

# A conceptual framework to approach conservation of Indian modernist heritage

Vaisali Krishna Kumar

University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas

**ABSTRACT:** Preservation community over the last fifty years have developed philosophical and technical competence in managing various cultural heritage. However, it is yet to come in terms with the challenges pertaining to Modernist architecture, the latest to come under the umbrella of 'heritage'. Conserving Modernist Heritage involves many technical and philosophical challenges. Lack of recognition and protection, absence of a shared methodological approach, dearth of public appreciation, obsolescence in term of functionality, sustainability and adaptability are some of the challenges that needs to be tackled while dealing with built heritage of the Modernist era. The transplantation and development of modernist architectural principles in every country was deeply influenced by the socio-political and economic agenda of the country. Therefore, concepts of heritage conservation require to be flexible in interpretation and region specific with respect to Modernist heritage. A conceptual framework needs to be developed with full understanding of the socio-economic, cultural and historical contexts of the region/country under study. This paper aims to develop a conceptual framework to determine appropriate conservation approach for Modernist Heritage in India. Modernist Heritage in India does not qualify the 'age' criteria defined by heritage legislations of the country and hence is not protected by the government. With the loss of one of its most significant and iconic modernist landmark, the need for an immediate framework becomes indispensable in India to recognize and protect the remaining significant Modernist heritage resources. The paper is based on a systematic literature review of pertinent sources on concepts such as heritage value assessment, community engagement, authenticity and its association with Indian Modernist heritage. The paper deduces that in order to develop an approach to recognize and protect Modernist Heritage of India, a collective understanding is critical, which involves three key dimensions: established/ existing frameworks, experts and local community.

**KEYWORDS:** Modernist Architecture, Cultural Heritage, India. Historic Preservation, Document Analysis

## INTRODUCTION

The clandestine razing of the Hall of Nations in Delhi on April 24th, 2017, a mere three days before a hearing in Delhi High Court to preserve it, shocked both local and international architecture communities. The structure was inaugurated in 1972 to commemorate twenty-five years of India's independence. The demolition of this historically significant and iconic modernist structure testifies to the threat faced by all other modernist buildings and sites in India. The Hall of Nations located on the grounds of Pragati Maidan was designed by the architect Raj Rewal and the structural engineer Mahendra Raj and was the largest concrete space-frame structure in the world.

The architectural heritage of the modernist era in India is a significant part of its cultural landscape, but it does not meet the one-hundred-years 'age' criteria defined by India's heritage legislation and hence is not protected by the government. The sites on which many of the significant modernist structures are located have also grown in value and now attract new functions and development opportunities, increasing the pressure to demolish these structures. The question is, how can we effectively preserve the architectural heritage of the modernist era given the lukewarm public acceptance of the style and the lack of a comprehensive philosophical approach to it? Heritage preservation communities over the last fifty years have developed philosophical and technical competence in managing various cultural heritage sites around the world. However, they have yet to achieve similar standards when considering modernist architecture. Conserving modernist heritage involves many technical and philosophical challenges such as the lack of explicit recognition and protection standards, the absence of a shared methodological approach, the dearth of public appreciation, and their obsolescence in terms of functionality, sustainability, and adaptability. The transplantation and development of modernist architectural principles in every country are deeply influenced by the socio-political and economic agenda of the people in power. Therefore, 'established' or 'accepted' concepts of heritage conservation and preservation need to be flexible to allow for local and regional interpretations.

This paper attempts to develop a conceptual framework for this purpose by looking at some central concepts vis-à-vis heritage and how it impacts conservation of Modernist heritage in India. The main concepts that would be discussed below are heritage value assessment, authenticity and local community. The first section of the paper discusses some concerns and issues regarding preservation of modernist heritage in general and in India, underpinning the problem the paper attempts to address. The paper concludes with a proposed conceptual framework that could be used to evaluate modernist heritage and aids its sustainable management.

## 1.0 PRESERVATION OF MODERNIST ARCHITECTURE- ISSUES AND CONCERNS

The concept of Modernity is understood in various ways by different practitioners, historians and other experts. Hilda Hayden (1999) in *Architecture and Modernity*, defines Modernity as “ a condition of living imposed upon individuals by socioeconomic process of modernization. She postulates that the experience of modernity involves a rupture with tradition and has a profound impact on the ways of life and habit.” Modernity is that quality that makes the present different from the past and paves new direction to the future, usually by rejecting the inheritance of the past. In *All that is Solid Melts into Air* (1988), Marshall Berman’s studies the dialectics of modernization and modernism. He claims that the turbulence of modern life has been fed from many sources. These are, the discoveries in physical sciences that changed our image of the universe and our place in it; the industrialization of production- which converted scientific knowledge into technology that helped create new human environments and destroyed old ones; human migration with several millions of people moving from their ancestral lands to build new lives; rapid urban growth; development in systems of mass communications; changing political dynamics with increasingly powerful national states striving to expand their powers; mass social movements of people challenging their political rulers and eventually developing an ever-expanding and fluctuating capitalist world market. Berman asserts that in twentieth century, the social process mentioned above brought in a turbulence into being and kept it in a state of perpetual becoming and termed it as “modernization”. These world processes have nourished a variety of visions and ideas that aim to make men and women both objects and subjects of modernization, to give power to change the world that is changing them, to make sense of the turbulence and own it. Berman states that these visions and values over the past century have grouped together under the name of “modernism”.

Modernism as a rupture from the traditional way of living emerged as an art and architectural movement during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, gaining momentum in the inter-World War period (1919-1939). The origins and evolution of modernist architecture are complex and have been widely discussed in architectural scholarship (Collins, 1965; Curtis, 2010; Frampton, 2007; Prudon, 2008). Post-WWII, changes in the power dynamics around the world, increased housing demands, and limited availability of resources catalyzed the opportunity for modernism to thrive. Society perceived the benefits of technology to create healthy working and living environments through experimenting with new materials and streamlining production processes. For war-ravaged Europe, the concept of moving towards a future without explicit references to historical precedents was compelling. Modernist architecture emphasized the functional, technical, and spatial properties of design rather than ornamentation or decoration. European modernists saw architecture as a means to improve the lives of people. In India, modernist architecture evolved from a British imperialist propaganda into a political tool used by the government to re-invent the newly independent country starting in 1947 (Chatterjee, 1985; Lang, 2002; Sriver, Srivastava, 2015). Indian modernist architecture, therefore, represented the technological innovation of a new-nation re-branded as an economical, educational, and industrial powerhouse, equipped to compete internationally. Modernist architectural principles were used to design and build structures catering to the growing housing and institutional needs of India as an independent country. Over the years (1930s-1980s) modernist architecture in India had evolved from the international modernist principles to adapt to the local cultural and climatic requirements as well as the design philosophy of the local Indian architects. This adaptation and evolution has resulted in modernist architecture that is unique to India.

A characteristic that distinguishes modernist heritage is the shortened time period between its creation and its need for conservation (Macdonald, 2011). The conservation needs of modernist heritage range from individual buildings (e.g. Sydney Opera House), to an entire city (e.g. Brasilia, Brazil) or a collection of works by a single architect spread across different regions (e.g. Louis Kahn, Le Corbusier). It is imperative to keep in mind that the commercial possibilities, public empathy, and technical skill set needed to conserve modernist heritage differ from region to region as do the philosophical attitudes towards building conservation(). Apart from the challenges mentioned above, other practical and philosophical challenges to conserving modernist works include the quality of materials used for the construction, such as concrete, plastics, synthetic paints, which have not necessarily aged well, complicate the determination of authenticity and integrity. Many modernist buildings also perform poorly against current environmental and sustainability standards. Both the general public and a significant portion of professionals and policy makers do not consider this heritage worthy of protection. Studies have shown that the established concepts and principles of conservation are ill-equipped (Orbasli, 2017) and need to be more flexible in terms of modernist heritage. A general framework such as *The Madrid Document* proposed by the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) cannot be used

directly in any cultural context without adaptation. This reiterates the fact that a framework needs to be developed on a country-by-country basis with full understanding of the socio-economic, ecological, cultural, and historical contexts of the heritage in question.

### **3.0. HERITAGE CONCEPTS AND MODERNIST HERITAGE – AN EVALUATION**

#### **3.1. Heritage and value assessment of modernist architecture**

The term 'heritage' has been associated with a numbers of items from buildings to culinary, from personal belongings to ethnicity etc., making it a 'conveniently ambiguous' and problematic concept (Lowenthal, 1985). Heritage is also seen as a set of relationships characterized by attachment to select objects, places and practices that is connected to the past in some way (Harrison, 2013). UNESCO has identified categories of heritage: Cultural heritage (Tangible and intangible), Natural heritage and heritage in the event of armed conflicts. Considering that a heritage becomes culturally significant to its custodian(s) based on the 'values' that is attached to it (Australia ICOMOS, 2013), the dimension of values and its various forms becomes important in the narrative of heritage. Early definitions of cultural heritage were merely individual monuments and buildings, often regarded as standalone with no relation with the surrounding elements. In contemporary conservation practice, cultural heritage is regarded to be a product of interactions between built environment and natural environment based on cultural interpretations by humanity (Nezhad & ed.al.,2015). With this expanded definition of cultural heritage, it becomes more significant to assess significance and determine the worthiness for conservation. Modernist heritage can range from individual buildings to entire city (Brasilia, Brazil) to collection of buildings and sites spread across many countries unified by its designer/architect. Recent understandings on heritage endorse that it has to undergo processes of adaptations to meet social needs instead of remaining 'frozen' or 'petrified' in time (Assi, 2000). With the ever increasing social and economic development needs of contemporary society, especially in developing countries like India, heritage must be conceived within the framework of development. This becomes even more relevant in terms of modernist heritage, which would be more beneficial to the society through adaptive reuse or continued use rather than 'monumentalization'.

Heritage is multivalent as it has different values ascribed at different levels, making this its most essential quality(Mason, 2002). To make the process of understanding and assessing the different values associated with heritage easier to comprehend, it was compartmentalized and categorized. Also, such a clear-cut classification and definition was assumed to benefit historic preservationists/conservationist, community and other important stakeholders in having a common dialect in which a conversation between them to express values they ascribe can be possible. However, such an approach can be problematic especially when community and other stakeholders are involved. Firstly, the various articulations of heritage values by different people are at some level different expression of the same qualities, for example the yardsticks used by an art historian, economist, sociologist and architect to describe the value of an object cannot be compared or translated to one another. Secondly, there can be differences in assessment of a particular value by different stake holders, for example, the economic value assessed by a corporate organization operating or owning a heritage site compared to a typical resident of the community will be completely different. A third challenge in categorizing and characterizing values lies in the fact that value is never constant, it changes from time to time and hence this should be considered to be an essential nature of heritage (Silva, 2015; Mehrotra, 2016). It is this subjectivity and contingency of heritage values that makes it challenging to assess and create a clear framework to evaluate them. Heritage value assessment is an ongoing process, where time, space, social and cultural experiences play a vital role in the potential diversity of the methods of valuation, making it site specific (Mydland & Grahn, 2012).

Comparing the various heritage value typologies devised by various scholars and organizations ( Reigl (1982); Lipe(1984) ; BURRA Charter( 1999); Frey(1997); English Heritage(1997)) , The Getty Conservation Institute(Mason, 2002) came up with a provisional typology of heritage values that comprises of all the values one could ascribe to a cultural heritage. However, a recent study re-examining heritage value typologies (Fredheim & Khalaf, 2016) concludes that the value-based theory is based on the incomplete understanding of values, and recommends a critical review and reframing of the value-based heritage discourse as necessary.

The applicability of using the aforementioned value categories to assess Modern Architecture need to be further investigated. Perhaps the incompatibility of the previous approached formalized to assess buildings and places of the Modern Movement probably resulted in the *The Madrid Document: Approaches for the Conservation OF Twentieth-Century Architectural Heritage*. The Document of Madrid (Burke & ed.al, 2011) was prepared by the International Scientific Committee on 20<sup>th</sup> Century Heritage(ISC20C) and currently limited to criteria for identification, conservation and intervention of architectural heritage. To Identify and assess cultural significance, the document suggests using 'accepted' heritage identification and assessment criteria, and the assessment must include interiors, fittings, associated furniture and art work, setting and landscapes.

Other suggestion in this respect include development of inventories of the architectural heritage of the twentieth century and comparative analysis to establish cultural significance. The document further details recommendations for managing change to conserve cultural significance, promote environmental sustainability, interpretation and communication.

Do.Co.Mo.Mo or the International Committee for documentation and conservation of buildings, sites and neighbourhoods of the Modern Movement, a is non-profit organization was initiated in 1988( DoCoMoMo website). The Mission of this organization are to be on a look out for important modern movement buildings under threat, knowledge exchange related to conservation technology, history and education, fostering interest in the ideas and heritage of the modern movement and to elicit responsibility towards this recent architectural inheritance. The organization claims to its success through its interdisciplinary approach and include 69 worldwide chapters. The Do.Co.Mo.Mo. US chapter register provides a criterion to evaluate significance of the Modern Movement buildings which is on the basis of six categories:( DoCoMoMo website): Technological merit; Social merit; Artistic and Aesthetic merit; Canonic merit; Referential Value; Integrity. The feasibility of the same six criteria for Indian examples need to be investigated and the possibility of building a national-wide online register with the assistance of the community needs to be assessed. Do.Co.Mo.Mo India chapter is currently underdeveloped and does not have any presence on the internet or social media scene at the moment. Involving the community and making them a valuable stakeholder in this mission could benefit the cause. The importance of community participation in the conservation movement on whole and preserving Indian Modernist Heritage in particular therefore needs further exploration.

### 3.2. Authenticity

Authenticity is one of the most fluid concept in the scholarship of heritage conservation. It has been the official qualifying criterion for the inclusion of sites in the UNESCO World heritage list. One of the fundamental objectives of heritage conservation is to safeguard monuments and heritage places for the present and future generations by preserving them in the most possible *authentic* form (Jones & Yarrow, 2013). Authenticity has been given multiple interpretations such as, it is the quality of cultural heritage that convinces us about its heritage value (Assi, 2000); or ability of an object or property to convey its significance over time (Labadi,2010). The *Madrid Document: Approaches for the Conservation of Twentieth-Century Architectural Heritage* (Burke & ed.al, 2011) defines Authenticity as “the quality of a heritage site to express its cultural significance through its material attributes and intangible values in a truthful and credible manner. It depends on the type of cultural heritage site and its cultural context”. This definition leaves enough room for case specific interpretation and adaptability when it comes to modernist heritage. Authenticity does not give any value to an object or property per se, nor can it be added to the subject. It can be revealed only as long as it exists, unlike values which is subject to cultural processes and changes over time. The Nara Conference in 1994 and the subsequent drafting of the *Nara Document on Authenticity* (henceforth referred to as the Nara Document) organized by Japanese government with the aim to better define the concept of authenticity and make the World Heritage Convention relevant to the diversity of world cultures.. The *Nara Document* states in detail that the assessment of the authenticity of cultural heritage is based on multiple attributes, including: Form and Design, Materials and Substance, Use and Function, Traditions and Techniques, Location and Settings Language, and Other Forms of Intangible Heritage, Spirit and Feeling, and Other Internal and External Factors.

Authenticity in terms of materialistic and constructivist approach is an intriguing debate. Over centuries, philosophers have discussed concepts of continuity, change and truth value, both of which are relevant in the notion of authenticity. The case of the ship of Theseus by Plutarch is often taken as an example to demonstrate the debate (Jokilehto, 2006, Labadi, 2010). In a study conducted to examine intersection between material transformation, scientific intervention and cultural value (Douglas-Jones, Jones, Hughes, Yarrow, 2016), it was understood that attention needs to be given to interdisciplinary approaches to comprehend the evolving role of materiality in heritage conservation. An interdisciplinary approach would be beneficial to understand the cultural implications associated with material transformation in heritage structures. For instance, in some cases material weathering and decay and accure ‘age value’ marking the passage of time and hence contribute to authenticity. In other cases, loss of materiality can be associated with loss of value or authenticity through loss of material or because of larger consequences of deterioration. In the context of modernist heritage or modernist architectural examples, the short-life span of their construction materials complicates determining the role of materiality in defining its authenticity. Recent, conservation practices have taken into account the social and cultural processes of heritage and turned away from viewing conservation as a material practice- which is particularly predominant in understanding modern architecture along with its complexities (Tait & While, 2009).

Even though, authenticity as a concept is important in itself, an equal emphasis should be placed on the importance of the procedures used to define what is authentic (Labadi, 2010). The practical applications of the guidelines on authenticity has presented various challenges. Authenticity is often crafted in the process of conservation by the different players on the basis of their expert practice (Jones & Yarrow, 2013). In their ethnographic study of conservation of Glasgow Cathedral Jones and Yarrow (2013) interacted with the

different 'players' like architects, masons, curators. It was observed that each player interpreted authenticity in a different form. Curators advocated for the Cathedral's historic fabric, Masons in the cutting of the material stone and Architects on the design of the building. In practice therefore, the maintenance of authenticity is a result of co-existence of various techniques deployed by each expert player. Jones and Yarrow suggests that locating the conservation project 'inside' or 'outside' the history, could also facilitate in resolving the material authenticity versus fabric authenticity dilemma. To discuss further on the practical implications of preserving and determining authenticity in preservation of modernist heritage, the case study of Frank Lloyd Wright's Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York would be apt. During its preservation process four major design challenges namely structural repairs, rain protection, fenestration upgrade and exterior colour issues, were tackled (Ayon, 2009). While design intent of the architect was given importance in some instances, historic fabric or *original* material was given in others and sometimes neither of the factors were considered, proving that a sole guiding principle cannot be used for preserving modernist heritage. In the research paper (Ayon, 2009) discussing the above case-study extensively, the author establishes that a new paradigm is not necessarily required to intervene in Modernist Architecture, but acknowledging the historic fabric vs. design intent dichotomy is required for analyzing them. The design intent become as important as historic fabric in of Modernist Architecture as it resonates with technical innovation and functional efficiency that characterizes them. As per *Madrid Document*, Modernist Architecture conservation standards need to compliment environmental efficiency, while intervening with these examples a sustainable preservation approach should be adopted. Such an approach would be able to replace authentic but poor-performing historic fabric with improved systems that retain the buildings historic character.

### **3.3. Local community and heritage**

Heritage and community share a symbiotic relationship with each other. However, when it comes to assessing heritage values it is the experts that take the lead with limited or no involvement of the public for whom it is conserved for. Assuming that the value that community inscribes to its heritage is different and often influenced by tradition, memories and place attachment; when compared to the experts' values, the need for a combined understanding and approach becomes evident.

In living heritage sites (heritage sites that are continually inhabited and used by local community) across rural and urban Asia, there is a continuing relationship between the community and its built and natural environment, hence decoding this relationship is crucial to discover how they have survived over the centuries (Sharma, 2013). However, this connection is overlooked and ignored in conventional conservation approaches until the 2005 UNESCO Convention, post which the concept of 'Living Heritage' has gained momentum (Wijesuriya, n.d.). *Living Heritage Approach* aims at empowering the community to make decisions for their heritage and focusing on a long term sustainability in heritage management.

Traditionally in India, views of experts which includes historian, historic preservationists, archaeologists etc. are considered to be the guiding directions towards formulating policies and guidelines. The local community is kept away from the scene and are often neglected in the whole process. This has led to the lack of awareness and motivation to protect their heritage among the people, which in turn harms the unprotected heritage. Understanding what communities consider their heritage is and what values are attributed to those heritage is essential (Silva, 2010) and cannot be emphasized enough. Community based heritage management has been extensively experimented by experts all around the world (Norway, Australia, UK for example) but not all have been a success story. Studies have shown (Hodges & Watson, 2000; Aas, Ladkin, & Fletcher, 2005) that involving the community in the decision making and implementation of the heritage management does not define their capacity to participate. though there is willingness among the people in the community to participate, there is also lack of faith in the ability of the community to do so among experts. But in a few cases, traditions rooted in community stewardship ensured that heritage sites valued by the community have been repaired and renewed for over thousands of years. Each cycle of repair, renewal and creation has served to strengthen community associations with the site and has enhanced its value for contemporary communities for example in Ladakh, India (Sharma, 2013). Appropriate skills need to be developed among the people which also includes awareness and training on the principles of heritage conservation and planning. This is where the capacity of experts and researchers become vital. Potential of the participants needs to be understood in order to determine how each member can positively contribute towards the initiative. High level of public awareness regarding the significance of heritage areas need to be carried out as the authenticity and integrity of such locales will be safer in the hands of those who holds pride as custodians of unique heritage (A Engelhardt & Rogers, 2009). Although, very often there could be conflict of interest between the community and the professionals in terms of what they consider valuable to maintain and preserve.

In India, the community participation in heritage management is limited with the Eurocentric top-down approach being followed till date. Though in many instances, the community has conglomerated against officials protesting the mismanagement of heritage properties, it has also been countered with vandalism and theft of cultural heritage (Thapar, 1984). The public's true and collective attitude towards their cultural heritage

therefore remains ambiguous. First step towards this would be to define the 'local community' and identify important stakeholders. Gauging this public attitude and willingness to engage in conservation activities become all the more valuable in the case of 'unofficial' or 'unprotected' heritage as Indian Modernist Heritage, especially due to the unpopularity Modernist heritage has drawn in other parts of the world.

#### 4.0. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

A holistic or collective understanding of heritage must include three key dimensions: the existing heritage framework, the experts in the field, and local communities. Therefore, when dealing with the conservation of any particular cultural heritage, we could investigate these dimensions. Knowledge from the existing framework could be acquired through published research on the heritage as well as international laws and charters. Knowledge from experts could be gained through published accounts and interviews with architectural and heritage experts with theoretical and practical knowledge in dealing with the concerned heritage. Knowledge from local communities could be garnered through questionnaire survey with local residents and groups to assess their general awareness about heritage, the values they ascribe to it and their willingness to engage in conservation activities. The key to this dimension is to define the 'local community'. 'Heritage agnosticism,' a concept developed by anthropologist Christoph Brumann (2014), could be used as a theoretical lens for this purpose. Heritage agnosticism was developed as a middle path between the referential path of 'heritage belief' and the overly critical path of 'heritage atheism' and avoids their disadvantages. Brumann derives this analogy from ethnographers studying religion who use this path to steer away from biases when interacting with informants with extreme religious views. Since a clear dichotomy exists in India in terms of empathy towards preservation of modernist heritage, this approach would be useful to determine the most significant and valuable modernist examples in a more rational and objective manner and to promote sustainable conservation management. An agnostic study of heritage takes into account some qualities of heritage that can be considered verifiable facts, such as age and rarity, from subjective qualities such as aesthetics. It also rejects the idea of heritage value as being intrinsic to the object or practices so labelled.

The three knowledge dimensions mentioned here: Knowledge from existing frameworks, experts and local community; are interdependent and should not be excluded in the process of heritage evaluation. The deficiencies of excluding one of these dimensions in the framework is discussed below:

- When *Knowledge from Local Community* is excluded

This situation is relatable to the current heritage management framework followed in India. The local community is alienated from the process of conservation and hence affects their attitude towards heritage places negatively, leading to theft and vandalism of cultural property (Thapar, 1984, p. 70). Also, the change in the social value ascribed by the community towards heritage environment as a result of contemporary living practices is left unexplored (Jones, 2016)

- When *Knowledge from Experts* is excluded

In the situation where the community is given complete power over their heritage places with the help of established frameworks, the meaning of heritage values and authenticity could be misinterpreted, miscommunicated or lost in translation. Also, initiatives such as improving public awareness on heritage and empowering the community to manage them sustainably could be severely affected.

- When *Knowledge from Existing Heritage Frameworks* is excluded

In a situation when local community and experts are given the control over the heritage management without the foundation of any existing frameworks and prior knowledge to guide, it could lead to a potential chaos. Philosophical conflicts, errors on the adopted approach, and delay in implementation are some of the potential bottlenecks that could arise.

The paper argues that in order to implement a holistic and sustainable approach towards heritage management, a *Universal Knowledge on Heritage* needs to be obtained. The *Universal Knowledge on Heritage* is a combination of the three dimensions of knowledge screened through the lens of Heritage Agnosticism in order to avoid potential biases. This conceptual framework is suited for Indian Modernist heritage because: 1) currently they are not recognized as heritage by the legal framework, 2) public awareness on the issue of conserving Modernist heritage is unknown, 3) there is a lack of common methodological and theoretical understanding on conserving them among experts, 4) shorter life span and other technical issues that are characteristic to Modernist Heritage – which demands a case-specific conservation approach.

## CONCLUSION

The conceptual framework discussed above is an attempt to decipher and make the existing 'accepted' heritage frameworks flexible and adaptable on a case-to-case basis. Heritage preservation community has lately accepted the value of multi-disciplinary approach towards conservation of modernist heritage and acknowledged it as one of their key points in the *Madrid- New Delhi document*. This echoes the need to view and evaluate heritage through multi-lenses and dimensions. Involving different stakeholders in heritage management and engaging them in preservation activities could not only improve the public awareness about heritage issues, but also encourage public-private partnership in heritage preservation. India has a mammoth task at hand in the recognition and protection of its modernist heritage, however, recent efforts by local and national agencies such as INTACH Delhi and ICOMOS India National Committee on Twentieth Century Heritage are in the promising direction. Future research needs to be carried out to test the *Universal Knowledge on Heritage* framework with suitable modernist heritage case-studies to fully understand its virtues and shortcomings.

## REFERENCES

- Al-Ragam, A. (2013). The Destruction of Modernist Heritage: The Myth of Al-Sawaber. *Journal of Architectural Education*, 67(2), 243–252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10464883.2013.817167>
- Australia ICOMOS. (2013). *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS charter for places of cultural significance 2013*. Retrieved from <http://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/The-Burra-Charter-2013-Adopted-31.10.2013.pdf>
- Ayon, A. (2009). Historic Fabric vs. Design Intent Authenticity and Preservation of Modern Architecture at Frank Lloyd Wright's Guggenheim Museum. *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, 15(3).
- Bhatt, V., & Scriver, P. (1990). *After the Masters*. Ahmedabad: Mapin Pub. Pvt. Ltd.
- Bronson, S. D., & Jester, T. C. (1997). Conserving the Built Heritage of the Modern Era: Recent Developments and Ongoing Challenges. *APT Bulletin*, 28(4), 4. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1504588>
- Brumann, C. (2014). Heritage agnosticism: a third path for the study of cultural heritage: HERITAGE AGNOSTICISM. *Social Anthropology*, 22(2), 173–188. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12068>
- Burke, S., & ed.al. (2011, June). Approaches for the Conservation of Twentieth-century Architectural Heritage, Madrid Document 2011. ICOMOS International Scientific Committee for Twentieth Century Heritage (ISC20C).
- Chatterjee, M. (1985). *Architecture In India*. Paris and Milan: Electa Moniteur.
- Collins, P. (1965) *Changing ideals in Modern architecture, 1750-1950*. London, Faber and Faber, 1965.
- Curtis, W. J. (2010). *Modern Architecture since 1900*. London: Phaidon..
- Frampton, K. (2007) *Modern Architecture: A Critical History*, 4th ed. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Fredheim, L. H., & Khalaf, M. (2016). The significance of values: heritage value typologies re-examined. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 22(6), 466–481. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2016.1171247>
- Grimwade, G., & Carter, B. (2000). Managing Small Heritage Sites with Interpretation and Community Involvement. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 6(1), 33–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135272500363724>
- Harrison, R. (2013). *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. New York, Routledge.
- Hayden, H. (1999). *Architecture and Modernity*. Cambridge, MIT Press.
- Jones, S. (2016). Wrestling with the Social Value of Heritage: Problems, Dilemmas and Opportunities. *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20518196.2016.1193996>
- Jones, S., & Yarrow, T. (2013). Crafting authenticity: An ethnography of conservation practice. *Journal of Material Culture*, 18(1), 3–26.
- Lang, J. T. (2002). *A Concise History of Modern Architecture in India*. New Delhi: Permanent Black: Distributed by Orient Longman Ltd.
- Lipe, W. D. (1984). Value and Meaning in Cultural Resources. In *Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage: A Comparative Study of World Cultural Resource Management System* (pp. 1–11). Cambridge University Press.
- Lowenthal, D. (1985). *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge University Press
- Macdonald, S., & Ostergren, G. (2011). *Developing an Historic Thematic Framework to Assess the Significance of Twentieth-Century Cultural Heritage: An Initiative of ICOMOS International Scientific Committee of Twentieth-Century Heritage* (p. 22). Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute.
- Mason, R. (2002). Assessing Value in Conservation Planning: Methodological Issues and Choices. In *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage* (pp. 5–30). Los Angeles. The J. Paul Getty Trust.
- Mehrotra, R. (2011). *Architecture in India since 1990*. Mumbai, India: Pictor.

- Mehrotra, R. (2016). Prologue: Imagining the future of conservation in South Asia. In K. D. Silva & A. Sinha (Eds.), *Cultural Landscapes of South Asia: Studies in Heritage Conservation and Management*. Routledge.
- Mydland, L., & Grahn, W. (2012). Identifying heritage values in local communities. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 18(6), 564–587. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2011.619554>
- Nezhad, S. F., Eshrati, P., & Eshrati, D. (2015). A definition of authenticity concept in conservation of cultural landscapes. *International Journal of Architectural Research: ArchNet-IJAR*, 9(1), 93–107.
- Orbaşlı, A. (2017). Conservation theory in the twenty-first century: slow evolution or a paradigm shift? *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556207.2017.1368187>
- Prudon, T. (2008). *Preservation of Modern Architecture*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Prudon, T. (2017). Preservation, design and modern architecture: the challenges ahead. *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, 23(1–2), 27–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556207.2017.1327193>
- Scriver, P., & Srivastava, A. (2015). *India: modern architectures in history*. Reaktion Books Ltd.
- Sharma, T. (2013). A Community-based approach to Heritage Management from Ladakh, India. In K. D. Silva & N. K. Chapagain (Eds.), *Asian Heritage Management: Contexts, concerns, and prospects*. New York: Routledge.
- Silva, K. D. (2010). Tangible and Intangible Heritages: The Crisis of Official Definitions. *HBRC Journal*, (Special Issue), 12–18.
- Silva, K. D. (2015). The Spirit of Place of Bhaktapur, Nepal. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 21(8), 820–841.
- Smith, L. (2006). *Uses of Heritage*. New York: Routledge.
- Stefaniak, A., Bilewicz, M., & Lewicka, M. (2017). The merits of teaching local history: Increased place attachment enhances civic engagement and social trust. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 51, 217–225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2017.03.014>
- Suarez, J. A. (1997). Modernism and Gender Trouble. *Cuadernos de Filología Inglesa*, 9–31.
- Thapar, B. K. (1984). India. In *Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage: A comparative study of world cultural resource management systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- UNESCO. (1994). The Nara Document on Authenticity. UNESCO World Heritage Centre.
- UNESCO. (2016, October). Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

## ENDNOTES

<sup>i</sup> *The Madrid Document: Approaches for the Conservation of Twentieth-Century Architectural Heritage* (Burke & ed.al, 2011) was prepared by the International Scientific Committee on 20<sup>th</sup> Century Heritage (ISC20C) and revised in December 2017 as The Madrid-Delhi Document during the ICOMOS General Assembly, New Delhi.