# MEASURING HERITAGE

*Conservation*
*p e r f o r m a n c e*

Silvio Mendes Zancheti
Katriina Similä

ORGANIZERS

# 6th INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR ON URBAN CONSERVATION

Measuring Heritage Conservation Performance

Silvio Mendes Zancheti

Katriina Similä

ORGANIZERS

Olinda & Rome

2012

6<sup>th</sup> International Seminar on Urban Conservation

Measuring Heritage Conservation Performance

Organized by Silvio Mendes Zancheti & Katriina Similä

Cover: Rosane Piccolo Loretto

Production Editors: Brenna Hassett & Jennifer Copithorne

*6th International Seminar on Urban Conservation*

*MEASURING HERITAGE CONSERVATION PERFORMANCE*


*March 29th – 31th 2011*


Benício Dias Conference Room
Joaquim Nabuco Foundation
Avenida 17 de Agosto, 2187 – Casa Forte
Recife – Pernambuco – Brazil


Organization

CECI Centre for Advanced Studies in Integrated Conservation

ICCROM International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property

MDU/UFPE Graduated Program in Urban Development – Federal University of Pernambuco

FUNDAJ Joaquim Nabuco Foundation

IPHAN National Institute of the Historic and Artistic Heritage


Support

CNPq *Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico*

CAPES *Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior*

FACEPE *Fundação de Amparo à Ciência e Tecnologia do Estado de Pernambuco*


Executive Committee

Silvio Mendes Zancheti, General Coordinator (CECI & MDU/UFPE)

Maria Ângela de Sousa (MDU/UFPE)

Claudia Bastos do Nascimento (Iphan)

Katriina Similä (ICCROM)

Claudia Ranaboldo (RIMISP – *Centro Latino Americano para o Desenvolvimento Rural*)

Rita de Cássia Araújo (FUNDAJ)


Executive Secretary

Lúcia Tone Hidaka (CECI & UFAL)

Rosane Piccolo Loretto (CECI & UFPE)

Laura Alecrim (CECI)

Raquel Bertuzzi (CECI)

Gabriela Azevedo (CECI)

# Contents

# $F$OREWORD

ICCROM is an organization created by and for its Member States. For over half a century it has been our constant concern to maintain our relevance and usefulness for heritage institutions and professionals in different parts of the world. It is with this mandate in mind that I take great pleasure in presenting this publication, Measuring Heritage Conservation Performance, hoping it will reach the widest possible public. This volume is the compilation of the work presented at the 6th International Seminar on Urban Conservation organized in Recife, Brazil in March 2011.

In 2008, ICCROM's regional programme for Latin America and the Caribbean LATAM chose the theme of Economic Indicators in Heritage Conservation as one of its areas of collaboration. It was recognized that such a tool was necessary in all fields of heritage, in small archives, national museums or historic towns. The pressure to be accountable, and the lack of language and terminology to talk about what we do in these terms is felt throughout the cultural heritage field. CECI (Centre for Advanced Studies in Integrated Conservation) took the leadership in addressing this issue within the LATAM programme.

The seminar in Recife brought to light at least three important trends. Firstly, there is a substantial amount of work underway on this theme, both in academic and heritage settings. It is encouraging to note that the call for papers for the seminar attracted 120 proposals. Secondly, even if the seminar was organized within the framework of the regional LATAM programme, the papers proposed were from all over the world—confirming that this is an issue of interest not only to the Latin America and the Caribbean, but to colleagues and institutions worldwide. Thirdly, we have come to reconsider the title of our theme. What started out as Economic Indicators, has now matured and widened into Measuring Performance in Conservation, in recognition of the fact that the economics of conservation is only one dimension of accountability and that it is not necessarily a good thing to isolate this dimension from the wider context of social processes.

Measuring and indicating are useful activities to keep track of what we are doing: are we achieving the goals we set ourselves? Equally important is communicating with decision makers and other stakeholders, expressing the essence of our actions in terms understandable to people outside of our specialized field.

The diversity of approaches and the determination to come up and test different ways of measuring performance in conservation represented in these papers are a testimony of the eagerness of the heritage professionals to engage with the society at all levels. I hope sincerely that by making this body of work available we will not only encourage debate and discussion within conservation field, but also inspire engagement and participation of new colleagues from other areas of society, with whom we are willing and eager to join forces so as to build a more sustainable future.

Mounir Bouchenaki
Former Director-General, ICCROM

# MEASURING HERITAGE CONSERVATION PERFORMANCE:
## THE SEMINAR

# *I*NTRODUCTION

One of the great challenges for institutions and scholars of heritage conservation and protection has been to develop instruments for assessing the performance of the conservation actions of complex assets such as urban sites, cultural territories, landscapes and collections of many types of objects. UNESCO, for example, has been improving its Periodic Reports on the state of conservation of the assets on the World Heritage List in order to make the evaluations more transparent and less subject to distortions caused by technical and political constraints. However, monitoring and evaluation systems remain at an incipient stage; such systems would allow the performance of conservation actions and their impacts to be identified, recorded and assessed in an objective way. There are few conservation monitoring systems in continuous use and they are generally concentrated in developed countries with well-established heritage conservation institutional structures. Costs are generally used as an excuse for not implementing the monitoring systems, but also transparency is not a usual practice in heritage policies around the world.

There are some other difficulties encountered in designing and implementing heritage monitoring systems linked with the state of art of the conservation theory and practice. Ever since the *Burra Charter*, the theory of conservation has been undergoing a paradigm shift that sets the maintenance of significance as the central goal of heritage conservation. In addition to being informed by expert opinion, this change indicates that conservation of complex heritage assets must take into account the opinions of social actors directly involved with the assets (the stakeholders), and by doing so, this introduces cultural relativism and the use of subjectivity as an analytical tool. It is well established in theory that the assessment of the state of conservation of cultural assets is not objective in the positive sense. It depends on the subject that performs the evaluation and the criteria used to define damage or risks to the attributes of objects that convey values. This recognition does not put aside the objective methods for evaluating conservation, but frames them in a contingent structure. In this way, the use of indicators has been suggested as a useful way to construct a monitoring instrument applicable to the different types of complex assets as this permits the performance of conservation actions to be evaluated, as well as the associated public policies relating to conservation including the enhancement of economic value, sustainability and social inclusion.

The 6th International Seminar on Urban Conservation *Measuring Heritage Conservation Performance* addressed these issues by analysing both the theory and practice of evaluation of heritage conservation maintenance and of its impacts, and tried to respond to the following issues:

1) What are the consequences of change in the theoretical paradigm for monitoring and evaluation instruments for complex assets such as urban sites, cultural territories, landscapes and collections of various objects?

2) How can the performance of the conservation of heritage assets be evaluated over time? Can the performance of actions on different assets of the same kind or of different kinds be compared?

3) What lessons are to be learned from the use of indicators in the evaluation of conservation actions? Is it possible to estimate the efficiency and effectiveness of using these instruments for monitoring heritage conservation?

4) Have there been experiences of assessment or of use of conservation indicators that can contribute to the debate and so to the development of the theory and of the monitoring tools?

The response to the challenges posed by the call for papers was quite representative of the interest in the theme of the seminar. More than 120 abstracts were submitted, coming from specialists of academic and practical conservation and the development field from 23 different countries. During the seminar, 33 papers were chosen for presentation and/or inclusion in the proceedings. The Executive Committee of the seminar asked Isabel Villaseñor and Valerie Magar to prepare a position paper that would introduce the theme of the seminar to the participants and the authors of the papers.

This book gathers all papers selected for the 6th International Seminar on Urban Conservation. The papers were organized according to six subthemes for evaluation of conservation performance: identification and inventories; assessment and evaluation; economics and development; monitoring and measurements; participation and inclusivity; and indicators.

The 6th International Seminar on Urban Conservation was part of the activities of the LATAM Programme of ICCROM. It was held in Recife during the period of 29 - 31 March, 2011. It was jointly organized by the Centre for Advanced Studies in Integrated Conservation (CECI) and the Graduated Program on Urban Development of the Federal University of Pernambuco (MDU/UFPE), with the participation of the Brazilian National Institute of Historic and Artistic Heritage (IPHAN) and the Joaquim Nabuco Foundation (FUNDAJ). It received financial support from the following Brazilian institutions: *Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico* (CNPq), the *Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior* (CAPES) and the *Fundação de Amparo à Ciência e Tecnologia do Estado de Pernambuco* (FACEPE).

**Silvio Mendes Zancheti**

Centre for Advanced Studies in Integrated Conservation (CECI)

Graduated Program on Urban Development of the Federal University of Pernambuco (MDU/UFPE)

**Katriina Similä**

International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Renovation of Cultural Property (ICCROM)

# Inclusivity, interconnections and overlapping stakes: challenge to a static evaluation criteria

Sonal Mithal[1]

## Abstract

Heritage tradition and modernity are strategic political positions, not fixed or essential qualities of sites or cultural practices, much less of individual identities. When there are several stakeholders on one site, each with clashing notions of heritage 'value' and managerial foci, a single or uniform notion of authenticity is hard to establish. There is no identity or existence of the site itself, except for its values recognized by its users and stakeholders. Having 'authenticity' and 'value' as the primary criteria for World Heritage evaluation thus becomes problematic. This paper examines how ICOMOS monitoring, while ticking a box for 'authenticity', falls into the trap of its self-created bias for material preservation of tangible heritage resources. In the process, World Heritage status becomes oppressive to the stakeholders and local community of the site who are the real guardians of the site but now have to comply with World Heritage Committee ideologies. Critiquing the evaluation report of Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park, inscribed as a World Heritage site in 2004, and examining the nomination process and requirements, this paper argues for a paradigm shift in evaluation from monitoring how well the site has been preserved to ensuring how well the site can live on as an integral component of development process. Apart from being limited to a mere evaluation of a nomination dossier, the evaluation parameters need to integrate monitoring of interconnections and fluid boundaries of apparent heritage components, the dialectic between the tangible and the intangible, the inclusivity of overlapping ownership-usage realities and so also the open-endedness of *ad hoc* decisions.

**Keywords:** fluid heritage boundaries, overlapping stakes, ad-hoc decisions

[1] Ph.D. Student, Department of Landscape Architecture, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. modi1@illinois.edu

❖ ❖ ❖

## Introduction

In these days of globalization of western notions of heritage, control of heritage is a matter of political urgency. Every country's aspiration to have a site listed on UNESCO's well-reputed World Heritage list shows the inclination of nations to pursue western ideals of relating heritage to temporality and constructed identity (Choay, 2001, pp. 138). It is problematic as in this process every nation seeks a validation of a cultural identity by conforming to already established notions of heritage only to later reveal its deviance from the same. At the same time, by seeking recognition from a global, but essentially western, organization each country reinforces the power vested in the western countries which already have self-proclaimed power.

As stated in the abstract, this paper examines how ICOMOS monitoring, while ticking a box for 'authenticity', falls into the trap of its self-created bias for material preservation of tangible heritage resources, i.e. monuments and sites. In the process, the World Heritage status becomes oppressive to the stakeholders and local community of the site who are the real guardians of the site but now have to comply with World Heritage ideologies. This paper argues that the evaluation parameters fall short of a methodology to encourage a process for living heritage to age, fade and renew itself in harmony with a healthy, humane habitat. The argument is to shift the paradigm of evaluation from monitoring how well the site has been preserved to ensuring that the site can live on as an integral component of urban development process.

## 1. Why 'authenticity' and 'value' are problematic evaluation parameters

UNESCO's charters and ICOMOS documents show that heritage is driven less by theory than by consensus. Given this lack of a critical apparatus to determine a value of heritage, gauging 'authenticity' (UNESCO, 2005b) has become the most agreeable practice for World Heritage evaluation. It is ironic that authenticity has become extremely precarious in the discipline of heritage conservation; especially when most often it's neither the nation nor the state that can claim absolute right in matters of deciding authenticity for a site let alone the World Heritage Committee. The *Nara Document on Authenticity* was conceived to ensure protection of

cultural diversity and resist standardization of societies and environments; thereby suggesting a multiplicity of specific cases which are not comparable to each other (ICOMOS, 1994). Art-historian and scholar, Dede Ruggles reasons that acknowledgement of impermanence and renewal in the *Nara Document* (see Article 11, *ibid*.[1]) is in favour of the human being as being integral to the construction of meaning and ongoing creation of material culture. Article 12[2] of the *Nara Document* contradicts the previous article in the sense that if value of culture is based on interpretation and stakeholder interest then it is erroneous to universalize 'truth'. The World Heritage Nomination Dossier requires documentation that adequately presents a 'value' of the heritage site. Value is deemed necessary to construct a reference framework for the site that would lend the site its historical significance. Thus, the value is 'constructed' to specifically highlight temporal linearity of a history that can be conserved. The appendix to the *Nara Document* by Herb Stovel[3] brings up yet another impediment to outlining a definitive authenticity. If the value that makes anything authentic is constantly changing then this means that the authenticity is also changing, which subverts the very nature of authenticity.

Another contention of this paper is that there is no identity or existence of the site itself that is devoid of values unless recognized by the users or the stakeholders. In cases where there are several stakeholders managing a site and, each one's viewpoint clashes with that of the other, a single or uniform notion of authenticity is even harder to establish. The stakeholders may have good intentions but a rather limited purview of action and vision. Even if the stakeholders come to a consensus about how to conserve the site, the consensus will still be in the best interest of all the stakeholders or the site itself. The site endures abuse while its stewards are busy negotiating their agendas to come to a consensus about its 'authenticity' that can serve the least conflicting management attitude for the site. In this light it is imperative to answer who decides the value which judges a site to be 'authentic'.

Having professionally worked in identifying the tangible and intangible heritage components at the recently inscribed World Heritage Site of Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park in India, the author finds it to be the site best suited for such an examination because it is at present managed by seventeen stakeholders, belonging to central government, state government, local administration, private groups and religious bodies. The historic

structures fall under the purview of the Archaeological Survey of India while the Forestry Department owns 93% of the land, making it the largest stakeholder with respect to sheer size. Temple trusts and ashrams (sectarian establishments) are other institutions that own shrines and temples and facilitate pilgrimage by providing boarding and lodging facilities.

## 2. CHAMPANER-PAVAGADH ARCHEOLOGICAL PARK

Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park (Figure 1 and Figure 2) was declared a World Heritage site by UNESCO in 2004. Its designated Core Zone spreads over an area of approximately 14 sq. k.m. (1,328.89 ha) and its Buffer Zone over an area of 30 sq. k.m. (2,911.74 ha), see UNESCO documents (2004a; 2004b). This is the only example in India, so far, to have gained World Heritage recognition as a site, rather than as a city or a group of monuments. The site has been inscribed under the following selection criteria:

> **iii)** to bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared;
>
> **iv)** to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history;
>
> **v)** to be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change;
>
> **vi)** to be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance.[4]

The hyphenated name of Champaner-Pavagadh denotes the split identity between Pavagadh as a landscape characterized by plateaus, mounds and streams studded with ninth century Rajput ruins along with the abode of a Hindu goddess, and its foothill Champaner as the remains of a 16th century medieval Sultanate capital city largely buried beneath a thick forest cover (Ruggles and Sinha, 2009, p. 79). Complementing the obscure Rajput and Sultanate structures, buried city and temples are myths and legends that have been passed down for generations through traditions of Bhavai

**Figure 1. Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park: Pavagadh Hill (Source: Rahul Gajjar).**



**Figure 2. Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park: Beyond the Jama Masjid, the 'authentic' Sultanate city buried underneath forest (Source: Rahul Gajjar).**

enactments and *Garba* dances. The Hindu Goddess Kalikamata Temple at the summit of Pavagadh is believed to be one of Shakti Peeths, which attracts millions of pilgrims to this site every year.[5] Today a village of 2,000 families (UNESCO, 2004a, p. 71)[6] is completely dependent on the pilgrim industry and agriculture constitutes a major component of stakeholder statistics. The overgrown forest has practically left the pre-Mughal Sultanate evidence almost absolutely untouched, which makes the buried part of the site uniquely 'authentic'. This authenticity

makes it a very significant knowledge resource. But, there is an irony here. The site was unknown and so the sultanate ruins retained their completeness; a community came and settled here and rendered the site an extended embodied meaning of spiritual and spatial experience. When the buried site was discovered the 'authenticity' defined by the past and untouched took precedence over the 'authenticity' of experiential and bodily engagement with the landscape.

## 3. OVERLAPPING STAKES

The complexity of ownership issues is such that any steps towards an integrated development and conservation of the site are leading to, more often than not, the status quo. The biggest owner is the Gujarat State Forest Department, which administers the site under the *Indian Forest Act, 1927* [Act 16 of 1927] (Ministry Environment and Forests, India, 1927).[7] It has under its purview a large area of the site, mainly the Pavagadh Hill and the buried Sultanate city. Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) is another powerful stakeholder. It is the state representative to UNESCO as the official custodian of heritage in India. Although there have been 114 structures identified by ASI, a mere 55 receive protection by ASI under the *Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites Act, 1958* (Ministry of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs, 1959). ASI policies focus too narrowly on monuments resulting in a several islands of protected territories created within the entire Archaeological Park. It is ironic that although ASI nominated Champaner-Pavagadh as an Archaeological Park to the World Heritage Committee; it is bound by its own legislation in its inability to protect anything beyond the 300 metre fenced boundary.

Another important group of stakeholders are field-owners. They have been farming for over 200 years. Farming, due to its irrigation and ploughing requirements, has already resulted in an unintentional loss of important archaeological evidence. Heritage preservation measures that aim to forbid these practices highlight the tension between issues of human sustenance and academic conservation ideologies that weaken the case for an unbiased management of a heritage site. In similar vein, the residents of Champaner village (Figure 3) who stay within the ASI protected Royal Enclosure cannot upgrade their houses. ASI laws remain stringent, prohibiting any addition to its precincts; which means not even restrooms can be constructed. In cases like these the concern for heritage conflicts

**Figure 3. Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park: Royal Enclosure housing Champaner Village (Source: Rahul Gajjar).**



**Figure 4. Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park: a Jain Temple (Source: Rahul Gajjar).**

with basic human needs of health and hygiene. Upton regards academic conservation practices as an "emotional investment in authenticity [which] locates authenticity in the realm of identity, defined by difference and validated by culture" (Upton, 2001, p. 303). Authenticity is then merely a pleasure of the intellectual. The conflicts between ASI and local residents reveal the irrelevance of framing heritage in terms of authenticity of choice of traditional values, authentic forms and undiluted identities.

Nomination procedure insists on a systematic presentation of a site to tourists for the sake of knowledge dissemination about the heritage value of the site. This results in institutionalized objectification of the site for consumption. At the same time, choreographing the landscape leads to tourists losing freedom of interpretation and liberty to experience the site as they wish. Meaning occurs in the dialogue between the audience and the object. Photographic documentation and verbal description are just a biased medium of a professional or interest group. Several instances of graffiti on walls by tourists have led to a communication system that is often seen as obscene and detrimental to heritage. But if the monument is a human expression, so is graffiti. Why does the removal of graffiti conform to preservation of heritage? Why does preservation of one supersede the other? Do we really need the fake (constructed memorization) in terms of documented evidence of the original works for evaluation? The Tourism Department at Champaner-Pavagadh is merely concerned about provision of public conveniences in the absence of any specific tourism policy for the site. Most of the visitors to Champaner-Pavagadh are pilgrims (e.g. Figure 4) and they are unaware of the buried Sultanate Historic City. World Heritage status expects the site to

be educational and interactive, with participatory modes of tourism to convert the pilgrims into tourists. The expectation is to mediate the site to the visitors via special effects and audio-visual commentaries, including re-enactment of imaginary historical or mythical scenes. Instead, the evaluation should insist on a system that can help visitor to avoid these interferences and to be able to engage in non-mediated dialogue with the site.

The site is exploding at its seams, providing infrastructure to pilgrims far beyond its bearing capacity. It is especially ironic that as the visitors are a major source of stable economy the local residents make great efforts to please them, and often the ensuing resource constraints of the site are overlooked in the process. With the exalted status of the site, the Authority is meant to control the rampant economic activity that the local community wants to indulge in but in the process of controlling rampant development, all development is curtailed. Ironically, there is not much cultural tourist flow to the site that can specifically harm the site but since the World Heritage nomination tourism strategies aim at 'converting' the pilgrims to tourists and also to attract tourists to appreciate the site's historical and natural heritage. This is leading to more aggressive institutionalized exploitation of site to provide infrastructure resources that are detrimental to the sustainability of the site. Again because of the international status, the site is made to pretend to be touristy when it is better off simply sustaining itself as a purely pilgrim site.

Mithal, S. 2012. Inclusivity, interconnections and overlapping stakes: challenge to a static evaluation criteria. *In* Zancheti, S. M. & K. Similä, eds . *Measuring heritage conservation performance*, pp. 203-211. Rome, ICCROM.

## 4. OVERLAPPING STAKES BECOME MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE FOR WORLD HERITAGE SITE MANAGEMENT

Considering Art Historian Dell Upton's conviction that "it might be fruitful to understand heritage tradition, and modernity as strategic political positions, rather than as fixed or essential qualities of sites or cultural practices, much less of individual identities" (Upton, 2001, p. 303). it is critical to question whether the site under scrutiny is really benefited by the UNESCO WH-status – or is it being denied its right to urban development? The evaluation report for Champaner-Pavagadh strongly states that today the site is being managed through *ad hoc* decisions (UNESCO, 2004) and that there is urgency for a comprehensive management plan but its emphasis is still on the built environment. Champaner-Pavagadh provides the opportunity to study the interrelationship of architectural, urban, and landscape features in a complex historical settlement together with local communities. The site of Champaner-Pavagadh, and this holds true for many sites, cannot be limited to a specific historic moment and cannot be stabilized with fixed forms and meaning. Instead, it is a dynamic and interactive environment that is both a physical entity and an ongoing process. The Archaeological Park comprises a network of interconnected systems – pedestrian movement, water flow, habitats for vegetation and animals, a living village – that are hard to contain within a quarantine model of preservation within fenced enclosures (Ruggles and Sinha, 2009, p. 88).

In 2006, the Government of Gujarat, with the constant persuasive efforts of the Heritage Trust,[8] published an act popularly known as the 'Authority'[9] to "provide for constituting and establishing of an Authority to manage and ensure integrated conservation of heritage and natural environs, preservation of historical and cultural entity and also for preventing uncontrolled development and commercial exploitation of the Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto." The Authority came up as a first step to managing the site with multiple and complex ownership. But it is still a long way before various stakeholders open up their constricted vision and cooperate towards coexistence. Convenient misinterpretations of the Authority by implementing officials are leading to several bottlenecks in development procedures. There were numerous instances of misuse of the document as

an excuse to not work by the government officials and at this point it is worth acknowledging that the misrepresentation and misuse happened because the Authority failed drastically in being effectively communicated to people at all levels of stakeholder representation. Also, the local community had been responsible until this date for the effective management of cultural and natural resources for its economic sustenance and also for the intensification of tourism and pilgrimage industry on the site. So, it is essential to justify why the outside more powerful Authority can take over the 'responsibility' of managing the site.

The Authority was instituted partially to also meet the UNESCO requirement of a "management regime and comprehensive planning" (UNESCO, 2004b), the absence of which was the major reason for deferred nomination result in March 2004. As a subsequent response to the Authority the site was declared a World Heritage site. This is particularly important as several problems arose on site between the local community and the district administration, after the issuing of the Authority, as the role and intention of the authority was never communicated to the people. The evaluation team seemed convinced by the proposed management as long as long as there was a top-down bureaucratic management system in place, even though the site needs an equitable and social approach, entrusting responsibility to the people who actually manage things on site.

There are multiple levels at which the Authority can hinder the integrated process of heritage management. First is the lack of availability, or inaccessibility of complete information regarding various issues for each stakeholder. Secondly, vast amounts of cultural resources lie unclaimed and hence are unattended by the agenda of any stakeholder. Thirdly, pilgrim/tourist oriented opportunities make the site economically self-sustained but also highly vulnerable. Lastly, aspirations of the residents of the village for a better lifestyle are being marginalized in the name of retaining historic authenticity. The Authority only encourages development of a heritage zone: actors who are 'authorized' to take decisions about development work are from the field of "heritage, archaeology, tourism, environment co-opted by the authority on the recommendation of the chief executive officer" (Authority, 2006; Sec. 5, Part G). The Authority nowhere mentions the safeguarding of intangible heritage. The Authority is exceptionally stringent and bureaucratic about the development rights of

the community. In the absence of any set criteria it is completely on the discretion of the Authority to approve of development work (Authority, 2006; Sec. 3). The authority was introduced with the intention of prioritizing actions to reduce conflicts among stakeholders, if not eradicate them. The question remains unanswered whether reduced conflicts can help retain the authenticity of the site as well as benefit individual ideologies.

## 5. MAKE SPACE FOR NON-REPRESENTATIONAL HERITAGE, ITS FLUID BOUNDARIES AND EVER-EMERGING AD HOC DECISIONS AS EVALUATION PARAMETERS

Some of the problematic highlights of ICOMOS Evaluation process (ICOMOS, 2009) are firstly, it insists on main interaction with State Parties and secondly, it is the dossier that is being evaluated. UNESCO's inability to negotiate with any bodies other than the nation-state, i.e., no direct contact/ conversation with local communities is one of the serious shortcomings. The dossier is a one-time document that represents a site in accordance with the World Heritage Committee format, which is biased towards strict linear-history and the 'material culture' of the site. Anthropologist Thomas Eriksen finds the UN as "undecided about the relationship between culture as artistic work and culture as a way of life" (Eriksen, 2011, p. 131). If culture is a way of life then the dossier is expected to read as a catalogue of human activities. If culture is an artistic production then again it is a cataloguing of the representational. Eriksen insists on "what are spoken of as cultural rights in Our Creative Diversity, […] to be seen as individual rights" (Eriksen, 2011, p. 142).

The format furnished to State Parties for nomination dossier itself is very limiting. It encourages a temporal description of a commensurable physical property. An inherent bias is obvious towards the oldest while the contemporary is the seen more as a shift of 'original' values. The format of the dossier is inadequate to encourage applicants in presenting the intangible heritage. Champaner-Pavagadh has invaluable associations with its living intangible heritage of the earthly stories of the Goddess Kalikamata resonating in its mysterious forests (see Figure 5). These associations were one of the major criteria for its inscription into the World Heritage List. The myths and legends of Champaner-Pavagadh are not just restricted to the Kalikamata but are equally expressive about the wealth, grandeur, bravery and religiosity of the Rajputs. The

**Figure 5. Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park: temporary shrines along pilgrim path (Gource: Rahul Gajjar).**

stories tell us about the generosity and far-fetched vision of Sultan Mahmud Begarha and also about the poignant crumbling of his affluent empire into ashes before the ambitious ravage of the great Mughals. The *Garba* played during the Navratri festival throughout Gujarat celebrates the day when Kalikamata was enchanted at Pavagadh by the mesmerizing dance of her devotees and chose to take on a human aspect, joining them in their revelry. As the devotees enter the forecourt of the Kalikamata Temple at the summit of Pavagadh Hill this festive night comes alive in front of their eyes. The pilgrim path is lined with small shops selling ritual objects and collectibles related to the stories of Kalikamata. *Garba* songs and *Bhavai* music is played on CDs and cassette players in the wayside shops all along the path. The *Garba* is a dance form that the devotees perform in order to achieve the goal of spiritual unison with the divinity. With the *Garba* songs playing on their pilgrim path; the devotees are able to remain in that transcendent state with which they would want to appear before the goddess when they reach the temple.

The evaluation report does not recognize this live and festive quality nor does it evaluate/notice the absence of proposed strategies of how the continuity of practices of intangible heritage will be ensured at this site. Is the silence on this topic a way of silent acknowledgement of a practice that is best left to itself to thrive or is it a way of institutional indifference to its presence. Again there is an instance of

an inherent contradiction between World Heritage Nomination requirements and evaluation. The *Nara Document on Authenticity* acknowledges cultural landscapes are dynamic in nature, and the goal of management to guide change (Mitchel *et al.*, 2009, p. 58). To do this effectively, determinations need to be made on the impact of proposed modifications to the landscape resources and values. Certain types of change may be acceptable, while others would diminish the site's integrity. Nomination Dossier insists on proper inventory (Mitchel *et al.*, 2009, p. 27) of the site, but how important is an inventory if the value of the heritage component lies in its quality of constant change. The need is to define levels of acceptable change or thresholds for potential concern and also parameters to assess those definitions.

Geographer David Lowenthal opines about the two approaches to perceive heritage: one that is identifiable through objects and the other through awareness of 'organic change' (Lowenthal, 1979, p. 108 ). These two approaches lead to bipolar attitudes of conservation, i.e., preservation versus appreciation of decay which allows to "remould it to our desires" (*ibid.*, p. 116). In this case, the desires will keep changing with time and hence every effort at integrated conservation is itself insubstantial because it is particular to one specific moment in time. There is no need for a concept of culture to respect local conditions in development work. What is at stake in development work is not cultural authenticity or purity, but people's ability to gain control over their own lives. Mystifying the ideologically charged cultural concept has to be discarded to create global ethics system. The evaluation parameters should integrate the monitoring the interconnections and fluid boundaries of apparent heritage components. The dialectic between the tangible and the intangible, the inclusivity of overlapping ownership-usage realities and so also the open-endedness of *ad hoc* decisions are important agendas that need further consideration in evaluation systems. We could do better than mere institutionalized exploitation of cultural resources in the name of 'authentic' conservation.

## References

Chavan, A. R. 1966. *The flora of Pavagadh*. Baroda, Department of Botany, Maharaja Sayajirao University.

Choay, F. 2001. Historic heritage and the contemporary culture industry. *In* Choay, F, ed. *The invention of the historic monument*, pp. 138-163. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Eriksen, T. H. 2001. Between Universalism and Relativism: A critique of the UNESCO concept of culture. In Cowan, J. K.; Dembour M-B. & R. A. Wilson, eds. *Culture and rights*, pp. 127-148. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

ICOMOS. 1932. Athens Charter for the restoration of historic monuments. *First International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments.* (Available at: http: //www.icomos.org/docs/ athens_charter.html).

ICOMOS. 1976. *Recommendation Concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas.* (Available at: http: //www.icomos.org/unesco/ areas76.html).

ICOMOS. 1964. *Venice Charter (International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites)*. (Available at: www.icomos.org/venice_ charter.html).

ICOMOS. 1982. *Florence Charter*. ICOMOS-IFLA International Committee for Historic Gardens. (Available at: www.icomos.org/docs/florence_ charter.html).

ICOMOS. 1994. *Nara Document on Authenticity. ICOMOS, Nara Conference on Authenticity in Relation to the World Heritage Convention*. (Available at: www.international.icomos.org/charters/nara_e. htm).

ICOMOS. 2009. *17th General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, ICOMOS, Orientation Session*. (Available at: http: //www. whc.unesco.org/uploads/events/documents/ event-614-3.ppt).

Kryder-Reid, E. 2007. Sites of power and the power of sight. *In* Harris, D. & D. F. Ruggles, eds. *Sites unseen: landscape and vision*, pp. 181-212. Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press.

Lewis, P. 1975. The future of our past: our clouded vision of historic preservation. *Pioneer America* 6(2): 1-20.

Lowenthal, D. 1979. Age and Artifact: Dilemmas of Appreciation. *In* Meinig, D. W, ed. *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes*, pp. 103-128. New York, Oxford University Press.

Mithal, S. 2012. Inclusivity, interconnections and overlapping stakes: challenge to a static evaluation criteria. *In* Zancheti, S. M. & K. Similä, eds . *Measuring heritage conservation performance*, pp. 203-211. Rome, ICCROM.

Ministry of Environment and Forests, India. 1927. *The Indian forest act*. (Available at: http: //envfor. nic.in/legis/forest/forest4.html).

Ministry of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs. 1959. *Ancient monuments and archaeological sites and remains rules, 1959*. (Available at: http: //asi.nic.in/ pdf_data/7.pdf).

Misra, S. C. 1985. *Tarikh-i-Mahmus Shahi*. Baroda, Department of History, Maharaja Sayajirao University.

Mitchell, N.; Rössler, M. & P. Tricaud. 2009. *World heritage cultural landscapes: a handbook for conservation and management*. Paris, UNESCO. (Available at: http: //whc.unesco.org/ documents/publi_wh_papers_26_en.pdf).

Modi, S. M. 2002. Water intelligent city. *Landscapes of Water, History, Innovation and Sustainable Design*. Bari, Politechnico di Bari – Facolta di Architettura, Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Ingegneria Civile e dell'Architettura (ICAR).

Modi, S. 2004. *Impressions of a forgotten city – architectural documentation of Champaner-Pavagadh*. New Delhi, Archaeological Survey of India & Heritage Trust Baroda.

Modi, S. M. 2005. Intangible heritage – A medium for interpretation of the tangible heritage. *Architecture+Design*, pp. 24-27. Delhi, Media Transasia Publishers Ltd.

Modi, S. M. 2008. *Myths and legends of Champaner-Pavagadh*. Baroda, Transpek-Silox and Heritage Trust.

Patel, G. D. 1972. *Gazetteer of India – Panchmahals District, Gujarat*. Ahmedabad, Government Publications Depot.

People for Heritage Concern. 2001. *Cultural Resource Information System – Inventory of Built Heritage of Champaner-Pavagadh*. Baroda, Heritage Trust.

Ruggles, D. F. 2009. A critical view of landscape preservation and the role of landscape architects. *Preservation and Education Research: The Journal of the National Council for Preservation Education* 2: 65-72.

Ruggles, D. F. & A. Sinha. 2009. Preserving the cultural landscape heritage of Champaner-Pavagadh, Gujarat, India. *In* Ruggles, D.F. & H. Silverman, eds. *Intangible heritage embodied*, pp. 79-99. New York, Springer Science+Business Media, LLC.

Sinha, A. & G. Kesler. 2001. *Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park Plan*. Illinois, Department of Landscape, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign.

Thakur, N. 1987. *Champaner – Draft Action Plan for Integrated Conservation*. Baroda, Heritage Trust.

Thakur, N. 2000. *Note on the Legal Status of Champaner* (Unpublished).

Thakur, N. 2000b. *Participatory Conservation Collaborative: A Regeneration Program for Champaner-Pavagadh.* (Unpublished).

Thakur, N. 2004. Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 10(5): 397–399.

UNESCO. 1972. *World Heritage Convention (Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage). (*Available at: www. whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext/www.whc. unesco.org/archive/convention-en.pdf).

UNESCO. 2003. *Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage 2003*. (Available at: http: //unesdoc.unesco.org/ images/0013/001325/132540e.pdf).

UNESCO. 2004a. *Champaner-PavagadhWorld Heritage Nomination Dossier*. (Available at: http: // whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1101.pdf).

UNESCO. 2004b. *Advisory Body Evaluation, no. 1101: Champaner-Pavagadh.* (Available at: http: //whc.unesco.org/archive/advisory_body_ evaluation/1101.pdf).

UNESCO. 2005a. *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions.* (Available at: http: //unesdoc.unesco.org/ images/0014/001429/142919e.pdf).

UNESCO. 2005b. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. (Available at: http: //whc.unesco.org/en/ guidelines).

Upton, D. 2001. Authentic anxieties. In Al Sayyad, N., ed. *Consuming tradition, manufacturing heritage*, pp. 298-306. *New York*, Routledge.

## Endnotes

[1] "All judgments about values attributed to cultural properties as well as the credibility of related information sources may differ from culture to culture, and even within the same culture. It is thus not possible to base judgments of values and authenticity within fixed criteria. On the contrary, the respect due to all cultures requires that heritage properties must be considered and judged within the cultural contexts to which they belong."

[2] "[…] it is of the highest importance and urgency that, within each culture, recognition be accorded to the specific nature of its heritage values and the credibility and truthfulness of related information sources."

[3] "Efforts to update authenticity assessments in light of changing values and circumstances [are needed]."

[4] UNESCO. Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park. UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Available at: http: //whc. unesco.org/en/list/1101.

[5] Industries Commissionerate. Panchamahals. Available at: http://www.vibrantgujarat.com/documents/profiles/panchmahal-district-profile.pdf.28. It attracts about 2,000,000 (20 lakh) visitors every year and has shown a growth of 10.92 % in the inflow of tourists in 2005-06.

[6] The District Census (1982) states that a population of 1,856, comprising 392 households, lives in 387 houses in Champaner. Out of these, about 200 are located in the main settlement within the royal enclosure.

[7] A reserved forest denotes forests accorded a certain degree of protection. Land rights to forests declared to be reserved forests or protected forests are typically acquired (if not already owned) and owned by the Government of India. Reserved forests and protected forests are declared by the respective state governments. Rights to all activities like hunting, grazing, etc. in reserved forests are banned unless specific orders are issued otherwise.

[8] An NGO, based in Vadodara, Gujarat and working for the protection and Integrated Management of the site since 1986.

[9] In this paper this act has been referred to as the *Authority* for purposes of convenience and also because that's how it is popularly known among the stakeholders.

Mithal, S. 2012. Inclusivity, interconnections and overlapping stakes: challenge to a static evaluation criteria. *In* Zancheti, S. M. & K. Similä, eds . *Measuring heritage conservation performance*, pp. 203-211. Rome, ICCROM.

ICCROM

LATAM

CECI