

Rethinking the Role of World Heritage Sites in Development: Cases of Cultural Sites in Indonesia and Cambodia

Devi Roza Kausar

Graduate School of International Development, Nagoya University

Abstract

This paper aims to explore the role of World Heritage Sites (WHS) in development, especially through tourism. It discusses issues and challenges encountered by Indonesia and Cambodia in the utilization of cultural resources for development, namely Borobudur Temple in Central Java, Indonesia, and Angkor Archaeological Park in Siem Reap, Cambodia. There are three main matters discussed in the paper: (1) the socio-economic impacts of tourism that is generated by WHS; (2) how the sites could be managed to ensure benefits for communities; and (3) the dynamic of global – local interactions in World Heritage Site.

Keywords: World Heritage Sites, Borobudur, Angkor, tourism, communities, development.

I. Introduction

In recent years, the discourse of heritage sites, especially UNESCO's World Heritage Sites, had extended to more than conservation issues, which originally was the focal point of World Heritage Convention adopted in 1972. This extended issue is about the role of World Heritage Sites (WHS) in development or even poverty alleviation.

Koichiro Matsuura, the Director General of UNESCO, indicated that despite primary aim of World Heritage Convention to conserve cultural and natural heritage, the designation of World Heritage Sites (WHS) has to look also at efforts to reduce poverty (2008). Araoz (2008), on the other hand, argued that World Heritage Convention is silent about developmental issues because its focus is mainly the preservation of the Outstanding Universal Value¹ attributed to the property. He stated that the social and economic conditions of the population in and around WHS were not actually priority element in the content of nomination dossiers, nor in the monitoring process that followed inscription. As such, the management plans for WHS have not been expected to propose processes for meeting socio-economic needs of community development. However, every state needs to balance its responsibility to preserve heritage for the future with other agendas, including economic and social aspirations of communities. Hence, there is the need for World Heritage Convention's Operational Guidelines to offer guidance for nomination

¹ Outstanding Universal Value according to World Heritage Convention's Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention is cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity.

dossiers to present or analyse demographic information about the population in and around the sites proposed for inscription into the World Heritage List and to address potential impact of inscription on the local, regional or national economy (Araoz 2008).

This paper aims to explore the role of WHS in development especially through tourism. It is part of a dissertation research with objectives of assessing the impact of the presence of WHS and tourism on the livelihoods of community; examining how management system of WHS affect community's livelihoods; and identifying the roles of the management system of the site in facilitating tourism benefits for socio-economic development in the local level. The main research site of the dissertation is Borobudur Temple and its immediate vicinities in Central Java. Up to present day, field works were conducted twice (in 2007 and 2008) in Borobudur area. However, when discussing management system of World Heritage Sites, the dissertation will dedicate some parts to discuss the case of management of Angkor Archaeological Park in Cambodia as a comparison (to some extent) with the Borobudur case. The field work to Cambodia was conducted in 2008.

This particular paper will draw on some findings from a survey research carried out to assess tourism impacts to community livelihoods in Borobudur, Indonesia, and on information gathered through site visits and interviews with key informants from organizations involved in the management of the two sites: Borobudur Temple and Angkor Archaeological Park.

Indonesia and Cambodia may be in different stages of development, with the latter being upon a road of recovery after more than 20 years of turmoil (Winter 2007). However, pertaining to the role of WHS in development, there are some similarities as well as differences that can be highlighted as issues and challenges encountered by developing countries in the utilization of cultural resources for development. Firstly, how tourism that is generated by a WHS is affecting patterns of development and what are its socio-economic impacts? For instance, when pointing tourism revenue, employment, and investment as the economic impacts of tourism, it is also important to identify the magnitude of these tourism impacts. What kind of employment is generated by tourism? What is the magnitude of local revenue? Does tourism contribute to the improvement of well-being of residents?

Secondly, there is the issue of how the sites could be managed to ensure benefits for communities. Engelhardt (2005) suggested that the paradigm of WHS management needed to be shifted to ensure that the sites have positive social impact and relevance to humanity, especially communities that live in the surrounding areas. Paradigm shift in WHS management as according to Engelhardt can be observed in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Paradigm shift in World Heritage management

Old	New
Monuments of princes, priests, and politician	Places and spaces of ordinary people
Abandoned relic sites	Continuing communities
Physical components	Living traditions and practices
Management by central administration	Decentralised community management
Elite use (for recreation)	Popular use (for development)

Source: Engelhardt (2005)

The third point to be highlighted is about the dynamic of global – local interactions in WHS: presence of international bodies like UNESCO, national management authority, urban or metropolitan companies dominating the tourism industry, and how these organizations interact with people and their localities. This may lead to questions of local participation in preserving the site, tourism development, and in the utilization of cultural resources such as WHS for development.

II. World Heritage Sites, Tourism, and Their Socio-economic Impacts: Cases of Borobudur Temple and Angkor Archaeological Park

The earlier part of this section will discuss some findings obtained from survey conducted in Borobudur Sub-district in Central Java to assess implications of WHS presence and tourism on the livelihoods of community.

II.1. Borobudur Temple and Its Vicinity

Borobudur Temple or Candi Borobudur is an ancient and magnificent Buddhist temple built in the 8th century. The stone temple has a shape of a stepped pyramid consisting of nine super-imposed terraces and crowned by a huge bell-shaped stupa. In 1973, the restoration of Borobudur Temple began, under the coordination of UNESCO involving a national executive agency and an international supervisory committee. In 1979, a Master Plan for the management of the site was developed by Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA). The Master Plan divided Borobudur area into five zones encompassing the site itself, immediate vicinities (within Borobudur Sub-district), and other neighboring sub-districts. Presidential Decree No. 1/1992 then adopted the Master Plan so that its regulatory function could be put into effect. The Presidential Decree though only recognizes three zones from the five zones designation in the Master Plan. The decree also determined authorities in charge for each of three zones and decided that a state-owned company (PT Taman²) is the main body responsible for facilitating tourism in and around the temple.

² PT Taman refers to Taman Wisata Candi Borobudur, Prambanan, and Ratu Boko Limited, a state-owned company responsible for managing Borobudur Temple Recreation Park, Prambanan Temple Recreation Park, and Ratu Boko Temple Recreation Park. The company was declared rights to manage tourism and recreational function of the temple and park in Presidential Decision No. 1 1992.

Table 2 Zone designation and utilization for Borobudur area

Zone	Distance from temple and area coverage	Designation according JICA, 1979	Utilization according to Presidential Decree No.1/1992	Authority in charge
1	200 m; 44.8 ha	Sanctuary zone (the temple itself)	Monument preservation (the temple itself)	Directorate General of Culture, Ministry of Culture and Tourism
2	500 m; 42.3 ha	Archeological park zone	Recreation park, restaurants, museums, research facilities, area for cultural activities, car and coach parks.	State-owned enterprise (company)
3	2 km; 932 ha	Land-use regulated zone	Limited residential area, farming, green area, supporting zone	Government of Magelang District
4	5 km; 2,600 ha	Historical scenery preservation zone		
5	10 km; 7,850 ha	National archeological park zone		

Source: Soeroso (2007)

Borobudur Temple is one single most popular tourists' attraction in Indonesia and was given its World Heritage status in 1991. It is located in a rural area of Borobudur Sub-district, Magelang Regency, Central Java Province. For international visitors as well as domestic visitors from outside Central Java, Borobudur is usually reached from Yogyakarta (in the neighboring Special Province of Yogyakarta), which is located some 43 kilometers from the temple. Tourism in Borobudur is dominated by domestic tourists, with 80% of the average 2 million visitors per year are domestic tourists.

As most visitors stay in Yogyakarta and visit the temple on a half day trip, there has been a relatively low demand for accommodations and other tourism amenities. This is not to say that there are no accommodations at all in the area. Some visitors especially those interested in cultural and rural tourism do spend some nights in Borobudur. During holiday season the demand for accommodations sometimes even exceeds the available capacities. An exclusive accommodation targeted at high-end customers called Aman Jiwo Hotel is located some 2 kilometres from the temple. There are also a number of other hotels, guesthouses and homestays available.

II.2. Tourism Impacts to Community Livelihoods in Borobudur

Some previous studies and works have been leading to indications that there have been controversies over the limited economic benefit of tourism to the surrounding rural area

in Borobudur (Adishakti 2006; Boccardi et al. 2006). Hampton (2005) identified that the main concerns over tourism in Borobudur were economic leakages, employment issues, investment, linkages to local economy and ownership. There have also been some discontentment over the way Borobudur Temple World Heritage Site is managed (Wall and Black 2005; Soeroso 2007). There were opinions that PT Taman had been too dominant in the management of the site amid the presence of two other institutions (Borobudur Conservation Institute under the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and Local Government of Magelang Regency) in the management system as a whole³.

Borobudur Sub-district being one of the poorest sub-districts within the Magelang Regency in spite of tourism that is happening in the area is among the concerns. In addition, scarce job opportunities in the villages have created heavy pressure of informal sector (in particular, hawkers) to the core of conservation area (Adhisakti 2006; Soeroso 2007). In 2006, a Reactive Monitoring Mission team that was dispatched to Borobudur Temple concluded that there had been little attempt to provide opportunities for local community members to gain direct economic benefit from tourism and use the Borobudur Temple as a platform to bring benefits to the wider context (Boccardi et al. 2006).

To assess the implications of the presence of World Heritage Site and the impact of tourism on the livelihoods of the local community, the livelihoods framework approach is used. The livelihoods framework approach (Ashley 2000), originally developed by the Overseas Development Institute to assess the impacts of tourism on rural livelihoods in Namibia, was used as a reference when developing survey research targeting the residents as well as interviews to a number of key informants. Nonetheless, some modifications were made to fit Borobudur's condition⁴ and to apply the framework in a quantitative data collection method due to previous studies using the framework had been mainly qualitative (Ashley 2000; Novelli and Gebhardt 2007). The livelihoods framework approach offers a useful perspective on tourism for enhancing local benefits and tries to place the interests of rural people in the center. Using livelihoods framework, the impact of tourism can be considered in terms of:

1. Impacts of household assets (financial assets, physical assets, human resources, natural resources, social capital)
2. Impacts on other household activities and strategies
3. Contribution to variety of household goals (well-being, income, empowerment)
4. People's capacity to influence external policy environment (participation)

³ There are three institutions involved in the management system: (1) Borobudur Conservation Institute, responsible for actual conservation of the temple; (2) PT Taman, responsible for managing tourism and park operations; (3) Local Government of Magelang Regency, responsible for managing the surrounding areas.

⁴ The study using livelihood framework approach in Namibia took place in a conservation area where specific regulations concerning conservation were applied, hence affecting access to natural resources for communities. However, in the case of Borobudur there have not been any conservation-based regulations implemented outside the park. Thus, some of the variables in the original framework are not applicable in this particular research.

Through the application of this framework in a set of questionnaires comprising close ended questions, a set of opinionnaire, and open ended questions, it is expected that the impact of World Heritage Site presence and its tourism on the following aspects can be described:

- Land value
- Increased income
- Access to the site for economic and recreational purposes
- Skill improvements
- Natural environment
- Preservation of art and culture
- Rural infrastructure development
- Provision of public facilities
- Improvement in well-being
- Entrepreneurship opportunities
- Local products development
- Changes in social relationships between residents
- Local participation in decision making related to tourism

In addition, the survey also obtained information useful to describe how tourism affects work patterns among residents:

- Has tourism substituted previous works, such as farming, in the case of people currently working in tourism-related jobs? ; or
- Are tourism-related works mainly complementary works?
- Has tourism been providing routine/regular salary or wages for people working in tourism-related jobs? ; or
- Has tourism been mainly providing non-routine income such as revenue from sales or other casual earnings?

These questions are related to household activities and strategies in rural area where it is common for household members to undertake a range of activities which each in some ways contribute to one or more household needs (Ashley 2000). In rural areas, tourism may not be the only livelihoods strategies as agriculture is still a core activity for many households. However, the opportunities for improved living standards that may be brought about by tourism cannot be ignored. In such case, it may be useful to see how tourism impacted or contribute to rural households' livelihoods not just from economic perspectives (i.e. job creation and cash income) but also on other components such as rural infrastructure which contributes to the pursue of households' needs; opportunities for starting small businesses that could change households' activities and strategies; or enhancing people's skills that would be useful to pursue economic goals.

Survey with purposive sampling strategy to 119 respondents from nine villages in the Borobudur Sub-district was conducted in August 2008. The samples constituted of both people working and not working in the tourism-related sectors, producers/workers producing local products, teachers, villages' key persons (not necessarily village administrators), and vendors/hawkers in the Borobudur Recreation Park. Since the livelihoods framework approach emphasizes on impact to households, one household only received one questionnaire. Among these respondents (households), 31% households were not involved in any tourism-related jobs, while 67% were involved in

tourism-related jobs, either directly or indirectly. The rest 2% constitute of invalid answers.

The result revealed that in terms of impacts to household assets, with land value increase as the main indicator, it was felt mostly by people living near the main road while those living further down the villages have not felt significant increase in land value. Positive impact in financial assets through improvement of households' income was quite significant for most respondents but not yet to the degree where they can fully depend on it for giving fixed income. When all respondents (regardless of whether they were involved in tourism-related jobs or not) were asked if they received regular monthly salary from tourism-related jobs, 92.31% said "no". Whereas, 70.69% of the respondents said that they and/or their household members receive non-regular wages/income from tourism related jobs.

Tourism related income was appreciated mainly as alternative income source to traditional occupations such as farming or other extractive works, which had been especially important for people living in a naturally "dry" areas within the sub-district. Moreover, from informal interviews done in the sideline of the survey, it was recognized that there has been lack of assistance from the local government side to help farmers deal with water problem and unemployment during the dry season.

The majority of respondents' income is still below 500,000rupiahs, which is below the minimum regional wage determined by the local government and tourism related income is not always reliable as a fixed income. Nevertheless, as suggested by Cukier-snow and Wall (1993), almost all employment opportunities associated with tourism may be highly prized and attractive jobs from the perspectives of local residents, when compared with the back-breaking tasks and low returns gained from farming small plots of land.

Tourism has been perceived quite positively by nearly 53% of respondents as opening opportunities for skill improvement through trainings that are beneficial for individual skill improvement. For example, language training (provided by District Office of Tourism and Culture), ethics in selling (provided by PT Taman), tourism management for village tourism (provided by NGOs), and some souvenir making. However, when asked whether they thought tourism development has promoted any training for local products development, 57.14% of samples responded negatively.

Tourism generated by Borobudur Temple WHS was generally perceived positively as contributing to improve well-being and other variables that contributed to general well-being: infrastructure, public facilities, conservation of local culture, and sense of pride. It has not, however, been perceived as providing much chance for people to participate in decision making process which affects their life as the main stakeholder of the heritage site.

The impacts of tourism to local economy are still limited mostly to generating local employment in the informal sectors (especially being hawkers), which has been posing a problem for the quality of tourism itself. It has not been impacting significantly on the opportunities to start small businesses and on the provision of financial assistance or

training for local product development. Utilizing local products in developing rural industries (for consumption in the tourists' market) is actually one of the key in establishing better linkages to tourism and a key for more widespread benefits of tourism (Grefe 1994; Hampton 2005; Boccardi et al. 2006). Lack of promotion of rural products in the area is actually in contrary to statements found in the JICA Master Plan for Borobudur (1979), which pointed out that promotion of other local industries is important if incomes are to be increased and if the natural population increase of these areas are to be absorbed by them.

II.3. Tourism in Angkor Archaeological Park and the Region of Siem Reap

Angkor World Heritage Site holds an important role in Cambodian economic development. Angkor contains the spectacular remains of the metropolitan cities of the Khmer Empire that flourished in the 9th – 14th centuries. The growth of international tourism in Angkor has been extraordinary. Cambodian Ministry of Tourism recorded that from just 9000 tickets sold in 1993, in 2003 ticket sales have grown to around 750,000 (Winter 2007). In 2007, the number of visitors was nearly 2 million visitors including Cambodians (Hathaway 2008). The pressure on Angkor is intense as the government wants foreign currency earnings from tourism and to promote economic development (Wagner 1995). Investors also seek opportunities in new development of tourists' facilities and local people are keen to improve their income.

The inscription of Angkor on the World Heritage List was in 1992 and it was immediately included on the list of World Heritage in danger. Covering a total of 401 square kilometers, it is by far the biggest World Heritage Site (P. Delanghe, personal communication, December 12, 2008). There was a high urgency in its conservation after its maintenance was neglected during almost 20 years of turmoil in Cambodia. Angkor inscription was made in somewhat exceptional circumstances because five conditions were tagged to it: (1) adoption of a proper legal framework; (2) establishment of a national authority to be in charge (other cultural sites in Cambodia were actually under the Ministry of Culture); (3) establishment of permanent borders; (4) definition of buffer or protected zones; and (5) setting up an international committee for site monitoring and management.

At present, Angkor is managed by the Authority for the Protection and Safeguarding of Angkor and Region of Siem Reap (APSARA National Authority). International Coordinating Committee for the Safeguarding and Development of Historic Site of Angkor (ICC) has also been working and playing a major role in coordinating efforts to safeguard and develop Angkor site – efforts which have been involving donor countries, international development agencies, NGOs and universities from across the world.

Nowadays, tourism in Angkor is very much affecting patterns of development in the town of Siem Reap. Tourism has visible impacts in shaping the town of Siem Reap to what it is today: a town filled with numerous hotels and other accommodations catering from budget to high-end customers, restaurants, spas, shopping areas, and nightlife. Yet, this progress in tourism also brings some concerns, especially among conservationists, and urban planners and managers. Wastewater and rainwater drainage remains largely

inadequate due to poor basic infrastructure (Vattho 2007). Delanghe also noted that hotels pumping their own groundwater may in the future affect the stability of Angkor temples (P. Delanghe, personal communication, December 12, 2008). Harada (2007), one of the experts in the Ad hoc Group of Experts for Sustainable Development within the ICC, stated that the town of Siem Reap needs to overcome its traffic problems and to ensure proper land use through a comprehensive development master plan.

On the other hand, a report on Regional Economic Development by GTZ⁵ stated that the growth poles in the tourism sectors is concentrated in urban center of Siem Reap and radiate very little to the surrounding rural areas. According a study by GTZ (2007), the rate of local earnings which have a poverty-reducing effect in Siem Reap is only 5%. The rural population has hardly any share of the economic development in the province because the agriculture sector, whose growth would generate the most poverty-reducing effects, develops slowly. GTZ also argued that depending on the product and the season, local products make up only 20% to 50% of the fruit and vegetable market. Thus, in order to use the economic potential of the tourism industry for rural development and poverty alleviation, the GTZ pursues an integrated approach: the development of selected value chains that link with regional economic promotion.

APSARA National Authority had also tried developing better linkages between the agriculture and tourism sector. The Department of Demography and Development have been introducing new varieties and new cultivation techniques for households resided within the Archaeological Park. With a high demand from hotels for fresh produce (especially “Western” vegetables), local people can improve their income through supplying vegetables for tourists consumption. At present, 95% of vegetables for hotel consumptions have been imported from Thailand and Vietnam (K.N. Khoun, personal communication, December 17, 2008).

Moreover, UNESCO has started a number of initiatives to improve tourism benefits for local people (T. Jinnai, personal communication, December 12, 2008). The organization has been emphasizing the revitalization of intangible heritage such as local knowledge for skill improvement. Old traditions such as in wood carvings are again taught to young generation. Teruo Jinnai, UNESCO Representatives in Cambodia, said that capacity development remains an important issue if the local people from Siem Reap Region are going to be more involved in managing aspects of tourism. Revitalization of local knowledge is believed to be one of the starting points.

III. Management System in World Heritage Sites: Cases of Borobudur Temple and Angkor Archaeological Park

As explained briefly before, there are three different organizations managing the zones in Borobudur. Zone 1, which is the Borobudur Temple itself, is managed by the Borobudur Heritage Conservation Institute (BHCI), Ministry of Culture and Tourism. The recreation park, which is located in Zone 2, is managed by a state-owned company PT Taman Wisata Candi Borobudur, Prambanan, and Ratu Boko – or PT Taman Wisata as it is

⁵ An international cooperation enterprise for sustainable development, which is based in Germany.

usually mentioned – which reports to the Ministry of Finances. Zone 2 hosts a park that serves as an immediate buffer zone to the temple, museums, vendor stalls, eateries, area for cultural performance, as well as parking areas. Zone 3, which serves as a supporting zone, is under the management of the local government (Magelang District). In Zone 3 one may find restaurants, guests' houses, some shops selling daily goods, some residential and farming areas.

Soeroso (2007) argued that management by different authorities sometimes caused conflicts among the authorities, inefficient and un-integrated management, un-holistic management of the world heritage site as a monument and a tourist attraction. The World Heritage Committee (WHC) also saw underlying issue in the conservation and management of the property and its locality, such as lack of vision, weak institutional framework and absence of clear regulations (Boccardi et al. 2006). Lack of institutional coordination was recognized as the result of division of responsibility for the three zones.

While the WHC suggested on sustainable development approach that provide opportunities for local community members to gain economic benefit from tourism, it is not clear yet who will be the main actors for sustainable development of the rural area surrounding Borobudur. The BHCI is mainly concerned with the conservation of the temple, while PT Taman Wisata who is currently managing on-site tourism has not pursued any policy of linking the surrounding villages into a scheme of sustainable development of the Borobudur area. Local Government of Magelang District, who is responsible for the management of Zone 3 and who has authority over the villages in the Borobudur Sub-district, should naturally plays a main role in developing strategy for tourism beyond Borobudur. However, the strategy must be formed together with PT Taman Wisata and also BHCI in order for it to work for rural development, conservation and providing opportunities for tourists to know the locality of Borobudur.

While management system in Borobudur involves different organizations, Angkor is managed by a single authority (APSARA National Authority – hereinafter APSARA). APSARA was created by a Royal Decree in 1995. It is placed under the double supervision of the Presidency of the Council of Ministers (for technical supervision) and Ministry of Economic and Finance (for financial supervision). The organization is responsible for⁶:

- Protecting, maintaining, conserving and improving the value of archaeological park, the culture, the environment and the history of the Angkor region as defined on the World Heritage List.
- Refining and applying master plan on tourist development according to the five zones, defined in 1994 in the Royal Decree on the protection and management of Siem Reap - Angkor and taking action against deforestation, illegal territory occupation as well as anarchy activities in Siem Reap – Angkor.
- Finding financial sources and investments.
- Participating in the policy of cutting down poverty of the Royal Government in Siem Reap – Angkor.

⁶ See APSARA's website for more details: <http://www.autoriteapsara.org>

- Cooperating with the Cambodian Development Council on the investments of all the projects that are involved with APSARA Authority's mission.
- Cooperating with ministries, institutions, funds, national and international communities as well as international governmental institutions and non-governmental organization on all projects related to APSARA Authority.

APSARA is mandated to represent the Royal Government before all international partners. The organization thus preside the Cambodian delegation to the ICC.

The territorial authority of APSARA encompasses Angkor and Siem Reap, with the term Siem Reap – Angkor is defined in the Royal Decree establishing Protected Cultural Zones. Zoning is determined in 1993 and consisted of five zones. APSARA possesses exclusive rights for managing Zone 1 (core conservation zone) and Zone 2 (buffer zone), whereas Zone 3 to 5 is under the right of Siem Reap Provincial Government⁷.

The organizational structure of APSARA consists of seven departments and one unit, namely:

1. Department of Personal Staff, Finance and Communications
2. Department of Monument and Archaeology
3. Department of Land and Habitat Management
4. Department of Angkor Tourism Development
5. Department of Urbanization and Development in Siem Reap Angkor region
6. Department of Demography and Development
7. Department of Water and Forests
8. Intervention Unit for cracking down on deforestation, illegal territory occupation and taking action against the anarchy activities in Siem Reap – Angkor

Among the seven departments in APSARA, Department of Demography and Development is a response to a growing need of system to tackle issues in community development. This department was created in 2004, which characterized the second phase of development within APSARA, after it was given a second mandate in addition to conservation: sustainable development (K.N. Khoun, personal communication, December 17, 2008).

Examining the evident differences between the way Borobudur and Angkor is managed; there are some factors which may contribute to the different approach. The area of Borobudur Temple World Heritage Site is smaller and more confined compare to Angkor, thus the conservation needs are relatively less. By the time the Indonesian Presidential Decree No.1/1992 decided organizations in charge for Zone 1 - 3 in 1992, restoration projects had long finished. The priority had shifted to promote tourism; hence this might be the reason to have a state-owned company concentrating on managing tourism in Borobudur. On the contrary, Angkor is of much larger size and when it entered the World Heritage Lists in 1992, it was in immense need of restoration and conservation. Hence,

⁷ Development in Zone 3 – 5 is still monitored by APSARA, the provincial government needs to consult the Authority for big constructions or investments.

UNESCO put it on a condition that an establishment of a special national authority was needed.

In terms of efforts for ensuring tourism benefits for local community, the main actor for sustainable development can be identified more clearly in Angkor than in Borobudur. This study argues that in Borobudur, the positive impacts generated by WHS and tourism are sporadic and scattered because different organizations which constitute the management system have not clearly prioritize the community in their mission, vision, and objectives. In Angkor, on the other hand, the organizational structure of APSARA with special department responsible for sustainable development, may provide a better basis for executing sustainable development programs.

Challenges for APSARA may remain in the fact that it is such a big organization with big power. Delanghe argued that APSARA's many departments can almost be likened to the different entities in the management system in Borobudur (P. Delanghe, personal communication, December 12, 2008). Because in practice, it is sometimes hard to coordinate between departments and that each department has different objectives which may be conflicting with other departments' interests. Nonetheless, this study wants to argue that having a single authority in managing a site, or at least a collective management presided by one leader, enables management to adopt the principles that forms the foundations of successful management. The fourteen principles of management⁸ identified by Henry Fayol in 1916 actually served as guidelines for decisions and actions of managers (Wehrich and Koontz 2004). However, some of these principles, such as unity of command⁹ and unity of direction¹⁰ are actually very relevant for WHS management having to balance different functions: conservation, tourism, and economic development, all of which should contribute to the main aim of sustainable tourism development¹¹.

IV. Dynamic of Global – Local Interactions in WHS: Cases of Borobudur Temple and Angkor Archaeological Park

This section discusses global – local interactions in WHS management. The presence of WHS often means existence of the so called global or international interest, represented by international organizations such as UNESCO who provides guidelines for

⁸ The principles of management are: (1) division of work; (2) authority and responsibility; (3) discipline; (4) unity of command; (5) unity of direction; (6) subordination of individual interest; (7) remuneration; (8) degree of centralization; (9) scalar chain; (10) order; (11) equity; (12) stability of tenure or personnel; (13) initiative; and (14) esprit de corps.

⁹ This principle states that every subordinate (or in this case every division) should receive orders and be accountable to one and only one superior.

¹⁰ All those working in the same line of activity must understand and pursue the same objectives. All related activities should be put under one group, there should be one plan of action for them, and they should be under the control of one manager.

¹¹ Tourism development that generates long term benefits to the local economy without compromising the resources in which tourism is depending on.

implementation of World Heritage Convention, management authority, and organization of tourism industry often dominated by urban or metropolitan companies. The global side brings with it structures, systems, sets of rules, and certain perspectives. Wall and Black (2005) stated that perspectives and interests of the local people may be different, but not necessarily less important than perspectives and interests of organizations representing global interests.

In the case of Borobudur, Wall and Black (2005) argued that the perspectives of local people were not adequately represented in the top-down planning adopted in Borobudur following the formal designation as a World Heritage site. Thus, planning approach had tended to freeze sites, displace human activities, and effectively exclude local people from their own heritage. Such situations may be reflected in the development of Borobudur Temple Recreation Park with demarcation such as fences from the rest of the rural area. Moreover, the survey which was conducted in Borobudur for this study also revealed that there has yet much chance for people to participate in decision making process which affects their life as one of the main stakeholders of the heritage site.

In the case of Angkor, the challenges may rest in the fact that there are numerous international parties. Ranging from donor countries and NGOs involved in conserving the sites; and foreign companies that have been granted concessions to operate their businesses in Angkor and the region of Siem Reap. Thus APSARA should make sure that the interests and needs of local people are always considered in decisions that affects local people's life, and benefit for local economy can be maximized.

V. Conclusions

Borobudur Temple and the historic sites of Angkor are both ancient monuments listed in the World Heritage Lists. As both are in developing countries, they are expected to generate tourism, which can serve as a positive force for development. However, it should be realized that tourism can also inflict on fragile cultural resources.

Survey research that was conducted in Borobudur and literature studies as well as interviews that had been done in Angkor, revealed that similar issues are encountered by the two WHS in terms of the socio-economic impacts of tourism. These issues are namely: how to establish better linkages between tourism and local economy, how to develop skills and knowledge of local people, how to increase poverty reducing effects, and how to minimize negative impacts of tourism through comprehensive development plan.

In terms of approach used in managing the sites (one single authority or different entities managing different functions), this study argues that having a single authority in managing a site, or at least a collective management presided by one leader, enables management to balance different functions: conservation, tourism, and economic development, which should contribute to the main aim of sustainable tourism development.

Finally, in terms of dynamic of global – local interactions in WHS management, the two sites face different challenges. Management of Borobudur Temple needs to better position the recreation park as a place of ordinary people – one that can accommodate living traditions. Although the Buddhist temple is surrounded by predominantly Muslim communities, the place should be seen as a place for collective identity and memory of a Javanese village where the monument cannot be seen as separated from its natural and cultural landscapes – a place that does not only accommodate tourists' activities.

On the other hand, APSARA, due to the many international parties involved, should make sure that the interests and needs of local people are always considered in decisions that affect local people's life, and benefit for local economy can be maximized.

Acknowledgements – The author would like to thank respectable academic advisors Prof. Yoshiaki Nishikawa, Prof. Yoshihiko Nishimura, and Prof. Hiroshi Osada for always giving invaluable advice and support. Deep gratitude also goes to the Global Practicum Fund of the Graduate School of International Development, Nagoya University, for funding the field research to Indonesia; and the International Cooperation Center for Agricultural Education, Nagoya University, for funding the field research to Cambodia.

References

- Adhisakti, L., 2006. *Borobudur Heritage Site and Area Management: From temple to saujana heritage and for a better conservation and management of world heritage site*. Yogyakarta: ICOMOS Indonesia, Indonesian Trust, Center for Heritage Conservation – Department of Architecture & Planning, Gadjah Mada University.
- Araoz, G., 2008. World Heritage and Public Works: Development Cooperation and Poverty Reduction. In *World Heritage and Public Works: Development Cooperation for Poverty Alleviation Seminar*. Tokyo, Japan 29 August 2008. United Nations University: Tokyo.
- Ashley, C., 2000. The Impacts of Tourism on Rural Livelihoods: Namibia's Experience. In *Working Paper 128*. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Boccardi, G., Brooks, G. and Gurung, H., 2006. *Mission Report. Reactive Monitoring Mission to Borobudur Temple Compounds, World Heritage Property, Indonesia 18 – 25 February 2006*.
- Cukier-snow, J. and Wall, G. (1993) Tourism Employment: Perspectives from Bali. *Tourism Management 14*, pp. 195-201.
- Engelhardt, R.A., 2005. World Heritage: Its Implication and Relevance for Humanity. In *Training Workshop on the Conservation and Management of World Heritage Sites*. Hiroshima, Japan 18 April 2005. UNITAR Hiroshima Office for Asia and the Pacific: Hiroshima.
- Grefe, X. 1994. Is Tourism a Lever for Economic and Social Development. In Bramwell, B. and Lane, B. (eds) *Rural Tourism and Sustainable Development*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- GTZ. 2007. *Regional Economic Development – Green Belt, Siem Reap Province*. Available online: <http://www.gtz.de/en/weltweit/asien-pazifik/kambodscha/24890.htm>. Accessed: January 10, 2009.
- Hampton, M.P. (2005) Heritage, Local Communities and Economic Development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol.32(3), pp.735-759.
- Harada, T. 2007. Report of the Ad hoc Experts for Sustainable Development. In *Fourteenth Plenary Session International Co-ordinating Committee for the Safeguarding and Development of the Historic Site of Angkor*. Siem Reap 28 November 2008. UNESCO: Phnom Penh.
- Hathaway, B. 2008. Angkor Wat. *Smithsonian Magazine*, January 2008. Available online: <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/travel/lifelist-angkor-wat.html>. Accessed: January 10, 2009.

JICA. 1979. *Borobudur Prambanan National Archeological Parks Final Report*, July 1979.

Matsuura, K. (2008) Keynote speech. In *World Heritage and Public Works: Development Cooperation for Poverty Alleviation Seminar*. Tokyo, Japan 29 August 2008. United Nations University: Tokyo.

Novelli, M. and Gebhardt, K., 2007. Community Based Tourism in Namibia: 'Reality Show' or 'Window Dressing'? *Current Issues in Tourism* 10(5), pp. 443-479.

Soeroso, A. 2007. *Valuing Borobudur heritage area in a multi-attribute framework: environmental economic perspective and its ecotourism management policy implications*. Unpublished PhD dissertation (in Indonesia). Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University.

Vattho, T. 2007. Pollution Control in Siem Reap. In *Fourteenth Plenary Session International Co-ordinating Committee for the Safeguarding and Development of the Historic Site of Angkor*. Siem Reap 28 November 2008. UNESCO: Phnom Penh.

Wager, J. 1995. Developing Strategy for the Angkor World Heritage Site. *Tourism Management* 16(7), pp.515-523.

Wall, G. and Black, H. 2005. Commentary. Global Heritage and Local Problems: Some Examples from Indonesia. In Harrison, D. and Hitchcock, M., eds. *The Politics of World Heritage: Negotiating Tourism and Conservation*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

Wehrich, H. and Koontz, H. 2004. *Management: A Global Perspective*. Asia: McGraw-Hill Education.

Winter, T. 2007. Rethinking Tourism in Asia. *Annals of Tourism Research* 34(1), pp. 27-44.