



Culture Heritage and Local Community Engagement: Analyses of Kotagede and George Town Heritage Sites

Ellisha Nasruddin¹; Yeni Rosilawati²; Mohammad Reevany Bustami³; Krisna Mulawarman⁴

¹ Graduate School of Business (GSB), Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), Malaysia

¹ Program Studi Ilmu Komunikasi, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta (UMY), Indonesia

² Centre for Policy Research and International Studies (Cenpris), Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), Malaysia

⁴ Program Studi Ilmu Komunikasi, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta (UMY), Indonesia

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v6i5.1188>

Abstract

Societies are facing increasing risks of experiencing unpredictable disasters due to climate change, and thus, planning for sustainable development has become all the more urgent. More so, in some communities, histories of disasters have resulted in significant demographic changes, leaving behind the loss of iconic heritage properties and its cultural heritage. Yet, part of sustainable development include adequate urban planning where conservation and regeneration of historic urban areas becomes an integral part of requirement for sustainable livelihood for the cities of the future. This study evaluated the awareness and participation of the local communities in conservation efforts of cultural heritage within two historical heritage sites: Kotagede, Yogyakarta and George Town, Penang. Based on qualitative case studies and focused group discussions with the stakeholders of the local communities, three key themes on community participation emerged: sense of belonging towards a meaningful living heritage, sense of ownership towards restorative efforts, and sense of partnership in engagement efforts. These themes point towards an urgent implication: since the local communities already have a greater awareness and a high drive for involvement in maintaining the heritage of Kotagede and George Town, cohesive and appropriate collective actions in empowering the locals to lead in future conservation efforts of heritage programmes at Kotagede and George Town, are genuinely needed.

Keywords: Local Community; Community Engagement; Cultural Heritage; Conservation; Regeneration

Introduction

Sustainable Development: The lense of cultural heritage

The United Nations Charter of the Millennium Declaration recognizes the principles sustainable development, which fundamentally, requires that a systemic approach for the growth and control of raw

materials, products, and necessitates the preservation of natural capital, and hence, encourages the rise of a more benevolent society which care for the future generations. Nevertheless, rampant urbanisation and growth of cities has resulted in deteriorating urban environments, inadequate water supply and sanitation, as well as a vast increase in poverty and without proper urban planning, those living in slums do not have access to many of the social amenities and infrastructure of urban living. Such modes of urbanization have also been destructive to local ecologies and natural resources.

Related to this development is the continued persistent threats to heritage assets and values and the identity of historic urban areas. While challenges which comes with urbanisation does not bring about a more sustainable living, the incessant, excessive, and often uncontrolled modernisation also poses a threat to preservation of heritage sites. Among others, globalization processes has resulted in increasing homogenization and standardization across the world and identity which has a historical base in the historic urban spaces is lost in the process of dynamic change. Added to this dynamic change is the distortion in the value of heritage when global tourism sets in and create conflicts between global and local cultures.

What perhaps has become more alarming lately, is that societies are facing increasing risks of experiencing unpredictable disasters due to climate change, and thus, planning for sustainable development has become all the more urgent. More so, in some communities, histories of disasters have resulted in significant demographic changes, leaving behind iconic heritage properties which is not salvageable or reconstructed. Any intangible heritage that used to be rich and vibrant amongst the local communities are forgotten. Yet, part of sustainable development include adequate urban planning where regeneration historic urban areas becomes part of sustainable livelihood for the regeneration of cities.

It is important then, that stakeholders pursuing sustainable development integrates cultural heritage as one key priorities in all initiatives forward. The concept has indeed largely broadened since the adoption of the 1964 Venice Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monument Cites, where it was first described as *“the set of historical monuments, group of buildings, cites and towns around the world that are found evidence of a particular civilization, development or historic event, relevant for the unity of the human values, and therefore worthy to be preserved for future generations”* (The Venice Charter 1964). Today, cultural heritage is more commonly defined as the set of *“cultural assets inherited from the past in all forms and aspects, be it tangible, intangible or digital”*. This general definition incorporates monuments, buildings, sites, landscapes as well as collections, conserved and managed by public or private institutes, museums, libraries and archives but also including practices, knowledge and other expressions of human creativity, making hence no distinction between so called *“tangible and “intangible“ cultural heritage.*

The term cultural heritage, is defined by UNESCO as the entire corpus of material signs - either artistic or symbolic- handed on by the past to each culture and, therefore, to all of humankind. The term heritage itself refers to three main categories of heritage: tangible cultural heritage which includes: (i) movable cultural heritage (paintings, sculptures, coins, manuscripts), (ii) immovable cultural heritage (monuments, archaeological sites, and so on), (iii) underwater cultural heritage (shipwrecks, underwater ruins and cities); intangible cultural heritage which includes: oral traditions, performing arts, rituals; and natural heritage which includes: natural sites with cultural aspects such as cultural landscapes, physical, biological or geological formations and heritage in the event of armed conflict.

Moreover, UNESCO, as an institution which upholds and implement programmes related to heritage refers to the importance of human experiences as a significant contribution to cultural heritage:

“As a constituent part of affirmation and enrichment of cultural identities, as legacy belonging to all humankind, the cultural heritage gives each particular place its recognizable features and is the storehouse of human experience. The preservation of the cultural heritage is therefore a cornerstone of any cultural policy.”

However, in terms of emphasis, cultural heritage plays a somewhat marginal role in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It is explicitly mentioned only once in Target no.11, that refers to the cities, in particular to the need of making cities and human settlements “inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable”, through “inclusive and sustainable urbanization, planning and management” (Target 11.3). In particular, cultural heritage is mentioned in Target 11.4 (“strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage”), which is only one item out of 169 targets. Nevertheless, this is a weak reference as it does not point towards a specific mention on cultural heritage; rather, it is mentioned in concert with natural heritage. Furthermore, this specific target deals only with the protection and safeguarding of cultural heritage, without any reference to its regeneration.

Yet, the New Urban Agenda (NUA) recognizes cultural heritage as an important factor for urban sustainable development. In the last two decades, contemporary issues in urban heritage conservation has become urgent. Asia alone is expected to add 800,000,000 urban residents in the next 15 years. Rapid growth and globalization have transformed cities especially in many countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Two Heritage Cities

One of the important heritage sites in Yogyakarta province is the Kotagede heritage site. Kotagede is a historic neighbourhood in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. As such, the name was also used for the administrative district (*kecamatan*) of the same name in the City of Yogyakarta. Kotagede contains the remains of the first capital of the Mataram Sultanate, established in the 16th century. Some of the remains of old Kotagede are remains of the palace, the royal cemetery, the royal mosque, and defensive walls and moats.

In the 8th century, the area of Mataram (now is known as Yogyakarta) was the center of the Old Mataram Kingdom that ruled the entire Java. This kingdom had an extraordinary prosperous civilization, so it had the ability to build archeological wonders with extravagant architecture, such as the Prambanan Temple and Borobudur Temple. However, in the 10th century, due to unknown reasons, the kingdom moved their center of government to the East Java area. Thus, a great number of citizens left Mataram and gradually this area became a woodland or forest. However, Kotagede remained crowded although it was no longer the capital of the kingdom. Many historical remains such as the cemetery of the kingdom’s forefathers, Kotagede Mosque, traditional houses with Javanese architecture, the topography of the villages or kampongs that implemented the ancient city's systems, and the fort ruins can be found in Kotagede. The structure of Kotagede is similar to the structure of other Javanese old cities, such as Jepara and Kudus. Those cities have four components called Catur Gatra: kraton (palace), mosque, market and alun-alun (square).

During the May 2006 Java earthquake, many old buildings were destroyed and were then directly revitalized through the Pusaka Jogja Bangkit! (“Yogyakarta Heritage Revival!”) Program, carried out by Jogja Heritage Society, the Center for Heritage Conservation, Department of Architecture and Planning at Gajah Mada University, the Indonesian Network for Heritage Conservation, ICOMOS Indonesia, and other supporting institutions. The Government of Indonesia even enacted laws to preserve its cultural heritage, specifically law No. 11/ 2010 on Culture and Regulation and No. 6/ 2012 on Cultural Heritage. Therefore, the DIY Regional Government has an enacted legal system to carry out conservation efforts of general heritage and cultural heritage, in particular.

According to the law No.13/ 2012, Yogyakarta was chosen as a Special Region through the empowerment of special arrangement authority in various areas of its affairs. One of the areas that garner special arrangements is the field of culture. As a logical consequence of that law, therefore Yogyakarta has the

greater opportunity and commitment to implement a culture of conservation, maximization, and sustainability. Moreover, Lin Che Wei, Policy Advisor and the Founder of Jakarta Old Town Revitalization added that heritage holds a universal value that is far more important than religion, race and nationalism. The spirit of conservation is based on the idea that it has value that goes beyond not only Indonesian heritage but that of the world.

In Indonesia, the national criteria serves as a guide in determining cultural heritage at the provincial and municipal level. The national criteria for assessing Indonesian cultural heritage properties are mentioned in Article five under the Law No.11/2010 on Cultural Property. In the Law No.11 of 2010, Cultural Property is a material object of Cultural Heritage, be it Heritage Buildings, Cultural Heritage Structures, Cultural Heritage Sites, and Heritage Areas on land and/or in water that need to be preserved since it has important value for history, science, education, religion, and/or human culture through the process of determination. In Article 53 it is stated that objects, buildings or structures may be proposed as Cultural Heritage, Heritage Buildings, or Cultural Heritage Structures if they meet the following criteria: (1) aged 50 (fifty) years or more; (2) representing the shortest period of age 50 (fifty) years; (3) has special meaning for history, science, education, religion, and / or culture; and (4) has a cultural value for strengthening the nation's personality.

George Town was inscribed as a WHS (world heritage site) in July 2008 by UNESCO. Historically, in 1786, a colonial trading center was established in George Town by the British East India Company. Since then, George Town has become a hub of east-west trade and cultural exchange, evolving from a trading port into a multicultural historic city. With almost 1900 historic buildings protected within George Town's WHS zone, the city's architectural landscape is representative of a diversity of cultures and religions. George Town today, is known for its multitude of culture, ranging from religious festivals, dances, costumes, art, music, food, and lifestyles; all of which contribute to George Town's rich tangible and intangible heritage (Think City, 2013).

Yet, in order to appreciate the current socio-economic heritage in Penang, it would be vital to review its historical roots. In the past, economic activities was thriving in two key periods: 1794-1833 and 1860-1900. Both these periods showed remarkable trade growth in Georgetown then. In comparison to migrant communities (Europeans and descendents) as well as other indigenous Muslim groups, the statistics show a big population of Muslim population as well. Historical records show Muslim Economic Commercial Community (MECC) were active in seven areas (now known as the Penang World Heritage Site) even before the European settlements: Lebu Ah Quee, Lebu Pantai, Jalan Kapitan Keling, Lebu Chulia, Lebu Armenia, Fort Cornwallis, Lebu Aceh. Among the diverse economic activities of the MECC are textiles, cotton, spices, hajj pilgrimage services, printing, gold, jewelries, shipping, groceries, and trading bazaars (Anderson, 1971). A rich cultural heritage was present then where intermarriages and assimilation within the Malay archipelago--Malays, Acehnese, Medanese, Minang, Javanese—were on the rise. Other migrant communities from Southern Asian subcontinent (Indians, Chulias, Bengalese, Pakistanis) and Arab nations assimilated with the indigenous Muslim communities. The Penang pilgrimage hub for Hajj and Lebu Aceh as earliest urban Muslim settlement, was an important part of the growth of trade and commerce among Muslim business community and pilgrimage-oriented socio-economic hub between 1885 and late 1970s. While the pilgrimage activities increased and was punctuated by no activities during the world war I and II, statistics showed a strong presence of its operations in 1885 (3,685 pilgrims) in early 20th century (6,861 pilgrims) in 1914 (8,344 pilgrims), and in 1950 (3,886 pilgrims).

UNESCO summarized the city's outstanding universal values as an exceptional example of multicultural trading town with multicultural heritage and tradition of Asia and European colonial influences, forged through the mercantile exchanges of Malay, Chinese, Indian and European cultures, and the imprints of architecture, urban form, technology and monumental art.

Two conservation ordinances, the Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA) and the Local Government Act, were introduced in 1976 in a bid to conserve George Town's intangible and tangible heritage. While these acts represented early attempts to conserve George Town's heritage sites under the banner of urban planning, many parts of George Town are still protected under the TCPA, even if they fall outside the area covered by the UNESCO WHS listing. Furthermore, the National Heritage Act (NHA) 2005, National Heritage Regulation (NHR) 2007, and NHR 2008 have stipulated that proposed projects and urban plans be submitted to public hearings and that community engagement in conservation projects be encouraged before any plan can be initiated (Mustafa & Abdullah, 2013). Based on the TCPA, local residents must be notified of any proposals and be invited to express their opinions and make suggestions. Moreover, the State Planning Committee must consider the opinions and suggestions of private citizens before giving final approval on a plan.

Community Engagement in Conservation of Cultural Heritage

Community engagement can be defined as a relationship built by community members through collaboration and working together to achieve common goals and to make their community a better place in which to live (McCloskey et al, 2011). The significance of community engagement in preserving cultural heritage has been widely endorsed by a wide range of literature, including scholarly research and institutional conventions. In world Heritage Sites destinations, a community refers to the residents within a heritage sites area who are deemed instrumental in reviving the heritage sites.

Community participation in heritage sites can settle various conflicts between the needs and interests of residents. The charter of Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas recognizes the value of community participation. The participation and involvement of the residents are essential for the success of the conservation programs and should be largely encouraged. Communities should be knowledgeable with respects to the site's historical background and this, in turn, enhances their appreciation of the site itself. However, community engagement is vital in this process of instilling a sense of pride regarding the site and its associated community. In fact, engaging communities in the protection of heritage means that the communities living around the heritage sites are involved in the process of identifying issues that affect the conservation of these sites and can propose ways by which these issues can be addressed.

Furthermore, community participation in heritage projects positively influences the sense of belonging among residents, assists people in developing social networks with others both within and outside their community, and instills an appreciation towards the heritage assets of the local area (Yung & Chan, 2013). Community engagement also emphasizes on the connections and interactions between community members. Furthermore, community participation can create a sense of ownership, trust and credibility among community members (Rasoolimanesh, Badarulzaman, & Jaafar, 2013).

There are three types of participation that can be identified: coercive participation, induced participation and spontaneous participation. Coercive participation refers to the lower level of participations in which residents have no power. Their involvement is limited to various predefined activities revolving around heritage sites and they receive few economic benefits. In induced community participation, although local residents have a say in the heritage management, they have no actual power or control over the decisions being made by those in positions of authority. In spontaneous participation local residents have the power to make decisions and control the development process. Fox and Le Dantec (2014) found that it is important to understand the local needs and develop the strategies to empower the local community, as it is important in preserving historical sites.

Among the many benefits participation brings for the individuals of community are: (1) awareness of the problem and possible solutions among the people: citizens could exercise their rights and efforts in a way relevant to development in a rational manner (Arora, 2006); (2) increase level of confidence: participation may not only include increased confidence and self-esteem, but also, the chance to acquire new skills and greater satisfaction along with an improved quality of life (Moriarty et al., 2007); (3) discovery of one's own potential: by helping people realize their own potential, participation can make citizens feel that the decisions of the system of which they are a part of, are their own. This process can induce increased popular enthusiasm for the implementation of decisions (Arora, 2006); (4) voice in local decision making and planning is established amongst the majority, rather than a few influential ones: participation offers new opportunities for creative thinking and innovative planning and development.

The role of the local community is especially important in the development of sustainable tourism that *'is deliberately planned from the beginning to benefit local residents, respect local culture, conserve natural resources, and educate both tourists and local residents'* (Steck, 1999, p. 4). This role needs to be in accordance with the triple bottom line approach where all activities and practices of sustainable tourism are directly connected to all three aspects of organizing a local community environment, social circle (culturally), and economy. Sustainable tourism as an emerging paradigm seems to enhance the existing conceptual frameworks on tourism planning and development by making the residents its focal point (Choi and Sirakaya, 2005). Local governments, developers and community residents have been known to overlook or dismiss the importance of the surrounding environment and aspire only to maximize economic growth.

For tourism to be truly sustainable, it needs community participation to protect local and national culture, improve social and individual well being, and conserve the surrounding environment. Community participation ranges from involvement in the decision-making processes at the highest level down to economic involvement and the promotion of the destination at the lowest level. The shape of which community participation ultimately takes depends on the circumstance of the destination. Development and preservation of urban heritage areas as a tourism area needs to involve the community.

Research Methodology

This research is based on a study of two heritage cities: Kotagede, Yogyakarta and George Town, Penang. In particular, it evaluated the awareness of the urban local communities and their extent of involvement in conservation and regeneration of cultural heritage. Based on a qualitative and constructivist approach, the findings were analysed based on an inter subjective process, from Focused Group Discussions (FGDs) data results and individual case studies. The case studies were interpreted from the insiders' viewpoint (Yin, 2003). In accordance to the requirements of case study and FGD methods, the analyses delved as much as possible into detailed narratives from the multiple groups of local communities, and discussions with local residents and local leaders. Data analysis involved examining, sorting, categorizing, evaluating, comparing, synthesizing, and contemplating the coded data, as well as developing first and second order abstractions from transcribed recorded data and synthesised themes (Neuman, 2000).

Findings and Discussion

The findings below, compare and contrast the nature of community participation within the two heritage sites. There are three particular overriding themes which emanated from the analyses: sense of belonging towards a meaningful living heritage, sense of ownership towards restorative efforts, and sense of partnership in engagement efforts.

Sense of belonging towards a meaningful living heritage

A sense of belonging by the local communities towards what is known as meaningful history of Kotagede local heritage, where they are part-and-parcel of nurturing its development through their very own 'lived' experiences, is very much evident. According to Yung and Chan (2013), community participation in heritage projects positively influences the sense of belonging among residents, assists people in developing social networks with others both within and outside their community, and instils an appreciation of the heritage assets of the local area. In the case of Kotagede, consequently, knowledge-sharing of local wisdom emerges and continues to be part of the day-to-day living.

During the interview, a local community leader in Kotagede explained his experiences:

I was born in Kotagede and since my house was in the center of the bustling geography of Kotagede, my house was in the market corner. I witnessed a bitter past in Kotagede. But that will only be the case when talking about cultural heritage. Well, in Kotagede, I found what was already there, there was a region, there were aisles, there were traditional houses with various forms. I also learned the living culture in Kotagede such as the valueable traditions when preparing for a party. As Javanese have a unique tradition called as "tata dhahar", a local tradition to prepare set of lunch or dinner for special guests in a party.

The feeling of connection with a familiar past and being involved in reliving this past is much cherished. He added that:

Kotagede is a place of birth, life and possibly death. When I had experience working out of town for ten years I was always reminded of the atmosphere of Kotagede which was really wonderful, it was hard to find it in other cities. When we meet people in Kotagede, we always said hello to each other. We should preserve of Kotagede so that it remains comfortable to live in. For us and maybe even for our children and grandchildren. Kotagede has been so important for Indonesia and the world as an important site of heritage.

Many of the respondents agree that culture in Kotagede is not limited to tangible culture such as the Javanese traditional houses that are called joglo but also encompasses the living culture such as wisdom that has been inherited from the older generations. The Javanese local wisdom has a high and deep philosophy specifically in tolerance. Tolerance is the response to a variety of realities. Tolerance can be basically seen as wisdom in accepting the changes and developments that come from within and outside Javanese culture. Javanese local wisdom also promotes the value of gotong royong (mutual help), which teaches sharing among people and the value of reciprocal relationships among communities. The highly regarded Javanese value of local wisdom also includes *empan papan* and *tepa slira*. To maintain balance in their dealings with others, the foundations of inward attitude, or *empan papan*, meaning knowing our self and understanding our own position and well-putting our self in a social interaction, and the outward, *tepa slira*, meaning understanding

and self-awareness of others, far from being concerned of ourself, is applied as the standout basis of Javanese attitude.

In spite of these strong connection to the past, one of the local community members (aged 55) mentioned that however, all traditional culture needs to be rebuilt in an acceptable form for the younger generations:

However, we must realize culture continues to change and develop, including its products. Revitalizing becomes very important but now we are facing more challenges such as the changing of values of society. We have to teach our children to love and respect heritage.

Hence, currently, the Kotagede community promotes and share their tradition and heritage through the web or online, created privately and collectively. Kotagede offers a library of information and a special website that is useful for those who wants to obtain more knowledge and information about Kotagede's history and heritage. It is also through collaborative heritage project activities between the local communities and educational institutions, such as Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM) at Yogyakarta, that events such as Kotagede Heritage Trail keeps on going with refreshing perspectives, connecting the past history with the present and future contexts.

In contrast, within George Town, it is the growth of heritage tourism and the revival of economic traditional activities that brings the local communities in touch with their own roots and increase their sense of awareness and belonging towards the importance of heritage preservation. Restoration of old heritage buildings, heritage traditional family homes, and heritage businesses and development of heritage hotels and heritage cafes, among others, where local participation is sought, evokes commitment and pride amongst local communities. The rich cultural (intangible) traditions come alive through the tangible products and services offered. For instance, according to the residents in the heart of George Town, the local Achenese community is very much involved when tourists and students visited the Achenese area, guiding and briefing them about the Achenese history and heritage. Hence, within this heritage site, arts and culture and their related products relive the past traditions, and the participation of local communities in heritage events brings out a continued sense of belonging to their own heritage.

However, the feeling of an 'empty heritage' is also felt since some of these heritage buildings were replaced by commercial ones, and in some cases, the actual inhabitants or community members of particular ethnic heritage living within the heritage site have left and sold the properties, and the population has slowly diminished, if not have long gone, as the younger generations were not inclined to bear the high cost of restorations for the heritage buildings. Hence, a sense of belonging about family heritage by some local communities and an appreciation for the meaningful memories (which needs its continued revival through physical heritage buildings as well as its cultural day-to-day living), is somewhat low and needs more encouragement and support by the government. The original essence of the traditions could not be experientially shared with visitors, perhaps only the story.

In addition, another concern is that the emphasis on physical building preservation comes at the expense of marginalization of local indigenous (Malay) culture, as in events and festivals, it was obvious that only particular cultural roots were promoted in the heritage site. Street arts marginally present the indigenous Malay culture as the events are oriented towards branding of the city for tourism purposes and monopolised by established institutions with financial and political power, a typical yet crucial issue with urban heritage project.

The heritage buildings are showcasing what tourists want to see and the restoration projects are only tourist spots. No one really know the history of the building since actual family and ancestors are long gone. If the authority like the project, then they will finance it, but most are related to non-Malay heritage.

When we beautify the buildings and preserve its architecture, it is good for the Penang economy. This good participation they ask from us. Only, we always overlook what is not obvious and what we don't understand, our values within the culture does not come out. This participation is lacking.

Sense of ownership towards restorative efforts

From the research it was also found that the Kotagede local communities were concerned with the issue of heritage conservation and preservation and a sense of ownership towards participating in the solutions related to urban regeneration issues and that they are helping to make a difference, was much needed. As stated by Rasoolimanesh, Badarulzaman, & Jaafar (2013), participation of the community in conservation and preservation creates a sense of ownership, trust and credibility amongst the community members.

The evidences point towards one of the important sights in Kotagede: the traditional wooden houses. After the earthquake, numerous houses in Kotagede were damaged and some owners sold their Joglo to other parties. As such, there are more than 60 traditional wooden houses missing from Kotagede. Out of a total of 150 traditional houses, overall 88 houses were not salvageable--at least 8 traditional houses (9%) were damaged, 47 traditional houses (54%) have collapsed and could not be occupied, 16 traditional houses (18%) have collapsed in several parts and could not be occupied while 17 traditional houses (19%) were cracked. Most of the bad conditions of these homes could no longer support further restorative construction. One of the local community leaders, aged 57 explained:

We tried to keep communicate to each other. We don't want to loose any wooden house anymore. That's why now the communication forum is created. Who would like to sell the wooden house can tell us. So we can find proper buyer who will be seriously concerned with its preservation. We have networkings so that we know who the buyers are and where they are from. So that they have the same missions with us to preserve Kotagede.

Some owners of the traditional houses felt disappointed during the renovation process, since some of processes required could not be carried out in the renovation. The cutting of materials to reduce the budget of renovation are common practice. They also complained that the reduction of tax for land and housing is unfair, as the government only reduced about Rp 50.000 (equals to USD 3) in the land and housing taxation policy towards Kotagede citizens. This also contributed towards many owners not wanting to maintain and preserve their houses.

Whereas, in Penang, many stakeholders agreed that the spillovers of heritage tourism is that, conservation and preservation of traditional crafts could be seen throughout particular festivals. These craft-making activities include crafts/hand-made products related to ketupat-weaving, star lantern-making, pottery-making, songkok-making, iron-smith and most-prominent, hand-made traditional food such as bread-making traditional savouries and locale cuisines which are known to be famous in the old days. Nevertheless, this revival comes from participation from those citizens who are able and willing to be part of the touristic

promotion requirements. As a consequence, the promotion of traditional culture and the sales of the related products are skewed towards what is seen as fashionable for tourists, along side the street food hawker traders who blends attractive food preparation/display/site, with the necessary infrastructural support provided by the authority in charged. An ownership towards preserving such cultural activities is somewhat sacrificed for some other higher purpose, in this case, tourism.

The community called to participate only when it fits the promotion for tourism. It is good to see a renewal of old businesses which could be forgotten....too much construction and development of shopping centres can dilute the value of old crafts....

The trendy kiosks are welcoming to the eyes, but when they market it, the actual touch, feel, and look of the old days are gone...a bit artificial

In the spurt of rapid urbanisation and movement towards improving the infrastructure for the heritage site, as well as promoting heritage- and eco-tourism, comments came forth also, with regards to how traditional settlements of fishermen (this may include at the Clan Jetty Village) are experiencing livelihood marginalisation, and thus, experiencing marginalised living heritage. While incentive programmes have been introduced, with the intention of improving the infrastructure and basic utilities, the ideas and views have not been well heard. Hence, the support were seen as less effective in getting the community to work hand-in-hand to protect the cultural and natural heritage of the traditional settlements, as expected.

They say they want to help the fishermen, but we don't get full continuous support. They don't understand that cultural heritage is more than just repairing the walkways. It is also about understanding how we live, fish, support each other, and live with nature, and build our little economy around preserving the environment. We are Malay settlement here and we are discriminated.

The requirements and the necessity to maintain certain developments raised the cost of properties and cost of living in that area. That is the contention on marginalized Malays. Hence, ownership to particular heritage projects is at a minimum. The participation of indigenous local Malay heritage-related artisans, businesses and commercial activities are far and few between. Penang heritage site is dominated largely by non-indigenous/non-pribumis. The pribumis / Malays who are the original natives of George Town before even the arrival of the British or others have been effectively marginalized.

The capitalistic production of heritage products, its commodification and commercialisation, requires continuous urban regeneration, with priorities given towards heritage interpretations for boutique experiences of contemporary boutique products and boutique economy, marginalising the urban-poor residents who are not able to cope with the cost of living. This is most evident with the displacement of Malay indigenous communities towards areas outside of the heritage zones, either voluntarily or through pressure, which are more affordable. The capitalistic production of heritage products, its commodification and commercialisation, the promotion of heritage activities as part of the urban regeneration (Gopinath 2011; Khor,2011), and the promotion of heritage interpretations for boutique experiences of contemporary boutique products and boutique economy, have been criticised for its marginalisation effects of the poor who are not part of this cultural economy (Samadi & Yunus, 2012; Chang and Teo, 2009).

As some stakeholders argued, the demolition of villages, which are older than George Town, to make way for urban development, has not been questioned, yet is seen as an accepted part of their living heritage.

Where do we go when development and cost of housing go up....our families can't survive long in Penang. Our business and craftwork are not fully appreciated, like the community used to like before.

When they ask us to leave without understanding our views and feelings, it is not good since we have been here since our ancestors' days. What we have been cherishing as our village and community and the richness of our past is all part of the village we used to know. But we can't fight this modern lifestyle since some of us do not question that this new lifestyle is not who we really are.

In addition, the shift towards tourism-centred businesses meant that other types of local business setups are substituted and replaced, including the residents. This is especially so for the local ethnic Malay Muslim business and residential communities, as discussed earlier. The war-cry of heritage site development seems to be 'regeneration'. This is championed by certain segments of the granting agencies and certain segments of the authorities.

Sense of partnership in engagement efforts

In Indonesia, community participation has been identified as key to the successful preparation of the heritage assets register that contains building and sites that might not meet the national criteria for statutory designations but are still valued locally for their historic interest. The public has taken a proactive approach in assisting heritage management committees to compile the heritage assets register of locally significant heritage assets located outside designated conservation areas to inform planning decisions communities and Local Government.

For the residents, Kotagede has a huge meaning for them and it is also their hope that the future generations and their children nurtures and sustains Kotagede. In order to preserve Kotagede, it needs a bottom up approach from the local communities. Engaging communities in the protection of heritage means that the communities living around the heritage sites are involved in the process of identifying issues that affect the conservation of these sites and can include themselves in proposing ways by which they can be addressed.

Participatory planning is an essential part of developing Kotagede as a heritage site that is rich in culture. Moreover participation can make its citizens feel that the decisions of the system of which they are a part of, are also their own. This is accordance with Fox and Le Dantec (2014) who stated that it is important to understand the needs and develop the strategies to empower the local community when preserving historical sites.

Having said this, for the indigenous communities living in Kotagede, the sentiment was that their voices must be heard by the local government and they must have avenues to express their inputs and concerns about Kotagede. The local communities feel that the government applies top down policies, regardless of the concerns from the local communities.

The Kotagede respondents agreed that there are many positive impacts from the heritage sites as traditional economic activities are being revived. These include crafts/hand-made products related to hand-made traditional food such as bread-making, traditional savouries and locale cuisines which are known to be

famous in the old days such as “kipo”, a traditional cake and “kembang waru” cake. Nevertheless, the respondents felt that the government did not seriously care for the silver smiths in Kotagede. When the earthquake hit Kotagede, the silversmiths faced economic collapse due to the increasing price of raw silver. Some of the respondents in the in-depth interview mentioned that the central government tried to help by giving silversmiths some equipment but it was not suitable. One of the respondents explained:

The silver crafts was hit first due to the increase in the price of raw materials and silver. It increased to as high as 700% compared to before the financial crisis in 1998. Since the aftermath of 1998, again in 2006 the silver smith trade took a hit due to the earthquake. The government didn't take any serious action to revive the silver craft trade and support the craftsman. They don't understand about the condition that we are facing. Moreover, the government taxed the raw material of silver with a the high tax. It is really hard for silversmiths.

While the another respondent mentioned that the government should provide adequate strategic planning and protection for the silversmiths in Kotagede. He mentioned that:

Even there's no proper documentation such as book about the history of silver in Kotagede. This is so embarrassing, Indonesians, especially the younger generations don't know much about the history of silver in Kotagede.

He also mentioned that Kotagede was not only famous for its silver. But in the last decades, they was a batik cloth factory at Kotagede and traditional woven textiles were also produced locally in Kotagede.

For the residents in George Town, according to most of the stakeholders, there is limited partnership in regeneration efforts (at least not direct community engagement). Nevertheless, what is prevalent is that institutional engagement or engagement amongst different institutions, either as directed by the authorities in charge of heritage preservation or sponsored communities and business organisations who are well connected with the tourism industry. The local communities are then directed and nurtured as well as given some limited say in their involvement, among those who are involved: the temples, the masjids, community groups, local councils heritage-related communities and residents. What is more obvious is that parties converge at different points in time, more so, either during annual heritage celebrations, campaigns promoting cultural traditions, or commemorations of the past traditions in line with tourism festivals.

Regardless, the participation of segments of communities in preservation of heritage and its coordination was seen as a challenge, as stronger engagements were coming from particular associations and communities which were non-Malays, especially, the Chinese associations and Indian Muslim communities. As perceived by some stakeholders, these associations, with economic power in their hands, connect to the rich cultural heritage of their particular communities, and receive financial and non-financial support to strengthen their language and cultural traditions, through campaigns, communal activities, and public festivities. Therefore, community engagement is limited to the few, yet community integration is deemed very important in a heritage site such as George Town (Rasha Sayed & Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2017).

Those with connections and influences and get support, gets help and those who don't just stay quiet. We are not coordinated to help our own community, the more we are disconnected, the more we stay silent.

Stakeholders also complained about the lack of community engagement present, especially in the early planning stage. Another aspect is with the SAP (Site Allocation Plan) in that there is no consultation before it was formulated. Consultation only happened when decisions were finalised. Citizens were not active participants of the plan, but were end observers and critics.

The following are some telling comments:

"Usually the plan is ready, then only they (the authorities) call us and show us... But during election campaigns, they throw us many promises. They tell us this plan and that plan. The point is more important is that they include us in the planning...."

Community consultation is limited to only some selected parties or people. The sentiment with echoes by a number of respondents points towards:

"This heritage thing is an elitist UNESCO project...Now, with the discussion on mapping the diverse intangible heritage in Penang, to create an inventory of cultures, only selected communities will be invited to participate."

Conclusion

The local communities within both heritage sites do have a greater awareness and interest towards being more involved in the conservation and regeneration (or rebuilding anew) their cultural heritage, yet, with the opportunity to be given the mandate to steer a leadership role (as subjects) in any restorative projects, and not as the object of programs being carried out. Participation to these communities, also meant that their opinions and testimonies are given due consideration, in order to ensure optimum results with the implementation process. As much as possible, the local community wants to be empowered with the capacity to also participate in the assessment, planning, implementation, and monitoring of any heritage-related projects.

As part of modernisation, urban planning of cities would continuously require all stakeholders to heed the call for understanding the local wisdom behind any conservation of cultural heritage. Hence, collective actions which integrate the voices of the citizens, are needed in making sure that the conservation planning programme within Kotagede and George Town continue to have a positive impact. The persistent issues related to both intangible and tangible cultural heritage preservation, needs equal emphasis through a higher level of community engagement and cohesive support from not only the local government, private organizations and non-governmental institutions, but also from the local leaders and the local community and residents.

Acknowledgement

This research paper is based on the USM (Malaysia) tourism heritage grant outputs from: Foresight on corporate social responsibility and corporate power in the tourism sector: a case study of Penang as a sustainable heritage site as well further cross collaboration with UMY (Indonesia): International research collaboration with UMY (Indonesia) academicians on Heritage sites and community engagement to achieve sustainable development: analyses of South Asian countries (2017-2018).

References

- Anderson, J. (1971). *Acheen and the Ports on the North and East Coasts of Sumatra*. UK: Oxford University Press.
- Arora, R.K. (2006). *People's Participation in Development Process*. Jaipur: HCM SIPA.
- Chang, T.C. & Teo, P. (2009). The Shophouse Hotel: Vernacular Heritage in a Creative City. *Urban Studies*, 46(2): 341-367.
- Choi, H.S.C. and Sirakaya, E. (2005). 'Measuring Residents' Attitude toward Sustainable Tourism: Development of Sustainable Tourism Attitude Scale', 2005, *Journal of Travel Research*, vol. 43, pp. 380-394. Tourism Conference, August 2005, Weihai, China
- Fox, S.A. & Le Dantec, C. (2014). *Community Historians: Scaffolding Community Through Culture and Heritage*, DIS 14, June 21-2, Vancouver, BC, Canada.
- Gopinath, A. (2011). *Urban Rejuvenation: What Khazanah Nasional and Think City Sdn Bhd are doing to revitalize the world heritage site*. Penang A Portrait of Progress (pp. 26-29). Retrieved from http://www.eohotels.com/download/pullouts_2.pdf
- International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter 1964). Retrieved from https://www.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf
- McCloskey, D. J., McDonald, M. A., Cook, J., Heurtin-Roberts, S., Updegrove, S., Sampson, D. (2011). *Community engagement: definitions and organizing concepts from the literature*. In *Principles of community engagement* (2nd ed.). Washington D.C.: NIH Publication.
- Moriarty, J., Rapaport, P., Beresford, P., Branfield, F., Forrest, V., Manthorpe, J., Martineau, S., Cornes M., Butt, J., Iliffe, S., Taylor, B., Keady, J. (2007). *Practice Guide: The Participation of Adult Service Users Including Older People in Developing Social Care*. Social Care Institute for Excellence: Great Britain.
- Mustafa, N.A. & Abdullah N.C. (2013). *Preservation Of Cultural Heritage In Malaysia: An Insight of The National Heritage Act 2005*. *Proceedings of International Conference on Tourism Development*, February, 407-415.
- Neuman, L.W. (2000). *Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Boston, USA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Rasha Sayed & Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2017). *Promoting Local Community Integration in World Heritage Site Planning: George Town, Penang, Malaysia*. Malaysia Sustainable Cities Program, Working Paper Series, 1-19.
- Rasoolimanesh, S.M., Badarulzaman, N., & Jaafar, M. (2013). *A Review of City Development Strategies Success Factors*. *Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management*, 8(3), 62-78.
- Rasoolimanesh, S.M., Badarulzaman, N., & Jaafar, M. *Community Participation toward Tourism Development and Conservation Program in Rural World Heritage Site*. Retrieved from <https://www.intechopen.com/books/subject/business-management-and-economics>

Samadi, Z., & Yunus, R.M. (2012). Conflict of Image and Identity in Heritage Commercialization. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 50, 675-684.

Steck, B. (ed.). (2014). Sustainable Tourism as a Development Option Practical Guide for Local Planners, Developers and Decision Makers, Eschborn: Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1999. Retrieved from <http://www.giz.de/expertise/downloads/en-tourism-sustainable-development.pdf>

Think City. "George Town World Heritage Site Population and Land Use Change 2009-2013." Think City, 2013. UNESCO. Retrieved from <http://en.unesco.org>

Yin, R.K. (2003). Case study research: design and methods. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, C. A : Sage Publications.

Yung, E.H., & Chan, E.H. (2013). Evaluation for the conservation of historic buildings: Differences between the laymen, professionals and policy makers. *Facilities*, 31(11/12), 542-564.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).