

WHO MANAGES WHAT, FOR WHOM?

Michael A Tomlan

Cornell University

Up to this point in the conference the discussion has centered on the process of nominating a World Heritage Site. The steps have been itemized and described, and examples have been provided that have parallels with the current effort to designate properties contributing to Civil Rights history in the United States. This essay explores the implications of the last provision in the process, that is, the stipulation that a management plan should be designed and implemented for each of the properties. The implications of the management plan are important, but often overlooked. This problem involves considerable sensitivity to those involved in creating and implementing the plan, and how it should make a difference for the treatment of a site, particularly as it applies to an active religious property.

Although anthropologists, archaeologists, and historians who become involved in collecting information about tentative World Heritage Sites do not often think about it, the management of the property, which often includes several buildings or sites in disparate locations, rest on expectations of the local residents. In a similar fashion, the views of the lawyers, engineers, architects, conservators, religious leader and local, state and federal level government officials that become involved with the practical aspects often are brought into the discussion later to contribute their views. Unfortunately for both groups, the local population and the visitors who frequent the site—in the case of religious properties, some more than once—further complicate the implementation of what can only be understood as a general, reasonable approach, particularly when everyone is speaking different languages, both literally and figuratively. Hence, the creation of a management plan can take as long, and will probably take longer than the process of nomination and recognition. There is no “magic bullet;” no simple solution. There are only a range of variables. There are a number of reasons for this, as will be demonstrated in the World Heritage Site at Hampi, in the State of Karnataka, India. (Fig. 1, below)



Fig. 2. Hampi, Karnataka, India: panoramic view.

The history of preservation owes a great deal to the advocates of the nineteenth century, particularly in England. One of the most celebrated campaigns to influence the treatment of an important site was launched from London by John Ruskin, William Morris and their associates in attempt to save the west front of St. Mark's Basilica.

This was one of many campaigns launched by the English advocates as they introduced their ideas into every corner of the British Empire, including India. Hence, the ideas and activities of the English Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (1877), embodied in the 1882 Ancient Monuments Act, and the advocacy of National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or Scenic Beauty (1995) were carried to every one of the English "colonies," including the subcontinent, then a patchwork of princely states of various sizes.

The British exploration and documentation led to greater appreciation and interpretation that implied some measure of protection. In the Asian subcontinent the establishment of the Asiatic Society in Calcutta (1784), marks the comparative study of Sanskrit, Greek and Latin, and the first modern account of Hampi is assembled by Col. Colin MacKenzie follows (1799-1800). Photography would stimulate more interest. The large format photographs of the site taken by Col. Alexander John Greenlaw in 1855 in 1856, rediscovered in the 1983 by architect and photographer John Gollings, becomes an important part of the story. The role of the well-traveled George Nathaniel Curzon of Kedleston, who became the Viceroy of India (1899-1905) is important for re-affirming the direction of the Archaeological Survey of India with the appointment of an English classics professor John Marshall, who led excavations for the next quarter of a century.

After India became independent, the country became more aggressive in recognizing its history. The legislation began in 1958 with the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act, amended in 1992. Important for Hampi, the State of Karnataka adopted its Ancient and Historic Monuments and Archaeological Remains Act in 1981.

With the creation of the World Heritage Convention in 1972, India took steps to submit nominations of both prehistoric and historic sites. The monuments at Hampi were nominated a decade later, the twelfth in a growing list of properties. The group of monuments was inscribed on the basis of cultural criteria, under categories one and three and four, recognized for its outstanding universal value representing a masterpiece of creative human created genius, testimony of a cultural tradition and civilization, and for its superior architectural ensemble and landscape features.

Questions arose almost immediately after list about the *ad hoc* changes which were taking place and the need for a management plan. The approaches being used to “restore” the structures were questioned, the boundary lines and buffer zones were inadequately marked, and unplanned tourist facilities sprang up as commercial and residential buildings were modified to accommodate the growing number of pilgrims and visitors. By 1999 these and other questions led to investigations which in turn led to the site being listed by the World Heritage Committee as endangered. The prospect of a bridge over the Tungabhadra River at Anagundi was an obvious affront to the heritage planning process as the bridge abutments indicated that the path of travel would carry truck and automobile traffic through the historic site. The people living in Hampi and in the neighboring communities of Anagundi and Kamalapuram, all within the boundaries of the heritage area, had a stake in the discussion, arguing both pro and con. Legal action was taken to stop the bridge construction, which was halted in September 2001, although petitions arose almost immediately to complete the span. In January, 2009, the construction restarted, but when additional concrete was being poured, the bridge failed and eight construction workers lost their lives, and a number of others were injured.



(Figure 3. The Anagundi Bridge, under construction)

In an attempt to meet the need for a management plan, in 2002, the State of Karnataka established The Hampi World Heritage Area Management Authority (HWHAMA). Its staff immediately began to assemble previous documentation and do the mapping necessary on the ground to determine ownership patterns. Meanwhile, in 2003, with the assistance of the State of Karnataka and the Archaeological Survey of India, the University of Delhi Prof. Nalini Thakur began to form a team of alumni and students from her heritage conservation program to develop what became a multivolume integrated conservation management plan. It examined the natural features, fauna and flora, in addition to the heritage above and below ground. In 2009, the HWHAMA submitted a master plan for the properties, much abbreviated by comparison to the work provided by Prof. Thakur, but it was rejected by the World Heritage Committee.

The changes undertaken by the Archaeological Survey of India to stabilize and “restore” the major monuments continued, as the idea grew that the World Heritage site should be considered a park, largely for the enjoyment of outside visitors. In late July 2011, the Deputy Commissioner of the Bellary (and member of HWHAMA) issued an oral warning to the 1,500 residents of Hampi village that demolition of their shops and homes was to begin in 24 hours. The Hampi Development Authority and the Archaeological Survey of India then began to demolish 260 “illegal constructions” in Hampi’s core, centered on the Virupaksha Temple’s Bazaar Street, justifying the removal of the families and merchants with newspaper articles and images of the “exciting archaeological findings” below the surface of the thoroughfare. Discussion about whether the residents would be provided compensation and/or another plot resulted in the relocation of some families outside of the temple area.

Despite yearly conferences in Mumbai, Bangalore, and Hampi that brought together experts, scholars, officials and representatives of the communities, and outside private and public sector funders, the management plan remains an elusive goal to implement. The discussion revolves in part around the growing recognition that this World Heritage Site is important not only to foreign

visitors who see its living heritage in active religious activities, with millions with hundreds of thousands of pilgrims visiting the area every year.

What are the lessons that this offers to those in the United States pursuing a World Heritage designation for sites associated with the Civil Rights struggle? The fundamental idea is that the significance of properties that remain actively faith-based must be held uppermost in the minds of all those who become involved. We must explain the fact that the Protestant Churches harbored Civil Rights advocates, providing leadership, nourishing their hopes and dreams, celebrating their victories with justifiable pride, and providing solace when facing defeat. The commitment to this greater recognition is a natural extension of the strong sense of commitment generations of Civil Rights advocates have already voiced. Recognizing this challenge is essential because active congregations require respect. Patronizing governmental attitudes at the federal, state and local level must be avoided, not only for the church congregations but others outside, in the communities. Management should be a continuous process of discussion that involves as much--if not more--listening than speaking, so that motivations and intentions can be appropriately understood. Relocation of any segment of a community should be avoided, and the legal, economic and political goals put in service of the religious and social welfare. In essence, appropriate management requires continued, careful examination of who is involved, and for whom actions are to be taken, before addressing what path to follow.

(For further reading, see “Chapter 8: Placing Greater Faith in Religion,” in *Historic Preservation: Caring for Our Expanding Legacy* (Springer, 2015), by the author.)