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Chapter 6

Heritage tourism
The dawn of a new era?

Tim Winter

For many years tourism has been one of the principal ways through which the relationship between heritage and globalisation is analytically articulated. Countless studies since the 1970s have considered the arrival of tourism as the precipitator of modernity, of modernisation and of widespread social transformation. There is little doubt this tradition of scholarship will continue to thrive and evolve. By way of a contribution to this research, this chapter sets out to illustrate why current debates in this field need to shift direction, and why frameworks which better reflect the realities of today’s global tourism industry need to be developed, most notably ones which can better account for the ongoing rise of non-Western forms of tourism.

In recent years the limitations of accounts which conflate global tourism (read globalisation) with Westernisation (read the Western tourist) have become increasingly apparent. The rapid growth of domestic and intra-regional tourism in Asia, understood as an important manifestation of a ‘rising Asia’, is calling into question many of the conceptual frameworks and analytical models that have oriented the field of tourism studies to date. Indeed, as I have argued elsewhere, tourism studies is now faced with the challenge of overcoming its Anglo-Western biases if it is to adequately deal with the multi-polar complexities of global tourism in the future (Alneng 2002; Winter 2009; Winter, Teo and Chang 2009). In this chapter I will demonstrate why similar analytical shifts and reforms are required in ‘Heritage Studies’. Too often heritage scholarship frames tourism in monolithic terms. In the vast majority of the heritage literature the very word itself – ‘tourism’ – has come to be a metaphor for destruction, erosion, or commodification. More infrequently, but increasingly so, it is read in less pejorative terms and seen as a source of revival, empowerment or grassroots development. But regardless of the author’s persuasion, ‘the tourist’ is presented throughout such accounts as the embodied carrier of such forces and processes, challenges and opportunities. In an attempt to offer analytical clarification, the heritage field, both in academic and policy environments, often dissect this conceptual monolith into the sub-categories of ‘eco-’, ‘cultural’, ‘mass’ or ‘quality’ tourists.

However, these categories continue to be conceived and re-conceived with the underlying assumption that ‘the tourist’ – as modern subject – resides in the post-industrial, global north. Since the 1970s the vast majority of English language
studies on tourism and heritage tourism have looked at 'Western' tourists and their impact on communities, places and environments (Winter et al. 2009). This does not mean, however, that 'non-Western' forms of travel have been ignored entirely, but the dominance of a Western-centric notion of tourism means such studies have been analytically subsumed within theories developed in the metropole (Connell 2007, 2009). English language scholarship on heritage rarely questions these prevailing Western-centric paradigms, meaning that accounts of heritage tourism and tourists conceived in the historical, cultural and social changes of Europe and North America are consistently invoked in universalist ways. In looking to address this situation this chapter is not concerned with deconstructing 'the tourist'. Instead my interest here is to illustrate how a form of non-Western tourism, in this case intra-regional Asian tourism, is emerging as a powerful force of social transformation for a series of heritage landscapes. In presenting such an analysis my intention is to highlight why ongoing shifts in today's globalisation mean those concerned with heritage need to look much more closely at non-Western forms of travel and the impact they are now having. In essence, the chapter argues that current analyses of tourism and heritage tourism, with their in-built geographic, national and ethnic biases, need to evolve so that they don't remain blind to important social, cultural and economic shifts now occurring.

**Heritage development in Asia: a new era of regionalism**

In October 2008 three Cambodian and two Thai soldiers were killed over the disputed temple complex of Preah Vihear. An outstanding example of Khmer architecture dating from the tenth and eleventh centuries, Preah Vihear has been a highly contentious marker of the boundary between Thailand and Cambodia for the past hundred years. On 7 July 2008 Cambodia was awarded its second World Heritage Site, with Preah Vihear being listed in controversial circumstances. While Cambodia's capital, Phnom Penh, erupted into celebrations, Thailand's foreign minister resigned over the issue just three days later. Indeed, the listing of the site became a pivotal issue in the domestic politics of both countries, with politicians on either side of the border using inflammatory rhetoric over the issue to legitimise their credentials in the lead up to their respective national elections. As tensions escalated in the weeks following Preah Vihear's listing, both Thailand and Cambodia moved hundreds of troops and heavy military equipment into the area. The standoff lasted several months, with insults being traded between the two governments and shots exchanged. On 14 October the two sides opened fire on each other again, resulting in the death of three Cambodians and the wounding of seven Thai soldiers. A week later one of the Thai soldiers died from his wounds, and one other was accidentally killed by his weapon.

These events mark the latest chapter in a long-running story of disputed ownership. In 1904 a joint commission made up of Siamese and French administrators, established for mapping the region, proposed a treaty which created a border largely
following the watershed line of the Dangrek mountains (Cuasay 2001; Thongchai Winichakul 1994). Given that Preah Vihear surmounted a 525-metre-high spur, the treaty placed the temple within Siamese territory. However, as French cartographers submitted maps to Bangkok in 1908, demarcating the new boundaries between Siam and their protectorate, Cambodge, the border line was modified to give sovereignty over the temple to the French.\(^1\) In the wake of France’s diminishing control over the region during World War II, Thailand moved to regain control of territories it had previously ceded, including the Preah Vihear site and surrounding areas. In 1962 the International Court of Justice in The Hague upheld the 1908 boundary line, awarding ownership of the disputed site to Cambodia. Located high up on the very edge of Cambodian territory, Preah Vihear would subsequently become one of the last strongholds for soldiers loyal to the Khmer Rouge regime.

Clearly, then, reference to the political machinations surrounding the construction and subsequent negotiation of state boundaries over the course of colonial and post-colonial administrations helps us interpret the events of 2008. However, in addition to being a site of political significance, Preah Vihear has now become an important economic resource: one that is evidently worth fighting over. Both countries understand well that World Heritage guarantees attention and visibility in the highly lucrative international tourism industry. To date, the number of tourists to the site has been small compared to sites like Angkor, Sukhothai or Ayutthaya. Up until the early 2000s the area was inaccessible from the Cambodian side because of the ongoing fighting in the region and the presence of mines in the vicinity of the temple complex. Given its location high up on the cliff, access to the site is considerably easier from the Thai side, with a sealed road and parking facility enabling visitors to drive up close to the entrance. Not surprisingly then, up until this point the vast majority of tourists have reached Preah Vihear from this direction. In 2008 the Royal Government of Cambodia moved to secure greater control over the management of tourism at its newly listed World Heritage Site by constructing a sealed road that would snake its way up the side of the spur (see Figure 6.1). Indeed a significant component of the dispute concerning World Heritage listing centred on the surrounding zoning regions and their implications for site management, including the collection of entrance fees. With Cambodia now awarded full authority over the temple, the Royal Government will look to establish a new ticketing scheme, with foreign tourists likely to be charged somewhere in the order of US$20 per visit. In the longer term, the most substantial income for the government will come from land transactions and the development of hospitality infrastructure, including hotels, restaurants and entertainment facilities. Rumours have also been rife about the construction of a cable car system for transporting tourists up to the site.\(^2\) However, in order for this localised tourist infrastructure to emerge, and for the Preah Vihear region to evolve as a major destination in its own right, Cambodia first needs to build a sealed, all weather road southwards to the Siem Reap–Angkor area. And, more crucially, it is only when we consider such a transformation — of what just a few years ago was considered to be a ‘remote’ location into a significant tourist destination — within its wider geographical context, that we begin to really
understand what is now unfolding around heritage tourism in Southeast Asia, and why we need to shift our analytical gaze accordingly.

On returning from a visit to China in October 2008, Cambodia’s Prime Minister, Hun Sen, announced he had accepted a gift of US$290 million from the Chinese government to fund the construction of the road linking Preah Vihear to Angkor. Of course, and as Mauss (2002) reminds us, such ‘gifts’ are always motivated by a number of factors. In this case, however, two key issues can be identified. First, Asia’s geopolitical landscape is rapidly shifting, as reflected in the intra-regional aid and investments, that have increased steadily since the end of the Cold War and associated tensions in Southeast Asia. China in particular has increased its presence in countries like Laos and Cambodia. In fact as Cambodia continues to recover from an era characterised by civil war, genocide and foreign occupation, Chinese interests in the country are now enabling the Royal Government to be less beholden to the demands made by aid agencies such as the World Bank or Asian Development Bank for monetary and budgetary discipline. From the Chinese government’s perspective, becoming Cambodia’s leading bi-lateral donor of aid has allowed it to secure influence at a moment when other countries from Northeast Asia are seeking to establish strategic alliances in Southeast Asia.

The second key factor here is the rapid growth of domestic and intra-regional tourism in Asia. From 2000 onwards Cambodia’s inbound tourism industry has seen a major change in direction, with ‘Western’ tourists being supplanted by Asians as the country’s key source markets. By 2007 more than 70 per cent of visitors to the country travelled from within the region. An annual growth rate of around 20 per cent in inbound tourism over several years has, in large part, been driven by the increase in
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tourists coming from China, Taiwan and, most notably, Korea. Accompanying this rapid growth in arrivals has been an extremely sharp increase in intra-regional tourism-related investment. Organisations like JICA (Japanese International Cooperation Agency) have long played a significant role in assisting with the construction of tourism-related infrastructure across Southeast Asia. In recent years, however, Japan has been joined by Korea and China in this area. Indeed, while China has a substantial record of aid to Cambodia, intra-regional tourism has provided a valuable context for mobilising new partnerships between the Chinese state and Cambodia’s growing Chinese diaspora. As I have documented elsewhere, Angkor’s tourism industry has been profoundly transformed since 2000 by a private sector of Chinese, Korean and Taiwanese entrepreneurs operating businesses in the Siem Reap region (Winter 2007a). Such developments are in line with the analysis offered by Ong (2006) concerning the neoliberal directions states throughout Southeast Asia are now taking. Although she gives little attention to tourism, Ong identifies a new track of market-driven ideology within the region, a process that is re-articulating citizens and places. Indeed, today the expansion of Siem Reap’s urban landscape continues apace, and while it is rarely acknowledged officially, it is widely understood within the town’s communities that much of the financing for the construction of whole new ‘quarters’ is tied to investors from Northeast Asia (see Figure 6.2). In late 2008 the ground-breaking ceremony took place for a new road which would allow more traffic to by-pass the Angkor Archaeological Park. In recognition of the controversial nature of the project, one official from the local management authority,

Figure 6.2 New Urban Quarters of Siem Reap (Photo by the author)
APSARA, confirmed the sealed road would be a joint venture between the Korean government and the Korean business community of Siem Reap. The former would finance the foundations of the road, while private sector money would fund its surfacing.

Not surprisingly these Chinese- and Korean-funded initiatives for road construction linking provinces in the northwest of the country form part of much larger plans for heritage tourism-related infrastructure development. To date tourism in Cambodia has been overwhelmingly oriented to the Angkor site. Trips to the country’s more ‘outlying’ or ‘remote’ temples have always been associated with adventure or risk, undertaken by a small number of travellers seeking to ‘get off the well trodden path’ of Southeast Asia tourism (Winter 2006, 2007b). The introduction of sealed roads will bring a number of significant temple sites within range of the mainstream tourism sector. Indeed, over the coming years it is highly likely that a ribbon of heritage tourism development will emerge connecting up a number of temples to the north of Angkor, including Beng Melea, Preah Khan, Koh Ker, and Preah Vihear, as well as Banteay Chmar in the far northwest of the country.

Of course the Angkor–Siem Reap area will continue to be the central commercial hub within this larger development plan. In fact, growing intra-Asian tourism means that, over the coming years, tourism-related development in this area will accelerate rapidly. Discussions between the government and Korean investors have taken place concerning the construction of an ‘urban resort’, just south of the existing Siem Reap city. At the time of writing little information concerning this project has been released publicly. However, members of the Siem Reap community who have attended presentations of the project indicated the proposal – for what they described as a ‘new town’ – including hotel complexes, facilities for horse racing, a golf course and housing. In both Siem Reap and Phnom Penh precedents exist for such projects. In January 2009 Cambodia’s Prime Minister, Hun Sen, opened Siem Reap’s second golf course, part of a US$450 million project that included one hundred and sixty residential properties, spas, a hotel, restaurants and a race course, all of which have been financed by the Korean company KTC Investments. In Phnom Penh investments from Northeast Asia in real estate projects increased sharply in 2007–8. The Korean developer GS Engineering and Construction is currently overseeing the construction of a fifty-two-storey tower that will be home to a convention centre, residential apartments and an international school. Expected to be complete around 2012, the International Finance Complex will dramatically change the capital’s skyline. However, the single biggest foreign direct investment to date is the proposed US$2 billion urban complex ‘Phnom Penh New Town’. Positioned on the outskirts of the capital, the satellite city will include residential villas and condominiums, trade and financial centres, office buildings, shopping centres, hotels, schools and hospitals. A joint venture between a number of Korean and Cambodian companies, the 300-acre development is being managed by World City Co., part of Landmark Worldwide, a Korean development company, with South Korea’s Shinhan Bank acting as the chief financier. Construction of the first phase, an area of residential properties, commenced in 2007.
Cambodia is not alone in witnessing such developments. In late 2008 the *Vientiane Times* in Laos reported on a proposal to construct a US$2 billion, 3,000-hectare site near Luang Prabang, an historic town lying just over 200 kilometres to the north of the capital Vientiane. As a parallel to the ones in Siem Reap, the proposed development includes tourism, residential and recreational facilities. To be known as 'Diamond City', the project would be a joint venture between eleven Korean and four national investors. The newspaper confirmed that a memorandum of understanding between the companies had been signed and the proposal was now moving forward for government approval. Given the lack of infrastructure in the region, the project would also include the construction of a bridge crossing the Mekong, various roads, and utilities like electricity, water and telecommunications. Economic justification for the project centres upon a rapidly growing tourism industry, and the importance of Luang Prabang within it. Since becoming a World Heritage Site in 1995 the town has emerged as a key international tourist destination, both in its own right and as a base for eco-tourism trips in rural areas to the north. As with Cambodia, inbound tourism is now dominated by regional markets, with more than 70 per cent of tourists coming from neighbouring countries. To facilitate the ongoing development of the Luang Prabang region, plans have been progressing to upgrade the airport. While this project began as an Asian Development Bank initiative, a loan from the Chinese government has been put in place to fund the construction of an extended runway and larger facilities, both of which will facilitate the arrival of much larger, long-distance aircraft (see Figure 6.3).
In November 2007 a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission undertook a Reactive Monitoring Mission for Luang Prabang. Its final report expressed strong concerns about both existing and proposed forms of development around the World Heritage property. Accordingly, its executive summary states:

Around the perimeter of the Town of Luang Prabang, several proposed development projects, including a new airport and a new town on the right bank of the Mekong, would have an adverse impact on the World Heritage property, both in terms of visual integrity and noise pollution.

(Boccardi and Logan 2008: 2)

At various points throughout the report, these concerns are documented in greater detail:

Tourism infrastructure proposals already approved include a 900 ha tourist complex with golf course south of the historic core, under an MOU signed with a South Korean company. If constructed, such developments will eat into the agricultural areas and further disrupt drainage patterns in the area and may overwhelm the town’s tourist-carrying capacity.

(ibid.: 17)

In addition to extending the buffer zones of the World Heritage Site, the report also suggested the airport be relocated to a site further away from the historic town centre, rather than be expanded. By way of a conclusion the report indicates that current real estate development trends have to be reversed if Luang Prabang’s World Heritage status is to be maintained:

The Mission is convinced that the Town of Luang Prabang is at a crucial stage in its development and that decisions taken now will determine the safeguarding of the Town’s OUV [outstanding universal value] or its complete loss. ... Unprecedented pressure from development is posing new strains on the site, in the face of which the competent authorities appear unable to cope. If the Lao traditional heritage in particular continues its steady decline, the Town of Luang Prabang is heading towards a situation that would justify World Heritage in Danger listing. There is an urgent need to prepare an up-to-date inventory and map to reveal the full extent of the changes that have occurred in the inscribed area ... The current negative trend needs to be immediately reversed by much more thorough enforcement of the heritage protection regulations.

(ibid.: 27)

Elsewhere in Laos, plans for another ‘satellite city’ have been drawn up for Vientiane. On this occasion the foreign investment is coming from Vietnam. In December 2008 the Lao government signed an agreement with the Long Thanh
Golf Investment and Business Joint Stock Company, a developer based in southeast Vietnam. As with the proposal for Luang Prabang, this 557-hectare, US$1 billion project will be comprised of hotels, a golf course, offices, shops and residential properties. Although Vientiane is not a World Heritage Site, as the capital city it naturally serves as a key tourism hub and destination. As Logan, Long and Hansen (2002) demonstrate at length, the city boasts an extensive cultural and natural heritage and remains an important focal point of Lao national identity. Indeed, with so much attention lavished on Luang Prabang the authors contend that the government has yet to fully recognise the cultural and historical significance of its capital city.

Corridors of commerce

In addition to the upgrading of airports and urban infrastructure, development projects addressing the region’s key transport corridors are now greatly improving the connections into these various Southeast Asian cities. With organisations like the Asian Development Bank, Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the World Bank assisting governments to increase the economic integration of the Asian region, the construction and upgrading of sea and air ports, rail lines and roads remains a long-term commitment. The cases highlighted above all lie within the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS), an area within which many infrastructure projects are currently being funded by the Asian Development Bank (see also Sofield 2008; Vathana Pholsena and Banomyang 2007). The scale of the Bank’s investment in the GMS, along with the role of intra-regional tourism in this, is apparent in the following excerpt from its 2008 publication, Emerging Asian Regionalism; a Partnership for Shared Prosperity:

As of April 2008, more than 150 new investment projects related to transport corridors have been proposed. These include 31 high priority projects with an estimated cost of US$2.4 billion, including 20 road, 2 railway, 4 airport, and 5 water transport projects. Nine transport corridors have been identified to connect the north, central and south areas of the GMS into a single loop.

The development of the transport network will enable Yunnan province of the People’s Republic of China and northern Lao People’s Democratic Republic to gain access to international seaports in Thailand and Viet Nam; provide a continuous land route between the South China sea and the Andaman sea; offer access to seaports in northeast Thailand and the central regions of Lao PDR; accelerate the westward flow of goods, eventually to India and ease the movement of goods and people, especially tourists, in the region.

(Asian Development Bank 2008: 216)

Not surprisingly, Siem Reap, Luang Prabang, Phnom Penh and Vientiane are key nodes within this ever-expanding GMS network. Indeed the importance of connecting these cities as linked up ‘destinations’ is evident in the inclusion of tourism
in the Bank's list of six regional indicators for advancing integration; the others are trade policy cooperation, foreign direct investment, equity markets, macroeconomic links and intra-regional trade (ibid.: 42–45).

Gambling on the future

One of the key drivers of the Asian tourism market today is the casino and gaming sector. Over the last decade or so publications like *BusinessWeek* and *Forbes* have periodically reported on the 'boom' in the casino industry across Asia. With gambling historically being illegal in countries like China, Vietnam and Thailand, this sector has expanded in interesting ways. For example, in the border regions of Poipet–Aranyaprathet (Cambodia/Thailand) and Moc Bai–Bavet (Cambodia/Vietnam) more than a dozen large casinos have been built. Initially the client base for these businesses consisted of Thai and Vietnamese gamblers. More recently, expansion has come from the arrival of high-spending tourists from China, Taiwan and Korea. Cambodia has been particularly aggressive in targeting the gaming intra-regional tourism sector, with the country now hosting more than thirty legally registered casinos, most of which are grouped in clusters in the above border regions, the southern resort town of Sihanoukville, as well as in Phnom Penh and Siem Reap.

But it is in the current property developments in Macao and Singapore that we can really begin to see how significant this sector will be in the future, notwithstanding the global economic downturn beginning in late 2008. Following Macao's lead, Singapore has begun constructing a number of integrated resorts estimated to cost in the region of US$6 billion. In Macao, the city's unprecedented scale and speed of casino development enabled it to overtake Las Vegas as the gaming capital of the world in 2007. This was achieved in large part through a vast US$10 billion investment by Las Vegas Sands, which included the centrepiece US$2.3 billion Venetian Macao. Clearly for both Singapore and Macao the decision to roll the dice on such vast investments has been predicated on an anticipated long-term growth in intra-regional tourism. More specifically, for both cities financial success will be impossible unless they are able to attract millions of high-spending gamblers from mainland China every year.

Seen together the cases of Singapore and Macao illustrate the importance of gaming as an economic driver of development and urban planning, and the centrality of Asian tourism in that process. For Macao, the fast-changing urban landscape is having a significant impact on its urban heritage. Listed as a World Heritage Site in 2005, the *Historic Center of Macao* is under growing pressure from both rising pollution and congestion, and the construction of large buildings. One of the city's iconic sites, the Guia Lighthouse, is now being visually disconnected from the sea through the construction of office towers and casino-hotels. For Imon (2008), such construction, which began after the relaxation of height restrictions in 2002, is gradually denuding Macao of its historic meaning as a trading port. He suggests the desire for casino owners and architects to make bold architectural statements is undermining the integrity of the built environment around the
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In addition to the challenges of big urban construction programs, a rapid rise in visitor arrivals – from 11.5 million in 2002 to 27 million in 2007 – is delivering major problems for those involved in the management of the city’s most popular heritage attractions. As Imon demonstrates, much of Macao’s growing popularity as a tourist destination now rests on the fact that it combines an internationally recognised cultural heritage with a highly sophisticated entertainment industry.

In light of the earlier discussion, I would thus suggest that over the coming years this combination of heritage and entertainment will be a defining feature of the World Heritage regions of Angkor and Luang Prabang, as well as the historic cities of Phnom Penh and Vientiane. And looking further afield, the legalisation of gambling on offshore islands in Taiwan in January 2009 is indicative of a wider shift in parliamentary attitudes towards casinos across the region. It is also crucial to note that World Heritage has become a very powerful brand in Asia. Governments throughout the region are now well aware that World Heritage not only offers substantial prestige on the international stage, but also guarantees for the state the wealth generation associated with tourism. With this in mind, it is likely that sites like Halong Bay in Vietnam, Gyeongju in South Korea, or Sukhothai in Thailand will be exposed to large-scale developmental initiatives over the longer term. Crucially, however, and as this chapter has set out to illustrate, ‘the tourist’ of such initiatives will not be white and Western, but will be domestic or regional.

Conclusion

Forty per cent of the world’s population lives in Asia, a region that witnessed unprecedented socio-economic growth over the 1990s and 2000s. The global financial crisis that began in late 2008 sharply put the brakes on this upward curve of development. It is therefore difficult to assess when and how many of the proposed developments outlined here will be realised. What is for sure, however, is the longer-term trend of a rising middle class in Asia, an increasingly cosmopolitan group characterised by a desire to travel. With that long-term demand in place there is little doubt private investors and governments will look to build infrastructure oriented towards the Asian consumer.

In highlighting such future trajectories, I would suggest a number of significant heritage landscapes in Asia are now entering a new era, one that will be characterised by increasingly powerful forces of social and economic transformation. Southeast Asia in particular, including cities like Hong Kong and Macao, offers us important signposts to the future. If the historical development of tourism in Europe, which evolved and expanded geographically from its domestic and intra-regional beginnings, is any sort of guide, we can see that the early growth of Northern Europeans travelling south to the Mediterranean offers us a parallel to the tourists from Northeast Asia travelling south today. And, therefore, in the same way as European tourism expanded outwards to the rest of the world it is highly likely the same will happen with Asian tourists in the future. However, two defining
characteristics of contemporary Asia, scale and speed, undoubtedly mean unfamiliar and unprecedented challenges will continue to unfold. To date the heritage industry has implicitly read international/global tourism vis-a-vis 'Western' tourism. In this chapter I have presented a series of examples, which, when seen together, vividly illustrate why the field of heritage needs to undertake a number of analytical shifts and reforms. If we are to address the shifting nature of globalisation in the twenty-first century, new ways of looking at, thinking about, interpreting and conceptualising the interface between heritage and tourism are required urgently.

Notes

1 For detailed discussion of events surrounding Preah Vihear in the early decades of the twentieth century see Cuasay 2001.
2 There are enough historical precedents of planned cable cars to suggest it is unlikely that UNESCO would allow such an intervention to proceed.
3 For an account of Chinese investments in Cambodia see: China's growing influence in Cambodia, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Southeast_Asia/HJ06Ae01.html
4 Authority for the Protection and Safeguarding of the Angkor Region.
5 This was confirmed by a departmental director of APSARA at a Pacific Rim Council for Urban Development workshop held in Siem Reap, 26–29 October 2008.
6 For further details see http://worldcitycambodia.com and http://www.camkocity.net. Various videos offering a virtual tour of the city have also received much attention on sites such as YouTube. For example see http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xG982cT9sCI
7 For an account of Chinese aid into Laos see: Communist capital flows downstream: China's aid to Laos, http://www.chinadevelopmentbrief.com/node/454
8 For further details see: Giant investment project to Laos submitted to Government, http://english.vietnamnet.vn/biz/2009/01/822656/
11 For further details see http://www.gamingfloor.com/Asian_Casinos.html
12 For further details see: Downturn raises odds at Singapore casinos, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Southeast_Asia/KA15Ae01.html
13 See http://www.venetianmacao.com/en/

Bibliography

Heritage tourism


