

**¹Between Cultural Preservation and Tourism Industry:
Dialectic Relations in Cultural Heritage Tourism Management
in Tanah Lot and Borobudur Indonesia**

I Ketut Surya Diarta

Universitas Udayana

Corresponding author: suryadiarta_unud@yahoo.com

ARTICLE INFO

Received
09 November 2016
Accepted
18 August 2017
Available online
25 August 2017

ABSTRACT

Cultural heritage tourism has a great role in supporting economic growth in Indonesia. This can only be achieved if cultural heritage tourism is well managed. Well and integrated management refers to the balance of preservation of cultural heritage and tourism industry since both are two entities that have a contradictory management regime approach. This paper discusses the destination management model of two cultural heritages: Borobudur Temple in Central Java and Tanah Lot Temple in Bali which are two cultural heritages developed as cultural heritage tourism destinations. Both are trying to balance between the aspects of cultural heritage preservation and tourism business by emphasizing harmony between tourism aspects, utilization of cultural heritage, consume of products and experiences, and services to tourists. The results show that both destinations provide adequate space of dialectical process that is reflected from the shifting management paradigm from competitors towards collaborators relationship. Both destination managements are directed towards symbiotic cooperation in cultural heritage tourism. Preservation and tourism purposes mutually influencing each other. In Tanah Lot Temple cultural heritage tourism managed by customary village and local government while in Borobudur temple managed by PT. Taman Wisata Borobudur, a state owned enterprises.

Keywords: dialectic, cultural, heritage, tourism, Indonesia

Introduction

Background

The relationship between cultural preservation and tourism industry is an important issue within world cultural heritage tourism model. As tourism becomes increasingly globalised phenomenon, in the cultural heritage tourism context, some might argue that cultural heritage is becoming inauthentic. In the conservationist point of view, “the protection, conservation, interpretation, and presentation of heritage are important challenges for both present and

future generation” (Smith, 2009). Yet, some might also argue that cultural heritage is a promising niche to tourism industry.

Some countries, including Indonesia, underlined the importance of tourism for the national economic growth. Moreover, in the case of Bali Province, tourism is the principal economic activity and becomes the main local economic generator. However, related to cultural heritage based tourism, viewing cultural heritage as tourism assets will bring about the problem of commercialization, commodification, and inauthenticity to the cultural heritage. Balancing relations between tourism industry and heritage preservation is main agenda to gain a mutual sustainable relationship in cultural heritage tourism.

¹The article had been presented in The International Tourism Conference “Promoting Cultural & Heritage Tourism” at Udayana University, 1-3 September 2016.

The relationship between tourism development and heritage management is a complex and sensitive one (Smith, 2009). Furthermore, according to Smith the relationship between tourism and heritage is often perceived as being fraught with problems, rather than harmonious and symbiotic. Although Ashworth (1995 in Smith, 2009) questions “the naïve assumptions of harmony” that exist among those who argue that tourism and heritage necessarily enjoy a symbiotic relationship, he recognises the mutual benefits of heritage tourism development.

In Indonesia, Kagami (1997: 77) found that Indonesian Government “use[s] the historical monuments within the country for tourism development, while at the same time trying to intervene in their management in the name of their preservation as part of nation’s cultural heritage”. Furthermore, according to Kagami, these processes “do not take a single course” but rather “proceed in parallel, mutually influencing each other”. This process what in this paper will be called as “a dialectic relationship”.

ICOMOS International Cultural Tourism Charter in article 2.2 describes the ideal dialectic relationship that heritage resources or values and tourism is dynamic and ever changing, generating opportunities and challenges, as well as potential conflicts. Tourism projects, activities and developments should achieve positive outcomes and minimize adverse impacts on the heritage and lifestyles of the host community, while responding to the needs and aspirations of the visitor (ICOMOS, 1999: 8).

Research Objective

This paper will discuss two best practices on how a dialectic relationship between cultural heritage preservation and cultural heritage tourism implemented in two Indonesian cultural heritage masterpieces: Borobudur Tempel in Magelang, Central Java Province and Tanah Lot Temple, Bali Province.

Literature Review

Heritage can be viewed as the preservation or reconstruction of material objects, which isolates them from the flux of history through a process of recontextualization in which abstract qualities (the nation, the people, the locality, the past) are attributed to, or embodied in, narratives of material culture and localities, narratives that emphasize the continuity of the past in the present (Meethan, 1996:325). To be narrowing down in cultural aspects, cultural heritage is defined as an expression of the ways of living developed by a community and passed on from generation to generation, including customs, practices, places, objects, artistic expressions and values. Cultural Heritage is often expressed as either Intangible or Tangible Cultural Heritage (ICOMOS, 2002).

In the countries of Southeast Asia, the Foreign Ministers of these countries, who met on 25 July 2000, adopted the ASEAN Declaration on Cultural Heritage that defines cultural heritage as “structures and artefacts, sites and human habitats, oral or folk heritage, written heritage, and popular cultural heritage” (Ahmad, 2006: 298). Similar to other countries, the scope of heritage in Southeast Asia, in general, now covers both tangible and intangible heritage, but the broader definitions are very different from those used by UNESCO or ICOMOS, which adopted the terms monument, group of buildings and site; or with neighbouring countries in the Asia-Pacific region that define ‘place’ as their heritage. The degree of refinement of the scope and definitions at national levels in Southeast Asia varies (Ahmad, 2006: 298).

According to Nuryanti (1996:251) with respect to tourism, especially in cultural heritage tourism, heritage can be used to describe “material form such as monuments, historical or architectural remains and artifacts on display in museum; or immaterial forms such as philosophy, traditions and art in all their manifestations; the celebration of great events or personalities in history; distinctive ways of life; and education expressed, for the example, through literature and folklore”.

In modern era, when tourism becomes a globalized phenomenon, cultural heritage is developed as part of cultural tourism industry. Kirschenblatt-Gimblett (1998 in Smith 2003: 13) eloquently illustrated the relations that “heritage and tourism are collaborative industries, heritage converting locations into destinations and tourism making them economically viable as exhibits of themselves. Locations become museums of themselves within a tourism industry”.

As a subset of cultural tourism, cultural heritage tourism is a form of tourism not a form of cultural heritage management. Consequently, according to McKercher and Du Cros (2002: 6) this point is sometimes not appreciated by some member of cultural heritage management community who may see tourism as a means of achieving other agendas or who fail to appreciate just what is needed to make an asset work as a tourism attraction. This situation what (Smith, 2009) stated as “being fraught with problems, rather than harmonious and symbiotic”. Indeed, the paradox in managing cultural heritage tourism occurs: the decision to enter this sector must be driven by tourism considerations, assets are managed by principle of cultural heritage management. This competing approach can be a source of friction between tourism and cultural heritage management interests (McKercher and Du Cros, 2002: 7).

The consumption of experiences and products in cultural heritage tourism also become a crucial issue. On tourism side, to facilitate this consumption, cultural heritage assets must be transformed into cultural tourism product that can be consumed and experienced by visitors (McKercher and Du Cros, 2002: 8). This is a commodified process. On the other hand, from the perspective of heritage management, to protect the authenticity of intrinsic values of heritage is a must. In Indonesia, some efforts to create symbiotic relationships have been performed in several cultural heritage tourisms. For example, Borobudur and Tanah Lot cultural heritage tourism are managed based on dialectic relationships between two competing ideas accordingly.

Dialectic Relations in Cultural Heritage Tourism Management in Indonesia

A Brief History of Borobudur Temple Management

The Borobudur Temple Compounds was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1991. Borobudur, a famous Indonesia Buddhist temple, dating from the 8th and 9th centuries, is located in central Java. It was built in three tiers: a pyramidal base with five concentric square terraces, the trunk of a cone with three circular platforms and, at the top, a monumental stupa. The walls and balustrades are decorated with fine low reliefs, covering a total surface area of 2,500 m². Around the circular platforms are 72 openwork stupas, each containing a statue of the Buddha. The monument was restored with UNESCO's help in the 1970s (UNESCO, 2016).

World Heritage List document reported that the legal and institutional framework for the effective management of the property is regulated by a Presidential Decree Number 1 Year 1992. The established zones within the World Heritage property are respectively under the responsibility of the Borobudur Heritage Conservation Office under Ministry of Education and Culture, of state-owned institute PT. Taman Wisata Candi Borobudur under the Ministry of Enterprises, and of the local governments (Magelang Regency and Central Java Province). A study on the integrated management of Borobudur Temple Compounds has been conducted, including attention for the ecosystem, social and cultural aspects, ecotourism, public and private partnership and organisational feasibility study. This study is the basis of the still to be developed visitor management approach (UNESCO, 2016).

Based on the Presidential Decree Number 1 Year 1992 (articles 4, 5, and 6), Borobudur Temple areas are divided into three zones: (1) Zone 1 (approximately 44.8 hectares) is an archaeological environment designed for the protection, maintenance, and preservation of the physical environment of the temple, (2) Zone 2 (approximately 42.3 hectares) is the circular area outside of Zone 1 for tourism activities, researchs, cultural activities, and conservation of temple's

environment, (3) Zona 3 (approximately 932 hectares) is the area outside the Zone 2 for limited housing, agricultural area, the green line, or certain other facilities provided to ensure harmony and balance function of the area and to support sustainability temple and surrounding areas (KEPPRES, 1992).

The protection of the property is performed under Indonesian Law Number 11 year 2010 concerning Cultural Heritage and Its Surrounding Cultural Landscape. It is executed under a National Strategic Area and the Spatial Management Plan by the Ministry of Public Works in accordance with the Law concerning Spatial Management Number 26 year 2007 and Governmental Regulation Number 26 year 2008 concerning National Spatial Planning. In order to ensure consistency between the 1992 Presidential Decree and the 1972 JICA Master Plan zone-system indicated in the World Heritage nomination dossier and to strengthen the regulations regarding development, a New Presidential Regulation is still being formulated by a Coordinating Board (14 Ministries and local authorities as well as representatives of local communities) and by formalizing the role of the proposed Management Board into the wider zones. In addition, the protection of the property has been ensured by the regular financial contribution by the national budget (UNESCO, 2016).

The Borobudur Heritage Conservation Office has conducted community development programs targeting especially at the youth to raise their awareness. In improving and empowering local community as specialist guide for Borobudur Temple Compounds, several training programs have been conducted. The community developments related to economical sector (small enterprises that produce traditional handicrafts, culinaries, etc) have already being conducted by the municipalities of Magelang Regency and Central Java Province (UNESCO, 2016).

According to UNESCO documents, the UNESCO representative to the Third International Experts Meeting on Borobudur, held on site in January 1995 made recommendations to avoid any future actions or activities that would unnecessarily disturb

the traditional appearance of the site, e.g. construction of park features that have little relationship with the local landscape, indigenous plant species; functions which would devalue the dignity of the site, and develop tourism management policy to ensure protection of site and distribution of tourism revenue for conservation activities. On 29 January 2003, the Governor of Central Java (Indonesia) requested from the Director-General of UNESCO the support of the Organization to review and finalize a proposed tourism development plan to enhance the presentation and tourism facilities at the Borobudur World Heritage property. This plan proposed the construction of a large shopping centre on four hectares of land in Zone 3, immediately outside Zone 2, of the property and approximately 880 metres from the Borobudur Temple itself.

In Zone 1, the construction of a paved parking lot for VIPs, which can accommodate 50-100 vehicles, is a principal contributor to the increase in temperature, and temperature gradient within the monument's micro-climate. In Zone 2, the number of commercial vendors has been allowed to grow uncontrolled from the originally planned 70 kiosks to approximately 2000 kiosks. This has led to overcrowding, solid waste pollution, and social friction among the vendors who compete aggressively for visitor attention. In addition, the capacity of the vehicle parking lots has been greatly exceeded, with consequent crowding of the designated parking areas, and unregulated spill-over into other parts of Zones 2 and 3, and an overall increase in both temperature and air-borne pollutants.

In Zone 3, the commercial development zone, various proposals are being suggested by the local government authorities, which are responsible for the management of this zone, to develop this area with shopping complexes and other commercial tourist facilities. However, this area also functions as an environmental and visual buffer protecting the main monument itself. The currently proposed plans for shopping complexes in Zone 3 do not adequately take into consideration the conservation needs of the World Heritage property, but underscores its commercial development. While

acknowledging the desire for large scale commercial development of the area to bring economic benefit to the surrounding populations, and also acknowledging the need to better control the present informal commercial activities at the entrance to the site, the UNESCO-ICOMOS mission noted that the best solution would be to discourage vendors to loiter around the property, and develop the existing marketplace in the settlements east of the main monument (UNESCO, 2003).

In 2004, the Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission elaborated a long-term commercial and marketing strategy for the property, starting with the organization and control of the informal commercial activities within Zone 2, the visitor is still forced to go through a labyrinth of small shops selling souvenirs and food stalls. This area is turning into a small village, as some of the vendors and their families are actually living in the stalls. At certain seasons, the amount of vendors and hawkers strolling around the site by far exceeds the number of tourists visiting the temple. This would be appropriate for the wider socio-economic aspects, such as development of local activities, skills, products, and performance-based attractions for visitors. Assistance is also needed for tourism management and the reworking of the existing entrance area. There should be a programme of targeted intervention assistance with the objective of reorganizing and redesigning the buildings and other facilities at the entrance area (UNESCO, 2006).

On 1 February 2005, the State Party submitted to the World Heritage Centre a document entitled "Long Term Management and Strategy of Borobudur Temple". The document contains a brief summary of the provisions that apply to existing zones established around the World Heritage property. No reference is made to the three issues raised by the Committee in its Decision of 2004, namely the ban on major road developments, the halting of any construction of major commercial centres, and the erection of a new tourist entrance and retail precinct (Jagad Jawa). An overview is also provided of the various factors affecting the state of conservation of the property, including pressure from visitors.

The document indicates as well some of the actions which are being taken, or are envisaged, to address the conservation problems at the property, in the short, mid and long-term. Training sessions were organized by the UNESCO Office in Jakarta for the local population, including tour guides and craftsmen, to promote the development of local activities for income-generation and community participation in heritage conservation. However, no information is included on the actual progress made in their implementation.

The major issue regarding closer coordination of the management agencies responsible for the various components or zoning system of the property has yet to be addressed. This is a complex issue, particularly as various agencies are under the jurisdiction of different ministries and have quite different bureaucratic and policy objectives. It is not clear whether the proposed two-layer system of management (Steering Committee and Executive Team) is conceived as a permanent arrangement related to the overall management of the World Heritage property, or if its scope is limited to the specific initiative for the sustainable development of the region surrounding the monuments (UNESCO, 2006).

On February 2006, a joint World Heritage Centre (ICOMOS) mission carried out at the request of the World Heritage Committee assessed the state of conservation of the World Heritage property of Borobudur Temple Compound, in Indonesia. The State Party has confirmed in writing and reiterated during the mission that no major road developments will be carried out in zones 1, 2 and 3; no major commercial complexes will be built; and that the Jawa Jagad Project has been now cancelled. The very strong commitment of the Indonesian authorities to protect the heritage value of the site and address the requests by the Committee should be given adequate recognition, considering also the substantial interests attached to the proposed development projects. Meanwhile, it is apparent that its outstanding universal value depends also on the extraordinary relationship between the monument and its setting.

The latter is at serious risk of losing its integrity if urgent steps are not taken. The protection of this setting is also crucial for the long-term sustainable development of the local community. The extent of the vendor stalls around the car park and site entry forecourt, however, remains a major concern. The current, visually chaotic situation is not compatible with the visitor's expectation of a world class heritage site as it detracts significantly from the experience and is a cause for frustration for visitors and local community alike. This problem is related to the lack of an effective policy to develop sustainable tourism in the area of Borobudur by using the Temple as a platform to bring benefits to the entire community.

The division of the responsibility for zones 1, 2 and 3 among three separate institutions with different mandates and objectives is at the root of most of the problems at Borobudur. Decisions taken by each of these institutions, especially by PT Taman Wisata (managing zone 2, i.e. the buffer zone), are likely to impact on the zones under the responsibility of the other two institutions, in the absence of a common vision and clear mechanisms to coordinate. The issue is not just that these institutions do not coordinate enough among themselves, but that their respective objectives appear to be sometimes conflicting, and no formal regulatory and planning framework exists to reconcile these different mandates within a single agreed vision and policy.

A complete set of recommendations, with indicative time-frames for implementation, is included in the mission report, whose conclusions were discussed at length with the national authorities in Jakarta. These recommendations include: not carrying out the proposed development of a commercial street along the northern edge of zone 2; a review of the Presidential Decree of 1992 to establish a single, combined, management authority for zones 1 and 2, and the extension of the boundaries of zone 3 (i.e. to become the new buffer zone of the site); the development of appropriate regulatory and planning framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property, with a view to preserving its rural character; the development of a management plan for the Borobudur World

Heritage property, once the new management authority has been established.

The next was maintaining the current layout of zones 1 and 2 and improving the quality and appearance of the existing infrastructure where the vendors are located, by reducing its extent and controlling it so as to avoid over spilling throughout zone; and upgrading the urban design, facades and infrastructure of the street and square leading to the site (where the existing village is developing in a chaotic way).

Concerning the deterioration of the stone of the Temple, the Mission recommended, as initial steps, to develop and conduct a diagnostic monitoring programme to identify the causes of the current increasing rate of deterioration of the stone and to organize an international stone conservation experts meeting to review results of the monitoring and discuss future options (UNESCO, 2006: 165-169).

On January 2009, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property to the World Heritage Centre which reported progress against the Committee's requests as follows:

- (a) Revision of the legal and institution framework. The State Party has engaged in a consultation programme with stakeholders and inter-institutional representatives to revise the legal and institutional framework for the protection and management of the property and its surrounding area. As a result, all parties agreed to continue efforts to revise the existing legal framework (Presidential Decree Number 1 of 1992) to ensure a better protection and management of Borobudur and its surrounding areas. Subsequently, the State Party designated Borobudur as a National Strategic Area, in which the property will be directly under the central government's control. The State Party is yet to finalize a zoning system which will clearly demarcate the boundaries of the protected area and associated management conditions. Management of the property will be coordinated through a national institution and involve ongoing consultation with all

stakeholders. The State Party's report also included a Master Plan concept, prepared by Indonesia's Ministry of Culture and Tourism, which overviewed the proposed updates to the existing 1979 Master Plan for the property. The new Master Plan will address issues including the legal system, visitor management, community development, tourism development and administrative structures;

- (b) Discontinuation of conservation practices that have potential adverse effects. The State Party reports that it has now limited the use of epoxy resin, but not totally eliminated it, as an alternate substance has not yet been found. They envisage that it will be gradually phased out until a substitute has been identified. The report indicates that the primary ongoing uses of epoxy include coating for water resistance, gluing of broken stones and glue injection into cracks and camouflage. To minimize the adverse effects of the epoxy on the property, the State Party has been conducting research into the impacts of epoxy and potential substitutes, and has discontinued the use of epoxies that have noted adverse effects. They also report that the use of steam cleaning is now very limited and is only applied to the floor. In addition, the State Party reported that water repellents are no longer used on the Borobudur Temple (UNESCO, 2009).

A Brief History of Tanah Lot Temple Management

Tanah Lot Temple is one of the most famous tourist attractions and even become an icon of cultural tourism in Bali. Tanah Lot Temple was founded in the 15th century by Dang Hyang Dwijendra a Hindu Priest from Java who came to Bali to spread the teachings of Hinduism. Tanah Lot is one of tourism object in Bali which offers a beautiful sunset with a scenic temple on the rocks by the beach in Beraban Village, Tabanan Regency.

Since its development in the 1980s, Tanah Lot was controlled and managed by the local government. The lack of professional human resources, its management was contracted out to the CV Ary Jasa, a local

private enterprise. Starting in year 2000, local community (Beraban Customary Village) began to be involved as a group who co-owns the heritage so that the local people have access to and control of both cultural preservation of the tempel as a Hindu's heritage and economic gain from its used as a tourism object (Darmaputra and Pitana, 2010: 84-85).

Management of Tanah Lot Temple both as cultural heritage and cultural tourism has quite interesting dynamics starting in the 1980s. The historical period of the dynamics can be divided into three periods:

The period of the 1980s, where the Tanah Lot is managed by private enterprises, namely CV. Ary Jasa Wisata which is given full authority by local government to manage Tanah Lot until the year 2011. CV Ary Jasa Wisata promoted Tanah Lot as a tourism object and added traditional arts performances for visitors. Performing arts is bundled with dinner while enjoying the scenic Tanah Lot sunset. To accommodate visitors need, CV Ary Jasa Wisata then built Dewi Shinta Hotel and Restaurant near the heritage. On this period, mostly focus on promoting the heritage to be a tourism object. Private enterprise management of Tanah Lot brought about the issue of marginalization of local community to be involved in controlling and managing the heritage both in tourism and cultural area.

Economic benefits brought by tourism activities in Tanah Lot enjoyed by the local government and CV Ary Jasa as the field operator. Ironically, religious ceremonies and festivals of Tanah Lot Temple and other temples surrounding was still remaining on local community. Indonesian political turmoil in 1998 (reformation era) brought the freedom of speech of local community to assert their rights to be involved in the heritage management. Tabanan government decided to involve Beraban Customary Village as one of three members of the Management Board of Tanah Lot based on Tabanan Regent Decree number 644 year 2000.

The period of the 2000s until 2011, in which Tanah Lot was managed by Badan Pengelola Tanah Lot (a joint management board), consisting of local government, CV. Ary Jasa and Beraban Customary Village

(Dewi and Kusuma, 2012; Sujana, 2009). The revenue from tourism activities in Tanah Lot is divided as follows: local government by 55%, CV. Ary Jasa by 15%, and the Beraban Customary Village by 30%. The income was also used to heritage preservation, religious ceremonies and festivals and built tourism facilities.

The period after the year 2011, based on Cooperation Agreements No. 16 year 2011 Tanah Lot is managed by two parties, namely local government and Beraban Customary Village until December 13, 2026. This is this possible considering a contract with CV Ary Jasa had ended in 2011. Based on the new management composition, Tanah Lot tourism revenue is divided as follows: local government 58%, Beraban Customary Village by 24%, Tanah Lot Temple and its surrounding temple by 7.5%, and the rest 6.5% is given to four customary villages within Kediri District. Tanah Lot tourism revenue growth and number of visitors can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. The Number of Visitors in Tanah Lot and Its Revenue from Year 2001 to 2014

No.	Years	Number of Visitors (Person)	Amount of Revenue (Rupiah)
1	2001	768,017	21,046,579,000
2	2002	782,418	20,944,771,000
3	2003	830,082	20,404,108,000
4	2004	1,043,177	23,370,810,000
5	2005	1,153,127	26,661,082,000
6	2006	1,027,287	22,607,270,000
7	2007	1,297,577	27,837,816,000
8	2008	1,574,806	33,774,806,000
9	2009	1,854,020	39,893,302,000
10	2010	2,149,893	47,299,297,000
11	2011	2,315,966	50,664,140,000
12	2012	2,577,299	57,257,687,000
13	2013	2,842,281	62,960,928,000
14	2014	3,125,206	65,434,585,000

Source: Management of Tanah Lot (2015)

Dialectic Relations between Cultural Preservation and Tourism Industry

The history of conflicting relations between cultural heritage management and tourism management in heritage site in Indonesia can be traced back before 1970s when the issue concerning primarily with the

protection of heritages against loss and destruction both because of natural process and tourism activities. The most interesting is the memorandum of the Minister for Administrative Reform addressed to the Minister for Education and Culture and the Minister of Communication. The memorandum refers to some trouble caused by the conflicting views on the preservation of monuments between the officials of the cultural section within the government (Kagami, 1997:64).

Since the important role of tourism to boost national economic growth, Indonesian government gives more positive role in the utilization of cultural heritage. This situation gives birth to the new niche in tourism industry in Indonesia whar so called cultural tourism. The idea of cultural tourism becomes a solution in managing relation of cultural preservation and tourism management in a mutual symbiotic manner. The relation is in a cause and effect: the more the cultural heritage is preserved, the more the tourism is growing in sustainable manner. For some cases, for example Tanah Lot Temple in Bali, the cost of heritage preservation is taken from the revenue derived from tourism activities at the heritage. This model is a dialectic relations in managing both cultural preservation and tourism in which “proceed in parallel, mutually influencing each other” (Kagami, 1997: 77).

As described in the management of Borobudur and Tanah Lot that the challenges faced in the development of cultural heritage tourism in both heritages is to find a balance realtions between heritage management with tourism management. More ioperational, how to combine the 'consumption of extrinsic values' by tourists in their tourism activities with efforts to 'conserve intrinsic value' of cultural heritage since both aspects using the same resources. In ideal dialectic relation described eloquantly by ICOMOS as “tourism can capture the economic characteristics of heritage and harness these for conservation by generating funding, educating the community and influencing policy. It can be an important factor in development, when managed successfully” (ICOMOS, 1999).

Table 2 shows the comparison between Borobudur Temple and Tanah Lot

Temple in managing the heritage both for the purpose of heritage preservation and tourism industry.

Table 2. Comparing Heritage Management between Borobudur and Tanah Lot

No	Issue	Borobudur Temple	Tanah Lot Temple
1	Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State-owned enterprise • Profit makinh 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local government and local community pwned enterprise • Profit making
2	Goal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broader commercial goal • Some efforts done for balancing between heritage preservation and tourism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broader commercial goal • Some efforts done for balancing between heritage preservatio n and tourism
3	Key stakeholder s today	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local government and customary village
4	Economic attitude to heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use the value for tourism though still used as a cultural and religious activities • More obvious in extrinsic value exploitation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservatio n of intrinsic and extrinsic values are pursued in balance
5	User group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PT. Taman Wisata (state-owned enterprise) • Local tourism industries • Local government • Sourroundin g residents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local community • Local tourism industries • Customary village • Local government
6	Use of asset	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More for the tourism purposes while still pay attention to certain aspects of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balancing of religious purposes (Hinduism) and tourism purposes.

the public interest (adherents of Buddhism)

Adopted from: McKercher and Du Cros, (2002) model

Heritage tourism management models in Borobudur Temple and Tanah Lot Temple as described above, practically, have been applying the principles of integrated management structure between conservation management and tourism management. It also proves that the theory and practice can be implemented in both cases.

However, in the case of Borobudur, the substantive controller is not on the local community. The surrounding community emotionally and religiously is no longer a majority of the followers of the teachings of Buddha as the source of value in the creation of Borobudur. More specifically, because the lack of involvement of local communities in shaping the Borobudur as “a living heritage” like Tanah Lot Temple in Bali, the more likely Borobudur Temple managed as tourists consumption because of its extrinsic value. On the other hand, Tanah Lot Temple shows a more suitable dialectic relations in more aspects. The heritage is managed by balancing purposes between religious and tourism needs. Local community as the source of living value is there supporting Tanah Lot Temple as a living heritage. Local community through their customary village is also as a main controller both in business and cultural of the temple.

Conclusion

The development of cultural heritage tourism in Indoensia by reviewing the cases of Borobudur Temple and Tanah Lot Temple shows that the shifting effort from independently heritage and tourism management to collaborative management. The relations between preservation of heritage purposes and tourism industry purposes proceed in parallel, mutually influencing each other and become an empirical evidence of mutual diaclectic relationship.

Two cases show that the involvement of local community in managing the heritage both for conservation (intrinsic value) and for tourism (extrinsic value) bring about a better chance for both purposes. Local community is a living museum for the heritage. Local community is also as a local guard and responsible for heritage save and sustainability.

References

- Ahmad, Y. (2006) 'The scope and definitions of heritage: from tangible to intangible', *International journal of heritage studies*. Taylor & Francis, 12(3), pp. 292–300.
- Dewi, L. and Kusuma, G. L. (2012) *Partisipasi dan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Desa Beraban dalam Pengelolaan Secara Berkelanjutan Daya Tarik Wisata Tanah Lot*. Universitas Udayana.
- ICOMOS (1999) 'International Cultural Tourism Charter (Managing Tourism as Places of Heritage Significance)', in *ICOMOS 12th General Assembly Mexico*.
- ICOMOS (2002) 'International Cultural Tourism Charter: Principles And Guidelines For Managing Tourism At Places Of Cultural And Heritage Significance', in *ICOMOS International Cultural Tourism Committee*.
- Kagami, H. (1997) 'Tourism and national culture: Indonesian policies on cultural heritage and its utilization in tourism', *Shinji Yamashita, Kadir H. Din, and JS Eades (eds., pp. 61-82). Tourism and cultural development in Asia and Oceania*. Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- KEPPRES (1992) 'KEPPRES No.1 Tahun 1992 tentang Pengelolaan Taman Wisata Candi Borobudur dan Taman Wisata Candi Prambanan serta Pengendalian Lingkungan Kawasannya'.
- McKercher, B. and Du Cros, H. (2002) *Cultural tourism: The partnership between tourism and cultural heritage management*. Routledge.
- Meethan, K. (1996) 'Consuming (in) the civilized city', *Annals of tourism research*. Elsevier, 23(2), pp. 322–340.
- Nuryanti, W. (1996) 'Heritage and postmodern tourism', *Annals of tourism research*. Elsevier, 23(2), pp. 249–260.
- Smith, M. K. (2009) *Issues in cultural tourism studies*. Routledge.
- Sujana, I. M. (2009) *Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Kunjungan Wisatawan ke Daya Tarik Wisata Tanah Lot Tabanan Bali*. Universitas Udayana.
- UNESCO (2003) 'Convention Concerning The Protection Of The World Cultural and Natural Heritage'. Available at: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2003/w hc03-27com-07be.pdf>.
- UNESCO (2006) 'Convention Concerning The Protection Of The World Cultural and Natural Heritage. World Heritage Committee Twenty-ninth Session Durban, South Africa 10-17 July 2005.' Available at: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2005/w hc05-29com-07BReve.pdf>.
- UNESCO (2009) 'Convention Concerning The Protection of The World Cultural and Natural Heritage. World Heritage Committee Thirty-third Session Seville, Spain 22-30 June 2009.' Available at: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2009/w hc09-33com-7Be.pdf>.
- UNESCO (2016) 'Borobudur Temple Compounds. World Heritage List'. Available at: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/592/>.