

CHAPTER 11

Prambanan and Borobudur

Managing Tourism and Conservation in Indonesia

Michael Hitchcock and I Nyoman Darma Putra

Introduction

In a collection of papers marking the 30th anniversary of the signing of the World Heritage Convention, Harrison and Hitchcock (2005) analysed how tourism and conservation are negotiated in a wide variety of contexts. Based on empirical research by twenty different authors, the published chapters drew attention to the need for a discerning kind of tourism that delivered economic benefits on the one hand, while being culturally and environmentally sustainable on the other (Bandarin, 2005). This chapter reflects on this observation by examining two Indonesian World Heritage Sites – Borobudur and Prambanan – both of them cultural sites, from the perspective of management. It describes how the management structures for both sites came into being and how they operate in 2012 and asks how the desirable perspectives outlined in the 2005 volume can realistically be achieved. Like many World Heritage Sites located in developing countries, the Borobudur and Prambanan sites have limited funds for conservation and are also complex sites culturally, administratively and environmentally. For example, one temple is Mahayana Buddhist (Borobudur) while the other is Hindu (Prambanan), and they are two different kinds of structures with entirely different layouts. To complicate matters further there are other temples and structures that are part of the Borobudur complex, but are not physically adjacent to it, as well as a third major site, Ratu Boko that is on the Tentative WHS List for Indonesia, which also comes under Borobudur's and Prambanan's jurisdiction. All these structures

are at risk from seismic activity and eruptions from the nearby Merapi volcano; heavy rainfall in Java's tropical climate also poses a threat from erosion. The eruption of Mount Kelud, East Java, in February 2013 spewed volcanic ash over Borobudur, Prambanan and other parts of Central Java, some 250 kilometres from Mount Kelud, thus reminding the monuments' managers and conservators of the unpredictable Mother Nature and the ongoing threats to the monuments. The Kelud eruption forced the management to close both temple complexes to visitors for a couple of days.

There are important cultural, historical and archaeological debates pertaining to these complexes as the religions that they represent are not directly connected to the predominantly Muslim populations that live around them. It was also Western archaeologists who began to explore and eventually to restore these monuments, though this work continues today with locally-trained archaeologists. The monuments are simultaneously international, national and local in the following ways. For example, Borobudur is held in high regard by Buddhists around the world and mainly outside Indonesia – though there is an Indonesian Buddhist population – and is famous internationally as a must-see tourist attraction, particularly given its status as a WHS. However, it is also an important national, cultural and historical monument within the Republic of Indonesia and generates a substantial domestic tourism demand. Finally, it is a local site in several senses not least because it is part of the local economy and has local strands of management involved. Similar points can be made about Prambanan, but here there is a difference in that there is still a Hindu population in Java and there are many Balinese Hindu migrants in the region; both groups revere the temple complex. Both temples are local in another way in that certain aspects of Javanese Islamic culture have synthesised aspects of these earlier religious customs as was famously posited by Clifford Geertz in his study of Javanese religion (1960). However, this latter point is controversial in Indonesia in that not all citizens sympathise with this view. In the final outcome the current managers of these sites have to be content with increasing numbers of international and domestic tourists, as well as the occasional controversy relating to religious issues.

Borobudur Temple (Candi Borobudur) is a magnificent Buddhist monument, the largest of its kind in the world that dates from the eighth

century CE. It takes the form of six square stone platforms surmounted by three circular ones, the highest of which supports a large dome. The walls on its lower tiers are richly adorned with relief carvings pierced with enormous staircases flanked by mythical creatures (*naga*) while the summit is covered with statues of the Buddha in the earth-witnessing position protected by perforated stone pavilions.

Dating from the eighth century the Prambanan Temple (Candi Prambanan) comprises a collection of magnificent towers surrounding a central temple that rises to a height of 47 metres. Decorated with sumptuous stone carvings and statuary the temples contain inner vaults, some of which still retain their deities; it remains one of the largest Hindu structures in Southeast Asia (UNESCO WHC, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/642>).

Tourism and World Heritage Sites in Southeast Asia

Much of the research that has been conducted on World Heritage Sites in Southeast Asia has focused on the various actors and stakeholders involved in encounters and contestation, often referring to notions of identity construction and negotiation, both local and national (Hitchcock, King and Parnwell, 2010a). Other topics that have been addressed include: the ownership of heritage and its appropriate use; access to it set against the needs of conservation; heritage as a commodity and as a medium of entertainment; heritage as an educational medium and its interpretation and representation (*ibid.*). Turning to heritage management, Wiendu Nuryanti (1996) has drawn attention to the institutional problems that prevail in developing countries and it is useful to refer to Hall's point about the difficulties of coordinating action and implementing legislation (2000). In particular Aas et al. (2005) have drawn attention to the lack of effective communication between the various organisations involved with regard to Borobudur, and Kausar et al. (2011) noted the lack of an effective legal framework specifying coordination. Of special concern as far as this chapter is concerned is Mason's (2003) point that problems of management could influence the kind of impact that tourism has. What is also important to note is Mark Hampton's (2005) observation that the presence of large attractions close to local communities generates both benefits and costs and

that the nested relationships of various kinds of management with local people can be very complex with regard to places such as Borobudur.

In a very welcome volume providing an overview on the broader question of managing cultural resources in Southeast Asia (Miksic et al., 2011) emphasis is given to the fact that analyses of specific World Heritage Sites in terms of management issues are rare. There is rather more on the planning process and, in an overview of the region's World Heritage Sites, Black and Wall make the important observation that the evaluation of these sites tends to be formulated in a top-down fashion without significant consultation with the local people who live on or around the site (2001: 132–33). The consequence of this is that local interests and cultural meanings and interpretations tend to be overlooked even to the extent that local cultural participation, as for example in traditional arts, is often not encouraged (*ibid.*). A common outcome is that the needs of tourists prevail, which, in the case of Borobudur, has taken on elements of a theme park with fenced off areas, car parks, ticket booths, touts, security guards, loudspeakers and gardens landscaped in a contemporary fashion (Steels, 2007). Fencing moreover also addresses the demands of governments and conservation agencies, which are especially significant considerations in the case of nationally revered monuments such as Borobudur.

In addition to the needs of tourism, there is another sense in which national and international interests predominate, as is especially the case in Borobudur that is instantly recognisable as a national symbol of the Republic of Indonesia and is promoted more as a cultural symbol as opposed to a religious monument (Hitchcock, King and Parnwell, 2010b: 19). This complex continues to be a centre for national and international Buddhist pilgrimage, but for the Indonesian authorities, and specifically the Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy, it is primarily a cultural heritage site that is closely linked to the promotion of national and international tourism (*ibid.*). For the time being, however, it would appear that Steels' (2007) observations are still relevant, namely that tourists appear not to be especially concerned with authenticity and local meanings or indeed the perspectives of international agencies such as UNESCO. For the majority of them Borobudur is simply a major monument on the tourist circuit at which they want to be seen and photographed; a 'must see' destination to be gazed upon that is associ-

ated vaguely with a forgotten and romanticised past (ibid.). This ‘tourist gaze’, adopting John Urry’s (1990) well-known expression, exercises its own influence over the culture that is being gazed upon and may be positive in the sense of creating a greater sense of appreciation and pride in local culture (Miksic, 2011: xiv). Alternatively, it may be negative, creating a sense of inferiority and perhaps creating an impetus to simplify local culture to make it more appealing to outside visitors. Interestingly, Miksic considers how to manage this gaze and argues that by making people aware of what it is before it is applied and felt it will enable people to make decisions about their own culture, thereby empowering them to develop strategies to preserve those cultural resources that they wish to conserve (ibid.). Miksic also makes the important point that cultural resource management is at a nascent phase in Southeast Asia and that more data need to be collected before revisions of standard Western models can be attempted and that many local researchers appreciate that solutions to local problems will not necessarily be resolved by looking exclusively inward (2011: xx). This chapter examines the management of Borobudur’s and Prambanan’s cultural resources, in terms of the evolution of the management structure of the two sites, the physical threats to conservation and the relationship with tourism, and argues that the approach to negotiating management and conservation in these locations needs re-thinking.

Methodology

The approach adopted here makes use of four main strands: desk research, observation, interviews and the administration of questionnaires, though the emphasis in this chapter is on the first three, as the data collected by the fourth approach, which help inform this chapter, is the main focus of a separate article. With regard to the first of these approaches, use was made of on-line sources, notably mission statements by the Indonesian authorities, colonial sources on tourism, and contemporary media coverage in Indonesia and elsewhere. The first author is also a trained ethnographer with a background in heritage management and tourism, and he spent three weeks at both sites in 2009 observing tourists and site employees, and recording and translating the various forms of interpretation used there. The authors are familiar with both sites having visited them regularly since the 1980s and have had the op-

portunity to discuss their findings with researchers at nearby Universitas Gajah Mada (UGM) in Yogyakarta. Through this university permission was granted to meet the senior management of the temple complexes using an open-ended interview, though an outline of the topics to be covered in Indonesian was sent in advance. More informal and spontaneous interviews were conducted on both temple sites with employees, vendors and guides. The questionnaire was produced in English and Indonesian with the same questions, and was administered ($n = 303$) inside the perimeter walls of both temple complexes by a team of 6–8 Masters students studying tourism at UGM who all spoke English and Indonesian, as well as some other languages, notably Spanish.

Evolution of the management structure

Tourism has a long history in Central Java and was first developed under Dutch colonial rule and the *Vereniging Toeristenverkeer* (Association of Tourism Traffic). For example Borobudur was mentioned in a newspaper article published in a Melbourne newspaper that presumably had potential travellers in mind (Foster, 1910), though the numbers of visitors are likely to have been quite small in comparison with today's standards as the infrastructure of the period was limited. Interestingly, the official guidebook was published in English suggesting that tourism was not limited to the Dutch, either resident in what was then the Dutch East Indies or from Holland. Tourism declined with the Japanese invasion of 1942 and did not really get going again until the end of Sukarno's rule in the early 1960s and even then it was focused on Bali. It was under Suharto's long period of office (1966–98) that tourism began to develop significantly and Yogyakarta and Central Java were essential to the planning initiatives of the period. In addition to the region's well known heritage attractions, Suharto and his wife also had origins in this part of Java, which no doubt had a bearing on the geographical focus of tourism planning. Tourism arrivals began to rise sharply in the 1980s and by the mid-1990s tourism had become the third most important source of foreign exchange with Yogyakarta being the second most visited Indonesian destination after Bali. Of the two monuments, Borobudur is the most visited with numbers rising from a relatively robust base of 260,000 per annum in 1974 to 2.5 million in the mid-1990s, 80 per cent of whom were domestic tourists. The Asian Crisis (1997–98) and ensuing unrest

in Indonesia suppressed demand for a while but by 2004 numbers were exceeding two million and had by 2008 risen to 2,237,717 per annum in Borobudur, (<http://konservasiborobudur.org>). In 2013, the number of visitors reached over three million (3,362,061) – the highest so far: most of them were domestic tourists (3,145,846) while foreign tourists comprised only a couple of hundred thousand (216,215), the majority of them from the Netherlands, Japan and Malaysia (*Republika On Line*, 15 February 2014).

Despite the religious affiliations of the Borobudur and Prambanan temple complexes, they originally came under the auspices of the Ministry of Tourism and Culture (now the Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy) but since 2011 responsibility has been transferred to the Ministry of Education and Culture, unlike Bali's renowned mother temple of Besakih, which is overseen by the Ministry of Religion. This is an important distinction since Borobudur and Prambanan are seen as primarily national sites and important tourism destinations, as opposed to edifices relating to two of Indonesia's recognised religions. In contrast, Besakih is first and foremost a religious site relating to Indonesia's Hindu population and then only secondly a tourism attraction. This distinction also means that the composition of stakeholders in Borobudur and Prambanan is different from that in Besakih with national and local government bodies, tourism companies, local residents and traders in Java being more significant than religious groupings, though this could well change.

The Ministry of Tourism and Culture had overall authority up to the end of the 1970s but then devolved the management of the two sites in 1980 to a state-owned company known as PT Taman Wisata Candi Borobudur dan Candi Prambanan. In 1991 Borobudur, which also includes the temples of Mendut and Pawon, and Prambanan were inscribed as World Heritage Sites. Three years later the management was also assigned responsibility for running Ratu Boko, a ruined palace or *kraton*, which was submitted to UNESCO for consideration in 1995, but remains on the UNESCO Tentative List (Kausar, 2010: 151). In accordance with Presidential Decree Number 1/1992, PT Taman has the right to charge entrance fees and keep revenues earned from other sources (for example entertainment, retail, catering), and is subject to taxes and other contributions to the government, which, according to

its Annual Report of 2005 included dividends, corporate income tax, property tax, income tax, and miscellaneous tax, for example on entertainment (Kausar, 2010: 152). The parkland surrounding both temple complexes was acquired by compulsory purchase and enabled the state-owned authority to remove the markets selling food and souvenirs that clustered around Borobudur and Prambanan. These actions conformed to UNESCO's guidelines on the introduction of 'buffer zones', which the World Heritage Centre (WHC) described as providing 'effective protection of the nominated property' (UNESCO WHC, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/592>). Moreover, although such zones are not normally part of the WHS itself, and modifications to the buffer zones were subject to the approval of the WHC (ibid.). Since 1980 PT Taman has had overall responsibility for these sites, but reforms in 2010 altered this management structure, though it remains unclear whether the changes will lead to a greater focus on the sites' weaknesses. There are fears that the unclear boundary arrangements could be exploited by developers to build inappropriate structures for tourism within or close to these important sites.

A complicating feature of the sites' management structure is that, while PT Taman may have nominal overall responsibility for the two sites, in reality the management arrangements involve the division of each site into three zones, each with its own administrative authorities. For example, in the case of Borobudur, responsibility for the innermost zone (zone1) falls to the Borobudur Heritage Conservation Institute (BHCI), which in turn answers to the Director-General of History and Archaeology under the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, which from October 2011 became the Ministry of Education and Culture (whilst tourism came under the Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy). It is the surrounding park (zone 2) at Borobudur that comes under the state-owned authority, answerable to the Ministry of State Owned Enterprises. Another complexity is that PT Taman has its headquarters near to Prambanan and thus does not have a high-level management presence at Borobudur. A similar set of arrangements is found at Prambanan in respect of zones 1 (under the auspices of the Prambanan Conservation Institute), and 2 (under PT Taman), but a somewhat different collection of responsibilities are found in both temples with regard to the outer areas (zone 3). Prambanan, for example, is situated

in the Kabupaten (Regency) of Sleman and is thus part of Yogyakarta, a special administrative region (Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta) comprising the city of Yogyakarta and surrounding area. Here the hereditary King or Sultan is the head of government despite the country's overall status as a Republic in recognition of Yogyakarta's role as capital of Indonesia during the independence struggle against the Dutch (1945–1949). In contrast, Borobudur is located in the neighbouring province of Central Java and thus the Regency of Magelang has responsibility for this temple's outer area. In short there are two ministries, two institutes, one state-owned company and two provincial authorities (and their subsidiary arms) involved in the management of what is supposed to be a unified structure.

In view of this complexity, it is worth comparing their various functions and the expectations of these different bodies as this has a strong influence on how the sites are run on an everyday basis. Starting with the innermost areas (zone 1), it is the institutes that have responsibility for conserving and restoring the two temple sites, as well as acting as training centres on archaeology and conservation. The institutes' mission statements are very clear and their roles are couched primarily in terms of conservation, archaeological training and the need to support their respective World Heritage Sites. For example, Borobudur's vision comprises 'the realization of Borobudur Heritage Conservation Institute as [a] (sic) center of research and training for conservation of archaeological artefacts'. But with so many tourists visiting daily and with often unclear boundary maintenance as to what is or is not off limits, the institutes struggle to fulfil their roles. Security and cleanliness remain constant headaches as visitors have to be prevented from leaving rubbish on the monuments and from clambering over the temples damaging the precious reliefs. Managers complain that the budgets are insufficient to hire enough security men and at busy times both temple complexes resemble noisy picnic sites.

The vision and mission of the management of the surrounding parkland presents a marked contrast as the language is couched in market terms with references to such management concepts and phrases as 'professionally qualified human resources' and 'the full capacity to compete globally'. Its mission is concerned with 'cultural heritage preservation' but is also focused on the market-orientated need of 'developing the tourism industry for the benefit of the community, region

and nation'. A similar perspective is echoed by the managers of the third zone, the local authorities, with Magelang regarding Borobudur as a key source of regional development. This authority moreover has access to an undisclosed proportion of the entry fees for the WHS as it controls access to the two outlying temples and is thus quite closely involved in the finances of the site (Kausar, 2010: 155).

A similar perspective is apparent in Prambanan and given its location close to the main road between two major cities – Yogyakarta and Surakarta – the commercial pressures of tourism are even more apparent. Some of the most noticeable features of the site are the open-air and indoor stages with their special effects lighting gantries situated on the west side of the temple across the River Opak. They were built to stage the Ramayana dance drama, which was given a contemporary choreographic edge in the 1990s. During the full moon the temple itself becomes part of the stage as it serves as a dramatic backdrop illuminated with theatre lights.

There is, however, another contemporary twist in Prambanan, which is not quite so evident in Borobudur, due to the increasing presence of Hindu Balinese migrants in Yogyakarta and Central Java. Along with the indigenous Javanese Hindu community, the Balinese have drawn attention to Prambanan's religious significance and increasingly express a strong desire to perform their sacred ceremonies there. Contemporary Hindu interest in the site is comparatively new, whereas Buddhists recommenced using Borobudur as a place of worship in the 1970s. Buddhists, however, remain relatively few in number, whereas the Hindu population in Java appears to be rising and is becoming more affluent and assertive. Interestingly, this religious dimension is not flagged up in the visions and mission statements of the managements of the inner zones where the focus remains fixed on conservation and tourism development. Thousands of Hindu followers attend a purification ceremony in the Prambanan site every year prior to the celebration of Nyepi Day, the Hindu New Year that falls every March/April. This annual ritual is the biggest and most elaborate Indonesian Hindu ritual performed outside Bali; it is widely considered as the nation-wide Hindu ritual event or celebration and is often attended by the Minister of Religion to show his respect and to showcase Indonesia's religious diversity and tolerance.

Physical threats to the sites

While the management of all World Heritage Sites and the importance of devising and implementing a viable, efficient and effective management plan are central concerns for UNESCO, the sites of Borobudur and Prambanan are especially problematic because of the number and variety of threats they face, both man-made and natural. In the case of the former, the temples provide particularly tempting targets because they simultaneously represent both the government of Indonesia as national cultural and historical monuments and also serve as symbols and sacred sites of two of the country's religious minorities. They also have global WHS recognition, and thus anyone with a grudge against either the Indonesian government or the members of another religion, or both of these may be tempted to vent their frustrations by attacking these edifices, safe in the knowledge that actions of this kind are likely to attract significant international media interest. Thus far the temples have remained largely unscathed, though the lessons learned from an attack that took place on 21 January 1985 should not be forgotten. On this occasion bombs were placed inside the stupas on the upper part of the Borobudur temple leaving nine of them badly damaged; soon after the event the police arrested three suspects. One of them, Abdulkahir Ali Alhabsyi, revealed that the attack was a response to the deaths of Muslims at the hands of the security forces at an earlier incident at Tanjung Priok; subsequently a blind cleric, Husein Ali Al Habsyie was arrested six years later for orchestrating a series of bombings from 1984 to 1985, including the Borobudur attack.

The bombings may have been dramatic and very destructive, but they have thus far represented a one-off incident and what has concerned UNESCO a great deal more is the constant threat of vandalism by visitors. There are warning signs in both complexes telling visitors not to touch anything and not to climb on the statues and these are backed up regularly with announcements on loudspeakers. However, the number of security personnel remains limited and these instructions are seldom enforced. The security staff can also appear quite demoralised, as if overwhelmed by the sheer volume of tourists, and may stand passively by as the rules are flagrantly ignored. It also does not help that signs posted in English are often so poorly translated from Indonesian that they appear comic and undermine their serious intent. To be fair to the

site managers it is worth noting that many of the tourists who visit these sites come from highly varied backgrounds making communication with them challenging, both from a linguistic and cultural point of view, especially if one is trying to manage their experiences from the perspective of conservation. The tourists also come with profoundly different expectations ranging from seeking a fun day out on the one hand and searching for some kind of spiritual solace on the other.

While it may be difficult to communicate with these varied visitors, it is still worth pointing out that there are no mechanisms at either temple for evaluating an upper limit for visitors and the visitor management systems that exist are perfunctory. For example, the use of mandatory guided tours in sensitive parts of the sites could be used to manage the visitors, but guided tours are primarily offered on a voluntary basis. It is widely held among local researchers that Indonesian visitors are primarily responsible for much of the damage, but on any visit to the temples overseas visitors can also be seen scrambling over delicately carved structures and sitting for photographs on top of ancient statuary. Unfortunately, vandalism, much of it unintentional, on bas-reliefs and temple structures is a common occurrence, but it is not possible to be sure which groups are the most destructive.

Local tourists certainly seem to arrive in larger and noisier groups than international ones, but not all locally-derived tourism is solely concerned with fun as there is often a mystical or spiritual dimension to Indonesian tourism. Some of the carvings and bas-reliefs found in these temples are believed to have spiritual powers to which local guides like to draw attention. For example, if women want to look prettier then they touch the face of the statue of Loro Jonggrang at Prambanan and then they touch their own faces three times (Salazar, 2009: 6). Men are not encouraged by guides to do the same and instead their attentions are directed to touch the statue's breasts for good luck (*ibid.*). As a result of this activity the parts of the statue that are most handled have become blackened through constant use, though whether these customs are seen as vandalism by the management remains a moot point. When in the company of foreign visitors, local guides appear to look down on these traditions, though some seem to enjoy informing their groups about these practices and take a keen interest in seeing whether foreigners follow them too (*ibid.*). Significantly, UNESCO recognises that vandalism

by visitors is very worrying, but in reality the World Heritage Committee is unable to impose sanctions to encourage a better approach to conservation other than the threat to withdraw its recognition, and thus far serious measures to mitigate this problem have not been implemented.

The damage caused by visitors is significant, but probably the main threat to both monuments is natural disasters since the temples are located in an area of frequent seismic activity. Earthquakes in particular are a serious hazard and the one that struck on 27 May 2006 registered a magnitude of 6.2 on the Richter scale. The quake caused severe damage in Central Java and there were many casualties in Yogyakarta. Prambanan was badly damaged with large amounts of masonry shaken to the ground, but the site reopened surprisingly quickly a few months later, though many areas remained sealed off.

In contrast Borobudur got off lightly in 2006, but was heavily affected by the eruption of Mount Merapi in October and November 2010. Volcanic ash from Merapi rained down on the temple complex, which is approximately 28 kilometres (17 miles) west-southwest of the volcano's crater. A layer of ash up to 2.5 centimetres deep smothered the edifice after the eruption of 3–5 November; it killed nearby vegetation and the custodians worried that its acidity would damage the stone carvings. The temple complex was closed between 5 and 9 November to clean up the ash and UNESCO donated US\$ 3 million towards its rehabilitation. The clean-up took approximately six months and some 55,000 blocks of stone had to be dismantled in order to reopen the drainage system – vital to the monuments' preservation – which had become clogged with slurry caused by a combination of ash and rain.

Soil erosion is another natural problem since the earth is quite soft and can be rapidly washed away with heavy rain destabilising the temple's foundations (Borobudur, <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2013/01/11/borobudur-stupas-covered-anticipate-merapi-eruption.html>).

Tourism development and local stakeholders

There has long been the contention that local villagers around Borobudur and Prambanan are routinely ignored in plans to turn both monuments into major tourism destinations. For example, in 2003 residents and small business proprietors around Borobudur organised

a series of meetings, including poetry protests, objecting to a provincial government plan to build a three-story mall complex, entitled the 'Java World'. The state-owned company was charged with turning Borobudur into a 'world class' cultural tourism destination and it would appear that serious engagement with local stakeholders was not part of its remit, though its site managers are well aware of the accusations made by local stakeholders. What makes managing sites such as Borobudur especially difficult is that it is not just local stakeholders who have an interest, but international ones too. For example, up-market cruise ship operators such as Swan Hellenic that take passengers to Borobudur often receive negative feedback from their customers complaining about being harassed by desperate traders. Such is the ubiquity of this negative feedback that planners bringing international tourists to these sites have sometimes considered excluding them from their itineraries. However, so intense is the media focus on sites like Borobudur with celebrities such as Richard Gere gracing them with their presence that removing them from a tour is not a realistic option. Upscale tourists seem to clamour for the opportunity to visit these temples and then to bemoan the experience immediately after when completing the customary questionnaire, though what they recall long after the visit remains unknown.

Commercial tour operators know a great deal about the opinions of their clients, though this is rarely made available to academic researchers; however the Tripadvisor blog rankings were very enthusiastic with 625 rating a visit to Borobudur as excellent, 216 as very good and a mere 37 as average (Borobudur, http://www.tripadvisor.com/Attraction_Review-g297709-d320054-Reviews-Borobudur_Temple-Magelang_Central_Java_Java.html). In contrast there seems to be less publicly available information on the opinions of local stakeholders, though this may simply be a matter of access. One trend that seems to be emerging in Indonesia is that the views of local residents are worth canvassing, something that has occurred as part of the reform era that followed the demise of Suharto's 'New Order' regime in 1998. The point is that the relationship between the monuments and local stakeholders should no longer be seen simply as a stress point since there are a number of villages that have clearly benefited from tourism such as Candirejo which has had community-based tourism since 1999. The village became known for its traditional festivals and has become

a centre for various activities such as walking, cycling and riding tours and traditional cooking lessons (Kausar, 2010: 81; Darma Putra and Pitana, 2010). These developments also received official approval since it was the local Regent who declared the village to be worthy of local government assistance to develop community-based tourism. There is also evidence of consultations with stakeholders, which UNESCO actively encourages. For example, UNESCO's portal contains a report of a meeting organised about Borobudur by the Central Java Development and Planning Agency (BAPPEDA Jateng) concerning road expansion and the management of the site's scenery and environment. Also under discussion was the revitalisation of the Archaeological Museum at Borobudur, and a mission by representatives of UNESCO is specifically mentioned (UNESCO, Portal.unesco.org/geography/en/ev).

Conclusion

It is our contention that the management of tourism and conservation at the sites of Borobudur and Prambanan are challenged by a number of factors: the natural environment, the pressure for development, a lack of awareness of the negative side of the tourist gaze, and the need to manage potential religious tensions and to overcome years of neglect of local community involvement in the Suharto years. Resolving these challenges is, however, further complicated by a labyrinthine form of management that acts to disempower managers, archaeologists, conservators, security officials, ticket-sellers and guides in carrying out their tasks effectively. For example, the uniformed security staff or guardians often give the impression that they do not know what to do when tourists flout instructions to stay off monuments and even seem to be confused about their role.

This study has identified seven bodies, discounting their subsidiary arms, which have been tasked with managing these important edifices, each with their very different perspectives and missions. These groupings of management have to not only deal with the problems mentioned above, but have to engage with a complex mix of both international and local stakeholders, including religious and academic ones. On top of these concerns, the management mix has to devote time to conservation, interpretation and visitor management, which is often very limited with signs simply saying *Dilarang Naik* (Do not climb) without any reasons

being given. The overall impression is that these important functions are handled in a haphazard way to the detriment of the sites' sustainability and the pleasure of some visitors, at least the foreign-derived ones.

It is our view that merely tinkering with the superstructure of the state-owned management company will not have much impact on the overall management of these two sites and that a clearer vision is needed that includes simplifying the management structure and possibly even abandoning running it as a unitary authority for the two sites. It would be a shame if the green shoots of greater local community involvement were to be negated by what can best be described as a complex and convoluted management structure however well intentioned. It is not the purpose of the chapter to apportion blame as it is clear to us that both managers and stakeholders in these two temple complexes would like to see them work more effectively, but ultimately it is the management structure that needs to be remedied before significant steps forward can be taken in visitor management, conservation and interpretation.

However, it is also our view that the way a heritage site is managed does influence the impact on conservation in the manner proposed by Mason (2003) and that neither of these two temple sites is managed in a way that enhances their conservation. It is suggested that a unitary form of management for each along with more effective interpretation to enhance tourists' understanding of the cultural/historical importance of these sites and thus the importance of conservation; effective visitor management, including more assertive security, would also help reduce the negative impacts on the fabric of the buildings by tourists. It would also help if more resources could be made available to conserve and manage these two edifices, not least because there is the added burden of having to contend with natural disasters. That said, on a positive note there is an emerging awareness of the need for local communities and the various arms of government to collaborate more effectively in negotiating heritage conservation and tourism development.