke the past. Building conservation is not simply “reflecting an interest in the aesthetics of the built form as such”; it is, for Morris, the “capacity for a true conception of history, a power of making the past part of the present.” He believes that heritage can bring the past alive. On the contrary, as many critics have argued, due to the selection process mentioned above, heritage is viewed as a debased history. In The Heritage Industry, Hewison argues that history is absorbed in heritage, but is “floating on the larger frame of the present”; using heritage as a touristic resource is “a devaluation of significance, an impoverishment of meaning.” Some other scholars have considered the use of the past as a resource “imaginative” and “dishonest,” and could even be called a form of “cultural prostitution.” Lowenthal challenges the idea of authenticity and the ultimate coining of the word antitheritage animus summarizes the corpus of opposition to the heritage concept into six basic elements: destructive chauvinism, elitism, incoherence and inanition, commercial debasement, and bad history.

Heritage as a cultural process

David Harvey argues that heritage is not simply a physical artefact or record, but a cultural process, in which he quotes Bender, “identities are created and disputed, whether as
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individual, group or nation state.” Lowenthal also acknowledges the role identity plays in this process of identity politics as “chauvinistic” and “elitist,” and is “contested” because it represent values from a certain dominant class, echoing Smith’s idea of the AHD. Laurajane Smith further claims that “all heritage is intangible.” Even though Smith was aware that places, sites, objects and localities are identifiable as heritages, by stressing on the intangibility of the heritage, Smith tries to denaturalize the material basis as innately valuable as heritage. From Smith’s point of view, all preservation and conservation process putting the material remains under protection or management is a “constitutive cultural process.”

**Heritage that upholds the value of the dominant class**

Scholars try to demonstrate that the invention of heritage is by large for the interest of the middle and upper class. Smith uses the heritagization of the English country house as an example to illustrate that heritage was used to serve the upper class’ interest. Although the Ancient Monument Protection Act 1882 does not provide protection for the medieval historic buildings, the protection of landscape was institutionalized with the creation of the National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty in 1895. In 1907, The National Trust Act was enacted endowing National Trust the right to declare properties it possessed as alienable. Historic buildings were fallen into protection under this Act. Mandler writes in his study of the English heritage that Phillippe Kerr, the eleventh Marquess of Lothian, lobbied the National Trust Officials to consider the “plight” of the country house, urging the Trust to acquire the houses from the hands of aristocrats who were impoverished after the First World War, to repair and modernize the country houses and let them to tenants, some of
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whom may be their old owners.\textsuperscript{82} Hewison points out that the National Trust in the United Kingdom was criticized by one of its former chairman Lord Antrim as a “self-perpetuating oligarchy” and is the fiefdom of “the amenity earls.”\textsuperscript{83}

Although the landed class is less dominant in the National Trust in the United States, Barthel notes that the majority of its members and leaders was drawn from the upper middle and upper class and hence is charged for its “White Anglo-Saxon Protestant cast.”\textsuperscript{84} Therefore, not only is the maintenance and protection over heritage with the public expenses serving the \textit{nouveau pauvre} middle-upper class directly, the National Trust in United Kingdom and United States are also serving the taste and gaze of their white- or middle and upper class-leaders.\textsuperscript{85}

Patrick Wright also notes, in \textit{On Living in an Old Country}, the increased interest in visiting country house in England is a tendency to go back to the old social hierarchy which appears to be “alluring” in the modern days when such hierarchy is no longer formative.\textsuperscript{86} The mass interest in nostalgia is also articulated by Hewison, as a means to “adjust to change.”\textsuperscript{87} It shows that the value of heritage is propagated throughout the society, from the middle-upper dominant class to the lower and working class, out of a conservative bent.

**Heritage appreciation as a cultural capital**

Therefore, scholars have used Bourdieu’s theory on cultural capital to explain the power dynamics behind heritage appreciation. To understand heritage, cultural capital is required

\textsuperscript{82} Peter Mandler, \textit{The Fall and Rise of the Stately Home} (New Haven, C.T: Yale University Press, 1997), 295-296; see also, Smith, \textit{Uses of Heritage}, 22.
\textsuperscript{83} Hewison, \textit{The Heritage Industry}, 55.
\textsuperscript{84} Barthel, \textit{Historic Preservation}, 6.
\textsuperscript{85} Although National Trust is a private charity, it has a special relationship with the Treasury. The properties given to the national trust are in lieu of tax. Therefore, the resources that National Trust uses on property maintenance can be viewed as a kind of public resources.
\textsuperscript{87} Hewison, \textit{The Heritage Industry}, 45.
and the idea of cultural capital is often associated with economic capital and family education background, the taste and hence the ability to appreciate demonstrate what Bourdieu called “aesthetic legitimacy.” Ashworth argues that there is a “dominant ideology hypothesis” asserting that governments or ruling elites will “project a message legitimating their position,” by capturing “cultural capital,” which is “composed of both the accumulated cultural productivity of society and also the criteria of taste for the selection and valuation” of such cultural products. Brian Graham also presented similar views in “Heritage as Knowledge: Capital or Culture?,” but he urges for a deeper understanding in the variety of forms that heritage takes, official and unofficial, as heritage is being produced and reproduced through time.

Dennis Hardy points out that heritage is a “value-loaded concept,” “embracing (and often obscuring) differences of interpretation,” he categorizes heritage into two different uses based on the “differences of interpretation,” i.e. “the heritage used in a conservative sense” and “heritage as a radical concept.” The former refers to the heritage that strikes the chords of the dominant class or interest, whilst the latter refers to the heritage interpretation that challenges the status quo or the socially powerful. If heritage interpretation that upholds the value of the upper and middle class is conservative, then the heritage that dissents is radical.

**The idea of Dissonant, Dissent and Subaltern Heritage**

---

Riding on the Stuart Hall’s theory on representation, Graham, Ashworth and Tunbridge argue that heritage is, like language, produced and reproduced. 92 Graham et.al. use the word “dissonance” to refer to the contestation in heritage — “one person’s heritage is the disinheritance of another,” which they believe is intrinsic to heritage. 93 “Dissonance” is defined as “mis-match between heritage and people, in space and time”; 94 “the probability of shifts in population groups, political and social power structures and ideological allegiances leaving behind cultural and material relics that no longer reflect relevant or desirable contemporary place symbolisms is extremely high. Such diffusions … can be described as … heritage dissonance.”95 The word “dissonant” literally means discordant sound, the root – sonance means sound in Latin. Dissonant heritage refers to the idea that heritage is inevitably multi-vocal, not singular.

When introducing the alternative discourse, Smith refers to the idea of dissonance but disagrees with Ashworth and Tunbridge that dissonance could be actively managed and “overcome.”96 Ashworth and Tunbridge propose, in The Tourist –Historic City, a model of heritage dissonance could be developed for sustainable growth, to identify new heritage resources with “sensitive appropriation” for a segmented markets. 97 Smith agrees that heritage is dissonant, but argues that Ashworth and Tunbridge are reducing the idea of dissonance to a site-specific management problem. Instead, Smith believes that heritage is a constitutive social process in which the role of regulation and governance are equally important in the contestation of heritage. On top of that, rather than using the term “dissonance,” Smith uses the word “dissenting” to represent the alternatives to the dominant ideological discourse. The word “dissent,” according to Oxford English Dictionary, is defined as “the holding or expression of opinions at variance with those commonly or officially

93 Ibid., 6, 93; See also Tunbridge and Ashworth, Dissonant Heritage, 21.
95 Tunbridge and Ashworth, Dissonant Heritage, 32.
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The word “dissent” is highly charged by its connotation to power relations, i.e. resistance to an authority or “official view,” whereas dissonance is more neutral. She identifies two strands of dissenting discourse; the first is “subaltern” discourse — the community participation in conservation processes which is not addressed in the AHD, the second is the critique developed around heritage tourism and industry.

As a result of the dissonant nature of heritage and the likely existence of dissenting discourses against the orthodox discourse, many scholars have identified heritage as a site of contest.

**Heritage and identity**

Heritage is psychologically important in constructing individual and collective identities. This point is well cited in heritage literature, for example, Graham et.al writes, “acting as one means of representing the past, heritage provides meaning to human existence by conveying the ideas of timeless values and unbroken lineages that underpin identity.” From the point of view of environmental perception study, Tuan also confirms that the past and familiar places are important in identity construction, as cultural experience is pertinent to the physical setting. It is equally valid for collective identity construction because of the built environment that we collectively shared.
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Stuart Hall further argues that there is no identity that is not collective, as he puts it, “identification is constructed on the back of a recognition of some common origin or shared characteristics with another person or group, or with an ideal, and with the natural closure of solidarity and allegiance established on this foundation.” However, Hall also stresses on the fluidity of the concept of identity by referring to Derrida’s *différance* in seeing identity as a sort of double writing, thinking in interval of the difference of two concepts, e.g. what bring low was high. Thus, identity is operating “under erasure” in the interval between reversal and emergence. The concept of identity is inherently discursive, even when being sustained by “its determinate conditions of existence” such as “material and symbolic resources,” it is always “conditional” and in the state of “contingency,” as Hall presents.

From this point of view, built environment serves as the material or symbolic resources that sustained identities, and identities are emergent contingent to social changes. Lowenthal also observes that conservation is a reaction to anxieties generated by modernist amnesia. We preserve because the pace of changes and development has attenuated a legacy integral to our identity and well-being.

**Collective Memory**

Maurice Halbwachs’ *On Collective memory* is important for understanding the idea of collective memory. In Halbwachs’ term, collective memory is a social framework, and “individual always use social frameworks when they remember. It is necessary to place oneself in the perspective of the group or groups.” Therefore it is “in society that they
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recall, reorganize, and localize their memories.”

Halbwachs uses aphasia to illustrate the idea of collective memory, external memory insufficiently internalized due to the lack of words. Therefore, “verbal conventions” constitute “the most elementary and the most stable framework of collective memory.” Hablwachs’ work is insightful in two senses, first, memory is always social and collective; second, discursive practice is a constituting device to construct the collective memory.

iv. HERITAGE VALUE

As early as in 1903, Alois Riegl, the Austrian state-appointed “General Conservator” tries to put forward the typology of heritage values. After a historical review of the development of the restoration principles, Riegl divided values of modern conservation into two groups: the memorial values—age value, historical value and intended memorial value; and the present-day values—use value, art value, newness value and relative art value. Jokilehto says that Riegl’s theory takes an abstract and condensed form and is not easy to translate, therefore his influence is largely limited to German-speaking countries. Gibson, Pendlebury and Smith however, follow similar line of division by acknowledging the schism of instrumental value or use value vis-à-vis intrinsic or inherent values.

With regard to the instrumental value, literature recognizes the importance of preserving historic buildings in creating lively urban environment, and hence, livable cities. There are also other researches demonstrating that heritage can regenerate the city; provide a
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conducive environment for the development of creative industries, and play an important role in place-making, or boosting tourism. Much of these literature emphasizes the benefits of preservation for something else, hence, the instrumental value of heritage over intrinsic value. This thinking produces what Pendlebury called the “opportunity space,” while the intrinsic value presents heritage as “historic space.”

John Pendlebury’s *Conservation in the Age of Consensus* explores the evolution of the policy rationale behind conservation and, in particular, the trend of instrumentalization of conservation in the UK. As Pendlebury describes, the conservation in the UK started off with protection of ancient monuments in late 19th Century and evolved to concern about the reconciliation between conservation and planning for development after the Second World War, until it arrived at what Pendlebury called the “Age of Consensus” when the socio-cultural and economic benefits of conservation were conceived of greater importance, and sometimes provided justification for the conservation, i.e. when instrumental values override intrinsic values of conservation.

**Heritage values embedded in urban fabric: From Monuments to Landscape**

As elaborated by Gibson and Pendlebury, the heritage value “is not an intrinsic quality but rather the fabric, object or environment is the bearer of an externally imposed culturally and
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historically specific meaning, that attracts a value status depending on the dominant framework of value of the time and space.”\textsuperscript{120} This description explains the adoption of the term “historic environment” in the British, as well as the UNESCO discourse. The UNESCO World Heritage Cities Programme was an initiative to coordinate an integrated, dynamic approach to the management of historic sites.\textsuperscript{121} It led to the adoption of a new standard-setting instrument, the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape, which defines historic urban landscape as “the urban area understood as the result of a historic layering of cultural and natural values and attributes, extending beyond the notion of a “historic centre” or “ensemble” to include the broader urban context and its geographical setting.”\textsuperscript{122} Such policy tools are useful for expanding the heritage concept from historic buildings to urban fabrics and even spatial organization that carries specific meaning. The introduction of the term “historic urban landscape” suggests the recognition of heritage values of a holistic environment, rather than individual monument, as Pozo and González points out the need to focus on the “territorial value” of heritage sites in order to break the vicious cycle of rendering individual monuments irrelevant to the place identity and memory.\textsuperscript{123}

Therefore, the challenge for the field of practice is to respect the citizens’ rights to heritage and assimilate the increasingly pluralistic interpretation of heritage. From the academic point of view, however, there is an imminent need to critically reflect on the trend of pluralization of heritage interpretation and assessment.

\section*{v. Conservation of Modern Architecture}

\textsuperscript{120} Lisanne Gibson and John Pendlebury, Valuing Historic Environments (Surrey, VT: Ashgate, 2012), 1.
There are international networks or organizations concerning demolition of the built
inheritance that are not considered heritage, such as DOCOMOMO International which cares
about sites from the modern movement. A DOCOMOMO Hong Kong Chapter was
established in 2012 with a mission to enhance public’s knowledge about modern architecture
while promoting the protection of “notable examples of modern architecture” in Hong
Kong.  

Is heritage a non-renewable / irreplaceable resource?

John Carman acknowledges the view that heritage and archaeological sites are perceived as
finite and non-renewable resources because they are materials things, once destroyed is lost
forever, unlike Flora and fauna that can reproduce itself. Carman identifies, however, there
are possible ways to render heritage renewable: first, the deposition of new “rubbish”
materials to become the archaeology of the future; second, the discovery of new
archaeological sites; and third, the discovery, recognition or identification of entirely new
classes of archaeological remains. He explains the third point with his investigation into the
relationship between legislation and archaeology.

Similarly, Robert Hewison notes that list of heritage buildings and historical sites have only
been growing:

Since the principle of listing buildings in order to inhibit their demolition or
alteration was first introduced in 1947, the number has steadily grown, and is
expected to reach half a million in 1988, double the number in 1982. But the latest
changes to the system mean that the potential number is infinite. The cut-off date

---

126 Ibid.
will no longer be 1939, but a rolling period by which any building more than thirty
years old may qualify for protection.127

Other than historical buildings, the conservation areas and historical sites were also increasing
as noted by Hewison. Ultimately, Hewison quoted Lord Charteris, the Chairman of the
National Heritage Memorial Fund and former private secretary to the Queen, the heritage
means “anything you want.”128 Views alike have been taken by Rem Koolhaas. He says, the
preservation law revisions have rendered more recent buildings become “historical buildings”
and thus, claims that “preservation is overtaking us.”129 If we take into account the pace of
urban changes, it is not surprising to see the revision of preservation law as a logical
consequence to protect the material remains of what was quickly out-fashioned in the modern
development.

The question of monumentality

In heritage literature, scholars have discussed the idea of “monumentality” of heritage and
explained why some built form with more monumentality is often preferred over the
vernacular and the mundane. Choay details the evolution of the word “monument” in French,
with a root in the Latin word *monumentum*, it is derived from *monere* — to warn or recall —
calls upon the “faculty of memory.” It is about its power to call upon the present. The word
only gradually assumes more meaning of the “grandeur,” “magnificent” and “glorious” in
17th Century.130 From Choay’s work, one can see it is important to go back to the root of the
keywords and see how the social changes have been reflected in the understanding of the
language, seeing the signified beyond the signifier, rather than assuming lexicons are static
and unchangeable.
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The question of aesthetics

At one point, the inclusion of more and more modern architecture as historic buildings becomes controversial as it requires different set of language for the aesthetics, and more often than not, it is subjective. In the 1980s, Hewison noted that there was “a crisis of confidence” within the architectural profession when modern architecture was considered as ugly. For example, during the RIBA’s 150th anniversary celebration banquet, the Prince of Wales attacked the proposed modernist design of the National Gallery extension as a “monstrous carbuncle,” subsequently the current design of what is called a “sympathetic pastiche” is adopted.\textsuperscript{131}

The aesthetic judgement is not only subjective, but is also influenced by political stance. For example, the right wing aesthetician Roger Scruton has attacked modernist architecture as “the architecture of Leninism.”\textsuperscript{132} On the other hand, Aslet believes that there is a political agenda behind the classical revivalism.\textsuperscript{133}

Amongst the family of modern buildings, industrial architecture was usually considered as unaesthetic, as it is made for functions and material efficiency. However, Harbinson argues that it is exactly the taste of industrial architecture, “the taste of industrial architecture is paradoxically discovered as elements without aesthetic intent.”\textsuperscript{134} Despite the aesthetically unpleasing appearance of industrial architecture, there are arguments supporting the preservation because of its peculiar aesthetic quality of what Okada believes to be the quality of Wabi-sabi (of Japanese origin). The term “Wabi” is understood as “enjoyment of a quiet, leisurely life free from worldly concerns,” while Sabi as “quiet simplicity, lonely, austere beauty,” etc. Okada quoted Japanese aesthetician Atsushi Tanigawa’s view on the \textit{Sachlich}

\textsuperscript{131} Hewison, \textit{The Heritage Industry}, 43.
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\textsuperscript{134} Harbinson, quoted in Okada’s “Industrial Ruins”, 152.
(factual) beauty that ruined landscape can offer which is often characterized by irregularity, diversity, chaos or coarseness, to argue that something not beautiful has a special value to offer in the modernity.

Okada opposes to measures mitigating the deterioration of industrial architecture and believes that the industrial ruins should remain as it is as “passage of time” is another important element possessed by heritage.\textsuperscript{135} As Huyssen puts it, “the chance for things to age and to become ruin has diminished in the aged of turbo capitalism.”\textsuperscript{136} The encounter of the hidden, rundown space sharpens the experience of the city and offers authenticity.\textsuperscript{137} Derelict sites are increasingly marginalized in the modern heritage discourse, or could only survive by reconfiguring itself into either “historic space” or the “opportunity space,” as Pendlebury labels, under the capitalist and highly gentrified society.

vi. HERITAGE IN HONG KONG

In Hong Kong, the protection of heritage came with the implementation of the Antiquities and Monument Ordinance in 1976. Before that, the government has set up a temporary committee in 1946, the Public Monuments Committee, to discuss various issues regarding monuments within the territory of Hong Kong. Nevertheless, such establishment was temporary and the primary aim was to discuss the removal of any physical remains after the Japanese occupation during the Second World War and to restore the monuments of the colonial government which were demolished by the Japanese army.\textsuperscript{138} Indeed, the Antiquities and Monuments Bill was enacted in 1971, five years earlier before its implementation. It was because of the


\textsuperscript{138} Related documents could be found in HKRS337-3-1, Archival Series, Public Record Office, Hong Kong.
“inability” to locate suitable candidates to occupy the position of the Secretary, the ordinance was not effective until 1976.139

As of 20 May, 2016, there were 114 declared monuments in Hong Kong.140 They are evenly spread out on Hong Kong Island, New Territories and the outlying islands. The Antiquities and Monuments Board (AAB) has also graded 1,444 historic buildings. Grade 1 means that the building has outstanding merit and every effort should be made to preserve if possible; Grade 2 means building has special merit, efforts should be made to selectively preserve; Grade 3 means that building is of some merit, preservation of some form would be desirable and alternative means should be considered if preservation is not practicable.141 However, the graded buildings are not protected from demolition and are not covered by the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance.

Some research on heritage policy in Hong Kong has been done so far from a myriad of perspectives, from policy studies, colonial studies, anthropological studies, human geography, and urban planning.

**Extrospective/ Introspective Policy?**

Lachlan Barber analyzes in “(Re)Making Heritage Policy in Hong Kong: A Relational Politics of Global Knowledge and Local Innovation” from the perspective of urban policy mobilities. The author argues that heritage policy in Hong Kong is largely an “extrospective” (outward looking) process; the policy is largely an outcome of learning and adoption.142 Barber sees the heritage policy in Hong Kong as “a product of colonial governance” and
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“reflects Eurocentric biases concerning monumentality, antiquity and expertise.”143 One of the evidence that Barber puts forward to support the “colonial traits” of the heritage policy is a letter that Eddie from the Public Works Department wrote to Noel in 1971 to inquire whether any of the graduates of the Oriental Studies Programme at the Australian National University might be educated to know enough of Chinese archaeology to be able to recognize a relic. Barber interprets this act, to source talents from overseas rather than from local, as “illustrative of the workings of the colonial administration” and quoting Chan in arguing that the upper echelons of the civil service in Hong Kong were dominated by expatriates, as they think locals are not up to par in running the government.144 However, I have doubt over this interpretation and have conducted follow up research to find out that Dr. Noel Barnard was a teacher in the Department of Oriental Studies in Australian National University and he was a personal acquaintance of Eddie, i.e. Edwin Wong, Chief architect of the Public Works Department at the 70s. Question arises as to whether Edwin Wong should be considered as expatriate. Although Edwin Wong was born in New Zealand and received university education there, he was raised in Guangzhou from 11 months-old until he entered university in New Zealand.145 The division between local and expatriate is never as clear cut as in theoretical discourse, such generalization could not lead to insightful remarks without defining and delineating the concept of “local.” Quite the contrary of what Barber expects, the result of this exchange of mail correspondence was the recommendation of a candidate called Wong Yin-wai who was born in Canton, educated in Taiwan and Australia.146 Having mentioned that, Mr. Wong did not take up the post of the Secretary at the end and no record further explains the reason. Therefore, it is not the talent search that shows that “colonial administration” was at work. Instead, an examination of the people who had taken up senior offices would reveal so.
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Barber also argues that, the Ordinance “celebrates monumental heritage over its more everyday forms” due to its “European origins.” Therefore, Barber cites, from 1976-1990, only 39 sites in the entire Hong Kong territory were awarded monument status, many of them were archaeological sites, including rock carving and inscriptions. Despite a few “innovations” in the heritage administrative endeavors, such as the creation of a new Commissioner for Heritage post and office under a newly formed Development Bureau in 2008, “the policy itself has not changed, largely due to the importance of redevelopment to Hong Kong governance.”

Barber’s research provides insights on how the policy ideas are “mobilizes” across different political territories and is quite accurate at pointing out the heritage policy in Hong Kong had remained rather fixated towards the “monumentality” quality of the historic environment despite international trends has evolved to value more of the social and cultural value over material value.

David Lung’s article also addresses similar concerns arguing the heritage legal and administrative framework in Hong Kong was insufficient in meeting social aspiration. Lung argues that firstly, the definition of heritage is too narrow under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance; secondly, the current practice provides no authoritative measures in heritage grading and assessment. The process of grading is “somewhat obscure” to the public and there was question as to the statutory basis of the grading exercise; thirdly, the respect for private ownership was too strong to render any privately-owned property as declared monuments; thus, fourthly, the mechanism of compensating the private property owners in exchange for the preservation, whether in situ land exchange or transfer of development rights

---

147 Barbar, “(Re)making Heritage Policy,” 1187.
148 South China Morning Post, “39 sites safe from destruction,” South China Morning Post, 3rd February 1990, 27.
149 Barbar, “(Re)making Heritage Policy,” 1187-9.
150 Ibid.
(TDR), or bonus plot ratio, is a sign showing that there is “not a single genuine case of protection.”

Jeff Cody’s article challenges the “extrospective” aspect of the heritage law in Hong Kong. The Ordinance in 1971, by adopting a restrictive definition of “antiquities” and “monuments,” it “ignored precedents from France’s secteurs sauvegardes (1962), the United Kingdom’s “conservation areas” (1965), and the “historic districts” of the US national Historic Preservation Act (1966). When [the government] amended the Ordinance in the 1980s, the government did not incorporate aspects of either UNESCO’s Recommendation Concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas (1976) or Australia’s Burra Charter (1979).”

My question would be, extended from the discussion of local vis-à-vis expatriate, at what level could one conclude that the heritage policy is a result of the colonial administration? As the international heritage discourse develops, and the heritage policy in the United Kingdom underwent a great leap after the Second World War, has Hong Kong stopped learning from international counterparts and her colonizer? Why so? Is the fixation of heritage policy towards the monumental heritage a succession of the colonizer’s orthodox heritage discourse, as what Smith argues, or a response to the local constraints? How the society perceives the innate material value vis-à-vis the social and cultural value of heritage policy at large?

**Heritage as a site of contest and negotiation**

Sidney Cheung’s paper about “The Meanings of a Heritage Trail in Hong Kong” is insightful in revealing that heritage policy or heritage sites was hardly an act out of pure conservationist concerns, and it could become the battle ground between the colonizer and the colonized. The
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case study on heritage trail shows the contested interest of various stakeholders, i.e. the
government, the site’s owner, the agency and local organizations, concerning a heritage
site.\textsuperscript{154} It has also provided copious details about the history of struggle between the Tang
Clan and the colonial government, especially the 1898 rebellion of the Ping Shan villagers
and the subsequent \textit{feng shui} debates. From the paper, a few points are noted and will be of
interest to my research. First, the villagers closed down some sites along the heritage trail as a
reaction to the government’s initiation for removing the graves. The heritage sites as private
properties could serve as a bargaining chip in power struggle or negotiation between the
villagers and the government. The villagers concerned about the \textit{feng shui} of their own clan
rather than the publicness of the heritage values reflected in their heritage. Second, the author
argues that Government’s creation of the heritage trail before the handover is a search for the
distinctiveness of Hong Kong culture and identity. This part will be further elaborated under
the section of “Hong Kong Identity.”

\textbf{Politics of disappearance: Heritage under the colonial and post-colonial era}

Old photos showing the Central and Wanchai district during the early colonial time was full
of European-style buildings, but only a few remained standing nowadays. Despite the
enactment of the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance in 1971, and some occurrence of
government’s initiative over the heritage in Hong Kong, as shown in the Ping Shan Heritage
Trail, Hong Kong built environment was undergoing a drastic change, to a state of what
Ackbar Abbas termed as a “reverse hallucination,” i.e. “not seeing what is there,” and the
resultant built environment is a state of “disappearance.”\textsuperscript{155}


\textsuperscript{155} Ackbar Abbas, \textit{Hong Kong: Culture and Politics of Disappearance} (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press,
Several scholars have considered heritage policy in Hong Kong from a post-colonial perspective. Tracey L.D. Lu claims in “Heritage Conservation in Post-colonial Hong Kong” that the community starts to show interest in heritage conservation only after the handover, as a gesture to articulate their Hong Kong identity, and to resist “Sinicization.” Lu follows on to write about the Lee Tung Street Preservation movement, as it marks the beginning of a heritage conservation movement in Hong Kong. Lu argues it is a kind community empowerment in the urban heritage discourse. I agree with Lu that community participation in conservation was quite different before and after the handover. However, I do not think that the public interest in heritage conservation prior 1997 was entirely non-existent. Public discourse that argues for conservation had surfaced via various channels, especially on various news media. Oppositions and protests were also noted against the knock-down of the former Kowloon-Canton Railway Station (KCR), Hong Kong Club and the General Police Office in the late 1970s and 1980s.

Henderson’s work “Conserving Hong Kong’s Heritage: The case of Queen’s Pier” gives a detailed account on the controversy of the demolition of the Queen’s Pier in Hong Kong. Henderson argues that under the pro-development rationale, heritage selection assumes a de-colonialization agenda. Heritage of the colonial history, such as the Queen’s pier are much less preferred than heritage showing the Chinese roots. Desmond Sham’s PhD Thesis also discussed the preservation movement of the Queen’s Pier, but from the protestors’ point of view. He argues that the protestors started to bring in the socio-political perspective in the heritage preservation movement, by re-staging what had happened in 1966 — the hunger-strike of So Sau Chung against the colonial government’s approval of raising the star-ferry fare. Through such action, the protestors presented a radicalized collective memory to argue

---


for the significance of the place.  

Therefore, Sham argues that heritage preservation can become the resistance to colonization, national identity and urban colonialism in the guise of gentrification, and be integral to the wider decolonization process. Maggi Leung consolidates such views by arguing that the demolition of the Queen’s Pier, as well as the Star Ferry Pier, showed government’s attempt in trying to “uproot the people’s struggle in their identity search and creation” and concludes that “Hong Kong government is less haunted by the city’s colonial past than the increasingly vocal and conscious citizenry, especially because it is not yet ready to shed its colonial governmentality.”

Therefore, from Leung’s point of view, the politics of forgetting and erasure has pretty much continued from the colonial era to the post-colonial era, despite the increasing uproar from the citizens.

Land value and heritage conservation

Esther Yung Hiu Kwan’s PhD thesis “Architectural Heritage conservation in Hong Kong: An Empirical Analysis” mainly study heritage conservation from a real estate point of view. It is a fact-finding quantitative study on the relationship between land value and heritage conservation. The thesis evaluates a total of 155 sites and finds out that a site is more likely to be declared a monument or with a higher grading if, i. the age is older; ii. the gross site area is smaller; iii. it is a Chinese design; iv. it has a higher land value. The study also shows that the ownership of a building and the zoning has no correlation with the conservation decision.

This study is interesting as it is the first quantitative study on the heritage conservation and has proven some misconceptions wrong. For example, people tend to believe that a site with higher land value, or located in private development, would be less likely to be receive higher
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160 Atkinson and Bridge, Gentrification in a Global Context, 2.
162 Ibid., 37.
163 Yung Hiu Kwan Esther, “Architectural heritage conservation in Hong Kong: an empirical analysis” (PhD diss., University of Hong Kong, 2007)
grades or listed as a monument. However, the limitation of this study is that it does not factor in the historic aspect of the site, i.e. land with higher land value, e.g. Central or Wanchai, usually has a longer development history, or is the focal point of major historical events. Therefore, it is very logical to have more sites with higher land value being listed as monument or receiving a higher grade.

Subsequent investigations by Yung could be divided into two strands, one concerns about the growth ideology and conservation; another concerns the public participation in conservation practice. In the article “Re-examining the Growth Machine Ideology of Cities: Conservation of Historic Properties in Hong Kong,” Yung and Chan examine the impact of growth machine ideology on heritage conservation. The article discusses the reasons and dynamics behind the conservation of two cases, the Central Police Compound and the Marine Police Quarters, despite their land value. Major findings include, firstly, heritage conservation fits in the growth machine model in the sense of place-marketing, tourism and consumerism; secondly, the institutional arrangements (government and property developer vis-à-vis government vis-à-vis Non-Profit Organization) have informed the growth machine model; thirdly, public concerns is contributing/preventing the growth machine. This article is more like a continuation of Yung’s PhD thesis on examining why heritage with a high land value could be conserved in such a pro-growth environment. This strand of Yung and Chan’s investigation enriches the discussion of heritage policy from the real estate development point of view, which mainly sees heritage as a kind of resource or instrument for something else. It does not concern the intrinsic heritage value. Discussion of the media and community initiative is also limited to pro-development or anti-development.

Public participation in heritage conservation

---


165 Ibid., 197-204.
Another strand of investigation by Yung and Chan concerns public participation in conservation practice. In “Critical Social Sustainability factors in urban conservation,” Yung and Chan examines the critical factors for enhancing social sustainability of the conservation of built heritage projects and argues that education, local cultural promotion, meanings of places, social inclusion and public participations as factors of social sustainability should be considered in urban heritage conservation.\textsuperscript{166} Another article by Yung and Chan, “Problem Issues of public participation in built-heritage conservation: Two Controversial cases in Hong Kong,” discusses major factors that hinder public participation in heritage conservation, which include, the lack of effective public participation mechanism and integrated conservation approach in decision making process; the different and conflicting interest of various stakeholders; power disparity; propaganda and mobilization of interest groups; and the lack of knowledge on heritage conservation.\textsuperscript{167} This study is insightful in pointing out that the professionals, town planners and architects, considered the community incapable in comprehending “heritage values.”\textsuperscript{168} Taking this comment uncritically, Yung and Chan have not gone further in the query of “heritage value,” and provided no account for the discrepancy in understanding the “heritage value” given. This point of view reflects what Smith identifies as the consequence of the AHD — the community has difficulty in learning the language of the conservation experts, or they possess a very different set of heritage values.

\textbf{Modern built heritage in Hong Kong}

Discussion on modern architecture or non-European style of heritage is rather limited. Apart from occasional case studies such as the Queen’s Pier, Star Ferry Pier, Lee Tung Street and Blue House. These case studies usually concern the approach of public participation rather


\textsuperscript{168} Ibid., 461.
considering the valorisation of these heritage sites. Maggie Leung and Dietrich Soyez were amongst the earliest to write about the industrial heritage in Hong Kong. They argue that perspectives of heritage in Hong Kong was based on the dichotomy of traditional Chineseness vis-à-vis post-colonial romanticism, industrial heritage, alongside with other modern buildings, were therefore undervalued, if not totally neglected. Leung and Soyez argues for the significance of industrial heritage in Hong Kong by positioning Hong Kong as a Newly industrializing economies (NIEs) within the global context. The compressed time-space nature of Hong Kong industrial development, i.e. the volatility of Hong Kong’s industrial path and the trans-boundary context of rapid de-/industrialization, demands a renewed perspective in valorizing industrial heritage of the NIEs. On one hand, the authors challenge the international discourse of industrial heritage by ignoring the NIEs, one the other hand, nonetheless, the significance of industrial heritage was argued from within the “universalized” heritage perspective. The valorization of industrial heritage as a subaltern discourse demonstrates the consequence of the AHD — one hardly think outside the AHD framework.

**Hong Kong identity**

The idea of collective memory is interesting in the Hong Kong context as emigration became the major factor of population growth before 1960s. Therefore, David Faure suggests that there might be a kind of “refugee mentality” shaping the indifference in politics in Hong Kong people’s mind. Although Faure does not think that Hong Kong people were
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169 Hong Kong as a Newly industrializing economies (NIEs), Leung and Soyez identified the compressed time-space nature of Hong Kong industrial development, i.e. the volatility of Hong Kong’s industrial path and the trans-boundary context of rapid de-/industrialization; and calls for a renewed perspective in valorizing industrial heritage of the NIEs that pays more thoughtful evaluation of the time-space context of the urban fabrics. Maggie Leung and Dietrich Soyez, “Industrial Heritage: Valorising the Spatial-Temporal Dynamics of Another Hong Kong Story,” *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 15(1)(2009):57-75, doi: 10.1080/13527250902746096.

Hong Kong people were perceived so by the colonizer. In a meeting between Sir Alexander Grantham, the Governor of Hong Kong and the Colonial Office in 1950, it is noted that “the population was a collection of self-seeking individuals with no sort of civic consciousness” and “no centre around…such consciousness might develop— for example there was not even a Town Hall.”

Jonathan Grant argues that this identity vacuum may be part of the apolitical agenda of the colonial government, especially during the cold war, i.e. from post-war era to the end of 70s. It is argued that the colonial government tries to maintain stability in Hong Kong by asserting apolitical administration for fear of the encroachment of the communist influence. In 1952, Alexandra Grantham rejected the viability of democracy in Hong Kong for fear to give way to the “imperum in imperio” (empire within an empire). The Education Ordinance amendment in 1948 also prohibited any nationalistic content and “being apolitical” has remained as the major principles in subsequent curriculum revisions.

However, in another form of representation of identity, Faure identifies that Hong Kong people under the colonial governance indeed were eager to show their Chineseness by wearing long gown (Cheong Sam). For the Hong Kong people, the tradition of appearing in the long gown in front of British colonial officials lasted until 1960, when China itself has abandoned it, and it has become part of the “British colonial heritage.”

Most literature identifies that a distinctive Hong Kong identity was formulated around 60-
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171 David Faure, *Colonialism and the Hong Kong Mentality* (Hong Kong: Centre of Asia Studies, University of Hong Kong, 2003), 48.
172 Notes of a meeting with Sir Alexandar Grantham, Governor of Hong Kong, 21.6.50, CO 129/629/8, reproduced in Faure, *Colonialism and the Hong Kong Mentality*, 112-3.
173 Jonathan S. Grant, “Cultural Formation in Postwar Hong Kong,” in *Hong Kong Reintegrating with China, Political, Cultural and Social Dimensions*, ed. Lee Pui-tak (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2001), 159-180.
174 Ibid., 160.
175 Ibid., 161.
70s, which Faure disagrees, but he acknowledges that public affairs has become increasing localized since the 70s when the colonial secretary was relatively more hands off, after the 1956 Suez Crisis. In fact, the British Colonial Office was subsumed under the Foreign Office in 1968. In the 70s, there was an enlargement of Hong Kong government; and senior civil servants, whether Chinese or British, were given more power in the decision-making. The 70s also marked the launch of various large scale welfare programmes, e.g. the provision of public housing and education. Faure argues that “our collective nostalgia is a selective memory very much coloured by this period,” and it is inaccurate to argue that the two campaigns, Clean Hong Kong and Fight Violent Crime campaign, were signs of social awakening.

In view of the localization process, scholars including Henderson, Ooi, and Cheung have speculated that the promotion of heritage, or the formulation of larger cultural policy, was part of the political agenda of the colonial government; to start fostering a sense of cultural identity after the discussion with China government over Hong Kong’s future commenced. Abbas argues that constructing a strong cultural identity of the distinctive Hong Kong serves as a “first line of defense against total political absorption.” The colonial government’s effort culminated in 1997 when that year was dedicated as the heritage year.

Henderson’s article “Heritage, Identity and Tourism in Hong Kong” gives a detailed account on governments initiatives in heritage and tourism before and after the handover. Henderson
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179 Ibid., 77-78.


181 Abbas, *Culture and the politics of disappearance*, 142.
describes Hong Kong identity as different from other decolonized territory where
decolonization has not been “accompanied by independence,” as Henderson puts it, “although
the Hong Kong people have acquired Chinese nationality, interest persists in formulating and
asserting a cultural identity that is related to but separated from that of China.”

Colonial administration and politics: The role of elites

It is perhaps due to the apolitical agenda that the colonial government has carefully
maintained during the colonial times, it is noted that the colonial government were operated
in the situation of what Ambrose King, and subsequently Lau Siu Kai called the
“administrative absorption of politics,” by which he means “a process by which the
government co-opts the political forces, often represented by elite groups, into an
administrative decision-making body, thus achieving some level of elite integration.”

The elite or elites, as a “loosely integrated political community,” form the middle ground
between the colonial government and the “family”— the social unit to solve the “day-to-day
problems.” Majority of this group of people “rose to prominence” based on their economic
power, “with a small portion of them grounding their status on the mastery of Western
knowledge.” They serve the colonial governance as members of consultative committees.

By doing so, they gained “official recognition of elite status” which would improve their
social status and serve as assets in establishing business connections. Imperative to the
investigation in the heritage discourse in Hong Kong, the values or perspectives brought by
these elites should be examined.
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185 Faure, Colonialism and the Hong Kong Mentality, 13.
186 Peter. J. Cain and Antony G. Hopkins, British Imperialism: Crisis and Deconstruction, 1914-1900 (London:
187 Lau, Society and Politics in Hong Kong, 129.
IV. REINSTATING THE RESEARCH QUESTION

Definition of the key terms

To address the unique geopolitical situation in Hong Kong, as a former British colony, the characteristics of AHD are defined as follows:

i. The reliance of professionals to determine the value of the historic sites;
ii. The belief of the historical materials as innately valuable;
iii. The application of Eurocentric lens in viewing the indigenous environment;

In my research, I would also address the dissenting and subaltern heritage discourse studied by Smith. To recap, Smith’s “subaltern discourse” refers to the community participation that is not addressed in the AHD. Possible subaltern discourse could be found in community’s effort in stipulating the significance of the historic environment that is not recognized within the AHD, for example, the industrial heritage in Hong Kong. Regarding the “dissenting discourse,” Smith refers to the critique developed around heritage tourism and industry. I would, however, expand the term “dissenting discourse,” not only to include the voices that disagree with the government’s preservation or conservation practice, but also to include the voices that against the demolition of relics, sites or buildings, against the culture and politics of “disappearance” in Hong Kong.

Research Questions

The literature review shows that although Smith’s notion of AHD is largely valid in understanding the heritage discourse, especially within the British context, there is limitation in its application in understanding the heritage discourse in Hong Kong.

188 Smith, Uses of Heritage, 35.
189 Ibid.
First, Smith identifies colonialism was the impetus for AHD to achieve dominance, and Barber also identifies that Hong Kong government was extrospective in its policy, but the fact that the colonial government adopted an erasure strategy due to the pressing redevelopment needs, was incongruent to AHD. Under what circumstances has the government turn from an extrospective to an introspective policy? How the colonial government perceived the value of historic environment in Hong Kong?

Second, AHD being heavily influenced by experts over material culture, how it assumes influence in the colonial setting in Hong Kong when the views of the professionals were under-valued in the colonial bureaucracy? What roles have the professionals and the elites played in the heritage valorization process?

Third, how the public, the community organizations and the NGOs perceive heritage values and how they assess the “innate material value”? What kinds of subaltern discourses and dissenting discourses have been developed?

Fourth, the discussion of the modern architecture has by large overshadowed by the identity politics — de– or re– sinicization, de-colonialization or localization. In my opinion, the heritage discourse does not necessarily have been “pluralized,” but “radicalized.” Were these kinds of radicalized narratives effective in refuting the AHD? How these narratives have influenced the valorization of the heritage value of our built environment?

**Significance to Knowledge**

Although many scholars have written about the heritage in Hong Kong pertaining to policy framework, identity issues, colonial and postcolonial identity struggle, land value and governance, the discourse discussing the various conception and ideological underpinning of heritage, namely theories of heritage, in Hong Kong is underexplored. This study will reposition the heritage discourse at the centre of discussion, rather than discussing heritage for
something else. Discourse over the discussion of the concept of heritage and its value will be examined, and distinction will be marked between the discussion over innate material value and other social and cultural values. This study will contribute to the study of the development of heritage discourse in Hong Kong from 1970-2016. Incidents in earlier period in the colonial era will also be studied in a sporadic manner to understand what values have the colonial government seen in the indigenous culture and against what background had the Ordinance been enacted.

V. METHODOLOGY

This research is going to adopt Norman Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as one of the key methodology. CDA is a three-dimensional discourse analysis. By three-dimensional, it means that the discourse is viewed as “simultaneously a piece of text, an instance of discursive practice, and an instance of social practice”; the “text dimension” refers to the language analysis; the “discursive practice dimension” refers to the interaction between text production and interpretation; the “social practice dimension” refers to the institutional and organization circumstances that are shaping the discursive practice.190

This methodology is useful in seeing the interrelationship between language and wider social changes. Language or discursive practice is reflecting social values; it is at the same time constituting social perceptions by reproducing, shifting or rejecting discursive frameworks. Not only wider social changes will be the subject of study, the method aims to be a critical method. By “critical,” Fairclough means “showing connection and causes which are hidden,” “it is important to avoid an image of discursive changes as a unilinear, top-down process.”191 Fairclough also explains, “critical approaches differ from non-critical approaches in not just describing discursive practices, but also showing how discourse is shaped by relations of

191 Fairclough, Discourse and Social Changes, 9.
power and ideologies, and the constructive effects discourse has upon social identities, social
relations and system of knowledge and belief.”

This method can ride on various traditional methods, such as language analysis, historical
analysis and visual analysis. Other than the language, historical analysis will empower the
analysis of the ordering of texts and the understanding of the text against its social and
institutional background. Visual analysis treating images as a piece of text might sometimes
be integral to support the construction of the language, for example, the study of the magazine
advertisement.

Jeff Cody has once adopted a keyword analysis on the published news article in Hong
Kong. Such method is useful in revealing the discursive changes in the society towards the
heritage. However, it requires a more careful delineation in deciding the time frame for
comparison, the source of the text, etc. and further analysis is needed to investigate the
context behind the uses of these keywords.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>傳統 (Tradition)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>古蹟 (Historic Site)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文物 (Cultural Relic)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>保護文物 (Protected Cultural Relic)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>社區重建 (Community Renewal)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of articles</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research will restrict its source data from published and unpublished text and visual
images. It will also include views and public opinion expressed on various channels of social
media. Historic information and text will be collected from archives and various news
databases. The following enlists some possible materials and source.

192 Ibid, 12.
Language of both Chinese and English will be consulted. For publications in both languages, English versions will be analyzed unless major discrepancies are noted between Chinese and English versions.
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194 From 2008 onwards, Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA) need to be carried out for all capital work projects involving historic and built heritage, and the project proponents and relevant work departments will be required to consider whether their projects will affect the sites or buildings of historic or archaeological significance. The HIA reports could be found in the reference library of HKHDC. Source: Antiquities and Monuments Office Website, http://www.amo.gov.hk/en/hia_01.php

195 Royal Asiatic Society was first founded in Hong Kong in 1847, but ceased to exist in 1859. It then resuscitated in 1959. The society was set up with an interest to investigate art, science and history of the Asia. The report and journals they published might of interest for the understanding of how the historic environment in Hong Kong was perceived amongst the English speaking community during the colonial era.
VI. Initial Research

The Elite’s participation in heritage valorization?

Records show that a Public Monuments Committee was established in 1947 to discuss issues of the remnants of the Japanese occupation and to restore monuments being destroyed by the Japanese army during the Second World War. It is noted that the meaning of “monument” is different from the “monument” in the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance in the 70s, of which the shifting discursive meaning will also be examined further. The mechanism of such consultative committee reveals how the government worked with the elites. Members of the committee included, Mr. H.S. Rouse (Public Works Department), Mr. J.H. Ruttonjee (Dina House), Sir Shouson Chow (Bank of East Asia), Mr. Ngai Shing Kwan (China Motor Bus), Miss Katie Woo (St. Paul Girls College), A.M.J. Wright (Architectural Office, Public Works Department, also serving as secretary). 196 (Fig. 1, left) It is noted that about half of the members belongs to the “elite” class. However, it is noted that in the 1977, the AAB members consist mainly of official members or professionals (curators, architects, historians). 197 (Fig. 1 right) It shows that, despite the government’s reliance on the elite class, the task to assess historic environment is still entrusted in the hands of the professionals.

196 HKRS337-3-1, Archival Series, Public Record Office, Hong Kong.
197 AAB Minutes, the 5th meeting, 17 August 1977. HKRS310-2-6, Archival Series, Public Record Office, Hong Kong.
The role of architects in colonial bureaucracy

Mr. Edwin Wong, an architect representing the Public Works Department in AAB, played a role in contributing to the early heritage assessment. The comments he has made were mainly from the architectural considerations, for example, in the assessment of the heritage value of University Hall, he suggested “to preserve the chapel only on architectural grounds.”

Other than giving architectural considerations, architects had also taken up some design work and technical tasks that deal with materials. The colonial government has designed a certificate of merit for awarding private entities in the preservation of the antiquities and monuments. Upon circulation amongst the AAB members, Edwin Wong did not approve the design and proposed to make drastic changes to improve the design, e.g. quit all borders, certificate to be “parchment,” etc. A few months later, the Executive Secretary of AAB S.M. Bard wrote to Edwin sending him the “final English and Chinese version of the Certificate”
without any substantial changes, however, he asked Edwin to re-design the Certificate with bold Sung character for the Chinese version. On 29 June 1977, Edwin provided Dr. Bard the third version, added in many Chinese elements, e.g. as a memo attached explained, “the Sung incised pattern used in ceramic wares,” “zoomorphic pattern across the page in fine red lines,” and insisted the certificate to be “parchment” with “torn-off” pages.199 (Fig. 2) There was no further record on whether the version designed by Wong was adopted. The incident of the design of the certificate of merit reveals that the task of the architects was indeed rather trivial, if not marginalized, in the heritage valorization bureaucracy.

Figure 2 Design of Certificate of Merit (From left to right, 28 March version, 3 June Version, 29 June version) 1977.

Jason Yuen, also a member of the AAB in 1970s, has published articles on magazines promoting the importance of historic buildings in Hong Kong.200 (Fig. 3) This article is being kept by the government. It shed lights on the understanding of the role of architects in heritage valorization process. Architects might work within and without the government institution.
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199 HKRS310-2-6, Archival Series, Public Record Office, Hong Kong.
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The dissenting discourse in heritage preservation

The Hong Kong Heritage Society submitted a full text of petition to the Hong Kong Governor to ask the government to keep the KCR, and the full text was published on the South China Morning Post on 3 August 1977. Interestingly, the article briefly noted a split amongst the architectural profession in the assessment of the architectural quality, but followed on with a lengthy petition on the easy administration procedure if the government could keep the station, for example, the plans of the new Cultural Centre was still at early stage, there was ample time for redesigning a scheme which would conserve the building, the land that the KCR building stand had not yet been allocated to the Urban council and was still remaining as a bus/ferry terminal concourse, etc.²⁰¹

In 2015, Yuan Yan published an article on the Economic Journal on the conservation policy in Hong Kong. He argues that without the large scale protest in 1976-1978 for the preservation of the KCR buildings, the colonial government would not even have enacted the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance. Given the fact that the Ordinance was being enacted as early as in 1971, such interpretation is inaccurate. However, it reveals the public sentiment that resent the indifference of the government over conservation and reinforces the general perception that the public has fought hard against it.

Not all dissenting discourse stands for protection over historic building. In the discussion of the preservation of Ho Tung Garden, public views were quite diverse. In an article published by Jake Van Der Kamp, “Ho Tung Garden was an eyesore…not Hong Kong Heritage,” the author comments, “I have additionally heard the argument that the building is a typical

---

example of Chinese Renaissance architecture. This is architects’ ‘blather’.” Van Der Kamp further writes:

The fact of the matter is that we have allowed our decisions on heritage preservation to be hijacked by architects. The Profession is slowly withering as advances in engineering overtake it and its members naturally wants to resist the trend. I can see why this induces them to venerate all structures they conceive but I can’t see why the rest of us should do so.²⁰³

It does not matter whether the author’s judgement on the development of architectural profession was correct; it shows, however, a disbelief in the architects’ opinion. The framework of discussion shifted from the discussion of heritage value, to the architectural value, and finally to the development of the profession. The author argues the decline of the architectural profession has put the architects in a position to venerate every structures; so to prove the value of existence of architect or architecture as a profession. This finding shows that how the public perceives architecture professional also relates to how they value historic environment.

VII. **THESIS PLAN**

The thesis will contain six chapters:

**Chapter 1: Introduction and Literature Review**
- The Evolution of the Heritage Concept
- The Authorized Heritage Discourse (AHD) as a theoretical lens
- Development of Hong Kong’s heritage policy
- Research Question
- Methodology

**Chapter 2: The Colonial Governance and the Enactment of Antiquities and Monument Ordinance**
- Colonial government’s view on monuments and historic environment
- Background of legislation
- Considerations in the law making process

**Chapter 3: The Role of Professionals in Constituting Heritage Value**
- Background of the Rise of the Professionals in Hong Kong
- The architects
- The archaeologist and historians
- The civil servants

**Chapter 4: The Dissenting and Subaltern Heritage Discourse in Heritage Valorization**
- Dissenting and Subaltern Heritage Discourse on innate material value
- Dissenting and Subaltern Heritage Discourse on other heritage values

**Chapter 5: The Ontological Politics of Heritage Valorization**
- Development of AHD in Hong Kong
- Radicalism in heritage valorization

**Chapter 6: Conclusion**
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### TABLE 1 HERITAGE LEGISLATION AND POLICY MEASURES IN HONG KONG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Chronology of legislation and policies</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Town Planning Ordinance (Cap 131) Amended 4 of 1991 s2) Vzone: TPOs 4(1) (h) zones or districts set apart for use as village type development, agriculture or other specified rural uses. (Added 4 of 1991 s6)</td>
<td>To promote the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community by making provision for the systematic preparation and approval of plans for the layout of areas of Hong Kong as well as for the types of building suitable for erection therein and for the preparation and approval of plans for areas within which permission is required for development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Buildings Ordinance (Cap 123) Replaced 72 of 1980 s2)</td>
<td>To provide for the planning, design and construction of buildings and associated works; to make provision for rendering safe dangerous buildings and land; and to make provision for matters connected therewith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Small House Policy</td>
<td>It allows an indigenous villager to apply for permission to erect for himself during his lifetime a small house on a suitable site within his own village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 (enacted) 1976 (implemented)</td>
<td>Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (cap 53)</td>
<td>To provide for the preservation of objects of historical, archaeological and paleontological interest and for matters ancillary thereto or connected therewith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (Cap 499)</td>
<td>To provide for assessing the impact on the environment of certain projects and proposals, for protecting the environment and for incidental matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance (Cap 563)</td>
<td>To establish the Urban Renewal Authority for the purpose of carrying out urban renewal and for connected purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>