

HERITAGE PRESERVATION IN PAKISTAN FROM NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

Mohammad Rafique Mughal

The story of heritage preservation in Pakistan is very interesting and a long one because it goes back to the nineteenth century of British Indian times. Pakistan inherited British legacy of preservation of monuments and sites and conducting excavations and explorations, museum development and maintenance, and all related issues concerning cultural, archaeological and architectural heritage. The story begins with the appointment of General (Sir) Alexander Cunningham as Surveyor and then Director General of Archaeological Survey with responsibilities *“to make an accurate description of such remains as most deserve notice, with the history of them so far as it is traceable and a record of the traditions that are retained regarding them.”* At that time the British Indian Government had no intention to make archaeology a permanent feature but Alexander Cunningham’s discoveries and great wealth of information published in twenty-three volumes persuaded the British Viceroy to India to continue work of systematic recording of all architectural and other remains which they thought were *“remarkable alike for their antiquity or their beauty or their historic interest.”* Cunningham worked for a total of 19 years mostly in the North-Western Frontier parts. Simultaneously, James Burgess was appointed to document all architectural remains in western India. The publications of investigations running into several volumes are still a source of primary information on the antiquities and archaeology of northern and western parts of British India including the regions now constituting Pakistan. It is significant that conservation of monuments was not a part of Cunningham’s responsibilities and as such, that task was given to the local (provincial) governments. However, it was in 1881 that the British Viceroy Lord (Sir Edward Bulwer) Lytton thought that conservation of monuments was an *“imperial”* duty and appointed Major H. H. Cole as curator of ancient monuments. To his credit go the publication of twenty-two preliminary reports on the state of preservation of monuments and ten folio volumes with details of illustrations entitled, *“Preservation of National Monuments in India”* (Calcutta 1881-85). For convenience of administration, the whole of British India was divided into five circles to carry out repairs and maintenance of the monuments. It was in 1899 with the appointment of Lord Curzon as Viceroy that legislation for protection of antiquities and monuments was introduced which emerged in the form of *Ancient Monuments Preservation Act, 1904* and became an important document in the subsequent years of British Indian history and archaeology.

Such was the legacy of the British Indian archaeological heritage, the procedures and practices adopted at that time, and of the developments which took place in many fields such as extensive explorations and excavations at numerous sites some of which continued for several years for example, at Taxila, Mohenjodaro, Harappa and many other places in the Frontier region of Pakistan. Regular publications for almost half a century constituted an essential part of research and as mentioned above, the reports published by Sir Alexander Cunningham, James Burgess, and H. H. Cole are testimony to the interest and care taken by the British colonial government in the preservation and maintenance of the cultural heritage in South Asian subcontinent. The major contribution was made by (Sir) John Marshall who was appointed as the Director General of Archaeological Survey of British India in 1902 and remained in that position until 1934. The most significant development was the legislation called *Ancient Monuments Preservation Act* in 1904 referred to above which was based on centuries of experience of the British in their own country and in the classical world while taking into consideration the local South Asian situation and special conditions which were observed by the British. This Act of 1904 was designed to provide an effective protection to all categories of monuments and cultural treasures all over the British Indian Empire. It also regulated excavations and empowered the government to ensure preservation and maintenance of such sites which were of religious nature too to make sure that ancient buildings were not misused. The Act also controlled the movement and sale of antiquities. The legislation did not protect the natural heritage and there was no reference to underwater archaeological remains at that time.

In 1947, Pakistan adopted the *Ancient Monuments Preservation Act, 1904* for some time but in 1968 created a new legislation called the *Antiquities Act* which repealed the 1904 AMP but retained most of its clauses in a modified form to suit the changed cultural and political realities. Under the Antiquities Act of 1968, any building dating prior to 1957 was defined as ancient. It also made a clear distinction between an ancient monument and an antiquity respectively dealing with standing buildings and moveable cultural objects. An important legislation provided for the federal government to assume custody of the antiquities or the building as a guardian if it was in danger and important aspect of history was threatened to be lost. It prohibited dealing in, copying, and export of moveable antiquities without the approval of the federal government. The Antiquities Act of 1968 was replaced with another one of 1975, amended in 1990 by which an ancient object was defined to be not less than 75 years old. The cultural heritage laws of Pakistan and the rules made under them for regulating and managing cultural properties are uniformly applicable to all categories of sites whether or not “protected” and regardless of their state of preservation, significance for national or international levels. There are no

separate rules to apply to the sites on the world heritage list which are seven at present and for others being considered for inscription. Moreover, there is no separate organization or administrative center to deal exclusively with the preservation and maintenance of world heritage monuments except for a temporary management structure constituted in the past when UNESCO-sponsored preservation campaign for Mohenjo-daro was launched.

In addition to the federal laws, the provinces except for Balochistan have enacted their own laws especially in Punjab, Sindh, and more recently in the (North-West Frontier) Sarhad Province. The provinces have prepared their own lists of monuments which are considered to be historically and culturally important in addition to the list of monuments located in their provinces but maintained by the federal government. There has not yet been any conflict among the provincial and federal departments of archaeology in undertaking conservation or supervising preservation projects by the non-governmental organizations. Formal permission to undertake excavations at the sites is still given by the federal government although there is a strong feeling that the provincial departments with their own legislations and activities centered in their respective regions should have independence in selecting and undertaking sites or regions for research. Several universities in Pakistan have now introduced archaeology in their curricula. The University of Peshawar which pioneered teaching of archaeology in Pakistan has now emerged a leading institution in teaching and conducting field researches by themselves and with foreign institutions. The control of monuments for preservation has now been physically taken over by the provincial governments of the Sarhad (N-W. Frontier), Punjab and Sindh Provinces. This is a very significant development after a long centralized control by the federal government in line with the colonial legacy advocating strong centralized control over heritage matters since the time of Sir Alexander Cunningham and Sir John Marshall. The results of such a drastic change are yet to be assessed. So far, the transfer of management and control of two world heritage sites of Lahore Fort and Shalamar Gardens to the Punjab government appears to be very successful. There is a visible change in the presentation and maintenance of these monuments. A concerted effort was made to prepare conservation projects on scientific lines based on detailed study and investigation of the monuments and documenting each and every step taken in the process. The implementation of such management or "Master" plans of preservation involving a team of specialists and stake holders has just begun with a clear vision of the objects. The tradition of publishing results of excavations, conservation, epigraphy and numismatic research and acquisitions of antiquities by the museums under the control of the federal governments has unfortunately been not maintained to that degree of excellence and promptness which was seen during the British Indian

times. Dr. F. A. Khan, an early architect of the federal department of archaeology started publication of an annual, *Pakistan Archaeology* in 1964. Since his retirement in 1970, several and long periods of interruptions occurred. The quality of publication could not be maintained at a respectable level which is so important for research journal. The Universities of Peshawar, Shah-Abdul Latif at Khairpur, and newly established Hazara University at Mansehra, have started publishing their own journals to report on the progress of archaeological research works done in their areas of interest.

DOCTORINAL DOCUMENTS ON PRESERVATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE AND THEIR RELEVANCE TO PAKISTAN

Being signatory to several international conventions, charters, recommendations and other documents dealing with cultural heritage, Pakistan is also expected to follow internationally accepted principles of conservation, restoration and maintenance of cultural properties including moveable antiquities in the museums and in conducting excavations and explorations at the heritage sites. There is a long list of international documents mostly introduced by the European until recent times, a study of which gives us an insight of various problems at particular point in time and consensus achieved among several countries called 'State Parties' officially. During the past century lot of changes have taken place in our understanding of various issues and approaches to define, preserve and maintain cultural properties consisting not only of monuments but also gardens, or what is now been called cultural landscapes. A review of important documents, would illustrate the spirit behind drawing up such charters to deal with various situations of preservation and protection of cultural properties.

In general, the documents dealing with conservation of the cultural heritage, especially of the world heritage, emphasize respect for and maintenance of original character of the monuments and their use consistent with the original purpose for which those were built and in agreement with their integrity, authenticity while undertaking any action for conservation and maintenance. Our concept of authenticity as defined in the *Nara Document of 1994* and further discussed in 1999, has been enlarged since its original definition contained in the first document. The other aspects contributing towards conservation and maintenance of the cultural heritage are quite specific such as doing full documentation of all steps taken during preservation and to provide legal protection, security and adequate preparedness to deal with any kind of risks posed to the heritage sites. For rehabilitation, or what otherwise is called reuse of the heritage, it is now accepted that a monument or a

historical place should continue to function for the activities for which it was originally built, or its re-use should be connected with the preservation and maintenance of that monument.

The concept of cultural landscape not yet fully adopted or perhaps understood in Pakistan, has now been enlarged and re-defined to include ancient railways, routes of slavery and trade in different commodities such as spice route, silk route, canals and the buildings or towns associated with the activities directly related to the use of canals. The cultural landscapes also include gardens of various types and layouts that were created at different times and regions. The world heritage sites present a great diversity in terms of location, cultural history, building materials, styles and functions to such an extent that it may not be possible to follow all the principles or guidelines as listed by a great number of experts at different times. Despite numerous guidelines and principles, charters and conventions on cultural properties, there are still serious questions regarding the degree of intervention, extent of restoration or repairs, re-use of monuments and historical places and those of spiritual or religious value, and also the rehabilitation of secular buildings in historic centers or urban areas and integration of monuments in the life of the community as a whole. There are also important issues regarding development of tourism and, by implication, access to the monuments and sites, some of which may not be accessible because of their location or size or even building materials.

Most of the international conventions, charters, principles, recommendations, declarations and other documents loaned under various names such as norms, resolutions and decisions dealing with specific issues relating to the heritage go back to the second half of the nineteenth century. All these documents can be grouped under architectural monuments, historic towns, or urban areas, historical gardens or cultural landscapes, archaeological heritage including excavations, historic timber structures and vernacular heritage, and finally principles of management (on regional levels). There has been a tendency right from the beginning of the twentieth century to focus on the preservation and protection of architectural monuments and archaeological sites while significance of historic towns and gardens including cultural landscape were recognized much later in the history of development of thoughts on historic conservation and management. These documents also reflect changing attitudes towards preservation and maintenance and their importance in the life of communities at the national and international levels. In the literature and on the UNESCO's World Heritage and ICOMOS websites full texts of these official documents produced at different occasions are available but a comprehensive

overview is not yet available except brief descriptions of the contents or title of the documents. It is therefore intended to examine important documents falling under different categories or thematic groups to highlight their specific focus on various aspects of heritage management even though the charters and conventions and other documents are not mutually exclusive because there is a considerable overlap among them.

(a) *ARCHITECTURAL REMAINS AND MONUMENTS*

It was in 1877 that the *Manifesto of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings* was drawn up which emphasized, among other things, great concern for over-restoration which gave a false view of old styles of architecture. It emphasized that an authentic and original appearance of the buildings should be retained for posterity. Commenting on the state of affairs, the manifesto made note of the false appearance of monuments and said, “*We think that if the present treatment of them (buildings) be continued, our descendants will find them useless for study and chilling to enthusiasm. We think that those last fifty years of knowledge and attention have done more for their destruction than all the foregoing centuries of revolution, violence and contempt.*”

In the beginning of twentieth century, the document on *Preservation and Restoration of Architectural Monuments Agreement* was drafted at the sixth International Congress of Architects held at Madrid in 1904. It made a clear distinction between the ‘dead’ monuments and the ‘living’ monuments and prescribed treatment for both categories of buildings. It said that the dead monuments which were created by the lost civilization or whose purpose had become ‘obsolete’ should be conserved to the extent of keeping them intact while the living monuments which are still in use should be ‘restored’ in their original style. It emphasized ‘unity of style’ on the basis of architectural beauty and comparison with other buildings in order to qualify for restoration which could involve reconstruction of the missing parts of the building. However, it emphasized that all periods of history indicated by later structures of the monuments should be retained. At that time, the Congress of Architects insisted that each country should create a society or organization for the preservation of historic and artistic monuments and that restoration work should be done by the persons authorized by the state.

In 1932, the *Italian Norms for the Restoration of Monuments* that were written by the Italian Superior Council of Antiquities and Fine Arts repeated some recommendations already made in 1904 such as, respect for all phases of the monuments and consolidation of structures to stabilize them and to prolong their life. It stated that all restoration projects both public and private should be according

to the established conservation guidelines which in turn should be approved prior to undertaking any work. The re-use of the monument, or what otherwise was called 'rehabilitation' should be based on historical documents. If necessary, modern techniques could be used where the traditional ones were insufficient for strengthening the monument. The restored part of the building should be made distinguishable from the original structure and new elements should be kept to the minimum. The Italian Norms emphasized importance of detailed documentation and also preservation of the setting of the monument, as far as the living monument was concerned. It is pointed out that the very first and famous , *Ancient Monuments Preservation Act* of the British Indian Government passed in 1904 already contained several provisions of the Italian Norms and the Athens Charter of 1932.

The document called, *Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments (1932)* was created by the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation which retained most of the provisions or resolutions of the Italian Norms and repeated the creation of the conservation center or organization at national level to advice on the restoration techniques. It also emphasized the introduction of suitable preservation legislation in which the rights of the private property owners should be respected. It said that international collaboration, education in documentation and preservation of monuments should be given priority over other developments. In a sense, the Athens Charter was the repetition of the Italian Norms but also the forerunner for the charter on the historic gardens and cultural landscapes because it expressed concern for preservation of surroundings of the monuments. It also emphasized preparation and publication of the inventory of the ancient monuments and collaboration with specialists of other disciplines for detailed study and preservation of monuments. While a number of new ideas were advanced, the Athens Charter indicated that the modern techniques and materials could be used in the work of consolidation but in a concealed manner. This suggestion which later on was not accepted by the world community, although the use of modern materials has continued in different parts of the world.

The International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites known as the *Venice Charter, 1964* has been recognized as the fundamental document of great significance in the history of philosophical thought and practice on conservation and restoration since it is extensively quoted around the world in the literature regardless of the applicability of some of its provisions in outside Europe especially in South Asia. It was built on the wisdom of previous charters, especially the Athens Charter of 1932 and experience gained in Europe for more than thirty years. It defines monuments and the urban setting including the rural areas and lays down the principles of conservation at basic level stating that

conservation should aim at protecting the works of arts of historical significance which should be maintained on permanent basis. The Venice Charter repeats the recommendation of earlier charters such as orienting efforts to preserve and reveal aesthetic and historic value of monuments; respect for originality and authenticity; disregard for conjecture; study of monuments and its history in all details; preservation of evidence of all periods of building; and use of traditional techniques but allowing use of modern material if found useful. The charter emphasized that restored parts of buildings must integrate harmoniously with the whole structure which should be made distinguishable from the original fabric. For maintaining archaeological sites, the Venice Charter recommended conservation and protection to facilitate understanding of the site. The Venice Charter has been discussed in the Asian context and also by the State Parties of Africa and non-European countries. Since it is drawn mostly by those who had experience in Europe, therefore, some of its provisions despite their significance are not applicable especially to Asia. Such deficiency has led to creation of separate and additional recommendations for protection of Islamic heritage. In China and Southeast Asia, the principles of conservation have been created which are suitable to the local preservation conditions and monuments.

In 1967, the *Norms of Quito* were created by the Organization of the American States in view of bad state of preservation of sites and monuments in the Americas due to inadequate protection, poverty, and accelerated economic development. It acknowledged the Venice Charter as a standard for conserving monuments and use of cultural resources for economic growth through tourism, re-use and conservation. It recommended enforcement of an official policy, suitable legislation and effective administrative structure and launching of short and long range multi-national and national plans for the development of the sites for tourism. The Norms of the Organization of American States strongly recommended stopping illegal traffic of cultural property from their member countries.

In 1975, the *European Charter of the Architectural Heritage* was adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe which aimed at creating a common conservation policy for European countries with recommendations to each member for initiating “legislative, administrative, financial and educational steps” for preservation of cultural heritage. This Charter is very much like the 1972 convention, the Venice Charter, and the Budapest Resolutions.

Another declaration was made in 1975 known as *The Declaration of Amsterdam of the Congress on the European Architectural Heritage*. This declaration was specifically directed towards European Architectural Heritage thought to be “an integral part of

the whole world” stating that it created consciousness of European history among the people. Therefore, the preservation of towns and villages of historical interest became a joint responsibility of the Europeans. It recommended strengthening of legislative and administrative measures, provision of financial resources, rehabilitation of old areas, and making architectural conservation a part of town planning. It also recommended that the gardens and surviving craftsmen must be included in the rehabilitation and preservation programs of any area. It is not known if the provisions of the *Declaration of Amsterdam* were followed in any part of Europe, and how much progress was achieved by following the declaration.

The Lahore Principles were adopted at the conclusion of an International Symposium on Conservation and Restoration of Islamic Architectural Heritage held at Lahore in 1980. It acknowledged the existing charters for preservation of heritage in the world and recommend adoption of certain principles that would deal specifically with the conservation of Islamic architecture which they thought was threatened by blind copy of western mode of planning and westernization of Islamic society. It stated that preservation of architectural heritage was a duty of all Muslims who should respect the works of art in order to understand their own place in God’s creation. It emphasized that Islamic architecture was the common heritage of all Muslims who should maintain and intensify cooperation among countries outside of Islamic world. The Lahore Principles extended protection to towns and villages, gardens, craftsmen and indigenous settings, and addressed several issues and threats. It was not specific to any country but related to the Muslim *Ummah* (brotherhood) which was linked with a common thread of Islam and addressed a great number of issues in the urban areas and potential challenge for their protection. It provided for a change of function for monuments and stressed joint effort by the Muslim countries for conservation and extending cooperation with non-Muslim countries containing Islamic heritage.

It may be observed that in many parts of the world including Pakistan, the conservators do not entirely respect the spirit of various conventions, charters and recommendations. There is a general consensus on certain principles of preservation. It is agreed that respect for authenticity and integrity of the sites should be maintained at all levels as envisaged in the *Nara Document on Authenticity*. However, special situations do emerge at local level for selecting a monument for preservation, the extent of intervention and materials to be used. Insensitive attitude of the Government officials often resulting from lack of appreciation of the cultural values of heritage sites and monuments has led to disfigurement, loss of authenticity and even destruction of historical monuments.

At the beginning of this Chapter, it was mentioned that Pakistan inherited the British Indian tradition of conservation, and followed guidelines given in the *Conservation Manual* by Sir John Marshall in 1928. It should have been updated in response to changes in the philosophy and methodology of conservation during the last eighty-two years (or 53 years) in Pakistan. There are several examples of deviation even from the (old) established practice of conservation for several seasons. Ignorance of the principles of conservation, lack of understanding of historical, aesthetic and cultural values of heritage sites have caused considerable damage. 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, 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.

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. The conservation of monuments and sites in China has a long history. The available published sources indicate that by 1930s, conservation procedures were firmly established in China. As a result of open-door policy adopted by China in 1978 there has been rapid economic development and as a result a great number of sites and monuments including commemorative buildings and contemporary places were affected. Before the turn of twentieth century, China constituted a large advisory group of professionals consisting of architects, archaeologists, museum curators, conservators and urban planners to draft principles governing preservation and management of cultural heritage sites in China. The group of professionals included representatives from the Getty Conservation Institute and ICOMOS. A draft of *Principles for Conservation of Heritage Sites in China* was published in Chinese language in 2000 and its translation came out two years later by the Getty Conservation Institute. This document 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*, as the document is called, draws upon the wisdom of ICOMOS charters and other documents and emphasizes research, documentation, and conservation process, identification and investigation

by surveys. It stresses preparation of inventories, selection of sites and ascertaining their cultural values, their state of preservation, management and interpretation. Four legal pre-requisites are mentioned, namely the demarcation of boundaries and buffer zones of sites, information on the protected status of sites, creation and maintenance of archives, and an institution designated to protect and manage the sites. The document contains a lengthy commentary on various issues with specific explanations on (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.

There has been a great deal of emphasis on maintaining authenticity of ancient sites and monuments while undertaking their conservation and doing restoration by intervention. In 1994, *the Nara Document of Authenticity* was prepared during a conference held at Nara while keeping the spirit of famous Charter of Venice of 1964 intact and the thoughts expressed in the other documents regarding various processes of conservation. The Nara Document, as it is called, is considered to be the most important one in conservation history because it defined authenticity in design, material and workmanship as it was mentioned in the World Heritage Convention of 1972. It explained that authenticity judgment is linked with the value and a variety of sources of information which includes aspects of “the form and design of monuments, their material and substance, use and function, location and setting, spirit and feeling, tradition and techniques, and any other internal and external factors”. Despite various explanations, there is a general agreement that reconstruction or restoration with new materials should be avoided in all circumstances unless compelling circumstances justify such a procedure. There is also confusion in the use of various terms or expressions such as conservation, preservation, restoration, and other words like reconstruction and rehabilitation. It is now generally agreed that all restoration and conservation are in fact preservation measures to prolong the life of the heritage sites and monuments.

(b) HISTORIC TOWNS AND URBAN AREAS

In 1975, *Rothenberg Resolution on the Conservations of Smaller Historic Towns* were passed to meet specific needs of small historic towns for conservation and to maintain original setting of the area. Although it was limited to a region because it

emphasized local initiatives and support in order to preserve the historicity of smaller towns, still it had wider application.

With a view to deal with the problems of preservation of the monuments located in North Africa and Asiatic Cities of the Mediterranean Basin, the Executive Committee of the Second Conference on the Conservation, Restoration, and Revival of Areas and Group of Buildings and Historic Interests, formulated *Tunis Recommendations* in 1968. These were intended to stop large scale destruction of the fabric of ancient cities and to preserve ancient lifestyles of the inhabitants while providing the inhabitants economic opportunities and modern life. A team of conservators, planners, economists and other professionals was constituted to investigate the preservation of historic cities, create management and maintenance plan, and to introduce legislation for the protection of monuments and creation of modern infrastructure. It was also recommended to educate the public on the value of historical landscapes while adjusting to the modern lifestyle.

In 1972, the *Budapest Resolutions on the Introduction of Contemporary Architecture into Ancient Group of Buildings* were passed on the occasion of the International Symposium held on the occasion of the Third ICOMOS General Assembly. It stressed that the historic monuments and the group of buildings must play an active part in the contemporary life of the people and the past, present, and future expressions of urban setting must be treated as a whole. It stated that the modern architecture could be introduced into the group of ancient buildings but it must be designed in harmony with the existing buildings or monuments “in scale, rhythm and appearance”.

In 1972, a very important Convention Concerning of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage was introduced by the UNESCO which laid the foundation for undertaking all activities relating to preservation, maintenance, monitoring of cultural heritage and planning for educating and providing technical and financial assistance to the State Parties (countries) globally. The convention emphasized that each State Party who is signatory to it, should prepare an inventory of natural and cultural properties located within their jurisdiction and undertake all measures to ensure their protection, management, and maintenance. It defined cultural properties as monuments, group of buildings and sites of outstanding universal value, including sculpture, archaeological remains, inscriptions, and group of buildings and the landscape in which they are located. The Convention also stated that each State Party should provide adequate legislation for the protection of cultural properties, adequate funds, and organization to maintain cultural heritage on permanent basis. It prohibited trade in antiquities and smuggling of heritage

properties. The Convention is very explicit in advocating protection and conservation of all cultural and natural heritages without prejudice to history or ethnicity. Most of the preservation campaigns, training, financial and technical assistance are carried out under this provision of the Convention.

In 1976, UNESCO *Recommendations Concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Places*, made at Nairobi, recognized “historic ensembles” or group of buildings or spaces that constitute a human settlement in any setting which may include cities, old urban neighborhoods, villages and towns. It encouraged member states to formulate national, regional and local policies to safeguard the historic ensembles and their settings and adapt them to the needs of the contemporary life of the people. It recognized the importance of systematic surveys aimed at documenting historic buildings, detailed architectural investigations and adoption of suitable steps to safeguard against possible threats. These recommendations of Nairobi also emphasized that monuments should not be isolated from their surroundings which have essential role to play in the life of the inhabitants.

Australia’s ICOMOS Charter, known as the *Burra Charter for the Conservation of Place of Cultural Significance* was first introduced in 1982, and then adopted by the ICOMOS in the 1988, revised in 1999, and again published with illustrations in 2004. The Burra Charter laid emphasis on the process of conservation, cultural significance of a place or area, recording of the fabric used and association of the historic place of cultural significance. The main points stressed in the Burra Charter were that the buildings must remain in their historical location; preservation measures should be limited to the protection and stabilization of the existing fabric; restoration done to the monument should contribute to prolong life of the ancient structures; respect must be shown for evidence of all periods of history represented at the monuments; reconstruction in rare cases may be allowed only to complete a depleted entity or fabric; and definition of cultural significance should include “aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value for the past, present or future generations”. The Burra Charter, originally designed for Australia, is an important document in the history of protection and conservation of monuments and has been recognized as a valuable addition to the Venice Charter.

A declaration limited to South America, called *Tlaxcala Declaration on the Revitalization of Small Settlements* was made in 1982 at the Third Inter-American Symposium on the Conservation of the Building Heritage, like the ‘Norms of Quito’ mentioned above. It stated that small settlements should be treated as repositories of the life styles of ancient people which bear witness to our cultures and therefore,

should be retained because they are identified with the inhabitants. It's the moral obligation and responsibility of the communities to conserve and rehabilitate small settlements of communities of indigenous people who should participate in the preservation of their heritage and also in publication of the ancient traditions.

In 1987, another famous *Charter for Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas*, (known as the Charter of Washington) was adopted by the ICOMOS General Assembly which incorporated provisions of 'Venice Charter', and 'Recommendations of Nairobi'. It stated that urban communities should be treated as "memory of mankind" having traditional values of urban cultures. Therefore, conservation should be an integral part of the economic and social development policies. It takes into consideration the relationship between structures and open spaces, the design, scale, materials, traffic patterns, history of town, and various functions of the settlement. The Washington Charter later on was enlarged and is now known as *US / ICOMOS Charter for Historic Towns, 1992*.

There have been several codes of ethic and guidelines for those involved in the conservation of cultural property. The first one was introduced in 1984 in Copenhagen emphasizing the "historic, stylistic, iconographic, technological, intellectual, aesthetic and spiritual messages" which the cultural data provides while doing restoration. Therefore, it stated that any intervention must follow scientific method of investigation of "sources, analysis, interpretation and synthesis". In 1984, the American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works provided another code called *AIC Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Practice* which again emphasized the need to maintain accurate, complete and permanent records of examination, sampling, scientific investigation, and treatment of cultural property. It stated that documentation was a valuable part of the history of the cultural property and therefore, should be preserved. Next year, in 1995, another code of ethics was introduced by the *Dutch Association of Professional Restorers*.

There are other documents which do not strictly relate to the monuments or historic area but have attracted attention of the world organizations because of specific nature of the structures requiring conservation and documentation procedures. In 1999, the *Principles for the Preservation of Historic Timber Structures* were adopted by the Twelfth General Assembly of ICOMOS in Mexico. It stated that care should be observed in recording state of preservation of timber structures and their components. All categories of materials and their storage should also be recorded. It stressed the need for treating timber structures with materials specified in other ICOMOS Charters and for preserving cultural values of the timber structures by improving their legibility and historic integrity, including design and

relevant historic evidence. The Northern Areas of Pakistan and Pakistani held Kashmir territory abounds in wooden architecture but no structure has yet been listed for preservation by either any government agency.

In the same Twelfth General Assembly of the ICOMOS, the *Charter on the Built Vernacular Heritage* was adopted which provided guidelines to undertake research and documentation of vernacular heritage and their accessibility as specified in other charters and principles applicable to the cultural heritage. In 2003, *Principles for the Analyses, Conservation and Structural Restoration of Architectural Heritage* were adopted at Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe by the 14th General Assembly of ICOMOS. It emphasized need for organized studies and strategies in dealing with heritage structures and their complex history to be conducted like those experts in other scientific disciplines who carry out diagnosis, therapy and treatment. It said that it was important to isolate causes of damage and decay and the choices which conservators have to make for taking remedial measures without allowing negative impact on the architectural heritage. The data collected and processed should formulate the basis for drawing up comprehensive plans of activities in the light of real problems identified for conservation of structures.

The Principles of 2003 recommended multi-disciplinary approach to solutions of problems and studies and diagnosis to be done without damaging the heritage. It was stated that restoration must be a means to an end not an end itself. It gave details of description of various choices to be made on the nature of interventions. It said that the deteriorated structures, wherever possible, should be repaired rather than replaced with new materials. The spirit of restoration is summed up in its Article 3, 10 which says: "The characteristics of materials used in restoration work (in particular, new materials) and their compatibility with existing materials should be fully established. This must include long term impacts, so that undesirable side effects are avoided".

Another set of *Principles for the Preservation and Conservation / Restoration of Wall Paintings* was adopted during the 14th General Assembly of ICOMOS in 2003 in Zimbabwe. It provided protection to wall paintings of all cultures regardless of religious or any other distinction and for preparation of inventories of monuments and sites including wall paintings as outlined already in the Venice Charter of 1964. The Principles call for detailed documentation and preservation and treatment of wall paintings with all illustrations of steps taken for preservation of wall paintings and making the record accessible to the public.

(c) CULTURAL LANDSCAPES AND GARDENS

The cultural landscapes formed a new category of cultural heritage consisting of natural and cultural features combined at a place or region. The original categories of world heritage consisted of natural and cultural remains to which another (third) category of cultural landscapes was added distinguished by a combination of cultural and natural features. The gardens were already defined as a separate category in 1981 by the *Florence Charter on Historic Gardens*. Since 1962, a progressive change in the concept of cultural landscapes is evident when UNESCO's *Recommendations Concerning the Safeguarding of the Beauty and Character of Landscapes and Sites* were made. The recommendations included landscapes and cultural sites especially, the urban and rural landscapes. It was also recommended that cultural landscapes should be properly safeguarded through effective supervision and control and by creating natural reserves in which ancient sites and cultural areas are located. The document dealt with the environment containing all aspects of human and natural activities.

Attention to the preservation of natural beauty in the context of human cultural developments was also drawn in various other documents like the *Venice Charter of 1964*, *Norms of Quito 1967*, *Declaration of Amsterdam in 1975*, *the Burra Charter in 1979*, (revised in 1981, 1988, 1999 and 2004), *in the Lahore Charter of 1980*, before *Florence Charter* of the ICOMOS was adopted in 1981. The subsequent documents also make special reference to the preservation of aesthetic and cultural beauty and preservation of natural environment until its recognition in 1992 by the World Heritage Convention when it was defined as “representing the combined works of nature and man”.

The most significant of documents is known as the *Florence Charter for the Preservation of Historic Gardens*, 1981. It was an addendum to the Venice Charter and provided definition of garden as an architectural and horticulture composition of interest to the public from the historical and artistic point of view. It outlined architectural composition of historic gardens to include basic plan and topography, vegetation, proportions, color schemes, with spacing and respective heights, structural and decoration features, water running or still. The Charter emphasized cosmic significance of an idealized image of the world and included all parks and gardens of every dimension. It stressed preservation based on identification and listing and reconstruction or restoration of the missing parts, but not in the area where garden has been completely destroyed. The rest of the provisions were more or less similar to those applicable to the built heritage including administrative and legal protection, maintenance of records, protection and security and access of the public to the gardens.

In the category of cultural landscape may be included the *Xian Declaration on the Conservation of the Setting of Heritage Structures, Sites and Areas*, 2005. The Declaration acknowledged all the contributions made by various charters and principles aimed at the preservation of the gardens, sites and monuments and emphasized the immediate environment of the monuments as the setting of heritage structure, site or area which contributed to the significance and distinctive character. It stated that it was necessary to understand, document and interpret the setting of diverse context and for appreciating the heritage significance of any structure, site or area. In the Xian Declaration it was recognized that planning tools and practices be developed to conserve and manage the settings, policies, strategies and to exercise control for the protection and management of such areas. It stated that legislation, regulation and guidelines for the protection, conservation and management of heritage structures, sites and areas should be created including the buffer zone around the monuments. To monitor and manage change in the settings affected by various reasons, an accurate and detailed record should be maintained and adverse effects of such changes be eliminated. A multidisciplinary approach is needed to protect the setting of the monuments or the historic areas. Professional training, interpretation, and involvement of the community were absolutely necessary to create an awareness of the importance of settings.

After the famous *Florence Charter of 1981* dealing exclusively with historic gardens, a report of the *Experts Meeting on "European Cultural Landscape of Outstanding Universal Value"*, 1996 was prepared. It was built on the previous experiences and providing definition of cultural landscapes. These definitions and categories of landscapes such as living or fossil cultural landscapes which are considered to have organically evolved and associative cultural landscapes were adopted while realizing the problem of complexity of cultural landscapes in various regions and cultural contexts.

To follow up on the definitions provided in 1996, the *European Landscape Convention* in 2000 described cultural landscapes as "*a basic component of the European natural and cultural heritage contributing to human well being and consolidation of the European identity.*" It called for a need for cooperation in protecting, managing and planning cultural landscapes in Europe as well as creating a new convention dealing with European landscape. It provided definition of not only landscapes but also outlined policies and objectives, protection, management and planning of European landscape issues. It stressed the need for cooperation among European countries and recommended for the creation of landscape award of the Council of Europe.

Awareness of cultural landscapes have brought into focus many other categories of cultural heritage such as routes as a part of cultural heritage and consideration of religious, trade, military, sports and historic events to be included in this historic routes. In the same category falls the industrial heritage. In 2003, the *Nizhni Tagil Charter* was adopted with detailed definition of industrial heritage. It consisted of remains of industrial culture such as building and machinery, workshops, mills and factories, mines and sites for processing and refining, warehouses and stores, power houses, transmission of energy, transport and other social activities related to such categories. The convention points out the importance of research and identification of industrial heritage and its preservation and presentation.

(d) ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

In Pakistan, there is a great need for an effective policy to devise and follow at national level for the management of archaeological sites consisting of both excavated and unexplored settlements sites and monuments. The archaeological sites in particular present different kinds of problems as compared to the standing, discussed above and demand special care and attention of the heritage managers and those exercising an overall supervision for their protection and management. In Pakistan, Mohenjo-daro and Taxila represent two best examples of archaeological sites for doing case studies of management strategies in theory and practice (yet to be undertaken). Needless to emphasize, 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. Any management and conservation plan has to aim at achieving long-term goals, while short-term plans can be adopted in response to specific situation.

The management of archaeological sites is not an easy matter of simple administration of staff posting at a site. In fact, it involves dealing with several interrelated administrative matters and overall supervision of the works of the 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, flood or earthquake.

Integral with the management strategy is proper maintenance of the sites, an aspect which is also related to an overall security and protection of archaeological remains in order to keep them in presentable state as source of inspiration, learning and recreation for the visitors. The *Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites* by Sir Fielden lists a number of essential tasks, which the administrators of heritage sites should undertake. It also is essential that local officials of other related agencies coordinate with each other in developing and maintaining archaeological sites on permanent basis.

The *Lahore Charter* (1980), as mentioned above, addressed some special issues which were not enunciated in the much advertised *Venice Charter* (1964) such as the preservation of Islamic heritage. For example, the management and conservation or repairs of monuments and the adjacent areas around religious buildings were traditionally maintained on permanent basis by creating 'waqfs' (Trusts of revenue generating state property) throughout the world of Islam in Asia, Africa and parts of Europe. The *waqfs* with permanent sources of funds ensured not only maintenance of the buildings but also supported necessary staff of various categories kept at the site such as mosques, tombs, *madras* (educational institutions) and hospitals.

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 sites. 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 1990s, 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 many structures collapsed into heaps of brick debris. At Taxila, tall grasses were left to grow because of negligence completely covering the excavated remains. It is all the more essential that increased communication and sharing of information among all officials engaged in the management of archaeological sites should be encouraged through frequent meetings and group visits.

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 was stressed that collaboration among various professionals both in the government and in the private sector should be established and maintained. It laid down the principles relating to the responsibilities for preparation of inventories, conducting surveys, excavations, research and maintenance of all sites and taking appropriate measures to conserve them for the 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 emphasizes cooperation among various scholars for excavations, management, conservation and publication of the results. In the same category falls an earlier document of the UNESCO regarding *International Recommendation on International Principles Applicable to Archaeological Excavations, 1956*. It stated that techniques of excavations should be standardized and carried out with international cooperation and encouraged access to the sites and the antiquities. It called for technical training of excavators and introducing an effective legislation to control and protect archaeological sites.

(e) CULTURAL HERITAGE IN AREAS OF ARMED CONFLICT

The world is witnessing serious consequences of the past and present armed conflicts and intentional destruction of human heritage in Asia, Africa and Europe despite UNESCO's Conventions to protect and preserve cultural properties in the event of armed conflict. The wars have accelerated the process of destruction and deterioration of cultural heritage which in many cases is already damaged seriously by human negligence and destructive forces of nature. The implementation of relevant conventions is yet another challenge for those involved in armed conflict across the world.

In the context of preservation of ancient sites, four categories, the *Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of an Armed Conflict* (Hague, 1954) is of great importance. It was adopted in response to the destruction of cultural heritage during World War II, and is based on 1899 and 1907 Conventions of The Hague and the Washington Pact of 1935. The convention provided a set of guidelines for the protection of moveable and immovable cultural properties in time of war, whether or not declared, and includes collections of museums and libraries, paintings and archives. It stated that the States occupying territories should be responsible for the protection of that territory's cultural property; should ensure that the military forces also respect the cultural heritage; do not change the place or transfer the cultural property unless it is absolutely necessary in case of loss or theft or cultural heritage; and that the occupying forces were responsible to find the missing property and return to its original place. There are other procedures

outlined for the occupying forces and dealing with matters relating to the safeguarding of cultural property of the occupied country.

(f) TOURISM AND HERITAGE PLACES

The cultural heritage sites are great resources for promotion of tourism, inducing economic benefits because the money generated by tourism can be used for protection, conservation and management of historic buildings. While cultural heritage sites promote public education and create awareness of the past, the primary needs for protection and preservation of heritage sites and the development of tourism often come into sharp conflict and become sources of friction among the stakeholders especially in Asian countries like Pakistan.

Admittedly, tourism plays an important role in projecting and promoting national image of the country internationally and at the local and national levels. The tourist destinations enhance understanding of cultural heritage of the people and their land. Therefore, the heritage managers play a central role in the development of sites and in coordinating activities of the stakeholders such as tourism industry, the media, educators, and art historians. However, there has always been a conflict of interests between the heritage managers and tourist industry in Pakistan for very understandable reasons. It is generally expected that archaeological sites should provide facilities to the visiting public such as restaurants, toilets, and accessibility to the site, recreation spots and all relevant information concerning the site through publications and other means. The visitors expect that multilingual and trained guides should be available to explain the site. Most of these tasks are considered outside the jurisdiction and direct responsibilities of the heritage managers who remain committed to the preservation, protection, maintenance and management of heritage sites. Therefore, there has been an uneasy relationship among the local administrators of tourism industry, heritage managers, conservators and archaeologists on many pertinent issues such as the number of visitors to be admitted to a site, reducing risk of damage to the ancient remains, entry of visitors exceeding the carrying capacity of a site and monuments and provision of public utilities. The ICOMOS during its 12th General Assembly in Mexico in 1999 adopted *International Cultural Tourism Charter: Managing Tourism at Places of Heritage Significance*. It laid down ethics of tourism oriented development at heritage sites advocating participation of indigenous people to promote tourism as source of education and recreation, security and protection of sites and visiting public of all age groups.

There are several other conventions and documents relating to cultural tourism, underwater archaeology, museums and ethical issues of acquisition of

moveable antiquities which are not discussed in present context which focuses on cultural heritage and landscapes. The intangible heritage is also not included in the present discussion.

PRESERVATION PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE IN ASIA: SOME OBSERVATIONS

Seen in the light of various International Charters, Recommendations and other documents, the situation regarding the state of preservation of cultural property in Pakistan and the measures taken to protect and preserve is very revealing. In Pakistan, the old out-dated *Conservation Manual* published in 1928 still exists as an antiquity of the British Raj though the procedures specified for the conservation of monuments are no longer followed strictly. The Manual has neither been revised nor replaced since Independence in 1947 but was gradually allowed to be forgotten mostly if not entirely. The current practice of conservation which until recent past, has long been exclusively in the hands of the Federal Department of Archaeology, does not necessarily conform to the old British Indian traditions. In fact there are no current rules or laws, policy or procedure for the conservation of monuments in Pakistan for the Federal and Provincial Government and also for the Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) who wish to undertake preservation of projects. A great deal of confusion exists regarding the use of new building materials and on following 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 causing damage to the cultural property. A long list of encroachment cases pending before various courts and which also came to the notice of the Chief Justice of Pakistan, illustrate difficulties being faced by the Archaeology officials. In the present discussion on the preservation of cultural properties, comments on the excavation and exploration rules and procedures adopted by the national and international teams are not included here. As of now, new changes are taking place in the administration of heritage sites. As a consequence we are beginning to witness a remarkable change in the preservation and presentation of monuments of two World Heritage sites in Lahore. Shalamar Gardens and Lahore Fort were transferred to the provincial Government of Punjab a few years ago. A remarkable improvement in the preservation and management of these two monuments is evident. Encouraged by the success achieved at two monuments, all other “protected” monuments and sites in the Punjab Province are being considered for transfer of control. The Government of Sindh has already taken charge of the monuments from the Federal government while, the Government of Peshawar has

also expressed willingness to take control of the listed sites and monuments. Such fundamental changes in the control of monuments from center to the provinces were never made during the British Raj. While our attention is mainly focused on the surviving monuments located in or around the cities, the sites found away from the main cities and towns also need proper attention for protection against vandalism, damage by natural disasters, or sheer neglect. In brief, a very basic and fundamental change in the philosophy of preservation of cultural heritage and procedures should be introduced to protect, preserve and maintain Pakistan's precious cultural heritage.

During the past two decades while actively engaged in the preservation procedures of built heritage and evaluation of sites in Asia (which were candidates for inscription to the World Heritage) on behalf of ICOMOS, a great diversity of approaches has been observed especially in Central and Middle Asia and also South Asia. Not all the principles of conservation as expressed in Venice Charter and acknowledged in the subsequent documents such as the Burra Charter and China Principles for Conservation of Heritage Sites are followed in letter and spirit. There is a great difference in approaches to the problems ranging from strictly keeping the original character, style and decoration of the monuments, to introducing changes in the fabric, materials and decorative motives and also introducing new elements in the structures. In this situation adherence to the principles of integrity and authenticity of monuments and their contexts, maintenance of originality in towns and in urban areas 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 some countries of Asia including Pakistan have profoundly influenced policies and procedures of protection and preservation of cultural properties at official level. The greatest challenge to the survival of Pakistan heritage continues to be the development projects of various kinds which usually do not take into consideration studies on cultural impact at a local or national level. In many cases, large scale and ruthless demolition of old domestic and public buildings has taken place. Modern structures of new forms and styles that do not necessarily show any inspiration from the past or have no link with material history or tradition of the place or with regional style, should be removed. Few remnants of the past that have been left out stand isolated and torn out of context and thus become meaningless to the people and their history. It seems essential, as expressed in many Charters and Conventions that close cooperation among the town planners and heritage managers, designers and architects, conservators and archeologists and civil administrators should be developed by mutual discussions if we want to preserve authenticity and historicity of individual buildings in urban areas. A balance

between the traditional cultural expressions of deeply rooted history of Pakistan and the need for enhanced quality of life which the people deserve has to be rightfully achieved amidst conflicting interests through consensus. A brief reference to at least four examples from Asia is given to illustrate the nature of challenges for preserving cultural heritage.

(i) Shalamar Garden in Pakistan was placed on the World Heritage list because of its unique character and as an example of Garden Landscape created by modification of nature. It was a culmination of the garden layout which in form symbolized the Quranic concept of paradise on earth already developed in Iran and Central Asia. Because of pressure of urban development, the environment of Shalamar Garden that was originally filled with several gardens of small size and open areas has now been completely changed. At present, there are no gardens of contemporary or later times left in the vicinity. An elaborate water supply system of the garden with fountains and canals were severely damaged and almost destroyed while widening the road, forcing the World Heritage Center to place the garden as the heritage at risk.

(ii) In Turkmenistan, city of Merv was the first to be placed on the World Heritage list. One of the surviving structural remains is the Mausoleum of Sultan Sanjar, a ruler of 12th century CE. The tomb of Sultan Sanjar once stood in the middle of a large funerary complex. Its restoration was carried out by a team of conservators and architects. At present, the tomb which according to the published accounts represented changing thoughts on conservation procedures does not necessarily portray the whole story by what has been accomplished. In actual fact, original surroundings of the tomb and structural fabric have been modified with new materials and some of the architectural features have also been changed. It is not understood why authenticity has been impaired in the restoration process of the tomb which is of great national importance to the people of Turkmenistan and in the architectural history of Central Asia.

(iii) The case of Lumbini the birthplace of Goutma Buddha is perhaps the worst of all and challenges to the World Heritage Center in the recent years. The birthplace of Buddha is documented by a strong inscribed pillar erected by the Buddhist King Ashoka in the 3rd century BC. There as no evidence of a temple or any other structure at the site except fragmentary bricks found during excavations of uncertain date. Now, a large structure has been built over the place which has no relevance whatsoever with the ancient architectural style or tradition. The existing structures violate all Principles and Charters on authenticity so far introduced by the

world community. Because of great religious importance of the site nothings has so far been done.

(iv) Moenjo-daro (as spelled in UNESCO's records), was inscribed on World Heritage list in 1980 as the largest Bronze Age city of early civilizations. The preservation of building remains of burnt brick was undertaken with international cooperation and assistance for which an appeal was launched by the UNESCO for funds in 1974. On the recommendation of the UNESCO, the government of Pakistan constituted a separate organization called Authority for the Preservation of Mohenjo-daro (called APM) with responsibilities to (a) control floods from the Indus river by constructing a series of spurs, (b) lower water table of the site by installing a ring of tube-wells around the site to pump out water which was adversely effecting the brick structure and (c) undertake conservation of the exposed structural remain which have deteriorated. The first two tasks under (a) and (b) above were undertaken and supervised by the Authority for the Preservation of Mohenjo-daro while the conservation works under (c) were assigned to the Federal Department of Archaeology and Museums. The funding for conservation was to be provided by the APM from the funds raised by the UNESCO.

The original master plan underwent two revisions as the work progressed between late 1970s and 1997. The UNESCO International Safeguarding Campaign was officially closed in 1997. The preservation work at the site was to continue under the supervision of the Government of Pakistan. Despite international assistance and tremendous efforts made by a number of experts participating in the consultations, the lowering of water table and consequently, reduction in the moisture and salinity could not be attained. A ring of twenty-six tube wells sunk around the site could not pump out subsoil water because of frequent failures of power supply with the result that the subsoil water regained its original level of almost six feet below the present surface. The fluctuations in the water table as a result of sucking out of water and then re-filling due to suspension of tube-wells, tended to create further complications and ultimately proved ineffective. The construction of spurs by stones brought in from Rohri Hills, however, was completed. It was an effective way to keep the flood waters of the Indus River away from damaging the site. Only this aspect of the project achieved success.

As stipulated in the approved Master Plan, the conservation of building remains was initially done by the Department of Archaeology with funds provided by the UNESCO but released through the APM. However, the conservation suffered seriously because of problems in releasing adequate funds to the Department of Archaeology and interference in the methodologies for conservation which was

never brought in question in the beginning of the campaign. The APM allegedly tried to take over conservation work too, not envisaged originally in the Master Plan. The funding to the Archaeology Department was stopped and even withheld even when urgently required under emergency situations created by heavy rainfall at Mohenjo-daro.

There is no single area at Mohenjo-daro which can be quoted as an example of conservation or where new methodologies of conservation were adopted. The foreigners suggested spraying mud at the structural remains and plastering of walls with mud, a method which was already adopted and practiced by the Department of Archaeology before launching international preservation campaign. It was ironical to revert back to the same procedure and methodology which was originally adopted by the Pakistani conservators but was abandoned when safeguarding campaign was initiated. The site was formally handed over to the Department of Archaeology in 1997 and the Safeguarding Campaign of UNESCO was officially closed. Since then, the condition of structural remains at Mohenjo-daro has gone bad to worse. The walls and debris heaps were sprayed with mud externally are now being reduced to powder gradually. The moisture has seriously damaged the structures further and is prominently visible in the exposed section of the city. The situation is simply alarming. Mohenjo-daro which was a part of international safeguarding campaign for nearly two decades was declared in the ICOMOS World Report on Monuments and Sites in "Danger" in 2000 since the "threats to the site caused by continued deterioration and lack of an appropriate management system have persisted."

A post-campaign strategy called "Medium-Term Strategy for the Preservation and Conservation of Moenjodaro" was developed by UNESCO in 2003/2004 which "addressed the need for a sustainable conservation programme, improved general condition of the site and its management, as well as the future development of the site." In 2000, an Executive Board was created "composed of representatives of the national and regional governments, UNESCO and the Department of Archaeology and Museums" to review the annual work plans and budget and release of funds (National Fund for Moenjodaro) for conservation works and national staff". Still the site continues to be threatened by "lack of an appropriate management system," absence of research database, and absence of conservation and restoration methods. The World Heritage Committee Document of 30th Session, 2006 stated, "The conservation interventions of the 1970s and 1980s, involving the drilling of tube wells to control the groundwater, have been largely ineffective. This is due mainly to the high maintenance costs, lack of upkeep of equipment and irregularity of electricity supply. Moreover, the salt action in the bricks, causing deterioration to the

exposed structures, is not halted by the groundwater control. "The report points out that "the lack of national capacity and knowledge of international standards of conservation techniques at local and national levels continues to be of grave concern." The World Heritage Committee noted "with concern the threats to the site caused by lack of an appropriate management system, continued deterioration of original wall structures, as well as inappropriate conservation measures which threaten the authenticity of the site." Regretting that "despite the considerable efforts and the important international campaign funds provided to the site in the last 26 years, this World Heritage site is still lacking an appropriate management structure, conservation plan and conservation capacities". The World Heritage Committee recommended the national authorities (of Pakistan) "to take all necessary measures to strengthen the administrative, management and technical structures for the site" and to "establish an appropriate management structure and long-term conservation plan for the site" and to ensure that "the conservation programme at the site is undertaken according to international conservation standards." After an apparent failure of the safeguarding campaign as expressed in the World Heritage Center statement of 30th Session, 2006. Mohenjo-daro is dying for the second and perhaps last time.

These four cases from Nepal, Turkmenistan and Pakistan pertain to four different monuments of the World Heritage, representing different cultures and different timelines and functions. They highlight complex preservation problems associated with each category of monuments. Likewise, the cultural configurations of Pakistan's heritage are very diverse, spanning over a very long period of human history and attesting to human genius, engineering skill and craftsmanship. The preservation and restoration efforts are currently focused on surviving cultural remains and the problems associated with them. There is an urgent need of review and re-assessment of all works to ascertain success and constraints and to draw up a road map for heritage related work in future. These objectives are possible to achieve if decisions are made by frequent consultations among representatives of heritage related educational institutions, government officials and members of the public forming an Advisory Committee, for which a specific provision already exists in the Federal Antiquities Act,1975.

(Boston, March 12, 2010)

BIBIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

To be added