

Historic Landscapes: From Habitat to Monument

Narayani Gupta

Former Professor

Department of History and Culture

Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi

E-mail: narayani.gupta@gmail.com

Abstract

When the Archaeological Survey of India was instituted in 1861, historic buildings, some deserted and some functioning, were designated as 'monuments'. From 1958 the responsibility for these was shared between the ASI and the Departments of Archaeology in different states. The Indian National Trust for Architectural and Cultural Heritage (INTACH), set up in 1984, listed many more buildings, most of them still in use, which are called 'heritage buildings'. The maintenance and viewing of our historic architecture should engender a sense of ownership, responsibility and affection. This paper argues that, sadly, there is a growing alienation from and indifference to these buildings. The boundaries of most ASI properties are not demarcated. The rules governing 'monuments' are clear, those about 'heritage buildings' have not been worked out. There is no cadre of trained heritage managers to co-ordinate the work of the ASI and conservation architects, and no trained heritage interpreters to help generate affection and respect for the structures from neighbourhood communities and visitors. We need to seriously discuss how this can be done.

Keywords: Heritage, monuments, ASI, architecture, conservation, community.

Modern Urbanisation and Historic Architecture

In the last 20 years, land in India is being converted increasingly into built form. This is most obviously visible in the expansion of urban settlements. The peaceful little town of Thrissur in the 1950s had remained a cherished video in my mind, and I could not recognise the large city it has become in the 21st century. All of us have similar tales to tell. Expanding towns are obliterating fields, forests, hillsides, beaches, and older buildings. In the area of Delhi it has been a stop-go process since the destruction of the Khandava forest to establish the city of Indraprastha till the massacre of trees to build high-rise government flats in south Delhi over the last year. The *process* is not new, the *rate* is.

90% of present-day towns in South Asia are built over older settlements, some sections of which have been modified or erased. The sub-continent has a five millennia-long history of urbanism. Because

baked clay is non-degradable, potsherds have been often the first clue to a buried settlement. More recently, in the past millennium, the use of stone has left for us clues for an architectural history. But potsherds or stone rubble is often cleared away. It takes a trained or sensitive mind to see these as clues to concealed or buried structures. It would be distressing but pointless to speculate on how many urban traces have been destroyed. The nineteenth century is replete with stories of people making their way through dense jungle and chancing upon a temple or caves veiled by trees and creepers. Some sites have returned to rural or barren land, and there are remains of deserted towns in the Rajasthan desert. But most of them have continued to be favoured sites over a long period of time. The history of Indian urban places is based on what has survived.

Once mapped, it is easy to recognise the logic of establishing settlements at cross-roads, at the foot of hills, at points where a river was easy to cross. With the establishment of politically-unified kingdoms, towns were set up to commemorate a ruler or a victory. Large 'cathedral' temples grew into townships. Inland market-towns and ports thrived as links were forged with other regions of the world. Flat landscapes were favourable to a few big cities, undulating land (as in Kerala, Saurashtra and the North East) to numerous smaller towns.

Identifying and Protecting 'Heritage'

Many earlier official record and travelogues have descriptions of individual towns, but a sense of the subcontinent's urban centres came in the nineteenth century. Surveying and classifying was a major project of the British in India, even when 'the British' meant just a commercial company. The all-embracing Survey of India set up in 1767¹ was supplemented by the Archaeological Survey a century later, in 1861². The ASI, starting with a limited agenda of surveying archaeological sites in north India, went on to list not only sites but also historic architecture, aided by the pioneering historicising work of James Fergusson (1876)³. Meanwhile the princely states also began to work on their own documentation. The past and the present were being clearly distinguished. Architecture was being historicised and classified.

More than 40 years later, Viceroy Curzon, who was passionately concerned that India's historic architecture should recover its original beauty, took a far-sighted decision. Listing was not enough, protection was needed. The ASI was given a new role as custodian of monuments, which thereby could be 'protected'. This was by the historic Act of 1904⁴, which essentially is still in operation, with amendments in 1958 and 2010⁵. Coincidentally, similar fears that industrialisation would erase historic landscapes led to the National Trust being established in England in 1895⁶, and the National Park Service in the USA in 1916⁷. But there is a difference – the English and American institutions

became landowners. In the case of the ASI, while ‘protection’ was extended in a general way to land around monuments, *these were not demarcated*. The reason was that at that time most monuments were in open areas, at a distance from modern settlements. That this was not done at the time each monument was listed as ‘protected’ was to prove a fatal flaw.

In the wondrous land-mass of India, there are three categories of land which are defined and ‘protected’ – 26 geological monuments⁸, 98 designated national parks (out of 166 authorised)⁹, the Coastal Regulation Zone (CRZ)¹⁰, and 3686 archaeological sites and architectural monuments protected by the ASI, and an unspecified number held by state departments of archaeology¹¹. Monuments have to be at least 100 years old before they can be taken under protection. In another eleven years Rashtrapati Bhavan and the Secretariat buildings in New Delhi will come under ASI protection. (I will not go now into the appropriateness of the word ‘Archaeological’ when so much is ‘architectural’). About 50,000 sites and buildings less than 100 years old have been listed as ‘heritage buildings’ by INTACH over the last 25 years. Only a few of these have been ‘notified’ by municipalities (towns in Maharashtra, and Goa, Hyderabad, Kolkata and Delhi). Even for these, the by-laws for conserving them are not very clear.

Visiting and viewing historic architecture – by pilgrims, men of business, state guests, congregations, or for entertainment or relaxation, has been happening for centuries. Visits by large numbers of people only for the purpose of viewing them has happened since the end of the 20th century¹². Tours are old, tourism is new. And a large part of what tourists pay to see are monuments.

The ambit of the ASI increases daily, the pressure on the structures increases daily. Increases daily is the gap between eloquent speeches about ‘Indian culture’ and the day-to-day challenge of keeping the exemplars of that culture in good condition.

The Crisis

The ASI’s properties, the most permanent part of India’s cultural heritage, include some of the greatest works of architecture and design in the world¹³. But, incrementally, our monuments are losing their contexts. This has been happening over a long time – as towns got deserted, they returned to field, and often the fields in turn were converted to neighbourhoods. With these transformations, the historic buildings which survive often look as lost as objects in museums. But unlike objects in museums which are not deteriorating, even if they are not very imaginatively displayed, our historic buildings are suffering – how often have we read the adjective ‘neglected’ appended to the word ‘monument’. There is a strong sense that they are part of the sarkari world, swaddled in layers of regulations which do not re-

cognise or encourage continuous and devoted maintenance¹⁴. Are they protected or orphaned?

Also, many are appreciated as sacred homes of deities (and others as locales of popular film scenes!), or remembered for the patron. This would be like remembering Pope Julius II in connection with the Vatican ceiling, and forgetting Michelangelo! It is the specialised skills and refined aesthetics of the architect and craftspeople that should be admired¹⁵. If we forget this, our monuments lose their 4-dimensional quality.

They are today in a state of serious crisis.

The crisis can be understood by looking at three areas - the state of the *discipline* of archaeology, the *agencies* for monument and heritage site management, and the links with local *communities*.

The Discipline

Thousands of students graduate in history every year. To them historic architecture appears either as achievement or as megalomania. But the history of monuments is more than an aspect of political power, symbols of extravagance, or simply ringing in new styles. They had context, located as they were in towns that had different functions - they were not only *rajdhani*s, but *pattanams*, *puras*, *qasbas* or *thirthas*. They are not random either in their location or design¹⁶. Even now there is native wisdoms from different regions that are sensitive to climate needs, landscape, vegetation, water-courses, local resources, and aesthetics. The intangible is tied up with the tangible, the natural with the manmade. But the links are being obliterated. What the Europeans did to many habitats of the indigenous inhabitants of the Americas and Australia is happening in India¹⁷. And there is no body of art historians to intervene. The only debates on monuments deemed to be media-worthy are those of a sectarian nature¹⁸.

Who becomes an archaeologist or an architectural historian? Have we ever stopped to think that most children, before they are distracted by school curricula, are natural archaeologists and architects? They are nearer the earth's surface, left to themselves, they sift sand and gravel through their hands, they build houses and castles. They are fascinated by the mixture of water and earth, dig channels, plant miniature gardens with pathways. Then they are imprisoned for twelve years in school, where their hands are trained to write, sometimes to draw, but not to design or build.

At 18 they have a chance to use their hands again – to become archaeologists, engineers, architects. The last two are possible, there are many colleges for them.

Archaeology is not. It is an 'adults only' subject in India. By con-

trast, in Britain there are about 40 universities that offer undergraduate courses in archaeology.

At the post-graduate level, in India less than 20 universities (most of them, I am afraid, not highly-rated) teach archaeology and in 10 of them it is in tandem with Ancient Indian History, which means they relate only to part of the holdings of the ASI. A relatively recent course in a few institutions is “Heritage Management”, a hotch-potch of courses from different fields¹⁹ To take it further - at the age of 22, if you have completed an MA specialising in ancient or medieval Indian history (not social sciences, pure sciences, or modern history – no matter that the ASI protects many sites of the ‘modern’ centuries) you may sit for an all-India exam, from which 15 students are selected for a 2-year diploma course in archaeology at the ASI. A student selected for this 2-year diploma in archaeology gets a munificent Rs.1,500 a month, his classmate who opted to do research and qualified for the Junior Research Fellowship from the UGC gets Rs 30,000 a month. The diploma in Archaeology (or a university M Phil) does not ensure that they will get jobs in the ASI. A Chennai newspaper referred to 150 students with M Phil degrees in archaeology who had not been able to get jobs.

Why is it not possible to make Archaeology a five-year professional course, as with Law, Engineering or Architecture? If a minimum of five years’ study of history can qualify one for a job teaching history or to do research in history, why cannot a 5-year course be developed as a minimum condition for writing reports on excavations or articles on archaeology? Why is there no link between universities and the ASI? Why cannot some of the best students be encouraged to study archaeology? Why is there no specialisation in conservation or epigraphy?

I would like to cite the parallel of another subject which, like Archaeology, has both a humanities and a practical aspect – Law. Not so long ago Law was an add-on course of 2 years, like Archaeology is today. Contrast that with the very competitive 5-year course it is now. If this is seen as a response to globalisation, can’t a cadre of archaeologists be seen as an answer to increasing tourism, also a product of globalisation? A strong course will help the management of monuments. In this, in addition to courses on excavation and epigraphy, there will be others on urban and rural development, on law specially focussed on land-control, and architectural and art history. As for writing skills - if lawyers are taught public speaking, and sent to ‘moots’, aspiring archaeologists should be taught to analyse excavations and write vigorous reports. Promising students should be encouraged to travel abroad and understand how archaeology is practised in other countries. Senior officers should accept that it is far more important for junior employees to attend seminars than for older ones. Otherwise the dead wood in the

ASI will become a fossil-forest!

An aside on architectural history which is closely connected with archaeology. This is taught to students of architecture, but its place in the curriculum is very small, because the Council of Architecture does not see it as significant²⁰. Also, students are not encouraged to stop and stare – to marvel at examples of older architecture, which can inspire them even when they are working with different materials and designs. They cannot visualise or find the language for different landscapes²¹. So architectural history falls into the crevice between the cliffs of history and that of architecture, instead of being a bridge between them.

A course which is given short shrift is tourism. Most people's sense of history is what they remember from middle-school history lessons, TV channels, and what the guides at monuments tell us. Whether it is groups of Cox and Kings tourists, or the busloads from Panicker's Tours, it is the guides who control what people should see, and what they should hear about what they see. What power they have! But no-one bothers to ensure quality²² - Indian tourist-guides are launched after a minimal one-year 'training' programme, and most of them happily mix fact and fiction. Contrast Egypt where there is a rigorous college course of five years to qualify as guides.

The ASI was one of the finest departments of government in earlier days. Today, it has to deal with many more issues. The diploma in archaeology does not create a cadre which can take on all these - of ensuring the upkeep of monuments and preventing encroachment, being knowledgeable about the historic landscapes in which they were located, and having the confidence to present them with the respect they deserve. At the same time, the number of organisations to monitor and 'protect' them keeps increasing! Our monuments suffer more than any other category of artistic heritage because of overlapping jurisdictions – the Department of Culture, the Ministry of Urban Development, the state governments, committees and commissions, not clear of the others' areas of control or, when they are aware of them, choosing to ignore them²³. The land, not the monuments, is what is seen as valuable. It is unbelievable that the ASI admitted in 2013 that it did not have figures for the number of centrally-protected monuments (92 were said to have 'gone missing'!) but in 2018 the Minister of Culture confidently gave the figure of 3686, and said they were all well-maintained!

Heritage Management

That old landscapes would be threatened by new structures was understood a century ago. To illustrate this point, let me give the example of the city I know best, Delhi. Seven years after the 1904 Act, Delhi to its own surprise had the honour of the capital of British India thrust on it, and on the site selected there were many monuments as well as ruins and graves. The nationalist movement was at this time

becoming more persistent, and anything could escalate into an agitation. The government, anxious to ensure that the building of the new city should not be stalled, did things thoroughly. The ASI was asked to make a comprehensive list of old structures, and then grade them so that the less significant ones could be sacrificed, after getting permission from the custodians²⁴. The efficiency with which this was done meant that there was not a single provocation for popular protest.

What we inherited from Maulvi Zafar Hasan's amazingly comprehensive survey was 174 blue boards indicating protected sites and buildings. But while the blue boards were fine as a starting-point, they are no longer adequate. Apart from the sins of commission specified in them – defacing or mutilating the monuments – there are many equally serious indirect sins, like building close to the monument, blocking the entrance, drawing away subsoil water, or building a towering structure near it. It is strange that a government which was obsessed with measuring land for revenue purposes, did not measure out the territories of the ASI properties. An example from Karnataka, a state richly-endowed with historic architecture - as late as 2012 only 31 of 763 ASI monuments were fenced.

Delhi is a particularly complicated case. Not only is it the capital, but its population has increased from 2 lakhs in 1901 to 20 million today, and it has over 160 centrally-protected monuments. The absence of careful demarcation in Delhi at the time of protection in the 1910s and 1920s can be explained by the dominant preoccupation then – of which grade to assign to monuments. 20 years later, the crisis of Partition further blurred the issue, because many monuments in Delhi were occupied by refugees, and when they were asked to leave, they huddled near the monument, on what was vaguely called ASI land. But the ASI could not make a case in a court without a map and measurements. The 'violations' were not only by the poor. It was even more visible when perpetrated by the rich and powerful (compare the Daniells' painting of the Jantar Mantar with today's view, where the monuments are welled in by tall buildings; the monuments at Hauz Khas are blocked by the congestion of boutiques and eateries in Hauz Khas 'Village'²⁵

In June 1992 (6 months before the Babri Masjid demolition) the ASI went into overdrive, and announced regulations to *prohibit* construction 100m beyond the protected (areas of) monuments, and to *regulate* the height of buildings in a wider circle of another 200m. But till today, it has not been able to prepare professionally-executed maps to indicate the controlled areas. The circles of 'protection' drawn by a compass around monuments do not correspond to the geography of the site. Nature is charmingly asymmetric, so the line has to be a flexible one. There is often a frightening mindlessness to implementing the rule – 100 metres around an *underground monument* are kept zealously

clear, 100 metres around a graveyard are carefully measured. In the case of a low-rise Kerala temple, a barren 100m area all round looks depressing. Surely in such a case, height control is all that should be ensured. Has anyone thought to ask why the prohibition, why the control – to enable a good view? To keep a distance between present-day life and the vestiges of the past? To enable the construction of a fence and a locked gate?

An Act in 2010 incorporated the 1992 Regulations into the Act of 1958. It also set up a new body - the National Monuments Authority – charged with the task of preparing ‘templates’ for bye-laws under the 1992 rules. Its Director has a position equivalent to the Director-General of the ASI, and the division of responsibilities between the two are somewhat blurred. The NMA has got mired in dealing with endless applications from individuals whose properties are adjacent to protected monuments²⁶

Town-planners are not taught to appreciate historic landscapes when they design wide roads and innumerable flyovers. They use Google Earth images, where the world is flat. The link between settlements, topography, water-channels and water-bodies, and monuments is not studied or incorporated. Delhi is criss-crossed with the channels of canals going back to the fourteenth century. The Delhi Government publicised its plans to make Delhi ‘a Venice of the East’ (the first time this term was used for an Indian town was when Viceroy Curzon used it to describe Alappuzha!), but all they did was to remove the shacks of poor families who lived along the canal. The channels were then roofed and made into car-parks²⁷.

What is needed is to do what the charismatic sociologist Patrick Geddes²⁸ would have advised – identify the silhouette of the monument, see it in relation to the surrounding area, and make it a harmonious part of it, not separated by a *cordon sanitaire*. In Delhi, there was a proposal to surround the Jama Masjid with a wide lawn – a design that goes against the spirit of a masjid, which is to be in the midst of a busy town, not to be distanced from it or seen as a picnic spot! Not very far from the Jama Masjid are some older buildings, now enclosed in a large park. Lodi Garden (described by *TIME Magazine* as the most beautiful public space in Asia) veils a long history – from dispersed 15th-century garden pavilions to the village of Khairpur, near a canal linked to the Yamuna. Then, with the village relocated, back to being a garden, a buffer between official New Delhi and privately-built neighbourhoods. It is very different from the 15th-century gardens; it is landscaped in British ‘picturesque’ style, with a mixture of Japanese. The link between water and land is not evident now. In southwest Delhi, a section of the Ridge, which for centuries protected Delhi from the march of the Rajasthan desert, was hastily ‘protected’ by the Forest

Department in 1997, by which time most of it had been flattened by quarrying and by building large structures.

In response to a requirement of UNESCO, the ASI has been commissioning conservation architects to prepare management plans for the 37 World Heritage Sites. This highly competitive exercise, hamstrung by the official practice of calling for bids, is followed by a quantum of expenditure which must leave ASI employees goggle-eyed. But there is a real weakness in the practice - *there is no time-line, no monitoring of the follow-up action on the recommendations*. The exercise could be made to generate a continuous and satisfying synergy between academic historians, trained ASI personnel, conservation architects and urban geographers, which alone can revive a sense of the successive historic landscapes and settlement patterns. Conservation architects refer to the need to establish 'authenticity', but soon find it is not all that easy. A village near a 600 year-old monument is assumed to be of the same vintage, though what is much more likely is that the city to which the monument belonged became deserted, and a long time later, a few families settled down to occupy the ruins. To understand the changes in this historic landscape, the ASI should have a permanent research wing. This research activity should continuously connect with the interpretation of the monument to visitors. Why is there no literature available at most sites – not expensive books behind glass, but simple flyers and books for children? Recognition creates respect, even affection, but anonymity encourages vandalism.

Today, research, such as there is, is communicated through seminars and conferences. These do not result in any plan of action or policy change for the monuments. Much more worthwhile would be to send maintenance staff at least once in their lifetimes for a workshop abroad, where they will also be shown best examples of conservation, gardens, visitor centres. One could also give awards – there are prizes for architects, for public gardens, why not for ASI properties and for the junior staff who have worked on them?

There is a frustrating lack of concern with both archaeologists and architectural conservationists of the sense of a need for archives, and process-documentation. The annual reports of the ASI are far from up-to-date. Particularly for the last 70 years or so, it is often difficult to know exactly when a certain intervention occurred; it is as though one is functioning in a bubble where time and place do not matter. Nowhere is there a record of the number of monuments destroyed between the Act of 1958 and that of 2010, of the number of sites where the ASI has lost land to other land-controllers, or of the number of sites which do have clearly defined boundaries. History departments in universities could help with the construction of archives.

There are two levels of historic landscapes – the spacious ones

around World Heritage Sites, where what is now called ‘footfalls’ is high. And then there are the smaller ones, most of them short of funds and staff. World Heritage Sites are the objects of management plans, but it is the smaller ones that often offer greater scope for recovering forgotten topographies or intangible heritages. These can be integrated into the adjacent areas and create islands of beauty. And is it not possible to give a sense of dignity to the vestiges of the past – do they have to be manned by guards and governed by prohibitions only, and can’t they be more welcoming?

Communities

As towns expand, and enclave adjacent villages, the bond of monuments with neighbouring communities gets eroded. This is a danger-point. Another is when neighbouring communities are confronted by ASI officials, guards and by-laws, and seen as potential threats. Surely if the monument needs to be ‘protected’ by the ASI against the people who live near it, there is something wrong? The story of K.K. Muhammed enlisting the help of the Chambal dacoits to restore Bateshwar Temple, should be the template the officials are looking for²⁹

Apart from the local community, there are people who have been inspired by visits, study, or even lectures and films to want to join in caring for historic sites. The classic example is the very close relation Hampi has with the architect-author George Michell and archaeologist John Fritz. This kind of bond can generate a deep sense of satisfaction. At another level, we should look at the example of western countries, where institutions have networks of members or volunteers, with clearly defined roles and privileges. Think of 100 ‘Friends’ for each monument – this gives us some lakhs of people. Isn’t that infinitely better than a situation when the ASI has to have lathi-armed chowkidars to enforce the by-laws at monuments? It should also be possible to have ‘virtual’ historic landscapes created at sites, as well as tours of the site for those who are not strong enough to walk, and to afford views of areas one cannot go into. This is done very effectively in the Skellig Islands in Ireland.

Our monuments were public spaces, places of congregation - palace, fort, place of worship, step-well or tank. Today they are by definition public spaces. But public spaces do not have to be uninhabited. This is to break the link between the monument and the community (A similar flaw is the vast emptiness of the Place de la Bastille in Paris, where it is impossible to imagine the drama of 14 July 1789!). In Wazirabad, in north Delhi, an expensive ‘signature bridge’ is being constructed across a sorry stream called the Yamuna (not long ago a healthy river), but what of the protected Ferozshahi bridge and mosque near it? In 2005 the ASI pointed out that the government-sponsored Bridge was within the prohibited 100m zone. This was ignored.

Many visitors would approve of having the ‘monument’ hived off, and 100 metres around it clear of building and all activity other than tourist movement! This can be because of a cultivated admiration for classical architecture (as distinct from folk), or of a distaste for the monument’s environment, human and physical – either because they are degraded or because they have become heavily built-up. Another way in which the middle-class ‘appreciates’ monuments is to build a restaurant right up against a monument and tall enough to afford a view, no matter that the 100 metre regulation is being flouted. But at the same time the hares and the peacocks, for whom the area was habitat, have been frightened away³⁰

The attitudes of communities living nearby varies. Some, like the villagers of Delhi, do not relate to the monuments because they are recent immigrants who have no sense of the area’s past; there are others who are proud to talk about them, as the people of Bishnupur in Bengal do, about the terracotta temples; some are bored and impatient with them, like the inhabitants who walk past the painted havelis of Shekhavati every day. There are ways of reviving or generating a bond - why can’t monuments be the fulcrums for teaching geography or history or art? Why can’t listing of heritage properties or precincts be shared with the community, as was done in a limited way in Rajasthan³¹?

The shopkeepers of Chandni Chowk see opportunity in their street being given heritage status – can’t this be made an occasion for creating an interest in history (i.e. to give a shape to the vague agenda of ‘raising awareness’)?³²

In conclusion – The different age-cohorts in India’s steadily swelling urban populations need nourishing public areas - shops, parks, auditoria, restaurants, libraries. Can’t some of these be in or part of monument sites? It’s saddening to see the crowds at the malls and the loneliness of monuments. The sunrise-to-sunset rules of the ASI was made in a pre-electricity era. Wouldn’t it be wonderful if the exception made for occasional dance performances at Konark and Khajuraho, or music at the Qutb, was extended – say, once a week – for activities at monuments; what of calligraphy or art workshops, neighbourhood libraries and book discussions, poetry recitals, lectures ? As Naman Ahuja asked, why can’t monuments become part of our communities, part of our habitats, once again?³³

Notes

1. The Survey of India, set up in 1767, is an engineering agency which surveys and maps territories. Its greatest achievement was the Great Trigonometrical Survey of India begun in 1802 and completed 50 years later.
2. The Archaeological Survey of India was set up by the Viceroy in 1861, some years after it was suggested by Alexander Cunningham, an army

engineer, whose personal interest had led to the excavation of many Buddhist sites.

3. James Fergusson, *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture* in 2 vols. (1876)
4. The Ancient Monuments Preservation Act, 1904 (Act No. VII of 1904)
5. The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act, 1958 (No 24 of 1958); the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act 2010
6. The National Trust in England, a non-governmental body, was founded by 3 individuals in 1895, to preserve areas of beautiful landscape and private houses, threatened by the expansion of towns and the spread of industrial areas. It is the largest private landowner in England, and its properties are looked after by 70,000 volunteers. It has 5 million members today.
7. The National Park Service of the USA, founded in 1916, is an official body which manages National Parks (areas of great scenic beauty) and national monuments.
8. The Geological Survey of India was established in 1851 as part of the search for coal belts in British India. In 2016 it published a list of 32 of geo-heritage sites for protection.
9. The National Parks started with one in 1936, to 103 today. The expansion was chiefly from the 1970s, when 'Project Tiger' called for protection of the natural habitat of tigers.
10. In 1991 the Government of India notified Coastal Regulation Zones, prohibiting building along the shore for a specified distance. In 2018 a notification has been drafted which seeks to reduce the width of the prohibited stretch.
11. 'Living' monuments are not under the ASI, though the ASI might lend its expertise to conserving them. The state departments of archaeology can decide to protect a site/monument, usually ones that are smaller or less distinctive than a national one. For the nineteenth century many grandiose buildings which the ASI takes over are often being used as offices or residents.
12. The expansion of railway-lines, and, more recently, the coming of long-distance has made for a quantum increase in the numbers going on vacation or pilgrimage.
13. India bestirred itself a little belatedly about nominating sites for World Heritage status from UNESCO, but now has a tally of 38, with many others lined up to be considered.
14. One notable exception to the official control of monuments is the World Heritage Site of Humayun's Tomb in Delhi, where the ASI, the Aga Khan Trust for Culture, and the community work in partnership. This should be seen as a template for other sites.
15. Monuments are presented in terms of *function*, and of *style*. We have to go deeper, and see them in terms of individual *form*. For instance, many

churches, masajid and mandirs have family resemblances. The art historian's skill is to tease out the *specificities* of each, in terms of material, design and iconography. This will restore the spirit of architecture, where all the smiths – the panchalas – worked together, not discretely.

16. *Vastu-shastra* and *Shilpa-shastra* are classified as canonical Sanskrit literature. Actually they are region-specific building and engineering handbooks, that supplement the oral transmission of these skills. Such handbooks, written from the 3rd CE to the 19th CE, in different Indian languages, are known. There must have been many more. Only a few have been translated into English. Ideally they should be compiled by date and region, to educate today's builders and to build up an art history which makes connections and highlights innovations.
17. The European immigrants in America and Australia not only massacred many local inhabitants but destroyed their sacred sites and ignored their cultures. Only from the mid-twentieth century in north America, and from the 1970s in Australia were markers of their tangible and intangible cultures given some recognition. The written histories of the USA and Australia start with their 'discoveries', thus seeing them only in relation to European migrations. In India we are fortunate in still having with us a large population of communities who live close to nature and possess a wealth of knowledge of botany, ecology, medicine and zoology, as well as crafts where oral and material traditions are bound together. These peoples and their habitats are increasingly threatened by technologically advanced techniques of mining.
18. Monuments by default feed into communitarian anger, and are made sites of easily-generated 'debates' (which for most part have archaeological fact on one side, and unscientific conjecture on the other)
19. Heritage Management is a 'subject' taught in some institutes and universities. So far it has been cobbled together from courses of history, tourism and hotel management.
20. A college of architecture which tried to break the mould of the curriculum prepared by the Council of Architecture was the Tulsi Vidya Bharati School of Habitat Studies in Delhi (1990-2007) by 2 deviations – one, by offering modules on architectural history every year through the five-year course; two, by allowing students from the social sciences to apply for the architecture course. The Council of Architecture took objection and asked it to follow the standard curriculum they had drawn up.
21. A recent conservation proposal had a reference to Daryaganj, in Delhi. This was described as having been a 'leisure mall'! Its history had been obliterated. It was a riverside market in the fourteenth century. 200 years later (in the reign of Shahjahan), rajas built palaces there; still later, a British cantonment was set up.
22. Academic snobbery is partly to blame for this. College teachers think it is below their dignity to conduct courses for aspiring guides.
23. The ASI is part of the Department of Culture, which is sometimes independent, sometimes a partner of the Department of Tourism. In the last 20 years, the Ministry of Urban Development presides over 'heritage' – Her-

- itage Conservation Committees, 'Heritage Cities' are under this Ministry, when logically they should be under the same ministry as the ASI.
24. What are popularly called 'The Zafar Hasan volumes' are officially four volumes: J.A. Page, *List of Muhammadan and Hindu Monuments, Delhi Zail* (Calcutta, 1916, 1919, 1922)
 25. Emma Tarlo, *Clothing Matters : Dress and Identity in India* (Delhi, 1996). The Hauz Khas monuments were inhabited by farming families, who were asked to move out when the Archaeological Survey extended 'protection' to the monuments in the 1930s. In 1987 the villagers began to rent their premises to shop-owners, and today its lanes are crowded with glitzy high-end shops and eateries. Many other Delhi villages, enclaved in the growing metropolis, have followed this strategy and become prosperous renters.
 26. Of the 3686 centrally-protected monuments in India, the National Monuments Authority since its establishment in 2010 has prepared by-laws only for six !
 27. Delhi's canals (nahar), built in the 13th, 14th and 17th centuries for the fields and orchards around the forts, and for transporting heavy goods, became rainwater drains (nallah) in the 20th century. Just before the Commonwealth Games in 2010, many of them were covered and cemented to become car-parks. The process continues.
 28. Patrick Geddes, a scholar who is claimed by various disciplines, moved the word 'ecology' from being a subset of 'biology' to being under 'sociology'. All the 30-odd reports he wrote on Indian towns between 1914 and 1924 – ranging from 2 volumes on Indore to 2 pages on Lucknow - are sensitive and perceptive, and well worth studying afresh.
 29. KK Muhammed of the Archaeological Survey of India achieved a remarkable feat of restoring many temples in the Bateshwar Complex in the Chambal Valley of Madhya Pradesh, negotiating a perilous line between the dangers posed by the mining interests and the dacoits, winning the latter over to his side. <https://www.thehindu.com/features/metroplus/society/the-temple.../article4397093.ece>
 30. As in Hauz Khas Village (see note xxv above)
 31. Rajasthan has been through many phases of 'heritage-ification'. In a sense it was 'created' as a romantic landscape by the chronicler James Tod in the mid-19th century, after which the various rival kingdoms were brought together to form 'Rajputana'. From the 1970s, after the abolition of the rajas' privy purses, many royal palaces and forts were developed as hotels and tourist destinations. In the last 20 years, 'heritage' has covered the performing arts, textiles, cuisine and 'desert tourism', bringing rural areas into the fold.
 32. Chandni Chowk, a wide street running north from the Mughal fort at Delhi (the 'Red Fort') was actually the name of an opening in the street, marked by a pool. It has been a popular street-market for over 350 years, and branches off into lanes again lined with shops. The upper floors, originally dwellings, are getting converted into shops, offices and hotels.

There is much room for making it more attractive, by having the owners, conservationists and designers working together. There are many European examples which can suggest how this can be done.

33. Professor Naman Ahuja, art historian, School of Arts and Aesthetics, Jawaharlal Nehru University.

References

- Cariappa, Devika. 2017. *India through Archaeology: Excavating History*. Chennai: Tulika.
- Fergusson, James. 1876. *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture in 2 vols*. London: John Murray.
- Hewison, Robert. 1987. *The Heritage Industry: Britain in a climate of decline*. London: Methuen.
- Lahiri, Nayanjot, *Monuments Matter* (Marg, Mumbai, Vol. 68) 2017
- Jon Lang, Madhavi Desai, Miki Desai. 2000. *Architecture and Independence: The Search for Identity - India, 1880-1980*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Liddle, Swapna. 2017. *Chandni Chowk : The Mughal City of Old Delhi*. Delhi: Speaking Tiger.
- Meller, Helen. 2005. *Patrick Geddes: Social Evolutionist and City Planner*. London: Routledge.
- Nanda, Ratish. 2017. *Humayun's Tomb Conservation*. Ahmedabad: Mapin.
- Nilsson, Sten (Ed.). 1995. *Aspects of Conservation in Urban India*. Lund: Lund University Press.
- Page, J.A. 1997. *List of Muhammadan and Hindu Monuments*, Delhi: Zail was reprinted in 3 volumes with a new title - R C Agrawal, *Monuments of Delhi: Lasting Splendour of the Great Mughals and Others*. Delhi.
- Ramusack, Barbara N. 1994. 'Tourism and Icons: The Packaging of the Princely States of Rajasthan, in C B Asher and T R Metcalf, *Perceptions of South Asia's Visual Past*. Delhi: Oxford and IBH Publishers.
- Tarlo, Emma. 1996. *Clothing Matters: Dress and Identity in India*. London: Hurst and Co.