

Recuperating ruins, re-inscribing identity: Royal citadels and state mosques in re-‘heritagization’ projects in Melaka, Palembang and Makassar.

Imran bin Tajudeen,

National University of Singapore

Abstract. Melaka, Palembang and Makassar are historic port-polities in Malaya, Sumatra and Sulawesi in the Nusantara region, or the Austronesian portion of Southeast Asia, which reached their apogee in the 15th to 18th centuries. Their monumental cores were expunged, partially or completely, and appropriated or abandoned during the period of European colonial conquest and rule. This paper will review and compare the attempts since the late 20th century to recuperate these ruins or altered sites.

Architectural and cultural projects have been implemented on these sites and monuments that seek to re-inscribe their spirit of place with contemporary historical signification or valorization. Such re-inscriptions involve aligning both tangible and intangible heritage to conceptions of local identity that are being promoted for specific reasons. In particular, restorations or new constructions of state mosques replicate and accentuate what are perceived to be distinctive ‘local’ styles or forms, while the ubiquitous combination of open-air replica museums, ethnographic exhibits and cultural festivals in former royal citadels is primarily geared towards the prominent display of cultural symbols. These strategies reveal contemporary understandings of, and the endeavors to celebrate or recreate, ‘local cultural legacies’ which (re)shape the spirit of place of historically significant sites.

Local authorities and sources of funding often decide what gets emphasized as ‘memory of place’, what is protected or altered, and therefore how spirit of place is manipulated. Thus, while the projects to valorize heritage sites are often initiated by cultural activists, they become inevitably altered by the priorities of cultural tourism and political-economic considerations of regional identity. As such, the re-inscription of recovered heritage sites and artifacts – the process of re-‘heritagization’ – are shown to be determined by larger forces which prioritize the utility of heritage in revenue generation and, ultimately, the transmission and projection of accentuated conceptions of identity.

From Milieu to Lieu to Tableau: The inscription and re-inscription of place

The term ‘Spirit of Place’ comprises two terms that express the emotive/subjective and the material/object dimensions of a location. To focus on ‘spirit of place’ as a form of critique on heritage intervention is to acknowledge that physical acts on palimpsests and ruins, and didactic operations on non-extant socially-embodied memory or the creation of authoritative versions of ‘history’, are endeavours that intermingle.

“What begins as undifferentiated space becomes place as we get to know it better and endow it with value” (Tuan 1977:6).

The initial state: as a visitor or even as a long-time resident, one is as yet unfamiliar and therefore not cognisant of a place’s worth, especially when the significance of a site resides in its past events and developments. There is thus a need to get to know, to be acquainted with the basic story of the place. Subsequent valuation depends very much upon how and what we come to know of a place. Here lies the pervasive influence of tourism literature, and of authoritative renditions of History, Tradition and National, regional and local Culture as taught in national curricula and textbooks. What are the possible ways by which the interaction between ‘place’ and ‘spirit’ can be clarified and understood generally, and what new perspectives can this line of enquiry reveal in the critique of heritage intervention strategies?

Firstly the term ‘place’ can be understood as ‘sites’ (*lieu*) within which are found buildings and spaces, some of which may have been selected and cultivated as ‘monuments’; this physical setting may be ‘living’ in the sense that its milieu or social environment comprising communities and activities is still occupying and producing the space; or it may be a ‘dead’ site – a relic or ruin.

Secondly, consideration of the ‘spirit’ of a place demands a balance between competing networks of social relations – particularly with respect to decisions on the sort of physical intervention that is justifiable on a multilayered artefact, and on which aspects of the past and present to select for ‘valorisation’. Ideally, in re-imbibing a place’s ‘spirit’, a balance and coexistence, even contestation, is allowed for, between dominant and subaltern voices, and between present and previous layers and also aspirations for the future. In practice, however, this is a challenging goal.

The paper will retrace the physical changes and interventions in three historically important international emporia in the Southeast Asian region: Melaka, Palembang and Makassar. Changes at the scale of both the city’s shifting core and alterations in its fabric, and to individual buildings will be investigated; specific attention will be given to sites which today constitute key 16th to 18th century sites. How are monuments and sites mobilised to reinforce or emphasise different layers of past, present and aspired future identity, and how do these relate to the notion of ‘spirit of place’?

Tuan (1980) has referred to the notion of rootedness as distinguished from a self-conscious ascription of ‘sense of place’, which Arefi (1999) has extended to be compared also to a third stage of commodification. It is argued in this paper that these three stages of embeddedness in the production of meaning of place correspond to the state of milieu, *lieu* and *tableau*.

First, Tuan refers to a state of ‘rootedness’, that is not self-conscious, but instead natural or unmediated. In fact Cox (1968) has shown that this attachment is not related to physical setting – the sense of belonging remains even subsequent to the physical destruction of the place. This observation has resonance with the example of the market town of Geylang Serai in Singapore (Imran 2007).

In such situations, the spirit of place appears to reside not just in existing elements, but more importantly, in the past, in the form of remnants of the former practices, networks and activities – the *milieu*. These (non-physical) remnants emerge from the history of communities, members of which may no longer be present as residents or indeed, in extreme cases, in any engagement with a place’s activities (ie historic communities now displaced).

Tuan then contrasts this strong emotional attachment to place despite physical changes, with a self-conscious creation of ‘sense of place’, which is emphasised as a ‘modern venture’ expressed in “historic preservation projects glorifying national, regional or local identity” (Arefi 1999:184). In this case ‘spirit’ is conceived in terms of display, spectacle, and distinctive architectural form- and space-creation. – that it comes about ‘by design’.

In such situations, there is greater emphasis on the physical remains of former events and their formative forces on the site. The said elements largely emanate from regime changes and larger political-economic trends that may go beyond the immediate purview of the place in question – such forces are manifest in the layered artefacts, and specifically in the physical site or *lieu*.

The change from spirit of place rooted in milieu to one revolving around the physical forms of the *lieu* or site, may also occur when the site in question exists in the form of ruins that have been abandoned or have fallen into disrepair. The reconnection with such sites, for which the former milieu is ‘dead’ (or in the case of Angkor Wat in Cambodia, removed by archaeologists for the sake of effecting pristine physical restoration), is one that is built upon visual connection and identification, rather than social ones.

From this scenario, there is but a small step to the outright ‘commodification’ of historic sites for tourism as noted by Agnew (1984) (qtd in Arefi 1999:184). In such cases, intervention, which often involve

drastic overhauls of layered sites, is carried out on the physical remains or lieu. The remains are either capitalised upon, augmented and enhanced, or are removed or obscured, depending on the perceived 'desirability' or their 'compatibility' with the desired final image intended for portrayal

This third scenario is the contemporary extension of the second phenomenon of extraneous motivations, but which is now related to the global branding of destinations and the accentuation of 'culture' for display and profit. It is manifested in what Hewison (1987) has called the heritage industry, characterised by the strong role of the state in the industry's didactic promotion and physical outcomes/output.

This is a useful distinction between unself-conscious emotive and indeed non-physically determined attachment, and conscious ascription of significance via physical works or interventions, and finally the outright fabrication of spectacle to create distinctive places to entice consumption (as seem for example in themed malls).

Summarising this tripartite distinction, place thus encompasses both milieu and lieu – the socio-economic living environment which produces and occupies a site, a complex of physical artefacts – and, most importantly in the contemporary context and for the purposes of criticism, also what this paper proposes to call 'tableau'. The role and use of historic sites by state authorities in contemporary identity formation has become endemic, and takes the form of the (underlying) dialogue between the present reinvented displays and the past, hidden or expunged aspects of layered sites – this dialogue is found in the choices on which layer of history to enhance or emphasise or valorize, which express how deeply aspects of identity are known or made known, or remain unknown or ignored due to certain interpretive proclivities. Intervention projects that aim at a comprehensive program for a place will, by default, privilege certain meanings above others, considering the multiplicity of meanings and significance a place holds for individuals at the local, regional or national level, or from different social groups.

Horizon of knowing: sense of place versus spirit of place

The concern with 'spirit of place' arises from an insistence on making the ascriptive aspects of meaning-making and associative signification of place more explicit. It is also a way of problematising the political-economic contestations that are necessarily involved in the re-making and 'regeneration' of place that has become more commonplace in response to the rise of leisure travel.

The condition of 'tableau' arises due to two primary reasons, related to the situation of dead and living sites. Firstly, 'knowing a place' in the sense of its meaning and association (hence its 'spirit') is problematic, since it involves extraneously-determined ascriptions almost invariably made by 'outsider' who are outside the fold of 'rootedness'. Even as a local, the (temporal and geographic) horizon of what we can know and verify personally is necessarily limited, and both myth or folk memory, and professional or authorized official accounts ('history'), are paths by which human societies have sought to extend this horizon. In either path, we are confronted by selectivity and privileging, and on the flipside, omissions and silences, which may be necessitated by the need for brevity and mnemonic appeal, or be politically deliberate and purposive.

The critical emphasis for investigation here is that contemporary interventions on this horizon of knowing, through the supplementation of our reading of the meaning and associations of a place both via didactic dissemination to all potential visitors and via physical insemination into sites, constitute the formation of what is here termed tableau.

This limit to the horizon of common knowledge is exacerbated in instances where a site is dead, meaning that it has become devoid of community and exists only as a ruin or site/lieu. In such cases, where then would the 'spirit' be sought that can be (re)imbibed, since this would involve ascription based on reconstruction, which may be inaccurate or even biased? It appears one has to accept that reconstructions are always shaped by the larger agenda of the agent responsible.

At this juncture the remark by Lowenthal (1985:264) is apposite: intervention on the 'relic' assumes two forms, namely direct and indirect transformations, or "protection, iconoclasm, enhancement, reuse" versus "how they are seen, explained, illustrated, and appreciated".

Secondly, in considering the question of safeguarding the 'spirit of place' for a living site, we must be cognisant of the fact that transformations on any site, both physical changes to lieu or hardware, and changes to milieu or its community and social life, are an ongoing and never-ending reality. When a site is living, its socio-economic aspect is invariably diverse. Thus, can the endeavour to create an internal coherence to a 'place' – often created by differentiating the chosen site from all else that lies around but beyond the drawn boundaries – be justifiable or even desirable? Often such impulses arise in the name of creating or heightening a (distinctive) sense of place, with recourse to a homogenising or reductive thematic scheme which flattens the original character of sites or obscures its heterogeneous reality – a contrived venture for the presentation by a place, of itself. This is the creation of "difference" via accentuation, which is the essence of tableau – it enhances 'sense of place' with a preoccupation with the visual and sensorial, to the detriment of a more fragile 'spirit' which may reside in non-extant (unseen) aspects of the site.

Thus, knowledge of a site's meanings and association can be distinguished between an engaged or informed appreciation based on deeper knowledge of past events and significance in order to capture its 'spirit', as opposed to a fleeting impression which relies on the most captivating or spectacular aspects of a place, and a sensorial experience or 'sense of place'. The latter scenario is one reason accentuation, or the enhancement of the distinctiveness and uniqueness of a place, is now being (re)created or amplified for its entertainment value, as much as for the gratification of the desire for touch-and-go leisure 'sightseeing'.

Emergence, consolidation and expunction

Three categories of construction works are considered for this paper: citadels and forts; places of worship; and tomb complexes.

The colonial subjugation of 'native'-ruled international emporia in the Southeast Asian archipelago region (Nusantara) was achieved by the Portuguese to a limited extent, and by the Dutch to a much larger extent, in the 16th to 18th centuries via a program of conquest and destruction. This physically damaging campaign was backed up by the enforcement of monopolistic regulations restricting native emporia trade across the region to the least lucrative sectors, while encouraging and fostering the growth of the China trade. This policy was enforced via gunboats and warfare. The following is a brief summary overview of their artefactual and site histories.

Melaka was established circa 1400 and rose in the course of the 15th century to pre-eminence within the international emporia circuit for Asian maritime networks from Persia to China. The Portuguese had noted its rich trade and the multitudinous diversity of its merchant communities, and made it the coveted prize in order to bypass the lucrative stranglehold on trade in spices then held by Venice. With the Portuguese conquest in 1511, Melaka became the first international emporium east of the Indian Ocean to fall under European rule. Portuguese rule from 1511 to 1640 however saw a decline in its international importance. Subsequently, rival centres benefitted, taking their place as important international emporia from as early as the 1520s. Aceh on the western tip of the archipelago, Banten near its centre and Makassar in the east were chief among them. Dutch rule of Melaka from 1640 to 1824 (with a brief British interregnum) saw a further decline, as the Dutch priority was to foster the preeminent position of its headquarters in Batavia (present-day Jakarta) as the focus of all archipelago trade to the exclusion of all other centres.

Makassar's rise was meteoric, and its native rulers were multilingual. It arose as an emporium from the union of two kingdoms Gowa and Tallo' and the regularisation of administration and trade. Its importance as an emporium was given a boost with the arrival of a formal delegation of Malay merchants in 1561 who concluded a contract ratified by the king. This was followed by the consolidation and growth of commerce, which subsequently attracted other traders. In 1603 the Dutch arrived; in 1613 the English, 1615 the Spanish, 1618 the Danish, 1619 the Chinese and circa 1620 the Portuguese, who also arrived in greater numbers after their loss of Melaka to the Dutch in 1640. The trade of these communities was protected and fostered by the ruler of Makassar who maintained open port and free trade policies in the face of Dutch monopoly laws, much to the chagrin of the Dutch who finally saw to it that the Portuguese and all other Europeans were to be kept out of Makassar, and the Malay and native Sulawesi and eastern archipelago traders were to be banned from lucrative sectors of regional trade. To this end the Dutch pursued policies of aggression to native shipping in the 1630s, and occupied Makassar's Panakukang fort in 1660; in 1667 Ujung Pandang fort was captured. The final capitulation of Makassar occurred in 1669 with the destruction of the royal citadel Somba Opu (Bulbeck 1998: 72-80, Carey 2003: 521-2).

Palembang was the site of an international emporium from the 7th to 11th centuries, but a Chola (South Indian) raid of the capital and the 11 ports along the Straits of Melaka that were subject to it, in the late 12th century, weakened its control of commerce. Subsequently, the centre of international emporia trade appears to have shifted to its old 7th century rival Malayu, in the next-door Sumatran river network at Jambi. With the founding of Melaka circa 1400 by refugees who claimed descent from Palembang's ancient line of rulers, Palembang's role was further eclipsed. Its revival as an important port-polity began in 1573, when a refugee Javanese dynasty established a fortified citadel and several forts around which clustered a new trade settlement. The polity stimulated and dominated pepper production, a valuable commodity in that period whose production peaked in the 17th century, leading to a Dutch attack in 1659 over the polity's refusal to carry out the terms of an unequal treaty. The thick ironwood walls of Palembang's main citadel took three days to completely burn down. A new citadel and mosque was constructed further upriver from the previous site and facing away from the main river; finally the spate of construction activity in the early 18th century brought the new polity centre to its present location. This final site however was again attacked twice by the Dutch in 1819 but stood its ground, before being destroyed in the third war in 1821.

A summary of the major construction works from the initial pre-conquest period is as follows:

Historical Sites in Melaka:

Ma Huan account of 1413: king has constructed a bridge with "more than twenty pavilions" where "all the trading in every article takes place" (Mills 1997 [1970]:109). No longer in existence.

Malay Annals mentions three palaces built successively on the site of the hilltop but the one for which the most detailed description was given was the second one, upon which the present-day replica is loosely based.

Sultanate mosque of Melaka was of stone, and was used during the war between Melaka and the invading Portuguese in 1511, occupied by the Portuguese for several days before finally being dismantled over 3 days ... --- cont --- stone construction of the royal tombs on the hill was also dismantled, and together the stones thus pillaged from the Sultanate buildings were used to construct the first Portuguese structure of the newly conquered place, the A Famosa tower-fortress.

In fact the only structures to survive from the days of the 15th century Sultanate are four tombs and two wells.

The Bertam palace site and the royal pleasure gardens at ----- (Zakaria Ali --) – sites have not been archaeologically explored.

Historical Sites in Palembang:

First citadel site now fertilizer plant Pupuk Sriwijaya (PUSRI) built during the 1950s (ironic name); Based on accounts this expunged citadel was 1.1 km wide, of kayu unglan (*Eusideroxylon zwageri* T. & B.) walls were 7.25 meter high of square section 30 X 30 cm. Flanked by Sungai Buah and Sungai Taligawe (aka Lintah); Sungai Rengas ran to the middle of its front elevation and formed its main entrance. 10 November 1659 Dutch armada arrived and after Palembang's defeat, the Kraton was set on fire for 3 days. 1659 Sketch Joan van der Laen.

Intervening Beringin Janggut era (1659 till 1738): citadel built in the 1660s, and the royal mosque in 16--; nothing remains of these. The area of keraton bordered by the Musi river on the south, Tengkuruk river on the westside, Kepenedan river on northside, and Rendang/Karang Waru river on eastside. The Kepanedan is a canal to connecting Kemenduran river, Kapuran river, and Kebon Duku river. Because this rivers interaction, the resident journeying from Rendang river to Tengkuruk river, shall be no longer must go out through Musi river. The canal-based urban settlement had been further developed.

Graves are all that remain of the period up to 1659 and the period prior to the early 1700s. Sabokingking in ----, Sultan Agung complex just outside the PUSRI complex; Cinde Walang ----.

Construction projects of the early 1700s that gave rise to the present-day Palembang historic core: during the reign of Sultan Mahmud Badaruddin I and his son and grandson. An era of economic prosperity and urban development and consolidation.

The first citadel Kuto Batu alias Kuto Tengkuruk now called Kuto Lamo. (Hanafiah 1988a). 'Older citadel' destroyed and upon its ruins the Dutch Commissariat Regeering Commissaris was built for J.L. van Sevenhoven (Hanafiah 1988a), now used as a Museum named after the Sultan whose reign witnessed the attacks and conquest and his exile;

Benteng Kuto Besak (built 1780-1797) panjang 290 meter, lebar 180 meter, dan tinggi 6,60 meter-7,20 meter, with 4 bastions on the corners. Successfully withstood two abortive Dutch invasions in 1819. Musi, Tengkuruk, Kapuran and Sekanak Rivers around it. Old Fort next to it was occupied by Dutch forces in the first 1819 war. But they were subsequently evicted with many casualties.

Plan of the citadel and palace: Keraton Kuto Besak 1811, Major William Thorn & the 1811 sketch by Jaekes (reproduced in Vos and serves as basis for sketch in Hanafiah)

Third war 1821, Sultan was exiled and a puppet ruler placed on the throne; 1823 Sultanate was abolished and the old fort was demolished.

Sultanate Mosque: previously Masjid Sultan, now Masjid Agung; 1738-48, 30 x 36 m. Purported Chinese labour in construction. Replace earlier Sultanate mosques which had been demolished (At Beringin Janggut, Jalan Masjid Lama). 1753 minaret built; 1821 tiled roof and balcony constructed. 1848 colonial government builds entry porch in Doric columns with pediment. 1879 serambi pavilion as entrance; previous entrance vestibule was demolished.

Citadel's and Mosque's relationship to waterfront and creeks: Early 1930s Sungai Tengkuruk was filled in by the Dutch and turned into the major arterial road of Jl Sudirman as it exists today.

Historical Sites in Makassar:

Earliest known major work: 1525 Somba Opu citadel, and 1545 Ujung Pandang fort. Two other important spate of constructions occurred in ----- and the 1630s. Consolidation of existing forts, and the construction of defensive walls along the seacoast.

1635 map shows layout of town, but seems to focus only on the immediate environs of Somba Opu. A large palace, another large hall or warehouse, and a mosque along with various other buildings.

1660 invasion illustration shows the stretch of the town and its nine [??] forts. [SOURCE?]

Mosque at Katangka the only one remaining from the 17th century; the Mangallekana Malay quarter traders' mosque and Somba Opu royal mosques have disappeared.

Tomb complexes at Tallo' fort, and the various elements within Kale Gowa's large fort – walls have vanished

The case of Melaka, Palembang and Makassar thus illustrates how, by the early 19th century, international emporia in the region had been either destroyed and abandoned, or occupied, brought under control and reduced to regional significance to divert most trade flows to the new emporia run by and for Company profit. Seen against the above historical context, sites of expunged or appropriated native citadels then potentially embody a tense, even incendiary, 'spirit'. However, this aspect of the 'spirit' of these dead or altered sites is obscured or neutralised by officially-imposed tableau that are obsessed with displays of 'native' cultural spectacle. There is never any focus or presentation on the former tradition of mercantile dynamism and networks of commerce in which regional 'native' society was engaged.

Sites: Recuperating and reinscribing

In view of the layers of destruction or ruination in Melaka, Palembang and Makassar, the question then arises: which layer should be resurrected or reconstructed, especially when they are all superimposed? This is by default a highly charged political choice, especially since it involves colonial impositions on indigenous heritage.

In Palembang and Makassar, only one mosque and a number of tomb complexes have survived from the early era prior to European conquest; in Melaka the royal tombs were not spared desecration. Nothing of the citadels and their palaces, halls and other buildings were spared destruction and/or appropriation.

The assumption is that the recognition of the historic value of certain objects and practices and of the need to protect them, coupled with the use of the right approaches and methods, can ensure that in the "heritagization" process, the *spirit of place* is safeguarded. However, identification of the 'historic value' of sites for which invasion and destruction have left their mark is rather more complicated. Here we face the problem of two forms of 'change' that are forced upon a place – colonial conquest and one or more phases of ruination, and in more recent times the creation of 'tableau' by state authorities in the name of restoration and enhancement. Appropriation by colonial conquest, often for military encampments, has resulted in changes in the spirit of place that at times constitute a form of regression and disfigurement rather than further development. On top of this, the recuperation of these sites through archaeological works followed by reconstruction efforts carried out in Melaka, Palembang and Makassar have in some aspects resulted in a distortion of the spirit of place. The shortcomings appear in two forms.

Firstly, contemporary understandings of what is important or significant in 'local culture' have been allowed free play in (re)shaping the spirit of place of historically significant sites through the endeavors to celebrate or recreate specific events, artefacts and activities; these new superimpositions take the form of nationalistic or touristic didactic tableau. Secondly, while the projects to valorize heritage sites are often initiated by cultural activists, they become inevitably altered by the priorities of cultural tourism and political-economic considerations of regional identity. Serious recuperation or restoration/restitution efforts are lacking for the pre-colonial past where these have been possible. Instead, replicas have been made which are off the mark. We shall return to these points later.

Tableau: the agenda of Nationalism and Tourism in heritage industry interventions

In the contemporary period (since the 1980s and especially in the 1990s), the superimposition of tableau on historic sites has become dominant, following the rise of tourism and leisure as an important motivator for urban regeneration. The trend inspired the writing of *The Heritage Industry* in which Hewison asserts:

“postmodernism and the heritage industry are linked ... Both conspire to create a shallow screen that intervenes between our present lives [and] our history. We have no understanding of history in depth, but instead are offered a contemporary creation, *more costume drama and re-enactment* than critical discourse” (emphasis mine). (Hewison 1987:135):

This form of intervention is referred to in this paper as ‘tableau’ to denote its aim for display. The ‘tableau’ presents a freeze-frame portrayal that is intended to be iconic, memorable, self-explanatory and obvious; it is thus necessarily abbreviated, generalised and reductive; it has to exclude or weed out ‘irregularities’ in order to be picturesque, vivid or striking, clear and immediately legible, with a heavy reliance on visual spectacle as a means of communication. Well-known examples of tableau would include the Parthenon – all accretions were removed in restorations of the mid-19th century and 1975 – and the ‘Chinatown’ of San Francisco – the pseudo-vernacular ethnic kitsch it is well known for date from 1906. In the former example, all medieval Christian, Renaissance and Ottoman Muslim accretions were removed in order to present the Parthenon as a pure Greek icon; the creation of an independent Greek nation in 1832 triggered this undertaking. The architectural Chinatownification in San Francisco was initiated by real-estate landlords of Chinese-dominated quarters of San Francisco, to prevent eviction by municipal authorities, by recourse to self-Orientalising as a tourism product manoeuvre.

Whereas Hewison (1987) had linked “contemporary creations” of the heritage industry to postmodernism in their imposition of a “shallow screen”, such deception or temporal sleight-of-hand in fact has a longer history – once we go beyond a UK-centric perspective, the heritage industry can be seen to have a far longer precedent. Two examples will serve to illustrate this point.

The first example is an outcome of the stylistic unit approach: ‘conjunctive theory’ aims at a blending in through completion or [a pretence of] accretion, stressing harmony and continuity – thus the 1850s addition of new buildings in Florence was “so adroitly integrated as to fool many contemporary observers” into believing them to be also of Renaissance vintage. In fact subsequently a new strategy has come into favour, the modernist, dialectical approach, ‘disjunctive theory’ which aims for dynamic juxtaposition, to draw a clear distinction between old and new (Hewitt 1994:199).

The second example is from Quebec City. The Chateau Frontenac hotel building, constructed in 1893, has the largest presence atop the old citadel – it is not a historic artefact from the 17th century citadel period, and was built by an US architect for the Canadian Railway. Despite its historical origins, physically it plays a disproportionately important role as a readily understood, spectacular icon that generically renders an accentuated ‘French’ identity, and which, via its name, conveys also the political overtones of Quebecois identity. In contrast, a ‘real’ artefact like Notre Dame des Victoires church, Basse-Ville (Lower Town) is neither of sufficient size nor of suitable position to have a very visible presence.

Hewison’s remarks on the heritage industry were made with reference to the phenomenon of conversion of defunct industrial sites in the UK as a means of remaking itself in the face of its decline. It is against this context that one can read the following cynical definition of ‘heritage’ within the contemporary milieu of ‘consumption culture’ or the “political economy of showing” (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998: 1):

“[Heritage is] a mode of cultural production in the present that has recourse to the past. Heritage thus defined depends on display to give dying economies and dead sites a second life as exhibitions of themselves”. (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998: 7)

One can perhaps read a similar impetus for the remaking that is evident in Melaka, Palembang and Makassar, former international emporia that are today reduced to provincial status. Heritage has also been conceived of at the outset as attractions for which a form of product branding, namely the enhancement of their uniqueness to differentiate them from other destinations, is necessary. However, while the UK’s downward spiral as a manufacturing nation added a sense of economic urgency to its development, the growth of the heritage industry in places like Malaysia and Indonesia are outcomes of their interest in partaking in the potentially lucrative tourism industry.

These conceptions in turn constitute part of the rivalry noted by Adams (1997:158) between different groups in Indonesia over differential promotion and encouragement of tourism and enhancement and privileging in official state brochures and publications as tourism sites. This rivalry is closely intertwined with these cities' perception of their historical importance and significance. The political positioning of Melaka, Palembang and Makassar within the national landscape of Malaysia and Indonesia should be borne in mind when reviewing the historic site developments found in these cities.

Melaka, in its 15th century history as an emporia-kingdom, is routinely positioned in history textbooks as the ancestral state of Malaysia, and now reinforces this position through its tourism product offerings as a site that displays its former status as a cosmopolitan global maritime emporium via at times simplistic renderings of 'foreign' objects in its landscape. Melaka is also touted as having an important position in Melayu culture (which is always read in official discourse as the political culture of *kerajaan*, the rule by a king). As a corollary of its long standing as a cosmopolitan site, it is also touted as the home town of unique hybrid cultural communities – 'Chinese Peranakan', Chitty and Serani – whose present day cultural representations are putatively direct continuities from 15th century practices.

It therefore comes as no surprise when in 1988 Melaka was declared a 'Historical City', an official title conferred by the Federal Government. The overarching significance of this declaration is revealed on a commemorative plaque unveiled in Melaka in 1989 by the then Prime Minister, which proclaimed: "This is where it all began ... the birth of a Nation" ["di sini semuanya bermula ... lahirnya sebuah Negara"] (qtd in Worden 2003:31). In fact Melaka was chosen as the city for the first place of announcement of Malaya's forthcoming independence.

Meanwhile, in the Indonesian context Palembang, followed by Makassar, are distinguished by the fact that they were the two cities outside Java with the largest populations in the Netherlands East Indies, as indicated by the 1930 census (Pradadimara 2005:257). In the 1980s, the Indonesian state viewed the fostering of heritage sites in an instrumental manner. Thus Samidi, in the Country Report for Indonesia for a UNESCO-SPAFA Workshop, declared that the mission of creating archaeological parks is

"to achieve the national task of proper protection for the ancient cities, to give them a proper place in the national consciousness, and to make proper use of them. The main goals were geared to the permanent preservation of the ancient cities and their historical climate for further studies and for the promotion of national tourism." (SPAFA-UNESCO Workshop report 1988:88)

In both Palembang and Makassar, 'proper use' of archaeological sites were interpreted in a similarly instrumental mode, 'to give them a proper place in the national consciousness'. The exact implication of what constituted the 'proper place' of the respective cities was of course a matter of contention, and served as a prime motivating factor in the tableau enacted in these sites.

Palembang, in a parallel to Melaka's position within the Malaysian political boundary, is routinely pointed to in nationalist historiography as the earliest empire in present-day Indonesia. More importantly, it was the premier port known within the whole Asian maritime circuit from Persia to China in the period of the 7th to 11th centuries (subsequent to which the major emporium shifted to Jambi).

The development in Palembang of the Sriwijaya Kingdom Archaeological Park by the local government, officially opened in 1994 by the then President, had similar goals. The Park had as its highlight the archaeological site in eastern Palembang containing waterways and ponds and a 7th century inscribed boulder belonging to the city's ancient emporium polity. A tourist booklet declared that the park was created with these aims in mind: "... to appreciate the cultural values and strengthening the national pride while providing tourism benefits and educational values" (qtd in Taal 2002:192). In Palembang similar efforts have not extended to the remaking of the interior of the former royal citadel as attractions for national tourism and education. This may primarily be because the citadel is occupied by the Indonesian military.

Makassar is the historically most important port-capital on Sulawesi and was formerly the centre of a maritime empire with dominions throughout substantial parts of what is today eastern Indonesia. It had also served as capital of the short-lived Dutch-created state Negara Indonesia Timur (1946). It is in perennial competition with Surabaya as the most important port of the eastern half of the Indonesian nation. The 1984 declaration by Joop Ave, the director general of Tourism in Indonesia, that Tana Toraja was the “touristic *primadona* of South Sulawesi” and Makassar was (merely) the “Gateway to Tana Toraja” (Adams 1997:159), only served to sharpen the rivalry between the Bugis-Makassar and the Toraja in primacy of representation in South Sulawesi.

In an obvious attempt to graphically portray this historic dominance, Makassar’s initial plans for the open-air museum that would symbolically occupy the interior of the ruins of its 16th century royal citadel were ambitious – it was to be a Taman Mini Sulawesi, containing replicas of the adat (customary) vernacular house types of every district from all the provinces of Sulawesi. Had this grandiose vision been realised, the museum would have thus signified Makassar’s position as the focal point of the whole island (one of five major islands in Indonesia). Due to a lack of response from the other provinces, the plan was eventually scaled down to ‘Sulawesi Selatan Dalam Miniatur’ (South Sulawesi in Miniature’ (Robinson 1997:72).

In connection with the role of historic sites in registering a mnemonic version of the past, Nora (1989) has suggested that, based on evidence from France, places for which there is a ‘will to remember’ can be referred to as ‘sites of memory’; by this definition he opines that ‘sites of memory’ would exclude archaeological and prehistoric sites since, in the latter, people no longer have any social memory for such old sites. However, this assumption is problematic. Firstly, social memory is not unified or homogeneous and it is difficult to claim a ‘will to remember’ for any given site – in which segment of society must this will reside before the place becomes a ‘site of memory’? Secondly, most societies have some form of folk memory even of very old or ancient sites which may be mixed with myth and legend but which nonetheless constitutes a form of the ‘will to remember’.

In fact, this paper argues that there should be a distinction between relic sites (*lieu*) and sites which have been enhanced, framed, or reconstructed for accentuated display (*tableau*). The latter sites, *tableau*, would encompass historic sites both archaeologically rediscovered and extant, for which various forms of intervention for display have been made. This distinction allows for the agency and intent behind the exercise of re-inscription of ‘memory’ and of enhancing ‘spirit of place’ to be made explicit across all (historic) sites. It acknowledges that although the choices in interventions may be made to appear to ‘naturally emerge’ from a site, the resulting constructions invariably promote and foreground just one among the several possible interpretations.

It is precisely such sites on which interventions have been made to revive a forgotten past, or to modify or amplify folk memory of sites, which are here argued as constituting *tableau*. *Tableau*, or ‘sites of accentuated display’, differ from ‘sites of memory’ in that the former do not embody living memory that is readily known by the community – in fact the creation of *tableau* has as its goal precisely in fixing the spirit of place, in inscribing a new ‘social memory’ that will now be purposefully disseminated.

Making Monuments

The sense of a freeze-frame in the *tableau* is reflected in the word ‘monument’. Riegl (*Oppositions* 25/25) claims that monuments represent a modern cult, wherein “history imprisons the building”, and the value as monument supersedes other values (Hewitt 1994:198). This contention seems to be supported in the Malaysian context, when Paiman (1982), Assistant to the Antiquities Conservation, Museums Board, writing on ‘Monument Conservation Projects in Melaka State’, observes that “‘Monument’ remains a term that is still foreign to our community”.

The clue to the difference in the relationship to the past as found in contemporary society, to that found in preceding societies, seems to lie in the differing approach to how buildings are treated. Within this

difference lies the distinction between the notion of ‘monuments’ as a modern contrivance on the one hand, and historic ‘great built works’ on the other.

Prior to the rise of late colonial archaeology and colonial/world expositions, nationalist and touristic modes of display, interventions on sites from the past is characterised mainly by the agency of collective accretions, which build upon previous remains; even in coordinated projects, there is a tendency towards partial modifications and addition and alteration works. The goal then was to extend the life and utility of the building via *adaptations*. Thus buildings and structures such as Hagia Sophia even prior to its Ottoman renovations, the Great Wall of China and, in Indonesia, Borobudur were all the outcome of several building phases which were sometimes actually necessitated by partial collapse.

Today, however, nation-state are prominent as actors in interventions on past landscape relics and ruins. State authorities typically initiate programs to ‘salvage’ or recover historic sites entirely for didactic display. The goal is to fix historic landscapes and sites at a desired tableau, henceforth to be presented unchanged. The past is put on display in a carefully arranged manner, and unwanted aspects are removed or obscured. The goal is on *accentuation*, to ensure singular legibility and clarity of presentation, rather than on preserving or reflecting upon the complexity or diversity of the past. Sometimes the diversity is co-opted and neutralised into formulaic expressions of authorised cultural difference. This is especially the case with sites that have experienced invasions and rebuilding or imposition by other structures.

As an integral part of a ‘site of accentuated display’ or tableau, the creation of a monument entails restitution to, or reconstruction of, an element that is fixed as the desired projection of identity, which is highlighted to the exclusion of all other aspects. One suspects such imprisonment is related to two ‘modern’ phenomena: nation-building, and tourism. MacCannell (1976) has pointed out the practice of “framing” built landscapes for tourism, while as aforementioned, the state’s role in intervention on historic sites has become dominant, wherein the authorised rendering of a site’s value, which fixes the meanings and associations that the site is meant to convey, is disseminated to visitors and viewers via guides, narratives and publications.

Problematic replicas and obscured historical issues

During the regime of Suharto, the Indonesian state had set a strong precedent for the use of ‘adat’ (customary) houses, ‘adat’ costumes and other ‘cultural’ objects as markers of ethnic identity, organised according to province affiliation, in the construction of the monumental open-air house museum called Taman Mini Indonesia Indah (Beautiful Indonesia in Miniature Park) in 1975. The massive project was conceived by the wife of the former President Suharto, who had been inspired to embark on the project following a visit to Disneyland (Pemberton 1994). The project was situated in Jakarta, thus symbolically appropriating the cultures of the whole vast archipelagic nation and mapping them onto a site in the capital. South Sumatra, the province within which Palembang is capital, is architecturally represented by a Limas House, a Rakit (Raft) House, and an Ulu (Upriver groups) House. South Sulawesi, the province within which Makassar is capital, is represented by a ‘Toraja House’ and a ‘Bugis House’ (Ensiklopedi Jakarta 2005:247, 249). These are then the houses fixed as the ethnographic symbols.

Thus it comes as no surprise that, subsequent to concerted archaeological works on Somba Opu royal citadel ruins in Makassar in the late 1980s, the choice for the valorisation of this important archaeological site was in the creation of Makassar’s own version of such an open-air vernacular architectural museum-park superimposed over the interior of the former citadel. In actual fact, an approximate restitution of the historic buildings and general layout of the citadel would have been possible, given the number of maps from the early 17th century which depicted the citadel and old Makassar before its destruction in 1669. This option was however probably not deemed to possess sufficient symbolic potency within the politics of representation in Indonesia.

In 1990, Mukhlis Paeni, a cultural activist, came up with the initial idea of using the place within the citadel ruins as a cultural haven, for display of architecture, performing arts and literature. However, after

asking for and obtaining local govt support, the idea substantially revised by then-Governor H Achmad Amiruddin, and other officials, especially from Department of Tourism (Sutton 2002: 29-30)

Great care was taken to ensure the craft and typological authenticity and accuracy of the Adat (Customary) houses representing the various districts in South Sulawesi province that were built in Somba Opu Citadel's open-air museum – they had to either be exact replicas of actually existing houses, or be accurate reproductions based on available documentation. Houses that did not conform to the strict criteria of authenticity were excluded from the core display area and labelled 'Tradisional', as opposed to 'Adat' (Robinson 1997). Despite this care, however, the justification for an imposition which does not correspond to any form of restitution or reconstruction of the site's actual past condition remains highly questionable. The 'spirit of place' this project seems to promote is a skewed one, as it does not lead to a reconstitution of the urban setting of the old emporium, but to a pseudo-village display akin to colonial expositions, and obviously a local rhetoric that echoes the Taman Mini of Jakarta. The use of the site of the Somba Opu ruins for the symbolic gathering of South Sulawesi houses may in fact be interpreted as a means of staking out and asserting Makassar's centrality vis-à-vis the Toraja highlands within the South Sulawesi province, in response to the aforementioned ethnic rivalry between lowland/coastal Makassarese and Bugis, and the highland Torajas, in addition to expressing of Makassar's claim to preeminence within Indonesia on par with the national capital.

The 16th century Benteng Ujung Pandang was rebuilt in the 17th century as Fort Rotterdam by the Dutch, and is another important historic site in Makassar. The buildings have been restored and are seen as a landmark; however there is ambivalence about its presence as a reminder of Dutch conquest. The buildings now host a dance academy and an ethnographic museum named, ironically, La Galigo Museum (referring to the Bugis epic which predates even the 16th century Makassar port kingdom). The program in the fort makes no mention of Makassar's history as an international emporium, or of the war with the Dutch and of the rebuilding of the fort as a Dutch stronghold.

In contrast to such care for architectural authenticity in Makassar, in Palembang three typologically incorrect Rakit (Raft) House replicas have been constructed and placed on the waterfront of the Palembang citadel. Such Raft houses were historically used as residences and shops – indeed their use can be traced back to Palembang's initial rise as an emporium in the 7th to 11th centuries. The replicas in question were built in response to the proclamation, in 27 September 2005, of Palembang as a Kota Wisata Sungai (River Tourism City) by the President, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono. The Raft Houses constituted a distinctive typology with several model variations, built as they were by Malay upriver groups, local Palembangese as well as Chinese and Arabs, yet invariably they were built with a gable roof form with crossed finials (called lipat kajang). However, in Palembang the Limas House with its distinctive double hipped roof had become a pervasive symbol for the city, to the extent that it appeared on the provincial coat of arms, and a mayor's resolution in 1994 had decreed that the sporting of limas roofs was to be encouraged on all new buildings (Taal 2002: 177). It is therefore no surprise that the replicas of Rumah Rakits built by the local government also erroneously sported an imitation of the hipped form of the limas house roof. The three replicas were joined by two more built by corporate sponsors in 2008, in conjunction with the inaugural 'Festival Musi', Musi being the name of the large river on whose banks Palembang lies. Meanwhile little attention paid to actual old examples of Rakit Houses still found along the river.

Likewise, in Melaka, the Sultanate Palace replica is a very poor rendition that detracts from the historical description it purports to be based upon. It has also been sited at the wrong location, at the base of the hill on its southern side instead of near the top on its northern side facing the river and the old merchants' quarters – primarily because the actual site would have been too near the ruins of the Portuguese church and its Portuguese and Dutch tombstones which now occupy the summit. The construction of the replica was begun in 1984 (Hoyt 1993:73), and officially opened on 17 July 1986 as a Cultural Museum by the former Prime Minister Mahathir. The timber structure, measuring 74m by 18m, uses only prime hard wood (chengal and rasak), and is constructed in the traditional manner of carpentry joints without the use

of nails. The design of the replica was conceived by a team of artists from the *Persatuan Pelukis Melaka* (Malaysia Painters' Association), headed by Syed Hood Al-Habsyi. The official state tourism guide records that it was constructed "based on visuals obtained by the Architecture Unit of the Public Works Department (The Guide 2004:125). Although it purports to be based on the description given in the 'Malay Annals' written by the descendants of the Melakan court, it was noted that "for specific reasons, [the design] did not fulfil all aspects that were stipulated [in the text]" (Asmad 1987:83). One wonders if the reasons would have included an avoidance of an uncomfortable resemblance to the architecture of Minangkabau houses from neighbouring Sumatra in Indonesia, had the description of the roof form and its 'metal ornaments' been followed accurately. A reconstruction in which a Minangkabau-type roof is featured, in accordance with some of the features described in the historical text, had been offered by Sherwin (1981); however this was apparently rejected. In any case Sherwin's reconstruction too has its own misinterpretations of a typological nature.

Again according to the official state tourism guide, "The museum illustrates the role of the palace and its functionaries in the golden age of Melaka". Indeed its exhibits betray a preoccupation only with court ceremony and a narrow definition of 'culture'. The chamber galleries portray an Audience Hall replica, a representation of the fighting scene between two famous semi-legendary warriors, a Royal Bedchamber and a Gallery of Costumes (The Guide 2004:127). Interestingly, and in an echo of a similar silence in Makassar's Somba Opu and Ujung Pandang forts, the culture of Melaka as an international maritime emporium, its commerce and its cultural diversity receives no detailed mention in the palace replica's museum.

Mosques

In Makassar, the Al-Markaz Al-Islami (1994-96) (Yulianto 650):

Al Markaz mosque as a strange claim to creative amalgam or admixture of Katangka and Turkish mosque type. Previous Makassar city mosque, built by the Dutch in concrete but following the vernacular tiered roof form, has been torn down and replaced by a Saracenic post-modern fantasy.

The new State Mosque Al Azim modelled after the Melaka mosques post-1800s renovations but with important changes which in fact detract from its actual symbolic importance – roof peak ornament and ridge ends which were its distinctive marks, often conflated with Chinese ornaments which were indeed sometimes placed there instead of the Malayo-Javanese ones.

In Palembang, the new mosque has as its precedent the Tengker mosque, the 'State' Mosque, not the oldest surviving but was the site where the Sultan of Singapore is buried. Also situated at the edge of the historic suburb of Upeh which had been important for Javanese since the Sultanate period of the 15th century. Melakan mosques' history is not properly understood as a layered artefact and is instead read superficially as a readymade 'traditional' artefact to be copied in debased imitations; forgotten minaret relic

Attention to Masjid Agung in 2002 by then President Megawati whose husband is from Palembang: removal of all historic and recent accretions, and restoration to first state as can be ascertained from the remaining portions not affected by the accretions, and from old drawings.

Conclusion

Spirit of place does not simply emanate of its own accord, because the emotive and intellectual response to a place is itself conditioned by what one has been taught or informed about, and by one's connection to the place. Control over portrayals of the past and over memory is thus an important means by which the meaning and significance of a place can be created and manipulated, and thus in determining and fixing the 'spirit' that people will come to experience.