

Crimes against Cultures: How Local Practices of Regulation Shape Archaeological Landscapes in Trowulan, East Java

Tod Jones ¹ 

Adrian Perkasa ²

¹ School of Design and the Built Environment, Curtin University, Perth, WA, Australia

² Department of History, Faculty of Humanities, Airlangga University, Surabaya, Indonesia

Abstract

The abstract is published online only. If you did not include a short abstract for the online version when you submitted the manuscript, the first paragraph or the first 10 lines of the chapter will be displayed here. If possible, please provide us with an informative abstract.

This chapter applies Jacoby's ideas about the moral ecologies of resident relationships with their environment to the relationships of residents of Trowulan in East Java, Indonesia with Majapahit artefacts and sites. We augment moral ecologies with Tim Ingold's concept of meshwork, and argue that heritage should be theorized as movement in configuration with environments in order to challenge hierarchies that privilege state and expert regulation, and often ignore or disparage residents' regulation of artefacts and sites. Attention to the moral ecologies of heritage: reveals the sets of relations that generate the production and care for these objects; and, [as demonstrated through the experiences of Trowulan residents](#), Delete this. documents the power of these relationships to transform colonial and postcolonial relations into creative and fulfilling livelihoods.

Karl Jacoby's recounting of the arguments of various rural-dwelling Native American and non-Native American groups in *Crimes against Nature* challenges the narrow focus and appreciation of contemporary practices of heritage conservation today. His goal was no less than to:

[R]ecreate the moral universe that shaped local transgressions of conservation laws, enabling us to glimpse the pattern of beliefs, practices, and traditions that governed how ordinary rural folk interacted with the environment—a pattern [...] that I have come to term the participants' moral ecologies.¹

AQ1

Jacoby's exacting research [and focus](#) Delete on the practices, arguments and responses to what was generally an unresponsive officialdom and public commentariat continues to confront contemporary accounts of conservation, whether of cultural heritage or the environment, on two broad fronts: it called into question what it means to regulate nature; and in doing so revealed, in his words, 'strikingly different sense of what nature is and how it should be used'.² Both fronts are as relevant for cultural heritage conservation as nature conservation, although each case requires full consideration of the specifics of topic (in this chapter, cultural heritage), time (contemporary), and location (peri-urban Surabaya in East Java in Indonesia). The full brilliance and horror of

Jacoby's painful recounting (or recounting of the pain) of the advent of contemporary spatial regulation of conservation is possible because of his attention to the small, silent ripples left behind from the transformations of entire landscapes.

This chapter responds to Jacoby's approach to resident relationships, with both their surrounding environments and externally imposed conservation regimes, through an examination of first the relevance and applicability of this focus for heritage, and secondly through a case study of the issues arising from the presence of Majapahit heritage and conservation regimes from local perspectives in the small town of Trowulan in East Java, Indonesia. In examining what we conceive to be Jacoby's challenge to heritage studies, we elaborate a framework for approaching heritage drawing on the work of Tim Ingold as well as critical heritage research. We then turn to the context of Trowulan to understand the time-space of resident practices and interventions. The third section briefly outlines our research methods. The fourth section is a case study split into two parts: resident relations with artefacts; and resident relations with sites. We conclude by considering the lessons from *Crimes against Nature* for heritage studies, and what a sustained response to our analysis could look like and achieve.

Heritage and Moral Ecology

The primary reason for the importance of Jacoby's approach for heritage research is his fuller recognition of the presence and operation of local regulatory practices and of how these are displaced or influenced by externally imposed conservation regimes. The term 'fortress conservation', where a conservation area establishes a hard perimeter in order to forcefully keep people out, applies to both environmental and heritage conservation.³ However, the representation of local people who seek to continue their customary practices and use of local resources differs between environmental conservation and heritage. According to Jacoby, conventional accounts of conservation histories located local people on one side of a binary that hides the moral complexity of this transformation: heroic, civilized, law-abiding conservationists were confronted by underhand, uncivilized, criminal residents. In cultural heritage conservation conflicts, the binary is different: civilized, community-minded conservationists are generally opposed to uncivilized, profit-minded developers, and researchers position local residents as either split between these groups or convinced by one or the other.⁴ Resident concerns are generally not with either side, but, like Jacoby's protagonists, with continuing their practices and livelihoods. This is the realm of heritage unrecognized by, and in many circumstances unrecognizable to, official conservation management regimes change full top to comma .⁵ Or lower case. This is a single sentence. what historical geographer Iain Robertson labels residents' regimes of management and care as delete. 'heritage from below'.⁶

Furthermore, Jacoby recognized and recorded how the object of conservation, elements of environments misrecognized as nature, is shaped by its use (by animals and plants as well as humans) in conjunction with physical forces. There is no natural environment separated from humans, but it is instead both a product of relations as well as constituting the terms of those relations. A useful way of conceptualizing this 'environment' is Tim Ingold's concept of meshwork, or 'entangled lines of life, growth and movement':

It is rather a trail along which life is lived. Neither beginning here and ending there, nor vice versa, the trail winds through or amidst like the root of a plant or a stream between its bank. Each such trail is but one strand in a tissue of trails that together comprise the texture of the lifeworld. This texture is what I mean when I speak of organisms being constituted within a relational field. It is a field not of interconnected points but of interwoven lines; not a network but a meshwork.⁷

Residents' moral ecologies are entangled with the environments they interact with and shape. An environment like the Adirondacks in New York State was shaped by the learnings and arrangements of the communities who lived there in conjunction with the growth and movement of plants and animals and in interaction with its physical geography. Human movement through this meshwork is skilled, and is communicated by stories: 'we can understand the nature of things only by attending to their relations, or in other words, by telling their stories'.⁸ The importance of this recognition is that the moral ecologies of residents cannot be separated from their environments; they are their environments.

Cultural heritage phenomena, whether a dance, recipe, book, building or landscape, is similarly the crystallizations of human activity within their environments. However, it would be incorrect to focus on the crystallization itself as this mistakes the fluctuating object or event for the flows of materials that give it a form. This is the mistake of contemporary heritage regulation; it focusses on the correct categorization and treatment of objects.⁹ Instead, here we understand heritage as being the movement of humans and non-humans through the meshwork. Heritage is configured movement. For instance, a *tayuban* dance performance in Indonesia requires skilled practitioners' responses to their environment in their posturing and movement, including constant adjustments with fellow performers, audiences and conditions. While more fleeting than a temple, it is no less physical. The temple itself is a constantly changing physical form that responds to plants, animals, wind, rain and upkeep. Heritage, like ecology, is therefore much more widespread and entangled than most conservation regimes would allow, and is constituted by flows.¹⁰

There are differences between local people's relationships with 'nature' and cultural heritage, just as there are differences between environmental and heritage conservation.¹¹ The enlightenment legacies of nature and heritage allow for a greater engagement between people and heritage when compared to the separation of people and nature in the natural sciences. Nonetheless, a focus on maintaining the physical fabric of heritage objects has created a legacy in heritage management that, despite strong critiques¹² and, as is often the case in nature conservation, continues to overlook local peoples' practices and community regulation. Following Jacoby,¹³ it is also important to not replicate a division between nature and culture that has bedevilled heritage management including world heritage. The concept of meshwork dissolves 'nature' as a category as it is no longer detached from the world of humans, but is part of interconnected environments. Ingold writes that trees, like houses, 'have life-histories, which consist in the unfolding of their relations with both human and non-human components of their environments'; he notes that the extent to which they seem like a building or a landform relates to whether the human or non-human prevails.¹⁴

A field of research that has critically engaged with the application of conservation regimes is political ecology.¹⁵ Within this literature, there is a differentiation between Change to 'Political ecology researchers differentiate' how state institutions 'have a predilection for management through abstract space, through the establishment and enforcement of strict boundaries of conservation and use' and local institutions that 'are seen as managing through complex spatial arrangements, using overlapping and flexible boundaries of use and tenure'.¹⁶ However, this should not be conceived as a binary because, as demonstrated by Jacoby, the separation of state authorities and local people is impossible to maintain as 'each category flowed into the other, complicating any easy moral tale about conservation'.¹⁷ Hence, following Robin Roth, the establishment of conservation zones should be understood 'not as a conflict between state space and local space, but as a process of spatial reorganization instigated by insertion of state space into a landscape long managed through non-state institutions'.¹⁸ An issue that permeates this literature is the contention that the state asserts an 'abstract space'.¹⁹ The application of a conservation regime, as Jacoby demonstrates in great detail, requires large and intensive movements of resources and people from the time of its inception until its dissolution. Most flows do not

recognize boundaries, but are only countered by other flows, such as state-funded heritage management, or local practices, or, as is generally the case, a mish-mash of arrangements.²⁰ In practice, there is no abstract space except in the imagination of planners and researchers. Our attention should be directed to the presence and effects of flows from residents' perspectives and how they shape archaeological landscapes.

Our approach links Jacoby's concerns with recent research that confronts the rhetoric about looting and collecting in archaeological writings, in particular the division between archaeology, elite collecting and vernacular practices of collecting.²¹ Archaeologists are, unsurprisingly, firmly opposed to artefact collecting. This was not always the case. Renaissance collecting was driven by curiosity, which came into tension with science during the Enlightenment period in Europe.²² Archaeologists have characterized artefact collecting and looting as 'self-interested, antisience and an assault on collective rights to history and memory'.²³ Hart and Chilton²⁴ and Dennis Byrne²⁵ strongly challenge these characterizations, pointing out that antiquities collecting continues to overlap with archaeology in both its practices and how it values artefacts. Furthermore, Byrne argues both of these along with local excavations are within the collective of antiquities appreciation and circulation that is global in scope. Looting, or informal excavations of artefacts for private collection or sale, is the heritage equivalent of poaching within nature conservation.²⁶ Like poaching, looting is a characterization of a social practice that both ignores its sociality, local regulations and the complexity of its economics, while strengthening heritage experts' claims for external intervention in regulation and exclusive control. These practices require a nuanced and contextualized account in order to avoid being hidden behind the ideological condemnation of class,²⁷ postcolonial characterizations, and the claims for primacy of the nation-state.²⁸ What we bring to this research is a broader account of what constitutes engagement with artefacts (adding to Rose-Greenland's account of the artist Omero Bordo in Italy),²⁹ and more attention to how local entanglements regulate, respond and shape artefacts and sites in the meshwork of local environments.

A Brief History of Majapahit

The Majapahit Kingdom was founded in the late thirteenth century by Nararya Sanggramawijaya. Under the direction of the famous Prime Minister Rakryan Mapatih Pu Mada, better known as Gajah Mada, the Majapahit army conquered the eastern part of Java and invaded Bali. This kingdom reached its heyday in the fourteenth century, when it traded with China and had vassal states stretching from the Malay Peninsula to the eastern part of archipelago. A Franciscan friar, Odoric di Pordenone, also visited the Majapahit capital in Trowulan and witnessed its wealth in the fourteenth century. He wrote that materials in the palace from the roof to the floor were made from gold and silver.³⁰ Given its epic scale and reports of opulence, it is not surprising the Majapahit became an indispensable part of modern Indonesian political identity and nationalist history, much like Rome is for Italy and Athens is for Greece.

Majapahit rule only lasted until the fifteenth century. After its disappearance, the people of Java and the surrounding islands retained memories of and attachments to the Majapahit kingdom. Sundanese and Balinese aristocrats regularly undertook pilgrimages to former capital of Majapahit in Trowulan. Thomas Stamford Raffles initiated the first modern documentation of the ruins of Majapahit in Trowulan, and dedicated more than 30 pages to the history and antiquities of Majapahit in his *History of Java*.³¹ Interest in archaeological exploration declined when the British gave back Java to the Dutch and returned in the late nineteenth century. Official archaeological activities in Trowulan were accompanied by private ventures, in particular through the Majapahit Archaeological Association (OVM) founded by architect Henry Maclaine Pont and the Regent of Mojokerto (*Adipati*), Kromo Adinegoro in 1925. Maclaine Pont and Kromo Adinegoro collected many artefacts in Trowulan and its surrounding area, and together built the Majapahit Museum in

Trowulan. When the Japanese interned Maclaine Pont during their occupation of Java in 1942, his archaeological projects in Java halted. The next wave of official archaeological activities, which was the largest investment by far, came under Suharto's New Order regime.

While state activities expanded during Constitutional Democracy (1950–1958), they declined along with state revenue during the Sukarno-dominated Guided Democracy (1958–1965) period as Indonesia became increasingly internally divided and isolated internationally.³² Public funding limited state archaeological activities until the rise, on the back of international aid then oil revenues, of the General Suharto-led powerhouse state.³³ Following the success of the reconstruction of Borobudur between 1970 and 1983, the Indonesian government increased its investment in reconstructing Majapahit sites in Trowulan in the mid-1980s.³⁴ A large team, which included the foremost archaeologists of the period including Soejono and Soekmono, the Director-General of Culture Haryati Soebadio, as well as locals, published an extensive *Archaeological Masterplan of the City Remnants of the Trowulan Majapahit Kingdom*.³⁵ The extent of the Majapahit capital's underground remnant structures is thought to be spread across an area between 90 and 100 square kilometres.³⁶

By 1995, six of a planned sixteen sites had been reconstructed at a cost of Rp.2.2 billion.³⁷ The reconstruction effort survived the financial crisis and the fall of Suharto, but slowed after the decentralization process through Regional Autonomy was instituted in 2002. Eight sites were reconstructed. While decentralization transferred control of most regional cultural institutions (such as the *Taman Budaya*, Provincial Museums and the regional Cultural Offices) to the city or regency level, the Bureaus for the Conservation of Cultural Heritage (Balai Pelestarian Cagar Budaya, BPCB) remained under centralized control within the Directorate of Culture. Hence the national government was the focus of much of the criticism for the two major Majapahit controversies of the Reform Period.³⁸ In 2009, the Archaeological Conservation Bureau (the former name of the BPCB East Java) approved a plan to build a Majapahit Information Centre on a site where there were a large number of Majapahit era structures. This controversy, the most prominent heritage conflict of the Reform Era, started a national conversation about heritage that led to new national heritage legislation in 2010.³⁹ The second controversy occurred in 2013 when BPCB East Java supported a plan to build a steel factory in Trowulan, once again on the site of buried Majapahit structures. A coalition of resident groups [opposed to the factory](#) and Indonesian heritage activists opposed the factory and, with support of the World Monument Fund, pressured the Mojokerto and national parliaments to reject the proposal. The second controversy led to Trowulan being listed as a National Heritage Area (Kawasan Cagar Budaya Nasional) in December 2013, and a Masterplan (*Rencana Pengembangan Kawasan Cagar Budaya Majapahit Trowulan Mojokerto*, henceforth Majapahit Masterplan) that was released for discussion in 2016.

The push for heritage protection and related industries (tourism and craft) constitutes one of three drivers of landscape transformation in Trowulan. The second driver is constituted by long-established smallholder farming practices, in particular the production of rice and sugar, that continue to support many of Trowulan's inhabitants. However, these practices and heritage protection are coming under pressure from what we term the Surabaya effect, or the expansion of the peri-urban fringe in connection with increasing urbanization in and around Surabaya, the second largest city in Indonesia after Jakarta. Trowulan is less than an hours drive from Surabaya, a city of approximately 3 million, and part of an urbanizing region with a population of 9 million in 2010.

The production of bricks and sand mining is the source of much tension given the extent of Majapahit artefacts. While Trowulan residents have produced red bricks and other building materials for hundreds of years, production has increased to keep up with the demands of urbanization. Production of building materials can be divided into large and small-scale

production. Large scale, such as we observed in Jatirejo district in 2016, includes the diversion of rivers and large-scale excavation. Small-scale production is based on local brick manufacturers renting part of a field where they excavate the top one to two metres of soil, mould bricks, then fire them in a brick kiln that they construct in the field. A brick maker we interviewed was renting 300 square metres for three years for US\$1200 (Rp.16 million), and was selling his new bricks for 2–3 US cents (Rp.300–400) each. Excavation of the top layer of soil often includes excavation of Majapahit-era structures, and an Indonesian research project in 2014 counted over 300 traditional brick factories in Trowulan. In terms of volume, traditional brick manufacturers are the leading excavators of Majapahit era structures and artefacts.⁴⁰ Manufacturers sell the excavated older bricks for over three times what they get for new bricks (Rp.1000–2000 or eight to fifteen US cents). These large-scale changes to the landscape and the pressure for new factories in proximity to Surabaya are in tension with the local, national and international groups who are seeking the conservation and promotion of Majapahit heritage.

Our Approach

We utilized a mixed methods approach to the case study constituted by archival research and two periods of fieldwork, all of which is built on a long-term engagement with both heritage and cultural policy issues and local players. While Tod Jones has over sixteen years of experience undertaking research into cultural and heritage issues in Indonesia, Adrian Perkasa developed the more important set of relationships with local residents and officials in BPCB East Java and the Province of East Java through his Master's research into heritage controversies in Trowulan. The archival research was limited to documents following the 1983 decision to begin restoration of a series of local sites. Data was also collected on the demographic and economic characteristics of the region. While we engaged with secondary sources about the archaeological and historical characteristics of Trowulan, these topics sit outside the scope of this chapter.

We undertook fieldwork in May 2016 when we conducted site visits and eight interviews, and in May 2017 when we undertook a smaller number of site visits and six interviews (two were with people interviewed in 2016). The site visits were recorded using a field journal and photographs. The visits to the smaller sites included a meeting and discussion with the site caretaker, a local who lived nearby. All interviews utilized an interview schedule and were recorded and transcribed. They took place in Indonesian with the exception of one interview (with a brick manufacturer), which was in Javanese. Following Cope and Mayring, the data was thematically coded using NVIVO software following an inductive method.⁴¹

Artefacts

Like Jacoby observes in relation to the history of conservation movements,⁴² the relationships between Indonesian residents and artefacts have long been diminished then ignored in archaeological research and management. Thomas Raffles proposed that the historic structures he discussed in *The History of Java* were the product of Indian migrants and not the Javanese,⁴³ a colonial proposition that was still believed by a minority of Dutch archaeologists in the 1920s.⁴⁴ While most archaeologists by this time thought local people built the structures, they were still debating whether there was local appreciation and utilization.⁴⁵ A postcolonial echo of this debate was still reverberating in the 1980s as indicated in the *Majapahit Masterplan*:

The interview results from residents who live around Trowulan's archaeological sites indicate that they do not feel they 'own' or do not value archaeological remains as valuable heritage and the achievements of past cultures.⁴⁶

The *Majapahit Masterplan* then states that residents only appreciate the economic value of the Majapahit artefacts through the sale of artefacts and bricks, and respond to ‘to the threat of law’.⁴⁷ Senior staff at the BPCB East Java, which is based in Trowulan, now have a more nuanced understanding of local relationships and acknowledge local appreciation and that the conservation of artefacts will clash with local socio-economic systems that mesh with broader changes (such as the urbanization of Surabaya). However, also they hold the misperception that increasing understanding of archaeology and the reasons for laws will prevent local rituals, like touching objects at heritage sites.

Similarly to the rural dwellers and native Americans in *Crimes against Nature*, our interviews and observation of residents indicate local residents have an appreciation of artefacts that is nuanced and critical. Trowulan appears to differ from Byrne’s observations at archaeologically rich Bantuan in the Philippines in that working-class local people in Trowulan have their own collections of lower value artefacts.⁴⁸ For instance, Fig. 6.1 is a small collection of statue heads that was shown to us in 2016. These are not *pusaka*, or powerful objects capable of intervening in daily and spiritual life, but a reflection of local interest in Majapahit material culture. Residents also have their own set of sanctions, generally expressed as a strong dislike, if another resident sells an artefact to a dealer who takes the artefact out of the region. It is not illegal to sell an artefact to a collector within Indonesia, so local sanctions are geographically more restrictive than formal sanctions. Furthermore, local religious beliefs can prevent people from taking artefacts from important sites. One respondent said:

Fig. 6.1 Move this figure from the middle of a paragraph if possible.

A personal collection of small statue heads. 2016
(Photograph by Tod Jones)

What is effective is when they take something, they become sick, possessed, crazy. That is an effective sanction because our community is a religious community.⁴⁹

The effects of dealing with powerful objects are tracked quite closely in relation to dealers, whose health is thought to be regularly subjected to attacks from the objects they deal. Formal sanctions protecting artefacts can result in jail time of up to fifteen years and a fine of up to approximately \$US375,000,⁵⁰ but our informants only mentioned a single time a person was prosecuted, which occurred in the 1970s to a BPCB staff member. Local sanctions are both more restrictive and more often applied.

A moral ecologies framework needs to recognize the complexity of relations between the state and local residents. As in Deerfield, Massachusetts (USA),⁵¹ there is local distrust of the state archaeological managers (BPCB). When artefacts are reported to BPCB, they are often not seen again as they go into storage. Furthermore, there are rumours that staff at the museum have sold objects or exchanged them for new objects. However, the division between BPCB staff and Trowulan residents is not clear-cut. BPCB staff live in Trowulan, and there are a large number of long-term local residents who work in various capacities in or for BPCB. This includes most of the caretakers (*juru pelihara*) for local shrines, eight of which receive large numbers of visitors. As a retired BPCB staff member whose family has lived in Trowulan for many generations asserted, socialization of understanding about the history and value of artefacts spreads through the knowledge of local people.⁵² Trowulan residents also selectively make use of conservation rules and policing, and will contact the police or BPCB staff if they see activity that they regard as

suspicious. Many of our respondents reported that residents had in the past sold artefacts to brokers who are likely to have sold them to overseas collectors. As in Byrne's account of 'looters' in Batuan,⁵³ there was a strong economic motive given the low level of wealth in Trowulan historically, but there was also local resistance to these sales. In the present, locating artefacts of higher value is rare and, as stated by the Head of the History, Museum and Archaeology Section in the East Java Office of Culture and Tourism, most such 'finds' now are newly manufactured by Trowulan artists whose skill is such as to make the new artefacts indistinguishable to Trowulan Museum staff.

The intimate relationship between contemporary Trowulan artists and Majapahit artefacts has a long and fascinating history. It can be traced to the relationship between the Dutch architect Maclaine Pont and a local man, Sabar, who lived in the village of Bejjong.⁵⁴ Sabar was born in the 1900s to a farming family. Sabar began working for Maclaine Pont in 1924 when he started designing the old Majapahit Museum. Maclaine Pont and Sabar built a close working relationship that included working together on a bronze statue of Jesus in the Pohsarang Catholic Church in Kediri, East Java, that Maclaine Pont designed (itself important to Indonesian architectural history due to its combination of European and Indonesian architectural design) completed in 1936. After Maclaine Pont was interred by the Japanese and his archaeological work stopped, Sabar continued to look after his collection and correspond with him.⁵⁵ Sabar's grandson Nuryadi stated:

Nuryad These three lines need to be formatted as a quote, which is not the case at the moment. i:

Adrian:

Nuryadi:

When Maclaine Pont returned to the Netherlands, Sabar had a moral obligation to protect Maclaine Pont's collection.

Did Sabar continue to protect it?

Yes, as the legacy of Maclaine Pont, Sabar felt a moral responsibility to protect the collection.⁵⁶

Sabar moved his workshop to the front of the museum and lived behind it. From 1949 until his retirement in 1965 he worked in an unwaged capacity at the museum, generating income from commissions from visitors and other work connected to the collection. In the 1950s, his son Hariadi Sabar stated that his family with his second wife Rubeni⁵⁷ and his seven children were very poor and at times could not afford the Javanese staple of rice. A few months before he retired in 1965 he was appointed to a waged position in BPCB so that he could claim a pension.

While the history to 1965 demonstrates one family's strong connection to Majapahit material culture, Sabar was also a key contributor to what can be called the New Majapahit Art following his retirement. At this time he moved back to Bejjong and began experimenting with producing Majapahit statues, initially using lead and simple forms (such as animals), then progressing to metal and bronze and more complex forms. He started to sell his statues in front of the museum and to shops in Surabaya. His orientation, based on his extensive knowledge of Majapahit artefacts, was towards classical work in the style of the Majapahit with the goal of replicating their skill and design. It is difficult now to locate Sabar's statues, and it is likely that his mark on them has worn down with time. The one statue we located was a bust he made of himself in the workshop of his son Hariadi (see Fig. 6.2). Sabar taught his family, friends and neighbours how to manufacture metal objects including large statues. Hariadi Sabar is the most well-known bronze artist, and has worked with the staff and students of the nationally prominent Jakarta Arts Institute (*Institut Kesenian Jakarta*, IKJ) since 1986. According to Hariadi, over 150 people in Bejjong work in some capacity in the production of metal statues, jewellery and other objects. Sabar passed away in 1996.

Fig. 6.2

Sabar. A bronze bust of the artist. Date unknown

(Photograph by Tod Jones with permission of Hariadi Sabar)

Today, Trowulan artists are perhaps even better known for their stone statues. Stone statue production began after metal in 1977 with the work of a blacksmith, Harun and then Wagiran in the nearby village of Jatisumber. With the decline of blacksmith work, Harun turned to stone sculpture. Most of the stone sculptors today relate directly to these two founders. Wagiran was the father of Wakidi, who taught many of the sculptors in Jatisumber, including the internationally successful Ribut. Stone sculpture has become a successful exporting business, with 75% of the production of the sculptors we interviewed being produced for an international market. A third industry, which has not received the same level of national recognition, is in the production of terracotta Majapahit art. Terracotta tends to receive lower prices and is more easily mass-produced.

The presence of the museum and sites is essential to the emergence, forms and operations of the New Majapahit Art. The museum was the only point of reference for early artists, and Sabar's close relationship with artefacts in the museum both inspired his experimentation and led his practice. Both Hariadi and Ribut, currently the two most successful artists, still visit the museum weekly and make regular visits to sites both in and outside Trowulan. While younger artists are more likely to work from images, the connection to the museum remains. A younger artist, Tono, said to us: 'If I get stuck, I go to the museum'.⁵⁸ Stone sculptor Ribut links the presence of Majapahit art to the meshwork:

I myself still really feel that it [the art] is an impact from the museum, from the sites. Maybe not just here. One example in Magelang, there are sculptors... There are lots of sites... Its an impact from the environment, an effect of the environment.⁵⁹

Majapahit stone sculpture in particular has reached a level of technical production that, with contemporary techniques for ageing, makes it very difficult to know if an artefact is new or from the Majapahit era. Furthermore, the museum now asks senior artists to make such determinations, such as their familiarity and understanding of Majapahit artefacts, old and new.

Until now, the New Majapahit art has been understood to be making replicas, which threaten to undermine museums, galleries and collectors' efforts to protect the provenance and value of Majapahit art. Such judgements rely on a modern conception of creation that divides the processes of design and making,⁶⁰ and is inappropriate to regional art production in Indonesia and similar systems of production elsewhere.⁶¹ The division between design and making, essential to modern ideas about creativity and copyright,⁶² hides both the way creating art occurs in the acts and combinations of making, and the creativity and skill required for imitation. We quote Tim Ingold at length here because he captures the dynamics of the New Majapahit Art that are missed when complaints are levelled at replication:

Far from yielding a concrete and objectified end-product, every performance is just one moment in the work's concrescence—its ongoing generation. This idea is reinforced by a method of learning in which, through repetitive practice in copying or imitating previous or classic exemplars, novices incorporate the movements and sensibilities of the masters into their own bodily comportment, only to surpass them in the development of their own personal style. At no point, however, do they cease to copy. For every original is a copy in that it is modelled on previous studies, and every copy is an original in that it can become a model for those who follow.⁶³

Replication of an exceptional art form is a rare creative achievement. Replication of art that has not been practiced for over four hundred years and the achievement of art of such quality that experts struggle to identify its providence is phenomenal. Trowulan artists understand the process of creating Majapahit artefacts better than internationally educated experts. To represent the New Majapahit Art as underhand or criminal misunderstands its origins, operations and achievements, and inhibits opportunities for museums to work together with Trowulan artists.

While the attitude of museums to local production is a negative colonial legacy, an important insight from Trowulan is how colonial relationships are transformed in the meshwork of local lives. The New Majapahit Art is the best example of this transformation. Here the focus on the historical markers of Greater India (that still dominates archaeology), through extensive engagement and experimentation, has become the basis for a skilled local engagement that is entwined with connections to place, family, livelihoods and history. Furthermore, this is not an isolated incident. Magelan in Central Java also has many artefacts, sites and artists. Furthermore, it occurs in other countries. [Fiona Rose-Greenland](#)'s ethnography of 'looters' in Italy also identifies a 'moral code that militates against certain practices', detailed knowledge passed down within families, and their criminalization by the state.⁶⁴ She also identifies replication of, in this case, Eritrean wares as a basis for local manufacturing that were also dismissed by educated elites despite their remarkable similarity to ancient ceramics. Similar complexities and dismissals of local knowledge and relationships were identified in Northern Peru.⁶⁵ If heritage is the relationship between objects and environments that explains a valued past, then there is an argument to be made for the equivalence of New Majapahit Art with the original artefacts. The difference is that, while museums use state funding and expert knowledge to control flows of materials to prevent change to existing objects, Trowulan artists skilfully engage in material flows, learnt through knowledge gained from an extended community engagement with Majapahit art, to create anew. The colonial legacy that remains to be overcome is the vast gap in appreciation and attention to these categories, and resistance to returning cultural control of these artefacts to their places of origin where the meshwork of local lives has more chance of creative engagement and entanglement with livelihoods. While artefacts in museums are sustained through state funds, separation from visitors and expert knowledge, the New Majapahit art is sustained through Trowulan livelihoods and economics, family networks, private sales and artists' skilled interaction with materials.

Sites

With eight such monuments, Trowulan is one of the sub-districts (*kecamatan*) with the largest number of state-reconstructed archaeological sites in Indonesia. Trowulan became a focus of reconstruction efforts due to the representation of the Majapahit kingdom as the precursor for Indonesia in nationalist histories, the success of the reconstruction of Borobudur,⁶⁶ and, building on Raffles and Wardenaar, the archaeological work of Dutch scholars and local elites in the 1920s and 1930s. The presence of both locally maintained and reconstructed sites invites comparative analysis between them, particularly in relation to resident relations and state regulation. A moral ecologies approach recognizes the adaptiveness of local residents to new flows of people and resources, including those derived from state conservation initiatives and regulation, while also acknowledging the pain caused when relationships with heritage are severed by these changes.

A job that runs across and complicates the division between the reconstructed sites and the locally managed sites is the *juru kunci*, or keeper of the key. The term derives from the Javanese *juru kuncen*, where certain staff were tasked with the role of protecting particular sites, communicating their history, and facilitating related rituals. These are particularly important at sites of pilgrimage and tomb visitation (*ziarah*). James Fox identifies that *juru kunci* 'keep these traditions alive and

relevant to contemporary Javanese'.⁶⁷ There are many people who have performed the role of the *juru kunci* on Java, and they have been appointed and paid through a variety of different methods and institutions. In 2016, the East Java Office of Culture and Tourism paid 420 *juru kunci*, who are state employees, at various fractions and levels.⁶⁸ The *juru kunci* employed through the state system are now known as *juru pelihara* (Caretaker), and have a set of defined tasks and roles. While the two terms are both used now, we use *juru pelihara* to refer to state-paid and regulated roles, *juru kunci* to refer to roles regulated by non-state institutions with greater continuity with earlier roles, and caretaker to refer to all site caretakers. Most of the positions in Trowulan were waged, with *Juru Pelihara* at the local sites receiving a small salary through a fractional position. The Dutch East Indies government similarly paid a small stipend to *juru kunci* at certain sites. Generally caretakers live next to or quite near their site, and often the position is retained within the same family. Other *juru kunci* are appointed by local institutions, including villages. A village that oversaw one small shrine in Trowulan elected a new *juru kunci* for life just before we undertook fieldwork in 2017, leading to a local controversy when the winner overspent the agreed amount for campaigning.⁶⁹ This position was unwaged but, due to this shrine's connections to Suharto, it often attracted senior Golkar figures who tipped well, and it generated money through parking.

The restored sites correspond most closely to the notion of monumental sites⁷⁰ and fortress conservation.⁷¹ These sites, like Bajang Ratu (see Fig. 6.3), are surrounded by fences that have a specific BPCB style. They are open to the public during the day and generally closed at night. A critique of a senior staff member of BPCB was that 'There are no visitor facilities [at the archaeological sites in Trowulan] because it has the features of conservation, not of utilization'.⁷² The sites are surrounded by Western-style gardens with grass and often intricate hedges, but few tall trees, little shade, and no seating for visitors. This reduces their usefulness for locals who, on their day off on Sundays, prefer the Buddhist Wihara (see Fig. 6.4), the location of the large, new sleeping Buddha statue that is surrounded by a garden, reproductions of other Buddhist sites (like Borobudur), and has many places to sit and relax. The restored sites have large numbers of staff, mostly attract visitors on day trips, generally from Surabaya, who stay at the sites for short periods before journeying to the next site.

Fig. 6.3

Bajang Rau in Trowulan, Mojokerto, East Java, Indonesia
(Photograph by Tod Jones)

Fig. 6.4

The Buddhist Wihara in Trowulan
(Photograph by Tod Jones)

In contrast to the state-restored sites, the locally regulated sites are smaller and are not surrounded by gardens. Large trees provide shade, and there is often a shaded place for guests to rest. Whenever we visited a site, we would initially be alone, but a caretaker would generally arrive within five minutes. The sites were clean and well maintained. Often the trees and some of the structures had sheets tied around them, in a style similar to Bali, which indicated their spiritual qualities. Graves are a recurring feature of the locally regulated sites. As has been observed across

Indonesia,⁷⁵ the dead play an important role in the lives of the living. By visiting tombs and places where spirits inhabit, Islamic people in particular are able to ask for their intercession with Allah.⁷⁴ Ancestors and these other spirits are powerful beings, able to influence the physical world, in particular through sickness or assistance. These beliefs are important to site maintenance and discourage unauthorized excavations. Our local informants noted the frequency of graves at sites, not just in Trowulan but across East Java, and that the most popular sites have graves. Graves at sites are often acknowledged as potentially false, but pilgrims still visit the sites, potentially replace with 'often' because of the presence of other spiritual beings. Indeed, the large trees do not just provide shelter for the living. Henri Chambert-Loir observes that 'The place is usually marked by the presence of big trees (often banyan), which are themselves sacred as they are the domain of the spirits'.⁷⁵ Most of the locally regulated sites therefore have the characteristics of Javanese Islamic pilgrimage sites. These sites are constantly shifting form in relation to changes in use.

The physical characteristics of these sites and the rhythms of their use are shaped through their relationship to local people. As these sites are places of local gathering and pride, they are cleaned physically and spiritually. The patterns of their use correspond to special days and times in the Javanese calendar. For instance, a harvest festival (*ruwat desa*) in May will fill a local shrine for an entire day, ending with a Wayang performance late into the night. On Friday Legi Eve (*Malam Jumat Legi*),⁷⁶ a time for making prayers and seeking intercession, pilgrims come from across East Java, in particular to Trowulan's Tomb, a site made popular through the visits of ex-Indonesian President and Islamic leader Gus Dur. On Malam Jumat Legi, t Delete and start with 'On this day, ' he village and local tourism office close the road and it turns into a busy street festival. We visited a different grave with a group of local men on *Malam Jumat Legi* in 2016 where they prayed, then ate together at midnight. Women and children went earlier in the day where they ate a traditional food. Furthermore, as can be seen in Fig. 6.5, at other times of the day these sites are used for other activities like drying rice, and are used by local guides as a tourist site that they can interpret out of the way of the official guides who tend to stick to the museum and larger sites. The physical forms of these sites take their shape through their presence in the environment of Trowulan residents.

Fig. 6.5

Rice drying in front of the Watu Ombo shrine, Trowulan, East Java

The restoration of Majapahit era artefacts was in fact the transformation of locally regulated shrines into state-regulated, national monuments. These transformations took years and billions of Rupiah. Often they necessitated the movement of homes and gravesites. Sabar's grandson Nuryadi, who worked for over two decades supervising restoration work, observed that 'moving people is much easier than moving graves graves.''.⁷⁷ While no graves or houses were moved at Candi Brahu, at Bajang Ratu over fifty graves and one house were moved, necessitating many ceremonies and much negotiation so as to not upset ancestors. The Furthermore, the physical Please delete 'informed' from this sentence. This editing software is terrible. form of the reconstructed temples requires builders to imagine ~~an~~ informed builders to imagine imagination-of the shape of their original form. What is more, the actual construction is done by local people who place and set new and old stones. The massive investment in reconstruction does not stop with the end of a restoration. Physical forces and lines of life constantly transgress the boundaries of official sites, necessitating large teams to maintain the gardens and the monuments. In the experience of Marsaid, the senior *juru pelihara* at Candi Brahu and local resident, the wet season requires far greater work than dry season due to the phenomenal

growth of plants, grass and lichen. Marsaid and the other caretakers clean the Buddhist temple monthly using bamboo ladders and ropes (see Fig. 6.6). The shifts then from local to state regulation require a large initial and ongoing state investment to shape and maintain the site in its imagined original form. Such investments should not then be assumed to sever relations or destroy moral ecologies. Moral ecologies shift with these investments, often shaping new relationships and forms, while older forms wither and become memories if their flows are no longer sustained.

Fig. 6.6

Candi Brahu, a reconstructed Buddhist temple at Trowulan, East Java
(Photograph by Tod Jones 2017)

The postcolonial nationalist imagining of a monumental and impressive past is most obvious in the restored sites. However, as is usually the case, the situation is more complex because the restored sites also exist in local environments that give them their shape and form. Candi Brahu has a garden with plants trimmed to look like stupas and a Majapahit-inspired star-shaped hedge along with some larger trees and a large grassed area. Its design was conceived and executed by the caretakers, all of them local residents. What is more, the responsibilities of an effective *juru kunci* are very similar to that of an effective *juru pelihara*.⁷⁸ They must undertake regular maintenance and keep the site clean. They should know the site's history and not make things up. They should always be available for guests, day or evening. Marsaid and his team do these things and have the respect of people who carry out spiritual activities, and they often make use of the reconstructed Candi Brahu. They also use it for larger community events. Candi Brahu, as a Buddhist temple that was not a location for graves, was not used previously to any great degree by the local community. As a site with some shade and local caretakers, it has become more visited due to the restoration.

While residents then shape both restored and locally managed sites through their engagement and work, resident relationships are stronger and visits more frequent to local sites. However, as Marsaid and Candi Brahu demonstrate, this does not have to be the case, and local relationships with sites can take different forms and modes of engagement. These are intimately linked to the moral ecologies of the site, its physical form, and how the physical and organic forces that work on the temple are countered through residents' physical engagement. However, in neither case should the structures be considered monuments because it is that conception that poses the greatest danger to local relationships. A Trowulan artist and regular visitor to shrines addressed this issue:

The current method [of site regulation] is where old structures are considered as only monuments that are only to astound. If we are astounded, it means we cannot do anything but be astounded, and not do anything, and only do activities that are in the name of astonishment. We do not deeply consider; we are the astounded. That's all, but if societal enrichment is economic—ok, spiritual—ok, scientific—ok, I think it can come alive.⁷⁹

Living relationships, and all its benefits, requires flows linked to perceptions of what sites are and can be. Moral ecologies centres these relationships in our research and thinking.

Conclusion

In *Crimes against Nature*, Jacoby foreshadowed an important critique in social science research of assumptions of progress and a turn towards alternative sets of relations, themselves particular and

historical, that are ignored by scalable knowledge that seek universal application.⁸⁰ Through his concept of moral ecologies, Jacoby practiced what Anna Tsing calls ‘arts of noticing’ that allow for lower level engagements that cannot be scaled up and rolled out.⁸¹ By doing so, Jacoby highlighted the violence done and what has been lost when the narratives of conservation as progress go unchallenged. His detailed method and research avoided the romanticism that threatens research about geographically smaller, ‘local’ levels,⁸² and was an early contribution to a body of work that is now charting alternatives to singular paths of progress. Due to its attention to the particular and historical, cultural heritage is a field of practices that should be deeply engaged in these debates and conversations. It still has much to learn from Jacoby’s method and findings.

The attention we have paid to resident relations to cultural heritage in Trowulan reveals similarities today in the realm of cultural heritage to Jacoby’s observations about environmental conservation. Local histories of relations and ‘becomings-with’ are marginalized and ignored.⁸³ The remarkable story of the New Majapahit Art becomes copying and a threat to the provenance of valuable museum and collector pieces. The moral ecology of heritage we explore reveals the continuing colonial relations that marginalize and denigrate the skilled re-creation of Majapahit art. More efficient and integrated local heritage sites have been reterritorialized as national monuments at great and ongoing cost and with great difficulty. The rhythms of local sites come into focus when conceived as local moral ecologies, including their connections to local systems of belief, as do the ways in which a small number of sites are protected from and changed by the encroachment of peri-urban Surabaya.

We also demonstrate that considering heritage as movement in configuration with environments, as we do through our use of Ingold’s concept of meshwork, opens up finer grained considerations of resident-heritage interactions. Considering the New Majapahit Art as artefacts required us to acknowledge a new evolving knowledge and scale of perception that transforms postcolonial relations by using them as a resource within the meshwork of resident lives and livelihoods. Attention to flows of materials reveals the broader sets of relations that generate the production and care for these objects. Focussing on movement also complicates our consideration of resident relations with monumental sites. Even prescriptive state regulations cannot prevent resident meshwork from prising open and transforming these sites through residents’ daily interactions as gardeners, caretakers, visitors and community members. Moral ecologies’ challenge to the hierarchies of power that reinforce singular approaches at the expense of resident relationships and livelihoods must remain a focus of cultural heritage research if this research is willing to take on its conceptual limitations with regards to heritage practice. Being attentive to the multiple connections between cultural heritage and its environments both acknowledges the pain of unravelling entanglements caused by institutional interventions (however well-intentioned), and provides the tensions that will force important conceptual and ethical changes in how researchers consider and approach cultural heritage.

Notes

1. Karl Jacoby, *Crimes against Nature: Squatters, Poachers, Thieves, and the Hidden History of American Conservation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 3.
2. Ibid.
3. See, for instance, Lynn Meskell, *The Nature of Heritage: The New South Africa* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012).
4. Jacoby, *Crimes against Nature*, 1–7.

5. Denis Byrne, *Counterheritage: Critical Perspectives on Heritage Conservation in Asia* (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2014).
6. Iain Robertson, "Introduction: Heritage from Below," in *Heritage from Below*, ed. Iain Robertson (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), 15–42.
7. Tim Ingold, *Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description* (London and New York: Routledge, 2011), 69–70.
8. *Ibid.*, 160.
9. Denis Byrne, "Archaeology and the Fortress of Rationality," in *Cosmopolitan Archaeologies*, ed. Lynn Meskell (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009), 68–88.
10. Animals, as a group that has historically been subjugated to human achievements while also essential to them, has a complex relationship with commemoration. See, for instance, Hilda Kean's research on commemoration and the role of animals in the tangled relationships that shape cities. Hilda Kean, "Traces and Representations: Animal Pasts in London's Present," *The London Journal* 36, 1 (2011): 54–71.
11. Jacoby, *Crimes against Nature*.
12. Laurajane Smith, *Uses of Heritage* (London and New York: Routledge, 2006); Byrne, *Counterheritage*; Rodney Harrison, *Heritage: Critical Approaches* (Oxon: Routledge, 2013).
13. Jacoby, *Crimes against Nature*.
14. Tim Ingold, *The Perception of the Environment: Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), 187.
15. Paul Robbins, *Political Ecology: A Critical Introduction* (Malden, MA: Wiley, 2012); Roderick P. Neumann, *Imposing Wilderness: Struggles over Livelihood and Nature Preservation in Africa* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).
16. Robin J. Roth, "'Fixing' the Forest: The Spatiality of Conservation Conflict in Thailand," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 98, 2 (2008): 374.
17. Jacoby, *Crimes against Nature*, 146.
18. Roth, "'Fixing' the Forest," 142.
19. *Ibid.*; George Holmes, "Defining the Forest, Defending the Forest: Political Ecology, Territoriality, and Resistance to a Protected Area in the Dominican Republic," *Geoforum* 53 (2014): 1–10.
20. Ingold, *The Perception of the Environment*.
21. Byrne, *Counterheritage*; Siobhan. Hart and Elizabeth Chilton, "Digging and Destruction: Artifact Collecting as Meaningful Social Practice," *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21, 4 (2015): 318–35; Fiona Rose-Greenland, "Looters, Collectors and a Passion

- for Antiquities at the Margins of Italian Society,” *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 19, 5 (2014): 570–82.
22. Byrne, *Counterheritage*, 165–8.
 23. Hart and Chilton, “Digging and Destruction,” 320.
 24. Ibid.
 25. Byrne, *Counterheritage*, 159–99.
 26. Jacoby, *Crimes against Nature*.
 27. Rose-Greenland, “Looters, Collectors”.
 28. Byrne, *Counterheritage*; Benedict Anderson, “Cartoons and Monuments: The Evolution of Political Communication under the New Order,” in *Language and Power: Exploring Political Cultures in Indonesia*, ed. Benedict Anderson (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 282–321; Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 1991), 163–206.
 29. Rose-Greenland, “Looters, Collectors”.
 30. James R. Rush, *Java a Travellers’ Anthology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 1–2.
 31. Thomas Stanford Raffles, *The History of Java* (London: Open University Press, 1965/1817).
 32. Tod Jones, *Culture, Power, and Authoritarianism in the Indonesian State. Cultural Policy Across the Twentieth Century to the Reform Era* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 71–111.
 33. See Clifford Geertz, “Afterword: The Politics of Meaning,” in *Culture and Politics in Indonesia*, ed. Claire Holt (London: Cornell University Press, 1972), 319–35; and James Schiller *Developing Jepara in New Order Indonesia* (Melbourne: Monash Asia Institute, Monash University, 1996).
 34. The Indonesian Archaeological Service’s treatment of archaeological sites, in particular its preference for reconstruction, dates back to fierce debates in the 1910s and 1920s between Dutch experts in Indonesian antiquities: Marieke Bloembergen and Martijn Eickhoff, “Save Borobudur! The Moral Dynamics of Heritage Formation in Indonesia across Orders and Borders, 1930s–1980s,” in *Cultural Heritage as Civilizing Mission: From Decay to Recovery*, ed. Michael Falser (Cham: Springer, 2015), 83–119; Marieke Bloembergen and Martijn Eickhoff, “Conserving the Past, Mobilizing the Indonesian Future Archaeological Sites, Regime Change and Heritage Politics in Indonesia in the 1950s,” *Bijdragen Tot De Taal- Land- En Volkenkunde* 167, 4 (2011), 405–36.
 35. Proyek Pemugaran dan Pemeliharaan Peninggalan Sejarah dan Purbakala, “Archaeological Masterplan of the City Remnants of the Trowulan Majapahit Kingdom (Rencana Induk Arkeologi Bekas Kota Kerajaan Majapahit Trowulan),”

(Jakarta: Direktorat Perlindungan dan Pembinaan Peninggalan Sejarah dan Purbakala, 1986).

36. Two of our informants who were senior officials in BPCB East Java stated that the extent was 91 square kilometres, which is the extent of the National Heritage Area.
37. Koos Siti Rochmani, "Upaya Pelestarian Situs Kota Kerajaan Majapahit Di Trowulan, Mojokerto, Jawa Timur 1983–1995," (Jakarta: Bagian Proyek Pembinaan Peninggalan Sejarah Dan Kepurbakalaan Bekas Kota Kerajaan Majapahit, Direktorat Kebudayaan, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 1995).
38. The political period that began with the forced resignation of Suharto in 1998.
39. Adrian Perkasa, *Orang-Orang Tionghoa Dan Islam Di Majapahit* (Yogyakarta: Ombak, 2012), 184–95.
40. Amrit Gomperts, Arnoud Haag and Peter Carey "Stutterheim's Enigma: The Mystery of His Mapping of the Majapahit Kraton at Trowulan in 1941," *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 164, 4 (2008): fn.2. They estimated that since 1816 over 500 million cubic metres of soils with medieval bricks had been removed.
41. Meghan Cope, "Coding Qualitative Data," in *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, ed. Iain Hay (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 2010), 22–33; Philipp Mayring, "Qualitative Content Analysis," *Forum Qualitative Social Research* 1, 2 (2000), accessed 21 May 2018, <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0002204> .
42. Jacoby, *Crimes against Nature*, 1–7.
43. Raffles, *The History of Java*.
44. Bloembergen and Eickhoff, "Conserving the Past".
45. *Ibid.*, 414–8.
46. Proyek Pemugaran dan Pemeliharaan Peninggalan Sejarah dan Purbakala, "Archaeological Masterplan," 14.
47. *Ibid.*
48. Byrne, *Counterheritage*.
49. Interview with Trowulan artist, Trowulan, 31 March 2016.
50. Undang Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1992 tentang. Benda Cagar Budaya pasal 105. This is the fine for destroying an artefact. The maximum jail term for trading is five years and the maximum fine is still a substantial \$US110,000.
51. Hart and Chilton, "Digging and Destruction," 328.
52. Interview with Nuryadi Sabar, Jatisumber, Trowulan, 2 April 2016.

53. Byrne, *Counterheritage*.
54. It should be noted that this is an oral history based on interviews with Sabar's family and artists in Trowulan, supported by some archival research and should be regarded as an overview. The history of the New Majapahit Art requires much greater documentation, archival research and interviews both within and outside Trowulan.
55. Sabar's son and nationally renowned bronze sculptor Hariadi Sabar told us that Sabar used to take messages to Maclaine-Pont when he was interred concealed in grass that he said he brought into feed the horses.
56. Interview with Nuryadi Sabar, Trowulan, 13 May 2017.
57. Sabar's first wife, Sumi, had three children and passed away before Sabar married Rubeni, who gave birth to four children.
58. Interview with Trowulan stone artist, Trowulan, 1 April 2016.
59. Interview with Ribut, Trowulan, 13 May 2017.
60. Tim Ingold, "Introduction [to First Section]," in *Creativity and Cultural Improvisation*, ed. Elizabeth Hallam and Tim Ingold (Oxford: Berg, 2007).
61. Lorraine V. Aragon and James Leach, "Arts and Owners: Intellectual Property Law and the Politics of Scale in Indonesian Arts," *American Ethnologist* 35, 4 (2008): 607–31.
62. James Leach, "Creativity, Subjectivity, and the Dynamic of Possessive Individualism," in *Creativity and Cultural Improvisation*, 99–116.
63. Ingold, "Introduction [to First Section]," 50.
64. Rose-Greenland, "Looters, Collectors," 571.
65. Kimbra L. Smith, "Looting and the Politics of Archaeological Knowledge in Northern Peru," *Ethnos* 70, no. 2 (2005), 149–70.
66. Bloembergen and Eickhoff, "Save Borobudur!"
67. James Fox, "Interpreting the Historical Significance of Tombs and Chronicles in Contemporary Java," in *The Potent Dead: Ancestors, Saints and Heroes in Contemporary Indonesia*, ed. Henri Chambert-Loir and Anthony Reid (Sydney and Honolulu: Allen & Unwin and University of Hawaii Press, 2002), 172.
68. Interview with East Javanese official in the Office of Culture and Tourism, Surabaya, 4 April 2016.
69. Interview with Trowulan artist, Trowulan, 31 March 2016.
70. Smith, *Uses of Heritage*, Chapter 3.

71. Meskell, *The Nature of Heritage*.
72. Interview with official in PBCB, Trowulan, 1 April 2016.
73. Meskell, *The Nature of Heritage*.
74. Jörgen Hellman, "Living Together with Ancestors: Cultural Heritage and Sacred Places on West Java," *International Journal of Religious Tourism and Pilgrimage* 5, 1 (2017), accessed 21 May 2018, <https://arrow.dit.ie/ijrtp/vol5/iss1/8> .
75. Henri Chambert-Loir, "Saints and Ancestors: The Cult of Muslim Saints in Java," in *The Potent Dead: Ancestors, Saints and Heroes in Contemporary Indonesia*, ed. Henri Chambert-Loir and Anthony Reid (Sydney and Honolulu: Allen & Unwin and University of Hawaii Press, 2002), 136.
76. *Malam Jumat Legi* is the night before the coincidence of Friday in the seven day cycle and Legi in the five day cycle in the Javanese calendar.
77. Interview with Nuryadi Sabar, Jatisumber, Trowulan, 2 April 2016.
78. Interview with Trowulan artist, Trowulan, 31 March 2016.
79. Interview with Trowulan artist, Trowulan, 31 March 2016.
80. Anna Tsing, *The Mushroom at the End of the World: On the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2015).
81. *Ibid.*, 37.
82. David C. Harvey, "Heritage and Scale: Settings, Boundaries and Relations," *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21, 6 (2015): 577–93.
83. Donna Jeanne Haraway, *When Species Meet* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008).