

Heritage Management and Conservation in Pakistan: The British Legacy and Current Perspective

MOHAMMAD RAFIQUE MUGHAL

The development of archaeology involving the discovery and excavation of ancient sites, conservation of extant architectural remains and management of movable and immovable cultural heritage in South Asia (Pakistan, India, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka) is traced back to the early British colonial times. In most writings on this subject during the past century (Ghosh 1953; Lahiri 2006; Singh 2004), the story begins around the middle of the 18th century. It is a long but fascinating account of architectural heritage and antiquities documented and narrated by several writers enthusiastically while a few others have given provocative views of the colonial or imperial interests in promoting historical and cultural research (Chakrabarti 1997 and 2003).

This subject is examined here to highlight contributions of individuals and their impact in shaping the course of discoveries and historical research (Marshall 1939; Roy 1953). The British colonial legacy in South Asian countries is marked by most extensive archaeological explorations and excavations, conservation of countless monuments and sites of diverse cultural and historical contents, development of epigraphy, establishment of museums and above all, a comprehensive and effective legislation on cultural properties that still remains unsurpassed by any of the successor independent South Asian country. The conservation of monuments, regardless of their religious or historical affiliation, has been one of the fundamental and most significant contributions of the British on a scale that is unparalleled in the colonial history of the Europeans. As we look closely at the conservations undertaken during the British colonial period at monuments scattered over vast territories, it becomes apparent that it was in the pursuit of well-considered, organized and consistent policies that ensured preservation of monuments that have now survived to this day as landmarks of native history and culture. The Annual Reports of the Archaeological Survey of India and a series of Memoirs and other publications on related subjects like epigraphy, illustrate quite well the high standards maintained in conservation of major (categories I and II) monuments of the prehistoric, Buddhist, Jain, Hindu and Muslim periods which were directly under the charge of the central government. However, not all territories of the British Empire were fully explored to document archaeological and architectural wealth and consequently, many sites were not preserved to the extent the major monuments received attention. The Local (State) Governments were expected to supplement the field work in their respective administrative regions. It needs to be pointed out that creation and organization of a conservation wing under the centralized administration of the Director General and providing detailed guidelines on conservation best known as the *Conservation Manual* (1923), contributed substantially towards saving the heritage sites and monuments from disintegration. The current policies and procedures of conservation in the South Asian countries are largely a continuation of the British Raj that are now slightly modified and fine-tuned to mirror the national needs and aspirations of the individual countries. This paper examines the existing rules, policies and practices of conservation of architectural and

archaeological heritage sites in Pakistan which are seen basically as a reflection of the British colonial legacy with some suitable changes introduced since Independence in 1947.

In tracing the origin and gradual development of the concept and practice of archaeological and architectural conservation in the South Asian sub-continent it seems that interest in the preservation of ancient monuments started as early as the beginning of the 19th century as pointed out already. A formal recognition of the importance of cultural heritage and need to preserve it is indicated by the Bengal Regulation XIX of 1810. It empowered the government to intervene if any public 'edifice' was exposed to misuse by private individuals. However, no specific measures were taken under that Regulation. In 1844, the Court of the Directors of the East India Company decided to start the collection of detailed and well-classified information as to the nature, the extent and the state of existing monuments. It was desired to compile preliminary reports on each 'temple and building and to select specimens of buildings worthy of delineation' (for protection and repairs). The work undertaken did not, however, include the monuments located in the areas now forming Pakistan. It was only in the year 1855 that some repairs were carried out at Shah Jahan's mosque and few tombs at Makli Hill, Thatta (Sindh). In the year 1861, Lord Canning, the first Viceroy of India sanctioned a scheme for preparing an 'accurate description—illustrated by plans, measurements, drawings or photographs and by copies of inscriptions – if such remains as deserve notice, the history of them so far as it may be traceable, and a record of the traditions that are retained regarding them' (quoted by Roy 1953: 10 with footnote 6). At that time, the repair and maintenance of monuments were not included in the scheme prepared for funding. These events reflect an interest in the preservation of monument prior to the appointment of (Major General Sir) Alexander Cunningham as Director General of Archaeology in 1862. He was basically a civil engineer and instead of undertaking conservation of monuments, he excelled in recording and documenting archaeological, historical and architectural data. Nevertheless, the creation of the Archaeological Survey reflected a tacit and implicit realization by the British Government of the need to preserve the architectural wealth and cultural heritage of their colonial territories in India and Pakistan for posterity. However, there was no specific mention of the conservation of monuments, nor any plan or scheme was prepared for conservation. The aims of the Survey as stated in an official resolution, were to 'do a complete search over the whole country, and a systematic record and description of all architectural and other remains that are either remarkable for their antiquity or their beauty or their historical interest (quoted by Roy 1953:13). In an official P.W.D. (Public Works Department) circular No. 9 dated 13 February 1873 of the central government, the local (provincial) governments were assigned to preserve 'all buildings and monuments of historical and architectural interest' (Roy 1953: 15). To protect the sites from looting, the Treasure Trove Act was passed in 1878 which has never been amended or repealed. Lord Lytton, the Viceroy was quick to realize the dangers of handing over conservation works to the local governments. He wrote that 'the preservation of the national antiquities and works of art ought not to be exclusively left to the charge of the local governments which may not always be alive to the importance of such a duty. Lieutenant Governors who combined aesthetic culture with administrative energy are not likely to be very common, and I cannot conceive of any claims upon the administrative and financial resources of the Supreme Government more essentially imperial than this.' (as quoted by Roy 1953: 15).

Early in 1881, Major H. H. Cole was appointed as the Curator of Ancient Monuments in India 'to prepare classified lists of monuments of each province, grouping them according as they required to

be kept in permanent good repair or were decayed beyond that point but still not in complete ruin or were unimportant or irretrievably ruined' (cited by Marshall 1939: 4 and Roy 1953: 16). Major Cole in addition to advising the Government of India and local governments on restoration and conservation of monuments, produced ten folio volumes on the *Preservation of National Monuments in India* and excellent reports on the condition of principal monuments along with recommendations for their repairs (Roy 1953:16). These initial reports on the preservation of monuments were published by the Governments of India (Simla – Calcutta 1881-85). Cole also produced a series of Preliminary Reports on monuments in 22 parts and personally supervised conservation of quite a number of buildings. It goes to the credit of Cole to divide the monuments into three broad categories of I, II and III which were the basis of classification by Sir John Marshall in his *Conservation Manual* (1923) forty years later. The monuments of historical or archaeological or state of preservation which ought to be maintained in permanent good repair were placed in category I. Those monuments which could be saved from further decay by undertaking repairs were grouped under category II, while the rest in advanced stage of decay and of relatively less significance were grouped in category III

With the abolition of Cole's post in 1883, the task of conservation again reverted to the local governments. About thirty years later, the Government of British India again revised its policy and allowed the Archaeological Survey to include conservation. In 1899, a scheme was sanctioned according to which the British India was divided into five Archaeological Circles, three of which included Sindh, Punjab, Balochistan and Bengal. The most important duties of the new Director General were to care for the ancient monuments properly and that they were not misused and the repairs were executed when required and restorations, which may be attempted, were conducted on artistic lines (Ramachandran 1953:31). The most important and far reaching result of this change in the government policy was that the conservation of ancient monuments was made the foremost and paramount duty of the central government (Ramachandaran 1953).

The appointment of Lord Curzon as Viceroy in 1899 marked the beginning of a new era in the history of the Archaeological Survey. His personal enthusiasm brought about fundamental changes in the policy of the British Government towards the maintenance and preservation of monuments. In his speech before the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal in February 1899, Lord Curzon boldly defined his objectives and priorities in conducting research, development of archaeology and preservation of the relics of the past. His speech as quoted by Marshall (1939:9-10) served as a guideline for pursuing archaeological policy which said, 'There has been, during the last forty years, some sort of sustained effort on the part of Government to recognize its responsibilities and to purge itself of a well-merited reproach. This attempt has been accompanied, and sometimes delayed, by disputes as to the rival claims of research and of conservation, and by discussion over the legitimate spheres of action of the Central and Local Governments. There have been periods of supineness as well as of activity. There have been moments when it has been argued that the State had exhausted its duty or that it possessed no duty at all. There have been persons who thought that, when all the chief monuments were indexed and classified, one might sit with folded arms and allow them slowly and gracefully to crumble into ruin. There have been others who argued that railways and irrigation did not leave a modest half-lakh of rupees per annum for the requisite establishment to supervise the most glorious galaxy of monuments in the world. Nevertheless, with these interruptions and exceptions, which I hope may never again recur, the progress

be kept in permanent good repair or were decayed beyond that point but still not in complete ruin or were unimportant or irretrievably ruined' (cited by Marshall 1939: 4 and Roy 1953: 16). Major Cole in addition to advising the Government of India and local governments on restoration and conservation of monuments, produced ten folio volumes on the *Preservation of National Monuments in India* and excellent reports on the condition of principal monuments along with recommendations for their repairs (Roy 1953:16). These initial reports on the preservation of monuments were published by the Governments of India (Simla – Calcutta 1881-85). Cole also produced a series of Preliminary Reports on monuments in 22 parts and personally supervised conservation of quite a number of buildings. It goes to the credit of Cole to divide the monuments into three broad categories of I, II and III which were the basis of classification by Sir John Marshall in his *Conservation Manual* (1923) forty years later. The monuments of historical or archaeological or state of preservation which ought to be maintained in permanent good repair were placed in category I. Those monuments which could be saved from further decay by undertaking repairs were grouped under category II, while the rest in advanced stage of decay and of relatively less significance were grouped in category III

With the abolition of Cole's post in 1883, the task of conservation again reverted to the local governments. About thirty years later, the Government of British India again revised its policy and allowed the Archaeological Survey to include conservation. In 1899, a scheme was sanctioned according to which the British India was divided into five Archaeological Circles, three of which included Sindh, Punjab, Balochistan and Bengal. The most important duties of the new Director General were to care for the ancient monuments properly and that they were not misused and the repairs were executed when required and restorations, which may be attempted, were conducted on artistic lines (Ramachandran 1953:31). The most important and far reaching result of this change in the government policy was that the conservation of ancient monuments was made the foremost and paramount duty of the central government (Ramachandaran 1953).

The appointment of Lord Curzon as Viceroy in 1899 marked the beginning of a new era in the history of the Archaeological Survey. His personal enthusiasm brought about fundamental changes in the policy of the British Government towards the maintenance and preservation of monuments. In his speech before the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal in February 1899, Lord Curzon boldly defined his objectives and priorities in conducting research, development of archaeology and preservation of the relics of the past. His speech as quoted by Marshall (1939:9-10) served as a guideline for pursuing archaeological policy which said, 'There has been, during the last forty years, some sort of sustained effort on the part of Government to recognize its responsibilities and to purge itself of a well-merited reproach. This attempt has been accompanied, and sometimes delayed, by disputes as to the rival claims of research and of conservation, and by discussion over the legitimate spheres of action of the Central and Local Governments. There have been periods of supineness as well as of activity. There have been moments when it has been argued that the State had exhausted its duty or that it possessed no duty at all. There have been persons who thought that, when all the chief monuments were indexed and classified, one might sit with folded arms and allow them slowly and gracefully to crumble into ruin. There have been others who argued that railways and irrigation did not leave a modest half-lakh of rupees per annum for the requisite establishment to supervise the most glorious galaxy of monuments in the world. Nevertheless, with these interruptions and exceptions, which I hope may never again recur, the progress

has been positive and on the whole continuous'. Lord Curzon firmly believed that the Government of British India was responsible for the preservation of monuments which in the words of his predecessor Lord Lytton, were 'for variety, extent, completeness and beauty unsurpassed, perhaps unequalled in the world' (quoted by Roy 1953:26). It also goes to the credit of Lord Curzon to enact *Ancient Monuments Preservation Act* in 1904, which provided legal cover for the protection of heritage. His liberal support to the Archaeological Survey in all fields laid the foundation of management and development of heritage preservation. He said, 'It is, in my judgment, equally our duty to dig and discover, to classify, reproduce and describe, to copy and decipher and to cherish and conserve' (Ghosh 1953:30; Marshall 1939:13).

The next major turning point was the appointment of (Sir) John Marshall as Director General of Archaeological Survey of British India, whose contributions to the preservation of monuments, archaeological excavations, epigraphy, publications, establishment of museums and related fields constitute the most brilliant, fundamental and outstanding contributions that are unparalleled in the entire archaeological history of South Asia. The principles and procedures of conservation as conceived and practiced by Sir John Marshall are still a source of guidance and inspiration. His two books, *Conservation Manual* (1923) and *Archaeological Works Code* (1938) cover all important aspects of the conservation work and offer solutions to practical problems faced by the conservators in the field. It is pointed out that Marshall's principles of conservation were already practiced successfully forty years before the much publicized Venice Charter of 1964 and even the Athens Charter of 1932. He opposed hypothetical reconstruction and restoration and insisted on preservation of original components of monuments and decorative designs and for documenting various stages of processes of conservation. Marshall was far ahead of time when he firmly laid down the rules of conservation of monuments which said that '(a) hypothetical restorations were unwarranted unless they were essential to the stability of a building; (b) every original member of a building should be preserved in tact, and demolition and reconstruction should be undertaken only if the structure could not be otherwise maintained; (c) restoration of carved stone, carved wood or plaster-moulding should be undertaken only if artisans were able to attain the excellence of the old; and (d) in no case mythological or other scenes be carved' (Ghosh 1953:32). These rules have been religiously followed during the British colonial and later times in South Asia.

The Post-Colonial Era:

Heritage Management and Preservation in Pakistan

Before 1947, the entire area of South Asia was divided into six Archaeological Circles and Pakistan inherited this organizational structure of the British period for the management of the cultural heritage. Pakistan's West Pakistan Circle was the real successor to the British Indian Frontier Circle and the East Pakistan Circle was a part of colonial Eastern Circle. The Frontier Circle of Archaeological Survey was established at Peshawar as early as 1906 to look after the protected monuments in the former NWFP (now Khyber Pakhtunkhwa) including Balochistan. Two other circles known as Northern Circles were established with their headquarters at (i) Lahore to look after the Hindu and Buddhist monuments in the areas of west and East Punjab, Delhi, U.P. Central India and Rajputana, and the second at (ii) Agra to manage the Muslim and British monuments in the above provinces. The two headquarters of the

erstwhile Frontier Circle were shifted to Lahore in 1928 when the Muslim and British monuments in former Punjab were also transferred to that Circle. In 1931, due to financial stringency, the Circle dealing with the Hindu and Buddhist monuments at Lahore was abolished and transferred to the former Frontier Circle. In 1946, the control of the monuments located in the areas of former Sindh Province was also transferred to the Frontier Circle. With the establishment of Pakistan, this Circle was reorganized and re-named as West Pakistan Circle and all the monuments located in West Pakistan were put under its control. However, after the creation of Bangladesh in 1971, Pakistan was left with Western Pakistan Circle only. The administrative set up was reorganized into the Northern Circle of Archaeology and the Southern Circle of Archaeology with headquarters respectively at Lahore and Hyderabad. This division helped to bring about improvements in the functioning of the Federal Archaeology Department especially in the conservation works which otherwise were not possible to achieve within a single administrative unit of West Pakistan. For greater efficiency, the Northern Circle of Archaeology was further subdivided into four Sub-Regional Offices located at Multan, Taxila, Peshawar and Gilgit. One Sub-Regional Office at Quetta was created in the Southern Circle of Archaeology with its headquarter already established at Hyderabad. Despite all these changes, the main policy decisions came from the Director General of Archaeology and Museums whose headquarter office remained at Karachi until about 1998 when it moved to Islamabad.

A major change in the archaeological history of Pakistan took place in 2011 when all monuments and sites, museums and antiquities located in the provinces along with staff and their budgetary allocations were handed over to the respective provincial governments. The control of all 402 'protected' and World Heritage sites under the charge of the federal government has now been physically taken over by the provincial governments of the four provinces in Pakistan. This is a very significant development after a long centralized control of the federal government in line with the colonial legacy perpetuated since the time of Sir Alexander Cunningham and Sir John Marshall. The results of such a change are yet to be assessed. Under the new setup, the post of the Director General of Archaeology of the erstwhile Federal Department of Archaeology still survives but with restricted jurisdiction only over the Federal Capital Area. Each province has established its Department of Archaeology. They are gradually adopting the Federal Antiquities Act 1975 formally. They already have their provincial laws on heritage (except Balochistan) and separate list of sites and monuments in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Punjab and Sindh (Mughal 1995).

The Heritage Laws of Pakistan

Pakistan inherited a long tradition of heritage conservation and management from the British colonial government. The earliest heritage legislation, the *Ancient Monuments Preservation Act, 1904* (AMP Act), was a logical culmination of half a century of experience gained in archaeological surveys, excavations, conservation of monuments and epigraphical research. It was designed to provide effective protection to monuments and moveable antiquities and to regulate excavations. The AMP Act of 1904 empowered the Archaeological Survey of British India to acquire and give protection to any kind of cultural property to ensure its preservation. Voluntary contributions and endowments for undertaking repairs of monuments were acceptable. It also provided for a right of access to monuments if they were privately owned; protection of religious buildings against misuse; control over the movement and sale of antiquities. Under the Act, an archaeological site could be declared a protected monument and also

acquired for excavation with compensation to the owner (Mughal 1995). No legislation, however, was provided to protect natural heritage, cultural landscapes and underwater archaeological remains.

At Independence, Pakistan, like India, adopted the AMP Act 1904, which remained in place with few changes until 1968 when a separate legislation called the *Antiquities Act*, was passed. It repealed the 1904 AMP Act but retained most of its articles in a modified form. Under the new *Antiquities Act* 1968, an Advisory Committee was created to advise on all heritage issues. It re-defined an 'ancient' monument as dating prior to May 1857. The old AMP Act's two-fold classification of 'ancient monument' and 'antiquity' was replaced with new categories of 'movable' and 'immovable' antiquities with broad and almost all inclusive definitions. Among the highlights of the new legislation were provisions for assuming custody of antiquities by the federal government's Department of Archaeology in the absence of an owner, or to assume guardianship of monuments if their safety was in danger. It gave to the government the right of preemption if an antiquity was for sale. It also prohibited making copies, export or dealing in antiquities without authorization. The current *Antiquities Act* 1975 (amended in 1990), re-defined an 'ancient' object to be not less than 75 years old. It made the federal government the owner of all buried antiquities discovered from any site, whether protected or otherwise. It banned all new construction within a distance of 200 feet from protected antiquities. All other provisions of previous *Antiquities Act* were retained. However, it also contained no reference to the natural heritage, cultural landscapes and intangible heritage.

The cultural heritage laws of Pakistan are uniformly applicable to all categories of sites regardless of their state of preservation and classification as monuments of national or world heritage importance (Mughal 1996). There is no separate organization to look after any specific class of monuments such as the World Heritage sites. Only to preserve Mohenjo Daro, a separate agency was created in late 1970s called, 'Authority for the Preservation of Mohenjo Daro' for implementing the UNESCO-sponsored preservation programme. At the national level, the former Federal Department of Archaeology maintained until 2011, a register of 402 protected archaeological sites and monuments located in all the provinces of Pakistan. In addition, there are three provincial lists of sites and monuments and one of Karachi city (KDA) with an overall total exceeding one thousand protected sites. There are seven sites on the World Heritage list, which are now looked after by the provinces of their location. The list of unprotected monuments and sites is much longer than the collective total of all protected heritage properties.

Not all sites and monuments declared as protected 'antiquities', 'heritage' or 'premises' are owned by the government. In fact, the number of sites and monuments owned by both the federal and provincial governments is less than one-quarter of the total number of protected sites. The *Antiquities Act* of 1975, however, guarantees that no changes or repairs can be made to a protected monument even if owned privately without approval of the official agencies concerned with it. The heritage laws of Pakistan are generally effective for both national and World Heritage sites. However, enforcement of the *Antiquities Act* 1975 has brought out certain problems which will have to be addressed. For example, in urban areas, it is increasingly difficult to stop modern encroachments around monuments or demolition of privately owned structures. The executing agencies need authorization under the antiquity laws to demolish unauthorized constructions. The situation at some monuments has become very serious. Stringent laws are needed to stop illegal digging and smuggling of the nation's heritage. The situation in

the Gandhara region has become very serious indeed. New rules for conservation, repairs and restoration of sites and monuments should be framed like those of the exploration and excavation rules of 1978 (amended in 1989). The conservation guidelines and procedures as laid down by Sir John Marshall should be updated and modified in response to current realities.

Conservation Practice in Pakistan

It has already been mentioned that Pakistan inherited the time-tested British Indian procedures of conservation, and followed the guidelines given in the *Conservation Manual and Archaeological Works Code* by Sir John Marshall. It should have been updated in response to changes that have taken place in the philosophy and methodology of conservation since 1947 in Pakistan. Disregard of the principles of conservation, lack of understanding of historical, aesthetic and cultural values of heritage sites has caused considerable damage to the cultural properties. Until recent years, full documentation of all interventions done in course of conservation of monuments was not done or maintained on permanent basis for future reference except for notes relating to cost estimates and quantities of materials used. In contrast to Pakistan, the current state of conservation in Sri Lanka, China, Thailand and India (Ota 2010), to quote only four examples from Asian countries, reflects significant strategic changes in their policies and procedures that would match any international standards of heritage conservation. For example, the drafting of *Principles for Conservation of Heritage Sites in China* (2000) is the best illustration of international collaborative efforts. There are more than 300,000 sites so far registered in China which are considered historically and culturally important among which 1,268 are declared as 'National Priority Protected' sites. This is the highest level of protection given to the sites including 99 historically and culturally famous cities in China. This document, commonly called as 'China Conservation Principles' is the first of its kind produced in recent years by an Asian country which is specific to the local conditions and procedures to be adopted for heritage conservation. In a sense, it is a living document because it will be revised in the subsequent years. The China Conservation Principles draw upon the wisdom of ICOMOS Charters and other documents and emphasize research, documentation, and conservation process, identification, and investigation by surveys. It stresses preparation of inventories, selection of sites and for ascertaining their cultural values, their state of preservation, management and interpretation. Four legal pre-requisites are mentioned, namely (a) demarcation of boundaries and buffer zones of sites, (b) information on the protected status of sites, (c) creation and maintenance of archives, and (d) an institution designated to protect and manage the sites. The document contains a lengthy commentary on various issues with specific explanations of (1) heritage sites, (2) conservation process to be adopted, (3) archival records to be maintained for reference and records, and for drawing of proposals of preservation, (4) system of management, (5) assessment of the sites and state of conservation, (6) preparation of conservation master plan, (7) routine management maintenance and interpretation, (8) physical protection and strengthening of sites, (9) minor and major restoration, and (10) relocation and reconstruction. This document could be inspirational for many Asian countries sharing common issues of preservation and heritage management as distinct from European based experiences as contained in most of 40 Charters and Recommendations. Pakistan has already gained precious experience of undertaking conservation projects at the World Heritage sites which should be applied effectively at other sites. For example, in 1974, two development schemes (called PC-I) for the restoration and conservation of Shalamar Garden and Lahore Fort were launched by the

Northern Circle of Archaeology which lasted for more than ten years. The funding for these major projects came from special allocations. A great deal of conservation of major buildings at the two World Heritage sites was done on a large scale for the first time in Pakistan. The implementation of these projects however, brought into focus many new aspects of institutional strengths and weaknesses, pointing up new strategies to be adopted for undertaking such major conservation works in terms of planning, organization and training.

An evaluation of the projects (called performance review) clearly brought out the consequences of not providing separate project staff for those two world heritage monuments. The Department of Archaeology and Museums being the sponsoring agency was to supervise and provide professional and technical support through its senior and experienced site managers. The entire project staff was to be recruited who would have been trained in conservation procedures by the end of the project. Somehow, it was not done and instead, the entire burden was left on the shoulder of already meager staff of the sponsoring agency. It was also noted that the proposals themselves were not based on reliable data, which should have been obtained through extensive investigation of the problems of conservation causing deterioration. The projects suffered from time and cost over-runs. On the positive side, the experience gained at these two monuments was extremely valuable in formulating future schemes of development and restoration at these and other monuments in the country. It became clear that infusion of funds was not the only answer to the preservation of heritage. A steady flow of money, its judicious utilization and effective monitoring were essential elements for achieving any success because the whole process of restoring monuments was slow, time consuming and an expensive exercise. Two new conservation and management plans for Shalimar Garden and Lahore Fort (2006 – 2011), which are already operative have addressed most if not all the problems raised previously. The courses on conservation and cultural heritage were not offered at any level of higher education in Pakistan. At present, the Hazara University (Mansehra) and National College of Arts (Lahore) offer specialized courses in heritage that need to be strengthened with practical experience. Even if a formal education is imparted, it takes several years for an Architect or Civil Engineer to take up conservation projects independently.

In normal circumstances proper studies and investigation have to be carried out at each monument to document all features in detail before, during and after conservation works. The results of investigations constitute the basis for formulating conservation scheme. Few investigations have been carried out such as at Wah Garden yielding very useful information but this procedure has not been adopted for other monuments. Efforts have been made by the universities and other organizations for documentation of monuments but the available information has not been fully utilized for preservation and restoration of the monuments. Extensive documentations of site of Mohenjo Daro were done for many years. A series of studies of various kinds were carried out and data on every available aspect has been collected by a succession of UNESCO consultants or 'experts' of foreign origin since 1947. However, the entire data has yet to be analyzed and also utilized for the benefit of Mohenjo Daro and the world. It is somehow ironic that a huge body of data has been documented but without effective implementation and utilization. On the contrary, Shalimar Garden and Lahore Fort had no investigation for data but conservation and restoration works were completed at these monuments. The two essential procedures of data collection and conservation have been laid down by the national and even

international principles and recommendations for conservation.

In recent years, the Provincials Governments and other institutions such as the universities and NGOs (Non-Governmental Organizations) have come up with their proposals for conserving the built heritage in different part of the country. The basic problem with most of these organizations except few has been lack of expertise in the conservation of monuments. These institutions are very good in rehabilitation of buildings of comparatively recent dates and their re-use of monuments. It is however observed that in the name of conservation, monuments of more than 400 years old have been destroyed or disfigured with excessive intervention and thoughtless re-constructions, having no similarity or link with the original character or plan of the structures. Moreover, new building materials have been introduced which is against the principles of conservation. It is essential that a coordinating body should oversee these activities to ensure consistency of standards and adherence to the conservation principles and national policies so that the historical authenticity and originality of monuments are not sacrificed in the name of conservation. In addition to the definition and standardization of conservation procedures, there are real and serious problems arising out of the enforcement of national heritage laws.

Management of Archaeological Sites

In 1990, the *Charter for the Protection and the Management of the Archaeological Heritage* was adopted. It stated that archaeological heritage should be treated and protected like architectural remains. It laid down the principles relating to our responsibilities for preparation of inventories, conducting surveys, excavations, research and maintenance of all sites and for taking appropriate measures to conserve them for presentation to the public. It stated that integrated protection policies should be adopted to minimize destruction of archaeological heritage and adequate funds should be provided for undertaking excavations and documentation of all categories of evidence. It also emphasized cooperation among various scholars for excavations, management, conservation and publication of the results. This charter is built on an earlier document of UNESCO regarding *International Recommendation on International Principles Applicable to Archaeological Excavations 1956*. It called for technical training of excavators and for introducing an effective legislation to control and protect archaeological sites (Mughal 1995; 2010).

In Pakistan, there is a great need for adopting and enforcing an effective policy to follow for the management of archaeological sites, both excavated and unexplored sites as distinct from built urban areas and architectural remains. The archaeological sites in particular, present different kinds of problems as compared to the standing monuments. Mohenjo Daro and Taxila represent two best examples of archaeological sites for doing case studies of management strategies in theory and practice. Needless to emphasize that archaeological sites provide contexts to the cultural relics that are discovered from them and also provide explanation of antiquities and functions of the structures. It is therefore, necessary to preserve and manage archaeological sites on permanent basis along with architectural monuments and historic or urban areas. The management of archaeological sites does not simply relate to posting of staff at a site. In fact, it involves supervision of the works of entire field staff, engaged to ensure conservation of the excavated remains, protection of sites and their safety and security against human vandalism and natural disasters. It also involves strict vigilance against any encroachment at the site and close coordination among various agencies interested to develop the sites as tourist destinations. The management also involves adoption of appropriate measures that will reduce adverse impact of

natural disasters caused by the rains, floods or earthquakes. The *Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites* (Feilden and Jokilehto 1993) lists a number of essential tasks which the administrators of heritage sites should undertake.

All archaeological sites are perpetually exposed to the forces of nature such as rain, fire, earthquakes, floods and most recently, anti-heritage elements causing intentional destruction of cultural properties. It is important to anticipate possible levels of risks and to take appropriate steps to eliminate or mitigate impact of all such dangers to the sites. Herb Stovel's *Risk Preparedness: A Management Manual for World Cultural Heritage* (1998) is an excellent handbook for use. There have been worst cases of negligence and lack of preparedness even at the world heritage sites in Pakistan, for example, at Mohenjo Daro. The excavated remains at the largest Bronze Age capital city of burnt bricks, lacked proper outlets for rain water, ironically while international campaign for the preservation of Mohenjo Daro was in progress. On one rainy day of mid-1994, the excavated houses and streets in one city area were filled with rain water up to four feet deep. The stagnant water accelerated the process of decay of bricks, which were already very much affected due to salinity and salt, and caused many structures to collapse into heaps of brick debris (Mughal 2011). At Taxila, tall grasses grow quickly during the rainy season, at times completely covering the excavated remains, if not removed quickly.

Some Observations on Preservation Issues in Pakistan

Seen in the light of a long tradition of heritage preservation since the beginning of the British colonial era, the situation regarding the state of preservation of cultural property in Pakistan and the measures taken to protect and preserve, present a revealing picture. The current practice of conservation has long been mainly if not exclusively, in the hands of the Departments of Archaeology of the federal and provincial governments. It does not necessarily conform to the established British Indian traditions. Other than Marshall's *Conservation Manual* of 1923, there are no written rules or laws, policies or procedures for the conservation of monuments in Pakistan to guide the conservation officials of the government or the Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) who wish to undertake conservation projects (Mughal 1995; 1998). A great deal of confusion also exists regarding the use of new building materials and in following the old procedures. The provisions of Antiquities Act, 1975 (amended 1990) also do not specify the philosophy, rules or procedures of conservation of monuments in the country. The Act also lacks the administrative and legal powers to deal with encroachers on ancient sites and to impose penalty on those who cause damage to the cultural properties.

A great diversity of approaches to heritage conservation can be observed especially in Central and South Asia (Mughal 2005; 2011). Not all the principles of conservation as expressed in the European-sponsored charters such as Athens Charter (1932), Venice Charter (1964), Budapest Resolutions (1972), European Charter of the Architectural Heritage (1975) and Australian Burra Charter (originally 1982, revised 2004) and China Principles for Conservation of Heritage Sites (2002) are followed in letter and spirit (www.icomos.org). There are differences in approach of strictly keeping the original fabric, material, character, style and decoration of the monument, and of accepting changes in the light of Nara Document of Authenticity (1994). In this situation adherence to the principles of integrity and authenticity of monuments and their contexts and an appropriate re-use of historical buildings will continue to be a great challenging task generally in Asia but especially in Pakistan.

The current developments in the socio-economic sectors and changing political and religious ideologies in many countries are profoundly influencing policies and procedures regarding protection of human cultural heritage, its preservation priorities and maintenance of historical landmarks. The diversity of cultural remains in Pakistan as demonstrated by the ancient sites of different periods of history, monumental architecture and cultural landscapes will continue to occupy attention of heritage conservators and planners for preservation of the past for the future in order to connect it with the present. The greatest challenge to the survival of human material heritage especially in a developing country like Pakistan comes from the development projects of various kinds. In many cases, large scale and ruthless demolition of old domestic and public buildings has taken place. Modern structures of new forms and materials that do not show any connection with either the history or building traditions of the place or region have been built. Few remnants of the past, if left out, stand isolated and torn out of context and therefore, become meaningless to the people and their past. To preserve and maintain social and historical contexts of the built heritage is really challenging. It would demand collective efforts of the town planners and heritage managers, designers and architects, conservators and archaeologists. Their consensus has to be developed by mutual discussions if authenticity and historicity of individual buildings and urban fabrics of our townscapes are to be preserved. In this process, some compromises will have to be made through a consensus on conflicting demands and competing approaches if we want to save cultural heritage for the present and future generations of Pakistan and for the world.

Bibliography

- Chakrabarti, Dilip K. (2003) *Archaeology in the Third World: A History of Indian Archaeology Since 1947*, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd.
- Chakrabarti, Dilip K. (1997) *Colonial Indology: Sociopolitics of the Ancient Indian Past*, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd.
- Feilden, Bernard M. and Jokilehto, D. (1993) *Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites*. Rome: ICCROM.
- Ghosh, A. (1953) Fifty Years of the Archaeological Survey of India, *Ancient India* 9:29- 52.
- Lahiri, Nayanjot (2006) *Finding Forgotten Cities*, London, New York, Calcutta: Seagull Books.
- Mughal, M. Rafique (1995) *Legislations for the Protection and Management of Archaeological Heritage of Pakistan*, Karachi: Department of Archaeology and Museums.
- Mughal, M. Rafique (1996) 'Theory and Practice in Garden Conservation' In M. Hussain, A. Rehman, and J. L. Wescoat (eds), *The Mughal Garden: Interpretation, Conservation and Implications*, Islamabad - Lahore - Karachi: Ferozsons (Pvt.) Ltd:111- 113.
- Mughal, M. Rafique (1998) Heritage Legislation in Pakistan, *The World Heritage Newsletter* 16, April-June: 2, Paris.
- Mughal, M. Rafique (2005) 'Monuments at Kunya-Urgench, Turkmenistan: Comments on Preservation Policies and Procedures', *Circle of Inner Asian Art, SOAS* (University of London) 20: 16 – 19 (Now, *Journal of the Inner Asian Art*)
- Mughal, M. Rafique (2011) 'Heritage Preservation in Pakistan from the National and International Perspectives' In, Mahmood Zaman, *State Vandalism of History in Pakistan*, Lahore/ Karachi/ Islamabad: Vanguard Books (Pvt) Ltd: 104 – 128.
- Marshall, John (1923) *Conservation Manual*, Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, India.
- Marshall, John (1939) The Story of Archaeological Department in India. In, J. Cummings (ed), *Revealing India's Past*, London: The India Society: 1-33.
- Ota, S.B. (2010) 'Archaeological Heritage Resource Management in India'. In, P. M. Messenger and G.S. Smith (eds.), *Cultural Heritage Management: a Global Perspective*, Tampa: University Press of Florida: 82 – 98.
- Ramachandran, T. N. (1953) 'Preservation of Monuments', *Ancient India* 9: 170- 198.
- Roy, Sourindranath (1953) 'Indian Archaeology from Jones to Marshall (1784- 1902)', *Ancient India* 9: 4- 28.
- Singh, Upinder ((2004) *The Discovery of Ancient India: Early Archaeologists and the Beginnings of Archaeology*, Delhi: Permanent Black.