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Abstract

The aims of this thesis are threefold. Firstly, it aims to contribute to an ongoing re-theorization of the idea of architectural heritage. Secondly, it aims to examine the social and cultural roles of architectural heritage, and the importance of both architectural form and function in the post disaster context of Banda Aceh. Thirdly, it aims to reconsider to how architectural reconstruction and conservation maybe conducted in an Islamic context and in the face of disaster. To do this I draw on debates from within the critical heritage studies movement that argues that heritage is a cultural performance linked to activities of remembering and identity formation. This definition requires us to move beyond the idea that heritage is merely material, and asks us to acknowledge the importance of understanding how material culture is used.

However, in debates over the idea of heritage as performance, the importance of materiality, of form, can be obscured. Thus, I argue that the relationship between *form and function* should be central in understanding the significance and nature of architectural heritage. It is in the interrelationship of form and function, of material and its use, that architecture becomes a cultural tool in the facilitation of the activity of remembering and identity formation. The thesis examines these issues with particular reference to remembering and identity formation in terms of cultural resilience in the face of natural disaster, drawing on examples from Banda Aceh post the 2004 Tsunami. In exploring the relationship between form and function, the thesis uses an architectural anthropological method which documents both architectural spaces and the social activities in and around them. I
argue that traditional architectural conservation, including *adaptive reuse* that stresses the importance of building form, misunderstands the nature of heritage values, particularly in post-disaster contexts. Instead, the thesis offers the idea of *adaptive reform* where by function is privileged to the extent that form may be altered, even completely changed, to accommodate the resurrection of traditional uses and cultural meanings. It is argued that this is particularly important in both post-disaster and Southeast Asian cultural contexts, especially in regard to Islamic culture where materiality is viewed as impermanent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACHS</td>
<td>The Association for Critical Heritage Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adat</td>
<td>local customary practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHC</td>
<td>Aceh Heritage Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHD</td>
<td>Authorised Heritage Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIIC</td>
<td>The International Association of Conference Interpreters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPCB</td>
<td>Badan Pelestarian Cagar Budaya/ the Board for Conserving Tangible Cultural Remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPSNT</td>
<td>Badan Badan Pelestarian Sejarah dan Nilai Tradisional/ Board for conserving intangible heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRR</td>
<td>Badan Rehabilitasi dan Rekonstruksi Aceh dan Nias/ The Aceh and Nias Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESDM</td>
<td>Kementrian Energi dan Sumberdaya Mineral/ the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAM</td>
<td>Gerakan Aceh Merdeka/ Free Aceh Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemilang</td>
<td>Heyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotong Royong</td>
<td>Work together side by side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haul</td>
<td>The commemoration of the death of Teungku Dianjong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Historic Urban Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibadah</td>
<td>Worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>The International Council on Monuments and Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDNDR</td>
<td>the United Nations established the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idul Adha</td>
<td>A celebrations start at same time of the annual Hajj in Mecca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idul Fitri</td>
<td>End of Ramadhan (fasting) celebration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJHS</td>
<td>International Journal of Heritage Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka’bah</td>
<td>Islamic Prayer direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaffah</td>
<td>Complete or holistically</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kampung: A village in the Indonesian language

*Kenduri* Ritual feasts involving prayers and often the recitation of litanies, which held in Aceh for a variety of occasions

*Keuramat* This word is Arabic derived, and means a miracle performed by a *wali* (saint).

*Krueng* River

*Makamah Syariah* Islamic Court

*Meunasah* A communal building in Acehnese society that is usually used for praying, learning and other communal activities

*Nazar* Promise to Allah, God

*NGO* Non-Government Organizations

*OHD* Organic Heritage Discourse

*Orde Baru* New Order which is associated with the era during Soeharto presidency from 1966-1998

*Perang sabi* Holy war

*Qanun* Specific legal framework for Aceh

*Rumbia* Palm leaves

*Rumoh Aceh* The Acehnese traditional house

*SIRA* *Sentral Informasi Referendum Aceh/* an organization organizing referendum as to whether Aceh should secede or not from Indonesia

*SPAB* The Protection of Ancient Buildings

*SPSP* *Suaka Peninggalan Sejarah Purbakala/* Board for conservation of ancient remain

*Ulama* Imam or Islamic religious leader

*UNESCO* The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

*VOC* *Verenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie/* Dutch east India company

*Wali* Saint

*Waqf* Islamic endowment
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Backgrounds, Problems, and Aims

In a post disaster society, it is a dilemma whether or not to replace a heritage building or to rebuild. There is a dilemma in rebuilding the city between preserving the past, which is known as facsimile approach, or ‘building back better’, which is known as a tabula rasa approach. The most common approach in preserving architectural heritage is to keep it in its original condition by ensuring its material authenticity, to ensure the continuity of identity claims associated with the building. Often defined as representing a tangible expression of identity, particularly national identity, architectural heritage is often globally valued for its tangible or material features. In particular, age, authenticity, aesthetics, uniqueness, and monumental form are the values against which a building’s heritage values are measured. The designation and protection of architectural heritage are often undertaken in the name of the continuity of cultural identity (Pearson & Sullivan, 1995; Jokilehto, 1999; Bevan, 2006). Place familiarity and continuity of culture have also been seen in post-destruction literature as an important aspect in survivors’ resilience\(^1\) (ICCROM, 2005; Samuels, 2010; Daly & Rahmayati, 2012; Mahdi, 2012).

---

\(^{1}\) An ability to overcome traumatising experiences both undertaken personally or within community

\(^{14}\) Islam, as defined by a leading author in Islamic studies, Nasr (2010), is the manifestation of a religious and spiritual reality in society.

\(^{1}\) Authorized Heritage Discourse is a term coined by Smith (2006), which refers to expert and other elites’
Yet, in the name of providing cultural continuity and place familiarity, too much attention is given to tangibility, the material aspect of architectural heritage. This emphasis may misinterpret how and why architectural heritage should be reconstructed and conserved in post-disaster contexts, especially within Southeast Asia culture. According to Byrne (2012) and Kalstrom (2005), heritage in Southeast Asian contexts are mostly understood as being intangible. In addition, the emphasis on material authenticity makes more likely a possible misunderstanding of what constitutes important aspects of cultural continuity and resilience for survivors. As pointed out by Al-Nammari (2009), this misunderstanding has created delays in rebuilding several heritage buildings. Accordingly, this research posits a central question: "How is architectural heritage understood, conceived, used, and conserved after the 2004 tsunami in Banda Aceh, and how did this impact on the continuity of cultural identity and place familiarity, in providing survivors with potential resources to promote cultural resilience?" From this central question arise a number of subsidiary questions:

1) How has disaster affected the management and heritage planning of Banda Aceh? How does the Aceh government develop and deal with architectural heritage after the disaster? To what extent has the government taken into account the issues of the past as a component of identity construction reflected in architectural heritage of Banda Aceh?
2) In regard to the post-disaster context and Southeast Asian, especially Islamic\(^2\), context of my case study, what constitutes architectural heritage for governments, experts and communities? Is it the authenticity of material features (form) or activities (function) that ensure the heritage status of a building?

3) How have the changes to the built environment influence survivors’ sense of identity, place familiarity, and resilience?

4) Does remembering the past (being able to engage with the past) help to promote people’s resilience? What, if any, are the roles of three iconic architectural heritage sites: the Baiturrahman Mosque, the Tsunami Museum, and Peulanggahan Mosque, in triggering and facilitating acts of personal and social remembering. To what extend are the three Acehnese narrative templates creating Acehnese collective memories: (1) the twin disasters of the 2004 tsunami and earthquake, (2) conflict (wars), including the thirty years of conflict with the Indonesian government and the Dutch war, and (3) Islam and its influences, including the mythologised ‘glory’ of the historical Islamic kingdom, its central place in society and the role of Syariah Islam; used in this remembering? Why are these particular narrative templates significant for the personal and cultural resilience of survivors?

---

\(^2\) Islam, as defined by a leading author in Islamic studies, Nasr (2010), is the manifestation of a religious and spiritual reality in society.
5) Does “new iconic architectural heritage” emerge after disaster? If so, what makes this architectural heritage any different from previous examples of heritage? Why does this “new architectural heritage” emerge, and how does it emerge? How do new actors, including outsiders (such as aid agencies) become involved in decision making? To what extent do their involvement, and their cultural background and experience, influence that of local’s in selecting architectural heritage to remember the past? Do any issues of the politicising of memory and of dissonance in and about the past emerge?

In responding to these complex problems and questions, this research examines the consequences of the expert focus on the tangible aspects in architectural heritage conservation in post-disaster contexts. It considers alternative understandings of architectural heritage and its conservation in regard to post-disaster contexts and Islam in Southeast Asian cultures. The aims of this research are:

1) To contribute to an ongoing re-theorization of the idea of architectural heritage by adopting Smith’s theory of heritage as a cultural process.

2) To examine the social and cultural roles of architectural heritage, its form and function, in the post disaster context, by looking at how the three examples of iconic architectural heritage: the Baiturrahman Mosque, the Tsunami Museum, and Peulanggahan Mosque, are used in triggering and facilitating the act of remembering the three main Acehnese collective memories I have identified.

3) To provide an alternative to how, in the debate over form and function in architecture, an architectural reconstruction may possibly be conducted in
the face of disaster and in an Islamic context. I provide an alternative to traditional architectural conservation, which is applicable to non-Western culture -- especially Islamic Southeast Asian cultures -- in respect to architectural function and uses. This alternative I call adaptive reform, which is an approach that focuses on the function of buildings, noting that form is adjusted according to the use of space for activities. I also aim to examine how the Authorized Heritage Discourse (AHD)\(^3\) and, what I am calling the Organic Heritage Discourse (OHD),\(^4\) deal with the iconic architecture of Banda Aceh, and how the importance of form and function of architectural heritage has influenced the decision making of rebuilding Banda Aceh after the 2004 Tsunami disaster.

1.2 Why Examining Architectural Heritage is Important for a Post-disaster Society

The questions and aims above have led me to examine the literature on architectural heritage, in particular in regards to post-disaster\(^5\) reconstruction and the ways architectural heritage has been tackled in post-disaster context. From this body of literature I found at least two major problems, which lead to a lack of understanding of how architectural heritage should be defined, reconstructed and

---

\(^3\)Authorized Heritage Discourse is a term coined by Smith (2006), which refers to expert and other elites’ understanding of heritage.

\(^4\)Organic Heritage Discourse is a term I define in this thesis in opposition to the AHD. This discourse frames the traditional heritage conservation practices of local, non-expert, people. I develop this term, along with adaptive reform, as my contribution to the discussion on non-European understandings of heritage in a post-disaster context.

\(^5\)I define disaster as having both natural and human-made causes. So, war and conflict are also disasters causing the destruction of the built environment.
conserved in the light of disaster, and the growing awareness that heritage is intangible, especially in Southeast Asia and Islamic contexts. Firstly, there is a lack of theorization of architectural heritage understanding and its conservation, beyond the discussion of architectural forms and advanced research on conservation techniques and materials. This lack of understanding can be seen, for example, in the work of a leading scholar in architectural heritage such as Orbasli (2008), who still strongly associates architectural heritage with its tangible features, and papers published by well-established architectural heritage journals, see for example Giuriani & Marini (2008) and Marszałek (2008), who discuss how to conserve the tangible features of architectural heritage. Secondly, there is still a lack of theorization of the social and cultural roles that iconic architecture might play in the act of remembering and providing survivors’ with sources of personal and cultural resilience in a post-disaster context. Post-disaster literature on architectural heritage has also been strongly influenced by the idea that architecture is tangible, so that most of the decisions undertaken during reconstruction stress the importance of the physical aspects of architecture for the continuity of human life and survivors’ resilience. In other words, the physical aspects of architectural heritage, its presence, have been strongly regarded as tools for resilience (see for example Bevan, 2006 in his analysis of rebuilding architecture as a symbol of resilience).

The problems are arguably caused by two main factors. Firstly, by the Eurocentric Authorised Heritage Discourse, a term coined by Smith (2006), which refers to elite understanding of heritage which emerged in Europe around the 19th Century and has influenced the understandings of global heritage organization; within this tradition architectural heritage has been strongly associated with tangibility.
Architectural heritage is often defined by its aesthetic values as monumental buildings (Orbasli, 2008). The meaning of this architecture, like other artwork, is gained through reading its forms: façade, plan, ornamentations, amongst other elements (Whyte, 2006). Thus, as most initial founders of modern\(^6\) heritage conservation were architects and art critics, the architectural view has influenced the understanding of heritage as tangible, and at the same time architectural heritage has been shaped and reshaped by this modern heritage discourse (Orbasli, 2008; Smith, 2006). As a result, architectural heritage has been very strongly perceived as the artistic, monumental, material part of buildings, that is, its heritage values are linked almost exclusively to the form of the architecture (Orbasli, 2008). This association is strongly linked to the 19\(^{th}\) understanding of architecture and the way Europeans define heritage. While there is some discussion of the intangibility of aspects of architectural heritage, see for example Orbasli (2008), this intangibility, however, is interpreted merely as the value such architecture self-evidently has that enables it to be labelled as heritage. This point to view does not pay enough attention to the relationship between values, architectural heritage, and people. In addition, the uses or functions of architecture, that are important aspects of architectural creation, have been overlooked in the discussion. Little attention has been paid to the relationship between tangibility and intangibility, and between architectural form and its function: architecture is composed of form and function (Leathart, 1940; Ching, 2007), and this interrelationship requires in depth exploration.

\(^6\)Modern here refers to the nineteenth and twentieth century developments in heritage that incorporated an expert driven post-Enlightenment philosophical perception of heritage that broke with traditional or non-expert understandings of heritage in Europe (Lowenthal 1985).
Secondly, little attention has been given to cultural issues in post-disaster contexts, so that this creates lacunae in the development literature and debate over the importance of cultural issues for peoples’ resilience (Barakat, 2007). However, after a series of major disasters, including the 2004 tsunami and earthquake in Aceh, and those of 2011 in Japan, and Hurricane Katrina, in the US in 2005, several books published on post-disaster reconstruction have afforded significant attention to cultural aspects of reconstruction (see for example Al-Nammari, 2009; Barakat, 2007; Lakoff, 2010; Vale & Campanella, 2005 amongst other). These publications have indicated a delay in paying attention to cultural heritage issues as they are perceived as being of secondary importance. Cultural issues are important for understanding humanitarian issues, in particular because there has been an over-emphasis on material issues. Even if attention has given to cultural issues, especially in the case of Aceh, it has been given in the later stages of reconstruction, and it is naturally separated from emergency, technical and other more urgent issues such as health, infrastructure, and housing. In post-disaster societies, there has been a global trend to reconstruct destroyed buildings, especially heritage buildings, and to revive and resurrect cultural practice, yet, I argue, there is still a strong tendency to separate tangible from intangible heritage issues, which negatively impact on the utility of post-disaster heritage responses. Cultural practices, such as traditional ceremonies, artisanship, and other intangible cultural heritage, tend to be treated separately from the importance of heritage buildings. In fact, some cultural practices occur and take place in heritage buildings - to pretend otherwise separates architectural form from its functions and uses. The issues of food supply, shelter and health, will, of course, be a priority in post disaster conditions. However, the role of culture should also be recognized as important in the early phases of recovery, because aid distribution stands a better
chance of being successfully implemented if the cultural context of its beneficiaries is understood, and the ability of people to recover from such extreme situations will, in part, depend on their own cultural resilience (Ascherson, 2007). Tangible reconstruction stands a better change if it is conducted within the context of intangible heritage associations.

The very strong association of architectural heritage with tangibility has led to the misunderstanding of what constitutes sense of place. Daly and Rahmayati (2012) argue that changes on the built environment, the absence of public architectural heritage like mosques and *meunasah*, has contributed to the loss of familiar places where communal decision-making was made. In addition, mosques gained added value due to their survival rates during the tsunami, which also helped create resilience in the community as well. Although what they mean by heritage in their study is not clearly defined, they appear to focus on built forms. So for them, what constitutes place familiarity are architectural forms. In contrast, Samuels (2010) explores the role of the non-physical environment, such as neighborhoods, in providing resilience. Everyday activities have contributed to rebuilding processes along with physical reconstruction. Rico (2014) and Leeuwen (2011) have conducted research which is cognate to the intention of this thesis. Rico examines the concept of heritage at risk in the face of disaster, and argues that instead of acting as passive victims that are destroyed by disaster and wait to be rebuilt, heritage is in fact a form of cultural capital that sustains resilience. In contrast, Leeuwen's (2011) investigation of the awareness of particular sites of debris that have become symbolic of the disaster in Banda Aceh, argues that most Acehnese lack awareness of disaster symbols. In this sense, he argues that disaster heritage has little influence on Acehnese memory networks, and plays a minimal role in the
reconstruction process. I believe that his view is questionable. Drawing on Rico’s argument that disaster heritage plays an important role in the reconstruction process in promoting survivor’s resilience, and looking at numerous everyday symbols of disaster embodied in real urban and abstract space in Banda Aceh, I believe that his research seems to misinterpret this phenomenon. Acehnese now live in the wake of memories of disaster, so that memorials for these memories have become very common. Building on previous research, my research finds that there is a need for an investigation to bridge how everyday activities (the focus of Samuels) link to public or iconic structures (the focus of Daly and Rahmayati) in promoting resilience. Rico argues that the concept of heritage at risk should be rethought, because heritage is not a passive victim; rather it is able to facilitate resilience. Thus, I have mobilized her insights to specifically understand examples of iconic architecture and how they actively provide resilience. I expanded my investigation by not only looking at tsunami heritage, which has been examined by Rico (2014), but by also including the buildings that survived the tsunami and the buildings that were destroyed by the tsunami and then rebuilt. My investigation also aims to understand the relationship between people as place users and architectural heritage as a place where people’s activities are conducted. In addition, I examine the form and function of architecture and how it is used in the act of remembering and in enhancing collective identity formation and thus how it may promote survivors’ resilience. I provide an alternative to how an architectural reconstruction may be conducted in the face of disaster in an Islamic context. I provide an alternative to architectural conservation that is applicable to non-Western cultures and respects both its function and uses.
This research is therefore significant as it provides an important opportunity to advance the understanding of architectural heritage beyond its physical features. By doing so it fills the gap caused by the tardiness of architectural heritage studies in catching up with the growing understanding in heritage studies that heritage is intangible. It provides an explanation of how architectural forms and functions are interrelated with each other to provide survivors’ with resources that promote resilience. To do this I have needed to draw upon insights from a wide range of disciplines and methodologies. In addition to using the work of heritage, architecture, and post-disaster theorists, I have adapted the theoretical framework developed by theorists within critical heritage studies such as Laurajane Smith (2006), Denis Byrne (2009, 2011) and David Harvey (2001). I have in particular adopted Laurajane Smith’s (2006) idea that heritage is a cultural process. For Smith, heritage is intangible; it is an embodied cultural process to remember the past for, amongst other things, identity formation. Her definition has moved beyond the limited stress on heritage being merely material forms, and acknowledged the social and cultural aspects of heritage, the importance of using and engaging with heritage sites and places through these activities. To explore these issues I have chosen Banda Aceh as my case study for both personal and scientific reasons.

1.3 Banda Aceh as a Case Study

I selected Banda Aceh as a case study for two main reasons. Firstly, my choice stems from my personal experiences as an architect, who was born and grew up in
worked in Banda Aceh, and who also survived the 2004 Tsunami disaster. I miss those family members on my mother's side who did not survive: my grandmother, two uncles, two aunts, and four cousins. The destruction in the environment to which my memories were tied also affected me. I came very close to losing my life as well! My life, and life in Banda Aceh, was so completely changed after the Tsunami: fear, sadness, and trauma occupied one side of me, while on the other side I saw great hopes of rebuilding my life, my city and opportunities to be resilient. My concern was also about the consequences of the rapid changes to the built environment: I wanted to understand how the loss of built environments that have mediated the connections between the past and the present, and the rapidly emerging new buildings during reconstruction, have the potential to create new connections.

Secondly, I selected Banda Aceh for several scientific reasons. In studying the roles examples of architectural heritage play as cultural tools in heritage processes and in remembering in the context of trauma, I needed a case study that involved tremendous disaster where iconic architectural heritage significantly changes before and after the disaster. There should be cases of examples of iconic architectural heritage surviving the disaster, destroyed by the disaster and rebuilt, and newly built after the disaster, especially as a memorial. This case study should be located in Southeast Asian culture in order to understand architectural heritage from a non-Western culture. Within heritage studies, there is a significant absence of non-Western perspectives (Herzfeld, 2014; Winter, 2013) and a strong western hegemony in defining heritage (Byrne, 1991). Banda Aceh fulfills all these prerequisites.
Banda Aceh is one of the cities most affected during the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami and earthquake, which destroyed communities in more than five countries; indeed it is to date one of the largest natural disasters in the 21st century. In Aceh, the loss of human life was somewhere between 130,000 to 170,000 deaths, about 250,000 houses were destroyed (Kenny et al, 2010, p.3) and over 500,000 people were made homeless and displaced (Ananta & Onn, 2007, p.1). This disaster also caused the collapses of the local government and the economy of Aceh, and impacted the agricultural and fisheries sector, and infrastructure such as roads, bridges, electricity, and telecommunication. Key heritage buildings were also destroyed. The survivors suffered not only the loss of the built environment, but also the loss of beloved people and places, apart from the effect of the disaster on themselves, as many survivors were hospitalized for injuries and some lost their jobs, homes and other crucial elements of their lives. Thus, the profound effects of such destruction have attracted a great deal of attention from many countries across the world. International emergency aid and donors, including some vital United Nation’s organizations, have been involved since the beginning of the recovery process. To manage the aid and funding, in 2005, the Aceh and Nias Reconstruction Board (BRR) was established to manage one of the largest humanitarian aid projects in history (BRR, 2009). This rehabilitation and reconstruction agency operated for a four-year period (BRR, 2009).

In respect to heritage building issues, the process of reconstruction after the disaster also significantly provoked heritage conservation activities, as well as their promotion through tourism. Banda Aceh is the focus of heritage conservation more than ever before. As an old city, from the global AHD perspective, the
absence of material from the past raises doubts that Banda Aceh is old enough to warrant heritage conservation efforts. There were no significant heritage conservation activities in the city before the Tsunami. Only during the reconstruction process did the city give any attention to its heritage by obtaining an Indonesian government award and grant as an historic city, and significant activities for heritage conservation were conducted by several leading local Non-Government Organizations (NGO), such as Aceh Heritage Community (AHC) and Bustanussalatin. Starting in 2011, the local government of Banda Aceh promoted tourism through the Visit Banda Aceh 2011 Campaign (see for example the website of http://visitbandaaceh.com/ and http://bandaacehkota.go.id/). Several efforts have been undertaken to attract tourists to come to Banda Aceh, including organizing some festivals and using architectural heritage, ranging from pre-colonial, colonial, post-independence, and post-disaster eras, as tourism destinations. Prior to the tourism campaign, there were some inventories and heritage conservation campaigns after the tsunami conducted by various organizations and experts. One of the inventories was done by AHC. It has conducted the survey and inventory on cultural assets of the Acehnese, prioritizing areas destroyed by the tsunami to record and identify heritage damaged by the tsunami, to develop a database of heritage in Aceh, to safeguard the surviving heritage, and finally to gain support for heritage recovery. Another local organization which has actively involved in heritage conservation is Bustanussalatin organization. This organization has also tried to help local government in bring back the sense of the past along Krueng Aceh (Aceh River) by re-cultivating traditional plants. At the same time, some heritage buildings destroyed by the tsunami have also been renovated and rebuilt, in both similar and different styles from originally. These heritage conservation movements, although
not so dominant during the reconstruction process compared to other forms of physical reconstruction, have also fostered a different sense of place in Banda Aceh. Therefore, examining heritage conservation efforts will provide answers to several research questions I have proposed in this thesis.

The change of sense of place and the loss of heritage buildings in Banda Aceh, however, was not only caused by the 2004 tsunami, but also by other interrelated reasons. As its architecture developed and changed over time, the sense of place in Banda Aceh changed accordingly. As an old city that was recognized as a highly cultured community in 17th century South East Asia (Lombard, 1991; Waterson, 1990), it should have a long list of heritage sites and buildings. Nevertheless, most of them have been destroyed by war, new development, and disasters before the tsunami. Arguably, disaster has continuously contributed to the development of Aceh’s culture, including architectural heritage. Several times in the past the city centre of Banda Aceh has been moved, and some important parts of the city, such as Indra purwa, is now in the sea and Indrapatra is now partly in the sea (See Arif, 2008, p.286-287 for further explanation of disaster and the movements of the city center and city planning). In addition, the Dutch War also changed the look of Banda Aceh, such as by replacing the burnt Baiturrahman Mosque and the destroyed sultan's palace, and the thirty-year conflict with the central government has contributed to burning some public buildings and retarding development (Arif, 2008). As Hasan (2009, p.85) points out, since the pre-colonial era Acehnese architectural development has been influenced by other cultures, such as the design of some buildings in the Sultanate palace.
Along with this reconstruction process, there was also the peace building process in Aceh. The tsunami has also become a historical turning point for a peace agreement after a thirty-year conflict. As argued by Waizenegger & Hyndman (2010), the tsunami has shaped new political spaces for change by enabling cooperation between parties in conflict around humanitarian aid, and accelerated moves towards a peaceful resolution to the conflict which were already emerging before the disaster. Thus, for the Acehnese, the tsunami arguably has dual interrelated meanings, both as a traumatic past and as a turning point for a new peaceful life. It is a duality of remembering this disaster, between a blessing and a punishment (Samuels, 2010; Smith, 2012). This duality creates another complexity in association with two interrelated ways of remembering significant events in the past: conflict memories, which are mostly associated with negative aspects of the past, and Islamic Kingdom memories, which have become a widely accepted myth of past greatness in Aceh. In addition, this duality became more widely prevalent after the development of a dedicated luxurious tsunami museum established by the Indonesian government with the support of aid agencies. This creates a dissonance in public memories of Banda Aceh; to what extent is this memorial needed in the face of strong government intervention in creating it (see Zilberg, 2009 for this critique) and why is there no conflict memorial? Understanding all these contexts, and the ways Acehnese are dealing with reconstructing destroyed buildings, will provide a better understanding of how the traditional Acehnese heritage conservation ethos, which in this thesis I call the Organic Heritage Discourse (OHD), has been conducted over time and in different circumstances. In short, I aim to examine how the AHD and the OHD deal with the iconic architecture of Banda Aceh.
To represent the public architecture, which was and is in Banda Aceh before the tsunami, the Baiturrahman mosque was chosen. This is a powerful image of Banda Aceh (Arif, 2008; Reid, 2006a). The Baiturrahman Mosque is an existing icon of Banda Aceh that is physically unchanged by the Tsunami, though it has been altered several times and enlarged, by making exactly the same copy of the original mosque to accommodate the growing number of worshippers before the Tsunami. It grew from one to dome to seven domes; it is like cloning the initial dome to enlarge space. It also represents the everyday process of giving meaning and value to heritage buildings. This process, together with the enlargement process, has worked to turn and appropriate a building -- which was built by the enemy, the Dutch, for political purpose to gain sympathy from the Acehnese -- into the representation of identity of the Acehnese. The concrete mosque in Moghul style that we enjoy today was built by the Dutch in the same location of the former wooden three-tiered roof mosque, which is believed to have been built by Sultan Iskandar Muda (Arif, 2008; Raap, 1994). Considering all these aspects, this building was selected in order to examine whether or not the ways people attach, relate to, and remember the past through this building changed, or did not change, after the tsunami and several changes of forms made to accommodate the growing number of worshippers. The disaster, I argue, has possibly superimposed another set of memories, meanings and value on those pre-dating the tsunami. This mosque became a safe harbour in the chaos of disaster. There is a public myth which talks about the miracle of this mosque in save the lives of people after the disaster. Thus, after the disaster, it is very interesting to explore how this mosque supports resilience and facilitates a sense of place and belonging in the community.
To represent a building newly built after the tsunami, the second case study is the Tsunami museum. Similar to the Baiturrahman mosque, this museum has become an icon of tourism of Banda Aceh. This building has expanded the list of significant buildings in Banda Aceh, and, together with other objects, reflects how the city has become known for informal disaster made memorials such as kapal apung (boat on the top of the house), mass graves, etc. This building is chosen as a representation of the way in which the tsunami, a significant disaster in the 21st century, is being remembered by government. Although in the past there have been tsunamis (McKinnon, 2006), and presumably a lot of Acehnese cultural assets were destroyed by these disasters (Arif, 2008), there has not been a dedicated memorial for remembering the disasters. Through exploring how people use, interpret and constructed this museum, and then how people remember the past through it, this research can illustrate and explain the relation of disaster-torn society and its public memory embodied in public buildings such as museums. As an officially designated place of commemoration, this research investigates to understand ‘how official remembrance place are interpreted by inhabitants’ and whether or not this public building become, following Billig (1995), a banal object and a place for public mourning which promotes resilience.

The third case study is Teungku Dianjong/Peulanggahan mosque, which was an example of what is believed to be an original Indonesian mosque style with a three-tiered roof made of timber (O’Neill, 1994). The mosque was severely damaged by the tsunami, and afterwards rebuilt in the same style, but with different materials, a significant change from wood to concrete. Its founder, Teungku Dianjong, was also one of the prominent ulama (Islamic religious leader) in the past. This mosque is not as famous as the previous two case studies, yet its
status is similar to the Baiturrahman Mosque, in that it is not in its original form. However, through this building, I would like to investigate the attachment of people to architectural heritage after the disaster, in the absence of the original fabric. How do people relate to and use this new structure, which is not authentic in terms of material? In what ways does this mosque act as a resource which people use to promote resilience?

By examining this iconic architectural heritage my research has shown that there are several important aspects that make heritage, as understood by the AHD and the OHD in Banda Aceh, is different from the global AHD. I briefly discuss my research finding and argument below.

1.4 Thesis Statement: Architectural Heritage: Beyond Form

I found that the critical heritage study approaches, especially the work of Smith (2006), has benefited my research by providing a convincing and robust overarching theoretical framework, which I have used to expand the understanding of architectural heritage that suits the post-disaster context of Islamic Southeast Asia culture. By employing the idea of heritage as cultural process (Smith, 2006), I argue that architectural heritage has dimensions beyond just its physical form. Architectural heritage – in both its form and functions – is, to borrow Spelman’s (2008) term, a scaffolding for memories, a cultural tool to facilitate the remembering process for identity formation, and to contain activities and processes for promoting resilience in the face of disaster; in turn it represents
identity and symbolises resilience. It is in the interaction between form and function that architecture turns into architectural heritage. It is not in itself heritage; it is the activities and processes that occur at and around it that make it heritage (Smith, 2006).

Using this framework I examined the ways that three examples of iconic architectural heritage were used by the AHD and OHD after the 2004 tsunami and made several interesting discoveries. The construction of heritage in Banda Aceh performed by the local AHD and OHD has waived the need for time depth. This finding is similar to what Rico (2014) argues in her examination of heritage at risk in her research on tsunami heritage. In addition to issues of age of heritage sites, in my examination of the buildings that survived and were reconstructed after the tsunami, I found that the deep concern for authenticity of form and material had also been eliminated in defining heritage. The changing forms before and after the tsunami have not diminished people’s attachment to such places, nor significantly changed their familiarity with these places. As long as, cultural, social, and religious practices are still in place building and rebuilding have not changed the heritage meanings and values. Through performing these practices, survivors practice resilience and continue their lives after the disaster.

These findings suggest that approaches to architectural conservation should be expanded from merely preserving physical form to maintaining activities as well. Adaptive reuse, which has paid attention to the importance of how sites are used, should be expanded. Also, adaptive reform should be included as one of the potential approaches for reconstructing architectural heritage in the face of disaster. The fundamental differences between adaptive reuse and adaptive
reform is that adaptive reuse aims to preserve the tangibility of form by finding new functions (uses), such as adapting an obsolete building for current needs. Adaptive reform seeks to preserve function, its intangibility, by altering form to accommodate a growing number of users and resurrections of tradition, in this case to suit post-disaster contexts in which a total material reconstruction is, to some extent, unaffordable and impractical, and better conforms to Southeast Asian cultures’ sensibility that materiality is impermanent, as argued by Byrne (2012) and Kalstrom (2005). These are the arguments I elaborate in this thesis.

1.5 Structure of the Thesis

The thesis is developed based on multidisciplinary and cross-cultural research, linking together a wide range disciplines: architecture, heritage, memory studies, and post-disaster studies; in order to re-theorize architectural heritage and the way in which memory is specialized, recalled, and negotiated. As such I structure my thesis into Eight Chapters, including this chapter, the introduction as chapter one.

Chapter Two, “Re-theorising Architectural Heritage: Its Destruction and Reconstruction in a Post-Disaster Context”, examines the contemporary discourse of heritage and architectural heritage, and the consequences of this discourse to post-disaster societies. This chapter proposes an alternative definition of architectural heritage by adopting Laurajane Smith’s (2006) theory of heritage as a cultural process, and analyses the consequences of this alternative definition to the
relationship between architectural heritage and memory, identity, and value. In addition, it also proposes an alternative for architectural heritage conservation beyond adaptive reuse.

Chapter Three, “Research Methods: Architectural Anthropology”, outlines the methodologies and approaches that I have employed in this research. I outline how qualitative methodologies, especially architectural anthropology and ethnography, helped me answer my research questions and achieve my research aims.

Chapter Four, “Remembering the Banda Aceh Past: a History of Architectural Heritage Conservation”, outlines the geographical, political, social, and cultural context of Banda Aceh as a case study, alongside the introduction of individual examples of iconic architectural heritage: the Baiturrahman Mosque, the Tsunami Museum and Peulanggahan Mosque. This chapter shows the influences of the modern conservation ethos introduced by the Dutch during colonialism over Indonesian heritage policy. It also illustrates the origin of the Authorised Heritage Discourse (AHD) used in Banda Aceh. Despite this colonial influence, the chapter also outlines the idea of the organic conservation ethos, the Organic Heritage Discourse (OHD) adopted by Indonesian and other Southeast Asian culture in general, and Acehnese in particular, which sits awkwardly outside of the Eurocentric AHD.

Chapter Five, “Building Back Better”: Banda Aceh’s Urban Planning, Architectural Heritage and Memories in the “New Banda Aceh”, investigates the way authorities, within the AHD, use architectural heritage, especially the three examples of iconic architectural heritage selected for this research, in post-disaster Banda Aceh. I
show how the spirit of an idealised Islamic past is brought to life in Banda Aceh, though not only Islamic Sharia implementation, but also Islamic city planning and conservation, including several examples of the Islamism of memories and memorials. The chapter shows how the planning process has strengthened the Islamic identity of Banda Aceh and developed a particular AHD, an Asian and European hybrid.

Chapter Six, “Architectural Heritage as Scaffolding for Remembering: Examining the Memory Work at Landmark Architectural Heritage Sites of Banda Aceh”, investigates how communities use architectural heritage, especially the three examples of iconic architectural heritage selected for this research, as an anchor of memories, places of religious and cultural activities, and heritage processes. Drawing on Connerton’s (1989) idea of embodied memories in ritual activities, Wertch’s (2002) idea of the roles of text, in which I treat architecture as another kind of text, useful for recalling memories, and Whyte’s idea of architectural meaning, I demonstrate the role of form and function in remembering.

Chapter Seven, “Place Familiarity and the Iconic Architecture Heritage: Between the AHD and the OHD in post-disaster Banda Aceh” analyses the consequences of my research findings for the established architectural heritage definitions and conservation practice. I propose to include adaptive reform as an alternative in post-disaster contexts and Southeast Asian, especially Islamic societies, in the context of architectural heritage conservation.

Chapter Eight, “Conclusion”, provides a summation and rethinking of architectural heritage policy in the context of post-disaster societies and Southeast Asia,
especially Islamic societies. It also proposes further research directions in this area.
2.1. Introduction

This chapter aims to critically analyse theories of architectural heritage, and evaluate how these concepts fare in a post disaster context. I argue that current definitions of architectural heritage are insufficient to deal with post disaster contexts, and offer a new definition of architectural heritage that recognises the importance of the religious, social and cultural uses of architectural heritage. These uses are reflected in the ways this architecture is used in cultural processes of social and personal remembering. Through these uses the built environment, in this case architecture, can be used to provide survivors with sources of resilience in the face of disasters. Smith (2006) argues that showing how heritage is used is essential to understand the nature and significance of heritage. This thesis draws on the general arguments developed by Smith (2006) and applies them directly to understand architectural heritage, and identifies the influence of the “modern conservation ethos” on understandings of architectural heritage. This ethos, embedded in what she has called the Authorised Heritage Discourse, defines architectural heritage as tangible, objectively authentic and monumental, and in line with this architectural style is defined as the most important aspect of architectural heritage values. Further, it is assumed architectural heritage
physically represents a collective identity. That is, only physical aspects of a building are considered as a reflection of identity.

This thesis will move outside of the elite European understanding of heritage. I do this to highlight marginalised aspects of heritage -- the religious, cultural, and social roles of iconic architecture in providing sources of resilience for survivors -- which are overlooked by the Eurocentric AHD. The AHD has globally promoted a European understanding of heritage through international organizations like UNESCO and ICOMOS (Smith, 2006). As a number of authors have argued, European understandings of heritage have been applied in various contexts, which have undermined local communities’, and non-European understandings of heritage (see for example Byrne, 1991; Cleere, 2001; Meskell, 2002; Labadi, 2007; Aikawa-Faure, 2009; Waterton & Smith, 2009).

To do this I look at new ways of understanding heritage, which argue that heritage is *intangible* and has wider social and cultural roles. This new approach has emerged in the last decade through the work of several figures, such as David Harvey, Laurajane Smith, John Urry and Denis Byrne. Smith (2006) defines heritage as not necessarily the site itself or a physical place; rather that heritage is a cultural performance concerned with remembering, sense of place and identity. Similar understandings have also been put forward by Bella Dicks (2000), David Harvey (2001), Denis Byrne (2009) and John Urry (1996), all of whom define heritage as cultural processes, acts of communication, or an act of connection to the past in which we negotiate our social values, cultural identity and personal and collective memories. Through their work, they shift the understanding of heritage as a ‘thing’ to understanding it as a ‘verb’ Harvey (2001), as something which is
done or performed. This new understanding has inspired me to rethink how architectural heritage should be (re)-defined, and to question why this kind of heritage is still strongly dominated by ideas of materiality and ‘authenticity’. Is it that the nature of architecture is too strongly bonded to expert concerns about its material aspects? Or is the concern simply reflective of the nature of expert training and interpretation?

I argue that architectural heritage conservation practice has fallen behind in coping with the dynamic of social change and the growing body of critical literature in heritage studies. One modern architectural heritage conservation method, which has moved beyond a complete preservation of fabric, and on the surface seems to accommodate the dynamic and the debate in the critical heritage literature, is adaptive reuse to old buildings. This approach has been widely believed to be a panacea for conserving architectural heritage in post-destruction, post-industrial, and areas of rapid development and modernization such as in Asia. This approach strongly mediates sustainability issues in the light of climate change and environmental protection. In this chapter, I would like to investigate the extent to which this approach is actually successful, and open up debate on this issue by drawing on Riegl's (1903 [1982]) theory of the modern cult of the monument, and use this approach as my point of departure from modern architectural conservation debates.

To do this I divide the chapter into four parts. Firstly, I explore a discussion of the critical literature on heritage studies. Secondly, I provide a critical view on architectural conservation in the light of critical heritage literature. I also discuss the current debate on architectural heritage and conservation in post-disaster
contexts, especially in the relation to the act of remembering, memory, identity, and resilience. Thirdly, I provide a critical analysis on current architectural conservation with specific attention to adaptive reuse. Finally, I unpack the idea of architectural heritage and propose a new understanding, borrowing Smith’s (2006) argument that heritage is a cultural process concerned with remembering the past. I expand her theory to understand how architectural forms and functions interlink to facilitate heritage processes, and how these may help people gain resilience in the face of disaster. In defining architectural heritage, I also bring back a sufficient weight to materiality of architectural forms, something that Smith (2006) does not pay sufficient attention to. In other words, although I privilege the function and uses of architecture, I give slightly greater weight to architectural forms than Smith (2006) does.

2.2 Critical Heritage Studies: An Overview

This thesis begins from the desire to fill the gap in understanding how iconic architectural heritage is used in post-disaster contexts in Southeast Asia, and is built on that premise that intangibility has a premium position in Southeast Asian’s heritage (see for example Byrne, 1991; Karlström, 2005; Winter, 2014), and that function is an important element of architecture (Leathart, 1940; Ching, 2007). I argue that architectural heritage should not merely be understood as a tangible state of architectural forms and styles. Critical heritage studies have opened the debate beyond the material and technical aspects of heritage; heritage is now seen as intangible. As Smith (2012, p. 535) noted in a special editorial of the
International Journal of Heritage Studies (IJHS), discussing the establishment of the Association for Critical Heritage Studies (ACHS) that heritage, for critical heritage studies, is "primarily a cultural phenomenon, and not something simply subject to technical and policy debate". This has synergy with the aim of my thesis to look beyond material aspects of architectural heritage, which has dominated the current discussion on architectural conservation. Furthermore, critical heritage studies have also shown a sufficient attention to the development of literature on marginalised societies, which lends itself to the study of post-disaster contexts and non-Western cultures like those of Southeast Asia. This is reflected in the manifesto of the Association of Critical Heritage Studies, which provocatively states that:

...We argue that a truly critical heritage studies will ask many uncomfortable questions of traditional ways of thinking about and doing heritage, and that the interests of the marginalised and excluded will be brought to the forefront when posing these questions (Smith, 2012, p. 535).

Smith (2006) has provided a comprehensive understanding of heritage beyond the modern conservation ethos and a foundation for critical heritage studies. Heritage, for her, is intangible as it is not a “thing” and cannot be measured, mapped, or managed and this “thing”, tangible and intangible, is not heritage by itself; rather it is heritage representation and performance, the practice of heritage. Heritage is intangible because it is a process. In this sense, she provides a base for analysing how a “thing” turns into heritage and some of the political and cultural uses negotiated in this process. In this sense, I can extend her idea further to
understand architecture and the built environment, which also has tangible and intangible aspects, forms and functions, which become part of heritage, and show how the two aspects interact with each other.

As a response to the growing literature on the intangible aspects of heritage, especially in non-Western countries, and the critiques of the limitation of heritage definitions dominated by the idea heritage is tangible, UNESCO has also enacted the UNESCO Convention for Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, 2003. This defines such heritage as:

The 'intangible cultural heritage' means the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage (Article 1 & 2, 2003, p.4)

For Byrne (2009), however, this definition is a mixed blessing. On one side, it seems also to want to look at social practices, skills, and traditions as comparable to the heritage objects, places, or landscapes. In other words, intangible cultural practices such as dances, recipes and the like, are equivalent to the tangible definition that identifies such things as buildings, archaeological sites, landscapes and so on. This presupposition implies that intangible values are static and indisputable rather than dynamic and socially determined (Beazley 2005, p.5, in Byrne, 2009, p. 229). But on the other hand, it opens an opportunity to place a greater focus on the social, cultural, and religious dimensions of heritage. It, for some scholars, has been taken as an implicit recognition that the tangible and
intangible heritage are two interrelated aspects (Byrne, 1991, 2009; Munjeri, 2004; Smith, 2006), so that there is no reason to split them up. As Smith (2006) points out:

Stonehenge, for instance, is basically a collection of rocks in a field. What makes these things valuable and meaningful – what makes them ‘heritage’, or what makes the collection of rocks in a field ‘Stonehenge’ - are the present-day cultural process and activities that are undertaken at and around them, and of which they become a part. It is this processes that identify them as physical symbolic of particular cultural and social events, and thus gives them value and meaning (p.3).

In other words, for Smith (2006), ‘things’ becomes heritage because of cultural processes of remembering the past, which is intangible, and that work gives value and meaning to it, and thus turns it into heritage, which in turn facilitates this cultural performance. In Byrne's (1991) terms, archaeological objects or sites become meaningful to us by our act or performance to draw attention to objects and sites -we give value to artefacts and justify the reasons they have been selected as valuable representations of the past (Graham, 2002, p.250-251; Harvey, 2001; Munjeri, 2004). Therefore the real sense of heritage is not so much the possession of a thing from past, but the real moment of heritage when our emotions and sense of self are truly engaged in sharing and remembering the possession of such a thing (Smith, 2006) and our intention to bring such a thing forward and valorise it (Byrne, 1991). In David Harvey’s (2001) terms heritage is a ‘verb; it is not a ‘thing’, an action that no one can precisely notice. Thus, the senses of heritage are when we emotionally engage in connecting the tangible to the intangible, and past to
present, as well as valorising the ordinary past into a meaningful past. The two aspects, tangible and intangible, work together as a process of social remembering to create a meaningful past for people.

In this sense, remembering becomes a central issue in critical heritage studies. The importance of the act of remembering lies in its role as an important element of collective identity of a social group. Remembering provides connection with the past to enable us to define our identity (Smith, 2006). As Harvey (2001, p.320) argues “through understanding of the meaning and nature of what people tell each other about their past; about what they forget and remember, memorize and/or fake, that heritage studies can engage in academic debates beyond the confines of present-centred cultural, leisure, or tourism studies”. In addition, through understanding how people remember, we can understand the importance of the past for the present (Urry, 1996).

Thus, instead of focusing on personal memories (Guggenheim, 2009), which are mostly in the purview of psychologists and behavioural researchers, my work focuses on the idea of shared memories, the memories that we have in common, which are identified as collective memories (Wertsch, 2008b) or social memory (Connerton, 1989). Memories, according to critical heritage studies, do not lay inherently in the fabric of heritage sites, but rather they are transformed (Wertsch, 2002), transferred (Hodgkin & Radstone, 2003), and negotiated (Smith, 2006), or even betrayed (Huyssen, 2003) and forgotten (Billig, 1995; Huyssen, 2003) by people. Memories are remembered in inscribed text (Wertsch, 2002), and are also remembered and embodied in the rituals and ceremonies conducted at places (Smith, 2006), including examples of architecture, which have been attributed
heritage value. For Connerton (1989), reading the ways people perform ceremonies and interact with buildings, is similar to reading a text. This contrasts to the presupposition of memories in the modern conservation ethos, as argued by Sharr (2010), that memories are perceived as being stored silently in the material and embodied in the structure of buildings; buildings are thus seen as frozen stores of memories.

Another central issue that should be highlighted, and is important in critical heritage studies, is Smith's idea of heritage as engagement. Smith (2006) and Connerton (1989) stress the importance of engagement in performing the act of remembering. However, for Smith (2006, p.71), the activities of remembering are not only physical experiences of “doing”, like performing ritual ceremonies and bodily practices, but also the emotional experience of “being”. For this reason, heritage objects and places should be used; she argues that ritual, cultural, social, and political activities are conducted at such places by both visitors and managers. All these practices are important for creating place attachment and the ability of the place to represent abstract identity. People need places to bind themselves, it is an innate need (Tuan, 2003); this bounding is created by familiarising themselves with a place through, extending Smith’s (2006) idea, conducting activities and being at such places.

Architecture - as one of disciplines that is strongly involved in initiating the idea of heritage in the 19th Century, has been strongly associated with a form of representation of identity which people bind themselves to. It has not, however, moved forward and been involved in the dynamic discussion of critical heritage studies. Architectural heritage is still too often merely associated with physical,
architectural forms. The debate on architectural conservation approaches has stagnated at the application of adaptive reuse, which seems be in line with critical heritage studies promoting the importance of the intangibility of heritage. Below, drawing on critical heritage studies, I analyse architectural conservation by paying specific attention to adaptive reuse in post disaster contexts.

2.3 Architectural Heritage: History and Current Debate in Post-disaster Contexts

2.3.1 The History of the Modern Conservation Ethos

In Europe, heritage has traditionally been defined as tangible. It has been widely argued that the understanding of heritage in the 19th Century, was strongly influenced by the European architectural view of heritage (Byrne, 1991; Harvey, 2001; Smith, 2006). This way of thinking stressed the notion that heritage is material and has physical form that can be mapped, managed, and maintained, and has greatly influenced the ways people perceive heritage, especially architectural heritage today (Smith, 2006, 2007).

At least three interrelated preconditions were responsible for the development of the modern conservation ethos. Firstly, the destruction of old buildings from previous eras (Jokilehto, 1999), especially across Europe during the Second World War (Rodwell, 2012), have facilitated a significant romanticizing of the past and a sense of heritage (Smith, 2007). Secondly, the rise of the idea of nation states in
Europe promoted nationalism and a sense of national identity (Billig, 1995; Graham, Ashworth, & Tunbridge, 2000). This sense of identity has been associated with shared heritage and, as a nation, the need to act as a steward to look after such heritage (Smith, 2006, p.18). Thirdly, the Enlightenment, which claims the possibility of objective truth, was a base for liberal modernity that influenced a modern conservation ethos which valued the material aspects of heritage (Smith, 2006; Wash, 1992).

Liberal modernity is also responsible for the establishment of modern architecture – by this I mean architectural styles emerging from industrial revolution and the promotion of the idea of form following function (Jones & Canniffe, 2007). In architecture studies, the idea “form follow function” was enacted by Louis Sullivan (1856-1924). This thesis, however, by arguing the importance of function, does not want to be involved in this debate; rather to give another perspective of seeing architectural heritage from architectural anthropology and critical heritage studies, in which human needs are keys in designing the buildings and uses of such buildings are essential in heritage designation. Consequently, we can see the emergence of modern architecture movements which support the efficiency use of space, minimal ornamentation and sophisticated technology (Roth, 1993). Modern architecture was born outside of religious and monastery buildings (Rybczynski, 2013, p.4) which were expensive and possessed grand medieval ornamentation for the wealthy and aristocrats (Kostof, 1985). At the time of the Enlightenment, the social life of many people was enhanced; architecture, consequently, does not only belong to elite groups; rather many people were able to build and own buildings (Rybczynski, 2013). In addition, this era also marked a break with old tradition by creating something “new” (Widodo, 2007) and the Protestant Reformation (Byrne, 2007).
There was the shift in European thinking, marked by the disappearance of spiritual space and the emergence of functional, logical space (Relph, 1976). Architecture at this time promoted a scientific approach based on objective values. Not surprisingly then, buildings were regarded as having innate value. And this values was accorded scientific justification of its physical conservation (Smith, 2006). The buildings, especially old ones, are regarded as almost being alive and possessing a voice or personality (Littlefield et.al, 2007; Insall, 2008). As a consequence of this, in the face of uniformity of architecture and an objective approach, elite edifices (usually in a classical style with full ornamentations) look exclusive. In other words, old monumental buildings, which stand out from surroundings featuring a standardised, functional, and uniform style of building, are seen as economically and aesthetically valuable; consequently they are privileged in social memory (Thorpe, 1999).

Modern heritage conservation practices were first developed in France in 19th Century with the restoration of medieval buildings. This was pioneered, by the Inspector General of Historical Monuments, M. Viet (Viollet-le-Duc, 2007, 77). He based restoration on Viollet le-Duc's principles, stressing the importance of fabric, artisanship, and aesthetic values in heritage conservation. Le-Duc argued that architectural conservators ought to be aware of the forms and styles belonging to the fabric they are conserving. For him, conservation is aimed to reinstate the building's style. Every portion removed should be replaced with better materials, using superior techniques, but in the same style it was built in, by referring to the styles or school each building belonged to (Viollet-le-Duc, 2007, p.79-81).
Similar conservation movements and organizations were developed in other parts of Europe, such as Germany, Spain, and Italy; however, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), established in 1877 in England, has had the greatest influence on the development of the modern international conservation movement (Jokilehto, 1999). In England, the heritage conservation movement was marked by the declaration of the manifesto of SPAB. This manifesto had been developed based on the idea of ‘conserve as found’ (Emerick, 2014; Jokilehto, 1999). Unlike le-Duc, Ruskin and Morris rejected any intervention in the historical ruins. For William Morris, conservation is something to do with keeping heritage buildings, either the fabric or ornamentation of the building, in sound condition and as it was ‘found’ (Morris, [1877] 2007). Ancient buildings should be treated as monuments of a bygone art because they are artistic, picturesque, historical, antique or substantial (Morris, [1877] 2007). Another commentator in this era was John Ruskin, who believed in the romanticism and sense of nostalgia of the ruins of old buildings, and considered that heritage depended on the originality of material, not modern intervention (Ruskin, 1855). For him, old buildings do not completely belong to us, thus we do not have a right to modify them. These elite perceptions of what heritage have been influenced by their experiences and background as elites with art and architectural training. Therefore, architecture alongside archaeology played pivotal roles in the establishment of the modern conservation ethos (Jokilehto, 1999; Smith, 2006)

This modern conservation ethos became embedded in the AHD and has been adopted in UNESCO conventions, and this discourse assigns government and expert roles as stewards of heritage, to guard against alterations and look after heritage for future generations (Byrne, 1991; Smith, 2006; Smith & Akagawa, 2006).
Morris’s manifesto, together with the sense of ‘duty’, ‘reverence’ and ‘honesty’ coined by le-Duc, has influenced the heritage conservation ethos not only in Europe but also across the globe (Orbasli, 2008; Smith, 2006). As Smith (2006), argues this influence can be clearly seen in the Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments of 1931 and the Venice Charter (The international Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites) of 1964. The two charters have become foundations for the modern international architectural heritage conservation. The ultimate embodiment of these European understandings of heritage is in the World Heritage Convention, 1972, which promotes universal value for heritage and its conservation. The assessment of what is defined as heritage has been based on the Western privileging of the materiality of heritage and the Western way of experiencing the past (Byrne, 1991). The ‘world best practice’ underpinned by universal values developed in and by the West has also directly and indirectly influenced the way people in the rest of the world think of heritage, especially those who studied in or have contact with Western countries (Taylor, 2004). This happens because Europeans believe that they are representative of the highest achievements of human civilization (Lowenthal, 1985; Smith, 2006, p.17). The degree to which European countries have dominated the World Heritage List has been extensively commented on as reflecting the degree to which European’s perceive themselves as representing world heritage (see for example, Lowenthal 1996; Cleere 2001; Meskell 2002; Labadi 2007 amongst others).

The AHD, however, has over emphasized the inherent material value of heritage, and as a consequence this disengages the past from the present as it disempowers the present to rewrite the meaning of heritage (Smith, 2006, p.29). It tends to
diminish the community understanding of heritage, what in this thesis I call the Organic Heritage Discourse (OHD) - a heritage definition defined by a group outside the AHD, and emerging from grassroots contexts. By the concept of OHD I mean a heritage process which privileges communities’ values, and more the authenticity of uses and engagements rather than fabric. Here, I give an example of conflicting values of the AHD and this OHD concept coming from Africa, as noted by Munjeri (2009), who writes about a conflict of understanding of conserving the heritage site Ntaba Zika Mambo, in Zimbabwe. In 1952, the site was protected as a national monument for its significance as a centre of the sixteenth-seventeenth-century Rozvi Mambo civilization. However, in 1990, there was a revival of living tradition, and a traditional spiritual group that invaded and cleared the site established a shelter and granary for storing grain which required ritual ceremonies. This act does not allow the group to use the site in the way it was traditionally used. These actions were not in accord with the Act 25/11 and civil law on property rights, which did not acknowledge the intangible value of the rituals, behind such a site (Munjeri, 2009). I will develop the idea of the OHD in discussing the case of Banda Aceh, which falls under the Southeast Asia and strongly influenced by Islamic culture I explore in depth in chapter 4 and 6.

2.3.2 Current Debates in Architectural Heritage

The modern conservation ethos, on one hand, was developed on the basis of architectural understandings of heritage; but on the other hand, this in turn also influences the ways architectural heritage is defined. Under the modern conservation ethos, as architectural heritage is defined as old, aesthetically pleasing buildings (Jokilehto, 1999; Orbasli, 2008). Thus, architectural heritage
conservation approaches have been strongly built on the basis that architectural heritage value largely lies in its form and style; so that the preservation of form is a must (Smith, 2006). In this sense, the most important aspects of architectural heritage are age and authenticity of form. Aesthetics, the place as art history, its beauty and relationship to high culture, together with historical and architectural significance, have become important elements in heritage designation at international and local level (Emerick, 2014, p. 1).

The narrow view of architecture as merely art work, “noble and beautiful buildings” (Charlesworth, 2006; Lethaby, 1912), which is mostly germane to the European traditional understanding of architecture as beautiful buildings built by trained architects (see for example Leathart, 1940). This definition, through textbooks and colonial influences, has influenced Asian architectural understanding too (Widodo, 2012, 2013). This definition has excluded the wider function that architecture can play in a social context. It has also excluded minority views and day-to-day architecture by only acknowledging buildings designed by architects as architecture (Rudofsky, 1964). In addition, as argued by Kelbaugh (2007, p.87) by quoting Cesar Pelli that looking architecture as merely art and beautiful work has limited our understanding of architecture that only a handful architects is able to master the building skills. Under this blanket of definition of architecture, architectural heritage has mostly associated with monumental buildings belong to elites. Thus, in the earlier development of the modern conservation movement, elite edifices, valued for their picturesque and aesthetic attributes, dominated conservation lists across Europe (Jokilehto 1999). Jokilehto (1999), in his extensive description of the history of architectural conservation,
has comprehensively demonstrated the conservation emphasis on monumental buildings such as palaces, castles, and many others.

The influences of anthropology and studies of orientalism, have been long noticed as important aspects which brought non-European architecture to the attention of European philosophers, architects and art critics, and defined in their own terms (see for example Lethaby, 1912). The involvement of other disciplines in studying architecture, and the failure of the technical approach in resolving architectural problems in some cities, triggered an expansion of the definition of architecture (Amerlinck, 2001). This new understanding of architecture emerged in the mid-20th century and has been pursued by anthropology, amongst other disciplines (Amerlinck, 2001). Anthropology tries to look at architecture beyond its mere “physicality” by investigating social and cultural aspects of architecture and providing a wider understanding of architecture beyond physical fabric (see for example Waterson, 1990).

Fundamentally, architecture is created as a container for our activities (Ching, 2007; Ching & Eckler, 2013), and therefore, it is designed according to its intended functions. On one hand, architecture has a social and cultural nature, as Ching (2007) argues the architectural spaces and arrangement and ordering of forms are influential in promoting endeavours, eliciting responses and communicating meaning. On the other hand, it is the nature of architecture to have material consequences. In other words, architecture is about arranging form for containing our activities; but at the same time this form is strongly dependent on the function it contains. Styles, or physical appearances, are also something that is inevitably found in architecture; at least in the ways humans need to enclose space to protect
them from climate and other possible environment and other threats. To provide a simple example, a physical wall, even with insulation, can protect us from the cold of winter, and a Bank needs a strong wall, even with other forms of security, to protect money from thieves. Yet these are not determining factors in guiding our behaviours; although there is the case of buildings like jails, which have a high degree of behaviour determination (Rapoport, 1976). Forms, according to Rapoport (1976), provide choices, although certain choices are more probable than others. The earliest architecture originated when ancient peoples required places for protecting themselves and containing their basic activities: sleeping, cooking, eating, and gathering together; thus they occupied caves and made simple huts. The simple huts then evolved to more complex edifices, adding cultural symbolic signs and being used for cultural or religious ceremonies (Waterson, 1990), and drawing on more sophisticated techniques and technology (Rybczynski, 2013). The arrangements of a shelter became more complicated as the growing needs of a space or container for increasing complex and diversified human activities - from a single or two rooms to multiple rooms in a house and from just a simple hut to a range of modern edifices: house, office, school, and many others. Thus, as evidence of this transformation, the difference between architecture in the Middle Ages and today is in its function; in the Middle Ages the function of the architecture was for religious and aristocratic activities, while today the buildings contain more mundane and everyday activities (Rybczynski, 2013, p.4).

As an architect by training, it is thus hard for me to imagine designing a building without a specific function or use in mind. I make a design by knowing the function of the building that I am designing, such as an office, hospital, school and so forth.
Therefore, as Rybczynski (2013, p.6) argues “it is difficult to overlook functional deficiencies in the name of artistic purity and to excuse technical incompetence in the sake of experimentation”. For him, architects need a balance between function and inspiration, construction and visual expression, details and spatial effects. In this sense, I argue, among the three fundamental elements of architectural design coined by Vitruvius: *firmitas* (structure), *utilitas* (function), and *venustas* (beauty), *utilitas* makes architecture different from sculpture or other art works. Architecture is inevitably also a work of art, but it prioritises functions over aesthetical arrangements (Leathart, 1940; Davies, 1994).

Under the blanket of a new definition, architecture is “everything that has been built by people and possibly by their precursors” (Egenter, 1992), and it is the building which is built with emotion (Lethaby, 1912). Lethaby (1912) believes that “the men (sic) who first balanced one stone over two others must have looked with astonishment at the work of their hands, and have worshipped the stones they had set up” (Lethaby, 1912). Architecture is no longer seen as a ‘thing’; rather it now includes the ‘act’. Charlesworth (2006) also argues that the definition of architecture as the building of elite edifices for the aristocracy and bourgeoisie should be changed to a wider definition that includes the acts of thinking, creating and implementing in a structured intellectual framework, so that architecture has a wider role in the social and environmental wellbeing of the nation. In this sense, what is defined as architecture in this thesis, without wanting to make a rigid boundary, is every building made by people with their intention to enclose space in order to contain their activities. Therefore architecture has two important
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7For the purpose of this thesis I view that *firmitas* born from the need for a space for *utilitas*; *utilitas* precedes *firmitas*. We need a place for our activities. *Venustas* is the most debatable aspect that should be rethought and open to broader understanding, to include “architecture without architect” as architecture, while the other two are firmly accepted as dominant aspects of architectural design. *Utilitas*, however, has been also interpreted as human behaviour by several authors (see for example Moore, n.d)
components that should be underlined: form and functions or uses, which are fundamental for containing human activities. Architecture, thus, can be understood as the marriage between function and form; how it acts as a “heritage” cannot be understood via any single factor, but it could possibly be explained by the confluence of these two aspects coming together.

Architectural conservationists, however, in general, define architectural heritage as beautiful and monumentally important buildings (Jokilehto 1999). This definition has consequently tended to exclude vernacular architecture as heritage in preference for elite edifices whose form is valued over function (Smith, 2006). Nonetheless, there is growing acknowledgement of the importance of vernacular architectural heritage, although this heritage is often underestimated in some places. For example, as documented by Carrucci (2014, p.201), vernacular architectural heritage in Sardinian, Italy, has been overlooked. This is shown, Carrucci (2014) argued by the abandonment of rural buildings, the disappearance of traditional building practices, and their replacement with new methods of production. These issues have also been identified by the South Asian Vernacular Architecture Conference: Challenges to Its Continuity and Strategies for Its Future on 11th-13th December 2015 in Bhopal. The admiration of, and focus on, form is reflected in the discussion over the technical aspects of protecting monumental and aesthetic buildings from demolition and decay and with the search for ‘authenticity’. How this materiality has been imposed in academic debates on architectural heritage can be viewed from, for example, papers which have recently been published in the International Journal of Architectural Heritage (Giuriani & Marini, 2008; Marszałek, 2008) and the aims and scope of this well-

*see the conference aims at [http://sava.spabhopal.ac.in/](http://sava.spabhopal.ac.in/), accessed on 18 November 2015.*
established journal in architectural conservation to promote technical support for building conservation. The papers strongly suggest that architectural heritage is the physical aspects of a building by providing different types of conservation techniques against building decay.

In addition, besides these journal publications, there is a growing body of research devoted to preserving material aspects of architecture, understanding the fundamental mechanisms of damage to material, establishing instruments and techniques for investigation and diagnosis, and developing strategies for material conservation such as for stone and timber (see for example Baer & Snethlage, 1997; Croci, 1998; Insall, 2008; Orbasli, 2008). Orbasli (2008) gives a good example of this. In her book, Architectural Conservation, Orbasli (2008, p.5) defines the term ‘heritage’ as ruins, archaeological sites, monuments, palaces, castles, vernacular buildings, groups of buildings or ensembles, settlements and urban areas, as well as natural heritage, areas of landscape importance and the cultural values of meaning and association. She has also acknowledged what she refers to as ‘intangible values’ of heritage, and the need to accommodate the needs of associated communities to conserve buildings. She suggests that architectural heritage conservation should also recognise the values, qualities and characteristics that different users of place, in different times, on cultural heritage. Some social values relate to tangible items, such as buildings, or objects with aesthetic, archaeological or rarity values. Social value can also be accorded to intangible heritage, such as the emotional, symbolic, and spiritual meanings of a place (Orbasli, 2008p, 38). In saying this, she indicates that expert’s values are more likely to be applied to ‘managing’ the meanings attributed to tangible heritage, and the less formal folk life is relegated to the ‘intangible’. Both sets of
'values' are equally performative, abstract and 'intangible', but the association of authoritative expert knowledge with often high status material culture loans expert values more validity than community knowledge, and hides the fact that 'experts' are themselves a community of interest. Her definition, thus, still strongly suggests that architectural heritage is a 'thing', or merely the physical aspect of a building. Her discussion mostly focuses on how to technically conserve the fabric; yet like most of the literature on architectural conservation, she spends little time in explaining how the values which people have can turn buildings into heritage, or how the intangible links to materiality. This process remains rudimentary in the broader discussion of architectural heritage. She, like other contemporary architectural conservationists, has discussed and promoted adaptive reuse – often considered useful for meeting preservation challenges and as addressing changes demanded by current needs of space and modern facilities (see for example Baer & Snethlage, 1997; Croci, 1998; Insall, 2008; Orbasli, 2008). In addition, this approach is also considered as addressing environmental and economic sustainability.

As defined by the Illustrated Dictionary of Architectural Preservation (Burden, 2004), adaptive reuse is:

The process of converting a building to a use other than that for which it was originally designed. This conversion is accomplished with varying alterations to the building, which may include removal of some or all of the interior building elements except the structure.
This approach has been practised for decades. For example, monuments, which are structurally secure, had been pragmatically transformed for new uses without heritage conservation as an intention (Plevoets and Cleempoel, 2011, p. 155). In 19th Century, this approach was adopted as a modern conservation method (Plevoets and Cleempoel, 2011, p. 155). Unlike the values encapsulated in the “conserve as found” ethos and the practice of returning buildings to their “original condition”, this approach gives a lot more attention to uses and permits alteration of fabric. For example, following this approach in Australia, buildings, which lost their original functions, are sympathetically reused for new functions without diminishing their heritage significance (Australian Government, 2004, p. 3).

Although this approach has been practiced for a long time, it is only in the last few decades that it has been elaborated in modern conservation practices (Plevoets & Cleempoel, 2011). However, according to Plevoets and Cleempoel (2011) current debate on architectural conservation has not given enough attention to theorizing this approach. Although on the surface adaptive reuse privileges current uses of architectural heritage for current needs, it actually still privileges physical form and tangibility. Instead of being entirely negative about this approach, however, I look at the emergence of this approach in a positive way. Adaptive reuse is a stepping-stone for pushing the debate on architectural heritage to engage with critical heritage studies. Critiques in critical heritage studies have questioned the way expertise and materiality is defined in current preservation approaches that privilege material preservation and restoration over human uses. Before I move to this task, below I review how recent understanding of architectural heritage and its conservation is limited, and has failed to engage with current debates in heritage studies.
Architecture, especially, has not progressed in the same way its closest cousin, urban planning, has. Urban planning has extended the idea of heritage beyond merely the collection of built environment and architectural forms, and adopted ideas of cultural landscape, which acknowledges heritage as an integration of culture, nature, and meaning (Taylor, 2004, 2011). Urban conservation has emerged as an important approach in heritage conservation around the second half of the twentieth century, marked by the establishment of many excellent plans and programs started in the 1960s and 1970s (Bandarin, 2011, pp. 1-2). In 2005 UNESCO proposed the notion of Historic Urban Landscape (Taylor, 2011, p. 4). The HUL concept places itself within a wider conservation approach, rather than simply focussing on the conservation of historic buildings, to include the idea of the city as a layering of significances, identities, and values, and to acknowledge the integration of intangible aspects of urban culture (Taylor, 2011, p. 5). This implies that heritage is beyond architecture; as architecture is potentially excluded in critical definitions of heritage, due its limiting focus on the cultural values of aesthetics and style. As I have mentioned earlier architecture of course has physical aspects, but what is lacking in understanding the physicality of architecture is an appreciation of the social and cultural roles of its form. In other words, while acknowledging the physicality of architecture, I problematize the ways modern conservation understands and conserves this physicality and do not want architecture to be excluded from heritage.

In summary, this stagnancy has consequences in dealing with post-disaster reconstruction issues. I focus in particular on how adaptive reuse methods differ from common rebuilding approaches, such as facsimile and tabula rasa. A city will be called tabula rasa if it is completely populated by new forms, and facsimile if the
city is still holding on to old forms (Charlesworth, 2006). Adaptive reuse has been highlighted for two reasons. Firstly, this approach has stepped away from a pure preservation approach which strongly privileges fabric. Despite its intention to preserve part of a building, especially its facade and structure, this approach has given some attention to the importance of uses for heritage -- which is the key issue in this thesis. Secondly, in post-disaster contexts this approach has also been applied for reusing damaged buildings and abandoned traditional buildings, and is discussed in the following section

2.3.3 Architectural Heritage in Post-disaster Contexts

The valuation and associations of heritage, especially architectural heritage, as tangible have two main interrelated consequences in a post-destruction (either by war or disaster) context. Firstly, heritage is an expensive luxury in such contexts. The efforts to reconstruct architectural heritage in an authentic state requires a great deal of money, sophisticated technology, scarce resources and lengthy timeframes. The restoration and reconstruction of a heritage building should follow established international guidelines to ensure its “heritageness” (or cultural significance), especially its stylistic authenticity. As heritage is linked to identity, the loss of architectural heritage is often perceived as causing a disengagement between past and present (ICCROM, 2005). This disengagement is the threat to the continuity of collective identity, even though, in reality, identity is not stable over time (Bevan, 2006). To ensure the identity of a community remains the same heritage is rebuilt in the same form and style (see for example the Mostar Bridge, and rebuilding cities like Warsaw, Ypres and Dresden after wartime destruction). the established protocols for action in conflict or post-conflict contexts begin with
a concern to protect heritage from destruction, and assessing heritage damages in the face of the disaster, to establish “the art of (re) construction” which requires an extensive expert scrutiny (see for Al-Nammari, 2009 for example of this scrutiny). To deal with disaster - not only caused by long-term effects of climate change, but also by sudden and more localised disasters like earthquakes, flooding, and volcanic eruption - heritage, especially World Heritage, has been under expert surveillance and continuous protection of its physical aspects (an example of this protection can be seen in UNESCO, 2010). To prevent the destruction of heritage, UNESCO has established the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict 1954 (the Hague Convention). As part of a growing awareness of the threats of disaster, UNESCO has also established the World Heritage Resource Manual for Managing Disaster Risks for World Heritage in 2010. The seed of this disaster risk manual, however, had been planted since 1954 by the establishment the Hague Convention. In 1990, the United Nations established the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR), which tackled specific questions of the fate of cultural heritage at risk from disaster (Rico, 2014). The aims of the 2010 disaster risk manual are to reduce risks to heritage values embodied in the world heritage properties (authenticity and/or integrity and sustainability), and also to human lives, physical assets and livelihoods (UNESCO, 2010, p.11). Protection of cultural heritage therefore means the protection of all monumentally grand and aesthetic buildings and sites to ensure the continuity of human history (UNESCO, 2010, p.10). All these efforts not only place heritage as materially valuable, but also incur great costs; so that heritage becomes something of a luxury in post-disaster situations.
These approaches, I argue, have proven costly and unaffordable, not only in developing nations, but also the developed world; this has delayed and complicated the reconstruction process. Al-Nammari (2009) used data from the city of San Francisco after the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake to examine the cost and time needs for the recovery of historic buildings. The focus of her research was on the recovery of physical fabric, and showed that the recovery of a historic building takes a longer time than non-historic buildings, such as residential structures, infrastructure facilities and emergency buildings. This delay in the recovery of historic buildings after the disaster, she argues, was caused by the debates and disagreements over damage estimates, the cost of repairs, and the level of expected performance.

Secondly, in the face of the destruction of its physical elements, such as buildings, roads, and other facilities, a place is regarded, I argue, as losing its attraction and importance; a place is vanished, so that it is no longer supportive of human life and can no longer be heritage. In other words, in the absence of its physical elements, a place is regarded as empty and not heritage anymore, so that it can be developed as wanted, or abandoned if it is considered unsafe to live there. This was evident in Banda Aceh after the 2004 Tsunami disaster. As documented by Mahdi (2012) and Samuels (2010) the relocation of victims from the disaster-hit area, which is usually unsafe, was amongst the first steps undertaken in emergency situations after the disaster. Yet most, if not all, of the victims refused to be relocated. This was also the case in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina (Flaherty, 2008). The reasons for returning to destroyed places are, amongst other, memories of lost people and a sense of place that still lives in the mind of the survivors (Read, 1996; Samuels, 2010; Spelman, 2008). Returning to an empty place does not necessarily,
as Read’ (1996) argues, mean returning to nothing; rather it is returning to a place where past memories are still alive (Samuels, 2010). In other words, we still remember in the absence of objects (Spelman, 2008), and consequently the heritage process of remembering the past is still happening in the absence of material elements; a place can still be meaningful in the absence of material representation. However, people also feel unstable in the face of the destruction of such things as iconic architecture to which their memories are tied (Read, 1996), and where they usually conduct communal activities (Daly & Rahmayati, 2012), the destruction of private houses has more effects on the stability of people than community property (Ascherson, 2007). In the latter part of this chapter, I discuss and explain in depth this argument by interrogating how architectural heritage, in its presence and absence, plays a role in this reconstruction process.

Given these explanations, it is clear that the responses to calamity and the subsequent planning for physical reconstruction have neglected cultural aspects in the early stages of reconstruction. I do not mean to say that the cultural and social aspects are absent in the reconstruction process; rather that they are separated from the physical reconstruction. In almost every reconstruction, the attention to cultural aspects emerges in the later stages after physical reconstruction is almost completed. For example, in Aceh, the cultural issues only had significant involvement starting in the second year of reconstruction (Badan Rekonstruksi dan Rehabilitasi Aceh dan Nias/ BRR, 2009). Over emphasis on physical aspects has meant that the social and cultural dimensions of architectural heritage are seen as secondary concerns for communities emerging from disaster (Barakat, 2007; The Executing Agency for Rehabilitation and Reconstruction (BRR) of Aceh-Nias 2005-2009, 2009; Jha & Barenstein, 2010). This is not to say that heritage is
as important as food, accommodation or medical resources in these contexts, but that heritage becomes important in social and cultural recovery in order to assist the smooth delivery of physical reconstruction (Ascherson, 2007). In addition, heritage has potential for providing people with resources for resilience. As argued by Rico (2014, p. 4), heritage, in its ability to preserve traditional knowledge, is one of the sources of resilience, and is not a passive victim which is at risk and should be protected. In addition, Daly and Rahmayati (2012) argue that the importance of heritage lies in its physical setting, along with social and cultural aspects of recovery. For them, communities need landscape that represents their cultural understanding of long term processes, as well as material places to contain activities contributing to resilience. For example, religious buildings have served as shelter, meeting point, etc in the face of calamity (Sugimoto & Sagayaraj, 2011). In Aceh, the mosque and meunah9 have served as places where communal decision making about recovery was made (Daly & Rahmayati, 2012).

The issue of resilience has become central in post-destruction contexts (Daly & Rahmayati, 2012). However, the modern conservation ethos embodied in reconstruction procedures may come into conflict with values adopted by communities. In their edited book The Resilient City: How Modern Cities Recover from Disaster, Vale and Campanella (2005) argue that there is a significant increase of cultural resilience following disaster and war. For example, in the case of Japanese cities, Hein (2005) shows how they are resilient under threats of continuous disaster by applying traditional principles and building techniques, and almost always quickly recover from the disasters, even within days, when the buildings are rebuilt by private initiative. Even in the light of a corrupt
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9 A communal place which is located in village level, and functions not only as a place for prayer, but also as a gathering place and a venue for education, as well as a place where other communal activities are conducted.
government, Davis (2005) notes the ways in which people-led reconstruction in Mexico after the 1985 Earthquake transformed the city in a democratic fashion. Contrast to the two examples where resilience was developed in the disaster hit area, Read (1996) also shows that resilience is also developed outside the affected area through diaspora and later return to a destroyed site. In this sense, the resilience is shown by the ability of people to rebuild their lives while coping with memories of a painful past, the loss of beloved people, places, buildings, and other familiar environments (Huyssen, 2003; Linenthal, 2005; Geertsma, 2011). Thus, resilience has been understood as the ways people recover from extreme situations, aftershocks and back to a ‘new normal’, in which activities are retrieved, the city and its infrastructure are rebuilt, and social, cultural and economic life function again (Vale & Campanella, 2005). It is like saying ‘I have lost everything, but I am fine, I can continue my life and I can remember the events, although they are traumatic, as part of my identity (who I am)’. In relation to resilience and architecture, there have been two interrelated elements of resilience which emerge in literature: rebuilding the city (Linenthal, 2005) and establishing public memory discourse (Huyssen, 2003) which is usually marked by the creation of physical public space for commemorations, such as memorials and monuments (Fredericks, 2011; Huyssen, 2003; Linenthal, 2005), and in public debate, in a more abstract fashion which Freud would have called a “talking cure” (Geertsma, 2011).

The issue of rebuilding destroyed cities or buildings has traditionally been viewed from with the modern conservation ethos as physically reconstructing the city and building. Understanding architectural heritage as monumentally important buildings, which should retain their physical aspects for the purpose of collective
identity and resilience, has also triggered the encouragement not only of a physical restoration approach, but also adaptive reuse of those buildings that survived destruction. For example, after the 2006 Earthquake in Kota Gede Heritage District, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, houses were abandoned due to technical and economic issues (Adishakti, 2008, p. 252). The cost of reconstruction of damaged houses was very high, yet, for the sake of a “better” Kota Gede after the disaster adaptive reuse of abandoned traditional houses was encouraged.

Through the lens of the modern conservation ethos, consequently, the level of destruction caused by a disaster is recognised and mapped based on the survival and damaged physical environment and how to conduct reconstruction approach—whether it is tabula rasa or facsimile - is determined by the existence or absence of physical aspects which embody memories, values, meanings, and identities. Thus, for this ethos, just as with the hostile erasure of the iconic architecture that is interpreted as the erasure of memories, identities and the evidence of a society (Bevan, 2006), rebuilding on the top of ruins and clearing up the debris, thus, can be also regarded as an attempt to erase tragic memory, and a physical void to be filled (Huyssen, 2003). Adrian Forty (1999, p. 10) refers to this as a process of forgetting which involves “remaking something in order to forget what its absence signified”. However, if we perceive that the memories are also embodied in rituals and ceremonies (Connerton, 1989), and activities and processes conducted at the sites (Smith, 2006), what implications does this have in post-disaster contexts?

The important implication that I draw here is that a site or a building can be destroyed but a place cannot. There is no such thing as a complete tabula rasa and facsimile reconstruction approach. Disaster does not completely destroy the past,
and what is rebuilt during the reconstruction process is not completely new. The disaster destroys the physical aspects of the built environment, which act as mediums of memories and the representation of heritage process; it destroys a site, not a place. By saying this, I perceive that architectural heritage is, at one hand, a place as perceived by the Australian ICOMOS Burra Charter; while on the other hand, it is also a place where multiple layers of meanings and functions intersect. Tuan (2003), calls an enclosed space a place -- which, following Relph (1976), has three main components: physical components, observable activities, and symbols and meanings; while a site is a more tangible aspect of place (Smith, 2006, p.78). The destruction of site is observable, while place is not. In addition, amongst Relph's three place identity components, only physical aspects, only one, physical anchors to tie memories, are destroyed by disaster, while the others – symbolic meanings and observable activities -- may still be there. As Hayden (1997, p. 9) states, “Urban landscapes are storehouses of social memories, because natural features such as hills or harbours, as well as streets, buildings, and patterns of settlement, frame the lives of many people and often outlast many lifetimes”. In other words, following Graham et al's (2000) idea of place and scale in heritage, architectural heritage is located at a local or specific scale of urban landscape, in which personal and public memories and identities tied and attached to its fabric. This may, however also overlap with political, social, economic uses and values of heritage. In the absence of physicality, therefore, people still remember the past; as long as other aspects are present. This is explored by Peter Read (1996), who argues that visiting a place which lost its physical features may still trigger some memories of the place. Emotional feelings and memories may be, as he points out, still very vivid in the mind of those who return. In addition, returning to lost sites also continues to happen through storytelling, despite people being unable to revisit
the place (Davidson, 2009, p. 340). The destruction of physical aspects to some extent hurts and creates an emotional response; especially in cases of the destruction of iconic or other significantly familiar architecture, its removal from the memory network leaves the network unsettled (Guggenheim, 2009). However, the absence of architecture is not necessarily causing the absence of memories associated with it (Bevan, 2006).

Therefore, there is no such thing as a new beginning. Toufic’s (in press) and Connerton’s (1989) arguments of new beginning are built on the bases of resurrection and recollection, and will help me to connect and analyse the paradoxical “absence” and “presence” in the tabula rasa and facsimile approaches. According to Connerton (1989, p.6) recollection underpins all beginnings. For him all new experiences are built on the top of prior experience in order to ensure that they are intelligible. This recollection, for him, occurs in implicit and explicit ways. The surviving, newly emerging, disappearing architectural heritage is not completely the new and the old, or absent and present, its traces remain in the society and its newness is part of the past that is resurrected. His argument is supported by Toufic (in press, p.25-6):

Any building that was not razed to the ground during the surpassing disaster, materially subsisting in some manner; but was immaterially withdrawn by the surpassing disaster; and then had the fortune of being resurrected by artists, writers, and thinkers is a monument. Therefore, while many buildings that were considered monuments of the culture in question are revealed by their availability, without resurrection, past the surpassing disaster as not monuments at all of that culture, other
buildings, generally viewed as indifferent, are revealed by their withdrawal to be monuments of that culture.

A common phenomenon after destruction is marked by the old tradition being resurrected and the new culture emerging as a result of the withdrawing of some traditions (Bevan, 2006; Charlesworth, 2006; ICCROM, 2005). In Beirut, new places with modern lifestyles as a result of the withdrawal of Lebanese traditions has marked “new” life in Beirut after war (Bevan, 2006; Larkin, 2009). Hmong society experienced their culture, especially costume and music, which was resurrected during their diaspora (Lee, 2007). As memories are not destroyed, the survivors resurrect and recollect the tradition, and start a new beginning, either with strong aspects of the past or not.

For these reasons, the tabula rasa approach still embodies some past aspects in it and does not produce everything completely new. The facsimile approach does not always retain the past in the present, because what is preserved or reconstructed has been reinterpreted in the current situation. For example, for the sake of a better future a city is rebuilt as a new one, like Rotterdam and Coventry, by taking the opportunity of a completely destroyed city as a test case for forming a guide for rebuilding other cities which have been similarly devastated (Charlesworth, 2006, pp. 27-28). However, this new city, with new buildings, is still capable of triggering the memories that are not associated with those new buildings. An example - although not from a reconstructed city, but from the two cities which trigger the same memories - is offered by Max Ferber, an enigmatic protagonist in Winfried Georg Sebald’s, The Emigrants. Ferber moved to Manchester to start a new life without sorrow, past or memories, as Manchester was a city in which he had no
associations or connections. Yet, the urban landscape and Jewish culture of Manchester provided prompts of his traumatic past life, which he sought so desperately to erase. Though he is of German-Jewish background, he never imagined that Manchester, with its industrial past, was permeated with German-Jewish culture that would recall his past pain (Gilloch and Kilby, 2005).

Along with rebuilding, establishing memorials has become viral in post-destruction contexts. As the world today is full of fear of oblivion, memorials have become an alternative for always remembering (Huyssen, 2003). An object like architectural heritage is a popular choice for a memorial. Guggenheim (2009) and Davidson (2009) argue that architecture can act as a medium which is able to trigger memories in the process of remembering. Architecture and other material states can be used for “commemoration” — embodiment of memory or knowledge of a person or event — and “memento” — a reminder or warning for future generations (Bonder, 2009). These buildings and other material states, according to Riegl (1903 [1982]) in his theory of the cult monument, proceed in different ways to be a monument. Firstly, there is the intentional monument that is purposefully designed to commemorate an event or people. Its makers determine the significance, location and other related issues. Secondly, there is the unintentional monument, which has taken on historic or other associations not originally intended or expected. Regardless of the processes of building to be a monument which serves as a memorial, it has meanings as connection to both past and future.

Establishing memorials for traumatic events has mixed consequences. On one hand, building a memorial can promote resilience. For example, to reduce the
trauma of a traumatic event, the Polish government has built a memorial, as Fredericks (2011) reveals in her work of ‘Remembering Katyn: Mourning, Memory, and National Identity’. The memorial constructed at the burial site at Katyn acts as a place for curing trauma and the symbol of Poland’s struggle for freedom against the history of Polish censorship. On the other hand, although this memorial provides a place for a public “talking cure”, in which traumatic events are publicly acknowledged and discussed, this memorial is not a complete past and a safe place of resilience for several reasons. Firstly, As Dziuban (2010) points out, a site of memory such as memorial architecture, especially for the Holocaust, “when confronting with a difficult or traumatic past can be interpreted as space where the past violates the more or less familiar present rather than a safe harbour for memory” (Dziuban, 2010, p.1). Secondly, “Architecture and other artworks cannot compensate for public trauma or mass murder; yet it establishes a dialogical relation with those events and helps frame a process of understanding” (Bonder, 2009, p.65).

In addition to this complexity, attaching memories, which have a dynamic nature, and are very prone to change through different interpretations, to a place or object, which has a more stable nature, is problematic. Memories are transmitted to subsequent generations, and are not tied to people who experienced a given event, so that it is possible that such memories and rememberers who share their memories change too (Hodgkin & Radstone, 2003). Indeed, it is very difficult to stabilize the relation between memories and places or objects, since it is extremely complicated (Benton & Cecil, 2010), as there are various layers of memories accumulated, as well as users (Guggenheim, 2009) whose interpretations are different (Nuryanti, 1996). Returning to Riegl’s (1903 [1982]) arguments about
cult monument; the created memorials are memories that have been interpreted for us by someone else who established it. It is not free of political purposes. In this sense, memorials or architectural heritage which may be considered as places of dissonance due to different interpretations might be involved in defining and using such places (Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996).

In addition to this, in reconstruction processes, where outsiders are involved in helping, dissonance is more likely to arise not only for political reasons, but also due to issues of misinterpretation. Reconstruction after disaster is not necessarily apolitical. In the reconstruction process there are challenge triggered by the involvement of outsiders, which can bring benefits, but can also create debate regarding the outsiders’ intervention in interpreting the insiders’ needs (Ascherson, 2007; Barakat, 2007; Price, 2007). These outsiders are imported experts (Charlesworth, 2006) in reconstruction who try to interpret the needs of the local residents. Their interpretation is highly influenced by their expertise, cultural background, values (Charlesworth, 2006) and political agendas (Lakoff, 2010). Careful attention should be given to the relationship between outsiders and insiders to avoid conflict and damage to the capacity of insiders (Perring & Linde, 2009, 209). There are traditional understandings of local people, and victims are not ready to give their view because of on-going trauma after losing power, family and property, especially during the first phase of the emergency. Thus, what is to be remembered is often decided by donors of dominant powers in the reconstruction process (Charlesworth, 2006). Fischer (2008), however, argues that trauma and loss do not obstruct participation in rebuilding communities (quoted in Samuels, 2010, p. 211). In addition, in respect of their local knowledge, local people are also potential human resources for development in the aftermath
of war or disaster (Fanany, 2010; Samuels, 2010). There should be a positive attitude towards the survivor in respect to their continuity of lives, and of their past and present. Various actors, the victims and the temporary helpers, are inextricably involved, directly and indirectly, in defining how to remember the disaster and how to construct such memorials. It should be an opportunity for survivors to decide what kind of reconstruction and memorial is needed, whether it is necessary at all, for them to remember their past. It is the survivors who will live in the built environment which donors helped to rebuild, while donors at the end of the day pack their suitcases and go back to their own countries. The politics and the dominant role of donors behind the aid for disaster relief should be reduced for humanitarian reasons (Lakoff, 2010).

In summary, in the case of post-war reconstruction and disaster, it is imperative to understand the social role of cultural heritage, that is, understanding heritage beyond its physical dimensions (Barakat, 2007). In addition, heritage should be understood beyond the concept of material heritage or curation; heritage conservation is regarded as the care of such heritage and people who are connected to it (Perring & Linde, 2009, p.197 and p.210). The understanding of the social and cultural roles of buildings is far more important than physical building conservation itself because, as argued by Cawood (2011), buildings become important because they carry significant meanings for the society that built them. This meanings and values are attached through a cultural process of remembering the past for contemporary purposes of constructing social and cultural identity and sense of place (Smith, 2006). In addition, what is important in heritage reconstruction is not the approach that is taken, whether to engage with facsimile or tabula, but the networking and social relations built on the basis of equity
among involved stakeholders: community and government and expert, to enhance and facilitate sense of belonging of what is reconstructed and what is saved for remembering. But we do not need sites of memory, lieu de mémoire like architecture, as long as we still have a real environment of memory, milieux de mémoire, (Nora, 1989). The rebuilding and removal the debris of disaster, the scars, are not always to be associated with the removal of memories, because the memories are not in the buildings. As long as other elements exist, symbolic and observable activities, which can be in the form of ceremonies or bodily practices, i.e. the heritage process, the act of remembering the past; is still there in the community.

2.4 A Critical View of Architectural Heritage

Therefore, commentators in critical heritage studies have found this modern conservation ethos focusing on values assigned to material to be problematic. I analyse the approach to preserve material by focusing on adaptive reuse. One of the landmark works that initially mark the commencement of academic debate on these critical heritage studies is the publications of Riegl's (1903 [1982]). This work, interestingly perhaps, says something about the complexity of preserving tangible aspects of heritage.

The modern conservation ethos adopts the conservation approaches based largely on historical, artistic, commemorative and age values. In fact, according to Riegl (1903 [1982]), all these values are in conflict at the philosophical and operational
levels of not only the preservation method, but also the adaptive reuse method. The values most in conflict in the preservation of monuments - a method for keeping a building in its original condition - are historical value and age value, which is usually between 50 to 100 years minimum, and these are complicated. For Riegl (1903 [1982]) historical value -- which aims for the best possible preservation of a monument in its present state (to stop the decay for the sake of the availability of historical evidence) -- is in conflict with age value, which mandates the buildings to exhibit its oldness by showing its dissolution (to allow the decay to continue). In addition, the age value appreciates the past for its own sake, and reveals itself at a first glance in the monument's outmoded appearances, so that it is relatively easy to spot old and new buildings. In contrast, historical value is more likely to privilege a particular moment from the developmental history of the past and interpret it for us. The originality, which is mandated by historical value, is different from that promoted by age value. From the standpoint of historical value, the more original the monument the more historic it is; in contrast, the more signs of dissolution the more original the monument (Riegl, 1903 [1982]). Following this premise, what people expect to encounter in visiting the historical monument is encountering the original monument, which is free from human intervention to its as-found form; free of the sign of decays; and preserved or frozen. In contrast, what people expect from collecting antiques is signs of decay; the more signs of decay the more antique the monument. However, what interests us in the monument is not necessarily its age and historical value; but also the most relevant value which drives us to preserve monuments that deliberately commemorate values (specifically the intentional monument). To remember is about presence (Smith, 2006). This value is a present-day value which mandates protection against destruction by human intervention. In this
sense, the deliberate commemorative value and the present-day value are sworn enemies of age value. Therefore, the method for preserving such heritage is more likely to privilege one value over another.

The conflict is greater in adaptive reuse approaches - reusing architectural heritage for current (modern) needs with some alteration of forms are permitted. This approach seems to be in line with new understandings of architectural heritage which underlines the importance of uses, activities, and the functions of architecture. Adaptive reuse, even though at first it promotes the present values and social uses of buildings, is in the end no different from other conservation methods which mandate the protection of fabric. In other words, fabric comes first, while functions are altered in order to give a “life” to obsolete buildings; so this “life” becomes a legitimate reason for safeguarding the fabric as such. This approach is mostly applied to buildings which societies or nations have plenty of, and are not so “special”. This approach is usually not applied to rare, monumental, and national significant architecture like those on World Heritage lists. The AHD must not expect that the Palace of Versailles be reused for anything other than a museum which preserves its pristine state from the intrusion of modern life, which is permissible in adaptive reuse. The uses of the preserved buildings are strictly controlled to avoid the decay which may cause the loss of historical values which are embodied in the buildings. Countless numbers of buildings have shifted function; for example, Penang local government promotes adaptive reuse of old shophouses which are available in abundance in Penang by allowing modern modification and intervention, yet maintaining the facade of the shophouses to preserve the streetscape of the city (Ismail & Shamsuddin, 2005).
In fact, following Riegl (1903 [1982]), adaptive reuse is inextricably linked to present-day newness values, which are the enemy of historical values and age values, which are the main elements of architectural heritage designation. Buildings may be preserved in order to protect historical evidence and for commemorative reasons, which largely depend on present-day interpretations and needs. However, adaptive reuse, which is seen to be a bridge old forms and new activities, are not completely successful in doing so. Reusing architecture is not like an antique vase which can be preserved in a display cabinet. As architecture is used for humans who conduct both inside and conduct activities (Ching, 2007) which might harm, or at least might reduce, a building's fabric, such as a painting in a kitchen being discolored as the kitchen is used over time. In addition, to accommodate modern needs, for example, air conditioning is added to old and antique walls, which could potentially damage the wall For Riegl (1903 [1982]), human health and comfort come first. The new activities require form to be adjusted; discolored walls to be painted, broken floors to be replaced with modern ones, and many others adjustments which compromise age values and historical values. However, these adjustments, to meet present-day values and use values, not only protect architecture from decay (against age value), but also worsen its condition before reuse (against historical value). If the buildings fail to have these adjustments made, they would be more likely to be abandoned and regarded as obsolete. In addition, all these repairs give a sense of newness to such architecture; as Riegl (1903 [1982]) argues that renovation, like repainting, renews buildings as if newly created. Consequently, considering the possibility of making replicas of such architecture raises a question; to what extent does such reuse of a building look original in comparison with its replica?
Up to this point I have discussed the debate on critical heritage studies, and the problematic understanding of architectural heritage under the influence of the modern conservation ethos, and the consequences of this understanding in post-disaster contexts. The limitation of this understanding has framed how the reconstruction process deals with material reconstruction and ensuring the authenticity of fabric. I now want to move to re-defining architectural heritage, and to consider in what ways it is possible for architecture to facilitate resilience in the face of disaster.

2.5 A New Definition of Architectural Heritage

Following Smith (2006), I argue that architectural heritage is a physical medium in which heritage processes of remembering the past are conducted. In this sense, heritage places the physical site -- acts as a medium for negotiating memories and identities. The meaning making and memory negotiation take place through activities conducted at a place (Smith, 2006; Urry, 1996). Thus, heritage is something that happens at and with the place (Smith, 2006). Objects and physical sites can function as a cultural medium that facilitates these negotiated activities, and in turn become a physical symbolic form that represents these negotiations. The object, in other words, is simply a neutral state until we give meaning to it; the object itself does not have agency, rather, as Smith (2006) argues, it is people who attribute agency to the object. As Wertsch (2002) argues, in the process of remembering active agents cannot always work alone to recall memory, and to some extent they need a tool to help. In this sense, a deliberate effort and skill to
use a tool, or to employ such a tool, by an agent is needed to remember, and heritage sites can become cultural tools for remembering (Wertsch, 2002).

Architecture can be employed in a remembering network to help people remember (Guggenheim, 2009). According to Rodrigo (2011), various physical forms have the potential to bring the past to the present. In some societies, indeed, building is the primary text for handing down a tradition (Tuan, 2003, p.112). Architecture, for this reason, has been used as a medium for expressing multiple messages through building design which can survive for generations (Makstutis, 2010; Nas, 2003). Thus, architecture continues to be a medium within which the messages of its creators and communities are clearly or ambiguously displayed and interpreted in certain cultural context (Susana & Geoffrey, 2007). In this sense, the ways architectural heritage built a connection with the past, and could be a medium for the messages, are through use, especially through activities of remembering.

In the act of remembering, architecture can act, borrowing Spelman’s (2008) terms, as a scaffolding of memory through which memories are reached. In this sense, according to her, architecture provides a kind of platform through which memories are recalled, a clue for the past to be recalled and a clue for it to be represented. Architecture is defined in this thesis as having two main interrelated elements: form and function; architectural heritage significance lies in the relationship between form and function. By treating architecture as ‘scaffolding’, it can be removed, but the network it shaped and enfolded remains standing (Spelman, 2008). However, there is a uniqueness of memory tied to an object. Once we encounter an object, it might trigger us to remember (Spelman, 2008);
conversely, once an object is removed from the memory network, or if a space disappears or changes unexpectedly, it might also remind us to remember (Harvey, 2005, p.132). Architecture is more visible when it is most needed (Lara, 2008), and creates a void in our physical environment (Huyssen, 2003) and gap in our mind if it is missing (Sklair, 2011). In other words, when we need it, but architecture is not there, disappeared from our environment, it creates a gap in our mind; it forces us to remember it, so that it is more visible, in some ways, when it disappears. The destruction of the familiar places arguably unsettles the memory network. The loss of familiar places is influential, as they are anchors that tie memories and cultural performance. Thus, the absence and presence of these familiar places are unique. I show the uniqueness of architecture in remembering network by interrogating the physical and functional aspects of architectural heritage.

What makes architecture unique, compared to other remembering geometric forms such as sculpture, and other objects and other mediums such as songs, poetry, narrative texts, and the like, is its three dimensional form, which can be bodily entered and is functional. What I mean by the functional in this thesis is a wider definition, including the function or use of the whole architecture as a tool in a remembering network (an abstract use, such as a political tool, a cultural tool, etc) and the function that architecture can serve as a real place that can be entered and experienced (a real use).

The characteristics of geometric patterns and style, which have a relatively certain meaning, enable architecture and other urban features to recall certain memories. Sophia Psarra states that “the geometry and configuration of buildings define visual fields of individuals located inside these buildings” (quoted in Rashid, 2010,
Certain geometric patterns distinguish one building from another. Helped by our memory and experience, we can distinguish the difference between house and school from their appearance and geometric characteristics. Architecture in most cases can also act as a physical symbolic place to which one anchors memories. Sydney, for example, is always associated with the Opera House, and Paris with its Eiffel Tower, and the creation of these structures were also influenced by the city, the context, they are located in.

In addition to this physical reference, the ability of architectural heritage to contain activities provides people with a place for cultural performance. Therefore, I argue function is a central element of architecture in remembering processes, which leads to an emphasis on form. In this sense, of the three dimensional, massive, and functional form, architecture gives more a sense of the past experience than, say, written histories, photos, etc, so the past drama represented in such architecture can be experienced in a three-dimensional way. In other words we occupy and use architecture and fully engage in the drama it plays out. For example, being in the Colosseum rather than seeing a photo or reading about the Colosseum and Roman times gives, via experience, a stronger sense of Roman times. In addition, as Davidson (2009) argues, visiting a place gives a sense of the past in our experience. She explains this idea by giving a personal example of her visit to her childhood house transferring her to a full drama of the past. Architecture can be experienced; we can enter and feel the sense of place created by architecture. The emphasis on uses of heritage places like architectural heritage is in line with

---

10 I am aware that there is debate that understanding something by reading a text is looser than seeing a photograph or an object itself (see for example Aronowitz & DiFazio, 2010; Campbell, 2008). Reading a text is requires the exercise of imagination. For example, a text describing a situation, or an building, or a town, or a time or place would have more open interpretation about what it looks like, rather than seeing a photo or being directly in the building or town discussed. In this thesis, however, I see the importance of being there to experience.
Smith’s (2006, p.46) ideas. For her, using a place is required to make a place heritage; by using it people experiences and engage in a sense of heritage. Using also creates familiarity, which is also important for attachment (Tuan, 2003, p.159). Therefore, architecture, which has been used for multiple purposes and functions, borrowing Samuel’s (1996)’s term, becomes a “theatre of memory” or, borrowing Hussyen’s (2003) term, a “palimpsest of memories”, in which memories are recalled.

The engagement and visit to a place can be done physically, metaphorically or in the mind. A story written or told about architecture, and all activities conducted at such architecture, can be seen as a way of visiting and revisiting the architecture too. These metaphorical visits and engagements include seeing photos and videos. The architecture, in these metaphorical activities, is brought to the observers, instead of the other way around. I acknowledge all these activities as aspects that contribute to shaping meaning, recalling memories, giving meaning forming identity. However, the architecture here is not in its “real” form, as it has been represented in other mediums, such as text in a book, somebody’s interpretation through words, pictures in a movie and photography. The sense of architecture with its unique ability and elements: three dimensional form which we can enter and experience, is absent in the story or these ways of recalling memories via architecture. Therefore, the sense of being there to experience and to engage is still fundamental to obtain the full effect. The senses of smell, hearing and touch, (Ching, 2007, p.X) play a role in organising remembering through architectural heritage. In this regard, the ways in which architectural heritage provides resilience for survivors after a disaster is not only the protection afforded by its massive and durable structure. Rather, it is also in the ways architecture is used for
religious and cultural activities that contribute to people’s sense of personal and cultural resilience.

2.6 Conclusion

I found critical heritage studies, especially the work of Smith (2006), useful for providing a foundation for my research looking at the essence of heritage places in Southeast Asia. As argued by Taylor (2004, p. 423) "Asian cultures have a spiritual view of what is culturally valuable from the past; the past lives on in memory of people, of events and places through time rather than concentrating on the material fabric which can be changed or be replaced". Therefore, architectural heritage in this context should be understood beyond its mere physical, architectural structure. It is problematic to merely look at the physical aspects of architectural heritage, as architecture creation is not just about constructing a physical form, rather it is constructing physical a form for containing human activities. There are other important aspects of architecture, such as activities at and uses of such structure. In addition, in the case of disaster prone and post-disaster contexts, material is under a continuous threat of destruction, and in the light of work of Connerton (1989) and Wertsch (2002), memories are not embedded in a building's fabric, but in religious and cultural activities.

Therefore, I argue architecture is scaffolding or anchor that facilitates a cultural process of remembering. Its space has provided a place for performing ceremonies and bodily practices which are highly likely to sustain memories in the face of
disaster. Ultimately, all of these contribute to the performance of heritage, in which memories are embodied, negotiated, and challenged. Therefore, heritage processes conducted at a place are more likely to survive the disaster and provide people with resilience; rather than a physical site. The destruction of physical aspects does not necessarily destroy the process, and memories involved in such processes. The ways architecture supports resilience in the face of disaster lies in the relationship between forms and functions, the uses and activities conducted at such places. In this sense, the tabula rasa and facsimile are not completely new and old respectively. The implication of this new understanding of heritage and its reconstruction, consequently, has an implication to its conservation as well. Traditional ideas of preservation and adaptive reuse framed by the conservation ethos, which is itself framed by the Eurocentric AHD, should be re-evaluated. In this sense, adaptive reuse, which tries to preserve physical structures of architectural heritage while adjusting its functions and uses, should be expanded. This is because, on one hand, we acknowledge architecture which lost its traditional and original functions and activities as heritage, and might conserve this architecture through adaptive reuse, finding new uses. On the other hand, however, we do not give the same appreciation to architecture that has lost its original structural forms but still contains original and traditional activities and functions as it was. This architecture is heritage too. Using this theoretical framework I analyse three iconic architectural heritage sites in the post disaster context of Banda Aceh.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODS: ARCHITECTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY AND ETHNOGRAPHY

3.1 Investigating the Ways People Use Heritage through Architectural Anthropology and Ethnography

As this research is interdisciplinary and concerned with determining the cultural and social values and uses of heritage, a mixed methods approach is employed. This research engages with both Architecture and Heritage studies, thus, two important sources, *Architectural Research Methods* (Groat & Wang, 2002) and *Heritage Studies, Methods, and Approaches* (Sørensen & Carman, 2009), have informed the selection of research methods. In addition, as I am looking at the relationship between people and architectural heritage, this research also benefits from the literature on architectural anthropology research methods.

Following Groat and Wang (2002) and Sørensen and Carman (2009) leads, my research is based on qualitative methods, using ethnographical interviews as one of its approaches. As this research seeks to understand the uses of architectural heritage as a cultural tool within the mediation of human relationships with the built environment and collective memories, – an ethnographic approach is one of most suitable methods. I employ ethnographic methods influenced by
architectural anthropology. This chapter explains the utility of an anthropological architectural and ethnography methods for the research.

As architecture, as outlined in Chapter 2, is comprised of both form and function, an architectural anthropological approach gives me the opportunity to document the actual significance and essence of architectural forms, styles, and functions to people. The various modes of perceiving and reacting to architectural spaces, and the various significances that architecture can have in communication systems – the understanding of non-material functions of architecture -- is the central concern of the research (Pieper, 1980, p. 5). As Amerlinck argues an anthropological approach to architecture is “anthropologically oriented synchronic and diachronic research on the building activities and processes of construction that produce human settlements, dwellings, and other buildings, and built environments” (Amerlinck, 2001). In other words, this approach documents both architectural spaces and social activities (Pieper, 1980, p. 5). Architectural anthropology provides a systematic framework to understand the relationship between people within small and larger communities. For Rykwert, the “anthropologist enables architects to see how buildings are interpreted and experienced in the past”; moreover, “an anthropology for architecture can provide a corrective lesson about the essential human artifice, the urgency of narrative, and the inescapable but salutary power of myth” (quoted in Amerlinck, 2001, p.10). Such research looks anthropologically at architecture and vice versa (Egenter, 1992). From the standpoint of architecture, architectural anthropology is closely related to the theory of architecture. From the standpoint of anthropology, the term allows us to learn how humans culturally framed space and the environment over time (Egenter, 1992) and how space in return forms our
perception (Lynch, 1960; Rapoport, 1976). In addition, to understand the creation and consequence of cultural space, Amerlinck argues that architects should do fieldwork, firsthand observation, and cultural research, and the anthropologist should understand aspects of construction and visual data such as maps, diagrams, graphics, and drawings (Amerlinck, 2001). Through an architectural anthropological approach, the building has not only a visual representation (for example, the design concept, drawing and construction plan), but also its cultural narrative (Amerlinck, 2001, p.12) and meaning for people (Egenter, 1992, p.77). In other words, architectural anthropology works to provide both complete pictures and narratives of the buildings in regards to the relationship between humans and architecture.

Ethnographic approaches emphasize in-depth engagement, and a full understanding of a particular setting of the subject being researched, to persuade a wide audience of its human validity, yet it does not aim to provide an explanatory theory that can be applied to many settings like grounded theory (Groat & Wang, 2002, p. 182). The methodology asks for the full immersion the of researcher in a particular context through a reliance on unstructured data, a focus on single case or small number of cases, and data analysis that emphasises the meanings and functions of human actions (Groat & Wang, 2002, pp. 182-183). It opens up the opportunity to talk about architecture beyond physical objects and understands buildings beyond planning and construction. Through this opportunity I was able to record the engagement of my respondents with targeted architecture. This engagement, as I have mentioned in chapter 1, is of importance for Smith's (2006) arguments in relation to heritage that I adopted in this thesis. In addition, an ethnographic approach, which is reliant on participant observation (Groat & Wang,
2002, p. 183), allows me to fully engage and immerse myself in the activities of my respondents.

In short, doing ethnography within the umbrella of architectural anthropology provides me with a better understanding of architectural forms through documentation of architectural designs and styles, and at the same time allows me to understand architectural functions in the ways people use these designs and styles. In addition, as data in architectural anthropology is also presented in the form of narratives and images (Amerlinck, 2001, p. 12).

I am also aware that architectural anthropology is usually used in researching old towns or other ancient architecture. The opportunity offered by this approach to document not only architectural design, but also human uses of this design, is arguably not limited to looking at only ancient material. Examining recent architecture and its meaning in the present may follow the same conceptual framework and methods.

Architectural anthropology, however, in the light of Environmental Behaviour Studies (EBS), has been criticised as failing to engage with the human-environment relationship. This critique is important to note in order to minimize the limitations of an architectural anthropology analysis. Rapoport (2001), for example, is not satisfied with architectural anthropology, arguing that its focus on the built-environment is too narrow. As he notes, people in their daily life do not only interact with built fabrics, but also interact with other environmental contexts. However, for the purpose of this research, which aims to examine the meaning of
certain core architectural places in post-disaster contexts, the framework of architectural anthropology will be used.

To support pursuing this anthropological approach, even though I am an architect, I have also received trained in doing qualitative research, especially ethnography and semi-structured interviews, at the Aceh Research Training Institute (ARTI) in Banda Aceh, from mid-2008 to mid-2009, by conducting my own research under the supervision of Prof. Barbara Leigh from the University of Technology Sydney. After finishing this training, in mid-2009 to mid-2010, I also led another anthropological research project examining the uses of architectural heritage for tourism development in Peunayong, Banda Aceh, funded by the Indonesian Higher Education Board (DIKTI). In addition to this, I have also undertaken twelve credits of courses of Anthropology subjects at the Australian National University in 2011.

3.2 Architectural Anthropology: Data Collection

I did my ethnographic fieldwork for three and half months in 2012, one and half months in 2013, and one month in 2014, totalling six months in the field. The reasons for the series of fieldwork periods was that, while they allowed me to undertake relevant interviews and observations, it also allowed me to think about the data I had gathered, and to go back into the field to test and develop my initial ideas and observations. In addition, it gave me a span of time to observe the object of my research. To ensure the validity of the data, this research was conducted using three different strategies: participant observation, semi-structured
appendix for semi-structure interview questions), and textual studies. The detailed data collection has been developed as follows:

Participant observation has also become one of main tools in understanding my interviewees and the ways they understand and use iconic architectural heritage places. It was conducted to provide closely-observed data (Jackson, 1983, p.340). I agree with Samuels (2010), who has conducted anthropological research on the 2004 tsunami disaster social reconstruction, who argues that the best way to understand emotion and feeling, besides interviewing, is by observing what people are doing at a place. This observation method provides a check against participants’ subjective reporting of what they believe and do. This method is most useful in analysing the interaction between people and their built-environment. Jorgensen (1989) argues that participant observation is most suitable for studies of almost every aspect of human existence, including research problems concerned with human interactions and meanings from the insider’s perspective (Jorgersen, 1989, p.12). Data recorded during participant observation was maintained by camera, sketch, and note taking (I built a fieldwork notebook which contained not only my observation notes, but also my reflections on what I was seeing. I constantly involved myself in the activities of my respondents, for example I joined them in preparing the food for haul\textsuperscript{11} of Teungku Dianjong at Peulanggahan Mosque, I joined them in praying (as a Muslim I can be involved in full emulation of what they do and feel the essence of such activities), I joined them in breaking fast, and many other activities. As an insider, I potentially experience cultural bias in doing participant observation, but at the same time I have a deep understanding of the context.

\textsuperscript{11} The commemoration of the death of Teungku Dianjong.
Semi-structured and ethnographic interviews were undertaken to determine how people use and engage with architectural heritage. Semi-structured interviews provided me with data that can be quantitatively analysed and presented in tables. Basic descriptive statistics presented in tables were derived from coding this interview. For example, I can show how many interviewees think that the Baiturrahman Mosque is the most important building in Banda Aceh. I do not use graphs and plans, as widely used in architectural research, because this research is addressing questions of cultural value and the meaning people place on buildings, rather than undertaking standard architectural research on buildings. To answer my research questions, I have used ethnographic interviews to address my questions. Graphs and plans may be useful to explain architectural styles and form, but this research is more interested in understanding how buildings are valued and used in the processes of remembering than in documenting their physical characteristics. Ethnographic interviews also provide me with a fuller understanding of the context. This strategy allows me to talk in a friendly informal way with my respondents, which helped me gain their trust (Spradley, 1979, p. 52), especially those I met more often and with whom I made friends during my fieldwork. Through these friendships I gained a fuller understanding of the meanings my interviewees make and remake in their interactions with architecture. This methodology benefits the research by being a form of meaning making between interviewer (researcher) and interviewee (respondents), and helps develop a continuously two-way conversation in developing meaning (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995). Interviews were conducted in relation to three case studies: Baiturrahman Mosque, the Tsunami Museum, and Teungku Dianjong/Peulanggahan Mosque. In addition, I also drew insight in my engagement with Banda Aceh’s inhabitants outside of the sites, to understand their perception
of the mosques and the museum in a broader way. I recorded the data using a voice recorder, and note taking for those who did not wish to be recorded. I found in some cases more genuine and natural responses when I did the interview without a recorder, engaging them in everyday language and conversation. The interview schedule was used as a guide during the interviews.

The respondents were randomly selected, using on site recruitment (oral invitation). I obtained permission from the management of each site to do the interview. Recruitment of professional interviewees was made by initial contact through email and/or letters to the relevant individuals. In my experience in researching in Aceh, Acehnese are usually happy to be recruited, especially if the research is for academic purposes. However, I kept monitoring the willingness of participants by giving them the opportunity for them to stop providing me with information at any point. This was particularly important as I discussed memories of major disasters and human conflicts, which are not only highly emotional, but may be very distressing for some people. I also ensured that any distressed participant could terminate the interview if they felt uncomfortable or distressed, and provided them with the names or numbers of relevant Aceh counselling services. Interviewees could also stop for any reason. However, I am confident I have been sensitive to these issues, as I come from the same cultural context as my interviewees, and I experienced both war and the 2004 tsunami disaster in Banda Aceh. I fully understand the unwritten cultural rules when engaging with people in this cultural context. For example, it is not polite, and it is inappropriate, to ask sensitive questions upon an initial meeting. Luckily, in the event none of those interviewed terminated the interviews due to distress
To examine the orientation of the OHD in Banda Aceh I interviewed inhabitants around the case studies and visitors to the Baiturrahman Mosque, the Tsunami Museum, Teungku Dianjong/Peulanggahan Mosque. To give a balanced view of how people valued such places, I also interviewed residents and visitors around all these buildings. Through interviewing people outside the sites, I gained a complete picture of the importance of such buildings for the whole community and visitors, not only for those visiting the sites, who presumably regard such places as important. In addition, some purposeful selection was done to ensure gender and age representativeness. As a woman researcher, it was easier to talk to women in the public space of Banda Aceh rather than to men. Therefore, I initially interviewed more women than men. However, along the way I found to give a wide range views between older and young generations, as well as between males and females, I therefore purposely targeted males, as I had tended initially to avoid them. I hired a male research assistant to help me interviewing male respondents in the mosques.

I also conducted group interviews to accommodate people who did not want to be interviewed one by one, people who were there during my participant observation when I was involved in their activities and the like, and people who had a very short time to talk to me. In these group interviews I was unable to record, but I took notes instead. I only recorded one group interview with a group of Chinese who were willing to be interviewed, but with very limited time. The details, numbers and basic statistical data of my interviewees can be found in chapter 6.

To provide the official, AHD view of heritage in Banda Aceh I interviewed 21 people: from government, architect/ planners, NGO employees and academics: the
Mayor of Banda Aceh, Head of the Planning Board, the Head of Tourism and Culture Board, the architect of the Tsunami Museum, the Committee of the Tsunami Museum Development, Head of the Conservation Board, archaeologists, architects, and the like. They were selected based on their roles and involvement in heritage planning and the architectural heritage that I selected as my case studies for this thesis.

Lastly, reference studies relating to the history of Banda Aceh, and urban planning pre and post-disaster, were undertaken. Resources in Banda Aceh such as old and recent maps, newspaper reports, future programs, planning, and architectural designs, and policy documents were searched and consulted. This material underpins discussions in chapter 4, and provided important contextual information for developing the interview questions for the Banda Aceh professionals and policy makers.

3.3 Data Analysis and Limitations

As my data comprises different forms of data -- audio interviews, participant observation notes, photos, and written documents such as newspapers and magazines, reports, planning and legal documents, and drawings -- I managed and analysed them differently. I transcribed the interviews, and used NVivo to help me in grouping and coding the responses. Beforehand, I read through all the data to identify the main themes emerging in my interview data. After the coding process, all transcripts were printed. All participant observation notes were copied to make
it easier for me to code, group, and then analyse them. I also used NVivo to help coding, grouping, and analysing selected photos from my fieldwork and other secondary resources such as from magazines, newspapers, and reports. Finally, selected data from written documents were copied and then coded as well.

It should be noted how I count the interview respondents, as I did not count them based on number of interviewees, but rather based on their responses. For example, an interviewee may have three different responses to my question “what reasons underpinned your visit to this place?” They may answer, for example, “waiting for friend, but while waiting I was also praying and enjoying the view here.” In this sense, their answers are coded under different themes: religious, casual, and recreation. Even though their main reason is to wait for a friend, the other two reasons reflect what they do at the site. In addition, most respondents, especially at the mosques, were there for many times and for different reasons. They also mentioned these routine and special purposes behind their coming to these places, which reflects the ways such places are used.

I presented my interview data in two different ways. Firstly, the semi-structured interviews are summarised through descriptive statistics and presented in tables. Secondly, I also quote from my interviews to give examples of the responses. This is done with both semi-structured and ethnographic interviews. In my data presentation, I also used photos to help me describe the situations and activities people conducted at my case study sites. However, I do not use specific plans and graphs, as normally used in architectural research, because I selected media that can help me explain the feelings and emotions of users; rather than analysing architectural forms per se.
However, there are some limitations of my research. As a female researcher I would probably have gender bias in interviewing only women that are comfortable to talk to me in a public place, especially the mosques. In addition, as I am an insider this provides both positive and negative contributions to my research. I might be culturally blind in some ways, but at the same time I have a good knowledge of my case studies and of ways of approaching people. Lastly, 166 interviews I have in this research are not representative, and I am not making a claim that they are statistically significant.
CHAPTER 4

REMEMBERING THE BANDA ACEH PAST:
A HISTORY OF ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE CONSERVATION

4.1 Introduction

Within the literature three aspects of the history of Aceh and Banda Aceh tend to be emphasised. Firstly, the twin disasters of the 2004 earthquake and tsunami, secondly, the violence that has beset the region since 1873 (including the Dutch war and thirty years of conflict with the Indonesian government), and thirdly Islam and its influences, including the “glory” of the past Islamic kingdom, its central place in society and the role of Islamic Sharia. In this chapter, I bring these aspects together in a discussion of the history of architectural heritage conservation, particularly in the Acehnese capital city, before and after the Tsunami of 2004.

Why do I do this?

There has been little discussion of the history of architectural conservation in Indonesia in general, and Banda Aceh in particular, which could provide an insight into the past developments that influence the present heritage conservation principles, practices and policies. Therefore it is important to present a critical review of this history, and to update the current movement/condition of architectural heritage conservation in the region. This chapter, therefore, has two aims. Firstly, it aims to describe a contextual and historical background of my case study, Banda Aceh, through the discussion of its architectural heritage
conservation history. I focus in particular on the history of how the AHD (Authorised Heritage Discourse) and the OHD (Organic Heritage Discourse) were developed, and how they interacted over the course of time in the region. This history is important for providing a background for further understanding of the ways heritage planning is undertaken, and the ways people perceive and use architectural heritage in the post Tsunami disaster context of Banda Aceh. The chapter also provide a historical context for the case studies, the Baiturrahman Mosque and the Teungku Dianjong Mosque. The Tsunami Museum is introduced in the following chapter to tie its establishment together with post-disaster heritage conservation.

The second aim is to argue that the in Banda Aceh is strongly influenced by its popular religion, Islam, which, as argued by Byrne (2011), which is also to some extent found elsewhere in Southeast Asia, where popular religions have influenced heritage understanding. The AHD, in particular the national AHD, in contrast, was developed based on a European understanding of heritage. The modern European understanding of heritage has been a foundation for the post-independence Indonesian government’s understanding of heritage. Having this foundation, the Indonesian AHD finds its heritage conservation is in synergy with the global understanding of heritage. Accordingly, Indonesia has subscribed to and adopted the charters and policies from international heritage organizations such as UNESCO and ICOMOS, which have been argued by some heritage analysts as being heavily influenced by European sensibilities (Byrne, 1991; Smith, 2006), but at the same time Indonesia has developed its own heritage initiatives. The Dutch brought European understanding of heritage to Indonesia during the colonial era, for attempted to control not only the natural resources, but also the cultural
resources. Therefore, before I move to the following chapters, which discuss the ways the OHD and the AHD interacted and the tension between the two after the 2004 Tsunami disaster, a discussion of the Dutch influence on the ways the AHD influenced Indonesian understanding of architectural conservation is essential in this chapter.

I start my discussion about the general condition of Banda Aceh with some statistics. It is then followed by an explanation of the OHD, which interrogates the available record of conservation of two Mosques, especially the Baiturrahman Mosque. The next discussion is the introduction, and a discussion of the influence of the European AHD brought by the Dutch during colonial era. Following the discussion of the colonial turning point is the development of the AHD in post-independent Indonesia. In Banda Aceh, this development is challenged by conflicts and disasters.

4.2 Banda Aceh: Location, People And Culture

Banda Aceh is the capital city of Aceh province, which is one of thirty-three provinces in the Republic of Indonesia. The city area, after the tsunami, was reduced from 61,36 to 59,99 square kilometres\(^2\). In 2004, Banda Aceh had a population of 239,146 people, reduced to 177,881 in 2005 after the Tsunami of 2004, while in 2011 the population reached 228,562 (Badan Pusat Statistik Aceh, 2012).

\(^2\)Interview with Spatial Planning Board Official.
Banda Aceh is located in the northern part of Sumatra, one of five large islands in Indonesia (see figure 1).

Figure 4.1: Map of Banda Aceh against map of Indonesia. The case studies, located in heart of old Banda Aceh\textsuperscript{13}, are marked by red spots: Number 1 is the Teungku Dianjong/Peulanggahan Mosque, Number 2 is the Baiturrahman Mosque, and Number 3 is the Tsunami Museum.

Source: Bustanussalatin map and Google images.

The scholarly literature on Aceh, including work by Michael Feener (2011), Anthony Reid (1969, 2006b), Edward Aspinal (2007), and Ibrahim Alfian (2004),

\textsuperscript{13} After the tsunami, the new city development of Banda Aceh was expanded to move away from the coastal area, where the old city is located, and the existing city recognizes the old town centre/old Central Business District [CBD], for further explanation see (Banda Aceh Government, 2009).
demonstrates that Aceh has a long, rich, and complex history, though not perhaps corresponding to the “glorious” (*mulia, gemilang, emas* in local language) stereotype in the collective memory of many Acehnese, which I explore further in chapter 6. The three Acehnese narrative templates that work to frame collective memories: (1) Islam (2) conflict (wars) (3) disaster have shaped different images of Banda Aceh. The narratives about Islam14 have given Banda Aceh a reputation as *Serambi Mekkah* (Veranda of Mecca), an image that is strongly tied to the Baiturrahman Mosque. Banda Aceh’s location in a strategic region and, consequently, its long term contact with traders from the Middle East and India, have contributed not only to its economic and political development, but also to the development of Islam in the region (Reid, 1969). It was the centre for Islamic learning and literature in Indonesia, and the wider Malay world (Feener, 2011). It is, therefore, not surprising that Islam has a strong influence, and now almost 98% of the population are Muslims, the majority of whom are ethnic Acehnese (Badan Pusat Statistic Aceh, 2010). Islam colours all aspects of individual and community life. The influence of Islam can be seen in the customs and ceremonies surrounding marriage, circumcision, building construction, and many other life transitions (Schroter, 2010). The influences of previous religious cultures, such as Hinduism and animism, however, are still lurking behind Islamic ceremonies (Leigh, 1990). Now, a special law based on Sharia Islam15 has been applied in the area. This law is controversial because it enforces women to adhere to an ‘Islamic’ dress code, especially within the Baiturrahman Mosque, although the law is very vague as to how Islamic dress may be defined. Indonesia acknowledges five main religions,

14 Aceh was the entry point for Islam to enter Indonesia in 13th Century, and the first Islamic Kingdom, Samudera Pasai, was located in Aceh. Aceh therefore became a place of departure for pilgrims to go to Mekkah (Mecca).

15 During Megawaty’s presidency, Undang Undang (law) number 18 year 2001 was enacted which gives special autonomy to and saw the establishment Sharia court in Aceh. Qanun No.11 was established in 2002 to implement Islamic Sharia in Aceh.
Islam, Christianity (Protestant and Catholic), Hinduism, and Buddhism, and comprises many ethnic groups such as Chinese, Javanese, Sundanese and many others (Ananta, 2007), and this diversity is also found in Aceh. During the 2005-9 reconstruction process, the ethnic diversity of the city grew due to the presence of aid workers living and working in the city (Badan Rekonstruksi dan Rehabilitasi Aceh dan Nias/ BRR, 2009; Schroter, 2010).

Figure 4.2: A sign enforces visitors of the Baiturrahman Mosque to wear Muslim dress code.

Source: Photo by Cut Dewi
Apart from its reputation as being *Serambi Mekkah*, Aceh is also known as an area beset with conflict, particularly following the thirty-year civil war. Its position along the ring of fire and plate boundaries and in the mouth of *Krueng Aceh*\(^{16}\) has also meant that Aceh lies in an area prone to natural disasters, especially earthquakes, tsunamis and flooding. Its reputation as a disaster area became stronger after the 2004 Tsunami.

Below, I discuss the development of these perceptions, which were influenced by collective narrative templates over a long period of time, along with the discussion of the history of architectural heritage conservation.

### 4.3 The Organic Heritage Discourse in Banda Aceh

In Banda Aceh, like other Southeast Asian cultures, the popular religions, in this case, Islam has also shaped the ways people understand and venerate heritage places. To some extent Islam has assimilated itself into much older traditions of venerating the spirit of places, such as animism and Hinduism. Now, Islam has colonized the landscape of present-day Banda Aceh. This is in synergy with the phenomenon in Southeast Asia that former religious cultures were assimilated and embodied in later religious cultures (Byrne, 2012). As building traditions in Asia was also shaped by manifestation of rituals and beliefs (Widodo, 2012), Islam has also influenced the relationship between people and buildings. Therefore, it is essential in this thesis to discuss Islamic conservation approaches by looking at a

\(^{16}\) Aceh river
specific interface between Islamic teachings about mosque conservation as the most obvious sacred, protected place in Islam.

Many Southeast Asians believe that places have spirits residing at them or associated with them (Byrne, 2012, p. 4). Supernatural spirits reside in objects such as Buddhist stupas, Christian Crosses and statues, Hindu statues, and animism old trees. In Islam, God is not particularly in heaven, as Byrne (2012) described for the Protestant Reformation, he does not present himself in objects either. Places on earth are just a medium through which people perform their worship to God, Allah. Thus, Moslems do not venerate places in the way they worship places or objects, but rather in the way they use, respect and look after places and objects. This occurs for at least two interrelated reasons.

Firstly, it is quite similar, to some degree, to other Southeast Asian cultures. The animism tradition of venerating place, on the arrival of Islam, was assimilated with Islamic teachings. Therefore, there is shift in Islamic society from venerating the spirits of ancestors and deities to respecting the spirits of Sufi saints residing in such places. In addition, religious buildings like mosques have similar association as houses of God. The places are religiously important, and like mosques and other Sufi saint tombs are considered *keuramat* places. During important days like *Idul Fitri*, during the month of Ramadan, and *Idul Adha*, people make pilgrimages to such places and during their visit they would prepare a *kenduri* and pray, asking a favor from God through the spirits of the saints (Siapno, 2002) or, as I witnessed as an Acehnese, for thanking God for what they have. The contemporary Islamic

---

17 This word is Arabic derived, and means a miracle performed by a *wali* (saint). According to Dahri (2007), *keuramat* is also the priority given to a person who is always obedient to God’s rules; one who consistently follows Islamic teachings. *Keuramat* are also Malay tutelary spirits, so that it is strongly associated with Islam by Chinese in the Malay Peninsula (Byrne, 2014). According to Snouck Hurgronje (1985b, p.338-9) in Acehnese society *keuramat* refers to something and someone that are respected.
generation in Aceh regard the tradition of venerating places as un-Islamic, see for example Siapno (2002).

Secondly, Moslem look after the environment not because God is in heritage sites, or it is the world of God, but because it is a command from God to do so. Humans in Islam are given the privilege of making use of the earth, at the same time they have a responsibility to look after it (Khan, 2011). In return, followers of Islam would obtain rewards from God. As argued by Khan (2011, p. 22), this stewardship includes the protection of heritage: “The servants of (Allah) All Merciful are they who tread gently upon the earth with humility” (Quran 25: 63). For Khan (2011, p. 22) this saying is interpreted as “being prudent with both building and natural capital supports this notion of safeguarding them for future generations”. As nature is God’s creation so it is a human obligation to look after it. In contrast, architecture is not a direct creation of God, but through their hands humans make use of natural resources to create architecture. In this sense, natural conservation links to cultural heritage conservation. In Islam balancing use and conservation is an essential foundation in human life. In Islamic teachings, the universe and its various elements are evidence of the Creator’s greatness, and there is not a thing He has created but celebrates and praises Him. In this regard, worshipping things rather than God is strictly prohibited in Islam. Muslims do not respect a place or object but in the name of God, or as a part of merit making for preparing for their life in the hereafter. In addition, as Akbar (2012) argues, Moslems should avoid overvaluing material objects, and suggests that valuing materiality is not in accordance with Islamic values and practices. Given this explanation, for Muslims, materiality, which is strongly associated with life in this world, is impermanent,
but activities conducted at certain material places that praise God, or are performed in the name of God, are more permanent and have greater currency.

In Banda Aceh, in addition to Islamic teachings, living under continuous natural and human-made destruction has also contributed to attitudes toward materiality as being impermanent. Banda Aceh had experienced several disasters that have impacted on its political and social development (McKinnon, 2006). Its position at the mouth of a river has resulted in a sequence of major and minor floods, which have been recorded in the notes of several travellers who came to Banda Aceh (see for example in Lombard, 1991). The river, nevertheless, was one source of drinking water for foreign traders and passers-by across the Indian Ocean and the China Sea, because its high quality water could last for six months without sedimentation, and was thought to be able to cure several diseases (Lombard, 1991, p. 57-58). Besides flooding, Beaulieu (1620-30) also noted the recurrence of earthquake three to four times a year, and it was on 7 March 1621 that a large earthquake hit Banda Aceh and caused panic (Lombard, 1991). In addition, he also witnessed a big fire, just a couple months after the earthquake on 4 June 1621, which burnt approximately 260 houses (Lombard, 1991). It is, however, hard to find written records and archaeological proof of the existence of ancient tsunamis. Recent archaeological work undertaken by McKinnon (2006) has argued that over the last two hundred years tsunami’s have been experienced (McKinnon, 2006). His hypothesis is drawn from, and strongly supported by, a recent geophysical research conducted by Aron J. Meltzner et. al (2010), which documents the history of earthquakes and tsunamis in Aceh between 1390 and 1455. Travelers also noted the resilience of people demonstrated by the quick reconstruction after disasters using traditional techniques and materials (Lombard, 1991).
The Mosque is a good example to illustrate the ways Muslims look after their architectural heritage. It is not only one of the places most venerated in Islamic society, including Acehnese society, but also has enough data to enable me to analyse the people engaged in maintaining the mosque. As argued by Khalfana and Ogurab (2012, p. 594), as Islamic ritual objects the mosques are morally imbued with protection value; once erected they cannot be demolished, unless they are to be replaced. Yet, in their study of the role of *waqf*\(^{18}\) in building conservation in Zanzibar, they mistakenly interpret this mosque protection. They believe that mosques in Islamic societies have not changed physically and functionally. They contrast this to Churches that have undergone changes, for example in England. Their proposition contrasts with what other scholars have written on the conservation of other mosques. Khan (2011) finds that mosques are under continuous change, enlargement, and restoration over centuries. Ariffin (2005) finds that the Nabawi mosque shows continuous physical changes as well. In addition, the Masjidil Haram\(^{19}\) -- containing the Ka’ba, the Islamic praying direction, and located in the holy land Mecca – is under continuous enlargement and modification, even modernization, to accommodate the growing number of worshippers (Khan, 2011). Therefore, the protection here is undertaken on function; so that once a mosque is erected, the function and uses of such building cannot be changed.

We can illustrate this building conservation practice in Banda Aceh through the development of the Baiturrahman. The mosque has also experienced many

---

\(^{18}\) An Islamic endowment

\(^{19}\) I am aware that there is a debate over this enlargement which demolished other sites of heritage in Mecca, yet I do not interrogate this further in this thesis since it is beyond the scope of this thesis. The purpose to this example is to show how the change has occurred in Islamic heritage overtime to accommodate activities and function.
changes since its establishment during the Iskandar Muda era in the early 17th Century (Raap, 1994). In his era, Aceh was at its most powerful, which has been remembered as a “glorious time”\textsuperscript{20}. Yet, the date of when this mosque, with its three tiered roof (see figure 2), was built is still debatable. In different versions of history, the mosque was established before Iskandar Muda, and he just enlarged the mosque to accommodate increasing numbers of the faithful (Manguin, 1999). However, the intention here is not to discuss who built the mosque, but rather to discuss the development of the mosque and the attitudes of Acehnese towards it.

After the death of Sultan Iskandar Muda, the Kingdom of Aceh gradually became less powerful under a controversial sequence of women leaders (Reid, 2006). At the end of this era there was a reaction against the power of women, which was believed as contrary to Islamic conviction (Reid, 2006). There were four Sultanahs who ruled Aceh after the death of Iskandar Tani, the successor to the throne of Iskandar Muda between 1636 and 1641. They were Sultanah Tajul Alam Safiatuddin Syah (1641-1675), Sultanah Nurul Alam Nakiatuddin Syah (1675-1678), Sultanah Inayat Syah Zakiatuddin Syah (1678-1688) and Sultanah Kamalat Syah (1688-1699). To protest these leaderships, people burnt several public buildings, including the palace and the Baiturrahman mosque. The mosque was rebuilt again several times, and finally in the 1860s, under the direction of Sayyid Abd al-Rahman bin Muhammad al-Zahir, an Arab immigrant and reputed descendant of the prophet Muhammad -- in a different style, more like the model of the Masjidil Haram in Mecca (Raap, 1994), where the Ka'bah\textsuperscript{21} is (see figure 2). How this mosque appears still raises doubts, since there is no local evidence of this mosque.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[20] This era is regarded as “golden age” in some books such as one written by Raap (1994), or zaman gemilang/kegemilangan [heyday] as described by Hadi (2010, p. 270)
\item[21] Islamic prayer direction
\end{footnotes}
What does the establishment and enlargement of the mosque (if we are to believe another version of the mosque history), its immediate rebuilding, and the rebuilding in different styles, tell us about the relationship between Islamic society in Banda Aceh and architectural heritage? This shows how the Acehnese Organic Heritage Discourse (OHD), which is strongly influenced by Islamic teachings, was expressed. It is evidence of a renewal of the conservation ethos as conservation methods that Kwanda (2010) argues as important aspect of heritage conservation in Indonesia and Asia. Byrne (2012) observes that in the name of merit making several venerated places, such as temples, have undergone beautification and renewal. The enlargement of the mosque was undertaken as a way to maintain its existence by rebuilding it quickly to accommodate the need for space and the continuation of ritual practices. Moreover, a quick rebuilding in different styles was also done to maintain these ritual practices, and it did not change the meaning of the mosque for Acehnese people. This suggests that materiality is seen impermanent, so that it is subject to change. For Acehnese to make a public architectural heritage, especially religious buildings such as mosques and meunasah, in sound condition, does not require its original form, style and material to be maintained. What is valued is the spirit and sense of the place of the mosque rather than its material aspect.

For Acehnese people establishing, maintaining, transferring and visiting the mosque and meunasah are, thus, maintaining and visiting God’s house and ensuring the sustainability of Islamic learning practices, and consequently Acehnese Islamic identity. Thus, this relates to merit making, cultural continuity, and sources of resilience. Not surprisingly, then, the religious building is a

---

22 A communal building in Acehnese society that is usually used for praying, learning and other communal activities.
community inheritance and important for community resilience. Thus, a good Muslim, especially a leader, should pay attention to the development and maintenance of religious buildings, especially mosques, making merit by keeping them in sound condition (Hurgronje, 1985a; Yani, 2011). In Acehnese society, constructing and looking after the public facilities and buildings, including mosques and *meunasah*, are done by the community through *gotong royong*\(^\text{23}\), so that the whole community obtains merit for their life in the hereafter. Every village has a responsibility for looking after its village including village facilities (Mahdi, 2012).

Given all these explanations and debates, what is important to note is that memories for Acehnese people are embodied in religious and everyday activities; rather than architectural forms or other inscribed texts. The change of the forms, even the transformation of the modern ones, is undertaken to accommodate the continuity between the past and the present through the authenticity of activities. It was the Dutch, during the colonial era, who introduced a modern way of conserving buildings.

### 4.4 The Introduction of European Authorised Heritage Discourse

The Dutch interest in cultural resources in Indonesia followed its interest in economic resources. Dutch colonialization started in the 17\(^{\text{th}}\) Century through their monopolistic spice and trade routes under the umbrella of the VOC, *Verenigde*
*Oost-Indische Compagnie* (Rath, 1997). Their intervention in cultural matters, including what would later be seen as heritage, eventually shaped the foundation for the current Indonesian Authorised Heritage Discourse (AHD) through heritage policy and practice, and consequently, as heritage is imbricated with identity formation, it has also shaped contemporary Indonesian identity reflected through architectural heritage. Therefore, it is important to discuss the influence of Dutch colonialism and its legacy.

The Dutch interest in Indonesian heritage has been noted around 18th Century. Tanudirdjo (2003), in a paper presented at *Kongres Kebudayaan* (Cultural Congress) V in Bukit Tinggi, West Sumatra, Indonesia, argued that as early as 1705, G.E. Rumphius, a Dutch natural scientist that mostly worked in Maluku, was the first scholar studying Indonesian heritage. Rumphius published a book entitled *D'Amboinsche Rariteitkamer*, which discussed some artefacts and their associated meanings. In 1778, an organization called *Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenscappen* was established by independent art and antique collectors who were seen as representatives of European Enlightenment ideas (Wibowo, 1976 in Tanudirjo, 1995). This organization later established a museum in Jakarta, which after 1945 became the National Museum of Indonesia (Tanudirjo, 2003). Another important figure that contributed to the Dutch interest in Indonesian antiquities was Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles, a Governor General during the British interregnum in Java, 1811-16 (Tanudirjo, 1995). Among his most important works were the rediscovery of Borobudur temple in 1814, and the publication of his two-volume book *The History of Java*, in which he outlined the antiquities of Java (Tanudirjo, 1995). His work stimulated the Dutch administration to establish a Commission for the Exploration and Conservation of
Antiquities, which failed due to lack of interest of its members to be formally involved in the antiquities business (Tanudirjo, 1995).

The formal involvement of the Dutch in managing and governing Indonesian antiquities occurred after the success of the International Colonial Exhibition in Paris in 1900. Even though previously the Dutch had been involved in some exhibitions of their colonies, such as the international colonial exhibition in Amsterdam in 1883, where the most remarkable element of the Dutch exhibition was the traditional Javanese village (Maussen, 2009), the Paris exhibition had a more profound influence. The most obvious message of Dutch involvement in the exhibition was that their colonial style and regime were based on thoughtful knowledge, serious study and careful attention on indigenous culture (Maussen, 2009). In these exhibitions, they wanted to show how careful they were in dealing with the fragile indigenous culture.

Following these rediscoveries, publications, and exhibitions, in 1901, the Dutch established a Commission in the Dutch Indies for Archaeological Research in Java and Madura, headed by J.L.A Brandes (Tanudirjo, 1995; Winarni & Wahjudin, 2000). This commission, on the advice of N. J Krom, was transformed into Oudheidkundige Dienst in Nederlandsche-Indie, Archaeological Service in the Dutch Indies, a board for managing cultural remains, established on 14 June 1913. This was the seed for Badan Pelestarian Cagar Budaya\(^2\) (BPCB), the current Indonesian Board for Conserving Tangible Cultural Remains (Tanudirjo, 1995; Winarni & Wahjudin, 2000). The first director of this board was Dr. N.J. Krom. After two years, he returned to the Netherlands. From 1916 to 1936 the conservation board was

\(^2\) Board for managing tangible cultural remains.
headed by Dr. F.D.K Bosh. In applying, conducting and managing heritage conservation, however, a debate arose between these two prominent conservators. The debate was similar to that between Ruskin and le Duc I discussed in chapter 2. For Krom, the reconstruction of damaged heritage is considered as re-authentication of the heritage and, consequently, biases the historical evidence. This action, for him, is not in line with scientific principles because there is no guarantee that what is reconstructed is in the original form, style and material (Winarni & Wahjudin, 2000). In this sense, he is at one with Ruskin and Morris. While for Bosh, who is with le Duc, as long as the reconstruction is based on scientific method the connection between past and present is established (Winarni & Wahjudin, 2000). In other words, heritage is allowed to be reconstructed and reinstated to its original condition. What was then applied to Indonesian heritage conservation at the time was Bosh’s approach. This is evident in the ways the Dutch, by adopting the European AHD, conserved Borobudur temple and other temples around it by restoring the temple to its previous condition (Nagaoka, 2014, n.d). In line with the establishment of this board, the Dutch also established law to manage and govern Indonesian heritage called monumenten ordonnantie 1931. Under this law, all Indonesian cultural heritage came under government control (Direktorat-Purbakala, 1931). However, like what the Dutch had done in other sectors, such as improving irrigation and transportation systems, these were all introduced to sustain colonial power in Indonesia (Gin, 2004; Kusno, 2000). The infrastructure -- such as railway, road, harbour, etc -- were designed to accommodate the Dutch interest and companies, by transporting natural resources and agricultural products, as well as accommodating the Dutch administration system (Kusno, 2000). Conservation efforts were undertaken to gain international
prestige (Maussen, 2009), to govern Indonesian heritage (Tanudirjo, 2003) and later to protect their architecture in Indonesia (Martokusumo, 2010a).

The Dutch, however, did not undertake many heritage related activities in Banda Aceh, unlike in Java and Madura, except for the design of a home for the Cakra Donya bell25 (Tichelman, 1980), establishing the Aceh Museum and collecting Acehnese coins as their passion of preserving antiquity. Creating a house for this historical bell reveals the Dutch intention to intervene in heritage conservation, and to protect physical and cultural remains. The tiered roof of the bell house was subsequently adopted by Wim Sutrisno in designing the auditorium of the Aceh Museum (Nas, 2003). Now, roofs of this style are widely used as a symbol of Acehnese architectural heritage and identity (Nas, 2003).

In addition to their direct involvement in conserving the bell and the Dutch involvement in reconstructing the Baiturrahman Mosque brought a new architectural style and identity not only in Banda Aceh, but also to Indonesia. The Dutch first attacked the mosque in 1873, fired flares into the flammable palm-leaf roof, and forced the Acehnese to leave the mosque (Raap, 1994, p. 45). Yet, due to safety reasons, they withdrew to their bivouac near the beach. A second attack in December 1873 successfully occupied the fortified grand mosque, Baiturrahman, and took over, and razed to the ground the Sultan’s palace, (Reid, 1969, p. 111). However there were substantial Dutch losses, including the death of the Dutch General J.H.R Kohler in front of the Baiturrahman Mosque (Raap, 1994, p. 45). By conquering these two important buildings, the Dutch had thought that they won the war (Reid, 1969, p. 111), although in fact they had not. Guerrilla warfare

25 A bell, given by the Chinese Emperor.
ensued (Reid, 1969), which was known as “perang sabi”, or literally holy war, against the Dutch, led by ulama (Hadi, 2011). Therefore, during the Dutch occupation between 1873 and 1942, a lot of effort and money was dedicated to dealing with local resistance to their occupation (Reid, 1969). This resistance also changed the Dutch view towards Islam, from seeing it as one of the layers of indigenous culture and religious politics that were not of importance for the Dutch, to seeing it as one of the challenges to Dutch power (Maussen, 2009). This change was indicated by the decision to delegate Snouck Hurgronje to research Islam in Indonesia, especially in Aceh. His account influenced the Dutch religious policies in the colony (Maussen, 2009; Reid, 2006). Therefore, the Dutch war against the Acehnese was an important milestone of the Dutch policy towards Islam (Maussen, 2009). The Dutch intention to rebuild the mosque, which was initially begun in 1879 and finished in 1881, was triggered by their political purpose to win the hearts of the Acehnese and end the war, which was informed by the Dutch religious policies (Raap, 1994; Reid, 1969, 2007). In 1879, by employing a Dutch architect and consulting Islamic ulama from Java, the mosque was carefully rebuilt in the Moghul style, which is completely different from the previous mosque’s architectural style (see figure 2) (Raap, 1994). This decision was regarded as controversial because of the Christian traditions of the Dutch, and was criticised in Holland (Raap, 1994). On the other hand, the mosque was rejected by the Acehnese due to its alien architecture and association with the colonizers. After several years of rejection, the mosque was finally used again, after ulama involvement in winning over the Acehnese. Now, the mosque has become an architectural symbol of Banda Aceh (Arif, 2008) and is on the heritage list of Banda Aceh, which is subject to Indonesian heritage protection. Below I outline heritage policies and practices in post-colonial Indonesia.
4.5 Architectural Heritage Conservation in Contemporary Indonesia

4.5.1 The Adoption of European Influences in Heritage Planning in Indonesia

In this section, I note two important and interrelated points regarding Dutch heritage law and architectural heritage: the adoption of colonial heritage law and, as part of the consequences of this adoption, the acknowledgement of colonial architecture as heritage by the Indonesian government, and consequently the continuity of conserving heritage designated by the Dutch by newly emerging Indonesian heritage initiatives, such as Taman Mini Indonesia Indah (TMII), and other traditional architectural and kampung\textsuperscript{26} conservation efforts.

After independence, heritage conservation, however, was not a priority in the national agenda, which still focused on infrastructure development (Martokusumo, 2010a). During the Soekarno era, heritage conservation was not very active, except for the reopening Oudheidkundige Dienst in 1950. This organization transformed into Suaka Peninggalan Sejarah Purbakala (SPSP) and was led by the first Indonesian heritage scholar, Soekmono. This happened because of his vision of making Jakarta a modern city, comparable to other world cities in international recognition (Kusno, 2000, pp. 50, 72). He rejected colonial influences by shaping Indonesian modern architectural heritage, for example the establishment of the National Monument (Kusno, 2000, pp. 62-66). For Soekarno, Indonesian architectural identity was neither the colonial inheritance nor the traditional one, but one that is modern (Kusno, 2000, p. 68). In the Soeharto era, the situation was reversed, because he did not want Indonesian architectural identity comparable to

\textsuperscript{26} A village in the Indonesian language. According to Widodo (2012), this village is part of the early urban settlement of Southeast Asia.
those in other modern world cities like New York (Kusno, 2000, p. 72). In his era, 1970s was an important landmark for heritage conservation became a national agenda which was marked by several architectural heritage conservation. His desire to shape Indonesian architectural identity by valorising Indonesian traditional architecture was obvious, which was evident in the establishment *Taman Mini Indonesia Indah*, (Mini Indonesian Park), where replicas of Indonesian traditional houses were collected along with modern facilities, such as cinemas (Kusno, 2000). In addition, he also funded research on traditional architecture/Indonesian heritage. Yet, at the same time, his administrative systems found synergy with the colonial era (Kehoe, 2008, p. 19). In 1970 the first conservation project, aimed at conserving Kota Tua, was funded. The Dutch, even now, are trying to sustain their power and identity in former colonised countries like Indonesia through a political infrastructure, known as “mutual heritage” (Nas & Hengel, 2007) or “common heritage” (Fieneg et al., 2008), to encourage and ensuring the conservation of Dutch colonial heritage. One example of this project in Indonesia is the conservation of Fort Vredeburg, Yogyakarta (Nas & Hengel, 2007, p. 339).

The “common heritage” policy can be seen as an attempt to sustain European influence in former colonised countries; consequently this also sustains European heritage understandings. The Dutch retain their interest in colonial architectural heritage because it is their heritage (Kehoe, 2008). Thus, the conservation project - - as in the case of restoring The National Archives building –imbues Indonesia with a continuing Dutch identity and attempts to validate a continuing Dutch economic colonialism that supports the presence of over sixty Dutch businesses in Indonesia (Kehoe, 2008). This building restoration, as discussed by Kehoe (2008), was
initiated by several Dutch lawyers. Unfortunately, there is a significant difference in the understanding of this type of architecture between the European AHD adopted by the Dutch and Indonesian AHD’s (Fienieg, et al., 2008). For the Indonesian AHD, the project was triggered by the desire to promote the preservation of sites that would interest Western tourists (Fienieg, et al., 2008; Kehoe, 2008). On the other hand, the European AHD’s focus was on restoration for the educational and scientific benefit of a public back home in Europe (Fienieg, et al., 2008; Kehoe, 2008). Yet, due to the pressure from the Indonesian AHD, the projects shift focus to adaptive reuse of buildings for cultural activities (Kehoe, 2008; Khan, 1983). The projects, especially the conservation of Kota Tua, however, have ultimately been failures (Kehoe, 2008; Martokusumo, 2010a), because of obvious, and unsurprising, unwillingness and sceptical attitudes towards colonialism (Martokusumo, 2010a).

There is also, along with the world-wide excitement about ‘lost civilizations’ and ancient monuments, a continued interest in preserving heritage designated by the Dutch. For example, Borobudur Temple – an abandoned temple excavated and valorised by the Dutch AHD—continues to receive attention from the Indonesian AHD. Even now the temple is one of the most important World Heritage sites. The buried heritage remains unknown until it is physically excavated, and politically as well as culturally valorised through heritage discourse (Byrne, 1991). For Byrne, even though archaeological objects have been excavated and are present, they remain buried if heritage discourse does not bring them forward. Following him, the temple was not only excavated but also valorised by the Dutch AHD during the colonial era. This gives new meaning to an object that was abandoned when its function becomes obsolete after the advent of overwhelming Islamic influences.
(Rath, 1997). The Dutch physical excavation and political valorisation, argues Tanudirjo (2013, p. 79), have changed the relationship of the surrounding people to Borobudur. He points out that Borobudur, when it was still buried under the ground and obscured by vegetation, was a dangerous sacred place. Now it is a monument to which people relate with pride as the descendants of the great monument builders, and they think that they are the guardians of heritage. In addition, through their intervention in conserving several other temples such as Prambanan, the Dutch have brought back to life another aspect of Indonesian identity, which is otherwise recognised as the most populous Islamic society in the world. The Indonesian past, as Hindu and Buddhist societies, has emerged again due to the acknowledgment of the Borobudur Temple as a world heritage site. This temple’s designation conveys a distinct identity to the majority Islamic society of Indonesia, a Buddhist past over the palimpsest of Islamic memories. Therefore, it is the Dutch that started to institutionalise and ratify traditional custom, in that it continues to influence current Indonesian identity (Rath, 1997).

The question arises as to why there is no Islamic architectural heritage from Indonesia acknowledged in the world heritage list? In fact, Indonesia has almost the same importance in the development of Islam in the Malay World (Feener, 2011) as its importance to Buddhist development, which is acknowledged through the temple designation. In addition to this question, does a mundane, day-to-day architecture such as housing receive enough attention? In many cases this kind of architecture has been overlooked.

There is, arguably, Islamic heritage in the list, but only tombs that are mostly given attention via the Indonesian AHD, especially archaeologists. This is due to the
framework set up by the European principles. Among mosques, only several “antique” ones are granted heritage status. Arguably, this exclusion is due to the fact that the mosques are under continuous renewal to accommodate their original uses, as they are not ruined and preserved antique objects but are in a constant state of renewal to suit their current functions and uses. Budiardjo (1986) argues that the European view of what defines heritage is not applicable in South Asia countries, including Indonesia. For him, what is defined as important in Indonesia as heritage is not the same as in European traditions. The cities in Indonesia were not made of durable fabrics like those in European countries, thus the architectural heritage of Indonesia is not as magnificent as that of Western nations, but are comfortable to live in and suitable to accommodate the way of life on the Indonesian people (Budiardjo, 1986). Indonesian cities are made of several kampungs (Martokusumo, 2010b), which are not found in European cities. Mundane architecture like kampung has also been looked after by the Dutch, especially after the announcement of the Ethical Policy, and it has continued to receive attention after independence through Kampung Improvement Project (KIP). However, all conservation projects that were conducted from early independence until the 1990s were criticised as just beautification and mummification (Martokusumo, 2010a). Haryadi (1994) proposes that we should consider Indonesian ways of conservation, which give priority to conserving activities within the heritage, not the environmental setting or container of these activities. The concern of the Indonesian organic conservation ethos, including in Banda Aceh, is on cultural phenomenon, social-economic and human environments, rather than on physical objects (Budiardjo, 1986) and the beautification of buildings (Martokusumo, 2010a).
Under Soeharto era the SPSP, which in 2002 became Badan Pelestarian Peninggalan Purbakala (BP3) and is now known as Badan Pelestarian Cagar Budaya (BPCB), continued to manage tangible cultural remains such as buildings, artefacts, archaeological sites, etc. This board was established in Banda Aceh in 1990. Accompanying this board, the Indonesian government also established another board, Badan Badan Pelestarian Sejarah dan Nilai Tradisional/BPSNT (Board for conserving intangible heritage), for managing intangible heritage such as dances, customs and rituals. The two divisions, however, are managed by the same general directorate under the Ministry of Culture and Education, which obtained received cultural affairs back in 2011 from the Ministry of Tourism and Culture (Indonesian Government, 2012). In addition, there is also Badan Arkelogi (Archaeology Board), which is managed by the same ministry, for managing archaeological remains (Balai Arkeologi Medan, n.d; Indonesian Government, 1994). The three boards are not at provincial or local level; rather they manage several provinces together. For example, the BPCB in Banda Aceh manages heritage in Aceh and North Sumatra Province.

Besides the Ministry of Culture and Education, in practice, another two ministries are directly involved: the Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy, which is involved in promoting and using cultural resources in the tourism industry, and the Ministry of Public Works, which issues spatial planning regulations and also manages heritage, especially tangible heritage like buildings and parks. Other ministries might be involved as well, but in indirect ways. For example, the Ministry of Religious Affairs is involved in taking care of specific buildings related

---

27 Board for managing histories and intangible values (intangible heritages).
28 President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono undertook a cabinet reshuffle and announced Presidential Decree No 77 year 2011 about a second change of Presidential Decree No 47 year 2009 regarding the formation of the ministries to reintegrate culture and education under the Ministry of Education and Culture.
to religious activities, and the Indonesian Bank and the Indonesian Army is involved in taking care of colonial architecture, especially of their own assets. At a provincial and local level, tourism and cultural offices and public work offices also have responsibility for managing cultural heritage.

BPCB and Badan Arkeologi mostly operate based on the European tradition of heritage conservation, and fully adopting the Dutch policy, *monumenten ordonnantie* 1931. It was easier for newly independent Indonesia to adopt the established colonial policy. It is not uncommon for newly dependent nations like Indonesia to adopt this law, as noted by Cleere ((1989, p.7-8) in Byrne, 1991, p. 231): “departing colonial powers often left a legacy of heritage law in the newly independent states. The legacy was not rejected; in fact there has been a widespread tendency for the new states to use and conserve pre-colonial and even colonial archaeological heritage in the name of national identity”. Not surprisingly, considering the emphasis placed on physical authenticity, colonial architecture made of bricks and stone dominated the authorized list of post-independence Indonesia. Since colonial architecture lasts longer than Indonesian traditional architecture made of timber, which is easy to decay by natural processes, so that it is hard to find good quality and materially authentic traditional architecture. In addition, traditional architecture aforementioned has undergone a renewal process (Kwanda, 2010) and transformation to modern representation (Nas, 2003). Thus, most, if not all, noteworthy heritage conservation projects during early Indonesian independence conserved colonial buildings such as the Conservation of Kota Tua, the Dutch former port city, in Jakarta, 1970s, Braga urban quarter in Bandung in 1980s (Martokusumo, 2010a, 2010b).
Not surprisingly, most, if not all, well-established Non-Government Organizations (NGO) – Badan Warisan Sumatera in Medan, Bandung Paguyuban Pelestarian Budaya in Bandung, and many others -- were established in the area where there was a lot of colonial heritage. The existence of NGOs in the Indonesian AHD is a recent arrival (Wiltcher & Affandy, 1993). Most of their activity is lobbying government for heritage conservation. In their works, these NGOs initially listed only urban colonial buildings. As pointed out by Wiltcher and Affandy (1993) in their note on Bandung Paguyuban Pelestarian Budaya, this organization advocates for the preservation of urban buildings in Bandung, which are dominated by colonial buildings, and its initial project was the Savoy Homann Hotel. During the Suharto era, in 1992, the Indonesian government, as mentioned in the preamble of this act, then considered that the colonial policy was not in line with an independent Indonesia, and established its own law No. 5 year 1992. Heritage in this law is “benda”, (literally “thing” in English) which is strongly refers to tangible forms, so that heritage is artefacts, buildings, structures, and sites (see article 1 of this law).

Heritage is a human and natural made thing which is moveable and non-moveable and is found in a unity, group, or ruin. It has at least to be 50 years old and has important values for history, knowledge, and culture.

In 2010, during Soesilo Bambang Yudhoyono's Presidency, following global heritage conservation trends, a new improved legislative apparatus, law No.11
year 2010, was announced. What is defined as heritage in this legal framework, however, still refers to fifty-year old material culture. Yet the category of ‘heritage items’, besides items included in the 1995 heritage law, has been expanded to include the concept of areas and landscapes. In addition, in this law people or community obtain a right to manage and own heritage, since UNESCO and local experts have encouraged the incorporation of communities in managing heritage. The new heritage legislation gives the same mandate of involvement, responsibility, and authority to local governments in managing heritage. This corrected the previous law, seen by Rath (1997) as pushing for unity of culture, while ignoring regional cultures that cannot fit into the central government’s definition of “unity in diversity”. This new law acknowledges different levels of heritage lists ranging from national to provincial and local level (See article 17 of Indonesian Heritage Legeslation no.11 year 2010). This shifts the authoritative right to list and designate heritage from a minister and central government to governors, regents, and mayors, who have rights to list and delist heritage which is significant for their level of responsibilities. An expert team of “national heritage experts” with certification, which was recently formed by the announcement of the Minister of Education and Culture Decree No. 29/P/2012, helps the central government in listing heritage. In the future, each local government is expected to have its own heritage expert team. Looking at the definition, this legal framework is still strongly influenced by the definition of heritage developed by UNESCO in the World Heritage Convention 1972. Heritage is material culture and nationally significant (UNESCO, 1972). The reasons to follow UNESCO’s understanding and to join this organization for Indonesia are not only for funding reasons (Winarni & Wahjudin, 2000), but also for international acknowledgement as a country which cares about heritage.
Looking at Banda Aceh through this European conservation ethos framework, it certainly does not have many examples of tangible heritage, especially architectural heritage. As I mentioned previously, wars, disasters, current developments, and natural decay have taken away many examples of architectural heritage in the city. In Banda Aceh, therefore, it is also evident that colonial buildings dominate the AHD heritage list, together with limited numbers of pre-colonial graveyards and artefacts like the Gunongan\textsuperscript{30}, which date from the Islamic Kingdom (See for example Banda Aceh heritage list issued by Dinas Kebudayaan dan Pariwisata Aceh, 2011). The reason why these pre-colonial buildings are included as heritage is their originality as the most unchanged architecture from the Sultanate days. In other words, Gunongan and Pinto Khop, amongst the oldest heritage objects in Banda Aceh that have in fact not changed since it was built around 17\textsuperscript{th} century (Wessing, 1988). Within the global AHD, these 17\textsuperscript{th} century artefacts are certainly heritage. Yet, for the locals they are not. As I revealed in chapter 6, it is evidence that they are not significantly emerge on memories of people what I asked what is important building before and after the tsunami for Banda Aceh.

Banda Aceh’s AHD architectural heritage listing gives a lot of room to colonial heritage, but excludes the Baiturrahman Mosque, even though it was also part of colonial heritage, and currently still serves its original purpose. It is in the local heritage list, but it is not assigned as heritage like other colonial architecture such as Pendopo Gubernur (Governor’s Residence), Menara Building, Bappreris Building or Indonesian Bank Building, which obtained their heritage certification from the central government through the ministry decree no 014/M/1999. Even in the later

\textsuperscript{30} an artificial mountain built in the seventeenth century
certification in 2011, in which its cousin the Baiturrahim Mosque built by the Dutch, and several other pre-colonial mosques, were certified as heritage (ministry decree PM.90/PW.007/MKP/2011), the Baiturrahman Mosque does not obtain its heritage certificate. The Baiturrahman Mosque has not been the subject of a degree or other certification. The reason for its exclusion lies in its lack of material originality; this example of colonial architecture has undergone several physical changes to appropriate its uses and functions. According to my interview with BPCB officials, only the front part of the mosque is considered as heritage, due to its being more than fifty years old and the originality of its material. So only the front part this building is attracts the concern and surveillance of BPCB, while the rest of the building is considered ‘new’ architecture and thus not heritage31.

In fact, what underpinned the enlargement was the desire to strengthen the mosque’s links and utility to Acehnese culture, and to follow Islamic values in Acehnese society, which require that prominent Moslems should build a mosque, as the house of God, in a sound condition to accommodate the needs of worshippers. It is part of merit making to build, maintain, and use the mosque. The addition of two more domes, in 1936, during the first enlargement during colonial times, was undertaken to change the plan of the mosque, which was considered to resemble a church, which was inappropriate for a mosque and the Islamic culture of the Acehnese (Raap, 1994). The following enlargements after independence, which added 2 more domes in 1958-1962, were to contain growing numbers of worshippers. The increasing numbers of worshippers have lobbied several governors of Aceh to enlarge the mosque (Hasan, 2003). Governor Ibrahim Hasan undertook the last enlargement in 1992. He had a strong desire to develop an

31 Interview with BPCB Officials.
Acehnese identity and bring it to life, including in architecture. After his last enlargement, therefore, he forbade further enlargements in order to retain the philosophical concepts he incorporated; he related the numbers of domes of the mosque with Surah Al-Fatihah, the most prominent Surah in Al-Quran, which is Surah number seven (Hasan, 2003). Hence the domes cannot exceed seven in number. All these enlargements retained the originality of the front part of the mosque, which was the initial mosque built by the Dutch³².

Figure 4.3: The Transformation of the Baiturrahman Mosque

Source: Figure 1967 (from Reid, 1996); Figure 1675-1678, 1890, and 1936 (from Bidang Pendidikan Agama Islam pada Masyarakat dan Pemberdayaan Mesjid (Panama), 2009); figure 1958 (from Raap, 1994), and figure 1992-now: photo by Cut Dewi

³²Interview with BPCB officials and Imam of the Baiturrahman Mosque.
In contrast to the Baiturrahman Mosque, the pre-tsunami renovation and enlargement of Peulanggahan Mosque was stopped due to the strong influence of BPCB, that considered the renovation was not in line with heritage law because of the enlargement of the building with bricks, instead of its original timber. This mosque was destroyed by the 2004 Tsunami and rebuilt in the same style, but with different material, using bricks and other modern materials.

The mosque, located in Peulanggahan Village\(^33\), was established by ulama, head of Islamic religion, Teungku Dianjong or Al Qutb-Al Habib-Sayyid Abubakar bin Husain Bilfaqih, during the reign of Sultan Alauddin Mahmud Syah, 1760-1781. He was an Arab who had moved to Banda Aceh and married a local woman. He was endorsed for his contribution to the development of Islam in Banda Aceh, especially in Peulanggahan. He trained the hajj pilgrims from other parts of Indonesia before they left for Mekkah (Mecca). For people of Peulanggahan and nearby, he is also well known for the generous lending of his land, which in Islam is known as waqf\(^34\). For his dedication, Habib Sayid Abubakar is known as Teungku Dianjong, which means an ulama or imam that is adored. The architecture of the mosque, with a three-tiered roof, adopted the local architecture of the area at the time it was established. This kind of architecture was also found in other nearby mosques, such as the early Baiturrahman Mosque and Indrapuri mosque in Aceh Besar, Great Aceh, which remains in its original form. The architectural style was adopted from Hindu culture (Raap, 1994), which at the time was strongly influenced by the early development of Islam in Indonesia (Wessing, 1998). Officially the school was used as a mosque in 1982 after experiencing several

\(^33\) The Village was an earlier Acehnese Kingdom city center.
\(^34\) Islamic endowment
renovations. The first renovation occurred in 1899, when the material of the roof was changed from *rumbia* (palm leaves) to a metal roof.

Figure 4.4: The Transformation of Peulanggahan Mosque

Source: Figure 1882, 1980s, and 1990s (from Bidang Pendidikan Agama Islam pada Masyarakat dan Pemberdayaan Mesjid (Panama), 2009); Figure 2008, Photo by Cut Dewi

The point I want to underline here is that the global AHD is in conflict with OHD in Banda Aceh. Even though the governor represented the AHD in his action, he could not ignore the Islamic precepts embodied in the OHD. This means in practice that leaders and heritage practitioners, while being part of the AHD, still, on one hand, want to pursue the OHD conservation principles by renewing, beautifying, and adjusting the structure of architectural heritage like mosques for religious and
cultural reasons. Yet, on the other hand, they are also mandated to retain the originality of fabric central to the law formulated by the central government.

4.5.2 The Consequences of the AHD in Post-Independence Indonesia

In contemporary Indonesia, heritage conservation built on European principles and concepts has a lot of criticism. This has centred on issues of beautification, the overlooking of Indonesian heritage traditions in the AHD, and the focus on the conservation of some colonial architecture (Budihardjo, 1986; Martokusumo, 2006, 2010a, 2010b). I will explore further the consequences of continuing to preserve heritage selected and bestowed by the colonial government, such as Borobudur Temple, for current Indonesian heritage identity. Here I note a few scholars who have moved beyond the enclave of the European conservation ethos and critiqued it by revealing some tensions of philosophical concepts of its ethos and that of the Indonesian organic conservation movement.

Sukarno’s architectural and urban policy has been criticised by Kusno (2000) as replica without origin. In this sense, his intention to build Indonesian identity through architectural expression did not see the past as important. He pursued his ideal tabula rasa development after winning a war with the Dutch through a process of what Kusno (2000) called decolonialization. Suharto’s cultural policies express a lack of appreciation of Indonesian heritage traditions which, as I mentioned, value the connection between the tangible and intangible. The TMII project, although paying attention to local architectural heritage conservation on the surface, was an effort to separate tangible and intangible, or what Rath (1997) calls a displacement of function, meaning and natural space. The buildings
collected in the park have been detached from their setting and original uses. This policy has the same purpose as another Suharto policy that collected Indonesian cultural remains and museumised them. Rath (1997) similarly criticizes this policy as problematic because it not only caused hybridization of “selective traditions”, but also ignored the Indonesian tradition of collection. Most Indonesians, if not all, do not collect for the reasons Western modernizers have – rational, scientific, or categorising – but rather for possessing the powers which are believed to reside in the objects they are collecting (Rath, 1997). As a consequence, Rath (1997) argues this contributed to the further decay of traditional art forms contained in the museum, and detached them from their traditional setting where these objects are actively looked after.

The heritage laws of the 1992 and 2010 shows little difference from the colonial law 1931. The idea that heritage is physical matter, a site or building older than 50 years, is still central to all these legislations, and it tends to protect grand historical objects and buildings of national value which the state has authority in managing, researching and owning (Direktorat Purbakala, 1931; Indonesian Government, 1992a). Heritage is still dominated by the AHD. The experts still work and select heritage and inform communities about their decisions. Even though the 2010 Indonesian heritage law encourages community involvement in taking care of heritage through tax waivers (see article 22 of this law), the community is only allowed to own and manage heritage that it has owned for generations (see article 13 of this law) and only if the state owns the same kind of heritage in reasonable numbers (see article 12 of this law). In addition, any excavation for heritage assets is controlled by the state. People should report and indeed submit the “things” found intentionally or not to government (Indonesian heritage law no.11 2010,
article 29), in this case the government institution responsible for cultural matters. Thus, I argue people or community still have little room in heritage conservation.

The intention to include expert judgement in heritage designation through the formation of expert boards adds another burden and pushes the debate on heritage backward. This desire to educate the public about heritage has been criticised in the heritage literature as a strong commitment to following the modern European understanding of heritage (see for example Byrne, 1991, 2009; Smith, 2006, 2007; Smith & Akagawa, 2009)

The new heritage law, Undang-undang no.11 year 2010, however, still lacks a supporting legal framework to be implemented. It is not paired by the Peraturan Pemerintah (a technical guidelines for the implementation of the legislation). Not surprisingly, then, government officials still refer to the previous technical guidelines Peraturan Pemerintah No.10 1995 that complemented the old heritage legislation, Undang-undang No.5 1992. In addition, there is still a lack of coordination between involved stakeholders. For example, the law contains poor information on the link between Urban Planning (locally-based) and Education and Cultural Departments (regionally-based) (Wiltcher & Affandy, 1993).

In the case of Banda Aceh, for example, this lack of linkage and coordination is evident when listing heritage. In article 49 point 5 of the spatial law no.4 year 2009 clearly mentions some heritage quarters and architectural heritage of the city: the Baiturrahman Mosque, Aceh Museum, Gunongan (an artificial mountain built in the seventeenth century), Putroe Phang Garden (a garden of similar date), Pendopo (Governor House), Kerkhoff (the 1890s Dutch military cemetery), Pinto Khop (a gate built during around the seventeenth century), the grave of Syiah Kuala
(Abdurrauf al-Singkili, Aceh’s most popular Sufi saint, died 1693), the grave of Sultan Iskandar Muda (died 1636), Kandang XII graveyard (the Islamic Kingdom inheritance), the tsunami heritage area in Ulee Lheue, the Tsunami Museum, PLTD Apung (a large ship carrying an electricity generator pushed inland by the tsunami), the boat on top of a roof in Lampulo, and the tsunami mass graveyard. There are also some whole districts of the city listed as heritage areas, such as Kampong Pande, Neusu, and Peunayong (see article 73 point 3 of the spatial law). One can see the combination of the Islamic kingdom heritage, the Dutch heritage, and the tsunami heritage in the list. Regardless of its age being less than 50 years, the tsunami inheritance was included in the list for its significant role in Acehnese history\(^{35}\). The local government’s decision to include the tsunami inheritance is a contrast to that the BPCB. The details of this discourse and differences are discussed in the following chapter.

4.5.3 Conflict and Modern Conservation Ethos

Conflict in Aceh has also influenced the architectural heritage conservation of the region. Banda Aceh, as the capital city of the region, has also become a battlefield and symbol of power.\(^{36}\) The first conflict was sponsored by Darul Islam in 1953, under the coordination of Teungku Daud Beureuh, the former military governor of Aceh. This rebellion demanded for a special Islamic state of Aceh. In 1965, the rebellion was finally ended with a promise from Jakarta to designate Aceh as a special region in religion, education and customary law. The former colonial name

\(^{35}\)Interview with Nurdin AR, Kamal A. Arif, and Head of Spatial Planning Office.

\(^{36}\)The Dutch realized that the power centre of the Acehnese was in Banda Aceh (Aceh Besar), since other areas beyond Banda Aceh were colonies of Banda Aceh, and the Acehnese have strong connections influenced by shared history, language, and culture for over 400 years (Reid, 2007). In addition, there is the pepper plantation investors’ connection, who were usually from Banda Aceh (Aceh Besar) and influenced people in the plantations across Aceh, has also tightened the connection between Banda Aceh and the rest of Aceh (Reid, 2007, p.118). For Acehnese rebellion, although their power was much stronger outside Banda Aceh, however, for them Banda Aceh is still a symbol of power over Aceh (Miller & Bunnell, 2010).
of the city, Koetaradja was changed to Banda Aceh. The province itself was renamed Daerah Istimewa Aceh, or Aceh Special Region.

During the New Order Regime, in 1976, the second rebellion emerged in Aceh, headed by Hasan di Tiro, as a reaction against a broken promise to give Aceh special rights in education, religion, and custom (Barron & Clark, 2006). The movement for independence called itself Gerakan Aceh Merdeka (GAM) or 'Free Aceh Movement'. Aspinall (2007; 951) points out this conflict was caused by “natural resource exploitation ... entangled in wider processes of identity construction and is reinterpreted back to the population by political entrepreneurs in ways that legitimate violence”. Acehnese are labelled as noble, brave, ancient and authentic, and Indonesians as perfidious, cruel, their identity novel and artificial by the leaders of this GAM movement (Aspinall, 2007). As argued by Reid (2006), the Acehnese had formed their identity through their relationship to a state, and to the dynasty of Aceh sultans, to a degree not found elsewhere. Besides this attachment to state (the Aceh kingdom), Acehnese are very proud of their past (Hadi, 2010) and their habit of resistance. They are tied together by pride in the Sultanate, a strong Islamic commitment, language, and adat (Reid, 2006). These identities have moulded Acehnese identity significantly differently from that of other Indonesians.

Most of the rebellions, however, happened outside the city of Banda Aceh. Thus, the urban and rural area of Aceh experienced conflict differently (Miller & Bunnell, 2010). It seems that, for Jakarta, securing Banda Aceh was important for

---

37 During Dutch occupation, they named Banda Aceh Koetaradja, or city of the king.
38 The regime of ex-General Soeharto (1966-98), who ousted 'President-for-life' Soekarno through a gradual military takeover, was known as the Orde Baru (New Order).
sustaining its power over the whole of Aceh. As illustrated by Miller and Bunnell (2010: 5): “President Soeharto’s New Order regime (1966-98)...retained control over Aceh’s urban centres while waging an intensive counterinsurgency campaign against GAM and their civilian supporters in the rebel’s traditional stronghold in parts of rural Aceh”. This rebellion had isolated Aceh from the rest of Indonesia and the world through travel restriction and media control (Miller & Bunnell, 2010).

The Soeharto era finally ended in 1998. The reaction against his centralized regime allowed GAM, for the first time, to appear publicly in Banda Aceh and other cities in Aceh (Miller & Bunnell, 2010). Incorporated by SIRA39 they organised a huge demonstration for a referendum in Aceh that was held in the front of the Baiturrahman mosque. Consequently, the mosque has also become a symbol of Aceh’s resistance to Indonesian authority (Miller & Bunnell, 2010). In addition, after the resignation of Soeharto, GAM also targeted, bombed and burnt down several public and government buildings as part of their protest against Jakarta, and, consequently, this insecure situation saw the introduction of a curfew in Banda Aceh, during which inhabitants were not allowed to be out after 7pm ("Darurat Militer, Nestapa Rakyat Aceh," 2003). The situation also hampered heritage conservation activities, not by attacking heritage buildings, but by a general attack on non-Acehnese government officials, including those who work in the heritage sector. Unfortunately, the majority of experts in the Conservation Board (BPCB) were non-Acehnese. In addition, there was also an attack on the office of the board, which burnt both the office and documentation. The attack, however, was not specially targeted against the conservation board and its

39 Sentral Informasi Referendum Aceh, an organization organizing referendum as to whether Aceh should secede or not from Indonesia.
officials; rather it targeted government buildings and non-Acehnese officials and people. This attack hampered the officials’ ability to meet the mandates of modern conservation to record heritage. In addition, the fire at the BPCB office had also burnt all documentation which is a prerequisite for modern-ethos conservation. Another challenge, as well as opportunity in heritage conservation is the disaster which is discussed in the following chapter.

4.6 Conclusion

The Indonesian Organic Heritage Discourse (OHD) is similar to those in other places within Southeast Asia, which are mostly influenced by local tradition and popular religion, and perceive materiality as impermanent in sustaining religious values and traditional beliefs. In Banda Aceh, Islam has strongly influenced the OHD at the local level. The reasons for venerating and conserving places are not because there are neither inherent values inside the buildings and places nor a divine presence in such places. The mosque, not surprisingly, has been the most resilient place in Islamic society in terms of the continuity of its functions. Its uses are protected, while its architectural forms are adjusted according to the growing number of worshippers and current architectural trends.

The Authorised Heritage Discourse (AHD) in Indonesia is built on the foundation of the European AHD. From an original interest in natural resources, the Dutch expanded their influence to all aspects of Indonesian life in the twentieth century, including cultural heritage. This has left two interrelated legacies in Indonesian
heritage conservation; in the framework for understanding and valuing the past, which is reflected in heritage law, and in Indonesian modern architectural identity. The existence of colonial heritage in heritage lists in several cities in Indonesia, and the continuous existence of ‘pre-colonial heritage’, was politically selected by the Dutch in order to show their carefulness in looking after and dealing with indigenous culture. The European influenced AHD and the OHD are both at work in Banda Aceh, and at times, as will be illustrated in the next chapter, work together in paradoxical contradiction.

In post-disaster Banda Aceh, the AHD and the OHD have been negotiated further in dealing with heritage reconstruction and designation. In the next chapter, I interrogate specifically the AHD in the post-disaster context by looking at several important issues such as heritage reconstruction, heritage listing, uses of heritage for tourism, and uses of heritage for remembering the past through the creation of memorials.
CHAPTER 5

"BUILDING BACK BETTER": BANDA ACEH’s URBAN PLANNING, ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE AND MEMORIES IN THE “NEW BANDA ACEH”

5.1. Introduction

I have discussed the history of architectural conservation in the previous chapter, and illustrated the Indonesian, especially Acehnese, organic architectural conservation ethos, and interrogated the influences of the modern architectural conservation ethos in Indonesia in general, and Banda Aceh in particular. Now, in this chapter, I specifically focus on how the AHD uses iconic architectural heritage to remember and forget the collective narrative templates: Islam, conflict, and disaster, and consequently to shape the collective identity of Acehnese and the identity of Aceh’s capital city, Banda Aceh. As Islam and the idea of the ‘modern’ are used intensively in this chapter, definitions of the terms are important to note here. The term Islam refers to a period of time when the Islamic Kingdom ruled Aceh, and refers to Islamic teachings that influenced the ways Muslims perceive themselves and things beyond them. As part of this chapter I explore the ways Muslims build and perceive urban planning in which architectural heritage is part. Islam is used both in reference to a philosophical understanding and to a particular expression and understanding of society itself. I am analysing architectural heritage within an Islamic context as well as under Islamic influences. While, the term ‘modern’ specifically refers to modernity, a philosophical position that
departs from tradition, and emphasises rationality, and scientific and technological development, and whose origins rest in 19th Century Europe. I use this term to refer to ways of thinking as well as the products of this thinking, such as modern technology.

The creation of identity imposed by static physical settings, like architecture and urban planning, has become a concern and interest of states through the hands of architects and urban planners. This chapter, therefore, sees urban planning and architectural design as state-controlled systems or state-driven systems of constructing and controlling a number of cultural tools in the heritage process. As noted by Billig (1995), architecture is a medium for conveying political messages of government; the banal nature of architecture works to continually reinforce particular understanding of identity. Eventually, landmark architecture is inextricably bound up with collective identity claims (Libeskind in Jones, 2006). The state, through its institutional policies and practices, politically controls the formation of architectural heritage, especially iconic or monumental architectural heritage. This is undertaken in order to form a certain sense of place. Consequently this can trigger certain memories and construct certain identities.

Given this explanation, I argue, from the perspective of heritage conservation, the philosophical foundation in the Aceh reconstruction and rehabilitation after the 2004 Tsunami Disaster, “building back better”, not only attributes a negative connotation to the Acehnese past, as argued by Daly and Rahmayati (2012), but also indicates that Banda Aceh does not have heritage that is worth conserving, so that a tabula rasa approach was justified. Departing from the notion of rebuilding Banda Aceh ‘better’, after the reconstruction process, the local government
pursued the idea of making Banda Aceh better by remaking it as an Islamic city. This notion, however, is not new, and was discussed long before the tsunami. Yet, it becomes very significant after the disaster, especially as this is in line with the implementation of Islamic Sharia and LoGA (the Law of Governing Aceh), signed after the 2005 peace agreement between GAM and the Indonesian government. The idea of rebuilding creating an ‘Islamic city’ has synergy with the implementation of Islamic Sharia in Aceh and, a desire to return to a “glorious past”, a time when Islamic Sharia and government, and arguably city planning provided prosperity and a better way of life. In addition, Islamic Sharia, for the government and other elites, is a panacea for the independence crisis that caused a thirty-year conflict in Aceh, as well as a way of distinguishing Acehnese identity from the rest of Indonesia. Therefore, it is also worth asking how conflict memories are incorporated in the “new” Islamic Banda Aceh. This application of Islamic city planning, alongside the valorising of Islamic heritage, heritage which has been associated with the history of Islam in Banda Aceh, and Islamism contemporary heritage, which is not directly related to Islamic development, can be also seen as a counter statement against the presupposition that Banda Aceh has no heritage, which was strongly demonstrated during the reconstruction process. This political statement claims that Banda Aceh has heritage worth valuing. This notion is also in line with the global phenomenon of rhetorical and politicised claims to return to 'Islamic’ values and teachings, and to form Islamic cities within the Islamic world. What makes the current Islamic city concepts different from those from the pre-colonial past is the adaptation of modern technology and urban planning - Banda Aceh urban planners want to create a “modern Islamic city”.
To analyse this complex heritage process through exploration of state driven top-down planning, the chapter is structured as follows. The first section explores the issues associated with the rehabilitation and reconstruction of Banda Aceh in regard to heritage conservation issues in general. The second part explores a state-driven Islamic city which is registered through Islamist planning (including flagging Islamic heritage sites through the historic city program), Islamist public memorials and city icons (the tsunami museum and other tsunami heritage), and Islamist tourism (involving Islamic tourism using all these attractions that have been Islamised) triggering an intense engagement of the Banda Aceh government in heritage conservation movements.

5.2. Post-disaster Heritage Conservation

In this part I evaluate the heritage conservation activities during the reconstruction process, which took place in the five years after the tsunami, 2004-2009. The dominant international assumption that heritage is material has affected heritage perceptions in post-disaster Banda Aceh to various degrees. During the reconstruction process, top-down post-reconstruction planning has been criticised as lacking attention to and understanding of local cultural aspects, especially in understanding the importance of familiarity for survivor’s resilience shaped by the built environment (Daly & Rahmayati, 2012) and sense of place (Samuels, 2010). Daly and Rahmayati (2012) argue that rebuilding Aceh with the tabula rasa approach using the slogan “building back better”, announced by the Indonesian President and echoed by *Badan Rekonstruksi dan Rehabilitasi Aceh dan Nias* BRR
(the Agency for the Rehabilitation and Reconstruction for Aceh and Nias), has a negative association with the Acehnese past. I agree with these prepositions. Arguably, in regard to heritage conservation, as with the global AHD heritage is strongly associated with materiality; this slogan has a negative connotation to Acehnese heritage because it indicates that, given the lack of surviving physical structures, Banda Aceh has no heritage worth noting. As I have outlined in chapter 4, that as an old city with a long and interesting history, Banda Aceh does not have a lot of heritage in terms of material remains due to conflicts, disasters, natural decay and current developments. Therefore, a tabula rasa approach has no constraints to be applied, since there is no such structure worth conserving in its previous conditions using the facsimile approach. In addition, as heritage is also associated with a highly civilised past, Banda Aceh is not civilised enough. This negative association is evident in several ways.

Firstly, during the reconstruction process, there was no noticeable heritage activities, except small amount activities initiated by local experts, to preserve architectural forms, which has been strongly regraded valuable in the AHD, from national and International heritage agencies. This contrasts with other disaster affected area in Indonesia, such as Yogyakarta, which was affected by an earthquake in 2006, and Padang in 2009. In both cities, special guidelines for managing heritage in the area in the face of disaster were launched, and significant heritage conservation activities, especially architectural heritage conservation, initiated by International and national heritage stakeholders, were noticeable. These included the conservation of Borobudur and Prambanan temples, and Kota Gede, initiated by UNESCO and other international agencies and
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governments (UNESCO, 2006), and Inner city Rehabilitation (Post-disaster) Padang, initiated by several national and international organizations ⁴¹. As discussed by Rico (2014), Indonesia had not shown adequate concern for heritage issues during the 2004 Tsunami and Earthquake from heritage agencies, except reports on the Ujung Kulon National Park, even though it is located on the other island Java, as reported by ICOMOS Australia. UNESCO also showed concern about the status of the only World Natural heritage site in Aceh, the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (UNESCO, 2003, pp. 53-54). In Banda Aceh, Rico (2014) notes international attention has been drawn to museum artefacts, as shown by a report from ICOM on the effects of earthquakes on the ceramics collection at the Aceh Museum. The disaster, however, has attracted International attention to the continuity of Saman Dance, which was included in the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding in 2011. In other words, there was a perception that there was no architectural heritage, and therefore no requirement for expert scrutiny and concern.

Local experts, through their NGOs, initiated limited heritage conservation activities in Banda Aceh during the reconstruction process. Yenny Rahmayati, who has an architectural background, through her organization Aceh Heritage Community (AHC) pursued some heritage activities. AHC conducted the survey and inventory of Acehnese cultural assets, prioritizing areas devastated by the tsunami, to record and identify damaged heritage, develop a database of heritage in Aceh, safeguard the surviving heritage, and finally to gain support for heritage recovery. The AHC even initiated a renovation of colonial heritage, the ex MULO School, now SMU 1 (High School), under *Fondation Chaine du Bonheur* (the Swiss Solidarity Fund) and

⁴¹ See [http://www.culturalheritageconnections.org/wiki/Inner_City_Rehabilitation_%28Post-Disaster%29_in_Padang](http://www.culturalheritageconnections.org/wiki/Inner_City_Rehabilitation_%28Post-Disaster%29_in_Padang) for further information of this project.
through the support of the International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC)\textsuperscript{42}. Another local expert was Kamal A. Arif\textsuperscript{43}, a local born architect living in Bandung, West Java. He, through various institutions and organizations, was actively involved in heritage conservation. He initiated \textit{Masyarakat Pusaka Nanggroe} (Heritage Community\textsuperscript{44}), Heritage Trails, and plaques established at heritage sites. He has also tried to help local government emphasise the sense of the past along \textit{Krueng Aceh} (Aceh River) by re-cultivating traditional plants, and to crystalize tsunami memories through the Aceh ‘Thanks to the World Memorial Garden’. At the same time, heritage buildings destroyed by the tsunami were renovated and rebuilt in both similar and different style from before the tsunami. One example worth noting was the Peulanggahan Mosque, which through the help of BRR was rebuilt in the same style, but using different materials.

Secondly, the destroyed areas have been regarded as empty places. This, as I have mentioned in chapter 2, is one of the misunderstandings of heritage in post-disaster contexts, which has vital consequences to the livelihoods and resilience of survivors. A place has vanished, so that it can be developed as wished or abandoned, if it is considered unsafe to live there. In the name of disaster mitigation and the resilience of people, many survivors were removed from their original places, especially those who used to live along the coast, and then they were temporarily relocated to communal barracks before aid houses were built (Daly & Rahmayati, 2012; Mahdi, 2012). The cleared zones were regarded as dangerous places that should be avoided. In fact, according to Samuels, these zones

\textsuperscript{42} See \url{http://lestariheritage.net/aceh/} for further activities of this organization during reconstruction process and afterwards.
\textsuperscript{43} He was also the head of the Tsunami Museum Design Competition
\textsuperscript{44} In his organization he tried to pull heritage elites such as the governor, mayor, historians, artists, and architects, including Yenny Rahmayati, together. It seems his organization acted more at the elite level, while the one established by Yenny focused more on the grassroots level, with most of its members being architecture student of Syiah Kuala University.
are also sources of survivors’ resilience. In the absence of physical fabric these zones were filled with memories of bygone people. For these reasons, many survivors decided to return to their homeland. In addition, in light of the view that heritage is old and authentic, many tsunami wrecks and debris were quickly cleared, because there were not heritage, especially due to their age. According to Rico (2014) clearing tsunami debris is also in line with the “building back better” slogan. Clearing was undertaken to return the city landscape to a “normal” before tsunami state, so that people could better continue their lives. In fact, for her this has potential for diminishing disaster knowledge that is important for survivors’ resilience. I agree with her, although she and I do not always associate memories to material representations, but this clearing action is worth spotlighting as an effort to associate heritage with material, so that only valuable material is preserved. In addition this action demonstrates a lack of knowledge of the involved actors in the importance of tsunami debris for survivors’ resilience. In short, this resilience and place familiarity is central to this thesis; chapter 7 further examines this issue by comparing the ways the government and communities deal with them.

Thirdly, the funding for cultural matters, including heritage, did not have a focus. It gained more attention between 2007-2008, a year before the end of reconstruction, but was still given the lowest priority (see the shifting focus Badan Rekonstruksi dan Rehabilitasi Aceh dan Nias/ BRR, 2009, p. 21). It seems the focus on cultural issues remains at meeting level. As argued by Daly and Rahmayati, (Daly & Rahmayati, 2012) the attention to cultural issues was reflected through a series of meetings without clear implementation and ends. Even in these meetings, Nurdin AR, head of the Museum Aceh, notes that BRR gave less priority to cultural
issues, as there was no dedicated infrastructure for accommodating a meeting with important cultural experts. The meeting discussing cultural issues was stopped due to another important meeting that needed to take place in the same room. However, through these series of meetings, instead of rescuing existing heritage, BRR and other involved actors decided to establish disaster heritage in Banda Aceh in the form of the Tsunami Museum and many other memorial plans, and to preserve tsunami debris like the Kapal Apung, the electricity boat pushed 5 Km inland by the tsunami, and Boat on the Top of the house. In this sense, the reconstruction itself has created noteworthy legacies for Banda Aceh. Reconstruction can also be seen as a heritage process and performance to legitimate and construct heritage. It is a wide-ranging action that defines and valorises certain heritage. The establishment of the Tsunami Museum, and the preservation of tsunami debris I discuss further in the section on Islamic memorials, as the local government Banda Aceh still manages these projects. The local government finds these projects have synergy with their mission to establish an Islamic city and to establish that Banda Aceh does indeed have heritage. Below I discussed how the development after the post-2004 tsunami reconstruction takes into account the iconic architectural heritage.

5.3. “Kota Madani” : Islamism of Urban Planning

For the new Banda Aceh, as shown by Qanun Rencana Tata Ruang Ruang Kota Banda Aceh (the urban planning law) No.4 year 2009, it is better to return to the past while engaging in appeals to modernity. This is done through the resurrection
of past tradition, in this case “Islamic” values, and the accommodation of new
technologies to compete with other modern cities in the world. This resurrection is
not unusual for a post-disaster city and society, and has marked many societies’
efforts to sustain cultural resilience after a surpassing disaster (ICCROM, 2005), as I
have discussed in chapter 2. In Banda Aceh after the tsunami, the new urban
planning law No.4 year 2009 of Banda Aceh aims to form an Islamic city based on
Islamic and modern principles. This Islamisation and modernization of planning
can be obviously seen through the aims of urban planning of Banda Aceh
“Mewujudkan Ruang Kota Banda Aceh sebagai Kota Jasa Yang Islami, Tamaddun,
Modern dan Berbasis Mitigasi Bencana” (to create Banda Aceh as a modern, Islamic
service city based on disaster mitigation) and Long Term Vision of development of
Banda Aceh “ Terwujudnya Banda Aceh Sebagai Kota Tamaddun, Modern dan
Islami” (To form Banda Aceh as a Modern Islamic city)45. What is interesting to
note for these aims is the words “Islam” and “modern”, which, following leading
literature in Islamic studies such as Nasr (2010), clash in philosophies and
principles. I will come back to this phrasing when I discuss in detail the concept of
urban planning in Banda Aceh later on. Along with its Islamic aims, my interview
with the mayor of Banda Aceh also reveals that the government of Banda Aceh
wants to turn the city into an Islamic city which is associated with kota madani, for
example:

We will create Banda Aceh as a model for kota madani...where there is
tolerance among Moslem and other believers...so that people can live
peacefully, harmoniously, and tolerantly...this is really like the ways

45In previous urban planning such as Rencana Tata Ruang Wilayah /RTRW 2000-2010 (Banda Aceh
Prophet Muhammad united Anshar and Muhajirin...everybody lived peacefully and tolerantly...this is what we hope in the future

Interview with the Mayor of Banda Aceh

Madani, which is also literally translated as civil society in English, is a translation from the Arabic word mujtama’ madani which has two meanings: madinah which means a city reflecting dynamic activities and tamaddun meaning civilization (Hafidhuddin, 2003). Kota Madani is the concept of an Islamic city based on egalitarian concepts. An example of this society was strongly associated with Al-Madinah city, Saudi Arabia, during the life of the Prophet Muhammad. If the age of Enlightenment was an important milestone for Western modernity, in Islam, generally speaking, the birth of the Prophet Muhammad is also seen as an important milestone, because he transformed ignorant human beings in to members of a civilised society. His sayings and actions, including the life during his era, have become one source of references for Muslims.

As Banda Aceh is the capital city of Aceh province, the intention of creating a Kota Madani has also influenced the decision making at provincial level; the governor, Zaini Abdullah, wants to support the designation of Kota Banda Aceh as Kota Madani by refurbishing the Baiturrahman Mosque in the style of the Nabawi
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46 Anshar was a group of people in Madinah, who helped Muhajirin, a group of people from Mecca who had just moved to Madinah.
48 Kota Madani adalah sebuah kota yang penduduknya beriman dan berakhlak mulia. Menjaga persatuan dan kesatuan, toleran dalam perbedaan, tata hakum, dan memiliki ruang publik yang luas (Kota madani is a city where the citizens are maintaining peace, tolerance, law, and open minded). From http://atjehpost.com/read/2012/03/22/4878/5/5/Mawardy-Nuradin-Illiza-Melanjutkan-Prestasi-dengan-Kota-Madani, accessed on 15 November 2014
Mosque in Medina. Below is the plan for the refurbishment of the mosque, which will be equipped with underground parking, a new ablution area and a wider garden. This plan has commenced in 2015.

Figure 5.1: The new Plan for the Refurbishment of the Baiturrahman Mosque
For Banda Aceh, however, the intention to form an Islamic city is not new. Banda Aceh has long been associated with the ideal of the Islamic city due to its image as the Verandah of Mecca (Arif, 2008; Reid, 2006), its role in the past as a centre of Islamic studies (Feener, 2011), and the city social life reflected through informal social rules, among others: to shut down any activities, especially public service, and trading during Friday prayer, and to shut down restaurants during the days of holy Ramadhan (fasting) month, and other social rules in relation to Islamic values which have been applied in Banda Aceh for years. According to Aspinall (2007), the intention to form an Islamic region has been pursued for a long time by the central government, the ulama, and the local bureaucratic elite. For central
government, according to Aspinall (2007), Islamic Sharia has been utilized for gaining support of Acehnese to continue to be a part of Indonesia; rather than to be with GAM asking for independence. For him, the provincial and local government officials, in supporting Islamic Sharia, want to maintain their ties with the central government, and to gain support from the locals, as well as the ulama, who want their privilege position in Acehnese society back as it was before the Dutch reduced their power. As Wertsch (2002) argues, the intention of the state to control collective memories through written histories as a way to control its subject, which in this case can be interpreted as a way to control the Acehnese identity for political purposes. According to Aspinall (2007) Islam, especially Islamic Sharia for these elites, are mandated by Acehnese history and identity. He notes that, since 1978, the official doctrine of the nostalgia for the golden age of Acehnese Islam and the importance of Islam for Acehnese identity has been promoted. This was then followed by the local press regularly publishing articles glorifying Aceh’s Islamic past and government initiatives to name streets, public buildings and institutions after past Islamic heroes. Through these continuous retellings, the Acehnese Islamic past, for him, becomes to be seen as more “glorious” and has affected outsiders’ perception of Aceh.

The Islamic past becomes more “glorious”, so that Islam becomes more prominent by the announcement of several laws mandating Islam’s central position in Acehnese society. In 1999, Law no.44 about Keistimewaan Aceh (Aceh’s Specialness), in which one of the specialness is religious, in this case Islam, was announced. This law has become a foundation for the formation of an Islamic
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49 According to Aspinall (Aspinall), the GAM aims for independent had evolved over time from forming an Islamic region (first GAM movement under Daud Beureuh) to promoting the Aceh resistance against outsider rules (second GAM movement under Hasan Tiro). What is interesting here is the changing uses of the term Islam, from an aim or goal to a weapon that is used by the government and other elites to defeat GAM.
50 For example, the leading state universities in Aceh are named after Syiah Kuala, Ulama and IAIN Ar-Arraniry.
region through the implementation of Islamic Sharia. Afterwards, Islamic Sharia has been further implemented in Aceh by the announcement of law No.18 of 2001 about A Special Autonomy for Aceh province, which allowed the formation of *Makamah Syariah* (Islamic Court) (see chapter 12 of this law), and law No.11 of 2006 about The Aceh Government clearly states that Islam has to be the base for government activities in Aceh (see article 20 of this law).

In regards to this, by incorporating Islam in Urban Planning, the Banda Aceh Government, whether consciously or not, maintains support from both the specific community and the provincial and Central Government. Seemingly, the way the Banda Aceh government promotes the Islamic image of Banda Aceh, through top down urban planning, reflects a reunion with the so-called glorious past, the times during Prophet Muhammad and the Islamic Kingdom, which are remembered as the best time in both Islamic and Acehnese society. When the Islamic Acehnese Kingdom reached its peak in the 17th Century is mostly remembered with pride in formal and everyday stories, which I have documented in chapter 6. Aspinall (2007) shows that Islamic Sharia and a dream for an Islamic region is a nostalgic notion and an expression of identity. He quotes two examples to explain this. Firstly, the statement by the speaker of the former provincial parliament, PPP politician Abu Yus, in a seminar reported by Waspada newspaper on 11 January 2001: “Aceh is identical with Islam, and legal norms have grown in the land of Aceh since Islam entered Aceh. Because of that, now is the time to seize the glory of Islam by way of the complete (*kaффah*) implementation of Islamic Sharia”. Secondly, he quotes the work of student writer, Djalil, who succinctly indicates this nostalgia: “the Islamic community of Aceh is experiencing a process of returning to its collective identity as a community whose identity is based on Islam”. In urban
planning, borrowing Aspinall’s (2007) argument, Islam is used to legitimize the power of the Banda Aceh Government, and to show that the government is more authentic and understands the Acehnese identity. As well the local government keeps gaining support from the citizens and maintains its ties with the provincial and the central government.

The return of Banda Aceh to its Islamic past is also part of a global phenomenon. This return mostly emerged after colonialization, or the end of World War II, and is part of a reaction to modernization and globalization (Nasr, 2010). Generally speaking, as argued by Frishman and Khan (1994; p.11), colonialism, together with war with Christianity and the Mongols, had caused the displacement of Islamic scholars from the centre of Islamic civilization, such as Cordoba and Granada in Spain. In addition to that, they mention that the fall and secularism of the centres of Islam, such as the Ottoman Empire in Istanbul in Turkey, have also contributed to the fall of Islam, which is now, however, emerging from its backwater and expanding to become the fastest growing major monotheistic religion. Thus, according to Nasr (2010), there are at least three general reactions to modernization emerging in the Islamic Word: Islamic modernism (adoption and Islamisation of modern technologies), a gradual attempt to study the meaning and history of Islamic science, and a study of Islamic science from an Islamic point of view through to re-reading unexplored Islamic manuscript stored in India, Yemen and many other places. In urban planning, Abu-Lughod (1987, p. 1) finds that urban planners, with a new respect for past achievements, are searching for ways to apply this to today’s cities that identify as Islamic, which is happening not only in many part of parts of the Arab world, but it seems now in other parts of the
Islamic world, and particularly in Malaysia and Indonesia. This, according to Abu-Lughod (1987), is really misleading, as the contemporary context of the Islamic world is not as it used to be. In addition, extending Smith’s (2006) idea of heritage as process and this process happening in a place, such as a city, there are also different process, memories, identities that work in a city to create differences between cities. In addition, the cities in the Islamic world today have followed the Western planning model for cities, especially American cities which are based on modern science and technologies that are not in line with Islamic science principles (Nasr, 2010). To adopt modern technologies, to be modern, for most non-Western culture such as in Southeast Asia, means to be developed (Byrne, 2012, p. 297). Yet, this modernity, as mentioned by Frishman (1994), in the Islamic world today, has negative connotations, as opposed to Islam, which has only positive connotations.

Using this perspective to look at the ways the government of Banda Aceh promotes “the modern Islamic city” reveals that the government wants to be a “good” government by adopting Islamic values, but at the same time wants to be recognized as a “developed” government by pursuing modern technologies. At the same time they also wish to make is clear that Islam in Aceh is not extreme and has emerged with modern principles. As Islam has become an issue internationally, especially in the west, local government does not want to lose international support by promoting a pure Islamic city. In addition, as Aceh also wants to be part of the wider world (Hasan, 2009), it does not want to lose its opportunity to be part of the world by promoting pure Islamic urban planning. An example of how Islamic Sharia becomes a threat for international aid during the post-tsunami

51 See for example the implementation of Islamic Sharia in Kelantan, Malaysia and Aceh, Indonesia.
reconstruction was reflected in the case of an aid project initiated by the city of Apeldoorn, the Netherlands. In 2007, this city assisted Banda Aceh in developing waste management and one stop access for public services ("Laporan Master Plan Pengelolaan Sampah Untuk Kota Banda Aceh Pasca Tsunami ", 2007). However, in 2009, this assistance was under review after the Apeldoorn government was informed about the implementation of Islamic Sharia in Banda Aceh ("Apeldoorn Hentikan Kerjasama dengan Aceh," 2009).

In Aceh, Islamic Sharia has been pursued through what might be called a religious symbolic policy, promoting symbolism rather than pursuing substantial and philosophical principles. This is reflected in the ways Sharia Islam enforces inhabitants, especially females, to wear appropriate Moslem dress and to behave in accordance with “Islamic practice”52. These are symbolic gestures, rather than addressing spiritual needs, which have attracted many critiques at local, national, and international levels, especially about the ways this law polices the behavior of the population. Accompanying this policy there is also a symbolic planning policy to maintain the existence of a symbolic Islamic built environment. This planning policy seems to pursue two main aspects of a tangible Islamic city.

Firstly, the Baiturrahman Mosque is deliberately planned to be the city’s symbol. The mosque lacks material authenticity, as I established in the chapter 4, so that it does not have heritage certification from the Badan Pelestarian Cagar Budaya/BPCB (the conservatory board for cultural remains), yet the spatial planning law (Qanun/Undang-Undang Tata Ruang) clearly acknowledges that this mosque as the most important example of architectural heritage in Banda Aceh.

---

52 See for example a report from the diplomat written by Soerono (2014) on the diplomat
The law stipulates that the buildings around the mosque should not be higher than the minaret of the mosque and should function in accordance with the religious uses of the mosque. For example, surrounding buildings may not operate as hotels, karaoke centres, or have other entertainments that are in conflict with the mosque (Banda Aceh Government, 2009).

Figure 5.3: The Baiturrahman Mosque,

Source: photo by Cut Dewi

Secondly, the policy uses architecture as an alternative medium to express the intention to make Banda Aceh a modern Islamic city. To reflect a modern city, the mayor consciously promotes modern architectural styles imbued with the spirit of
Islam, in this sense the use of domes has been literally interpreted as Islamic architecture, ranging from public buildings to recreational places. In addition, to reflect the image of a modern Islamic city, modern dome-roof styles have been adopted in some buildings, especially public buildings. Even though this style emerged before the tsunami, it is favored more now since it was adopted in the architectural design of the symbolic project *Balaikota*, the mayors’ office. The building was designed with a hollow-domed metal roof and a cubical ship-shape façade. Color, dominated by grey, and materials, a combination of concrete, glass, and metal, have contributed to a strong modern image.

Figure 5.4: Balai Kota (the Mayor’s Office/ Town Hall),

Source: photo by Cut Dewi

---

53 There is another misinterpretation of Islamic architecture mostly associated with the domes. As most Islamic architecture is derived from Hellenistic and Roman Imperial influences (Grabar, 2004; p.36), this dome actually belongs to the era before Islam, and Islam adopted the dome and appropriated it for Islamic purposes. The architectural details, most scholars agree, come from Islamic civilization’s calligraphy, geometry, and garden design (Al-Asad, 1994; Frishman & Khan, 1994; p.13-14). The three details are artworks which are replete with the spirit of obedience to God. The calligraphy, according to Frishman and Khan (1994), expresses the intention of the Moslem scholars to announce to passers-by that the buildings are considered sacred places and convey spiritual messages. Therefore, they avoid using the form of animal and people in the design, unlike in Classic European design (Frishman & Khan, 1994; Grabar, 2004; Thackston, 1994).
This building, however, has attracted controversy as it is not harmonious with its surroundings, which are dominated by old buildings from the 19th Century, as well as the nineteen sixties and eighties. Moreover, it has attracted many criticisms from local experts, especially architects, and the general community, both for its controversial architectural style and amount of funding, because it was built in the middle of a housing crisis after the tsunami. The critiques, however, tend to be confined to informal communication in coffee shops or blogs.

Another exemplar of the modern Islamic city concept is represented by the design of the shopping centre known as Pasar Aceh, an old market renovated with modern features through the program “Revitalization of Pasar Aceh”. The façade of the shopping center literally replicates the arch and ornamentation of the Baiturrahman Mosque, which is seen as a model for Islamic architecture by the government. The replication is undertaken to give a sense of traditional and Islamic style⁵⁴. Another example of this copy-paste architecture is the Politeknik Aceh, a new college developed along the Krueng Aceh River, just a few kilometers from the mosque. Literally, the skin of the buildings is similar to the Baiturrahman Mosque façade, which is believed to be an expression of Islamic architecture and Acehnese identity.

⁵⁴ See for example the mayor statement on the Government website on 2 January 2013, "Kita melakukan ini agar Pasar Atjeh dapat terlihat lebih modern, dan tetap tidak meninggalkan substansi tradisionalnya. Kita berharap agar hal ini dapat menjadi contoh untuk daerah-daerah lainnya," (we hope Pasar Aceh becomes more modern and still has traditional sense, which consequently it can be an example for other regions) (Purnama, 2013)
There are several other programs for making Banda Aceh a modern city, including: Banda Aceh Cyber Islamic City (BACIC), and Cities Development Initiative for Asia (CDIA). In BACIC, Banda Aceh presents a very strong concept of the Islamisation of modern technology -- in this case the use of the Internet -- as pursued by other societies within the Islamic world. The pure modern images, such as the pictures below, were taken from a government website in 2012. In line with this Islamisation of urban planning, the government has also reinvented the Islamic urban quarter and its architectural heritage, and “Islamised” urban memorials, including tsunami-made and built-memorials for the tsunami event. At the same time, all these urban features are polished as tourism attractions with an Islamic sensibility.

55 these images were taken from Bappeda Banda Aceh, CUDP Krueng Aceh river, http://bappeda.bandaacehkota.go.id/cudp-for-krueng-aceh-river/ accessed on 15 may 2012
56 I use term Islamized here as verb; instead of noun or adjective, to illustrate the process or action of creating Islamic architectural heritage.
Figure 5.6: The Design for Modern city along Krueng Aceh (Aceh River)


5.4. The Islamic City and Heritage Conservation

After the reconstruction, the most important activity of heritage conservation in Banda Aceh is the involvement of Banda Aceh in Program Penataan dan Pelestarian Kota Pusaka/P3KP (the heritage city planning and conservation program) initiated by the Ministry of Public Works and Badan Pelestarian Pusaka Indonesia/BPPI (Indonesia Heritage Trust). This program is also noted as one of the heritage programs in Indonesia that is not initiated by Badan Pelestarian Cagar Budaya/BPCB (the Conservation Board for Cultural Remains), which I have largely discussed in chapter 4, and is an old and influential heritage government board in Indonesia which has a direct inheritance of the legacy of the Dutch heritage
institution, and is dominated by archaeologists. Architects and urban planners dominate P3KP, since its aims are more focussed on historic urban landscape arrangements and spatial planning, rather than concerns with archaeological remains and individual buildings. This program is part of Indonesia’s responses to the UNESCO historic city program and cultural landscape initiatives. The program aims to forming Indonesia historic cities in 2015 and all these cities in 2020 can be recognised as the World Historic cities, gaining international recognition of the uniqueness of Indonesian cities (Kementerian Pekerjaan Umum & (BPPI), n.d-a, n.d-b).

The involvement of Banda Aceh in this historic city program, and the interest of central government in Banda Aceh’s heritage, raises an interesting question - what is the reasoning behind this? Because Banda Aceh is perceived to lack tangible heritage, so that its reconstruction has been conducted under a tabula rasa approach, and the intense monitoring and concern on rebuilding the city has not been given as much as Jogjakarta and Padang, which are considered to have an abundance of heritage. For the Banda Aceh government this program creates an opportunity to promote and announce the heritage assets in Banda Aceh, which had been ignored during conflicts, and to gain significant funding for developing the city through heritage conservation. For central government this program, together with another centralised program, like Green City, is another way to maintain their control over local governments in the era of decentralised government structure. In the case of Banda Aceh, consciously or not, the central government still anchors its power via its interpretation of Acehnese identity construction, and has obtained special autonomy rights, through maintaining heritage buildings which, in this case, have been understood by the state as
alternative media to convey national and regional identity. Heritage, especially public monumental heritage, has for a long time been a concern of state, which is demonstrated in a state driven system (Smith, 2006) like urban planning and architectural heritage designation (Ashworth, 1991). The selection of eligible cities is decided by the central government via a committee. Guidelines for writing a proposal and action plan have been also set by the central government through "Modul Penyusunan Proposal P3KP (Guidelines for formulating P3KP proposal)" and Modul Penyusunan Rencana Aksi Kota Pusaka (Guidelines for formulating P3KP Action Plan). To be approved for funding, a proposal must of course to meet these requirements.

For the Banda Aceh government, its conceptualisation and mobilisation of a ‘proud Islamic past’ is central to this program, which is clearly stated in the proposal P3KP, as is the intention to promote this past, in the absence of material remains. Banda Aceh, to the local government, is Pusaka Jejak Sejarah Islam, an Islamic historic heritage trail, which is clearly mentioned in Rencana Aksi Kota Pusaka/RAKP (the action for historic city planning) below:

Banda Aceh was a capital city of the first Islamic Kingdom in Southeast Asia....which had a highly civilized society in Asia, even amongst the top five big Kingdoms in the world. The Aceh Kingdom was very famous in the world which left many historical and cultural assets....Reviewing the long history of Banda Aceh and the result of heritage listing owned by Banda Aceh, the Banda Aceh Government is

---

57 See a presentation from the Ministry of Public Work in the process of socialization of this program. I obtained this presentation from Official of Bappeda (Planning Board) Banda Aceh in 2014. For some reasons, he could not remember when this presentation was given.
motivated to participate in the program Penataan dan Pelestarian Kota Pusaka/P3KP (Historic City Conservation)\(^5\)


The local government in this project again promotes the Baiturrahman Mosque and Gampong Pande, an old Islamic area which is an original part of Banda Aceh (see Bappeda, 2012). Like the Baiturrahman Mosque, which lacks material authenticity, Gampong Pande has no significant architectural remains from the Islamic period, but several tombs and archaeological artefacts such as coins, ceramics, etc. In the absence of material fabric, heritage in Banda Aceh’s past has been largely imagined based on historical data. This contrasts to what Rico (2014) argues is the modus operandi customary for disciplinary exchanges amongst heritage experts, which stress the material evidence of historical monuments and colonial architecture. She finds that the Acehnese past has been perceived as imagination in the mind of local experts. In her first visit to Banda Aceh, she was taken to Gampong Pande by Kamal A. Arif, and spent an hour discussing a non-existent sultan’s fortress, over the unexcavated coastal soil on this area, which is now covered in tsunami debris and trash. Kamal directed Rico to imagine this landscape based largely on historical data and visions of a future direction for heritage debates in the city. As an architect, who has worked for more than ten years in the arena of architectural conservation, I found a similar gesture when talking to local experts about heritage in Aceh. Most of them largely draw on

\(^5\)This is my translation of part of the proposal from Indonesian into English
imaginings from historical data and images. For them, this imagination is alive, and heritage is actually there. No wonder then that the historic city program is developed from this imagination, which does not fit with the framework set up by national government to create historic cities based on tangible evidence\(^5^9\). In short, the ways Banda Aceh local government promotes pre-colonial sites like Gampong Pande in the historic city program, following Labadi (2013), can be seen as a way of destabilizing the supposed superior position of the European states as the loci of civilization.

Figure 5.7: The proposal of the local government for the Historic city project: building new buildings in the empty land and reconstruction and conservation of some old tombs in Gampong Pande (Bappeda, 2013, pp. 19-21)

In the light of the Islamisation of the city, there are several heritage conservation issues worth considering and examining. Firstly, there is the Islamic planning and the intention to promote the old historic city through the historic city program, and the deletion of the Peulanggahan mosque from the BPCB heritage list, which I

\(^5^9\) See guidelines where there is a clear requirement for the existence of objects, *Modul Penyusunan P3KP*, p2.7, 2.3: element material and spiritual as a key quality of a historic city, p.1.6: A historic city is a city which has a historical value and tangible and intangible heritage as well as the interrelation of the two. The value and heritage live, develop, and are effectively managed.
see as a representation of the national AHD, so the mosque will no longer receive funding, and the initiative to fund Kerkhof, the Dutch military graveyards. BPCB removed Peulanggahan Mosque from its heritage list after the tsunami and stopped funding the mosque’s maintenance. This happened as the mosque, which has been destroyed, was reconstructed in different materials, albeit in the same style. The main reason of its removal was that the mosque is not authentic. In 2005, BRR completely removed the damaged mosque and established a temporary mosque. Then, in 2008, it built a permanent mosque made of concrete in a similar architectural style. This reconstruction was undertaken based on consultation with local inhabitants, of which only 20% survived the tsunami. From my interview with the head of Peulanggahan village, I was informed that the mosque reconstruction was initiated by the community through the head of the village and *tuha peut* (usually four wise representatives selected by the people). The head of the village told me that they needed the mosque for continuity of religious practices and other community and traditional activities, such as the remembrance of the death of Teungku Dianjong, the mosque’s founder. They, in their proposal, tried their best to retain the original form of the mosque. Finally, after getting the first aid for reconstructing a temporary mosque in 2005, the community got a permanent mosque in 2009 (Bustami, 2011). Yet for BCPB officials, like the Baiturrahman Mosque which is not original in form and materials, Peulanggahan mosque does not also fulfil the reconstruction standard for a heritage building. Here, we find the same problematic issues around authenticity,

---

60 This initiative was mentioned by one of the BPCB officials that I interviewed in 2012.
61 Surat Keputusan Kuasa Pengguna Anggaran Satuan Kerja Sekretariat BRR No: Kep-30/BRR.91/INF/X/2005 tentang Penunjukan/ Perintah Kerja Pelaksanaan Rehabitasi Mesjid Tgk. Dianjong, Kelurahan Peulanggahan, Kecamatan Kutaraja, Banda Aceh (a decree from BRR for the reconstruction of Peulanggahan /Tgk. Dianjong Mosque) source Arsip Tsunami (Tsunami Archive) no. ILP 195.32
form and materials mentioned by BPCB as reasons why both mosques are not deemed authentic, for example:

...The Baiturrahman Mosque does not have a certificate of heritage issued by the Ministry of Education and Culture because it has experienced some changes in form such as the minaret which increases in number from one to seven...It is not under our management....Only the front part where the female prayer space is located is still authentic.....

Interview with BPCB Official

The BPCB removed and stopped funding the maintenance Peulanggahan Mosque because:

Peulanggahan Mosque used to be in our inventory list and under our management and maintenance. We assigned a guard to keep the mosque in sound condition. Yet, after the tsunami, due to the style and form, especially material, has changed, we cannot continue to look after the mosque..... It is not in accordance to the heritage law...

Interview with BPCB Official

The old Kerkhoff is seen as more authentic than the refurbished old mosque by BPCB, a representation of central government and archaeological views. Yet, for
local experts, which in this case I see as representation of the local AHD, the mosque is still listed in the heritage list (Banda Aceh Government, 2011a) and even promoted as a tourism attraction. The old places, such as Gampong Pande and the surrounding area, the first place of old Banda Aceh, in the absence of architectural evidence, are also refurbished and reinterpreted (Banda Aceh Government, 2009). The tourism board designs several plans, such as visits Gampong Pande, etc. I am not arguing that the local government is ignorant of this ethos, rather I see this as relating to most local government officials are local people, who have been engaged with the sites, while BPCB is dominated by non-local people with strong archeological training, focusing on ensuring the authenticity of heritage. In contrast, the tourism officials mostly have non-archeological backgrounds.

Secondly, the Tsunami legacies, which are less than 100 years old, are acknowledged and even listed as heritage by local experts. There are again different views between local experts and BPCB as central government representation in Banda Aceh. For local experts, all these tsunami legacies, such as Kapal Apung, boat on the top of the roof in Lampulo, mass graveyards, and many others are heritage. The Tsunami Museum is an important heritage, in the sense that it stores tsunami memories and artifacts. In contrast, all tsunami legacies have not interested the BPCB, which does not see them as heritage due to their age. This is evident in my interview with several BPCB officials. I will discuss the debate over these legacies, which mostly regarded as memorials, below.

...Only heritage that has been in our heritage list, which is then also recognised as tsunami heritage, is our responsibility not that is not in our list and not accordance to heritage law (new heritage such as Kapal
Apung and the boat on the top of the house in Lampulo). Usually this heritage is fifty years old....the tsunami heritage like the boat on the top of the house is unique though, but it does not fit the definition of heritage set by the law....

Interview with BPCB Official

5.5. Islamism of Memorials: Hypertrophy of Memories

Initiatives to build memorials emerged a few months after the disaster. My interview with Nurdin AR, the head of the Aceh Museum and officials of the Tourism and Education Board, have revealed that an initial meeting for the development of permanent memorials for the tsunami were held in the house of the former acting governor of Aceh, Azwar Abubakar, just a few months after the tsunami, when the tsunami debris had not even been fully cleared. In this meeting, for unknown reasons, a Japanese memorial had been discussed as a model for the Acehnese tsunami memorial. This hypertrophy happens, arguably, due to the extent that the tsunami shocked Banda Aceh in unprecedented ways, so that it focussed the perception of experts and authorities on Banda Aceh as a theatre of memories. The city is in a monument mania, something that had never happened before. Even though I realize that the development of memorials in BandIa Aceh was not limited to after the tsunami, as there are memorials for the Seulawah Plane, etc, the memorials for the tsunami have significantly increased in Banda
In this part of the chapter I discuss the official interpretation, development and implications of memorials for the tsunami.

5.5.1. State-driven Memorials: Between Memorials and Political Control

The development of memorials after the tsunami has also become an arena for political contestation. Smith (2006) has discussed the way contemporary notions of heritage and heritage display have worked to mask the ways in which the heritage gaze constructs, regulates and authorizes. In the context of the museum display, what is displayed in the museum has been through a process of selection, which deliberately or not has valorised “things” that are displayed and masked other “things” that are not displayed. In addition, interpreting Billig (1995) thesis that the monumentality of flag in front of public building as the way of state banally infuses the sense of collective identity. The creation of the Tsunami Museum, which is monumental in form and ideas, in Banda Aceh is a state political statement or claim that the tsunami and the following reconstruction are to be remembered by the Acehnese as an important piece of their identity.

Like other voices, however, the government voice never constituted a politically homogenous goal, although the BRR voice is among noticeable voices within government during the reconstruction of Aceh and Nias. It is very obvious in the reconstruction process that the donor with the highest percentage of funding had the strongest voice. For example, BRR, which shared and managed almost all reconstruction funding, had a dominant voice and a great deal of power in decision-making, and one controversial decision was the development of tsunami memorials. The board, together with other government institutions, had planned
for at least nine memorials across Banda Aceh, and more than ten in the whole of Aceh, just months after the tsunami, see figure below.

Figure 5.8: Memorial Planning BRR version from the Presentation of Kamal Arif and Aulina Adamy at the Workshop and Seminar on “Pusaka Budaya Sebagai Salah Satu Sumberdaya Pembangunan Kota Banda Aceh” (Heritage as a Development Resource for Banda Aceh) on 21-22 August 2007 in Banda Aceh sponsored by the Banda Aceh government and GTZ.

The museum is initiated as a showpiece of the work of MDF in Aceh after the tsunami. It is not only a memorial for the tsunami, but also a memorial of international involvement and agency in the reconstruction after the tsunami. The museum is deliberately planned to be monumental and luxurious in order to illustrate the amount of funds that have been spent in Aceh during the
reconstruction process. It is evident that the humanitarian aid in Aceh was the largest in history (Badan Rekonstruksi dan Rehabilitasi Aceh dan Nias/ BRR, 2009). It is important to remember that the tsunami has become not only a natural phenomenon, but also a cultural phenomenon. It is a warning to 21st Century society about the unavoidable threat of natural processes on human lives. In the perspective of the Indonesian government, in this case BRR, the tsunami has killed a significant number of people, destroyed infrastructure, and caused the collapsed of the government. Then, in the following reconstruction, the significant amounts of funding and numbers of volunteers were triggered by huge surge of empathy. Therefore, for the donors involved, there is a need for a memorial to commemorate this event, the victims, and the donors and volunteers involved. In addition, the swift reconstruction process has brought about further tremendous changes to those caused by the tsunami. For example, in regard to tsunami memories, experts were disappointed by the quick removal of the fishing boat in front of the Medan Hotel before the government had time to gather itself and think about what should be done with it. There was a surge of disappointment at removing this boat. For the expert it is worthwhile to keep the boat in its position to demonstrate the tremendous effects of the tsunami. The tsunami debris, or things that were carried on to land or destroyed by the tsunami are important for the memories of the tsunami as revealed in my interview with Nurdin AR and Kamal A. Arif. The same concern was also mentioned by Kamal A. Arif during his interview with Rico (2014) a few years before I spoke to him. Therefore, the tsunami memorial, for these local experts, will also act as a replacement and container of this removed debris. The quick cleaning of signs of the tsunami marks and its debris during the reconstruction process also triggers anxiety amongst the local government that this event will be forgotten.
Thus, the development of this memorial is also associated with the common notion of memorials. As argued by Bonder (2009), memorial development is associated with momento, something to warn or remind, and commemoration, something to preserve. Therefore, the tsunami museum is intended not only to remember the event, but also to warn the future about the possibilities of this event happening in the future; it is also part of disaster mitigation for ensuring people’s resilience. The issue of resilience is interrogated further in chapter 7. This museum is ambiguously created for the world, and belongs to the world instead of merely the Acehnese. BRR promoted the idea of the museum as a world-class museum, and shows the work that it has spent a huge amount of money on during the reconstruction through a glamorous design of the museum; the idea that the museum represents a global memory is illustrated here:

We want a museum located in Aceh, but it does not belong to Acehnese, that what the Acehnese should know....this (the Tsunami Museum) belongs to the world, located in Aceh, and funded by the world, not the Acehnese’s....

Interview with the Committee for the Tsunami Museum Design Competition

This museum (the Tsunami Museum) is a global museum attracting international attention....

Interview with the Manager of the Tsunami Museum
This competition should be a world competition because we would like to establish a world tsunami museum. International...the ideas should be world class...not local’s...

Interview with Kamal A. Arif, the Committee for the Tsunami Museum Design Competition

The idea of a museum as a place of artefact collection has been argued for by Nurdin AR, one of the prominent museum experts in Banda Aceh. For him, it is very important to save all tsunami artefacts which are considered as “tsunami heritage” for them to be allocated in the museum. The museum, without these artefacts, is not a museum.

To realise this museum design, a local competition was initiated; although it failed to fulfil architectural and construction requirement of a museum design. A more serious competition for the museum design, conducted by BRR and Nurdin AR, with other nine experts involved in the scientific committee for choosing the design, was then arranged. It has become a global phenomenon that the development of an important memorial for state and collective identity has been executed through the design competition to choose the most appropriate and grand design. In Banda Aceh, this committee became an extended voice of BRR, which is the trustee of Multi Donor Fund/MDF and the central government of Indonesia. BRR was very dominant in the museum development because it

---

63See the BRR Decree NO. 23/KEP/BP-BRR/KPA.B90356/Vi/2007, on 6 June 2007 about the establishment the jury for the competition of the development of the Tsunami Museum Nangroe Aceh Darussalam (NAD-TM).
disbursed 100% of the $7.5 million of the design and construction cost (Zilberg, 2009). Even though, BRR did not directly involve in choosing the design, however, the series of meetings with the committee, especially with Kamal A. Arif as a leader of the committee, has cultivated BRR values in the selection process.

Eventually, a design from Ridwan Kamil64, a well-known Indonesian architect and lecturer at Institut Teknologi Bandung (ITB), was chosen through a blind selection. Base on my interview with some museum committees, the design was chosen for its uniqueness which intelligently transformed the philosophy of Acehnese design and incorporated it into modern architectural design. A good architectural design, for Ridwan Kamil, is a design which can accommodate the needs of space for activities and other functions, but is also based on sound concepts and ideas. From the concept provided for the museum design one can see the Acehnese values he reflects in his choice of Rumoh Aceh as an analogy of the building form, and Saman Dance, which is worked in to the design of the secondary skin of the building. Saman Dance, for him, is illustrated as solidarity and incorporation. Islamic values he incorporates mostly in the design of the interior, such as the light of God in the mourning room where victims’ names are displayed. Walking through the museum, the users are guided to understand the tsunami experiences. The museum provides three-dimensional experiences by using architectural designs, movies, photos and music, so that people totally engage with the tsunami as if there were there. The sadness of the tsunami, the fear of it and the happiness afterwards are expressed in the museum.

---

64 Ridwan Kamil has won various international and national prizes for his designs.
Through a lengthy informal interview with Ridwan Kamil I come to understand that in designing this museum, he faced a complex situation because this museum project is the most emotionally difficult of his design career. He worked very hard to position himself as an architect to convey traumatic stories in an aesthetic representation of architecture. He realised that architecture cannot compensate for trauma. This has also been argued by Bonder (2009), who suggests that architects have a complex and problematic role in dealing with difficult memories, and architectural practice only establishes a dialogical relationship with those traumatic events and helps to frame the process toward understanding these memories. Another expert that I talked to in this project was Quentin Stevens, an architect and urban planner who has published many works on memorial and urban space, and, at the time of researching for my PhD, was a visiting fellow at my research centre. For Stevens, architecture and memorials should not try to act as interpreters, rather as mediators. People should interpret the memories by being there. Stevens argues that memorials are interpreted and used differently from the intention of the architect, and the purpose of such memorials, especially those
which are in public space, and part of tourism attractions (Rodrigo, 2011; Stevens, 2007). Kamil designed the museum through his intangible, indirect interpretation of the tsunami. He designed a special tunnel called tsunami alley for people to feel the tremendous tsunami, and a special place for remembering and mourning. In addition, he interprets the development after the tsunami as a bright future, and symbolises it as a bridge. In short, the Tsunami Museum design is full of Kamil’s interpretation of the tsunami and several processes associated with it. It will be very interesting to see how the users interpret his design, and that is explored in the following chapter.

Figure 5.10: Interior of The Tsunami Museum, the bridge part

Source: Photo by Cut Dewi

Another dominant voice in creating the museum was *Kementrian Energi dan Sumberdaya Mineral* (ESDM), the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources. Why did ESDM become involved in the development of the Tsunami Museum? ESDM involvement in the establishment of the tsunami memorial is due to its scientific understanding of the tsunami, and privileging technical or natural issues
concerning natural disasters. ESDM was interested in, and responsible for, providing the content of the museum. Not surprisingly, then, most of displays in the museum reflect their interest; scientific aspects, such as the physical causes of the tsunami, and tsunami evacuation procedure displays, dominate the content. This is possibly because ESDM provided 100% of the museum displays’ cost. This of course contrasts with the Acehnese government views communicated in the early meetings of the museum. For the Acehnese government, the tsunami is also a cultural phenomenon, since the tsunami ended conflict and began a new life for Acehnese people, so that displays associated with cultural issues should be 50% of the museum content.

In the shared responsibilities of the development of this museum, the Aceh provincial government had the lowest contribution, has and appears to have had less say in the planning process. It only provided the land, and the management of the museum was initially going to be placed in the hand of Banda Aceh local government. In the implementation, however, provincial government was the acting manager of the museum until the formal management board formed. At the end of my fieldwork the form of the board had not been decided, and several seminars have been undertaken to discuss a proper form of museum management.

For this state domination, the museum has been criticised by Zilberg (2009) and the Komunitas Tikar Pandan, a social community, for the lack of community involvement in designing the museum, and the lack of content in the museum. Despite a competition for designing the museum building, and an exhibition for displaying approximately 120s architectural designs for community to choose from, he argues the museum development was considered to lack public
involvement. For him, the community involvement and the exhibition content are important aspects which ensure the success of a museum; therefore, due to its lack of content, the Tsunami Museum fails. I agree with the need for community involvement since, even though it is a world museum, the museum is located Aceh and concerns a tragedy that befell the people of Aceh. But I question his statement the museum fails; as a lot of visitors visit the museum and my interviewees think, even though not uniformly, that the museum is an important building in Banda Aceh after the tsunami. This account I discuss in chapter 6. I do not want to repeat the community participation issues in the development of the museum, rather I ask further questions, such as how the existence of this museum has affected the memories of conflict, which is also an important issue in Acehnese society.

5.5.2. The Dilemma: Conflict and Tsunami

Of the three main templates of Acehnese collective memories: the glorious past of the Islamic Kingdom, internal conflict, and the tsunami, only the conflict memories have not been included in formal memorials, and it has not been spoken of as freely the two other memories templates. Why has this happened? Why does the Acehnese government not create a special memorial for this memory as they did with the tsunami memorial?

The tsunami and its reconstruction process resulted in a pause in the conflict and other political tensions between GAM and the Indonesian government, as their attention was diverted to humanitarian issues. This transitional time has been utilized as a time for the politics of forgetting. The peace agreement, and the physical improvements made during reconstruction, have seen a reduction in
public debate and the forgetting of the memories of conflict. Extending Billig’s (1995) ideas of the banality of a monumental building, the Tsunami Museum, in its monumental form, which is passed by inhabitants and visitors every day, normalizes the tsunami memories while gradually burying the memories of conflict. Apart from some peace agreement photos in the museum, the memories of conflict have not been represented formally in public space. It seems that the conflict memories, considered as painful landmarks in Acehnese collective memories, have been washed away by the huge wave of the tsunami. Although there was some discussion in the initial expert seminar entitled "Semiloka tentang pemaknaan, pembangunan dan pengelolaan Museum Hidup Warisan Tsunami di Banda Aceh" (Seminar on the development and management of the living tsunami museum) on 1-2 November 2006 of designing the Tsunami Museum with the inclusion of material on the memories of conflict, the need for a memorial for these events have not emerged in public debate. During my interviews I asked those who were directly involved in establishing the Tsunami Museum about their view on the inclusion of the memories of conflict and the need for the representation of these memories in public space. The common answers were that they had wanted to incorporate the conflict stories in the Tsunami Museum because conflict and the tsunami are two faces in the same coin, the tsunami had ended the conflict and it is a turning point for the Aceh crisis. However, the creation of the displays of the museum were in the hand of ESDM, the central government, which insisted that the Tsunami Museum is a science museum, rather than a cultural museum. Thus, it should deal only with the history of the natural disaster. This demonstrates that there is a persistent view from the central government to exclude the memories of conflict from the museum.
Another public place which has potential for displaying the memories of conflict is the Baiturrahman Mosque, as it witnessed to the peace process. The mosque can be a hotspot for political debate and had been a forum for debate on Aceh’s independence. Unsurprisingly, the Baiturrahman Mosque has become an important site of pilgrimage for the Indonesian political elite, to pray and pronounce their public statements. This was especially so during the thirty-year conflict in Aceh with the central government. Like the Dutch, the Indonesian central government expected to reach a peace agreement using Baiturrahman’s “holy” persuasion.

Megawati’s speech at Baiturrahman in particular resonates in the collective Acehnese memory. On July 29 1999, while still Vice President, Megawati wept and with a conciliatory tone promised, “especially to my brothers and sisters in Aceh, I ask your patience. When Cut Nya (Acehnese for an aristocratic female leader) leads this country, I shall not allow a single drop of the people's blood to wet your sacred land, a land that made such a huge contribution to making Indonesia free. To all of you I shall give my love, I shall give you your Arun (oil fields), so that the people can enjoy the wondrous beauty of Mecca’s Veranda... The day of victory is coming and it will not be long. I beg your patience”65. This “holy” promise she then denied making in 2003 when, now as President, she declared martial law.

For international donors, there was an obvious hesitation to be involved in dealing with conflict issues. This, as argued by Zeccola (2011), is reflected in aid distribution after the tsunami. Since Aceh was not only affected by the tsunami but also by the human-made disaster of 30 years of conflict, the victims are segregated.

65 As quoted by Asia Times on 8 August 2001.
Aid was only distributed to tsunami victims, while those still suffering from the conflict were ignored, or at least got less attention. The reason for this hesitation when dealing with conflict issues suggests that the donor wants to ‘play safe’ and avoid risk (Waizenegger & Hyndman, 2010; Zeccola, 2011)

It seems that a fear of being involved in commemorating the memories of conflict has caused the donors, who initiated the tsunami museum, into refusing to discuss this history. There also seems to be a fear that commemorating this history would bring the conflict alive and violate the peace again. How the complexity between remembering and forgetting involves entanglement in remembering conflict is evidenced in Aceh. This complexity becomes accentuated in Aceh after the tsunami. The peace agreement is not executed as was imagined, as there is still political struggle for Aceh in its relation with central government. For example, there was jealousy amongst victims of conflict regarding the houses that were provided to tsunami victims. As reported by BBC News some conflict victims are still waiting for their houses to be fixed. BBC quoted Pak Awalat’s comment on the disparity of aid: “The tsunami victims lost their houses and they got fixed, I lost my home, and got nothing” (Williamson, 2006). To remember conflict memories in the meantime has every potential for violating the Indonesian unitary state and, consequently, violating “unity in diversity”, identity claim of Indonesia which has been maintained by the Indonesian government as a central nationalist slogan. Islam has been believed by the central government, agreed by the provincial government and ulama, and supported by local governments, as an important aspect in calming down any potential conflict in Aceh (Aspinall, 2007). Islam has also been also seen by these elites as an important aspect in commemorating the tsunami, which is evident in the way they Islamise tsunami memorials.
5.5.3. Islamism of Urban Symbols and Memorials.

Along with the Islamisation of planning, the tsunami legacies have been Islamised too. One of these legacies has been designated and successfully adopted as a second symbol of Banda Aceh. The Tsunami Museum, which was initiated by Multi Donor Fund, which was mostly, if not entirely, dominated by non-Moslem donors, is also Islamised, and it is interesting to explore this in my thesis. This museum was, as previously mentioned, created for the world and belongs to the world, rather than just the Acehnese; this museum, however, incorporates and entails Islamic values which attracted many critiques after the tragedy of 9/11 in the USA. The idea of incorporating Islam in the museum design and display was initiated during the seminar on 1-2 November 2006 in Banda Aceh, sponsored by BRR, to canvas ideas from various invited experts as what the museum should look like66. Kamal A. Arif, as a chief committee of the museum design competition, clearly asked to incorporate Islam in the museum design, because he argues that only a museum which was in line with the beliefs and values of the Acehnese would work well (Arif, 2006). Islam, as he revealed in the interview, is not only a religion, but is also has blended with culture.

The Museum was clearly intended as a second Islamic symbol; to complement the first Islamic urban symbol of Banda Aceh, the Baiturrahaman Mosque. Thus, a monumental design with Islamic values was chosen for this purpose. The interview with Ridwan Kamil reveals that he did incorporate Islamic features in his design, because of not only the guidelines of the museum design, but also his

---

66 As stated in the draft minutes of meeting of the seminar, No. M-/PPP.04/XII/2006, that the Tsunami Museum is a symbol which reflects the tsunami event, culture and Islamic Sharia for Acehnese and the world (menjadi simbol yang memiliki 'makna' yang diserap dari peristiwa tsunami, budaya dan syariat Islam bagi masyarakat Aceh dan dunia).
intention to leave the “masterpiece” imbued with Islamic values in Aceh which, for him, has a strong Islamic background. For him each generation should have a masterpiece representing the era they live in. Islam is clearly felt and seen in the design of the interior of the museum. The atmosphere of Islam is clearly expressed in the museum, by Al Quran recitations and the name of Allah written on the top of the chimney where the light comes through to a dark room, where names of the tsunami victims are displayed. In addition, my interviews with Kamal A. Arif and another tsunami museum committee, reveal that its location, which had been moved several times in order to find the perfect location and available land, contributes to this goal as well, as the museum is located in an historical area, where an Islamic garden, the Bustanussalatin ,was located, right in front of the historical oval, Blang Padang. Its monumentality of form can be obviously observed from the oval.

Due to unsolved problem with the previous land owner, the Tsunami Museum was then located in there (in front of Blang Padang Oval). It is a prime location. It (the museum) deserves to be there as a focal point. In addition, according to Kamal A. Arif, that location used to be a Sultanate garden, Bustanussalatin....

Interview with the Committee for the Tsunami Museum Design Competition

Along with Islamism themes at this Tsunami Museum, there are also Islamist elements at other tsunami memorials, tsunami-made/natural human-made
memorials. This is done through adding Al Quran recitations at the sites, and the opening hours are adjusted to prayer times accordingly. The tsunami-made memorials such as Kapal Apung (Electricity Ship) and boat on the top of the house in Lampulo, have been reinterpreted religiously as a proof of God’s power. By incorporating Islam, the political message is of a good government is flagged. This Islamism of the memorial and museum is not new in the Islamic world; in Iran this has been undertaken to flag the political ideology of the state, which is then incorporated into the museum design (Mozaffari, 2013). It is evidence in Iran that the design of the Islamic Period Museum of Iran has evoked traditional ritual and religious practices familiar to Moslems, and emphasises the primacy Islamic identity in Iran. In Banda Aceh, Islam is deliberately promoted to emphasise the primacy of the Islamic identity of the Acehnese. Islam, however, is combined with other difficult memories. Reading through the museum design and concept, I also see Islamic interpretations of disaster and trauma, such as the design for the light of God evoking a sense of submission to God and human surrender.

5.6. Islamism of Tourism: The Imagined Past In Contemporary Economic Resources

The discussion in this section might, in some parts, overlap with the previous theme. However, in this part I interrogate the role of architectural heritage as cultural and economic assets. The slogan “A place blessed with natural beauty and as a spiritual gateway” has been used to promote Banda Aceh as a religious tourism destination. On the plane to Jakarta for an interview during my fieldwork,
I found the picture of Banda Aceh’s mayor and his vice deputy promoting tourism in Banda Aceh. They promoted Banda Aceh as the destination for Ramadhan rituals by stressing its reputation as having an atmosphere of Islamic culture; the Baiturrahman Mosque is the background of this advertisement.

Economic issues have been a major impetus for Banda Aceh to engage in urban heritage conservation, and promote this in tourism advertising. After the tsunami, triggered by the realization of limited sources of income, the sudden advent of disaster tourists, and a new perspective in looking at heritage resulting from engagement with international heritage agencies, Banda Aceh’s local government seriously engaged in promoting heritage for tourism development. How seriously they took this is shown by the intense involvement in building restoration and conservation and in tourism promotion. The focus is not only on tsunami related buildings, but also on existing buildings which have been enhanced to make them tourist attractions. To promote Banda Aceh as a tourism destination, the Baiturrahman Mosque and the Tsunami Museum have been marketed as the main attractions, together with Saman Dance, and other cultural events (see this promotion in Dinas Kebudayaan dan Pariwisata Kota Aceh, 2011).

This tourism activity in Banda Aceh is part of the shift in the tourism industry in Islamic countries post the 9/11 tragedy (Scott & Jafari., 2010). The tragedy of 9/11 has seen a decline of North American and European tourists to Arab countries, and a shift in destination of Arab tourists to other Islamic countries. Malaysia, and other Islamic countries in Southeast Asia, such as Indonesia have benefited from this shift and attract an increasing number of Arab tourists (Ibrahim et al, 2009). Aceh sees this as an opportunity as well. Links with Islamic identity, and a long
term network with Islamic countries like Malaysia and Turkey, has contributed to the self-confidence of the Banda Aceh government to promote this kind of tourism destination, along with the natural attractions of surrounding areas like Sabang. This now can be seen through the increase of Malaysian tourists, which are amongst the most numerous visitors, to Banda Aceh (Badan Pusat Statistik Aceh, 2012).

This tourism industry has actually become a focus of debate in the Islamic world, since Islam is a conservative religion requiring certain social and cultural expectations to be met. For example, the issue of bikini-free tourism, alcohol-free tourism, etc have created problematic issues for the tourism industries of the Islamic world. This is also the case in Banda Aceh, while the tourists are expected to understand local culture. To do this BRR, during reconstruction process, had distributed “do's and don'ts” brochures at the airport (Badan Rekonstruksi dan Rehabilitasi Aceh dan Nias, 2009). Apparently, the government is still not sure about the market for this tourism industry; whether it is purely for Moslem's or for non-Moslem in the European, Australian, and North American market. The disaster tourism imbued with the spirit of Islam, the religious buildings, and the city itself have been not been specially packaged for specific markets. However, from the random package offered by the government, it seems there is mix between Moslems and non-Moslems in the targeted markets.

Using religious buildings for tourism, which is usually associated with fun, pleasure and glamour, has raised serious issues in Aceh. Religious buildings, such as a mosque, can be a main attraction in religious tourism (Rotherham, 2007 ). However, tourism is a recreational activity that may contribute to the economic
sustainability of local culture. However, tourism can create cultural tensions too. The problem of using religious buildings for tourism is not only raised in Banda Aceh, but also other part of the world (Olsen, 2006, p. 108). In Banda Aceh, to use the mosque as an attraction demonstrates a conflict between the “modern view” of tourism board officials and “conventional view” of ulama, especially in the case the Baiturrahman Mosque, which plays a central role in Acehnese society. There is a conflict of interest between maintaining the sacred of the mosque and allowing touristic pleasure seeking activities.

5.7. Conclusion

The influences of the European heritage conservation ethos, which views heritage as a tangible state, have also been present in Banda Aceh during and after the reconstruction process. However, the degree of its influence is varied across government institutions -- BPCB, the Cultural and Tourism Board, Bappeda, Ministry of Public Work, amongst other -- involved in heritage management. Should the Indonesian government seek to nominate heritage from Banda Aceh, UNESCO, under the frameworks of the AHD, would have trouble recognising that Banda Aceh has heritage, due to the absence of an authentic and old material past, such as architectural heritage. Thus, there was no significant heritage activities during the reconstruction process initiated by the international heritage agencies. Another government institution, which subscribes to this European heritage ethos with some vigour, as I have indicated in chapter 4, is BPCB, one of the representations of the national AHD in Banda Aceh. This is reflected in the ways
this institution objected to including and certifying as heritage two important mosques, the Baiturrahman Mosque and Peulanggahan Mosque, due to issues the authenticity of their fabric. Both mosques are not authentic due to several renewal, enlargement, and reconstruction projects. In addition, the tsunami legacies, for the international AHD and the national AHD, are also not heritage since they are less than fifty years old. But, for local AHD, the Cultural and Tourism Board and local experts, the mosques, regardless of their material authenticity, and tsunami debris, regardless of its age, are heritage. They are promoted as tourism destinations with pride.

However, this does not mean the local AHD completely ignores the importance of fabric like architectural heritage. It still employs fabric in its mission to form collective identity. Fabric is highly regarded as the representation of memories and consequently the representation of identity. Thus, the Banda Aceh government, through its urban planning, controls landmark architectural heritage, like religious buildings and memorials, to facilitate the remembering of the so-called “glorious Islamic past of the Acehnese”, and to formally reform a sense of the city as a self-consciously Islamic city. Along with this pride, the tsunami memories have been also frozen in stone, in this case by the establishment of the Tsunami Museum. This has implications for Acehnese cultural identity. Literally, the valuation of the Islamic past, and the recognition of tsunami memories as important elements in Acehnese collective memories, is registered in the government policy and practice to construct an Islamic city. This is undertaken through urban symbols, using religious buildings, to reinvent an Islamic urban quarter and its architectural heritage, and to “Islamise” urban memorials, including tsunami-made and built-
memorials for the tsunami. At the same time, all these urban features are polished as tourism attraction with an Islamic sensibility.

The government, consciously or not have also politicised these memorials for securing national identity, through excluding the actual representation of conflict memories in public space like memorials. Conflict memories, however, have not emerged in urban public places in the form of museums or memorials due to their nature, which is prone to invoke past pain. Conflict memories, which are associated with horror and intimidation, seem to have politically charged memories that can erode the security of the Indonesian unitary state, and the collective identity of Indonesians enjoying “unity in diversity”.

CHAPTER 6

ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE AS SCAFFOLDING FOR REMEMBERING: 
EXAMINING THE MEMORY WORK AT LANDMARK ARCHITECTURAL 
HERITAGE SITES OF BANDA ACEH

6.1. Introduction

We do not need to remember the (painful) past. If we want to move forward, we should be able to forget....let the past go....just think about today and the future...but for the tsunami we should be always remembering because it is a blessing (anugerah) for a better future and a reminder for us (Acehnese) to behave well. It is a disaster (musibah)\(^{67}\) from Allah....to remember it (the tsunami) is not always necessary to have the museum....it (the museum) is expensive and just a government project; rather we can do it by collecting photos from the disaster and do it in our natural ways

The speaker is a fifty-year old housewife – female, BM 03, housewife, Acehnese - in contrast to the majority of my interviewees. She considered the Tsunami museum unnecessary. Her views, however, represent the complexity of talking about such a painful event. Like the majority of Acehnese, for her, the tsunami is an important past event, one that has dual symbolism: of disaster (musibah) and blessing

---

\(^{67}\) Ascribing a disaster as musibah and bencana have different meanings for Acehnese. The former is more likely to be associated with the surrender (positive feeling) to God, while the later with punishment (negative feeling) from God.
(anugerah) (see Samuel, 2010 and Smith, 2012, for further analysis of the meaning of the tsunami for the Acehnese people).

This chapter looks at the duality of remembering and forgetting, which I have discussed in chapter 2, and explores how and why the act of remembering is important to the Acehnese in the post-tsunami period. It explores how the Acehnese and visitors to the region remember the past, and if or how the three narrative templates (Wertsch, 2008a) identified in chapter 4 inform or frame collective memories and identity formation. The three narrative templates are the idea of the “glorious” or “golden” Islamic past, the conflict for independence with the Indonesian government and the tsunami. It explores the roles of architectural heritage in this remembering process, and asks if architectural heritage helps the Acehnese and visitors to remember, and whether it facilitates the development of resilience after the 2004 disaster. This chapter, in exploring these questions, identifies the way the Organic Heritage Discourse (OHD) in Banda Aceh, after the 2004 tsunami disaster, was expressed, and the way it shaped the ideas of heritage of both visitors to and inhabitants of Banda Aceh. I argue that the capability of architecture to help recall memories lies in the relationship between form and function, and that function is perceived by users through activities, which are crucial in the creation of social memory. Activities give a form meaning. Activities that are conducted at sites of architectural heritage provide people with a sense of resilience in a traumatic situation. In other words, architectural forms act as a container of these activities which promote resilience. For example, it is activities such as praying, mourning, and remembering that help make people resilient; rather than architectural forms per se. Architectural heritage is an important material aspect of urban landscapes. Thus, how this material is perceived in the act
of remembering, and during peoples’ engagement with architecture in a post-disaster Southeast Asian Islamic society is explored in this chapter. The ability to help remember the past is not merely determined by the presence of original forms and the age of existing fabric. People do not regard the change and renewal of forms as compromising the authenticity of a place. These arguments are developed based on six months of fieldwork interviewing, undertaking participant observation, and analysis of the archives, at the three sites considered to be iconic architectural heritage.

The chapter is divided into several sections. Firstly, I outline the demographics of my interview sample. Secondly, the consequences of three collective memories: the Islamic Kingdom, the conflict, and the tsunami are discussed. Third, I discuss the importance of iconic architectural heritage in remembering the past for inhabitants and visitors of Banda Aceh. I divide this section into two sub headings: the role of architecture as cultural place (non-physicality) and the role of architectural form (physicality) in remembering the past. Finally, I conclude this chapter by arguing that, to be considered heritage, authenticity of architectural forms and materiality are not necessarily important to non-expert users of these places. Before I start my discussion here I will briefly discuss my interviews below.

6.2. The Interview at a Glance

I have carried out a total of 166 in-depth, semi-structured individual interviews, and 9 semi-structured group interviews, at the Baiturrahman Mosque,
Peulanggahan Mosque and the Tsunami Museum (see Table 1). I asked several core questions: what are the overall reasons for visiting the sites, what do you experience when visiting the sites, what do you remember when visiting the sites, what does the building mean to Banda Aceh, what is the building’s importance for Banda Aceh before and after the tsunami, and finally in what ways has Banda Aceh remained the same or changed after the tsunami? (see appendix 1 for an English translation of the interview schedule). Additional or follow up questions or prompts were asked depending on the content of individual interviews.

I used a random method in selecting my interviewees at the sites where possible, but in the end targeted certain peoples to make sure the sample was representative of age ranges and gender. This method does not reflect all aspects of the society of Banda Aceh, yet to some extent might reflect social conditions and population statistics. For example, the composition between male and female interviewees, which is 44% and 56% respectively, is not reflective of gender ratios in Banda Aceh, which is 51% male and 49% female (Badan Pusat Statistic Banda Aceh, 2013). However, it reflects cultural conditions in Aceh, i.e. that in the mosques women and men are well segregated, so that it was not easy for me to talk to men within the mosque, thus it is not surprising, although I have hired a male research assistant, that I interviewed slightly more women than men. My data covers a wide distribution of ages, ranging from 18 to over 65 years. However, most of the interviewees, were between 18-34, which corresponds to official statistics showing that this age range comprises 47% of the population in Banda Aceh (Badan Pusat Statistic Banda Aceh, 2013). Most of my interviewees, 93% of them, had high school and bachelor level university education. The dominant occupations of my interviewees were student, unemployed and self-employed. In
terms of place of residence, I had quite diverse interviewees living in Banda Aceh, in Aceh, but outside Banda Aceh, in Indonesia outside Aceh, and from overseas. The majority (84%), however, were Acehnese, while 73% of them had been in Banda Aceh for more than 8 years, which means since before the tsunami. This data distribution allows me to reasonably ask about their perception of the situation in the city before and after the disaster. I also interviewed people who were first or repeat visitors to Banda Aceh. All these categories, however, are not representative of the society in Banda Aceh.
Table 6.1: Summary of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Baiturrahman Mosque</th>
<th>Tsunami Museum</th>
<th>Peulanggahan Mosque</th>
<th>Outside Sites</th>
<th>Total Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed/Student</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Servant</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private company</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acehnese</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian (non-Acehnese)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banda Aceh</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other part of Aceh</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other part of</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Indonesia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration in Banda Aceh</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-7 days</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 days-11 months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year - 8 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 8 years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I believe that both inhabitants and visitors make a significant contribution to meaning making. Tourists not only consume heritage, but also shape and make their own heritage meanings (Smith et al 2012; Staiff and Bushell 2013). They not only enjoy it for pleasure, but also through their visit make a place meaningful, and take with them the cultural messages the heritage sites might trigger. Tourists are active in meaning making about the culture they interpret and understand. In other words, the meaning of a heritage place which is also used as a tourism place is not only shaped by the people who own, or who are attached to such places, but also by visitors or tourists. This contrasts with misleading, dominant understanding of tourists from within the AHD that emerged in 1960s-70s, and suggests that tourists are shallow consumers of received heritage meanings (Graburn and Barthel-Bouchier, 2001 in Smith, Waterton, & Watson, 2012, p.3). Tourists are not only simply seeing; they are feeling, doing, performing, being and touching too (Larsen, 2006, in Smith, et al., 2012, p. 5).

6.3. **What is the Meaning of the Past for Acehnese?**

Remembering or revisiting the past, according to Lowenthal (1985), has been undertaken by various communities in order to explain the past, to search for a golden age, for self-aggrandizement, and to change the past. Above all, for Smith (2006), the meanings of this remembering are determined by the present, rather than by the past itself. There is no “real” past, but the current re-interpretation of the past. People in the present day determine how they want to use and attach
meanings to the past. One of the prominent uses of the past, according to Harvey (2001), is legitimating present day ideas of individual and collective identities.

The past has also become a source of present day ideas of Acehnese collective memory and identity. Acehnese, according to Hadi (2010), have a strong culture practice of remembering the past. Therefore, before I analyse further how the past is triggered by the three examples of iconic architecture, and how the past and the architecture shape the identity of the Acehnese, it is important to give an overview of how Acehnese people remember, what the meaning of the past is for them, and reasons underpinning the social and cultural process of remembering the past. This account provides a platform for further analysis of how architecture helps people to remember the past, and how it is used in the process of identity formation. Although, for the purpose of structuring my interview questions, I ask about the importance of remembering the past last, this question actually emerges as being important to explore first, as most of my respondents think it is important to remember the past.

For the majority of my interviewees, i.e. 92%, recalling the past is of important to draw lessons from, as guides for a better future, and as sources of history. For instance:

It (the past) is a lesson for guiding us to a better future, so that we will not make the same mistake again.......

BM66, Female, Housewife, Acehnese
We need to remember the past as our guide for the future, but we need to do that for learning only, not for putting us in great despair….

BM62, Female, Housewife, Medan

Remembering the past is important. You are here because of the past. Thus, remembering the past provides you with a guide to the future.

BM55, Male, Pensioner, Acehnese

Remembering the past is of important for respondents in terms of shaping identity and guiding their future. The three collective memories: the Islamic past; the conflict, and the tsunami; have occupied an important place in Acehnese public spaces and debate. The ways these memories are recalled, however, are different. The Islamic past memories are a source of pride for many Acehnese. The conflict memories remain silent in public space, even after the peace agreement. The tsunami memories have become not only poignant memories, but also a powerful memory for a change for the better.

Acehnese proudly talk about and remember what they call “the golden Islamic past”. The 1950s and 1980s were an important period for the narratives produced by Acehnese and Indonesian elites. The elites promoted at least four images of Aceh: tanah rencong/Acehnese dagger land, serambi mekkah/veranda of Mecca, daerah modal/region of capital, and daerah istimewa/special region, which very quickly resonated culturally with Acehnese people (Birchock, 2013, p.57). As the
capital city of Aceh Province, most of these images, if not all, are represented in Banda Aceh. For example, as I have discussed in chapter 4, the Baiturrahman Mosque has been long associated as a representation of the image of *Serambi Mekkah* / veranda of Mecca (Arif, 2008). Due to this extensive narrative around the “greatness of Aceh”, it is not surprising that admiration of this “greatness” gained momentum in Aceh. Even younger people proudly recall, and unquestioningly receive the oral history passed down by their elders to them. This Islamic past is remembered not only for pride in Islam, but for the role Islam played in the war against colonialism, and the resistance against outside influence and intimidation. No wonder then, despite the fact the Dutch occupied Aceh from 1873 to 1942, that the Acehnese think that they were never truly colonised because of their long struggle against the Dutch, which made the Aceh war as the most bloody and expensive in Dutch history (Reid, 1969). The Acehnese have been proud of their culture for a long time, and consider it to be unique. This can be seen in their attitude to keep opportunities open for foreigners to come to Aceh, but at the same time maintain their unique culture by forcing foreigners to follow their ways (Reid, 2005). The Islamic past in Aceh, in short, has become a myth that is unquestionably perceived as a ‘great’ past, and a source of Acehnese cultural identity and pride. Some of the pride in this past emerged in my interviews, for example:

..I remember the killing of the Dutch soldiers….it is evident that Acehnese were very strong in the past. Only Acehnese killed the Dutch General.

BM29, Female, University student, Acehnese
...Acehnese fought against the Dutch on behalf of Islam and they killed the Dutch General, whose name was Kohler. So that the Dutch could not colonise Aceh....

BM55, Male, Pensioner, Acehnese

...Acehnese are very great because the Dutch could not defeat and occupy Aceh...it took some time for the Dutch to conquer Aceh....Finally they (the Dutch) gave us this (the Baiturrahman Mosque)...

BM15, Female, Housewife, Acehnese

The idea that people should learn from and remember the past appears to be stronger in Acehnese society following the tsunami. Acehnese demonstrate a strong determination to prevent oblivion. Therefore, the tsunami memories, as the disaster happened recently, are very boldly present in the mind of Acehnese people at the time of my fieldwork. The huge loss, in terms of human life and environmental damage, has contributed to a strongly focused intention to protect future generations from the effects of the tsunami, and to remember the past: both the people who died and the vanished environments. Countless examples of graffiti were written on the walls of wrecked houses destroyed by the tsunami to record and remember the tsunami just days after the disaster. The tsunami, in the Acehnese context, has been perceived in more religious understandings as
“musibah (disaster in positive mode)” and “anugerah (blessing)” from God. It is seen as tangible evidence of the abstract power of God. The tsunami has been interpreted as a test of faith, a warning for the wrong directions that people take, and a lesson to learn (Samuels, 2010 and Smith, 2012). I found the same attitudes in my interviews. Here I quote several interpretations of the tsunami emerging from my interviews:

Tsunami is the power of God (kuasa Allah)….the sea could be like this (so aggressive) and destroyed the buildings....

TM15, Female, Teacher, Acehnese

...from the religious perspective, it (the tsunami) reminds us about our mistakes or sins, might we be one of the reasons why Allah created the tsunami......we have to learn from this lesson to not to do the same mistakes again.....

TM21, Female, Uni Student, Acehnese

We have to always remember it (the tsunami) because it is a blessing (anugerah)....for making us better in the future.....

BM03, Female, Housewife, Acehnese
Some Acehnese see the tsunami as a blessing because it ended the thirty-year conflict between the Free Aceh Movement and the Indonesian Government. Apart from this positive association, the tsunami memories are also entangled with the unfairness of aid distribution, especially when people talking about housing distribution and cash in hand contributions. For instances:

.I feel it is not fair that the living costs promised, an amount of one hundred thousand rupiah per month for one year, but I only got three months...the money disappeared along the distribution chain...

BM13a, Male, Food seller, Javanese

...those who were not affected by the tsunami claimed that they were and got a house, but those who were genuinely the victims did not get a house....

BM13b, Male Photographer, Acehnese

The negative association of the tsunami memories is also caused by the development of the tsunami museum, which is considered to be an inappropriate government project. In the midst of the unfairness of cash distributions and housing aid, the money went to a grand glorious project that is considered as
misallocating aid, as this museum should not be built with aid money (Zilberg, 2009), for example:

We do not need a memorial like the Tsunami Museum now because it is too luxurious. What we need is just a simple museum. The aid money could be used for helping the victims because it is the reason why donors sent their money here....in addition what is displayed in the museum is hilarious, it is not appropriate because we, the survivors had seen something real and for us tsunami memories are in every corner of the town. Yet the displays are fine for those who did not experience the disaster.

BM13a, Food seller, Male, Javanese

For me we do not need to go to the Tsunami Museum to remember the tsunami. ....to remember it (the tsunami) is not always necessary to have the museum....it (the museum) is expensive and just a government project; rather we can do it by collecting photos from the disaster and do it in our natural ways. The museum is too luxurious and money is being spent on something that is not worth it. It is better to help the tsunami survivors rebuild their lives.

BM_03, Female, Housewife, Acehnese

In addition, the museum has also been regarded as human-made, which contrasts
to the perception of the tsunami as an act of God:

We do not need the (Tsunami) museum because it is just human-made.
The most important thing in remembering the tsunami is remembering God (Allah)...it reminds us to repent sins...

BM31, Female, Islamic teacher, Acehnese

In contrast to the Islamic memories which are proudly and publicly remembered, and the tsunami memories which are remembered with ambiguity, conflict memories have little chance of being remembered in a public space. It is not unusual for Acehnese to lower their voice if they are talking in a public space, or to foreigners about the conflict and its associated issues; they are cautious. Even now, after the peace agreement which ended the thirty-year conflict, conflict memories remain silenced in public spaces. The conflict memories are entangled with disappointment, intimidation, and insecurity, and haunt not only Acehnese, but also visitors informed about the conflict through the media. The mentality of intimidation and caution derive from events during the conflict, which made Aceh into a place of horror. This mentality is evident in Aceh, as revealed by Steven Shewfelt’s (2008,p.20 in Hadi, 2010) research, conducted in collaboration with IOM and the UNDP in Aceh, showing that wartime trauma causes a decline of social trust. In my interviews I also encountered some fear and reluctance when talking about the conflict, with some identifying issues of conspiracy. For instance, a man who talked about the conflicts developed a conspiracy argument in relation to the
causes and aftermath of the tsunami, although I succeeded to convince him that he will remain anonymous, was initially very afraid that I might record our conversation, as recorded in my notes, he states:

....I am afraid that you will record our conversation and I would be caught because of talking about the bomb....please don’t record that I told you about my speculation that the tsunami was an American conspiracy.....

BM13a, Male, Food seller, Javanese

..I am actually afraid coming to this mosque and that a journalist would take my picture here and publish it in a newspaper. My friends would think that I am part of them (former Free Aceh Movement)......

BM40, Male, Uni student, Acehnese

Here are other examples of feelings of insecurity haunting the visitors:

Hmmm...I heard about the conflict in Aceh and East Timor long before I came here.....and its strong Islam as well....

TM10, Male, Architect, Austria
The information about Aceh is very poor...so we did not know...when we want to come here, we were told by people in Medan don’t come to Aceh, not many tourists come to Aceh because Aceh has a lot of problems...Islamic fundamentalism and conflict ...so it is not worth going to Aceh.....

TM11, Male, Architect, Australia

In addition to insecurity and caution, the conflict also left many Acehnese people feeling disappointment, with not only the present but also the past. As I indicated in chapter 4, one of the factors that triggered the conflict in Aceh was disappointment with the central government, not only over the economic issues but also over identity and other social and cultural issues. In the face of corruption and nepotism in the exploitation of resources in Indonesia, Acehnese people felt the Indonesian central government has treated them unfairly. However now, after decentralization and the peace agreement, the disappointment has shifted to the local government, especially GAM elites, ever promising to change and improve Aceh. Instead of maintaining and implementing their promises, there is a widespread perception in Aceh that GAM elites take the opportunity to hold power in the government to further their own interests. As Aspinall (2009) pointed out, GAM has become one of the players in the corrupt security system because they obtain “security fees” from almost all projects in Aceh. During centralization all money was held and managed by the central government, but after decentralization and the implementation of LOGA (the Law on Governing Aceh),
the control over finance shifted to the local government (Aspinall, 2009), but only a limited amount flows on to support the livelihoods of ordinary people (Braithwaite et.al, 2010). Therefore, conflict memories have a higher degree of dissonance compared to the memories of the tsunami and Islamic past. I will outline the consequences of this dissonance in the following chapter.

As compensation for decreasing social trust and disappointment with the present government, I argue, a strong tendency to remember the Islamic past and its positive associations have emerged in Acehnese society. The tsunami has become, for Acehnese people, a turning point to move away from past political disappointments to find a better Aceh. The past is better for many Acehnese because the Islamic past is perceived as a time when there was an “ideal life” that was prosperous, fair, secure, and great. There is little public debate or acknowledgement of the insecurity in that past created by the King, Iskandar Muda and the harsh punishments he implemented for those who broke the law (Hadi (2010). The image of Aceh as pirate state, as described by Raap (1994), also tends not to be recalled or known. Examples of the idealised ‘good past’ perceived by Acehnese include:

...people in the old days were more honest than now....Iskandar Muda is a good example of an Acehnese leader, it is hard to find one like him now......

PM01, Male, Student, Acehnese
...We in the past lived in a prosperous and fair country....we even the most powerful kingdom in the world.....

PM05, Female, Housewife, Acehnese

The remembering of the “glorious past”, and the interpretation of that past as lessons and guides for present day lie, have been criticized by Hadi (2010). He argues that the Acehnese are overly and uncritically nostalgic about the “glorious Islamic past”, yet and take few lessons from this past. Therefore, Islamic teachings and laws, which are believed to be tools contributing to the past “golden age” of Aceh, have become only a proud, nostalgic identity for Acehnese, without reflexive implementation in the present (Hadi, 2010). For him, the pride of Islam as a uniting tool in Acehnese society is no longer evident, because Islam could not solve the conflict in Aceh. Therefore, he speculates that there might be different understandings of Islam for the current and past Acehnese. In addition, the nostalgia for the past, and the intention to preserve the consensus narrative as tradition, are results of the disappointment of the present (Hadi, 2010). This intention, for him, is very prone to political abuse and social modification.

It is misleading to think that collective memories alone cause nostalgia. The past represented in collective memories is simply one way to look to the past, and possibly for violating and challenging the truth provided by history (Huyssen, 2003). Therefore, as scholars in memory studies point out, there is also the problematic relation between ‘memory’, ‘truth’, and ‘experience’ in historical truth, which is always a representation and construction (Hodgkin & Radstone, 2003, p.2). In addition, the reliability of the concept of memory – provisional, subjective,
concerned with representation and the present rather than fact and the past – is questionable, but also it seems this concept, for the historians engaging in memory studies, offers a more cautious and qualified relation to the past which is not provided by the historical approach (Hodgkin & Radstone, 2003, p.2). For collective memory, history is, to some extent, a key sources of reference (Hodgkin & Radstone, 2003). Therefore, instead of seeing history as separable from memory, they are related, interwoven, and inform each other.

What is remembered by the Acehnese is also the product of historical narratives interpreted by historians, as well as current social interpretation of the past forming collective memories. These historical narratives are also produced for political purposes. The authorities in Banda Aceh deliberately created collective memories, as I have discussed in earlier part of this chapter. In addition, it is hard to see, at ground level, a clear-cut separation between history and memory as is evident in my interviews when I ask about both memories and history. For example, the event of the Dutch burning of the Baiturrahman Mosque is remembered by some as history (see the first quote, below), while others associated the event with memory (see the second quote):

Dewi: Are there any messages about the history of the Banda Aceh that you take away from the Baiturrahman Mosque?

Interviewee: Hmm….I think it is the history of the mosque ever burned

D: When?

I: During the Dutch time

BM_26, Female, University Student, Acehnese
Dewi: What do you remember when you are visiting the Baiturrahman Mosque?

Interviewee: I remember the Dutch ever burned this mosque…I know the story from the history books I read when I was at school and from the elders.

BM_47, Female, Housewife, Acehnese

Accompanying remembering, in Acehnese society is forgetting, which is relevant to the tsunami memories, which are considered painful in terms of the number of people lost and the environmental damage sustained. Acehnese chose to not “always” remember certain pasts, such as the tsunami related memories, because it is too painful to be remembered; sometimes, they just want to forget for a while in order to move forward. Grieving is a mechanism for forgetting (Samuels, 2010) and for curing Acehnese trauma (Smith, 2012). The way forgetting is done, and its relation to resilience and identity formation, is discussed in detail in chapter 6.

Up to this point I have shown the meanings of the past for the Acehnese, and how they remember the three collective memories in the post disaster context. But how do architectural places and designs help people to remember and recall – or forget – the past? Now is the time for me to move to the essential part of this chapter, the analysis of the roles of architecture in triggering and facilitating remembering the past in Banda Aceh. Below I try to unpack how people use architectural heritage and its elements such as forms, windows and other characteristics, in the remembering process in post-disaster Banda Aceh.
6.4. The Role of Iconic Architecture in the Remembering Process

The central part of this chapter involves examining the Organic Heritage Discourse (OHD) in Banda Aceh after the 2004 tsunami disaster, and the investigation of the social and cultural roles of three iconic architectural heritage sites in post-disaster Banda Aceh: (1) the Baiturrahman Mosque, the Tsunami Museum, and Peulanggahan Mosque; and how they work to provide resilience, and trigger and facilitate the act of remembering the three Acehnese narrative templates that work to frame collective memories, i.e. disaster, conflict (wars) and Islam.

In the OHD in Banda Aceh after the tsunami, I argue, as a scaffolding of memory, the iconic architectural heritage is important for two interrelated reasons. Firstly, its ability to contain activities provides people with a place for performing. Secondly, its physical elements, with highly visible features and ubiquitous presence, signify certain memories and spatial guidance to some people. Through the visibility of its features and setting, and its ability to contain activities, architecture helps create sense of place. Consequently, architectural heritage plays social and cultural roles in the process of remembering. In explaining my argument I use the theoretical framework of architectural heritage I developed in chapter 2 to analyse my case studies. In my research, I also found that it is evident that functions and uses of iconic architectural heritage give meanings to forms, but at the same time architectural form enhances the ability of such architecture to play its roles as social, cultural, and religious places, and places of resilience. This function is highly determined by social, culture, climate, etc of the contexts (Widodo, 2012; Knox, 2007, p. 116)
6.4.1 The Iconic Architectural Heritage as a Cultural Place

In analysing the role of architectural heritage as a cultural place, Smith’s (2006) idea of heritage as experience, identity, memory, and performance is expanded and combined with Billig’s (1995) ideas of banal nationalism, and Davidson’s (2009) idea of the importance of inhabitation in creating and recalling the meaning of architecture. To understand the role of the iconic architectural heritage as a cultural place, I analyse and discuss some of the main interview questions I asked in the field. What are the overall reasons that made you come to this place? What kind of memories do you remember when visiting and thinking of this place? What experiences do you value when visiting this place? What is the meaning of this place for you and Banda Aceh? There were also other follow-up questions to these four. Based on analysis of these questions, I found that performing activities is an important element in the OHD. A building that is used in everyday activities has a pivotal role in providing people with resilience. Below I show how I come to this argument.

It is, however, not easy to differentiate the reasons people come to these three iconic places. This is because people’s reasons are intertwined, and to some extent cannot be readily derived by what people say, which is especially the case when asking about religious states, which are highly subjective. I am also aware that visiting the mosques is not entirely a religious act, and a visit to the museum is not always non-religious. Although, in Islamic society, visiting the mosque and developing the mosque is imbued with religious meaning, and is also part of merit making, though at least there is voluntary worship that only can be done at the mosques (Sunat Tahyatul Masjid), and the rewards were accrued based on the
steps people make to make their way to the mosque. This contrasts to visiting the museum, which is regarded as a casual activity. In the absence of this intentional merit making, however, people encounter a spiritual sense and experience too upon their visit which I explain further in this section. Even though people’s visits to both the museum and the mosques have spiritual aspects, the spirituality is slightly different in the ways people use the museum and mosques. At the mosque, religious activities produce this spirituality, while those at the museum were triggered by the tragic event. Therefore, the categorization I made here is based on what they literally tell me.

Analysing the reasons people mentioning for visiting iconic architectural heritage, I found that the three examples of iconic architecture are places for performing activities. This is reflected in the reasons people gave for coming to the three iconic heritage places. People visit the sites for performing activities and experiencing the sites. In other words, people are driven by “doing things”; rather than being drawn to visit the “things” themselves as iconic sites. Compared to physical appeal, the activities have a greater potential to attract people. This finding is in line with Smith’s (2006) idea of heritage as a cultural process and emphasis on what is done at the places; for her, being in heritage places is to experience a sense of heritage, or what she calls the heritage moment that differs from one place to another. In this sense, I argue, people on their visit value activities undertaken at the buildings and experiences of ‘being there’ from the Baiturrahman Mosque, the Tsunami Museum, and Peulanggahan Mosque. Below I explore six interrelated themes emerging of my data of reasons driving people to come to the three iconic

---

68 Following Smith (2006, p.78) I use the idea of place rather than site to illustrate a certain space, because site has more physical associations and is more likely to be used to illustrate physicality than place.
architectures: religious, casual, educational, commemorative, recreational, and physical.

Table 6.2: Reason for coming to the Iconic Architecture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Coming</th>
<th>The Baiturrahman Mosque</th>
<th>Peulanggahan Mosque</th>
<th>The Tsunami Museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious (Total)</td>
<td>45 % 60</td>
<td>18 % 82</td>
<td>1 % 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praying</td>
<td>25 % 13</td>
<td>13 % 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazar*</td>
<td>10 % 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning/teaching Religion</td>
<td>9 % 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healing Trauma</td>
<td>1 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziarah**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational (Total)</td>
<td>14 % 18.7</td>
<td>1 % 4.5</td>
<td>24 % 44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoying</td>
<td>7 %</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking Pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resting</td>
<td>7 % 14.5</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying</td>
<td>5 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (Total)</td>
<td>10 % 13.3</td>
<td>2 % 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>5 %</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>5 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational (Total)</td>
<td>22 % 40.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilling Curiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about the Tsunami</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commemorative (Total)</td>
<td>2 % 4</td>
<td>4 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembering</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical (Total)</td>
<td>6 % 8</td>
<td>5 % 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness of Form</td>
<td>6 %</td>
<td>5 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Nazar: Fulfilling a promise to God
**Ziarah: visiting graveyards
In relation to heritage as a remembering process, I argue, it is visiting and performing activities at the iconic architecture that triggers and helps people remember a particular past. Adopting Billig’s (1995) theory of Banal Nationalism, inhabitation and use make the iconic architectural heritage banal places of collective meaning-making through a cultural process, making and remaking as well as connecting and reconnecting to the narratives and memories entangled within the physical fabric. Acehnese people are involved in everyday identity making through performing a cultural process encapsulated in activities ranging from things as simple as thinking of and passing by the architecture, to things as complex as emotionally involved as being in a deep engagement with the architecture. In this sense, the banality of monumental architecture, I argue, is possible because such architecture becomes enrolled in everyday activities. The cultural process is not only in the mind of, and conducted by, the visitors or users consciously visiting the place, but also the passers-by passing these buildings on their way between home and various destinations, and those who are not visiting or passing the mosques and museums. This banality of course, is different from the banality indicated by Billig (1995), which is drawn from everyday objects rather than monumental objects like iconic architecture.

The sense of being there, however, cannot be substituted by other kind of engagements or exposures such as thinking, looking at photos, reading, etc. People in their visits are involved in a (deep and shallow) direct engagement with the buildings or sites through performing activities and experiencing the sites. This engagement is central to architectural arguments about making a building alive and meaningful (see also in other architecture literature Davidson, 2009; White, 2006b). Following Martin Heiddegger (cited in Davidson (2009), building means to
dwell: to cultivate and to erect. In this sense, building is designed for containing activities. Therefore, a building should be dwelt in, used, and experienced in order to create its soul or spirit. Inhabitation makes a building meaningful. The engagement is not, however, easy to measure. For the purpose of this thesis, I define deep and shallow engagement by analysing what people tell me in the interview, observing what people are doing in place, and reading written documents. I measure their engagement by the long exposure of a person to such architecture and the feelings and experience they divulge to me.

When I asked about experiences and feelings at iconic architectural places, there were at least three main responses: comfortable (nyaman, tenang), sadness (sedih), and fear (takut, seram). “Comfortable”, with about 70% of the responses, has dominated the experiences people have at the mosques, and “sadness and fear”, in about 46% of the responses, was most common at the museum. People come to the mosque for a comfortable and peaceful (damai) experience of praying and performing religious and non-religious activities. The mosque is a place where a sense of “equity” (kesetaraan) is evoked and a sense of acceptance emerges. Regardless of their social status people sit together in the same row when praying and being in the mosque. Uniquely, despite its location in the heart of the city, which is noisy and busy, the Baiturrahman is a quiet and comfortable place for praying and resting. “Happy” (senang) is another dominant theme that emerges in the experience people have at the three iconic buildings. Some of the interviewees found it, however, difficult to describe their feelings when engaging with the mosque (“speechless”). The feeling is more intense at Baiturrahman Mosque than other places, even other mosques:
Why I come here is because in this (Baiturrahman) mosque (there are) a lot of worshippers and (it’s) more comfortable than other mosques in which worshippers are less than one prayer line...here it is similar to praying on the Islamic great days at other mosques.

BM_13, Male, Food Seller, Javanese

The Baiturrahman Mosque is different from other mosques because it has something special that other mosques do not have. I cannot say in words what that is, but I can feel it. It is very comfortable and peaceful here compared to other mosques.

BM42, Female, Public Servant, Acehnese

In addition, the feeling of safety (*aman*) and comfort provided by the Tsunami Museum is reflected in the ways the Banda Aceh Punk Rock Group, as mentioned during the interview, have chosen the museum as their gathering place, because for them the museum is in line with the spirit of disruption they hold. Punk has been evident in Banda Aceh since the 1990s. For them, the museum, despite the political top-down nature of its development, is a place where they believe they can safely express themselves without fear of the moral police who patrol Banda Aceh and implement Islamic Sharia in Banda Aceh. In addition, the museum is defined as ‘innocent’ (*tak berdosa*) in representing the death of innocent people; in
Islamic society it is believed that they will become martyrs. The spirit of innocent people will be, as the Punk Group believe, with them in fighting against what they believe as falsity. For example, for them, the Islamic Sharia in Aceh is just a symbol without concrete any implementation. This view, of course, contrasts to the wider belief in Aceh that the Punk Society is against Islamic values and other local values; therefore this group has been treated unfairly, as evidenced by their arrest and rehabilitation in 2011, when they had a musical concert in Taman Budaya (see for example a report from BBC News Asia written by Vaswani, 2011). This rehabilitation, reported by BBC Indonesia, involved being educated by an ulama. In highlighting this punk story I want to underline that the value of place, and the values of activities that are performed there, are highly variable and largely dependent on the interpretations of place by the people who use that place. Below I give another example of how the value of place is perceived.

The users engage with the spirit and values associated with shaping the meaning of a place. The three places, even though the Tsunami Museum is quite new, are experienced as enchanted places, both by visitors and inhabitants. Even the newly designed Tsunami Museum evinces enchanted feelings and mythical experiences. The Baiturrahman Mosque is also regarded as a sacred as well as an enchanted place. During my fieldwork I saw a long line of people in the morning, especially Monday and Thursday, at one of the water taps of the mosque. People had come to shower their newborn babies. In addition, I also saw kids swimming in the ditch at the doorstep of the mosque where people wash their feet before entering. Intrigued by what I was seeing I asked a couple of parents why they were

---

69 This enchantment is imbued with religious, philosophical, and mythical senses. This enchantment, in Aceh, is likely to occupy a crucial but highly problematic place between Islamic and older pre-Islamic understandings of the concept.
there. Most answers suggested that the tap water and the ditch water are believed to have the power to cure diseases, bring good luck and have other positive associations. This contrasts to water in the Tsunami Museum, which obviously has different associations and supports different engagements. Water here is associated with relatively negative feelings, sadness and fear.

Figure 6.1: People lining up in front of the mosque water tap for bathing their babies

Source: Photo by Cut Dewi
Figure 6.2: Kids swimming in the ditch to cure skin diseases and fulfilling their parents’ nazar.

Source: Photo by Cut Dewi

Figure 6.3: A baby placed on the floor in the front part of the mosque for fulfilling the parent’s nazar.

Source: Photo by Cut Dewi
Another enchanted and sacred association is also found at Peulanggahan Mosque, but in this mosque, for Acehnese, the “aura” comes from the mausoleum of Teungku Dianjong; rather than from the whole place, like at the Baiturrahman Mosque. People come, bring water mixed with flowers, and wash their faces in the graveyard to promote positive feelings. Here some examples from my interview about the enchanted feeling at the mosques:

I think Peulanggahan Mosque has an aura from the mausoleum. It contrasts to the Baiturrahman Mosque which has the invisible aura surrounding the mosque, but we don't know where it comes from. Might be there are other beautiful mosques, but empty and not a lot of people coming.

BM36, Male, Self-employed, Javanese

One day, I ever dreamt....not dreaming....but encountered with Habib Luthfi who designed this mosque (the Baiturrahman Mosque) ... ...he told me about the history...the design of the mosque...then suddenly the mosque smells so nice.

BM31, Female, Islamic teacher, Acehnese

---

70 It seems my interviewee referred to aura as mythical power which comes from a place, which makes the place enchanted.

71 She seems to have her own imagination as who designed and built the mosque. As I have mentioned in chapter 4 the current mosque was designed and rebuilt by the Dutch, while the previous mosque was reconstructed by Sayyid Abd al-Rahman bin Muhammad al-Zahir, an Arab immigrant and reputed descendant of the prophet Muhammad, yet she in her imagination created another sacred figure that was pivotal in the development of the mosque.
Another day when I felt asleep, suddenly I felt somebody wake me up....the mosque so fragrant....till I woke up and tried to find where this person was .... I could not find, just gone....

BM03, Female, Housewife, Acehnese

This sense of enchantment not only resulted from Islamic belief that the mosques are the house of God, so that they are imbued with the spirit of God, but also the sense of spirituality people associate with the mosque. For example, the Peulanggahan Mosque has been imbued with the narratives and spirit of Teungku Dianjong. The Baiturrahman Mosque has a more complex story related to this issue, ranging from the story of the Acehnese Sultan who built the mosque, the Dutch who rebuilt the Mosque, and the mosque being saved from the tsunami. This enchanted feeling, or a sense of place, attracts people to be in or do things in the mosques. The mosques seem to be sacred places which lend their sacredness to activities conducted at the places, but not necessarily in the architecturally defined space.

Places gain symbolic values following a number of events. At first, a place may be just an ordinary space, then a group of people or a society associates a place with their values for a variety of reasons. This could include something happening at such a place, or the place being deliberately designed for a specific need with a specific value - Riegl's (1903 [1982]) idea of deliberate and non-deliberate monuments is useful here. Once a place is regarded as having a special place, all values associated with such a place are transferable to activities conducted at it. The activities gain their importance in two ways: they are important, so that they
should be conducted at an important place, and/or they become important because they are conducted at an important place.

People travel a great distance just to pray at the Baiturrahman and Peulanggahan Mosques, because they believe praying in these mosques is so special. One example is Ibu Nani, 64 years old, from Jakarta, which is approximately 1824 kilometres away, who came to the Baiturrahman Mosque just to pray and to fulfil her nazar (promise to Allah, God; see as reported by Dahi on Tribune News on 23 June 2012). Another measure of the mosque’s a distinctive place is that the waiting list for marrying at the Baiturrahman Mosque is several months long. This is because marrying at the mosque is so special for Acehnese people, indeed I myself was married there too. To get access at the mosque, brides are willing to follow all the rules set by the mosque, such as having to wear a full cover dress according to Islamic rules. In addition, conducting the Friday prayer at the Baiturrahman Mosque for Muslim men is seen as a great honour, so many people insist on praying here, even though they have to pray on the steps, on the pavement, or on the grass. This is done to feel “the differences” or “the enchanted, sacred feeling” they can achieve being in and experiencing the mosque. It is not the place that lends the sacredness, however; rather the values, meanings, histories, and memories associated with the place.
Figure 6.4: People are willing to pray on the grass as long as they can conduct Friday prayer at the Baiturrahman Mosque

Source: Photo by Cut Dewi

Figure 6.5: People are willing to pray on the pavement as long as they can conduct Friday prayer at the Baiturrahman Mosque

Source: Photo by Cut Dewi
Therefore, looking at its important roles in containing activities, I argue that the iconic architectural heritage serves as a social and cultural place where activities are conducted to understand Acehnese people as Moslem. In Islamic teachings, humans are God’s only creations and should be obedient to His orders. The mosques and the museum are where these teachings are exercised, contemplated, and understood. How have people performed all these contemplations in line with Islamic teachings?

Mosques are places where the best praying is conducted and the best hope is placed. It is where trauma is hoped to be cured, and the best place to meet God and ask for a better future. I would like to return to the story of the fifty-year woman.
mentioned in the introduction of this chapter. For her, the Baiturrahman Mosque is a place of hope and escape from the sad and traumatic reality of the death of her daughter twelve years ago. Day and night she has come to the mosque for almost twelve years, and hopes she can forget about the death of her daughter and cure her trauma. She has a group with whom she always sits, talks, and prays. The mosque workers even know her well. The lady and her friends occupy the same spot in the mosque where they usually spend time together. Based on my interaction with them, it was evident that coming to the mosque fulfilled a desire to address their trauma, but was also seen as a source of escape from their continuing problems. On Friday they read the Al Quran together. I quote a part of my interview with her, where she talked at length about her trauma and reasons for coming to the mosque:

Dewi: Why do you come to the Baiturrahman Mosque? I see you almost every day here.

Lady: For praying...for a comfortable and peaceful life...and for knowing myself.

D: what experience do you most value by being in the mosque?

L: Since my daughter died, twelve years ago....when the doctor cannot cure me because he must (find it too) boring listening to me and there must be a lot of patients lining (up) outside his room. I don’t need money and world (dunia), money is nothing compare to my love for my daughter because she was so lovely....subhanallah (praise to
Allah).....I come here to hide from the world, from my friends who always ask about her.... I just cannot be home...cannot be asked the questions about her death, too painful to answer those questions because they bring back the memories of her....in this mosque I found ketenangan (comfort).....

The Tsunami Museum is the place where people surrender to the power of God and admit all tsunami consequences as musibah\textsuperscript{72}. Some people are involved in shallow and deep engagement in learning and commemorating the tsunami. Some people are involved in a deep engagement shown by a deep emotional feeling that emerges when they visit the museum. They feel as if they re-visited the day of the tsunami and met their disappeared families. In addition, these feelings are also shown by the realization of God’s power in creating the tsunami disaster, which I have discussed previously. Through surrendering to the power of God people realise who they are, and this has been a significant tool for recovery after the tsunami, which will be discussed in chapter 6. Therefore, almost all my interviewees, 87% of them, supported the development of a museum for remembering the tsunami. Even though most people I observed at the museum quickly jumped from one display to another, they still take away with them the messages about the tsunami. At least, the intention to visit the museum is a conscious decision they make to visit a particular history. This conscious action I consider to be part of a cultural process.

\textsuperscript{72} An accident which was initiated by God for testing for people’s faith or warning people of their mistakes.
Sorry...we need to go to Kapal Apung....we only have one day in Banda Aceh...I have a quick look at the displays .... the museum is so touching..

TM23, Male, Army, Medan

It is also evident in my interviews with some people who did not experience the tsunami, and were from other cultures, that they tried to relate to the disaster by using the disaster memories in their country as an entry point:

I share the feeling of the tsunami survivors....we don't have the tsunami in Australia, but we have bushfires.....it was so sad...TM Australia

TM11, Male, Architect, Australia

While for people in Banda Aceh, as can be seen in table below, what are remembered are historical events (above 50% at each site), sense of place, and activities people perform at the iconic places (second in rank after historical events). The Islamic Kingdom, Dutch colonialism and the Tsunami have dominated the most remembered historical events at the Baiturrahman Mosque. At the Tsunami Museum the tsunami memories are predominantly remembered. Teungku dianjong has become a central collective memory at the Peulanggahan Mosque. This finding is in line with Birth’s (2006) theory that people cluster what
they remember around historical events and stages of life, and use them as landmarks in their mind. Thus it is evident that my interviewees continually refer to the tsunami as a time of separation between past and the present, as well as a source of lessons.

Table 6.3: Memory work at Iconic Architectural Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memories</th>
<th>The Baiturrahman Mosque</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Peulanggahan Mosque</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>The Tsunami Museum</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical/important events</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsunami</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Colonialization</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Kingdom</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other memories</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Place</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicality</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beyond the answers people gave during interviews, I also examined written records, such as newspapers and social media, about the activities people perform in relation to The Baiturrahman Mosque. The most noticeable in the history of large scale events was the rally for a referendum for Aceh to remain a part of or separate from Indonesia in 1999 (Aspinall, 2009). This important rally was attended by 500,000 demonstrators, which was quite a significant number considering the total population of Aceh at that time was around 4 million (Bunnell. et al, 2013) and that of Banda Aceh around 220,000 people (Badan Pusat
Statistik Banda Aceh, 2000). Another noteworthy activity to maintain this as a place of hope was a rally against the development of the Best Western Hotel and Mall in 2012. People protested the development of a franchise Hotel, Best Western Hotel. People wanted the landmark of Banda Aceh to still be the Baiturrahman Mosque; the hotel and mall building, which is twelve stories tall, would stand over the minaret of the mosque and change the landscape of the mosque (see a report from Berita Satu on 4 January 2012, Best Western Hotel ditolak di Aceh). This rejection was expressed by signing a petition on fabric in front of the mosque (see for example Republika Online written by Purwadi, 2012). This was pursued to protect a place of hope and Aceh’s identity as an Islamic society, which is represented by the mosque.

Figure 6.7: Graffiti for Rejecting the hotel and mall.

Source: Photo by Cut Dewi
I also recorded a comment on the hotel in my interviews:

After the Tsunami the development of Banda Aceh is better, but I do not agree if a hotel is established next to the Baiturrahman Mosque because it might compete with the monumentality of the mosque. This can make the mosque less important because the new building is taller and attracts more attention than the old, well established one.

BM18, Female, University student, Acehnese

I would like to underline here that the values people associate with place, and the ways in which architectural designs act as an “enhancer”, contributes to the ability of architectural heritage to contain activities and provide people with a place for cultural performance. I argue, from the perspective architectural anthropology, humans are central in architecture, so their needs or activities are central. Thus function of architecture is a key in designing a building. This lends its importance to form. However, the form cannot completely be diminished. It has a power to attract attention and to give building images. It provides a shelter and space, which structurally secure human for conducting their activities. As argued by Gottdiener (1985) architecture as a product of complex relation between structure and human agency. Thus in the integration and connection between form and function an architecture becomes important and act as a scaffolding in a remembering network. What I mean by the function here is in a wider definition, including the function or use of the whole building as a tool (in an abstract use, such as a
political tool, a cultural tool, etc) and the function that architecture can serve as an actual place that can be entered and experienced (a real use). Architectural heritage is, for Acehnese, places for cultural activities, therefore, they are social and cultural places. The Mosque and meunasah are important places for important collective activities in Acehnese society (Daly & Rahmayati, 2012). In contrast to Daly, Samuels (2010) refers to more intangible and abstract place, the neighbourhood, as a social and cultural place for remaking social reconstruction in Banda Aceh after the tsunami. I agree with Samuels (2010) that there is an abstract form of place like the neighbourhood, but there is also a concrete place like mosque and meunasah, as Daly and Rahmayati (2012) point out. The tangible place is where people place their feet and experience a material or ‘real’ place for conducting activities. In other words, the mosque and meunasah are in a neighbourhood. Below, I demonstrate the roles of the physical features of architectural heritage in providing an anchor and entry point for further engagement and experience.

6.4.2 The Buildings as Clue in the Remembering Process.

In this section I investigate how the OHD is used in Banda Aceh to frame how people perceive issues of material authenticity, though the investigation of what happens to the feelings and attachment of people to the iconic architectural heritage – the Baiturrahman Mosque, Peulanggahan Mosque, and the Tsunami Museum – if the physicality of such iconic buildings changes, or has been changed in the past. I explore the follow up questions from the main questions I have raised in the discussion of architectural heritage as a cultural place above. I suggested several themes, as follows: “What do people think if the physicality of the iconic
architectural heritage change?” “Do they still have the same attachment and feeling to the buildings” “What makes Banda Aceh similar or changed after the tsunami”

The physical elements of the iconic architectural heritage, with high visibility features and ubiquitous presence, signify and spatially guide people. As an iconic landmark, it is well-known (Sklair, 2011, p.185), so that it is familiar to the observers. It becomes a familiar clue to orient people after the disaster, to familiarise visitors and to embrace returning citizens on their first days in Banda Aceh. In addition, the physical aspects have also become tools for people to describe the changes and disappearing environment after the disaster. Analysing from the perspective of its physicality, the familiarity of architectural heritage is created by three things: its tangible monumental (massive) form (Sklair, 2011, 2008), complex and unique form, and central location (Appleyard, 1976). Following on from these issues, I discuss below the three tangible aspects contributing to the familiarity of the three examples of iconic architectural heritage. I analyse the role of the iconic architectural heritage in relation to two polarities; between presence and absence, and between the change and continuity.

The monumental form has become a common aspect of iconic architecture (Sklair, 2011). From my participant observation, the Baiturrahman Mosque, the Tsunami Museum, and Peulanggahan Mosque are monumental in their surroundings. The sense of monumentality is created not only by their enormous forms, which are very obvious, but also by the gap and space between observers and the buildings. The wide front yard of the Baiturrahman Mosque provides a sequence for enjoying the physicality of the building. The mosque’s garden, is actually a part of the designated green areas of Banda Aceh. In the case of the Tsunami Museum, even
though its site is not large, the existence of Blang Padang field in front of the museum lends the museum a sense of the monumental. The Peulangahan Mosque occupies a complex populated by the relatively flat structures of Teungku Dianjong sacred mausoleum and other ordinary cemeteries, giving a sense of monumentality to the mosque which is vertically stunning.

Figure 6.8: The monumentality of the Baiturrahman Mosque

Source: Photo by Cut Dewi
Figure 6.9: The monumentality of the Tsunami Museum

Source: Photo by Cut Dewi

Figure 6.10: The monumentality of Peulanggahan Mosque

Source: Photo by Cut Dewi
In addition, from the point of view of architectural design theory, their forms are more complex than the surrounding buildings. The Baiturrahman Mosque adopts the detailed Moghul style, which contrasts to its surroundings, mainly populated by post 1980s shophouses with simple modern styles. The Tsunami Museum was designed in a traditional style in modern representation. Its unique ship-like form is distinctively different than the surrounding environment, which is dominated by offices with colonial architecture and a late modern style. And Peulanggahan Mosque is still an old mosque style, with a three-tiered roof. Its form is different from the surrounding areas, which are mainly occupied by houses designed around the 1980s, and aid houses designed after the tsunami, with very simple uniform architectural style. The three, in short, contrast to their surroundings, so that they are easily recognised.

The three iconic buildings are located at strategic locations. The Baiturrahman Mosque is in the heart of the city of Banda Aceh, at the intersection of major roads. In addition, people commuting between various parts of the city almost always pass the location. The existence of the central market next to the mosque also makes the location of the mosque strategic. The Tsunami Museum is located in an historic precinct, the former Bustanussatin Garden, and surrounded by main offices and the mayor's house, which adds to the symbolic importance of the museum. Peulanggahan Mosque is on a secondary road connecting the ancient and contemporary city centre of Banda Aceh. In this regard, the position or location of the buildings in the central places of Banda Aceh has contributed to their banality, in the way Billig (1995) uses the term, because they become banal objects which are present in everyday life. The more strategic location is the more people pass and visit, and the more familiar and banal such architecture becomes. It is evident
in my interviews that people describe the location as one of the aspects making the iconic architecture ubiquitous in their mind. The Baiturrahman Mosque has been mentioned as the most strategic location for people, for example:

The Baiturrahman Mosque is located at a strategic location...in the middle of Banda Aceh, therefore I can easily come...I get used to the mosque being there....

BM35, Male, Self-employed, Acehnene

This is (the Baiturrahman Mosque) one of symbols for Banda Aceh because of its strategic location, the (Tsunami) museum is not as strategic as this mosque.....

TM21, Female, Uni student, Acehnese

People build a connection with such iconic architecture through identification and association with its form. The form then becomes very familiar in the minds of people when thinking about a specific place. As Sklair (2011) argues, the iconic form catches our attention and tells us where we are; even a partial glimpse will suffice. Tellingly, she gives global exemplars, Sydney Opera House as a clue or signature of Sydney, the Eiffel tower of Paris, etc. The Baiturrahman Mosque has become a signature of the city of Banda Aceh and spatially orients people before and after the tsunami. Peulanggahan Mosque has also become a landmark, and spatially orients people, especially after the disaster. People use the mosques to
locate other places in the city. Several examples below, taken from interviews conducted at the two mosques, show that the mosques help people to spatially orient themselves. For example, the image of the Baiturrahman Mosque is very vivid in the mind of visitors and the Acehnese diaspora to identify Banda Aceh. Baiturrahman is the signature of Banda Aceh. As one of my interviewees, who was on a visit to Banda Aceh revealed:

We see the mosque on TV and photos, this is what we remember about Banda Aceh. In addition, people talk about this mosque in our village and they suggest that once I go to Banda Aceh I should visit this mosque.

BM14, Female, Unemployed, Acehnese

The Baiturrahman Mosque is the identity of Banda Aceh, it is a must visit and you should take a photo at the mosque as an evidence that you have been to Banda Aceh. Even the foreigners do this to prove that they were here.

BM40, Male, Uni student, Acehnese

These buildings, even though they are monumental in form, become, nonetheless, following Billig (1995), the everyday or banal part of the
landscape that reinforces a sense of place and self-identity. It is a familiar symbol of homeland and the material representations of feelings, images, and thoughts populate a place and makes a place meaningful; therefore what is called home varies, ranging from a specific point or place to the whole city (Tuan, 2003). As a visible sign, even a famous visible sign, iconic architectural heritage enhance a sense of one’s identity, and encourages a sense of awareness and loyalty to a place (Tuan, 2003). My interviewees also indicated the banality of form, because they have seen it in everyday life, of the Baiturrahman Mosque for inhabitants, and the extraordinary mosque for visitors:

Baiturrahman is the image of Aceh as the Veranda of Mecca......For us the inhabitant, the mosque becomes just an ordinary object that we pass and presents in our daily environment. For visitors, they will come and take photo in front of the mosque......

BM 35, Female, Housewife, Acehnese

Firstly, when I worked at the mosque (the Baiturrahman Mosque) I feel very special, it is very hard to describe what I felt that time, but as time moves on my feeling changes...I feel the mosque is so ubiquitous, but its speciality is still there......

BM 28, Female, Mosque worker, Acehnese
In addition they also described the iconic buildings, especially the Baiturrahman Mosque, as representations of Acehnese identity:

The Baiturrahman Mosque is one of Banda Aceh’s famous icons. It had been on TV during the tsunami…..it represents the identity of Banda Aceh as the Veranda of Mecca/ Serambi Mekkah)

BM26, Female, Uni student, Acehnese

The Baiturrahman Mosque is the symbol of Banda Aceh because we (Acehnese) are Moslem. In addition, the mosque is the second largest in the world after the one in Mecca (the Masjidil Haram)...yet our people need to be conscious (of Islamic practice/pious) ...

BM03, Female, Housewife, Acehnese

Even, for most of the interviewees, in the midst of the huge changes to village landscapes, the Peulanggahan Mosque was considered an unchanged part of their village, Peulanggahan. For example, when the survivors came back to their village, Peulanggahan, a village severely affected by the tsunami, the Peulanggahan Mosque, although half destroyed, was among the familiar places and objects which helped them to orientate the houses which had been flattened. An example of this expression is:

…..I returned to the village on the day of the tsunami. Everything was flattened and only the mosque was there; although it was half damaged. From the Peunayong Bridge what identifies Peulanggahan
was the mosque. My house just next to the mosque, so, even though it was flattened I still could find its site.....

PM04, Female, Self-employed, Acehnese

The evidence above also indicates what Sklair (2011, pp. 180-185) argues, that the physical aspect of iconic architecture is a tangible image, symbol, expression, and representation of abstract feelings. The mosques are a tangible representation of place identity. The mosques have become a strong anchor and gateway for further exploration and recalling memories and identities. The importance of physical state for these purposes can also be seen in the responses to the following questions and recognition. I asked, “What would you think and feel if the architecture or physical appearance of the Baiturrahman Mosque was changed?”, “Do you still have the same feeling and attachment to the mosque?”, and “Does the mosque still represent the identity of Acehnese and Banda Aceh?”

Most people (78%) interviewed at the Baiturrahman Mosque do not want the mosque to change. In addition, the fieldwork data suggests that after the reconstruction process, iconic architecture and old sites are among the highest percentage recognised as unchanged in the city, by 91% of the interviewees. The iconic architecture, no doubt, has also become the most remembered image of the built environment in Banda Aceh, both by its inhabitants and visitors after the disaster. The iconic architecture, the Baiturrahman Mosque, was mentioned by 68% of the responding interviewees asked about the unchanged part of the city. Alongside this mosque, there are some old buildings and old parts of the city which are considered as historic, like the Aceh Museum, Pendopo/the old governor’s
house, Putroe Phang Park, Unsyiah Monument, Kerkhoff/the Dutch Cemetery, Peunayong area, Blang Padang field, and Diponegoro Street. Amongst these, the Governor’s office, which was built during 1990s, and houses not affected by the tsunami, emerged in the answers too. The interviewees also mentioned natural and social aspects of the city like the beach, the landscape not affected by the tsunami, food, courtesy, and Islam.

Another finding supporting the importance of physical form as an entry point and anchor is the case of the Tsunami Museum. Its existence is recognised as one of the changes giving a new sense of place to Banda Aceh. Its monumental form and spectacular architectural styles have contributed to its recognition. It has now become a second symbol, which symbolises Banda Aceh as a city identified with disaster and huge losses. At least six foreigners I interviewed, who had no idea of Banda Aceh before, recognised the museum’s monumentality and unique form, so that due to these reasons they noticed the museum and wanted to visit it. The quoted interview below is one of the best examples of their reactions to the physical monumentality of the museum is:

On my way to Sabang I was struck by a monumental building which I had no idea what it was, therefore, I promised myself to visit the building upon my return from Sabang and extend my stay in Banda Aceh.....

TM10, Male, Architect, Austria
The absence of the built environment is also part of the stories people told me in the field. When describing the existing iconic architecture, people also mentioned several buildings that had been demolished. Aceh Hotel, the shophouses behind the Baiturrahman Mosque, the water tower in Taman Sari are among the examples of missing features of the built environment that were mentioned emerge in my interviews. People told me this because they want to highlight the change, both intended and unintentional, that is happening in Banda Aceh:

...now in Banda Aceh some buildings are no longer in place. For example the water tower in Taman Sari has been demolished. In fact, it is historical evidence, but it was bulldozed...hmmm...what I can do...

BM18, Female, University student, Acehnese

There were some shophouses just there behind the mosque, exactly where the parking is now and over there (pointing to back of the mosque) was a big tree as well....

BM32, Male, Self-employed, Acehnese

Understanding the importance of physical fabric, however, should not eclipse the heritage process. The reluctance to change the form of the Baiturrahman Mosque, the recognition of old buildings and urban quarters as the most unchanged part of the city, the emergence of the disappearing built environment in the interviews, without me having to prompt or ask, and the acknowledgement of the Tsunami
Museum as a second symbol and the signifier of change in Banda Aceh after the tsunami, should not be interpreted as an urge for the authenticity of material and the need for material appraisal, as defined in the Authorised Heritage Discourse (AHD). What people mean by unchanged is, I argue, the change of general form and use. Therefore, as long as the location is unchanged and silhouette or the general shapes of roof styles, colours, and other main architectural styles, remains the same, the architecture is for most people unchanged. This is evident in the way people describe the physicality of the Baiturrahman Mosque, which is in their mind unchanged, even though several renovations and enlargements have taken place, as I explained in chapter 4. In Banda Aceh, they notice change in a way that is beyond expert judgement. Regardless, the authenticity of the Baiturrahman Mosque is seen by many Acehnese as still original, so that it is heritage. In the next chapter I interrogate further the authenticity issues by using Riegl's (1903 [1982]) theory of cult monument.

Here are the examples of how people perceive the Baiturrahman Mosque as original in the midst of change:

...in general, the Baiturrahman Mosque is still the same. There is some renovation and maintenance of this Dutch inheritance mosque. But, the renovation does not change the original appearance of the mosque itself.....

OS13, Male, Public Servant, Acehnese
I know this building (the Baiturrahman Mosque) has been burned...rebuilt....enlarged...it is not original...but it is still the same....

BM16, Female, University Student, Acehnese

...The mosque (the Baiturrahman Mosque) is the same.....it was built with one dome and then renovated into several domes...the mosque was renovated to accommodate more worshippers...it is changed, but my enthusiasm to come and pray here does not change. To be closer to God (Allah) all the time. This (the mosque) is house of God.

BM63, Male, Pensioner, Acehnese

The mosque (the Baiturrahman Mosque) is an icon of Banda Aceh with a long history....the buildings remain the same, and indeed it is conserved as it is, only some renovation has been conducted so far, nothing broken and newly built.

OS08, Female, Uni Student, Acehnese
For some, even substantive change would not spoil their attachment to the mosque, and the change is just perceived as a temporal process. They would then get used to change, and perceive things as being essentially the same as long as the function is till the same:

This mosque (the Baiturrahman Mosque) is the identity of Banda Aceh. If it is changed, at the first place it might change the feeling and attachment, but later on we (Acehnese) would have become used to the change and accept it and indeed we always come there for praying.

BM18, Female, Uni Student, Acehnese

The attitude towards the materiality is just temporary, and is less important that the activities in place, and even the place itself is less important than activities and the relation between humans and God. Here the example of this expression taken from my interview with a tsunami survivor, BM13a, Male, Food seller, Javanese, at the Baiturrahman Mosque:

Dewi: How do you feel if the mosque style is changed?

The Tsunami Survivor: that (feeling) remains the same. There is no correlation between change of the mosque and the comfort (feelings). The most important thing is ibadah (worship); to me change does not do anything…..all the mosques are the same, the most important is worshipping at house of God (mosque).
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In addition, my question about the change to the Baiturrahman Mosque has been responded to stressing that it would not affect the attachment to and the value of the mosque for Acehnese people, an interview with BM13b, Male, Photographer, Acehnese:

Dewi : would you still have the same feeling and attachment, if the architectural form and style of the Baiturrahman Mosque changed?

Photographer: the change of the mosque is just human made....

This attitude toward change is also evident in the way people describe their feelings about the changes to the Peulanggahan Mosque after the tsunami. I asked a question about the changes to the Mosque, iconic to a particular urban quarter of Banda Aceh damaged by the tsunami and rebuilt in the same style, yet with different material. Almost all my respondents interviewed at Peulanggahan Mosque responded that, although the physicality of the mosque changed, it did not change their attachment to the mosque and the ability of the mosque to reflect the history and identity attached to it. This happens, I argue, because the position of the mosque is still in the same place or location, the function of the building is still the same, and it was rebuilt in the same architectural style, and its functions remain the same:

We recognise the changed materials of the mosque but it looks the same, roof style is the most obvious sameness of the old and the new mosque. In addition, it does not change my praying experience. I still
feel the same association. Even now, the mosque is better and comfortable, especially during wet season.

Male, PL 01, Student, Acehnese

6.5 Conclusion

In the OHD of Banda Aceh, the familiarity of the built environment is created by its social roles in the everyday lives of people; the tangible, physical form is an entry point and anchor for this familiarity. The activity on and around it lends an architectural form to its importance. Therefore, the built environment needs not be original in term of material and style; reconstruction and rebuilding do not necessarily negatively impact on the way heritage sites may be used, as long as the rituals and traditional activities may continue. Therefore, the changes to some architectural heritage, especially symbolic ones such as the Baiturrahman Mosque and the Peulanggahan Mosque, do not affect people’s attachment to them. It is evident in my research findings that the physicality of iconic buildings is remembered in association with the engagement of people and activities, feelings, and historical narratives built and recalled along this engagement.

As heritage is a verb or something that is done (Harvey, 2001), only that architecture which helps in the processes of remembering should be regarded as architectural heritage. It is architecture that facilitates, or is used to help people remember their past, even if banally engaging in people’s daily activities; and
consequently it helps people to experience a process and a moment of heritage. The attachment to physicality is not necessarily due to the sense of its physicality; rather it is in the sense of the narratives and the memories that it evokes and represents. People recognise the ‘sameness’ of Banda Aceh before and after the tsunami through the existence of old materials, and people do not want the Baiturrahman Mosque to change its physicality. They are afraid of losing their place attachment and associated memories and histories, even though the Mosque has radically changed appearance over time. However, the change of Peulanggahan Mosque does not affect attachment. What does this tell us? Understanding the importance of physical fabric, however, should not eclipse the heritage process, uses, and functions of architecture. The reluctance to change the form of the Baiturrahman Mosque should not be interpreted as the urge for authenticity of material and the need for material appraisal as defined in the Authorised Heritage Discourse (Mahdi, 2012). What people mean by unchanged is, as evidenced in my interviews outlined in this chapter, the change of general forms and uses. Therefore, as long as the location is unchanged and silhouette or the general shapes of roof styles, colours, and other main architectural styles, remains the same, the architecture is for most people unchanged.

The OHD in Banda Aceh, the authenticity of the iconic architectural heritage does not rely on its materiality and age, but on its ability to contain ritual, spiritual, and everyday activities, and to help people remember. The form is also important for its role as a physical gateway and anchor to deeper experiences with the buildings. Therefore, as long as the silhouette or the general shapes remains the same the architecture remains heritage. In other word, Acehnese and visitors visiting the sites are likely to value their ability to use and engage with the architecture
through various visits to, passing of, talking about, and even thinking of the architecture, while at the same time engaging by association with the architectural elements of the building. Through these actions people give meaning to a neutral space and turn it into an architectural place.

This finding is supported by research by Samuels (2010), Daly and Rahmayati (2012), and Mahdi (2012), who identify the importance of the neighbourhood sense of place in providing Acehnese resilience after the tsunami. The familiarity of form (rather than authenticity) of the built environment, together with its spirit, has become an important resource for survivors in promoting resilience. The issue of resilience is the subject of the next chapter. I juxtapose my research findings and theirs in the next chapter, while at the same time discussing and comparing the results of this chapter with the discussion in chapter 4. In addition, I bring several emerging issues that are worth discussing in relation to the remembering process and iconic architectural heritage, such as forgetting, identity, and authenticity.
7.1. Introduction

This chapter does two things. Firstly, it establishes the similarities and differences between the AHD's and the OHD's understanding and uses of iconic architectural heritage in shaping place familiarity, and the consequences of these different views for heritage policy in Banda Aceh, and Indonesia in general. Secondly, as this chapter pulls together the previous discussions of literature and research findings, it also analyses my contribution to the literature on architectural heritage designation and conservation, especially in the context of an Asian and post disaster society.

The different views between the AHD and the OHD, as well as variations with both the AHD and the OHD, creates a heritage process in Banda Aceh that derives from the negotiation between two understandings of heritage, modern and traditional; the latter of which is highly influenced by Islamic values and Southeast Asian heritage traditions. This traditional understanding of heritage plays a substantial role in the heritage discourse of Banda Aceh. The European AHD is still present in the local understanding of heritage, and helps create a local form of AHD. This practice, which Labadi (2013, p. 21) has referred to as “reiterative universalism”,

involves creative translations of international standards based on cultural conditions peculiar to each context. A key difference in this local AHD is evident in the debate over the inclusion of the emerging tsunami places, which are less than 50 years old, and the Baiturrahman Mosque and Peulanggahan Mosque, which have been changed, enlarged and replicated, as heritage. The Baiturrahman Mosque is a symbol of Banda Aceh and it is a very significant heritage site for Muslim Acehnese. In addition, the Tsunami Museum has become a second symbol of Banda Aceh, and has gained a significant place in Banda Aceh's heritage discourse. Identifying and understanding the local AHD and OHD in Banda Aceh gives another perspective in not only heritage policy and literature in Indonesia, but also in Asia and the world, especially in the context of a post disaster society.

In this chapter I discuss the dominant themes emerging in considering heritage from both local expert and grassroots contexts. As has been discussed in the heritage literature, place familiarity has become an important element in resourcing survivors' resilience in the face of disaster (Barakat, 2007; Daly & Rahmayati, 2012; Read, 1996; Samuels, 2010). I argue that there are significant differences between the AHD and the OHD in judging what aspects make a place familiar, especially in regard to the concept of authenticity and age. In addition, there are different approaches to conceptualizing ‘place’ and ‘space’. As a consequence of this, expertise fails to understand the ways places promote survivors’ resilience, and the dissonance and ‘looseness’ of place as an important aspect of the heritage process.

73 In Indonesia the minimum age for something to be designated heritage is 50 years old (see chapter 5 for more detail).
To do this, I divide the chapter into several parts. First, I explore the fundamental differences of understanding of heritage in Banda Aceh between the AHD and the OHD. This understanding consequently influences the ways governments, experts, and aid agencies involved in the reconstruction process, and how subsequent developments understand place familiarity for people and the aspects which make a place familiar, which I discuss in second part of this chapter. In the second and third parts, I further explore the issues of place familiarity, authenticity of place, and other intangible aspects related to the role of heritage in the act of remembering, and the role of architectural heritage in a post-disaster society. The fourth part of the chapter analyses the different views between the AHD and OHD and ‘looseness’ and dissonance of place. In the last part, I discuss the consequences of these differences to architectural heritage designation and conservation, as well as the consequences to heritage and urban planning policy and the architectural heritage literature.

7.2 What Makes a Place Both Familiar and Heritage?

In Banda Aceh, as shown in Chapter 5 and 6, the AHD used by government agencies and experts and the OHD used by community groups sometimes overlap, agreeing, for instance, that iconic architecture is an important medium for symbolising identity for people and providing a sense of place through familiarity. However, the most significant difference of the two views is in relation to the heritage status of such architecture, and what makes iconic architectural heritage familiar. In other words, despite their agreement that architecture can help create an
important place; this architecture is not automatically heritage. These differences, I argue, are caused by different ways the two discourses understand heritage and consequently architectural heritage. The views of authorities are predominantly influenced by the European conservation ethos enacted by the international AHD; while communities still hold onto a traditional conservation ethos embedded in the OHD.

To be a heritage place the Indonesian AHD holds an iconic architectural site to meeting certain criteria such as being old, historic, authentic, and aesthetic\textsuperscript{74}. In heritage designation, however, as I argued in chapter 5, government agencies and experts are not uniform in their views. This, therefore, creates several heritage lists which to some extent valorise the same heritage, and also at the same time diminish some places of importance. The significant differences amongst government agencies are between the local and national initiatives over heritage. The national initiatives of heritage involved in Aceh, in this case BPCB (the conservatory boards for preserving tangible material cultural remains), are dominated by archaeological views of heritage. Although there has been, as I explain in chapter 5, an historic city program driven by the Ministry of Public Work and BPPI and the Indonesian Heritage Trust (BPPI), in which architects and urban planners are also involved, the basic principles of this program are, like those programs initiated by BPCB, still strongly framed by the global AHD views of heritage. This is obvious in the way this program valorises material authenticity and age value (see Kementerian Pekerjaan Umum & (BPPI), n.d-a, n.d-b). The

\textsuperscript{74} Different criteria are developed by government agencies and experts to list heritage. Here I review several lists and criteria (criteria based, for example, from architecture department list developed for Historic City programs). The criteria are still based on Undang-undang Cagar Budaya (heritage law) which refers to global heritage practices. In developing a tentative list for the Historic City Program, the Architecture Department develops several criteria such as historical values, architectural values, and uniqueness values, amongst others.
national views of heritage, as depicted in the list of heritage sites developed by the BPCB and legalised by the Ministry of Education, do not count the three most iconic buildings in Banda Aceh discussed in this thesis – the Baiturrahman Mosque, the Tsunami Museum, and Peulanggahan Mosque – as heritage. The buildings do not have certificates of heritage from the Ministry of Education and Culture, which ensures their existence, and acknowledges as well as valorises their roles in shaping cultural identity. This happens due to such buildings being perceived as not being authentic and their materials not being old. This issue of authenticity and age are explored further in the next section.

In the local heritage lists developed by the Tourism and Culture Office, Architecture Department, and the spatial planning law (Qanun Tata Ruang) Banda Aceh 2009, these buildings are heritage. Local government and experts adopt the global AHD’s understanding of heritage, but at the same time still practice an organic heritage ethos. Their adoption of the organic ethos, arguably, is built by the connection of officials to a place where they grew up and live as part of the Acehnese community, but at the same time they follow the rules of heritage designation set up in the heritage system. The connection to place is obvious when such officials argue that particular places represent community sense of place and identity. Indeed, most of the representatives from local authorities that I interviewed are themselves Acehnese working as heritage agents or practitioners. Here the overlapping identities and views are clearly in tension. For example, in my interview with Nurdin AR, a former head of the Aceh Museum, he referred several times to places associated with community values like the mosque in Beureunun, which is an important place for the community and the history of the Acehnese, but is less than 50 years old. The conflicting interests in valuing the
places and negotiation between their emotional attachment and their duty as heritage agents have caused local authorities to expand their heritage definition. In addition, this is also an expression of their pride in the Acehnese past, so that they value this past and heritage associated with it in more subjective ways. Like the local government officials and experts, many of those Acehnese individuals interviewed in the street also considered iconic architecture as heritage, regardless of a sense of material authenticity and age, as long as the place in question was directly connected to them. In other words, place attachment is an important criteria for a place to be called heritage. These places are the physical representation of their identity and the background and medium where the identity as Acehnese is negotiated and shaped.

The other point to make is the relationship between the heritage conservation ethos adopted by local experts and community and familiar places. Following Relph (1976), the sense of place which makes a place familiar is constructed by three important factors – tangible objects, observable activities, and associated meanings and symbols. Both local experts and community members tend to agree that all these aspects are of importance for shaping familiarity of place in Banda Aceh, yet the emphasis placed on each element is different. This is influenced by the differing conservation ethos that both parties adopt. Expertise puts a strong emphasis on tangible aspects and meanings and symbols, while community members emphasise observable activities and meanings and symbols.

Thus, in a post-disaster context, the issues of the destruction in the built environment will become a primary concern of experts and government heritage agencies. The destruction of iconic architectural heritage, which is usually
associated with collective identity, is perceived as the destruction of identity; thus, without this architecture, there is no evidence of identity and the place is not the same; consequently it is no longer familiar. This concern then directs experts in disaster contexts to become involved primarily in protecting architectural and other material places from destruction or alteration. As argued by Rico (2014) the ‘heritage at risk discourse’ has classified heritage as a passive victim; rather than a witness to or part of the story of the event and source of resilience. For communities, the destruction of physical fabric hurts because it is a familiar place to which the collective memories are anchored, but as long as there is a chance for continuing traditional activities and practices, the meanings of a physical place still retain its symbolic values; consequently it is still familiar. In other words, what makes a place familiar for the community are memories, meanings, and values which are less vulnerable to destruction in disasters.

As I have mentioned in chapter 1, this research asks a central question “How is architectural heritage understood, conceived, used, and conserved after the 2004 tsunami in Banda Aceh, and how did this impact on the continuity of cultural identity and place familiarity, in providing survivors with potential resources to promote cultural resilience?”. This research is based on the premise that place familiarity is important in promoting survivor’s resilience, as suggested by current debates in the post-destruction literature (ICCROM, 2005; Barakat, 2007; Samuels, 2010; Daly & Rahmayati, 2012; Mahdi, 2012). Yet, it problematizes and challenges a strong notion of materiality as an important aspect of place familiarity and identity, so that conserving this physicality provides people with resilience. Building upon the work of Daly and Rahmayati (2012) on the importance of the built environment in maintaining place familiarity, and Samuels
(2010) on the roles of memories and everyday life in shaping resilience, my work looks at the importance of public buildings in shaping place familiarity, and examines how physical attributes, activities (functions) and meaning-making play a role in the social reconstruction and resilience process.

The data from my fieldwork supports the findings of the two research projects mentioned above. Iconic and landmark architecture, ranging from the city scale like the Baiturrahman Mosque and the Tsunami Museum, to the urban quarter or village scale like Peulanggahan Mosque, are important cultural assets for the residents of and visitors to Banda Aceh because of the activities at and around them, and the sense of place they create. Along with the importance of housing development, almost all my interviewees who were residents pointed to the importance of the social roles associated with iconic architecture. In addition, this iconic architecture is also important for visitors to orient themselves in a foreign place. Just after the disaster, they helped people to orient themselves, and it is an important aspect of the city that is remembered along with other personal sites. In addition, activities conducted at such architectural places have become an alternative source of resilience for survivors. In the light of increasing awareness of the importance of everyday buildings and environment, and the trend to move away from privileging iconic or landmark architecture, this prompts the question: why is iconic architecture of any significance for people in Banda Aceh? As the data chapter 6 illustrates, it is because iconic architecture plays a role in everyday life and day-to-day activities of people, so that this architectural banality enforces the sense of identity for people who are attached to it. In addition, the importance is not embodied in its material aspects; rather, supporting Samuels’ (2010) findings, it is in its social aspects. In other words, the physical aspects of iconic
architecture are remembered along with activities, events, and historical narratives entangled with such architecture. These factors make iconic architecture important for the Acehnese. Below, I discuss the range in understanding of heritage in Banda Aceh with regards to the issues of authenticity and age, as it is how these concepts are constructed that distinguishes the global AHD from the OHD in Banda Aceh.

7.3 Authenticity of a Place

The importance of place familiarity inextricably links to the preservation of place (or keeping a place in the same condition). This then links to a sense of ‘authenticity of place’. As the local and global AHD and the OHD have different views in terms of the concept of place familiarity, consequently, the two also understand place authenticity differently. As we return to the authenticity issues raised by the discourses outlined in chapter 5 and 6, it is important to note three points. First, the different discourses have substantially influenced the understanding authenticity. Second, the issue of age, or antiquity, inevitably influences the issue of authenticity of place. Thirdly, after the tsunami, an organic concept of authenticity has re-emerged.

In Banda Aceh, the significant debate of what makes a familiar place authentic, so that it is a heritage place, occurs over the issue of material authenticity and age. I start the discussion by considering how authenticity was defined in the reconstruction and development process following the tsunami. The
reconstruction process has paid little attention to the issues of heritage and place familiarity (Feener et al., 2011). This is arguably because Banda Aceh, on the whole, is not considered authentic because of the relatively frequent reconstruction of the urban landscape due to conflict and natural disasters. This is evident in the report provided by ICOMOS and ICOM that no news was reported about damage to Sumatra’s heritage after the disaster (Rico, 2014). In addition, as I mentioned in chapter 5, the ways global and national heritage organizations reacted to the destruction in Banda Aceh compared with other places that suffered disasters in Indonesia: Yogyakarta and Padang where significant heritage conservation activities were conducted by national and international heritage organization. This means, as I have disused in chapter 5, that in the middle of extensive destruction, in which almost 50% of the city of Banda Aceh collapsed and Peulanggahan Mosque and other local heritage places were destroyed, there was, from the perspective of the global AHD, no longer a single structure or example of fabric that was worth labelling as heritage. The AHD cannot readily recognize that Banda Aceh has heritage, because its long history and collective memories cannot be meaningful in the absence of authentic and old material pasts. Even its important symbols are not heritage. The Baiturrahman Mosque, the most recognised example of heritage for Acehnese people, is not officially recognised as heritage because its material is not authentic. Some expansions and replacements of material to accommodate current needs, such as the growing number of worshippers and to maintain the mosque, have failed to meet the global and national AHD’s standards. In addition, old Peulanggahan mosque is not officially heritage anymore due to its rebuilding in different materials. The Tsunami Museum and other tsunami debris are not perceived yet as heritage due to their young age. Therefore, the
reconstruction process driven by international donors and national funds has overlooked the existence of heritage places in Banda Aceh.

As previously discussed, local understandings of heritage constructs all the buildings mentioned above as heritage. In valorising the Tsunami Museum and other tsunami debris, the local heritage construct has waived the emphasis on age values and authenticity of material, so important to the global AHD. Rico (2014), in her examination of heritage in post-tsunami Banda Aceh, also found that the local understanding of heritage has challenged the global-led heritage discourse on the grounds of age. Rico (2014) is right in arguing this; the age factor has been eliminated in the importance of memories and histories of an event associated with “things”. It is evident in the inclusion in the local heritage list of the Tsunami Museum and other tsunami debris, such as PLTD Apung and the boat on the top of the house, despite their being less than 50 years old. The elimination of age factors is actually not new and has been practised for a long time in local heritage of Banda Aceh. Daly and Rahmayati (2012) have indicated that a newly built meunasah or mosque is regarded as Acehnese heritage. Thus, what happened during the reconstruction process, rebuilding a mosque in different style and acknowledging new building as heritage, is not entirely new; rather it is a re-emergence of organic heritage practice.

In addition to age values, ideas of authenticity have also been challenged. Kwanda’s (2010) research on authenticity in Javanese culture illustrates that the renewal of material is an important aspect of building conservation. This sense of conservation is also found in other Asian cultures (Byrne, 2011; Daly & Winter, 2012; Taylor, 2009; Winter, 2014). In Banda Aceh, renewal is still conducted as a
way to make a building last longer. The community are actively involved in taking care of the buildings by ensuring that the buildings are in sound condition for conducting relevant activities. This activity of making a building sound by adding new material is regarded within the AHD as damaging authenticity. As my interview with a BPCB official demonstrates:

The community actually have looked after the heritage buildings, yet the ways they do this are still wrong. For example in looking after Indrapuri Mosque, the community added cement without prior consultation with BPCB officials to mend the damaged stone parts, and added zinc roofing in other parts to shade the mosque, which made the appearance of the mosque inauthentic or reduce it aesthetic appeal.

The renewal of materials of iconic architecture is undertaken to make buildings last longer, so that such buildings can perform their social roles as containers of activities which are of importance. In addition, my findings stress the physical aspects need not always be original in terms of materials, forms, and styles as long as the silhouettes of the fabric looks the same, the buildings are there and the activities are unchanged. Or in other words, the replication of form involved in the Baiturrahman expansion and Peulanggahan rebuilding seems essential in creating familiarity as well. In this sense, renewal of material and rebuilding of a religious building in sound condition, as I demonstrated in Chapter 4, are undertaken to ensure the continuity of cultural practices. All of these practices can provide resources for people's resilience as discussed below.
7.4 Between Trauma and Resilience, and Remembering and Forgetting

Banda Aceh is one example of a resilient city. Throughout its history, as I have discussed in chapter 4, Banda Aceh has undergone various disasters and wars. The city has several times re-emerged and even moved from one location to another. (see chapter 5 for the map). The Sultan’s palace and the city centre have been moved and built in different locations.

In keeping with the topic of this thesis, resilience is discussed in relation to the act of remembering and forgetting drawing on the discussion undertaken in chapter 2. As I have discussed in chapter 2, resilience is an ability to overcome traumatising experiences. This relationship is paradoxical in the post-disaster society of Banda Aceh because remembering involves not only resilience, but also trauma and forgetting. To some extent, to remember the traumatised past is to live with the scars, and thus to live with trauma; while to forget is to withdraw from the scars. Resilience is neither determined by remembering nor by forgetting, it is a way of moving forward by accepting the tragic event as part of us. In this sense, I argue, the basic understanding of what heritage is, which consequently influences the understanding of what is architectural heritage, has a significant role in influencing the ways government and community in Banda Aceh see resilience, trauma, remembering, and forgetting.

The government and community have different mechanisms for dealing with trauma. To some extent, the policy makers and experts in their intention to show their awareness of trauma are possible for damaging the ability of the community to be resilient. Through urban planning law, which is reflected in the Master Plan
for Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Aceh and Nias 2005, on one hand, the government shows its awareness of trauma by providing a better city that is responsive to a disaster by creating a mitigation plan (Indonesian Government, 2005). The mitigation plan aims to reduce anxiety and trauma, and has been designed to reduce the level of catastrophe of a disaster. In addition, to educate people about tsunami mitigation, a Tsunami Museum has been created as a tsunami education centre and an escape building, apart from its other function as a memorial for the 2004 tsunami. In the museum an earthquake 3D experience (wahana 3D) and a video containing evacuation information explaining the mitigation system of the tsunami have been created. On the other hand, the government established a tabula rasa reconstruction, which has been criticised as showing a lack of awareness of trauma; in particular this approach has been criticised for mitigation plan mandates removing people from coastal areas, and thus removing them from familiar locations, their social networks and communal and religious activities (Daly & Rahmayati, 2012; Mahdi, 2012; Samuels, 2010). In addition, this tabula rasa approach also mandates the removal of natural tsunami debris. This removal of tsunami debris has been criticised by Rico (2014) as a lack of awareness of mitigation. Quoting McAdoo et al (2006), she argues that the debris are emerging heritage, and are witness to the tsunami (Rico, 2014, p. 16).

Rico (2014) is quite right in arguing this because the representation of memories and knowledge in materiality helps the Acehnese to calm their fear of losing more people in the future. By having memorials, people preserve the tsunami memories; so that the imagined future generation have knowledge of this event and can better reduce its impacts. Following Fredericks (2011), memorial creation is related to providing a place for public mourning. In Banda Aceh, the establishment of the
tsunami museum can be interpreted as not only providing knowledge of the mitigation system, but also as a way to reduce trauma. The reduction of trauma provided by a memorial is also evident in Poland, as Fredericks (2011) reveals in her work of ‘Remembering Katyn: Mourning, Memory, and National Identity’. The memorial constructed at the burial site at Katyn 75 has acted as a place for alleviating trauma and is the symbol of Poland’s struggle for freedom against censorship history. Through this public expression, extending Caruth’s (1991) theory of trauma curing, the trauma can be cured because it is publicly talked about and acknowledged. Memorials provide a place for the scars to be publicly acknowledged (Byrne, 2009; Huyssen, 2003).

In contrast to government, the community has pursued at least three major ways of encouraging resilience as indicated in chapter 6: to tie oneself to a familiar place shaped by the built environment and past memories, and to use religion, in this case the Islamic mechanism of reducing trauma by remembering God as a director of human destinies, and/or to avoid places of trauma. As discussed above, and as Samuels (2010) also demonstrates, being in familiar places is imperative for survivors because it gives a foundation from which to rebuild, and reminds them of missing people, thus contributing to people’s resilience after the disaster.

The use of the Islamic mechanisms of dealing with trauma by reciting praise to Allah and praying in private and public contexts has been extensively discussed by Samuels (2010) and Smith (2012). Samuels’s arguments are illustrated by the example of the forty year old woman in chapter 6 who describes her method of boosting resilience by being in the Baiturrahman Mosque and feeling that she is

75 In 1940, the Katyn Massacre, saw approximately 22,000 Polish citizens killed by the Soviet secret police under Stalin’s orders. The victims were then buried in mass graves.
closer to God. In addition, the religious places like the mosques have gained symbolic added value due to their survival rates in the face of the tsunami (Daly & Rahmayati, 2012). The mosques tended to be the structures that survived amongst the flattened landscape. Therefore, the notion of tying memories to objects or materiality is paradoxical in a traumatised society, a just-destroyed city. Surviving physical fabric takes on a reinforced sense of permanence. The mosque is seen as a safe place for seeking refuge from a disaster, so an organic way of being resilient is being in and visiting the mosque. Even though the mosques were not designed as places of mitigation or refuge, they culturally become a safe place. People ascribe their value as a place of refuge through a religious and cultural process, their belief is that the mosques were saved by divine intervention, and are seen as houses of God. At the same time as these religious buildings provide a safe physical place for seeking refuge and conducting religious activities, they also remind people of traumatic events, but arguably not in traumatised ways; rather, in the ways the traumatising event might remind the religious about the power of God. Therefore, these buildings are also unintentional memorials which remind people of many memories, even beyond the designated ones. The meanings of these buildings consequently are very loose and have the potential for triggering dissonance.

7.5 Places of Dissonances and 'Looseness' of Places

In their daily and political uses, iconic architecture may be defined as 'loose' and dissonant places. Public places, according to Franck & Stevens (2006) and Rodrigo
(2011), can be understood as ‘loose’ in the sense that people will conduct their activities in ways that extends the originally intended activities for those locations. For them, looseness is reflected in the way people appropriate public places to suit their own uses, which may contradict intended uses. Looseness is caused not only by activities conducted in such places, but also memory and identity contestation where the meanings and values are challenged, so that, in this regard, following Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996), they are also places of dissonance. For them, the planners should be able to manage this dissonance through at least two approaches: a minimalist approach which recognises only features which can be accepted by all groups as heritage and an inclusivist approach which acknowledges that all features have different, and sometimes competing, heritage values. Instead of seeing dissonance as a negative state, I would go along with Smith (2006, p. 82), who sees dissonance itself as a heritage process which is on one hand about regulating and legitimatizing, and on the other hand about working out, contesting, and challenging a range of cultural and social identities, senses of place, collective memories, values, and meanings (see also Graham, et al., 2000). This process happens every day in people’s minds, and is represented in the ways they use the places and activities conducted at places. I analyse the dissonances and looseness of the iconic architecture based on several possibilities that might occur. Firstly, I elaborate the potentiality of dissonances of the museum design, which is relatively beautiful, and the mournful memories it represents, and the function of the museum as a memorial for solemn events as well as tourism activities and daily uses. Secondly, I discuss the dissonance and looseness of using the Baiturrahman Mosque, a religious building, as a tourism destination and icon, and its design, a Dutch inheritance, and the symbolic role it has for Acehnese people’s and Banda Aceh’s identity. Thirdly, I interrogate further the dissonance caused by the deletion
of Peulanggahan Mosque from the heritage list for the community that emerged from the disaster.

The Baiturrahman Mosque has a very complex set of dissonant values attached to it, perhaps more than the other two iconic architectural heritage places analysed in this thesis. The greatest potential dissonance is using the mosque as a tourism symbol and destination. Underlying this dissonance is fear of the loss of the mosque’s sacredness. This dissonance is related to the mosque visitation and certain dress codes and required behaviour. On one hand, the mosque management and certain groups of ulama (imam) want to keep the mosque as a central place for Islamic sharia. This means all activities at the mosque have to be conducted in accordance with sharia Islam, including dress and behaviour. In the mosque there has been separation of males and females, not only in the mosque, but also in the fenced area around the mosque. On the other hand, the mosque attracts people to come, even in the absence of tourism promotion. The mosque itself has the power, lent by meanings and values Acehnese people have attached to it for years, to draw people to visit, and this has increased with the symbolic role it places in being one of the few buildings to survive the tsunami, and at which many survivors sheltered from the water. In the light of the campaign to attract tourists to the city, and the mosque’s role as a symbol for this, the mosque has increasingly become central to the tourism industry of Banda Aceh. During my fieldwork, I could see people taking photos from outside of the mosque’s fence, because they were not dressed in accordance with Islamic rules, and presumably could not come into the mosque. A sign at the gate strongly warns people that they are entering an Islamic dress code area. Dress issues have become the most well-known dissonance in relation to the mosque. A good example of this issue is a
complaint and debate on Facebook. An owner of one Facebook pages asked, “why (is) his friend, who did not wear Islamic dress, was not allowed to pray at the mosque?”. Most responses to this debated the tensions between human rights and religious rules, and how boundaries of both overlapped and interwove. To avoid this kind of conflict, and to accommodate tourists’ needs, the Banda Aceh’s local government, with the permission of the mosque management, established a changing room where tourists can get a jubbah. Providing this changing room is a way of managing dissonance. This balances maintaining the sacredness of the mosque and allowing visitors to enjoy it.

The Tsunami Museum has some potential examples of dissonance regarding the memories it represents, and its beauty and uses. It becomes dissonant because of the complexity of using a beautiful representation of a mournful memory. While certainly not exclusive to Banda Aceh, the tension between aesthetic and traumatic memories, as argued by Kaplan (2007), is inherent in the design principles applied to memorials. Indeed, as argued by Kaplan (2007), beauty is considered useful in increasing the possibility of a memory being remembered. At the same time, as argued by Nora (1989), sites of memory like architectural heritage also displace memories. In this regard, this beauty enhances the possibility of remembering certain memories valorised through the creation of a memorial; while it enhances the possibility of forgetting excluded memories. In other words, it is mournful because it represents a traumatic event and reinforces the forgetting of other events which might be important for identity, but they are not represented by such a beautiful memorial.
At Peulanggahan Mosque, the dissonance focuses on the inclusion and exclusion of the mosque in heritage registers, which has funding and emotional consequences. In the years following the disaster, and in the midst of the local community's physical and social reconstruction of their life, they had to self-fund maintenance of the mosque. The immediate need for the mosque meant that it had to be rebuilt with different materials. From my interview with various actors involved in the mosque reconstruction, I conclude that the Peulanggahan villagers proposed rebuilding the mosque to BRR. The rebuilding was undertaken without consultation with BPCB, which previously funded the maintenance of the mosque.

From the perspective of the head of the village, the mosque should be rebuilt, but lacking available timber and artisanal expertise, it was rebuilt using bricks and other modern materials which were available. He also indicated that he himself, and others involved, tried to retain the architectural style – three-tiered roof, as mandated by BPCB. After the reconstruction, the BPCB, referring to the guidelines for heritage funding, the Indonesian heritage law no.11 year 2010, deleted the mosque from their list and withdrew funding to the mosque. However, as aforementioned, due to reasons to do with authenticity, the BPCB keeps funding the maintenance of the mausoleum of Teungku Dianjong next to the mosque. The mausoleum is regarded as authentic since it has had no significant material damage or change. Besides this funding consequence, the deletion has caused emotional consequences; people are upset. The head of Peulanggahan Village expressed his disappointment:

How come we save such a building (Peulanggahan Mosque), we ourselves even almost died...we cannot keep it original in material....
the deletion takes away the funding for the mosque to have adequate
maintaining funding. .

In addition to this dissonance, the iconic places are also ‘loose’ places. I analyse this
looseness in terms of two things: activities and interpretations. The looseness can
occur because the iconic buildings serve not only their original designated
functions and activities: for the mosques are both religious and commemorative
like a museum 76, and tourism also gives the places recreational aspects and other
casual activities. It is very hard to manage activities at public places. These
activities however are not determining. In Banda Aceh people come to the iconic
buildings for various reasons, use them in various ways, and recall a wide range of
memories from the personal to the collective. In addition, the experiences, feelings,
and meanings people negotiate are not singular. Apart from the use I have
mentioned there are other uses that were not originally intended. Even for the
mosque, which is strictly controlled by the mosque management, some looseness
in the way it is used also takes place. For example, during my participant
observation I found several activities that were not related to the intended
function of the mosque77: there were a group of students doing their assignments
at the mosque, a group of males held a meeting, a couple of males were selling toys
and finger foods, some beggars wander through the mosque, and even some
people, both males and female, were sleeping in the mosque. This sleeping activity
significantly increases during the day of Ramadhan, especially after midday prayer.
There were 20-40 people lying down. Sleeping, however, is strictly controlled.

76As discussed in Chapter 4 this museum was designed to commemorate the tsunami and the reconstruction
process. The educational aspects are also presented as a way to commemorate the tsunami. To remember the
tsunami people are educated about the tsunami, so that they can survive future tsunamis. In addition,
whatever people do at the museum, even if they are just curious about the tsunami, they are also
commemorating.

77How the mosque is used in recent Islamic society is discussed in chapter 4
Mosque workers walk around the mosque interior to wake up people and other workers approach people and wake them up. Sleeping in the mosque, and mosque workers patrolling with a microphone, becomes a unique experience in the mosque during Ramadhan. At Peulanggahan Mosque, such observable unintended uses could probably not occur to any significant extent since this mosque is not visited by a lot of visitors and worshippers. At the Tsunami Museum, as discussed in chapter 6, it the use by a punk community which was initially stopped by government officials on the basis of security concerns and cultural values, yet, as revealed in my interviews, the punks came back to the museum as they found the museum reflects for them a message of freedom. As the museum was designated as a public place, not only as a memorial, people simply just hang out under the museum, even when the museum is closed. Therefore, as Rodrigo (2011) and Steven's (Stevens, 2007, 2013) argue, public spaces, regardless of their commemorative function as monuments (usually associated with a positive event) and memorials (negative), are loose spaces and can even be consumed as fun places.

The looseness of place is evident in my fieldwork; during my participant observation sitting under the big tree at the Peulanggahan complex, a young woman who had just arrived approached me. We became involved in an everyday conversation. She asked me what I was doing and whose graveyard it was. Her expression was normal until I answered her question about the graveyard. Once I said the Teungku Dianjong, the woman reacted, and her expression suddenly changed from impressed to fearful, and she hurried to leave. Her reaction leaves me questioning: why did she rush and what did she think about the graveyard? It seems in her mind this place has a special meaning and value; it is sanctified
(keuramat in local language). In Acehnese society people believe one should behave well and prepare oneself to encounter a sanctified place. This woman, I assume, had not prepared or expected to encounter such a place.

This example also gives evidence of the role of background, previous experience, and the memories of the past of observers in influencing their interpretation. These factors are involved in people’s comprehension of the place that they are experiencing at the moment. Previous experiences and memories are negotiated during the visit, and in turn this visit also becomes memories that will be negotiated upon another visit afterwards. Therefore, people always encounter new experience and memories even though they visit the same place several times (Smith, 2006).

While as Rodrigo (2011) and Stevens (2013) are concerned with the looseness of activities, it is evident from my data that memories at architectural places also grapple with the same sense of ‘looseness’. In this sense, a memorial can trigger different memories beyond the intended ones, such as the example quoted from a novel entitled Austerlitz in chapter 2. The character in this novel experiences a place that he has never seen before, but this place prompts him to remember his past. It is also evident in the way my interviewees in Banda Aceh describe places, including iconic buildings, by associating with places they have seen before, especially for those who have travelled to different places. The dark tunnel (the tsunami alley) in the museum, for some, is experienced differently. For some it seems like simply a tunnel, for others it is imbue with spirit of deceased people or sometimes it is associated with other places they have visited before. In the case of tourists to Banda Aceh, they do not only consume and negotiate their own
memories but also local memories at the same time. Understanding other’s memories influences people in understanding their own (Urry, 1996). Here are some examples of different associations of the Tsunami Museum and the Baiturrahman Mosque:

The museum reminds me of a Japanese Tunnel in Bukit Tinggi because
it is dark and scary

Female, Museum 09, Pensioner, Acehnese

Seeing this museum reminds me of a Japanese Memorial for the
Hiroshima Bomb I visited 10 years ago

Male, Museum 11, Architect, Australia

The posts of the mosque (the Baiturrahman Mosque) are pretty the like
those in the Nabawi Mosque (Medina, Saudi Arabia)....they are coated
with gold, this mosque is really like that mosque...

Female, Baiturrahman 37, Housewife, Acehnese
It is misleading if we assume that public places only prompt certain memories and are used as they were designated. They are actually, following Rodrigo (2011) and Stevens (2013), loose places. Memories are not only contained and triggered by merely a designed memorial, but also by other un-designed states like other buildings, events, and even the whole city or environment itself. This is also evident in Banda Aceh. In examining memories working at the three landmark architectural heritage in Banda Aceh, I found the Tsunami Museum of course triggers tsunami memories, but the other two icons also triggers tsunami memories even though, as with the mosques, they were not designed to memorialize the tsunami. The tsunami memory is another layer added on top of existing layers of memories. Amongst the three collective memories I documented, the Baiturrahman Mosque is the place where the three overlap and are interrelated. Therefore, the mosque is the most complex palimpsest of the collective memories with several meanings; the memories and meanings of not only Banda Aceh and its inhabitants, but also the Acehnese and visitors. Here the example of the tsunami memories is also assigned to the mosque:

The Baiturrahman Mosque is so incredible because it survived the tsunami….God saved it because it is a house of God…so that I remember the tsunami when visiting the mosque

Male, Baiturrahman13a, Food seller, Javanese
In relation to the tsunami, the Baiturrahman Mosque, is also a tsunami symbol, but a symbol of resilience. This contrasts to the Tsunami Museum which was designed for remembering the tsunami. The building designs: the dark tunnel (tsunami alley), light of God, tomb-like screen display, and the displays: Al Quran recitation, pictures, video, and diorama, have a power to evoke the trauma, and feelings of sadness, fear and other negative feelings. It is a place of trauma, while the mosque is a place of healing of trauma. The tsunami museum is a tragic place as well as a tourism place where leisure needs are fulfilled. To experience the tsunami through 3D theatre is not only undertaken for leisure, it can possibly have spiritual consequences. People enjoy places of trauma for educational purposes, but they may generate a sense of empathy and religious contemplation for those who are religious.

Therefore, it is misleading to argue that the Acehnese have little awareness of the tsunami symbol, as Leeuwen (2011) has done in his study of pre and post tsunami symbolism in Banda Aceh. He argues that the awareness of tsunami-related locations is quite low and the Baiturrahman Mosque remains important. This, for him, means important locations have not changed much after the tsunami. He only identifies two new tsunami locations, Kapal Apung and the mass graveyards, as important places (Leeuwen, 2011, p. 160). In this regard, he has misinterpreted his data by assuming that Acehnese people have little awareness of the symbols of the tsunami. He is misleading in two ways. Firstly, he assumes the Baiturrahman Mosque is not a tsunami place or symbol. In fact, in my interviews the Baiturrahman Mosque has been fully rendered and layered with tsunami memories. He seems to contradict himself, on one hand acknowledging that the existing buildings like the Baiturrahman Mosque have been associated with
tsunami memories and gained added symbolic values after the tsunami. However, he stresses that for something to be a monument it must be constructed as such. This narrow definition thus denies the possibility that something, in the same way as the Baiturrahman Mosque, has monumental and memorializing values.

Secondly, Leeuwen (2011) fails to acknowledge a number of observable non-official memorials for the tsunami, such as graffiti about the tsunami, as a form of monument or symbol of memorializing. In Banda Aceh, in fact, there has been a boom in tsunami memorials. The memorial emerged not only from government initiatives, but also organically from people’s unofficial efforts. The graffiti and association of existing buildings with tsunami memories are examples of popular initiatives. The graffiti mostly consists of ‘tsunami’, ‘26 Desember’ (in the local language), and the names of the dead or missing owners of the houses on which the graffiti is written.

The most immediate action people took was writing graffiti on the wall of wrecked or flattened buildings. One example, taken from a destroyed house in Lampulo, written in broken English is: “Don’t broken. Tsunami Minggu 26 Des 2004, jam 8:27”, which intends to freeze the moment of the tsunami by using architectural aspects as the medium. The wrecked wall itself is the witness and memorial for the tsunami, and the addition of graffiti on the top of it strengthens its role as a memorial. This example also shows how architecture needs narrative text or interpretation to support its role as a store of memory. In addition to these observable memorials, there is ceremony for commemorating the tsunami with public piety.
7.6 Rethinking of Conservation Process in the Face of Disaster

Up to this point, in relation to the uses of architectural heritage in post-disaster Acehnese society, I have teased out several important issues: authenticity, age, resilience, and dissonance. This section returns to the critiques of global theory and practice in architectural conservation outlined in Chapter 2. I have examined how global theory and practice tackle these issues and implement policy. In addition, I have problematized the approaches used in global theory and practice, especially focusing on adaptive reuse in Chapter 2. Now I juxtapose and review these critiques with my research findings.

Smith (2006), argues that all heritage is intangible, yet, as my data suggests, there are also places of heritage. Heritage representations in forms of materiality like architectural heritage are important. However, what makes my argument different from the global AHD or European understanding of heritage is the way we deal with and treat this materiality. On one hand I acknowledge the physical consequences of the heritage process, and architectural heritage consequently has a physical aspect that makes it tangible and concrete, yet on the other hand, I problematize and challenge the ways global theory and practice had dealt with this materiality or tangible representation of the heritage process.

My research findings have showed that in order to help this process, architecture has dual roles as a tangible anchor (physical aspect) and a cultural place or place of activities (social, cultural, religious, and even political aspects). This finding is in line with Daly and Rahmayati (2012). They argue for the importance of the built environment, and suggest that rebuilding with significant changes after a disaster
is not only potentially disorienting to communities looking to re-establish connections with familiar settings, because things look, feel, and seem foreign, but also because many latent coping and recovery mechanisms that communities need to draw upon in such times are interrelated with the material world in which they existed (Daly & Rahmayati, 2012, p. 61)

My research findings suggest, as I have outlined above, that familiarity is created by the interrelation of forms and functions of architectural heritage. The familiar form, however, does not lie in ideas of material authenticity and age. Rather, with the OHD, the destruction of physical fabric hurts because it is a familiar place to which the collective memories are anchored, but as long as there is a chance for continuing traditional activities and practices, the meanings of a physical place still retain their symbolic values; consequently it is still familiar. In other words, what makes a place familiar for a community are memories, meanings, and cultural and religious values which are less vulnerable to destruction during disaster. People will accept changes caused by disaster and other forms of uncontrolled destruction as long as this destruction, especially the mosques, is from God, and so that, they welcome physical changes in the process of reconstruction. This means architecture is just a container for social recoveries through social, cultural, and religious activities.

In the architectural heritage literature, however, architectural heritage has been strongly regarded as only a tangible anchor (see for example Jokilehto, 1999; Orbasli, 2008). This means that the physical aspects of architecture lend their importance to architectural heritage and activities conducted in and around such architecture. Therefore, the preservation and conservation of these physical
aspects become a main concern in global architectural heritage conservation (Jokilehto, 1999; Orbasli, 2008; Sharr, 2010). The importance given to the physicality of architecture has eclipsed other essential aspects of architecture, uses and functions. In architectural conservation, as discussed in chapter 2, the surge of adaptive reuse as a conservation approach has arisen as an alternative for the current need of spaces and environmental issues. At the surface, the adaptive reuse method of conservation seems to pay attention to functional aspects of architecture (see for example Orbasli, 2008; Plevoets & Cleempoel, 2011). I acknowledge that in some cultures the preservation of forms is important. Yet, in other cultures, especially in my case study of Banda Aceh, which is not only continuously under threats of disaster but also influenced by Islamic teachings and Southeast Asian culture more broadly, the preservation of functions and activities comes first.

My research findings provide evidence that the changing structure of architectural heritage does not necessarily affect place attachment, and a building can remain authentic to its users or community. The Baiturrahman Mosque is considered authentic in the midst of changes of physical fabric outlined in chapter 6. In the mind of users this mosque has not undergone any change. The alteration and enlargement, in the same style to accommodate new needs and a larger space, are not regarded as changes that damage its authenticity. The Peulanggahan Mosque also remains authentic for people even though it has been reconstructed after being destroyed in 2004. What people value is the authenticity of experience when engaging with the mosques. The authenticity of architecture does not largely lie with physical form, but rather on activities and function.
As I discussed in Chapter 2, the relationship between the status of heritage and its pivotal elements -- age and authenticity -- are not straightforward as assumed in the global conservation ethos, where a building is heritage because it is historical, unique, authentic and old enough. The issue of authenticity is quite complex for several reasons. If consider that a building should be original/authentic, and if buildings have undergone changes, we need to ask to what extent and to what forms or style and/or in what era’s style it should it be preserved. All buildings, especially those from the very distant past, have been repaired in subsequent eras following initial construction. For example, the Parthenon was rebuilt to a new form in the second century AD (Jokilehto, 1999, p. 3), so we want to conserve the Parthenon to what era’s version should we repair it to? Which style of authenticity should we follow? If we follow Le-Duc, we should restore it to its era of development, but then which era? The era after reconstruction or the era when it was constructed? Secondly, some buildings are not finished in the same era that building started - when the building continues in a subsequent time it might be with different style and materials. Thirdly, some buildings do not have a well-documented record. What about a building that is no longer there?

Fortunately, the global AHD has acknowledged the diversity in defining what is heritage and its authenticity. UNESCO has tried to stretch the definition of heritage and its authenticity beyond the tangible. This is reflected through the 2003 UNESCO Convention on Intangible Heritage. In addition, in 1994 several elements of Asian concepts of authenticity have also been defined in the Nara Document on Authenticity. This document, in article 13, acknowledges the authenticity of form and design, materials and substance, use and functions, traditions and techniques, location and setting, spirit and feeling, and other internal and external factors
In 2009, UNESCO enacted the Hoi An Protocol for Best Conservation Practices in Asia: Professional Guidelines for Assuring and Preserving the Authenticity of Heritage Sites in the Context of the Cultures of Asia. This protocol is a follow up of the UNESCO Regional Workshop “Conserving the Past- An Asian Perspective of Authenticity in the Consolidation, Restoration, and Reconstruction of Historic Monument and Sites” in Hoi An, Vietnam 2001. Several nations, in accordance to their cultural context, have also adopted this authenticity concept in their charters, such as the *Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China* (2000) and the INTACH Charter (2004). In this sense, UNESCO has become relatively sensitive to the variety of cultures and heritage beyond European understandings. In addition, and still in line with this understanding, UNESCO has extended its understanding of heritage from single buildings or sites to include a whole city as heritage through their Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) concept. This concept acknowledges the importance of sense of place and other intangible aspects of place as heritage (Taylor, 2011). In addition, through the growing influence of non-architectural disciplines involved in conservation, such as geography and anthropology, non-monumental buildings such as indigenous architecture, vernacular architecture and other buildings that are valued outside of the Western AHD are increasingly being identified as having heritage value. This inclusion was shown by the enactment of the ICOMOS charter on the Built Vernacular Heritage in 1999.

I also acknowledge that UNESCO has also paid attention to the issues of heritage and disaster by enacting the ‘Managing Disaster Risks for World Heritage guidelines’ (UNESCO, 2010). Several steps of preventing and coping with disaster at World Heritage sites have been carefully illustrated. However, this UNESCO
guideline only covers World Heritage sites. The document recognizes the resilience of traditional heritage (cultural heritage properties) and its role in providing shelter and psychological support to affected communities (UNESCO, 2010, p. 3). The protection of physical authenticity and integrity has become one of the main concerns of the impact of disaster on heritage sites (UNESCO, 2010). This is reflected in the ways the guideline mandates mapping the destruction, and then repairing and reconstructing the property back to its original form. This is because, from the perspective of UNESCO, tangible heritage, like architectural heritage and its material aspects, are very prone to decay and destruction caused by natural processes, human activities, and disaster. This of course contrasts to what people in my fieldwork think of heritage. As I have mentioned several times, for them, architectural heritage is a scaffolding or place for containing their activities, and the authenticity does not largely lie on material authenticity; rather on function and activities conducted at such places. In this sense, this heritage is not so prone to disaster.

However, in the UNESCO heritage guidelines, what is considered as important aspects of heritage authenticity are not in line with its acknowledgement of local culture, which often has a different way of defining what is or is not authentic. These disaster reduction guideless need to be more in step with the sensibilities of the Nara document, An Hoi protocol, and HUL concept, because respect for local culture in the face of disaster will illustrate care and respect to the society affected by a disaster. As argued by Ancherson (2007), attention to heritage in the face of destruction is a reflection of our care. In addition, too much attention to material authenticity in dealing with heritage places in post disaster society has the potential to delay survivor resilience. As an example, I have explored in this thesis
how the reconstructions of Peulanggahan Mosque contributed to people’s resilience.

In the face of increasing disaster threats (as reported by UNISDR, 2009 on the Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction, Risk and Poverty in Changing Climate), heritage is assumed to be increasingly threatened. Despite the concessions UNESCO has made in acknowledging Asian heritage values, it still treats heritage as a passive victim to be protected from the destruction caused by the disaster (Rico, 2014). It indicates that the destruction of physical aspects of heritage would be regarded as destruction of heritage as a whole. Following this view, the 2004 tsunami would be regarded as having destroyed Banda Aceh’s heritage, so that many places would lose their heritage status. As is evident in Banda Aceh, heritage in fact was, and continues to be, one of the resources of resilience (Daly & Rahmayati, 2012; Rico, 2014). Therefore, careful attention to local understandings of heritage is imperative when providing disaster relief and in protecting heritage in the face of disaster.

In addition, drawing from my research data, associating the destruction of heritage with the mere destruction of its physical aspect is complicated in at least two circumstances. Firstly, I analyse this complexity in the Islamic society of Banda Aceh, where Islam is not only a religion but frames most cultural and traditional practices. The Western idea of heritage as tangible is not directly applicable to Islamic culture. In Islam, all things are seen as mortal and transient; while the global AHD tend to assume that heritage is, or at least should be, immortal. Expertise, in the global AHD, is mandated to look after heritage so that it can live longer and never die (Herzfeld, 2014). Things, even the human body and soul in
Islamic teachings, do not belong to us; rather they belong to God. Fabric is therefore seen as impermanent, and activities conducted at the material place are timeless, so that Muslim’s have a duty of stewardship to ensure that future generations sustain all these activities. Secondly, in post-disaster contexts, materiality is prone to destruction. Life under the threat of potential and actual disaster has taught Acehnese to be resilient as well. Material place or fabric will be replaced immediately so that routine activities can carry on. An example of this I gave in chapter 4 is how Rumoh Aceh, the Acehnese traditional houses, was rebuilt after fire.

UNESCO and ICOMOS, so heavily invested in the global AHD, could usefully rethink the status of destroyed, rebuilt, and emerging heritage after disaster. The disaster and reconstruction process may be viewed as part of heritage processes that leave an imprint in the built environment. The global AHD should acknowledge other architecture that has been transformed or lost its original shape and form, yet still contains the other essential aspect of architecture, that of function, as architectural heritage too. So far, what has been practised in architectural heritage conservation is the deletion or exclusion as heritage of buildings which, while having the same function, have altered structures. Yet, buildings that have changed their function, with the form slightly altered to fit new uses, is still heritage. Architecture is created as a container for our activities (Ching & Eckler, 2013) and, therefore, is designed according to intended functions. If we acknowledge that buildings can change functions and still remain heritage, the assumption on which the adaptive reuse approach is based, we should also acknowledge that a building can change form and still remain heritage, a position I call adaptive reform. This thesis argues for a reconsideration of local and global architectural heritage understandings, and
consequently conservation, is needed. Any debate in architectural conservation needs to acknowledge the existence of different cultural perspectives and the implications of this for heritage conservation. As heritage is inherently dissonant, as Smith (2006) argues, heritage becomes a process and a place where various discourses are negotiated. Thus, the recording of every divergent discourse becomes an important part of heritage and architectural conservation.

7.7 Conclusion

On one hand, different terms and concepts of authenticity significantly influence the ways experts, policy makers and grassroots communities treat and understand heritage. The national and global AHDs see authenticity as material authenticity. Although UNESCO, through several charters, such as on HUL (Historic Urban Landscape) and the Nara document on authenticity, has acknowledged a subject-centred, rather than object-centred, heritage approach, the AHD as defined by Smith (2006) remains dominant. The object-centred approach and the view that authenticity lies in material not only ignores the Asian, especially Islamic heritage tradition, both of which focus on the uses of heritage and the more intangible aspects of heritage, but it also ignores the possibility that places destroyed by disasters may maintain their heritage value, while also tending to ignore emerging heritage after a disaster. This view, in addition, overlooks the importance of intangible aspects of places, such as a sense of familiarity, social values, and the memories people associate with places. Therefore the reconstruction process can be criticised as lacking an understating of how heritage may be used locally as a
resource for resilience. This is particularly marked in the design of the new spatial planning of Banda Aceh and its associated mitigation practices, as this has ignored the importance of familiarity of place constructed by memories and activities, and it treats heritage as a passive victim, as a thing, that has no ongoing context in people’s sense of place after a disaster.

On the other hand, although the global AHD in Banda Aceh influences the local AHD, the local conservation ethos, the OHD, also facilitates the inclusion of new emerging places associated with the tsunami as heritage. This has seen, for example, the PLTD Apung and the boat on the top of the house being included in the local government heritage list, as well as local heritage NGOs’ list. The involvement of Banda Aceh in the Historic City Program will also open the opportunity for promoting the tsunami places and altered architectural heritage which are imbued with the spirit of the OHD.

For the community, the OHD constructs heritage as intangible. Age and material authenticity are not important within the OHD. Rather, the continuity of memories through religious, cultural, and social activities are keys in providing survivor resilience. The attitudes toward heritage as being impermanent, influenced by Islamic and South-east Asian values and continuous living in a disaster prone area, has shaped a mentality that heritage is impermanent.
CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

This research examines the consequences of focusing too much attention on the tangible aspects of architectural heritage conservation in post-disaster contexts, particularly in an Islamic society within Southeast Asia. It has been the task of this thesis to step outside of the European-led global definition of architectural heritage, which has focuses on materiality, and to offer a definition of heritage which represents non-Western culture where disasters are prevalent society. To do this the argument that heritage is a process (Harvey, 2001; Smith, 2006) has been expanded and combined with existing debates in architecture, heritage, post-disaster studies, memories studies, and architectural conservation studies. In addition, the argument that heritage is a cultural process has also been extended to understand the role of architectural heritage in promoting a people’s resilience in the face of disaster. This thesis challenges the notion of the familiarity of architectural heritage that has been unproblematically associated with its material aspects -- as styles, forms, and details -- since these aspects represent cultural continuity and identity -- more often the national ones. In the face of disaster the destruction of physical aspects of heritage are traditionally regarded by those heritage experts operating in the Euro-centric AHD as also resulting in the destruction of heritage. The dominant assumption is that heritage values cannot continue to exist if the physical or material aspects of place are destroyed or significantly altered.
The critical heritage studies literature has been of benefit to this research, as it sees heritage as a social, cultural or political phenomena, and not simply something to be ‘conserved’, and has provided an overarching framework for the research. I have argued that an understanding of architectural heritage that suits a post-disaster context within Islamic Southeast Asia culture needs to be explored. By employing the idea of heritage as a cultural process I argue that architectural heritage – both its forms and functions – provides scaffolding for memories, a cultural tool to facilitate the remembering process for identity formation, and to contain activities and processes that sustain resilience in the face of disaster; in turn it represents identity and symbolises resilience. It is in the interaction between forms and functions that architecture turns into architectural heritage and becomes meaningful. Thus, a building is not in itself heritage, but rather, as Smith (2006) notes, the activities that occur in and around it, and the values attributed to it, make it heritage. However, unlike her, I argue that place and the interaction between form and function of a building is an important relationship in expressing heritage meanings and values.

In using this framework I have argued that a western or European influenced AHD exists in Band Aceh (see chapter 4), and ultimately derives from the Dutch colonial period, but has been further validated and influenced by Indonesian engagement with UNESCO and ICOMOS. This discourse, like its European counterpart, stresses materiality, the authenticity of fabric, age depth and monumentality, although where it differs from the AHD described by Smith (2006) in her book *Uses of Heritage*. In addition to the official or expert discourse, there also exists what I have termed an OHD, an organic heritage discourse. This discourse represents the community view of heritage, and represents a mostly indigenous and traditional
This discourse sits outside the AHD, and its main tenets strongly depend on the local values adopted within a community where this discourse is located. The main tenets that commonly underpin this discourse include the idea that heritage is intangible, that material fabric can be changed without impacting on the authenticity of place, age depth is not necessarily crucial, but that social and religious values are important. This discourse is also passed down through the generations.

By employing a framework that identifies heritage as a cultural process, and exploring the tensions between the AHD and OHD, the research has examined the ways architectural heritage, especially the three iconic architectural heritage sites represented by the Baiturrahman Mosque, the Tsunami Museum, and Peulanggahan Mosque, were used by the AHD and the OHD after the 2004 tsunami. Several interesting points emerge from this analysis that make important contributions to understanding heritage in post-disaster contexts, especially within a Southeast Asian Islamic society. My findings support those of Rico’s (2014) who argued, in her examination of heritage at risk and of the development of tsunami heritage, that the way heritage was thought of in Banda Aceh placed less stress on time depth, or even disregarded it, in the development of tsunami heritage. Examples of tsunami heritage which are less than fifty years – the minimum age set by Law No. 11 2010 – nonetheless became officially sanctioned as heritage. However, while Rico stresses the traumatic nature of the tsunami as facilitating this change in attitude to the age of tsunami heritage, I argue that within the OHD age is actually not a significant issue, as it is within the AHD. In addition of the issue of age depth, attitudes and issues of authenticity of form and material also changed. However, again, while certainly influenced by the tsunami
and previous disasters, the changing attitudes to authenticity of form and fabric are not quite as radical as they may seem from within the AHD, as again, these were not necessarily issues that ever exercised the OHD. The changes in forms of the Baiturrahman and Peulanggahan Mosques occurred both before and after the tsunami, and this history of change did not alter people’s attachment to such places. Indeed, these changes did not diminish the intention of local experts to include them in the local heritage list, and they are even promoted in the national heritage city program, P3KP and in tourism. In other words, while the disaster may have changed the form and the ‘material authenticity’ of certain sites, it did not change the place, or sense of place, or the intangible associations people had with a place. As long as, cultural, social, and religious practices were still held at certain places, those places were still considered heritage. Through performing these practices in place, engagement with cultural and religious meaning was retained, and thus survivors’ personal and cultural resilience was enhanced, which underpinned their emotional ability to continue their lives after the disaster.

In contrast to the OHD, the national AHD, especially represented by BPCB, the Conservatory Board for Cultural Remains, and arguably the global AHD; tsunami heritage, due to its age, the Baiturahman Mosque, due to its history of alteration, and the Peulanggahan Mosque due to its complete rebuilding; all had their status as ‘heritage’ questioned. Due to its enlargement, renewal, and modification, the Baiturrahman Mosque has not been awarded a certificate of heritage from the Ministry of Education and Culture through the BPCB proposal. The Peulanggahan Mosque has been removed from BPCB’s heritage list, and funding to the mosque was stopped when the original was destroyed by the tsunami. The Tsunami
museum and other examples of tsunami heritage are not perceived as heritage by policy makers as they are less than fifty years old.

The AHD’s definition of heritage is still influential in the local expert-led heritage designation, but following the tsunami the boundaries of the local AHD have been stretched to intersect with key aspects of the Acehnese OHD. Within the OHD the Baiturrahman Mosque is clearly heritage, as this mosque is not only a reflection of pride of the Islamic past, and an Acehnese Islamic identity, but is also a source of resilience after the disaster, as this mosque survived the 2004 tsunami. In addition, as outlined in Chapter 6, for the local community the mosques and the tsunami sites are indeed heritage, which they ask to be reclaimed and acknowledged. Community values are built on the memories of the building, the originality and continuation of activities at these places, and, in the case of a disaster-torn society, the ability to use the building for healing trauma and social reconstruction; rather than the physical aspects which might fade or disappear. The revocation of heritage status of sites after the destruction hurt many tsunami survivors, as heritage status gives a certain pride, authority and value to a site, building or event, and cancellation takes away self-respect and pride.

Therefore, this research provides significant contributions to the debates over what constitutes architectural heritage and what aspects of architecture, and heritage more generally, make architectural heritage ‘familiar’ and reassuring to the survivors of disaster. What provides familiarity, and thus may be identified as a potential resource for providing survivors with cultural resilience in the face of disaster, is not necessarily the familiarity of architectural form, but rather the ability of place to provide a space for familiar activities. This research challenges
two prominent elements of heritage constructed and defined by the global AHD, which is authorised through organisations such as UNESCO and ICOMOS. It challenges the notion of age depth as a key element in heritage, and the importance given to material authenticity as a requirement of heritage designations. The narrow definition of heritage as a “thing” that is “old”, “monumental”, “historical”, and other exclusive adjectives entangled within it, has excluded many places as heritage in communities emerging from disasters. It is not unusual for heritage sites damaged after natural disasters to be deleted from heritage lists, often based on issues around authenticity. In addition, the issue of age has underpinned the exclusion of those emerging important places and buildings after a disaster. For example, three churches in the Visayas have been removed from the UNESCO tentative list of sites being considered for World Heritage Status dues to the damage the churches suffered due to earthquake78. Drawing from interviews with people living in and visiting Banda Aceh (chapter 6) about the ways heritage was defined, used, and reconstructed in Banda Aceh, it is evident that defining heritage by merely its physical appearance is too limiting.

To avoid this limitation, I suggest Indonesia should be involved in advocating for alternative ways of looking at heritage, because not only is the global and European influenced AHD understanding alien and foreign to Indonesian heritage traditions, particularly at the grass roots level, but also due to the position of Indonesia in the ‘ring of fire’, a very disaster prone region. The ways in which the Indonesian government deals with the destruction or damage to architectural heritage should be rethought. A lesson learnt from Aceh has proved that age and

authenticity of material are not a rigid or defining element of heritage. While the international AHD is present and in use in Indonesia and Banda Aceh, its boundaries and nature were influenced by local understandings of heritage, as represented by the OHD. These boundaries were further pushed and challenged by both the history of conflict and the tsunami. This has meant that the Western AHD has not been entirely adopted; rather it has been negotiated with local traditions of understanding heritage privileging local values, rather than universal values. Global AHD attributes, such as age values, authenticity values, and other significant values are present, but these are not rigidly assessed by the local AHD. This is a result of how the local OHD has promoted its ways of seeing architectural heritage, and has negotiated this understanding at a national level through the Historic City Program, P3KP. The intention to include an historical place called Kampong Pande⁷⁹, that is empty (i.e. that has no material past presence) can be interpreted as the local AHD promoting its own ways of seeing heritage. This means that instead of letting the national AHD take control, the Banda Aceh local AHD and the OHD have been asserted to define their own heritage and valorise their ways of understanding heritage.

Given this explanation, the global response to the destruction of architectural heritage should be rethought. Several charters, guidelines, and principles have been enacted to accommodate Asian ways of seeing heritage authenticity, but these are still to be globally acknowledged (Fong et al, 2012). This way of seeing authenticity might not have the same authority as another tangible heritage which has clearly defined European authenticity (Taylor, 2012). Based on her professional involvement with the work of the World Heritage secretariat and

⁷⁹ See (Banda Aceh Government, 2012)
Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention, Labadi (2013, p.121) suggests that there is little chance for sites promoting forms of authenticity outside of the European discourse to be successful in World Heritage nominations. In addition, in the face of increasing threats of disaster (as reported by the 2009 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction, Risk and Poverty in Changing Climate/UNISDR, 2009), not only World Heritage, but also other heritage is assumed to be threatened. In the face of increasing global natural heritage disasters more heritage would inevitably be removed from heritage lists due to perceived destruction or alteration to authentic fabric. However, such deletions, based on a global AHD understanding of ‘authenticity’, only compounds the sense of loss and disaster. What if an European understanding of authenticity becomes, in post disaster contexts, arbitrarily imposed in a context where it may not be culturally relevant (particularly in Asian contexts), but also where it may be psychologically irrelevant if not counterproductive to people’s well-being. In the midst of loss, experts’ judgments can assume the right of a society to have a building or place regarded as heritage. This might be a hurdle for people who are trying be resilient in difficult circumstances, as heritage places provide places for enacting activities that contribute to resilience. In the developing world European practices of heritage conservation are considered expensive even in normal conditions and needless to say this becomes exacerbated in post disaster contexts. By uncritically applying the global AHD to a disaster prone area such as Banda Aceh, heritage sites and status become threatened not only by disasters, but also by the responses of international agencies and national responses framed within international policy responses. At the same time, the new sites constructed after the disaster are still not old enough to be recognized as heritage.
In this sense, the architectural conservation approach should be expanded from merely one focused on preserving physical form to one that engages with preserving and acknowledging the activities and functions of certain places as well. This has implications not only for general architectural heritage preservation and conservation practices, but also for policies such as adaptive reuse, which privileges fabric and materiality. Rather, adaptive reform should be considered as a potential approach for reconstructing architectural heritage in the face of disaster. Adaptive reuse, and indeed most conservation processes within the global AHD, aim to preserve architectural form and tangibility, by finding new functions or uses for a building, and thus adapting an obsolete building for current needs. However, I suggest adaptive reform is an approach that aims to preserve a building’s or site’s functions, its intangibility. Within this approach alterations to forms and fabric becomes a non-issue if undertaken to maintain the use of the building, and thus its core heritage values. As Byrne (2012) and Kalstrom (2005) note that Southeast Asian cultures regard materiality as impermanent, and in contexts where disasters are experienced more regularly, this importance is made all the more comprehensible.

By adopting this definition of architectural heritage, heritage definitions will become more inclusive and flexible, especially in the case a disaster-torn society. This definition offers an inclusion of buildings that have lost their material authenticity, but still retain their function. This definition takes us to return to the initial and underlying aim of architecture, that is architecture is about designing and building a structure for containing human activities.
There are, however, cases where in acknowledging culturally diversity the definitions and concepts I have developed here may not be relevant in other cultural or disaster contexts. However, further studies are required to identify potential ways of dealing with architectural heritage reconstruction in other societies and contexts. The development of studies that explore these issues in diverse cultural contexts should result in a much more flexible and inclusive understanding and set of practices for dealing with architectural heritage conservation. The important issue is to determine inclusive ways of engaging with heritage to enhancing survivor resilience after disasters, and the tendency for expert knowledge to focus on fabric and material will only diminish survivor resilience and well-being.
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Appendix I: list of semi-structured interview question for visitors of the
Baiturrahman mosque, the Tsunami museum, and Peulanggahan Mosque

1. Male/Female. 2. Age: A <17, B 18-24, C 25-34, D 35-44, E 45-54, F 55-64,
   G over 65 (Card 1)
2. Occupation / Occupation of main income earner in household:
3. Highest Educational Qualification (Card 2):
4. What part of Aceh do you live?
5. How would you define your ethnic background or affiliation:
6. How long you have been in Aceh?
7. Is this your first visit to visit (Baiturrahman mosque/Tsunami museum)?
   Y/N. If no, When did you last visit/how often do you visit :

NOTE: I now wish to ask you a number of open-ended questions, would it be ok if I
turn on the recorder, this is a totally anonymous survey and the recording is just to
help me take notes. If you would prefer, I can take written notes

8. What are your overall reasons for visiting this place?
9. What does the Baiturrahman mosque/Tsunami Museum/Peulanggahan
Mosque mean to you?

10. What do you feel when you are at this place?

11. What experiences do you value on visiting this place/building?

12. Are any aspects of the building or any activities in the building triggering your memory of the past? Why? What kind of past?

13. Are there any messages about the history of the Banda Aceh that you take away from this place?

14. Does the design of this building have any meaning for contemporary Banda Aceh?

15. What do you think if the form the mosque changed, do you still feel the same attachment and feeling? (special question for the Baiturrahman Mosque)

16. What do you think after the reconstruction of the mosque, do you still have the same attachment and feeling? (special question for Peulanggahan Mosque)

17. Is there any aspect of your personal identity to which this building speaks to or links?

18. Does this place represent Acehnese identity? Why?

19. Thinking back before the tsunami, what for you were some of important building in Banda Aceh? Why were they important?

20. After the tsunami, what buildings are important to you now? Why are they important?

21. What do you think about the way Banda Aceh has been re-built? In what ways has Banda Aceh changed and in what ways is it still the same?

22. Is it important to remember the past?

23. Besides the past that you have mentioned and discussed, is there any other
past that is worth remembering for Acehnese identity?

24. Is there anything you would like to add or tell me?

Thank you so much
Appendix II: list of experts interviewed

Below are the experts that I interviewed during my fieldwork. Some names are revealed following the permission or request of those interviewed, and others remain anonymous at the request of the interviewee:

1. Mayor of Banda Aceh, Mawardi Nurdin interviewed on 27 July 2012, in Banda Aceh

2. Head of BPCB / Badan Pelestarian Cagar Budaya (Board for conservation cultural remains), interviewed on 17 July 2012, in Banda Aceh

3. Conservation staff (archaeologist) at BPCB, interviewed on 26 June 2012, in Banda Aceh

4. Manager of the Tsunami Museum, interviewed on 27 June 2012, in Banda Aceh

5. Secretary of the Baiturrahman Mosque Committee, interviewed on 16 June 2012, in Banda Aceh

6. The Architect of the Tsunami Museum, Ridwan Kamil, interviewed on 7 July 2012, in Bandung

7. The head of the Committee for the Tsunami Museum Design Competition, Kamal A. Arif, interviewed on 7 July 2012, in Bandung

8. Member of the Committee for the Tsunami Museum Design Competition (architect representative), interviewed on 22 June 2012, in Banda Aceh

9. Head of Aceh Museum and Member of the Committee for the Tsunami Museum Design Competition (museum representative), Nurdin AR, interviewed on 13 July 2012, in Banda Aceh

10. BRR staff for the Tsunami Museum development, interviewed on 25 July 2012, in Banda Aceh
11. Staff at BPSNT/ Badan Badan Pelestarian Sejarah dan Nilai Tradisional (Board for conserving intangible heritage), interviewed on 23 July 2012, in Banda Aceh

12. Head of Spatial Planning Division at Public Work Office of Banda Aceh, interviewed on 31 July 2012 and 14 November 2013, in Banda Aceh

13. Spatial Planning Division staff at Public Work Office of Banda Aceh, interviewed on 31 July 2012, in Banda Aceh

14. Head of PDIA/ Pusat Dokumentasi Aceh (Aceh Achieve), interviewed on 3 August 2012

15. GIS Staff at Bappeda/ Badan Perencanaan Daerah (Spatial Planning Board), interviewed on 26 July 2012, in Banda Aceh

16. Planning Staff at Bappeda/ Badan Perencanaan Daerah (Spatial Planning Board), interviewed on 26 July 2012, in Banda Aceh

17. Heritage City Planning staff at Bappeda/ Badan Perencanaan Daerah (Spatial Planning Board), interviewed on 17 August 2013, in Banda Aceh

18. Documentary staff (archaeologist) at BPCB, interviewed on 18 November 2013, in Banda Aceh

19. Head of Culture and Tourism Office of Banda Aceh, interviewed on 11 November 2013, in Banda Aceh

20. Architect working at Syiah Kuala University and involved in the Reconstruction, interviewed on 19 June 2012, in Banda Aceh

21. Head of Peulanggahan Village, interviewed on 30 July 2012, in Banda Aceh