

ICES Research Papers

Producing the Present: History as Heritage in Post-War Patriotic Sri Lanka

Nira Wickramasinghe

INTERNATIONAL
CENTRE FOR
ETHNIC STUDIES



Research Paper No: 2
July 2012

Producing the Present:

History as Heritage in Post-War Patriotic Sri Lanka

This paper explores the consolidation by a patriotic post-conflict state of a notion of history reinvented as national heritage. The distinction between history as an analysis of the past and heritage was rarely made explicit in the public discourse of Sri Lanka. After the war ended the distinction disappeared entirely except in some rare university history departments. Heritage as we understand it, is present centred and is created, shaped and managed by and in response to, the demands of the present. It is to follow David Lowenthal, not history at all. While it borrows from and enlivens historical study, heritage is not an enquiry into the past but a celebration of it. The distinction between heritage and history is one of motive. Heritage is best understood as a claim, a special pleading. History in post war Sri Lanka has abandoned specialized journals to inhabit and flourish in theatre, film, videos and pamphlets encouraged by the patriotic state. Professional historians too have either left the public sphere or acquiesced in the production of a history/heritage. This study will draw from an array of sources and practices to develop an understanding of the ideological underpinnings of the new popular history/heritage.

Nira Konjit Wickramasinghe is a Professor and Chair of Modern South Asian Studies at Leiden University in the Netherlands. She was a professor in the Department of History and International Relations, University of Colombo, Sri Lanka until 2009. She has published widely on identity politics, everyday life under colonialism and the relationship between state and society in modern South Asia. She has pursued these interests through investigation into such diverse themes as politics of dress, civil society, citizens and migrants, and objects of consumption. Her most recent book is *Sri Lanka in the Modern Age: A History of Contested Identities* (C.Hurst, London and University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu 2006). She can be contacted at: n.k.wickramasinghe@hum.leidenuniv.nl

ICES Research Paper 2

**Producing the Present:
History as Heritage in Post-War Patriotic Sri Lanka**

Nira Wickramasinghe

International Centre for Ethnic Studies

July 2012

ICES Research Papers

© 2012 International Centre for Ethnic Studies
2, Kynsey Terrace, Colombo 8
Sri Lanka
E-mail: admin@ices.lk
URL: <http://ices.lk/>

ISBN: 978- 955-580-127-0

Printed By: Karunatatne & Sons (Pvt) Ltd

This research paper was commissioned as part of the Democracy and Equality Programme implemented by ICES with support from Diakonia, Sri Lanka.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Archaeological Survey of India	ASI
Baratiya Janata Party	BJP
Central Cultural Fund	CCF
Department of Archaeology	DoA
Department of Finance and Planning	FPD
Department of National Budget	NBD
Dutch Burgher Union	DBU
Galle Heritage Foundation	GHF
International Commission on Monuments and Sites	ICOMOS
International Commission on Museums	ICOM
Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam	LTTE
Ministry of Culture and Arts	MCA
Ministry of Defence	MoD
National Crafts Council	NCC
National Film Corporation	NFC
National Institute of Education	NIE
National Tourism Development Authority	SLTDA
Public Works Department	PWD
Royal Asiatic Society of Sri Lanka	RASSL
United National Party	UNP
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation	UNESCO
United States of America	USA
Young Men's Buddhist Association	YMBA

ICES Research Papers:

1. Krishnan, Sonny Inbaraj (2012), *Transition to Civilian Life of Teenage Girls and Young Women Ex-Combatants: A Case Study from Batticaloa*, ICES Research Paper 1, June. 2012

Producing the Present: History as Heritage in Post-War Patriotic Sri Lanka¹

The state – actually a shifting complex of peoples and roles...

Herzfeld (1997: 5)

Introduction

Walter Benjamin warned against the ‘appreciation of heritage’, describing it as a greater ‘catastrophe’ than indifference or disregard (Mathur 2007: 168). Indeed, heritage can be considered an essentially present-centred cultural practice and an instrument of cultural power. It is as much about the production of the present as it is about the reproduction of a past.

The changing fortunes and popularity of places and sites indicate that no site is inherently valuable as heritage. There is therefore no heritage per se and all heritage, as Laurajane Smith argues, is intangible (2006: 3). What make sites valuable are the present-day cultural processes and activities that are undertaken around them. It is through these constitutive cultural processes that things and places are identified as possessing meaning and value. As we will see in the case of post-civil war Sri Lanka, the choice in valorisation reflects contemporary cultural and social values, debates and aspirations (Smith 2006: 3).

What then is the hegemonic discourse of heritage “which acts to constitute the way we think, talk and write about heritage”? (Smith 2006: 11). This paper will explore the way this discourse has evolved in a post-war situation and the extent to which it has validated a set of practices and performances that inhabit popular, expert and state constructions of heritage.

For the purpose of clarity, and although I recognise that this formulation does not sufficiently take into account overlapping trajectories, I would like to argue that there are at least two main routes to the past: history and heritage, which share many commonalities but differ in a fundamental way. The purpose is not to idealise history as the true, pure method of inquiry and exposition of the past. Records of the past are indeed filtered by time and what is bequeathed to us are only a few traces. Few would contest the fact that there is no objective history where the voice of the author does not haunt the narrative. Most historians who admit that they cannot be objective at least try to be impartial. But where historians differ from producers of heritage is in their appreciation of the past as a truth that while imperfect and unachieved, is yet more a truth than a faith or belief, fixed and devoid of ambiguities. Mostly, the historian tries to convey a past open to inspection and proof following certain protocols recognised by all members of the guild. But as Chakrabarty (2000: 29-36) has shown, there are many knowledge asymmetries in the academic world, with scholars from the South unable to

¹ I thank Marina Carter, Anup Grewal, Sanayi Marcelline, Nilu Abeyratne and Sasanka Perera for their thoughtful reading of the original draft of this essay which enabled me to sharpen many of the arguments made here.

access the data produced in the North and often expected by journals and publishers to refer to works by Western authors while the converse is not demanded.

Today more than ever, nostalgia permeates heritage practices in Sri Lanka. This paper will first look at the return to heritage—a process that was not born in the post-civil war years but received more state sanction in the ideological setting of a triumphant Sinhala-Buddhist state victorious over un-national secessionist forces. It will then focus on the production of a hegemonic heritage discourse, mapping briefly the parties involved, and exploring in the final section heritage in practice as a site of contest. The paper concludes with some suggestions on possible ways of overcoming the weight of heritage.

Return to Heritage

In the new post-conflict patriotic state, President Rajapaksa promised there would no longer be minorities in spite of the fact that the idea of a multicultural society was embodied and endorsed in the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution of 1987. In the new ‘civic nation’ of the President’s speech, citizens/patriots would be ethnically undifferentiated, although he seemed to hold out the promise that all religions and ethnic identities would be respected. The idea of a civic nation is commendable but utopian. As Partha Chatterjee has argued, any attempt to construct ‘one people’ involves marginalising some (Chatterjee 1995). Furthermore, all examples of civic nations—the USA or France are cases in point—have anchored their liberal principles to a particularistic legacy. Most liberal democratic political cultures reflect the norms, history, habits and prejudices of majority groups, but they do usually attempt to foster a political identity whose political content makes it compatible with a variety of practices and beliefs. The new patriotism enunciated in President Rajapaksa’s speech also has little in common with the post-national or constitutional patriotism, which has been theorised as an alternative form of loyalty compatible with universal values but distinct from and superior to nationalism. It has little in common even with a civic patriotism that recognises that the public sphere cannot be neutral (Canovan 2000). On the contrary, the President’s vision merges nation and state and promotes a love of country based on a particular reading of the history and foundation myth of the Sinhala people, where all other groups—those formally known as minorities—are present merely as shadows and not as constitutive elements of a common political culture.

Today’s obsession with heritage in post-civil war Sri Lanka offers many parallels with the narrative reconstruction of the past that was promoted by an influential group of Sinhala literati of the early-twentieth century, who were located in an anti-colonial milieu critical of British rule yet partaking in the country’s immersion into a market society. There has been, in the last few years, a singular but clearly identifiable phenomenon in the public sphere which I would qualify as a ‘return to heritage’. This return has, moreover, been accompanied by a sharp decline in professional history’s popular relevance and national appreciation, which was

evident during the time of G.C. Mendis who wrote textbooks for schools as well as articles for the research community, and was translated in to vernacular languages. Globalisation and external enemies in the twenty first century, just like internationalisation and colonial rule in the early-twentieth century, have spawned a particular form of cultural response that sees a retreat from the teleological world history of the immediate post-independence decades. Heritage today plays a function similar to that played by myth a century ago: it appears to be apolitical, consensus-based, and formulates a seemingly unproblematic reading of the past. The other moment when heritage came to the fore as a state-endorsed discourse using nostalgia to legitimise the path of market-oriented development, was in the decades following the 1977 opening of the economy under the United National Party (UNP).

The Beginnings: Myth, Heritage and History

The first decades of the twentieth century witnessed in colonial Sri Lanka two principal routes of recounting the past that were sometimes distinct, evolving along parallel lines, while at other times were closely intertwined with one another. They can, for convenience sake, be called the historical path and the heritage path. Proponents of both modes of recovering the past affirmed that they conveyed a truth about the past, although they used very different strategies to reach their conclusions. The first group composed of amateurs and then professional historians, were explicit about their craft and methods and attempted to write an objective exposition of the past open to inspection and proof according to the accepted canons of the profession. The second group also made truth claims, but these were not supported by the type of evidence that professional historians would have considered as acceptable sources. These different trajectories towards unearthing the past have competed for public recognition as the true path. Over the years, the elitist academic register of history has clearly been superseded by the popular democratic surge of heritage as discourse and practice. Often the border between these two registers is blurred when professional historians cross it, creating a grey area where history and heritage practitioners reach an agreement of a sort. The lack of relevance of professional historiography is especially visible in the present regime's endorsement of heritage as the privileged means of reading the past.

The emergence of a discourse about heritage can be traced to the beginnings of anti-colonial stirrings in the late-nineteenth century and the growth of a national consciousness in Sri Lanka. Notions of authenticity were central to the growth of anti-colonial ideas, but the contours and features of the authentic varied considerably in time and space. Among the Sinhala-Buddhist literati, there was, in the late-nineteenth century, the idea of an authentic past that was grounded in the age-old hydraulic civilisation of the Rajarata. This dominant vision of the land of kings co-existed with the idea of an authentic for the present or 'for the immediate' founded on Kandyan signs and symbols. Interestingly, the Kandyan heritage was not superseded by the Mahavamsian dominant discourse of the nation but remained entrenched in the material culture of the peoples. In the colonial period, as today, there were clearly different

registers of heritage, assuming different roles and functions. Perceptions of authenticity differed according to which community, religion, region and class one belonged to. Many Tamils from the Jaffna peninsula, for instance, harboured a sense of heritage founded on affinity with South India, which was quite different from the sense of history and chronology grounded in the foundational book of the Sinhala, the Mahavamsa.² But among Tamils too, there would have been a sense of history, just as a sense of heritage or culture existed among Sinhala (Daniel 1996: 34).³ Alongside these visions of the past, existed many others: for instance, Christians' and Muslims' sense of the authentic past was deeply embedded in the history of their own faiths, a history external to the island in which they lived. By the early-twentieth century, the idea that there was a great and unbroken Sinhala past was widespread even among the non-literate classes. In 1903, in Anuradhapura, the capital of early Sinhala kingdoms, when the Public Works Department (PWD) took stones from ancient sites for their own use, people displayed an anger that revealed their clear identification with the past of Anuradhapura (Rogers 1987: 87). In the 1890s, the Mahavamsa was cited in petitions related to the protection of Buddhist sacred space and rituals, as evident in a petition to protect Bo trees that grew on the site of the Kalutara fort station (Rogers 1987: 100). Until the Mahavamsa was 'discovered' and translated from Pali to English by George Turnour, a British civil servant in the 1830s, British officials believed that Lanka had no real history recorded in authentic documents. In 1838, his text, which transmuted oral conceptions of history and erased in its translation notions of non-linear time and fantastic miracles, became the authoritative historical text of Sri Lanka. Alongside the research on, and translations of, the written chronicles of the island, archaeology was also breaking new ground. In the project of making the nation, pasts, invariably glorious, have to be declared lost to be recovered (Mitchell 2002: 191). The discovery of remains of ancient civilisations in the jungles prompted the first investigations. These remains confirmed in the mind of colonialists and nationalists alike the 'authenticity' of the histories related in the chronicles.

While the Mahavamsian vision of the authentic past has today become the central charter of Sinhala nationalist thought, this was not entirely the case in the early-twentieth century. Authenticity was sometimes sought out in events that predated those related in the Mahavamsa. For some Sinhala intellectuals, Vijaya was not a hero, but the 'archenemy'. In the 1930s and 1940s, the Hela identity upheld by the Sinhalese scholar Munidasa Cumaratunga (1887-1944), amounted in effect to a denial of the Arya-Sinhala identity forged during the religious-cultural revival. The Hela theory of the island suggests that long before the beginning of the lineage of kings recorded in the Mahavamsa, the Hela people had built up a great civilisation in Sri Lanka (Dharmadasa 1992: 262-86). The Hela myth was evocative of a

² According to the Vamsa literature, Sri Lanka is the *Dharmadvipa* (the island of faith) consecrated by the Buddha himself as the land in which his teachings would flourish. The Mahavamsa, a sixth century court chronicle states that on the very day of the Buddha's death, Vijaya—the founder of the Sinhala race—landed in Sri Lanka, as if to bear witness to the Buddha's prediction.

³ Valentine Daniel has argued that communities have different ways of approaching their past and therefore of writing their histories.

compelling need in the communal consciousness to sharpen the boundaries, particularly with regard to India. It was, however, the Vijayan myth that gave the island a centrality which no other myths could offer. The Vijayan myth had, furthermore, the advantage of being inscribed in the official history of the island, and seems to have gradually and un-problematically imposed itself as the most significant foundational myth of the Sinhala.

Roland Barthes suggests that myth, acting as “depoliticized speech (parole) does not deny things, that its function is, on the contrary, to speak about things simply. It purifies them and founds them in nature and eternity, gives them a clarity, which is not that of the explanation but of the statement” (Barthes 1957: 230). Nationalism, however, needed to rekindle certain material aspects of an authentic culture. With this purpose, rather than look back at the age-old and collapsed civilisation of the North Central Province, it turned towards still-surviving signs and symbols from another ‘ancient past’, that of the Kandyan kingdom, such as dress and performance as markers of an authentic and unspoiled identity. Indeed, the historical landscape of the Kandyan kingdom, the last kingdom to fall to the British in 1815, offered many possibilities for anti-colonial readings. In Tamil-speaking areas of the island, the past was conceived differently. Regional belonging too led to difference in identity between Tamils from Jaffna, the Vanni, Trincomalee and Batticaloa. Heritage, rather than linear ethno-history, was indeed, for long, ‘the mode of being Tamil’. Claims to part or totality of the land came much later and as a reaction to Sinhalese exclusivism. ‘For being Tamil’, suggests Hellman-Rajanayagam, no history of state is needed, but to justify existence it was (Hellman-Rajanayagam 1994: 54-59).

Modern Histories

In the early-twentieth century, the heyday of heritage as a mode of accessing the past, the discipline of history, as it is understood today, was still in its teething stage. The mid- and the late-nineteenth century was dominated by the oeuvre of a former colonial Secretary, Sir James Emerson Tennent (1859), whose first volume *Ceylon*, offered a near exhaustive narrative of the history of the island from the earliest times to the establishment and consolidation of British rule. Less known is William Knighton’s (1845) *History of Ceylon from the Earliest Period to the Present Time*. While Knighton accepted the events described in the Chronicles as factually correct, Tennent was more sceptical about some of the stories depicted in the Mahavamsa. A number of anglicised Sri Lankans followed the tradition begun by Tennent and Knighton, and produced histories of the island that often challenged some of the readings by British authors. James de Alwis’s (1823-78) *Sinhalese History*, was never actually published—a few of his chapters were serialised in newspapers—but he can be considered the first modern Sri Lankan historian (de Silva 1978: 1-12). In the Sinhala language, Dodanduwa Piyaratne Thero’s text of 1869 is considered the first textbook in Sinhala published for a non-monastic Buddhist school. Its content is revealing: following the core lessons that concern teaching the alphabet, guidelines to other lessons are included. They deal with ethical and spiritual dimensions of

Buddhism, establish Buddhism against the teachings about one single god (creator god), criticise non-Buddhists, offer moral advice, criticise other value systems and urge people to protect Buddhism from threats of *mithyadrushti* (false belief) (Sri Lanka National Archives, 5/63/150/(7)). There is no mention of historical figures, historical events, or periodisations in this particular text, where the student is invited to admire and emulate the Buddha rather than kings and heroes from the island. Interestingly, in the Jaffna peninsula, histories of the Jaffna Kingdom were being written. Casie Chitty wrote a history of Jaffna for the Royal Asiatic Society (RASSL). More so than Hindus, who had other means of identification with the territory, Christians felt the need for a secular history distinct from sacred texts like the *Sthalapuranas* and detached from the Saiva Siddhanta philosophy.

In the early-twentieth century, historical writing was represented by textbooks for schools, such as Louis Edmund Blaze's *A History of Ceylon for Schools* (1900) and the works of amateur historians such as Donald Obeysekere (1911), or Ponnambalam Arunachalam (1906). In the 1930s, a new generation of professionally-trained historians emerged, among whom were Paul Pieris, Fr. S.G. Perera, H.W. Codrington and G.C. Mendis. Mendis, in fact, can be considered the scholar who established history as an academic discipline in Sri Lanka. His thesis clearly departed from the mythic histories of Anagarika Dharmapala and his epigones, who took as incontrovertible facts the enunciation of the Chronicles. The reliability of the Mahavamsa was put in perspective: "Though it is on the whole reliable from the first century BC, it contains far too few details from the writing of history to satisfy modern requirements" (Mendis 1966: 75-76). In 1941-42, with the publication of Dr. Colvin R. de Silva's *Ceylon under the British Occupation 1795-1833*, the discipline of history was firmly grounded in the rules of truth and verifiability shared by historians in the western tradition of academic knowledge (Rogers 1990; Codrington 1939; Mendis 1935; Pieris 1913/14). From this time onwards, heritage and myth-based histories were relegated to a lesser domain of credibility and acceptance.

In Jaffna in the 1930s, we can also see a shift in the writing of history. Here the filtering in of new epigraphical South Indian sources changed the character of histories that had been mainly based on mythical chronicles, such as the Yalppana Vaipava Malai. Since the late- nineteenth century, the linguistic terms Aryan and Dravidian had been used in India to qualify people speaking languages that stemmed from Indo-European or Dravidian families. In Sri Lanka, Tamil writers began to refute the claims of some members of the Sinhalese literati of superiority based on their purported belonging to an Aryan race by using the term Dravidian (*Tiravitam*), to denote a place—the South—and a language as a race.⁴ An array of sources were mustered to emphasise quite forcefully the preponderance of Dravidians and Tamils in Sri Lanka from ancient times (Wickramasinghe 2006: 258-60). As Hellman Rajanayagam points out, C.Rasanayagam's *Ancient Jaffna* suggests that Sinhalese are a mixture of indigenous people, Aryans and Dravidians, and that Tamils are very closely related to the Sinhalese. Tamils, he argues, have been living in Jaffna from times immemorial (Hellman- Rajanayagam 1994: 71).

⁴ For a detailed account of the meanderings of the notion of Tamil race see Hellman-Rajanayagam, 1995: 132-33.

From Nostalgia in the Development Discourse to Heritage

From the 1930s onwards, when a measure of self-government was granted to the crown colony under the Donoughmore constitution, there was an underlying nostalgia for a bygone age where the peasantry was proud, prosperous, and embodied all the values that the modern age had destroyed. The colonisation of new land in the dry zone from the 1930s onwards was very much aimed at ushering in a new era in peasant welfare, together with the avowed aim of increasing the production of paddy. A few years after independence, a Kandyan Peasantry Commission report upheld the nostalgic image of the peasant economy centred on the eternal peasant, locked in heritage and firmly located outside history (Kandyan Peasantry Commission Report, 1951). The post-colonial state invested heavily in restoring ancient irrigation tanks in the North Central Province areas, constructing new dams in the Southeast (Gal oya and Welawe ganga); and finally, the large-scale project of organising the Mahaweli river and its affluent that started in 1968. The purpose of the project was not purely economic. Developmental discourse was enmeshed with nationalist underpinnings that emphasised the centrality of the Sinhala peasant, who became a 'sublime object' in the popular ideology. In the state ideology of the United National Party (UNP) government, which introduced a new economic policy based on economic liberalisation and an export-led economy, development through irrigated agriculture achieved a prominent place: as a reincarnation of the ancient, indigenous and Buddhist culture of Sri Lanka's golden age. The Minister of Mahaweli Development in the UNP regime, Gamini Dissanayake, declared quite candidly in 1983, "the soul of the new Mahaweli society will be cherished values of the ancient society, which were inspired and nourished by the Tank, the Temple and the Paddy Field" (cited in Tennekoon, 1988: 297).

The rural bias of politicians was not new: it had begun in the early-twentieth century, when a first generation of nationalists, looking for an issue that would give legitimacy to their claim to be 'representatives' of the people of the colony, found it convenient to champion the cause of the peasantry, who had suffered from dispossession of land in the plantation areas. They also romanticised the village and subscribed to the view that the source of strength and vitality of the ancient civilisation of Sri Lanka had been based on the rice economy (which itself had depended on an ingenious and intricate system of irrigation works). What was new after 1977, however, was the use of the state apparatus and the services of the business community to construct an image of society where the tension between the traditional and the modern was tactically mediated. The UNP regime was conscious that the modern development it was going to usher in had to be culturally mediated in order to be accepted by a fundamentally rural population. Newspaper and television advertisements made explicit references to the age-old local cultural practices of the people, who were always represented by members of the Sinhalese majority community (Kemper 2001: 62)⁵. Hennyake's work has shown that the agro-technology and insurance sectors were particularly involved in this process of embedding

⁵ Kemper has pointed out that only 5 percent of all advertisements portrayed minority communities.

development in the past. She cites the text from the advertisement of a fertiliser company from the post-1977 period:

Agriculture is a part of Sri Lankan heritage, its culture and tradition. Our ancient kings were inspired agriculturists. Our people here, from the time immemorial, combined an affinity for the earth with a talent for innovative technology. Anglo-Fert and Anglo-Chem are two companies who share a corporate commitment to the growth of agriculture in this country (Hennayake 2006: 123).

The UNP government was responsible for requesting the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) to provide guidance and assistance in managing the archaeological sites in the regions containing the three ancient capitals of Anuradhapura, Polonnaruwa and Kandy in 1978. Two years later, the director general of UNESCO, when appealing internationally for the funds necessary to safeguard the Cultural Triangle, reminded his interlocutors that “The Cultural Triangle... must be preserved for the sake of the world at large because it forms an integral part of man’s heritage” (cited in Silva 2005: 222). As both examples show the purpose of the state was to display its commitment to the deepest values of the nation in spite of pursuing an economic policy that called in all the ‘robber barons’, as President Jayewardene flippantly declaimed. Its dominant discourse was more and more embedded with a sense of the pastoral care of the material past, which would give the government the self-assigned right to radically alter the present. As Michael Herzfeld points out:

The static image of an unspoiled and irrecoverable past often plays an important part in present actions. It legitimizes deeds of the moment by investing them with the moral authority of eternal truth and by representing the vagaries of circumstance as realization of a larger universe of system and balance (1997: 206).

While the patriotic modernists of the early-twentieth century defined their ancient past as heritage in order to create pride in the nation in the making, and the liberal developmental state of the late-1970s used heritage to strengthen their claim to moral authority to transform an agrarian society into a market-oriented export processing zone, the post-civil war state of the twenty first century is using heritage for a purely political purpose, that of depoliticising its citizenry and muting any possible dissent. The construction of the present discourse is a process in which a number of different actors are involved.

The Construction of the Present Hegemonic Discourse Education

A number of actors, institutional, individual, state, non-state, local and international, contribute to the creation of a discursive field called heritage that, I will argue, has gradually merged with what is generally known as history. This new discursive field of heritage is shaped

through a number of discernible mechanisms: acts and practices of knowledge-creation about heritage, authentication of heritage through legislation and policing, giving value and taking away value through the politics of funding, and transforming heritage sites or objects through concrete acts of conservation. Technical and aesthetic experts make claims about the past and its remnants that are institutionalised in state and international cultural agencies. This discourse merges the grand narrative of nation and class, with the truth claims based on expertise and aesthetic judgment. Rather than focusing only on the different actors, it is also useful to understand the different processes and synergies between actors involved in the production of this field called heritage.

Education in Heritage

As Bourdieu has argued, educational structures aim at producing social agents worthy and capable of receiving the heritage of the group and capable of transmitting it in turn to a larger group (Bourdieu 1994: 6). Education in Sri Lanka is free at primary, secondary and tertiary levels. In 2010 there were 3,932,722 students following a primary and secondary education (Data Management Branch, Ministry of Education, 2010). A principle manner in which ideas about heritage are conveyed to a large public is through teaching in the school, university and *Dabam Pasala* (Buddhist Sunday school), and through textbooks. Indeed, textbooks provide a fairly accurate reflection of the manner in which history as critical assessment about the past has been superseded by a version of history that conveys a flat, uncontested and unproblematised story of the past (Siriwardena, Bastian, Indrapala & Kottegoda 1980; Wickramasinghe & Perera 1999). This process is not a recent one but has gained momentum after the war against the secessionist movement in the North and East entered its last and bloodiest phase.

In Sri Lanka, there has been a kind of obsession with history that explains why history textbooks have been so controversial. Until the 1990s, governments of the left and the right believed in the state's responsibility to produce a unitary text. Researchers at the National Institute of Education (NIE) and other commissioned authors wrote texts that conformed to the syllabus and to the directives of the ministry. Now, with the privatisation of production, anyone can produce a textbook. But, in the open textbook market it is still the same individuals who create knowledge for millions of children, the only difference being the fact that the authors are paid by publishers rather than the state and collect royalties on their books. Issues pertaining to heritage are introduced in history textbooks and Buddhism textbooks. History is now a compulsory subject up to the Ordinary-Level examination, and a cursory look at the texts produced by the NIE confirm the emphasis on monumental histories associated with royal lineages. History as a subject that interprets the past rather than glorifies it, is unrecognisable in these textbooks, which offer children a narrative of the glorious days

before invaders from India and colonial powers shattered the equilibrium of society ushering in modernity⁶.

The curriculum and texts used in schools have been scrutinised by scholars. Through this scrutiny, biases and flaws regarding the issue of origin and indigeneity are sometimes remedied. Reference to an Aryan colonisation of the island built around the myth of Vijaya, however, remains in school texts. The introduction of Aryans into the history of the country does not go back further than the nineteenth century, when historians and archaeologists conflated the Indo-European language Sinhala with a group of people purported to having brought the language with them. The confusion that persists in popular culture between language and ethnicity is not resolved in school textbooks, but the battle against stereotypes and the histories through which they were naturalised is still not completed. There are many sites of knowledge production where critical appraisals tantamount to betrayal of the nation.

Alongside grade-school history books, the syllabi and texts used for teaching Buddhism in *Daham Pasala*, should be looked at as one of the main sites of transmission of ideas about heritage to a younger and often gullible generation. The textbooks from grade 1 to grade 11 for Buddhist Sunday school are printed by the Department for Buddhist Affairs. Until 1961, it was the Young Men's Buddhist Association (YMBA), which had established a national network of Buddhist Sunday schools that provided printed texts and other educational resources (Gombrich 1998: 185) Later, successive government ministries took over this responsibility. Even a quick scrutiny of the present *Daham Pasala* texts that contain sections on Sri Lankan history are revealing of certain trends. Just as in school histories, important and 'great individuals' (*shrestha minissu*) are mentioned for their roles in promoting Buddhism. The history of Buddhism appears as one peppered with glorious deeds and exceptional individuals. It is a history full of omissions and chosen emphases, one which resembles the heritage/mythic mode of recounting the past rather than modern historiography. The exceptional individuals include, in Grade 8, various Buddhist priests and Colonel Henry Steel Olcott, King Asoka, and King Dhatusena; in Grade 9, Sumangala Himi, Walisinghe Harischandra and Anula Devi; in Grade 10, *Lakdiva Babalavu Kanthavo* (women who made the lakdiva/island shine); Mary Museus Higgins and King Dutugemunu and King Parakramabahu⁷. In Grade 11, one book called *Sasana Ithibasaya* (history of the Buddhist

⁶ I was Consultant Ministry of Education on Curriculum revision for schools (Chairperson of History syllabus committee) 2005

⁷ Henry Steel Olcott (1832-1907) was a former American military officer, co-founder of the Theosophist Society who helped create a renaissance of Buddhism in Sri Lanka. King Asoka was a king of the Maurya dynasty (third century BC) who converted to Buddhism and sent his son and daughter to Sri Lanka with the message of Buddhism. King Dhatusena ruled over the country in the fifth century after defeating South Indian rulers who held power until then. Wariyapola Sri Sumangala was a Buddhist monk of the early nineteenth century who helped the leaders of an anti-British rebellion in 1818 and was later convicted. Walisinghe Harischandra (1876-1913) was a social reformer and revivalist of Sri Lanka Buddhism. Queen Anula Devi was Sri Lanka's first ordained Buddhist nun in the third century BC. Mary Museus Higgins (1855-1926) was a theosophist and Principal of a reputed girls' Buddhist school subsequently named after her. King Dutugemunu is famous for having defeated the Tamil Chola King Elara who reigned from

order) is used as the main text. It gives a central place to the Mahindagamanaya—the journey of Mahinda, son of Emperor Asoka, to Lanka to introduce Buddhism to the country—and to the kings who created the temple complexes of Mahaviharaya, Abhayagiriya and the Jethavanaya (Sasana Ithihasaya 2010).

The term ‘history of the sasana’ or Buddhist order itself merits scrutiny, as it provides an alternative frame of reference to the same period in time that is taught in schools through the trope of the nation-state in the making. Obeyesekere (2006) who initially refrains from borrowing a term from the Western lexicon to qualify this sense of imagined community that existed in pre-modern times, has argued that pre-modern polities were “structurally disparate, yet ideologically imagined as a unified Buddhist ‘whatever’”. This ‘whatever’, he later shows, can be encapsulated in the term ‘sasana’, a Buddhist community created and imagined through different practices of concretisation, among which, the pilgrimage was central. Clearly, a student of the *Dabam Pasala* is being imparted with a notion of the past as the history of the sasana rather than that of the nation-state, a past made of feats performed by great individuals, monuments built to concretise their greatness, and actions that have served to consolidate the kings’ special relationship with the Buddhist sasana. If heritage is about the meanings placed upon artifacts or other traces and the representations that are created from them, what is dispensed in *Dabam Pasala*, or Buddhist Sunday school, is a heritagised version of history, in so far as the representations are presented as evidence that cannot be contested or questioned.

A further, recent, example of the way in which a certain discourse of heritage is entering the educational sector comes from the government’s compulsory training programme for new university students, led by none other than the military forces. There is a module entitled ‘History and National Heritage’. The topics of this module are, in order, the arrival of the Aryans, foreign invasions (who the foreigners are is not clear), and the development of Sinhalese kingdoms. ‘National heritage’ focuses exclusively on prominent cultural symbols of the majority Sinhala community, such as Sigiriya, the Temple of the Tooth, and the Aukana Buddha statue, and privileges monumental records of the past, as well as records from pre-colonial periods.⁸

Universities

At the University of Colombo, where I taught for nearly 20 years, student Buddhist monks in search of reassurance and certainties about a fictional, unmoving national culture in a world in constant flux, frequently opted for the study of history as an Honours course. They were, of course, disappointed to find that the courses we offered did not deal with history as heritage

Anuradhapura. King Parakramabahu of Polonnaruwa was the last king in the twelfth century to reign over a unified kingdom.

⁸ Course of developing the leadership abilities and positive thinking through the theoretical and practical training, A programme jointly organised by the Ministry of Higher Education and the Ministry of Defence, 2011 (See www.scribd.com/doc/57788381/Training-Manual-English-Version).

but rather turned all the preconceptions they held about the monastical history of the Chronicles upside down. History, as we taught it, was conceived precisely as the opposite of heritage studies. But this is not always the case in all the university departments of history, archaeology, heritage studies, Pali and Buddhist studies where notions of the past are being fashioned. The Rajarata University, a recently created institution of higher learning, is the only one that offers a course explicitly in heritage management, differentiating it from its programme in history. The older institutions, including University of Colombo, Peradeniya, Kelaniya, Sri Jayawardenapura and Jaffna, seemingly offer more traditional paths to the recovery of the past, namely through history, archaeology or Pali and Buddhist studies (see university websites). Course content is, however, less important than the manner in which a particular topic is taught. The same history syllabus can be presented in many different ways, depending on the lecturer's own approach and location in the political arena. Hence, history of the pre-modern era was for long taught at Colombo University in a heritage mode, with much emphasis on the uniqueness of its hydraulic civilisation.

There is, therefore, no uniformity in the content of knowledge on history and heritage imparted by these various institutions. Content depends on the type of programme from which it emanates and the individual lecturer's own interpretation of what needs to be valorised. A common feature is, however, that this content functions as 'expert knowledge', hence accompanied by an aura of legitimacy and sanctity. The criteria for belonging to this group of experts includes, first, educational qualifications, as generally an expert should hold a Ph.D. from a recognised university (initially non-Sri Lankan degrees were preferred but the lack of funding opportunities for training abroad have led to the growth of home grown Ph.D. programmes), or at least a Master's degree. 'The expert' should also be able to show an extended list of publications and membership on particular boards or projects at an international or national level, such as, for example, membership in the Society of South Asian Archaeology, or being a fellow of the Sri Lankan Council of Archaeologists. The heritage discourse that these institutions propound, influences the way heritage is managed and conserved. These practices are defined by the management and conservation protocols, techniques and procedures that all these heritage experts, historians, archaeologists, architects, museum curators and other specialists subscribe to (Smith 2006: 13).

Apart from universities, other institutions strengthen the experts' credibility as bearers of the power to determine what needs to be preserved or ignored from the past, by calling upon them to act as consultants. There are a number of ministries and government departments directly involved in the definition, production and preservation of heritage: the Ministries of Buddha Sasana and Religious Affairs, of Culture and the Arts, of National Heritage; the Archaeological Department, and those of the National Archives, National Museum, Buddhist Affairs, Christian Affairs, Hindu Religious and Cultural Affairs, Muslim Religious and Cultural Affairs and Cultural Affairs and Educational Publications. These institutions earn their power and credibility by displaying their activities in the print and audiovisual media, and by

otherwise making themselves visible before the public eye. Among them, the most prominent is the Ministry of Buddha Sasana and Religious Affairs, whose minister D.M. Jayaratne, is also the Prime Minister of the country. Under his leadership, when the new building of this ministry was opened in 2011, the boiling of a pot of milk at the correctly auspicious time was well covered by the state television and made news.

The government expenditure of some of these ministries is indicative of the importance placed in particular fields, although compared to the budget of the Ministry of Defence (MoD) all other budgetary allocations seem insignificant.

Table 1: Government expenditure by ministry/institution

Ministry	2008	2009	2010 (estimate) in Rs '000
Buddha Sasana and Religious Affairs	737,834	630,350	641,693
Tourism	37,928	44,778	
National Heritage and Cultural Affairs	1,158,555	1,200,102	1,230,149
Higher Education	10,272,847	10,641,332	11,993,360
Defense	163,791,599	183,122,022	191,287,930

Source: Department of National Budget (NBD), Department of Finance and Planning (FPD). http://203.94.72.22/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=334&Itemid=286

In addition to government ministries, a number of statutory bodies and non-state actors are concerned with particular aspects of heritage, either through teaching, research or funding conservation. These include the Central Cultural Fund (CCF), the Galle Heritage Foundation (GHF), the National Art Council (these might cover non-tangible heritage), the National Crafts Council (NCC), the National Performing Art Centre, and the UNESCO National Commission. Many experts sit on a number of these commissions, thus creating a self-fulfilling and self-perpetuating message on heritage that consolidates its own foundations rather than questioning them. Power and credibility are earned by these institutions in various ways as they target different audiences through a variety of projects. The CCF, which comes under the Ministry of Culture and the Arts (MCA⁹), gets much of its legitimacy from its interaction with important international actors and the conception of joint projects: for instance, a Mutual Heritage Centre was set up with the help of the Embassy of the Netherlands in Sri Lanka, thus cementing the power of experts in heritage management (see Cultural Heritage Connections website). Finally non-state actors play a considerable role in generating interest in heritage issues, among them the Royal Asiatic Society of Sri Lanka

⁹ Formerly the Ministry for Cultural Affairs

(RASSL), National Heritage Trust, Dutch Burgher Union (DBU), Archaeologists Association, local branch of the International Commission on Museums (ICOM), and the local chapter of the International Commission on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS). The mainstream institutional bodies involved in propagating a version of the past have to compete with an array of actors who are creating a new arena of popular understanding of the past, a past that is glorified and stripped of unpleasant events and which belongs to the domain of heritagised history. It gives people a safe place to think about the present and future.

Vying for Popular Appeal: Merging of History and Heritage in Popular Culture

The realm of popular culture has always been inhabited by accounts of history that have drawn from the chronicles, myths, and Jataka tales, and portrayed heroes and gods as the motors of history rather than in terms of social forces or class conflict. In post-colonial Sri Lanka, the gap between academic histories written in English and histories in the vernacular is not new, but was accentuated with the opening up of the economy and the emergence of a cosmopolitan class consuming Western modernity with a vengeance after a decade of austerity under Sirimavo Bandaranaike. The vernacular domain of culture had various layers, but a large group of people soon became adepts of an entertainment industry that pandered to their need for reassurance at a moment when the nation was threatened by secessionist anti-systemic groups. The trend became more pronounced in 2008, when the state began a full-scale patriotic war to re-conquer the East and the North from the Tamil rebels. In August 2008, the movie *Aba* was released in 38 cinemas across Sri Lanka. Counting the number of viewers in all cinemas screening the movie, leads to the impressive figure of 2,105,000, that is about 10 percent of the total population of the island. *Aba* was a production of EAP Edirisinghe, a group of companies that owned a popular TV channel called Swarnavahini. The film was directed by a popular film actor and TV personality named Jackson Anthony, and depicted the life of King Pandukabhaya, some 2,400 years ago. Pandukabhaya was the first king of Anuradhapura and according to the Chronicles, ruled for 70 years. The success of *Aba* led to other epic movies, among them, *Mahindagamanaya*, which was released by the National Film Corporation (NFC) on 18 May 2011, and has been seen, as of November 2011, by 1.6 million viewers. *Mahindagamanaya* relates one of the founding events/myths of the nation, that a son of Emperor Asoka was sent as an emissary to Sri Lanka to spread Buddhism, and that he was responsible for the conversion of King Devanampiyatissa and his followers to Buddhism. The popularity of the film epitomises the popular attachment among Sinhala people to the mythic story of the arrival of Buddhism embodied in an individual persona, Mahinda, about which, it must be noted, Indian sources have no traces (Mendis 1985: 2-3).

In 2008 television programmes with a historical slant also began to be aired at peak times. Among these, the *Maha Sinhale Vansa Kathava* (the great Sinhala chronicle) with Jackson Anthony as the anchorman, was the most popular. The programme brought together a panel of 'experts' who discussed an event of Sri Lanka's past, generally in a narrative and emphatic

style. Among the members of the panel there was sometimes an academic historian, but his/her interpretation was drowned by the dominant narrative of praise for the great feats of the kings and people of the past.¹⁰

In all these creative works, the tropes are the hydraulic civilisation and the aesthetic of the gargantuan. What is portrayed is not the past but Sri Lanka's fame, which is related to its past ability, for instance, to build stupas that are deemed exceptional mainly for being the largest brick structures known to the pre-modern world. Buddha statues too are admired less for their aesthetic value than for the fact that they compare in size with the Maligawila seventh century statue, 11 meters in height and considered to be the 'largest free standing Buddha figure' (see Tourism Sri Lanka website, tourism-srilanka.com). Monumentality is a central value in the production of heritage by state, business, journalists and consultants. The connection with the present is implicit. Today's patriotic state needs the 'signatures of the visible' (Appadurai, 2008) to construct a national imagination. Creative works, monuments and archaeology, as such 'signatures of the visible', create heritage products that consolidate national identity and the profile of certain political figures.

Fictionalised versions of the past for adults and children are also vehicles of a heritage discourse that draws on and naturalises certain narratives and, cultural and social experience, often linked to ideas of nation and nationhood. Historical novels are in great vogue. Jayantha Chandrasiri's novel, *The Great Dutugemunu (Maha Dutugemunu)*, which relates the glories of a third century BCE Sinhala hero who slayed the Tamil King Elara and recaptured the kingdom of Anuradhapura, is soon going to be made into a film. Some publishers, such as Visidunu Prakashakayo, give authors with a particular ideological leaning room to express their ideas in books for children. Srinath Ganewatte, for instance, who is part of the Hela Havula, a Sinhala literary movement that strives to replace Sanskrit words with *hela* or native words, wrote a series of market-oriented publications for young children on topics such as *Pandukabaya* or *Mibindu Pamineema* (Mahinda's arrival).¹¹ Visidunu reprints or high-selling books are distributed alongside scholarly books, such as archaeologist Senarath Paranavitana's *Puravidya Paryeshena* (archaeological researches), S.O. Kanagaratnam's *Madakalapuma Districckaya Vurthanta* (Stories from the Batticaloa district) or *Sithiyam Sahitha Puravidya* (archaeology with maps) by the early-twentieth century temperance movement leader, Walisinghe Harischandra and historical writings about great kings such as *Maha Vijayabahu* by Gunasena Gamage.

This new domain of commercialised knowledge-production on the past, leads either to a marginalising or a co-opting of older and more established sites of heritage creation. For

¹⁰ In the popular press it is no longer historians who discuss matters relating to the past but amateur historians who write without abiding by the protocols of the profession. Among these are Bandu de Silva, a former diplomat who frequently contributes to the English language newspapers *Island*, and *Daily News*, and Nuwera Eliya Hemapala and Ellawala Medananda who write for the Sinhala dailies.

¹¹ Interview with Nirmal Ranjith Dewasiri on 12 September 2011. All interviews for this paper were conducted and transcribed by Sanayi Marcelline whom I sincerely thank for her excellent work that went far beyond a simple collection of data.

example, CCF that was set up to finance the work of the Cultural Triangle Project in 1978 and to collect the income from entrance fees to the sites within the Cultural Triangle, also has a large publication programme that seems to be completely overshadowed by the more glossy publications by amateurs publishing with commercial publishers. The CCF represents the most scientific material produced by a government institution. Some of the publications, such as the *Paintings of Sri Lanka* series, which is composed of 30 albums published from the 1990s, are targeted at an expert readership. Only 200 to 300 books were published of each of these series, most of which are now out of stock except for *Sigiriya and Dambulla*, which has been printed for a second time. Each album is confined to a single temple or site that preserves significant mural painting, such as, for example, Kataluwa or Samudragiri Vihara. The albums are authored by a trio of scholars of international repute, Nandana Chutiwongs, Leelananda Premathillaka and Roland Silva. Apart from targeting expert readers, however, many works in Sinhala and Tamil are written especially for visitors to the cultural triangle sites, bringing new insights from the local scholars who author them—some of whom have gained first-hand knowledge on the sites by being involved in excavation and conservation programmes. Among the best sellers are *Sigiriya City Palace and Royal Garden*—Senaka Bandaranayake (published in 1999, and reprinted in 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2009), and *Cultural Triangle of Sri Lanka*, Vol. I and II (volume 2 is not available but volume I published in 1993 was reprinted in 1995, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006). Research publications in Sinhala and Tamil, such as *Ape Urumaya I-II* (Our Heritage), would only have a limited readership. Some valuable work, such as the Vihara Vamsa publications written in Sinhala, provide descriptions of some important Buddhist temples in Dambadeniya, and are authored by learned village monks and knowledgeable persons in the areas. But these also have a very limited readership and virtually no impact in the knowledge-production on the past.¹²

The CCF has also published a children’s literary series focusing on heroes, kings such as Parakramabahu, and sites generally around hydraulic tanks. This series seems to be a half-hearted attempt to compete on the same ideological plane as commercial children’s books. Today, it is clear that the public idea of what constitutes the past is fashioned in a vibrant commercial environment where publishers, authors, film and teledrama makers, using the print media as well as visual technologies and the internet and harbouring Sinhalese nationalist ideas, reproduce the monumental, most often exclusive, personality-oriented vision of the past as heritage that the state apparatus is conveying through educational institutions. This vision is, however, contested on occasions by dissenting views among the hegemonic discourse, as well as by members of communities that are excluded from this dominant vision.

¹² Annaruwe Vijayasundaramaya - Ven.Pallevele Ananda; Bihalpola Veheragala - Ven.Nakkawatte Ratanapala; Dambadeniye Vijayasundaramaya - Ven.Narangoda Sanghananda; Kaudumunne Indasararama - Ven.Dunumale Medhananda; Metiyagane Mayurawati Viharaya - Ven.Galagama Atthadassi; Murutange Sri Silabimbaramaya - Ven.Kandangamuve Piyaratana.

Heritage in Practice: Contests and Dissent

The past that was written about by professional historians in academic books and peer-reviewed journals and presented to fellow historians in academic congresses, is today performed as heritage for a wide and democratic public. The transformation of history into heritage must also be understood as its transformation from a selective and individualistic practice into a public performance that takes many shapes through acts such as visiting, interpreting and especially managing and conserving. Heritage is a discourse that becomes practice through conservation and management. The move towards a consensus view of the past is not without hurdles, especially when this move is concretised into practices of transforming the landscape of the country. The process of heritagisation of history unfolds through the construction of spaces. This process opens up the possibility of negotiation over a range of identities that sometimes become conflictual, as heritage is involved in the production of identity.

Ideologies in Spaces: The Contest over the Meaning of Sites

One initiative of the National Tourism Development Authority (SLTDA)¹³ is the Ramayana Trail, which takes people to 52 sites related to the epic, including the garden where the abducted Sita was imprisoned by Ravana. The Tourist Board started this initiative in 2007, the aim being to attract tourists from India in search of an authentic historical experience. In 2009, after the civil war ended, 4,000 Indian tourists arrived and numbers have been growing since. The Royal Asiatic Society of Sri Lanka (RASSL), especially its director, Susantha Goonetilleke, were vehemently against what Goonetilleke saw as a resurrection of a fictional trail based on no historical evidence, for purely commercial reasons. In a letter to the minister of tourism, society members denounced the trail as “a total travesty and a future danger for the territorial integrity of Sri Lanka as there is no historical evidence whatsoever about Rama and Ravana”. The Tourist Board was castigated as having fabricated inscriptions for the consumption of gullible tourists (*Hindustan Times*, 2009). There were other reasons apart from the championing of evidence-based historiography that led RASSL to denounce the Ramayana trail. Among these were a fear of a growing Indian influence in the country and anxiety that the Ramayana story, if taken as fact, appeared to confirm an Indian presence predating the arrival of Vijaya and the founding of the Sinhala people.

Professor S. Pathmanathan’s position epitomised that of the academic community vis-à-vis the trail: “I do not doubt the historicity of Ram. But the sites have no connection to the epic. I don’t think there is any evidence (to connect). One should not mix history and literature” (*Hindustan Times*, 2009). Unlike in India, where there was often collusion between the interests of scholars associated with the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) and popular histories, a forum strongly supported by the Baratiya Janata Party (BJP) and Sangh Parivar, in Sri Lanka, historians even of a nationalist cue disqualified certain claims to knowledge as not being

¹³ Formerly the Tourist Board of Sri Lanka

‘proper scientific knowledge’. In the late 1960s-70s in India, there was, in fact, a near-wedding of ASI interests to Hindu extremism, when sites such as Hastinapura were chosen for excavation in an attempt to authenticate epics like the Mahabharatha through archaeology, for political rather than commercial reasons. In Sri Lanka, by contrast, while political motives of consolidating an autonomous Sinhala identity with roots that went as far as Ravana’s reign existed, they were secondary. The possible outcomes of such claims, when they were made, were difficult to fathom. In India, the BJP and its Sangh Parivar claimed that ‘scientific excavations’, completed under the watchful eyes of the ASI, represented the ‘true’ unbiased history of an Aryan India, an assertion that directly contributed to the anti-Muslim sentiment in relation to the buildings in Ayodhya (Johnson-Roehr 2008). In Sri Lanka, the Ramayana Trail controversy shows that a filtering of useful and unthreatening myths is done by protectors of the patriotic nation-state, who do not hesitate to enlist positivist history to debunk the claims of a heritage narrative that does not conform to the dominant vision.

Contest over Place/Sites

Heritage is, to a certain extent, about the promotion of a consensus version of history by state-sanctioned cultural institutions and elites to regulate cultural and social tensions in the present. It can also, however, be a resource to challenge the stasis and the received values by subaltern groups. As such, it can be a progressive notion, a way of reworking meanings of the past, challenging the ways people and things are perceived. It can be about negotiating new ways of being and expressing identities (Smith 2006: 4).

Sites and landscapes provide the terrain for these conflicting claims to meet. Memory indeed requires a display, an articulation in objects or representation to give it meaning. Where nostalgia for a particular past becomes embodied, it transforms places. One then sees a concretisation of ideologies, as they are embedded in landscapes. The peculiar power of landscapes is inherent in the fact that they are visual, material forms. Materiality makes them appear neutral as mere traces of history. In Sri Lanka, the origin of historical landscapes is rarely questioned, they become naturalised. For example, who would contest the notion of a sacred city and Anuradhapura’s claim to such status? The politically-laden and socially-conditioned processes that actually produced the landscapes are obscured.

The post-conflict state has taken a determined stance in the consolidation of a notion of glorious national heritage through various performances. In June 2010, the *Daily News* reported thus,

The Jaya Sri Maha Bodhi Development Fund will conduct Hele Bodu Urumaya Exhibition, an exposition of sacred Buddha Relics and ashes of King Dutugemunu at the Jaya Sri Maha Bodhi premises in Anuradhapura, from June, 24 to 27. The organizers expect over 1,000,000 viewers at the relics exhibition. Ashes of King Dutugemunu were excavated from Dakkina Stupa in

1946 by the Archaeological Department and proven genuine scientifically
(Daily News 2010)

Dakkina Stupa had been honoured for centuries by local people, not as the tomb of Dutugemunu but as that of King Elara, the Tamil who was slain by Dutugemunu. But in 1946, ashes were discovered which Archaeological Commissioner Senarat Paranavitarna testified were those of Dutugemunu. The stupa was renamed and became known as Dutugemunu's stupa, while the ashes were collected and regularly displayed at times when people needed to be reminded of their past glories.¹⁴ The name change occurred, interestingly, in the Sinhalese nationalist discourse in the 1980s, at the same time the Dutugemunu ashes were paraded by Minister Cyril Matthew (Obeysekere 1992). This event shows the conflict over the ownership of a site and how a heritage claim by common people was displaced by the state narrative supported by expert knowledge. It begs the question: is veracity of facts important in a situation where both claims appear equally questionable?

Another recent example is Kandarodai, a place in the Jaffna Peninsula where a collection of circular structures was discovered in the early-twentieth century, on a megalithic site possibly dating from the early part of the second millennium. After the end of the civil war, pilgrims began to visit the place again and its name was subsequently Sinhalese as Kandurugoda, while the structures also were refashioned as stupas. Through this reconnection with the Buddhist past of the North, what was being contested was the entire Tamil nationalist historical narrative. Today, this could fuel tension between communities as they battle over the cultural meaning of this place. Unlike the case of the Ramayana Trail, the stupas appear to offer concrete evidence of a Buddhist past, further strengthened by an inscription naming the place Kandurugoda. This serves Sinhalese claims that Buddhism encompassed the entire island, the stupas being dated to the ninth century AD, a period similar to Boro budur in Indonesia (de Silva, D.G.B August 2002). Tamil scholars have acknowledged the Buddhist remains in Jaffna, described as 'burial monuments of monks, a buddhicised version of megalithicism', as proof of the existence of Tamil Buddhists in ancient times (Parameswara, 1999: 123-24). The presence of urn burial sites in the Jaffna area, offering very similar features to those in Tamil Nadu from Pudukottai to the Chittoore area of Andhra Pradesh, is in direct conflict with the Vijayan story of Aryan settlements and shows human settlements in the Jaffna area that began with a South Indian culture (Indrapala 2005: 69-71). Sinhalese nationalist Ven. Ellawalla Medhananda is championing the renovation of all Buddhist sites in areas 'desecrated' by decades of civil war: his book describes sites in Anuradhapura, Vavuniya and Mullaitivu districts (Medananda 2008). In the post-conflict period that began in 2009, Tamils felt the patriotic state was investing much in renovating traces of Buddhist heritage in the North and East as well as building new temples, while the Hindu heritage they subscribed to was being neglected:

¹⁴ For a more detailed account of the controversy about the ashes see Obeyesekere (1992).

Buddha statues have been found in places like Kandarodai, and this shows that Tamils have followed Buddhism and that Tamil Buddhism was practiced in Eelam, in a lesser extent, but the Sinhalese show these as Buddhist antiques and claim parts of the Tamil motherland as Sinhala areas (Global Tamil News, September 2011).

Tamils are countering with similarly grandiose claims of a 'Great Stone Age' in Kandarodai, using new media to disseminate their ideas (Global Tamil News, June 2011).

Another potential geo-political zone of conflict is the Jailani sufi shrine, 22 kilometres southwest of Balangoda, a predominantly Sinhalese area also known for being the hometown of the Ratwatte family, one of the leading political dynasties of Sri Lanka. The area is the site of a devotional cult of Shaykh Muhiyadeen Adul Qadir (A.D. 1166), who is believed to have visited the popular cave, which now houses a mosque at Kuragala, while on a pilgrimage to Adam's Peak and meditated there for 12 years. The site was rediscovered in 1875 and a festival began to be celebrated by the Muslim merchant community in Balangoda from 1890. The site is made of three large stone formations, one being the Kappal Malai, which resembles the prow of a ship, and at the base of which an open air mosque was erected in 1922. From the 1970s, there emerged claims by Sinhalese nationalists, based on the presence of second century Brahmi inscriptions, that Jailani was actually an ancient Buddhist archaeological site and that this heritage needed to be preserved. The state gave sanction to these claims by allowing the MCA¹⁵ to construct a small dagoba, just above the spot where the sufi saint is said to have meditated. In spite of the Jailani trustees' success in obtaining cabinet orders to limit the height of the construction, the Department of Archaeology (DoA) erected a sign claiming that Kuragala was the site of a Buddhist monastery (McGilvray 1998: 433-83; 2004: 273-89). Kuragala appears now and then in the news as a potential site of dispute. As I write, a similar conflict has arisen in Dambulla over alleged illegal Muslim and Hindu constructions within the premise of the sacred city (Groundviews 2012). Monuments and sites are thus being reinvested with new meanings, a phenomenon that existed in the past but that has been infused with a new urgency in a post-conflict situation where power relations between communities are being redefined. Each group is trying to test the limits of toleration of the others under the watchful eye of the patriotic state.

The Contest over the Nature of Restoration

Protecting built heritage and restoring it according to certain agreed upon criteria is an idea that was born in Europe in the nineteenth century and travelled to Sri Lanka with antiquarianism and colonial archaeology under H.C.P. Bell. In the post-colonial period, these principles were enshrined in a number of international treaties, among which, the Venice Charter of 1964 is the most central instrument. The preamble of this seminal document indicates the underlying ideas about the past that prevailed in the day:

¹⁵ Formerly the Ministry of Cultural Affairs

People are becoming more and more conscious of the unity of human values and regard ancient monuments as a common heritage. The common responsibility to safeguard them for future generations is recognized. It is our duty to hand them on in the full richness of their authenticity (ICOMOS International website).

It is on this crucial issue of ‘authenticity’ and the need to respect this feature when restoring monuments and sites that differences in interpretation between international organisations upholding these values and other parties who felt they had a trusteeship on the monument would occur.

In some cases, there is no clash between restoring a monument so that it resembles what is was in the past, creating a site that proves the grandeur of the past civilisations, and producing a site that can be a lived and used site by the people. As Jayatissa Herath of ICOMOS unambiguously states:

. . . Preservation is different to conservation so we focus on conservation; we try to restore a site to its past glory. There are some that make the argument that sites should not be changed but left as they are but in order to preserve it some things have to be done. Take the Ruwanwelisaya, it was not like this earlier, it is because of the restoration work that now it looks like it does now. But because of this restoration work people can also use it as a place of religious worship.¹⁶

The Temple of the Tooth or Dalada Maligawa, is believed by the Buddhist community to house the Buddha’s Tooth relic. The temple was constructed by King Wimaladharmasuriya (1593-1603) and is today under the control of two chief monks of the Malwatta and Asgiriya temples and a lay custodian (diyavadana nilame). The restoration of the Temple of the Tooth in Kandy after a Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) bomb destroyed part of it in 1998, offers a telling example of the local understanding of restoration as making anew. New tiles were laid, new *sandakadapahana* (moonstone) and new carvings were made, totally in contravention to the Venice Charter (ICOMOS 2004). The clash is here between the site of the temple as living heritage where people come to practice their rituals, and the World Heritage approach that stultifies places into fixed immutable things. The vision of the bhikkhus, as far as stupas and sites associated with Buddhism are concerned, is that heritage is a living thing that can be modified. Hence the restoration of the Dalada Maligawa to look exactly as it looked before, even if it meant using present day materials or the painting of ancient stupas in white, which is a common occurrence in Sri Lanka and thus made them similar to all other modern stupas in the country.

In 1986, when Prime Minister Premadasa announced his plan to build a ‘golden canopy’ over the shrine room of the temple, his suggestion was opposed by many experts, including the Director of the Sri Lanka Department of Archaeology (DoA) who argued that the canopy

¹⁶ Interview with Jayatissa Herath, 19 October 2011.

would not only put the building at risk but also damage the very ‘antiquity’ of it. Its antiquity and authenticity were legitimised by the belief that there had not been any additions made to the temple since the last king of Kandy. The decision by the representative of the state prevailed, however, and on 31 December 1987, a golden canopy costing 20 million rupees was unveiled by Premadasa. The sangha showed little concern with issues of authenticity or antiquity when they praised the construction of the canopy as a memorable and edifying act by a prime minister who, like the kings of the glorious past, worked in consort with the monks for the betterment of the country (Abeysekera 2002: 148-49). Archaeologists have not all followed state directives. From the very inception of the field, some of them have pointed to the need for excavation rather than reliance on “textual materials, decipherment of inscriptions and restoration of monuments of national and religious importance” (Begley 1967: 20-29). Other groups, such as ICOMOS Sri Lanka, for instance, work very closely with the state in an advisory capacity and accept the authorised heritage discourse without questioning in any way its premises:

“As for defining heritage, it is what is inherited from the past. There are two types of heritage: tangible and intangible, and in tangible heritage there is built heritage and natural heritage”.¹⁷.

Conclusion

In Sri Lanka, as in most states which are signatories of international conventions, ‘heritage’, in its multifarious guises, is endorsed simultaneously by a global bureaucratic apparatus the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), a global tourist industry and national governments” (Askew 2010: 19). UNESCO’s rhetoric appears to be progressive in that it purports to protect world cultures by means of protocols, declarations and inventories. But world heritage projects belong to a world system and world economy which is in no way contesting the way nation-states exhibit and promote a certain version of the past. The power structures of the nation-state and their endorsement of populist versions of the past are not challenged by international institutions. In that sense they protect the key instruments that perpetuate marginalisation of certain histories and dominance of the sphere of ideology and cultural symbolisation (Askew 2010: 22). The state uses the frame of world heritage sites for its own agenda of cultural hegemony and majoritarianism. The contradictions between nation-state ideology, morphed into what I have elsewhere qualified as ‘new patriotism’ (Wickramasinghe 2009: 1945-54) in the post-conflict years, and the lofty goals of UNESCO are rarely acknowledged by local representatives of UNESCO or members of ICOMOS. There are few voices left to dissent.

At a time when Western thinkers have lost their legitimacy among the people of Sri Lanka, it might be strategic to re-introduce them to the thought of Rabindranath Tagore. Indeed, Tagore advocates that when a country is seen as morally transgressing, it forfeits its claim to

¹⁷ Interview with Jayatissa Herath, 19 October 2011.

the loyalty of its citizens. His contemporary, Leo Tolstoy, made the same point when he stated that one could be a critic while at the same time being a patriot. What both thinkers discredited was an extreme patriotism that entailed a belief in the superiority of one's country and an exclusive concern for one's country (Tolstoy 1968). There is clearly in their thought virtue in disloyalty to one's country.

The issue of diversity of heritage is also addressed in Tagore's writings. In *Gora* (1907), the main character becomes aware of the futility of the strict observance of orthodox customs by Hindus who are without feelings of compassion for others in the predominantly Muslim village of Ghousepura. Gora learns at the end of the novel that he is the son of Irish parents, also a colonised people. He has "no mother, no father, no country, no nationality, no lineage, no God even". Scholars have suggested that there is a secular outlook in this novel, as Tagore is clearly fighting religion as a basis of political life. Tagore's view here seems closer to the French notion of *laïcité*, where religion is best seen as part of the private sphere, not taught in schools and not displayed in public. Other scholars have pointed to the influence of Ram Mohan Roy, and Lalan Kakir, a great Baul who followed the Sufi tradition, and whose poem opens the novel *Gora*. Both Roy and Kakir blended a reformed Hinduism with Islam. Ashis Nandy is perhaps closer to Tagore's thought when he describes *The Home and the World* as an anticipation of the "low-key, unheroic consensual nationalism which Gandhi wanted, a multi-ethnic society like India to follow" (Nandy 1994: 19).

Tagore's low-key nationalism is certainly at odds with the type of state patriotism promoted by the Sri Lankan government during the final phase of the civil war and eventual victory against the LTTE. I have argued elsewhere that if the Rajapaksa regime takes patriotism seriously and expects non-Sinhalese communities to identify with a super-ordinate identity that transcends their attachment to a group, it will need to be sensitive to the ways in which certain expressions of 'banal nationalism' can easily alienate cultural minorities. Continuing to flag Sinhala-Buddhist nationhood, a practice that started in the mid-1950s, might not be the most judicious way for the state to win over the hearts of members of other communities to the goal of civic patriotism.

There is, however, an interesting point of convergence between Tagore's critique of the nation and Rajapaksa's populist ideology. It is indeed the retreat from the political which Tagore performed as an individual through his own stands. Rajapaksa's new patriotism, too, implicitly states that all political parties of the Left and of the Right have no role to play, since the true path and best interests of all peoples are being pursued by the ruling party. Class politics, opposition politics and identity politics wither away and disappear in this symbiotic state-society utopia where alternative visions can only derail the state in the fulfilment of its mission. The terrain for the coupling of state and nation in this new patriotism was prepared by a gradual weakening of the party system, a system that did not exist in Tagore's India. Government was about more than consensus and representation, it was about nurturing the

kind of community all humans deserve to inhabit. Fashioning a ‘new patriotism’ during these last two years was made possible by the gradual weakening of traditional political parties of the Left and the Right and the consequent unconditional support bestowed by a depoliticised middle class to President Rajapaksa’s programme of home-grown solutions to national issues.

How does Tagore’s critique of the Janus face of nationalism and its corruptibility add to the seemingly infinite works on nationalism? What new insights does it bring to our understanding? Tagore’s writing is, as Borges pointed out (cited in Guha, 2010), steeped in general and real experiences. In that sense, he is not a theoretician who has coined a new paradigm on the nation. Rather, he writes using a passionate tone to convey his main idea that worship of one group often means othering or contempt of an other. His is a virulent condemnation of the nation:

The idea of the nation is one of the most powerful anaesthetics that man has invented. Under the influence of its fumes the whole people can carry out its systematic program of the most virulent self-seeking without being in the least aware of its moral perversion (Tagore 1917: 25-26).

At this particular juncture when there is a reaction and rejection of ideas and notions nurtured in the West, from human rights to secularism, invoking Tagore is a kind of political blessing for ideas that were later endorsed by political philosophers of the late- twentieth century. It can legitimise a critique of heritage practices that would otherwise be brushed away as alien or irrelevant. Tagore’s relevance is precisely his Asian location, his cultural insertion in a Hindu tradition—Tagore can critique caste and patriotism in South Asia precisely because he comes from Bengal. It is the situatedness of his critique of the nation and its rituals that is crucial, more than the novelty of his utterances.

References

- Abeyssekera, Ananda 2002 *Colors of the Robe: Religion, Identity and Difference*, New York, Columbia University Press.
- Appadurai, Arjun 2008 “The Globalization of Archaeology and Heritage: A Discussion with Arjun Appadurai” in G. Faiclough, R. Harrision Jnr, J. Jameson and J. Schofield (eds.), *The Heritage Reader*, London and New York Routledge, pp. 209-218.
- Arunachalam, Ponnambalam (1906 reprint 2004) *Sketches of Ceylon History*, Colombo Apothecaries/reprint New Delhi, Asian Educational Services.
- Askew, Marc 2010 “The Magic List of Global Status. UNESCO, World Heritage and the Agendas of States” in S. Labadi and C. Long (eds.), *Heritage and Globalisation*, Abingdon, Routledge, pp. 19-44.

- Barthes, Roland (1957) *Mythologies*, Paris, Seuil.
- Begley, Vimala 1967 “Northern Ceylon, 1967 —Archaeological Exploration in Northern Ceylon” in *Expedition* 9(4), pp. 20-29.
- Bourdieu, Pierre 1994 “Strategies de reproduction et modes de domination” in *Actes de la Recherche en Science Sociale*, No. 105, pp. 3-12.
- Canovan, Margaret 2000 “Patriotism is Not Enough” in *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol.30, No. 3, pp. 413-32.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh 2000 *Provincialising Europe. Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Chatterjee, Partha 1995 *The Nation and its Fragments. Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1995
- Codrington, H.W. 1939 *A Short History of Ceylon with a chapter on archaeology by A. M. Hocart*, London: Macmillan.
- Course of Developing the Leadership Abilities and Positive Thinking through the Theoretical and Practical Training (2011), A programme jointly organised by the Ministry of Higher Education and the Ministry of Defence available at www.scribd.com/doc/57788381/Training-Manual-English-Version (accessed on 6 June 2012)
- Cultural Heritage Connections available at http://www.culturalheritageconnections.org/wiki/General_Support_to_the_Mutual_Heritage_Centre_of_the_Central_Cultural_Fund.
- Daily News* (18 June 2010) “Buddha relics exposition in Anuradhapura” available at <http://www.dailynews.lk/2010/06/18/news33.asp> (accessed on 13 June 2012).
- Daniel, V. 1996 *Charred Lullabies: Chapters in an Anthropology of Violence*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Data Management Branch, Ministry of Education 2010, available at http://www.moe.gov.lk/web/images/stories/statistic/std_2010.pdf (accessed on 6 June 2012)

de Silva, D. G. B. (14 August 2002), "Kantarodai Buddhist Remains: A Sri Lankan Boro-budur lost for ever?" available at <http://www.island.lk/2002/08/14/> (Midweek Review) (accessed on 5 June 2012).

de Silva, K.M. 1978 "History and Historians in Twentieth Century Sri Lanka" in The G.C. Mendis Memorial Lecture, *Sri Lanka Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. I, pp.1-12.

de Silva, Colvin R. 1995 *Ceylon under the British Occupation 1795-1833, Vols I-II*, Delhi, Navrang (First published 1941-2).

Global Tamil News (29 September 2010/11) available at <http://www.globaltamilnews.net/MobileArticle/tabid/81/language/en-US/Default.aspx?pn=articles&aid=53410> (Accessed on 5 June 2012).

Global Tamil News (24 June 2011), "People of the Great Stone Age Civilization had Lived in Kandarodai" available at <http://www.globaltamilnews.net/GTMNEditorial/tabid/71/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/63096/language/en-US/People-of-the-Great-Stone-Age-Civilization-had-Lived-in-Kandarodai.aspx> (Accessed on 5 June 2012).

Gombrich, Richard F, 1988 *Theravāda Buddhism: a social history from ancient Benares to modern Colombo*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Groundviews (23 Apr 2012) "Bigoted monks and militant mobs: Is this Buddhism in Sri Lanka today?" Available at: <http://groundviews.org/2012/04/23/bigoted-monks-and-militant-mobs-is-this-buddhism-in-sri-lanka-today/> (Accessed 24 July 2012)

Guha, Ramachandra 2010 "Travelling with Tagore" available at <http://tagore150toronto.ca/Guha.Tagoreintro.pdf>, p. Lviii (accessed on 11 June 2012).

Hellman-Rajanayagam, Dagmar 1995 "Is There a Tamil Race" in Peter Robb (ed.), *The Concept of Race in South Asia*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, pp. 109-45.

----- 1994 "Tamils and the Meaning of History" in C. Manogaran and B. Pfaffenberger (eds.), *The Sri Lankan Tamils: Ethnicity and Identity*, Boulder, CO, Westview Press, pp. 169-207.

Hennayake, Nalani 2006 *Culture, Politics and Development in Postcolonial Sri Lanka*, Lanham, Md., Lexington Books.

Herzfeld, Michael 1997 *Cultural Intimacy. Social Poetics in the Nation-State*, London, Routledge.

- Hindustan Times* (26 November 2009), “Sri Lanka’s Ramayana Trail” available at <http://www.hindustantimes.com/world-news/SriLanka/Sri-Lanka-s-Ramayana-trail/Article1-480448.aspx> (accessed on 12 June 2012)
- ICOMOS International available at http://www.icomos.ie/main_content/icomos_international (accessed on 5 June 2012).
- ICOMOS 2004 *The history of the Venice Charter*, <http://www.icomos.org/venicecharter2004/index.html> (accessed on 24 July 2012)
- Indrapala, K. 2005 *The Evolution of an Ethnic Identity. The Tamils in Sri Lanka c 300BCE to c. 1200 CE*, Colombo, MV Publications.
- Johnson-Roehr, S.N. 2008 “The Archaeological Survey of India and Communal Violence in Post-Independence India” in *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 14(6), pp. 506-23.
- Kandyan Peasantry Commission Report 1951 Colombo: Government Publications Bureau.
- Kemper, Steven (2001), *Buying and Believing: Sri Lankan Advertising and Consumers in a Transnational World*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Knighton, W. 1845 *The History of Ceylon from the Earliest Period to the Present Time*, London.
- Mathur, S. 2007 *India by Design: Colonial History and Cultural Display*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
- McGilvray, Dennis B. 2004 “Jailani: A Sufi Shrine in Sri Lanka” in Imtiaz Ahmed (ed.), *Lived Islam in South Asia: Adaptation, Accommodation and Conflict*, Delhi, Social Science Press, pp. 273-89.
- 1998 “Arabs, Moors and Muslims: Sri Lankan Muslim Ethnicity in Regional Perspective” in *Contributions to India Sociology*, 32 (2), pp. 433-83.
- Medhananda, Ven. Ellawalla 2008 *Sinbala Bauddha Urumaya* (Sinhala Buddhist Heritage) 4th edition, Colombo, Dayawansa Jayakodi & Company.
- Mendis, G.C. 1966 *Problems of Ceylon History*, Colombo, Colombo Apothecaries.
- (1932, reprint 1985), *The Early History of Ceylon and its Relations with India and Other Foreign Countries*, New Delhi, Asian Educational Services.
- Mitchell, Timothy 2002 *Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity*, Berkeley CA, University of California Press.

Nandy, Ashis 1994 *The Illegitimacy of Nationalism: Rabindranath Tagore and the Politics of Self*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press.

Obeyesekere, Gananath 2006 “Buddhism, Ethnicity and Identity. A Problem in Buddhist History” in Deegalle Mahinda, *Buddhist Conflict and Violence in Modern Sri Lanka*, London, Routledge.

----- 1992 “Dutthagamani and the Buddhist Conscience” in Douglas Allen (ed.), *Religion and Political Conflict in South Asia. India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka*, Westport, Greenwood Press, PP. 135-160.

Obeyesekere, Donald 1911 *Outlines of Ceylon History*, Colombo, *The Times of Ceylon*.

Parameswara, N. 1999 *Early Tamils of Lanka – Ilankai*, KL Malaysia, pp. 123-24.

Pieris, P.E. 1913/14 *Ceylon: The Portuguese Era: Being a History of the Island for the Period 1505-1658*, Colombo, Colombo Apothecaries.

Rasanayagam, C. 1926, reprint 1984 *Ancient Jaffna*, New Delhi, Asian Educational Services.

Rogers, John D. 1990 “Historical Images in the British Period” in Jonathan Spencer (ed.), *History and the Roots of Conflict*, London, Routledge, pp. 87-106.

----- 1987 *Crime, Justice and Society in Colonial Sri Lanka*, London, Curzon Press.

Sasana Ithihasaya 2010 (Daham Pasal Avasana Sahathika Pathra Vibhagaya) Publisher - Buddhist Affairs Department.

Silva, Roland 2005 “The Cultural Triangle of Sri Lanka” in Henry Cleere (ed.), *Archeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*, London, Routledge, pp. 221-226

Siriwardena, R., S.Bastian, K.Indrapala and S.Kottegoda 1980 *School Textbooks and Communal Relations in Sri Lanka*, Part I, Colombo, Council for Communal Harmony through the Media.

Smith, Laurajane 2006 *The Uses of Heritage*, London, Routledge.

Tagore, Rabindranath 1917 *Nationalism*, London, Macmillan.

Tagore, Rabindranath 1908, reprint 2009 *Gora*, New Delhi, Penguin Books.

Tennekoon, N. Serena May 1988 “Rituals of Development: The Accelerated Mahavāli Development Program of Sri Lanka” in *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp.294-310

Tennent, J. 1859 *Ceylon: An Account of the Island; Physical, Historical, and Topographical*, 2 Vols, London.

Tolstoy, Leo 1968 “ ‘On Patriotism’ and ‘Patriotism or Peace’ ” in L. Tolstoy, *Writings on Civil Disobedience and Non-Violence*, New York, New American Library.

websites of universities;

http://www.rjt.ac.lk/ssh/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=5&Itemid=11; <http://www.kln.ac.lk/social/social/social.htm>; <http://www.pdn.ac.lk/arts/>; <http://www.sjp.ac.lk/fa/>; <http://www.jfn.ac.lk/faculties/arts/index.html>;

Wickramasinghe, Nira 2009 “After the War: A New Patriotism in Sri Lanka” in *Journal of Asian Studies*, 68 (4), pp. 1945-54.

----- 2006 *Sri Lanka in the Modern Age. A History of Contested Identities*, London, C.Hurst.

----- and Sasanka Perera 1999 “Assessment of Ethno-Cultural and Religious Bias in Social Studies and History Texts of Years 7,8,10, and 11”, Colombo, World Bank.

Tourism Sri Lanka in “Pilgrimage in Sri Lanka” available at <http://www.tourism-srilanka.com/religious-places/index.html> (accessed on 6 June 2012).

Latest News in Sri Lanka (Jan 3 2011), *Honouring age old traditions*
<http://latestnewslk.blogspot.com/2011/01/honoring-age-old-traditions.html>
(accessed July 2012)

This paper explores the consolidation by a patriotic post-conflict state of a notion of history reinvented as national heritage. The distinction between history as an analysis of the past and heritage was rarely made explicit in the public discourse of Sri Lanka. After the war ended the distinction disappeared entirely except in some rare university history departments. Heritage as we understand it, is present centered and is created, shaped and managed by and in response to, the demands of the present. It is to follow David Lowenthal, not history at all. While it borrows from and enlivens historical study, heritage is not an enquiry into the past but a celebration of it. The distinction between heritage and history is one of motive. Heritage is best understood as a claim, a special pleading. History in post war Sri Lanka has abandoned specialized journals to inhabit and flourish in theater, film, videos and pamphlets encouraged by the patriotic state. Professional historians too have either left the public sphere or acquiesced in the production of a history/heritage. This study will draw from an array of sources and practices to develop an understanding of the ideological underpinnings of the new popular history/heritage.

Nira Konjit Wickramasinghe is a Professor and Chair of Modern South Asian Studies at Leiden University in the Netherlands. She was a professor in the Department of History and International Relations, University of Colombo, Sri Lanka until 2009. She has published widely on identity politics, everyday life under colonialism and the relationship between state and society in modern South Asia. She has pursued these interests through investigation into such diverse themes as politics of dress, civil society, citizens and migrants, and objects of consumption. Her most recent book is *Sri Lanka in the Modern Age: A History of Contested Identities* (C.Hurst, London and University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu 2006). She can be contacted at: n.k.wickramasinghe@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Printed by Karunaratne & Sons (Pvt) Ltd.

