



A Review On Management Of Heritage: Unveiling Colonial Views And Policies

Dr. Amit^{1*}, Dr. Reena²

^{1*} Assistant Professor, Department of History, CBLU, Bhiwani, Haryana, India. Email: Dramitkadyan@gmail.com

² Assistant Professor, Nirwan University, Jaipur, India

Citation: Dr. Amit, Dr. Reena, (2024), A Review On Management Of Heritage: Unveiling Colonial Views And Policies, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(2), 983-989
Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v30i2.4016

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

India is a large country with a deep-rooted and respected culture and tradition. It is known for its wide variety of cultural treasures, such as ancient and early historical monuments, temples carved out of rocks, temples with structures, mosques, cathedrals, forts, buildings from the colonial era, and secular and local buildings. The Indian heritage's distinctiveness is a tale of the different climatic influences, artistic customs, and foreign influences. Every facet of life in the nation is connected to the country's intangible heritage. India's physical characteristics have played a significant role in shaping its history. The Vindhya Mountain range has created a clear division between the northern and southern areas. From the 3rd century BCE onwards, north India witnessed a continuous invasion by foreign forces, which led to systematic looting of Indian riches throughout the 11th and 12th centuries CE. As a result, there was a substantial depletion of cultural heritage, including religious and non-religious elements, from the ancient and medieval periods. The government must prioritize conservation, seeing it as a responsibility to past and present generations, and for future descendants. Archaeology was expected to create a new wave of passionate efforts and spark interest by publishing and distributing materials to a broad national and worldwide audience. The British acquired dominion over the regions that now comprise the states of Tamil Nadu and West Bengal via the English East India Company. Gradually, many parts of the southern states came under their control. In south India, Madras Presidency, there were notable temple complexes, actively revered and supported by many sections of society. These temples played a crucial role in shaping the region's cultural heritage and were renowned for their architectural significance. The Archaeological Survey of India was first founded in the northern region of India. However, in 1881, a separate branch was established specifically for the southern region of India. Robert Sewell undertook a comprehensive examination of ancient artifacts and subsequently created the first inventory of these artifacts. These lists functioned as authoritative documents to choose monuments to be preserved. In 1885, the government implemented a standardized framework for compiling these lists. This style mandated that district authorities and archaeological officers provide an initial inventory of ancient sites and constructions in their districts. The Madras Presidency faced difficulties while categorizing some sites as 'protected' under the 1904 Act, owing to an asymmetry between religious and secular structures. The trustees or owners were obligated to create a legal agreement with the government, which included the responsibility of adequate upkeep, prohibition of leasing, and refraining from selling the monument or property within a 100-foot radius. Nevertheless, several temples showed reluctance to participate, resulting in their omission from the Act. A conservation plan was implemented in 1907 to save historical sites. The technique classifies monuments into three distinct categories: those in pristine condition, those that may be conserved with minimum restoration, and those at the stage of decay. The archaeological surveyor required engineers from the Public Works Department to submit their cost estimates and building proposals for approval. The archaeology department has exclusive jurisdiction in determining the destruction and subsequent

repurposing of antiquated materials. The living monuments were identified as requiring significant restoration based on archaeological considerations, although little activity was seen.

Keywords: Cultural Heritage, Management of Heritage, Colonial Views.

Content

India & It's Culture

Culture, in anthropology, encompasses various aspects such as traditional food production, cooking, and consumption practices, architectural planning and arrangement of houses, adherence to social, moral, and religious values, and customary methods for attaining satisfaction about intellectual and emotional qualities. The culture of the Indian subcontinent is a comprehensive collection of traditions and behaviors widespread across the nation. The architectural legacies in the form of temples, forts, palaces, and archeological sites contribute to upholding its tradition. In the Indian context, incorporating both physical and non-physical aspects of history has guaranteed the preservation of cultural continuity within a specific region.

India boasts of its rich and time-honored culture and customs. The unique tapestry of culture and tradition of India, along with other Asian countries and Southeast Asia, contributes to a panoramic view of this region. India is adorned with various cultural assets. These assets include intangible and tangible elements alike. This paper discusses the heritage monuments that date back to the prehistoric and protohistoric eras. India has numerous rock-cut temples, structural temples, mosques, cathedrals, forts, colonial-era buildings, and more. India has a cultural legacy that does not adhere to a single category or is not limited to a certain region, rather it is characterized by diversity and variety. This diversity reflects an intricate blend of climatic impacts, artistic trends, and foreign influences. In addition, to monumental heritage, there is the mobile heritage, such as sculptures of stones and bronzes. The Indian culture has inherited, endured, and assimilated cultural elements from various other civilizations; thereby contributing to its distinctiveness. India faced numerous foreign invasions and was ruled by its conquerors for a very long time resulting in the interconnectedness of several dynasties.

India's history has been mostly shaped by its geographical features. The Indian sub-continent is distinctly divided by the Vindhyas mountain range, creating a sharp distinction between the northern and southern regions. The northern region was consistently subjected to the invasions of foreign powers starting from the 3rd century BCE. The raids escalated gradually, leading to the organized plundering of Indian wealth throughout the 11th and 12th centuries CE. During the early and medieval centuries, northern India witnessed a significant loss of its cultural history, including religious and secular aspects. Several renowned temples in Somnath were demolished and their riches were plundered. However, it would not be incorrect to say that these factors contributed numerous positive elements from ruling civilizations with varied cultures and traditions. In the current global quest for distinctiveness, India's culture and traditions are being seen from a fresh standpoint.

Built- Heritage

Nevertheless, several defensive constructions, like forts, were built strategically using the natural landscape, and some palaces and havelis from the later medieval era still exist today. Conversely, the southern region of India situated below the Vindhyas, including the current states of Maharashtra, Orissa, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, and Kerala, has been comparatively unaffected by invasions, preserving its cultural history, both tangible and intangible, to a great extent. This tradition is still appreciated in the present day. There are abundant religious buildings that survived these invaders during the early medieval era in the south differentiating it from north India. The Emperors of the Vijayanagara dynasty during the 14th and 15th centuries dedicated themselves to protecting the Hindu social and political structure from the influence of Islam. This is evident from the numerous magnificent temples that showcase the artistic accomplishments of successive generations and their ability to adapt to evolving political and social circumstances, thus ensuring continuity. The Mosques and cathedrals, among other religious heritage, are also well-represented and preserved. Forts that belong to the late medieval period still exist today and represent our secular past. Apart from this plethora of magnificent monuments India is home to several well-preserved colonial structures.

Heritage Management

The notion of heritage management emerged in response to the significant economic, political, social, and technical transformations that occurred following World War II, as well as the subsequent development and rebuilding efforts. The ideas of culture and heritage have become more confused due to several factors like rapid population increase, increasing prosperity, urbanization, globalization, and shifting values among people. As a result, the need for managing heritage has become a reality, nevertheless, this is a worldwide phenomenon.

Before the implementation of state regulation, the dynasties that constructed or inherited the cultural legacy were responsible for maintaining and safeguarding it. Fortifications were consistently reinforced to protect against outside dangers, resulting in the excellent upkeep and preservation of the forts. The monarchs of the late medieval era and throughout British rule personally maintained the palaces they created, since these

palaces served as their residences. Similarly, the monarchs provided material and financial support to sites of religious association, such as temples. Since the cultural legacy was in the direct jurisdiction of the monarchy, the administration and management of it were not seen as a burden for the royalty. Additionally, the people were actively engaged in temple matters.

The pre-colonial period was characterized by the interweaving of tradition, myth, and a sense of belonging, which together shaped the lived experiences of that time. After the arrival of the European powers, the monuments, and other cultural artifacts formerly supported by the royal rulers lost their financial support when the British took control of the Princely States. The remaining principalities, which were of smaller size, struggled to maintain their existence. As a result, cultural heritage continued to be ignored. Due to the withdrawal of support from the monarchy, the participation of ordinary people in preserving history was greatly restricted. Amidst the preserved cultural legacy, the houses of worship that received support from devotees sustained themselves monetarily and maintained the construction.

In addition to their administrative duties, the British took a keen interest in learning and familiarising themselves with all facets of Indian culture, this trend flourished under the influence of William Jones conducting a comprehensive assessment of the diverse and abundant cultural history hidden in India, which was unknown even to the Indian people, was deemed very important in their efforts. The Europeans designated to carry out this task were mostly concerned with only recording the physical remnants. Additional management responsibilities, such as conservation, were assigned to the public works departments of the three presidencies of India: Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras. While the Europeans in the organization had support from the local Indians, the procedures and policies implemented were fundamentally Western.

To facilitate the administration and management, the cultural artifacts of India were systematically categorized. Most of the unoccupied and publicly owned buildings like the forts, palaces, and temples were placed directly under the jurisdiction of the designated agency. A similar trend was seen in all three presidencies. It is important to mention that most of the remains in India had some religious association. When confronted with the matter of worship at temples and other places of worship, a conciliatory approach was adopted, particularly in South India, with little intervention in religious rituals. The affluent and prominent individuals in the society exerted control over the operations of the temples, resulting in periods of disorder and confusion. Just as people used to rely on former monarchs for answers, they still turned to the British for help, since they symbolized the current governing authority. Their action was embraced by a significant number of Indians, leading to a gradual transfer of management, administration, and control to the government. Public engagement, although still existing, had become insignificant.

In the Western sense, heritage is anything that no longer fulfills its original purpose. The heritage of Asia and Southeast Asia consists of a combination of buildings that continue to serve their original function and some buildings that do not. Therefore, the concept of 'living legacy' is a global phenomenon that differentiates it from the heritage that no longer exists or is non-living. The phrase 'living heritage' gained popularity in heritage discussions to refer to the legacy that has continuity and actively serves its original purpose. The comprehension of living heritage is intricately tied to the notions of a contemporary community's unbroken affiliation with heritage (continuity); alteration or development of this affiliation (always within the confines of continuity); and this specific community's uninterrupted connection with heritage (referred to as "core community"). Recently, especially after the 2005 convention, the meaning of the phrase 'living legacy' has expanded and is now associated with 'communities' and the 'continuity' of traditions and practices. In addition, several nations use the phrase to designate cultural legacy that encompasses the ongoing aspects or the uninterrupted transmission of customs, expertise, and even artisans.

Efforts to comprehend India and interpret its traditions are classified into these three categories; exoticist, magisterial, and curatorial approaches. The first category, exoticism, emphasizes the extraordinary qualities of India, highlighting the peculiarities of the land imagined by Europeans for thousands of years, as Hegel observed. The second group, the magisterial category, is closely linked to exercising the imperial authority. It views India as a region under the control of British administrators. This perspective encompasses a feeling of superiority and responsibility required to handle a nation that James Mill described as 'that significant arena of British influence'. The third area is the most Catholic as compared to others and encompasses different efforts to observe, categorize, and showcase many facets of Indian culture. In contrast to the exoticist approach, a curatorial approach does not solely seek out the unusual (although the 'different' must possess greater display worth). Furthermore, unlike the magisterial approach, it is not burdened by the influence of the ruler's preferences (although complete avoidance of the magisterial connection may be difficult when the authors themselves are part of the ruling imperial elite, as was occasionally the case). Due to these factors, there is a greater degree of liberation from preconceived notions under this third classification. However, the curatorial techniques have their tendencies, with a common emphasis on seeing the object—in this instance, India—as unique and exceptionally fascinating. According to Amartya Sen, the British used a curatorial approach to study and preserve the ancient artifacts of India, which led to their interest in assessing the country's antiquary remains. This ultimately resulted in the founding of the Archaeological Survey of India.

The administrators of the English East Company showed a keen interest in the customs and culture of India, which prompted them to engage in several study endeavors. In his correspondence with Warren Hastings, the inaugural Governor General in Bengal, Samuel Johnson, the renowned English author, and lexicographer,

emphasized the importance of studying the customs and histories of the eastern region. He advocated for exploring ancient structures, uncovering remnants of destroyed cities, and gaining knowledge about the arts and beliefs of a group of people about whom we have acquired limited information thus far. The credit for the foundation of the Asiatic Society in 1784 is attributed to William Jones, who demonstrated exceptional skill in coordinating structured research efforts. William Chambers and Colin McKenzie were the trailblazers of surveying in the southern region. Various efforts were made to survey and manage antiquary remains, such as the formation of the Archaeological Survey of India, the enactment of legislation, and active involvement in the administration of religious institutions affiliated with temples, particularly in the eastern and southern regions of India.

To begin with, a comprehensive survey (1862–1899) of the various regions of the Indian subcontinent was conducted by individual expeditions, such as the one led by A.H. Longhurst. The primary objective of these missions was to identify and choose significant monuments and places of artistic and historical importance for future investigation. These excursions were systematic throughout the northern and central Indian regions. A. Cunningham pioneered the first nationwide comprehensive investigation to provide logical documentation and description of all notable architectural and other remnants, regardless of their age, aesthetic appeal, or historical significance. The use of photography to chronicle heritage was the most valuable resource for archaeology throughout the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Curzon asserts in one of his remarks that the government has a fundamental responsibility to prioritize conservation, considering it a duty not only to our ancestors but also to our present and future generations. Curzon acknowledged that India's situation differed from Britain's, where most property was privately owned. India was adorned with the tangible remnants of disappeared ruling families, overlooked kings, and oppressed religious beliefs. These remnants were now situated within British territory, making them vulnerable to the destructive forces of a tropical climate, abundant plant life, and often uninformed local inhabitants. The field of archaeology was anticipated to generate a fresh surge of enthusiastic endeavors and ignite curiosity via the dissemination of publications to a wide-ranging national and global audience. For the first time, the Indian and British governments established a clear and organized plan to address the importance of preserving and researching monuments. Simultaneously, they acknowledged the political capacity of archaeology in providing origins and shared connections to India's many social and religious groups, while also amplifying the influence of the British Raj. Present-day Tamil Nadu and West Bengal were the first regions that the British gained authority over via the English East India Company. Over time, some areas of the other states in the southern region also fell under British authority. In south India (Madras Presidency), during the British Raj there were significant temple complexes, actively worshipped and supported by many segments of society, contributing to the region's rich cultural history and architectural landmarks.

The Nayakas were the last monarchs who successfully maintained the opulent temples, in terms of their architectural grandeur and spiritual significance. Due to their collapse and the absence of support from the monarchy, these impressive temples could not be protected. The fundamental purpose of worship was guaranteed to be maintained. Nevertheless, the upkeep of the colossal edifices was a problem that needed to be resolved. During this era, the temples were overseen by a board of trustees.

This arrangement was described by a resident of Mysore in the early 20th century, who noted that the administration of major temples across southern India, was entrusted to a committee. The shortcomings of this divided control, such as feebleness, indifference, and interpersonal rivalry, were readily apparent. The administration of these temples was characterized by several trustees who were often away but got substantial revenue, exemplified by the temples at Rameswaram, Tirupati, and Madurai, among others. The smaller temples, without significant support or patronage, started to decline. Additional organizations, such as palaces, that were within the jurisdiction of the former kings were more well-preserved.

Archeological Survey of India

The formation of the Archaeological Survey of India originally stimulated antiquarian study only in northern India. In 1881, there was a perceived need to create a branch in southern India. Robert Sewell was entrusted with surveying ancient artifacts, and he compiled the first inventory of these artifacts. In addition to recording the cultural significance, these lists also functioned as official records for selecting monuments for preservation. In 1885, the government established a specific format for the preparation of the list. The creation of the lists required three steps. First, the district authorities were responsible for creating a preliminary inventory of all old monuments and structures in each district with assistance from the Archeological Survey in India. Archeological officers were responsible for revising the first list and classifying these ancient sites based on their archaeological or historical significance, condition, and the feasibility or desirability of conserving them. The local administration was responsible for issuing directives to conduct a final review and further cataloguing of these sites.

The Circular of 1885 stated the standard operating principles for the department. The statement proclaimed that the main responsibility of archaeological officers was to provide guidance, and support, and ensure the

successful conservation of the selected buildings. Their secondary responsibility was to review and enhance the current inventories of archaeological remains in cases where these lists are still inadequate.

In 1903, the Director General conducted a review of the work that was completed. Frequently, the lists underwent revisions, and standardized lists of historical landmarks for preservation were created. The fourth compilation of monuments in 1917 consisted of 570 entries, but the 1928 list, after the enactment of the Reform plan, included 341 entries. The disparity between the two lists may be attributed to the failure to reach agreements as mandated by the Act. Sewell's List provides a concise overview of the monuments in all the taluks of the Presidency. Subsequent these lists were more thoughtful and served as guiding resources for the preservation efforts in the Presidency. The inventory of lists also included the contingent classification of the monument. The lists were compiled with dual objectives: to provide records for preservation and to assess structures of archaeological significance that would not undergo restoration.

According to the Village Officers Manual, the responsibility of the village officers was to oversee and document the protection of historical structures, inscriptions, and other old artifacts. They were required to notify the archaeological surveyor about any incidences of undesirable actions such as vandalism, destruction, or demolition of buildings for examination. As part of the survey of monuments, efforts were made to raise public awareness among managers and owners of cultural sites about the need to control vegetation growth in these buildings. Official warnings were given to the caretakers of all historical landmarks, advising them not to allow such plants to grow. Due to the limited funding available and the completion of the study and documentation of all significant relics, certain criteria were established for conducting repairs of the monuments. Temples that generated substantial income often did not get any financial assistance from the government. If the monument had extraordinary worth, commensurate financial assistance was suggested. Nevertheless, the government assumed direct authority over monuments like forts and other secular structures.

Laws and Regulations

Regulations about safeguarding historical architectural remains were established throughout the 19th century. These attempts may indicate the unfortunate situation resulting from ongoing plunder and destruction, and the governmental recognition of these acts of vandalism.

The first law was enacted by the passage of the Bengal Regulations XIX of 1810, with parts (iii) and (iv) replicated word for word in the Madras Regulations VII of 1817. The government was first granted authority under Madras Regulations VII of 1817, which allowed it to act in cases where a public building was in danger of being misused by private persons. At first glance, these restrictions seemed like a mere attempt to hide the inappropriate actions of those authorized to govern and uphold the law.

The Act XX of 1863, enacted half a century later, granted the government the power "to prevent harm to and safeguard buildings of notable age or of significant historical or architectural importance." The Treasure Trove Act was established in 1878, mandating collectors to report any discoveries to the government.

The Indian Treasure Trove Act of 1878 mandates that anyone who uncovers ancient artifacts must report them, and the state has the right to acquire significant pieces by compensating the finder. Currently, the responsibility for enforcing this legislation lies with the individual States. According to the announcement, the important discoveries were handed over to the museum and others were returned to the founder. This greatly augmented the museum's holdings. The primary objective of the Treasure Trove Act was to address the issue of treasure hunting, while also establishing regulations about the legal handling of valuables discovered by unintentional excavation. James Burgess, in his capacity as Director General, issued two directives: one prohibiting any individual or organization from conducting excavation activities without obtaining prior clearance from the Archaeological Survey, and the other barring officials from selling or getting rid of antiquities that they have discovered or attained without the government's permission. The Indian Museum Act, also known as Act XX of 1814, was enacted in 1814 and became effective.

The Ancient Monuments Preservation Act of 1904 in India laid a significant legislative milestone intended for safeguarding the country's rich cultural heritage. As it was introduced during British colonial rule, this act mirrored the efforts made in the United Kingdom to protect ancient monuments and archaeological sites.

This act provided a legal framework for identifying, preserving, and conserving India's ancient monuments, including historical structures, ruins, and archaeological remains. The Act empowered authorities to designate certain sites as protected monuments, enabling them to enforce regulations to prevent destruction, damage, or unauthorized alteration of these monuments. This legislation played a crucial role in the preservation of India's diverse cultural heritage, contributing to the understanding and appreciation of its ancient past

The administration encountered a very challenging predicament in the Madras Presidency when it came to designating sites as 'protected' under the 1904 Act. The proportion of religious constructions to secular ones was imbalanced. The former group was more in number than the latter group. According to Section 5 of the Act, the trustees or owners were to establish a formal agreement with the government.

The fundamental provisions of the contract stipulated that the trustees would ensure proper maintenance of the monument, refrain from leasing it for residential use, and abstain from selling the monument or any land within a 100-foot radius on all sides. Additionally, the government would assume responsibility for expenses related to major repairs, however, the trustees will fund the routine maintenance. Nevertheless, the

circumstances exhibited variability in several cases. The arrangement, by Section 5 of the Act, was formed to meet the specific needs of maintenance of the monument. The temple trustees and the government collaboratively drafted the provisions of this Act. However, many of these temples were not included in the Act due to their unwillingness to participate in an agreement.

Temples of significant architectural or historical importance were sometimes included in the Act, along with other enduring provisions, as shown by the Jvaraharesvara temple in Kanchipuram. The Nattukottai Chettiars, acting as representatives of the trustees, have carried out restoration work on the temple. Upon government intervention, the superstructure was completely dismantled. Due to its architectural significance, the temple was safeguarded from destruction. However, any future repairs to the temple need the approval of the archaeological officer. The Rameswaram temple was not placed within the purview of protection. Nevertheless, the trustees were planning to carry out renovations, this proposition faced strong opposition from the devotees who traveled to the temple from people as far away as Kashmir. The government granted the temple officials permission, subject to some limitations.

In 1907, a conservation strategy was established to carry out preservation efforts on historical landmarks. Due to the many types and characteristics of monuments, it was not possible to establish a comprehensive approach. The statement declares that conservation work should be carried out while considering the characteristics of the building, considering its unique qualities, and comparing them to others.

The monuments were categorized into three groups: those in excellent condition, those that may be preserved with little repairs, and the last group, which consisted of monuments in a deteriorated state. When carrying out repairs, it is important to constantly consider the worth of the original material, since the authenticity is in the original fabric. Additionally, it was indicated that pictures should not be substituted if their original placement is unknown or if they are absent or impaired. Instructions were provided for the creation of cost estimates and for overseeing construction projects. Before commencing any work, the engineers from the Public Works Department were required to submit their estimated budget to the archaeological surveyor for approval. The act of dismantling any preexisting building by the Public Works Department without obtaining prior authorization was a matter of concern.

The archaeology department had exclusive authority to determine the disposal and eventual reutilization of the old material. Regarding 'living monuments' (monuments still being used for their original function), there was a recognition of the need to repair them more extensively based solely on archaeological reasons. Although this practice was used in southern India, there was little intervention.

A set of regulations was established in 1893 to govern the deciphering and publishing of Indian inscriptions. It was required to disclose all of these findings to Hultzsch. The purpose behind these laws was to create a centralized authority and implement consistent standardization in the gathering and broadcasting of the inscriptions. In 1898, the regulations were eased, and a suggestion was made to invite honorary epigraphists from other provinces who would have the power to create inscriptions for *Epigraphia Indica*. Both surveyors and skilled epigraphists were appointed. In addition to Hultzsch, the other participants were responsible for documenting, categorizing, and collecting replicas of all the inscriptions within their respective areas, to have them published by academics in India and Europe. The annual reports were to provide just an initial record of new findings. The local authorities were responsible for informing the surveyor about the finding and location of the inscription. The Chief Commissioner of Burma provided precise instructions for the supervision of local authorities, along with a memorandum outlining the techniques for obtaining impressions. The outcomes are beyond expectations.

The excavation progress was hindered due to the use of an unscientific technique, resulting in delayed advancement. Marshall proposed that private organizations may conduct excavations, a suggestion that Lord Curzon strongly opposed; "We want to avoid an individual who is passionate about the continent and is holding a digging tool. We should conduct our excavations at our designated locations." The government considered the Rs 2000/- spent on the Adichchanallur excavations legitimate since the value of artifacts discovered during the excavation was sufficient to compensate. Exclusively replicated items were intended to be sent to other museums. The surveyors were to be appointed to official positions in the provincial museums to facilitate the gathering, classification, and publishing of antiquities. This would establish an efficient method for conducting more organized collections based on scientific principles and exert a certain degree of centralized oversight, which was previously absent. Each surveyor was given funds to acquire antiquities, particularly those necessary for a certain study area. The administration in South India established a clear and strategic direction for their beliefs and practices, even though many of the sites were actively used as temples.

In addition to his role in governing the kingdom, the king was also responsible for overseeing the administration of the temples. However, he delegated the task of oversight to his officials. Nevertheless, on rare occasions, he would intercede when there were indications of mismanagement. Officials of this kind were appointed during the Chola era and their tenure persisted till the arrival of the British.

Therefore, according to the indigenous rulers, it was their responsibility to safeguard and administer sacred establishments. This role was authorized by religion and also because the foundation of the state was theocratic. Initially, the British did not have a pre-established strategy of exerting control, supervision, and administration over the religious institutions of the local population. In contrast to the preceding phase, the second period documents instances of a more intimate connection between the corporation and the local

religious institutions. This was a result of the firm taking on various tasks about these organizations. The government oversaw the properties of the pagodas primarily to ensure that the assets were allocated in conformity with the provisions of the completed documents. These measures were implemented not merely to strengthen their authority but also to enhance their income. Occasionally, the government allocated funding to pagodas and mosques to maintain their facilities. As the company progressively took on the duties of upholding law and order, gathering revenue from the temples and allocating a portion of it for the state, mediating in conflicts, overseeing, supervising, and controlling the religious establishments, and ultimately providing them with financial support, the government managed to some degree to solidify its authority.

The historical relationship between the company's government and religious organizations from 1600-1839 illustrates deliberate endeavors by the government to progressively regulate and oversee the endowments. Therefore, from 1839 onwards, the English adhered to the Indian concept of kingship, which required the monarch to publicly declare his faith and ensure the preservation and support of the people's religious institutions. Nevertheless, the corporation did not directly assume the responsibility for managing the religious institutions. Hence, by assuming the responsibility of safeguarding and overseeing the religious establishments, the firm established an administrative atmosphere that was in line with the required political stability. After 1839, a new movement emerged that led to a shift in the government's attitude towards temple endowments. The directors expressed their belief that the tolerance and legal safeguarding of religion should never be transformed into support for anything that contradicts the principles and customs of Christianity.

Following India's independence and the enactment of the Constitution of India, the assignment of responsibilities assumed a lasting form. The allotment, by the Seventh Schedule, was divided into three groups: ancient monuments and archaeological sites of national significance, those of state significance, and those that did not fit into any of these categories. According to the Ancient and Historical Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act of 1951, all ancient and historical monuments, as well as historical sites and remains protected by the Ancient Monuments and Preservation Act of 1904, were officially designated as monuments and sites of national significance. A total of 450 monuments and sites from the erstwhile Indian states have been added to the national list. Under the State Reorganisation Act of 1956, more monuments and archaeological sites were officially designated as having national significance. The Ancient Monuments Preservation Act of 1904 was updated to align with the new constitutional changes. This resulted in the enactment of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act of 1958, along with its corresponding Rules in 1959. The primary objectives of the Act of 1958 were to save ancient and historical monuments, archaeological sites, and significant national remnants, to control archaeological excavations, and to provide protection for sculptures and similar carvings.

The AMASR Act of 1958 mandated that all monuments and sites previously designated as nationally significant under the 1951 and 1956 Acts would be subject to the jurisdiction of this Act. The legislation allows for the addition of new monuments and sites, as well as the removal of protection from existing sites if necessary. It grants the government the authority to intervene if owners of monuments or sites refuse to cooperate. The responsibilities that previously lay with state & district administrative officers will now be transferred to ASI officers. The law prohibits construction within protected areas and regulates construction, mining, quarrying, and excavating near protected monuments. Additionally, it authorizes the Archaeological Survey of India to conduct excavations in areas that are not currently protected. In 1992, the AMASR Act was modified to provide that a 100-meter area around the protected area should be designated as 'prohibited'

References:

1. Acharya, P.K. 1944, *An Encyclopedia of Hindu Architecture*, Government Press, Calcutta.
2. *Ancient India*, Bulletin of the Archaeological Survey of India, New Delhi.
3. Brihatsamhita, LV,2, as quoted by Stella Kramrisch, *The Hindu Temple*, I.P, 139, 1946.
4. Devakunjari, D. 1979, *Madurai through the ages*, Madras Society for Archaeological, Historical, and Epigraphical Research, Madras.
5. Hari Rao V.N., 1961, *Koilar Olugu (The chronicle of the Srirangam Temple with historical notes)*, Rochouse and Sons Private Limited, Madras/Tirumalai Olugu (Tirumalai Temple Chronicle) pub K. Balasundara Naicker, TTD22.
6. Meister, W Michael and M.A. Dhaky (Ed), 1983, *Encyclopaedia of Indian Temple Architecture - South India: Lower Dravidadesa, 200 B.C. - A.D. 1324*, American Institute of Indian Studies, University of Pennsylvania Press, Delhi.
7. Michell, George. 1977, *The Hindu Temple. An Introduction to its Meanings and Forms*, Paul Elek, London.
8. Raman, K.V. 1975, *Sri Varadarajaswami Temple - Kanchi*, Abhinav Publications, Delhi.
9. Soundara Rajan, K.V. 1982, *India's Religious Art — Ideas and Ideals*, Cosmo Publications, New Delhi.
10. Y. Subbarayalu, "The Cola state", *Studies in History*, Vol IV, no 2.