

Dilemma between Culture and Heritage Preservation and Tourist Attraction

I Gusti Bagus Rai Utama¹, Putu Chris Susanto², I Wayan Ruspendi Junaedi³, Ni Putu Dyah Krismawintari⁴

^{1,2,3,4}Universitas Dhyana Pura, Bali, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

*Published Online: 26 July 2021

Comparing a site listed as UNESCO's World Heritage Site, the Tower of London, with the site of Tanah Lot Temple in Bali presents several interesting, namely that both these places have similar strength in their uniqueness, but have a discernable difference in terms of universality. Whereas the Tower of London has a feature of universality accepted by the international community, Tanah Lot Temple has yet to share such features. Both are visited by large numbers of tourists, thus creating a threat to the mitigation or conservation efforts for the sites, in terms of physical and cultural value preservations. Both sites have been commoditized for public purposes even have entered a significant commercialization phase, but the Tanah Lot site has created a management conflict because it is yet to have a long-term planning scheme, while such conflict has yet to arise in the case of the Tower of London because the site has been nationally and professionally managed. The existence of the Tower of London has been recognized by UNESCO while Tanah Lot Temple has not. The interpretation of the Tower of London has been nationally recognized as a mandatory site for UK students, while Tanah Lot has yet.

Keywords:

World Heritage Site,
Tower of London,
Tanah Lot Temple,
Bali

1. INTRODUCTION

Along with the change in people's general perception of tourism, the practice of tourism is often seen on one hand as the engine that moves a nation's economy as foreign exchange reserves generator for the development of that nation. On the other hand, tourism also has wider-ranging developmental problems for a nation that can be seen as the negative impacts of tourism development. Internationally by 2004, tourism has reached its historical peak moving 763 million people around the globe and generating US\$ 623 billion in expenses. That figure was an 11% increase from the previous year of 2003, in which tourism reached 690 million people with a total worldwide expense of US\$ 524 billion. In conjunction with that phenomenon, it is estimated that the number of individual travels worldwide will reach 1.6 billion people annually by 2020 (UN-WTO, 2005; de Serres, 2002; Boniface, 2006; Adell, et al., 2015).

*Corresponding Author: I Gusti Bagus Rai Utama

*Cite this Article: I Gusti Bagus Rai Utama, Putu Chris Susanto, I Wayan Ruspendi Junaedi, Ni Putu Dyah Krismawintari (2021). *Dilemma between Culture and Heritage Preservation and Tourist Attraction. International Journal of Social Science and Education Research Studies, 1(1), 01-07*

The Indonesian Culture and Tourism Ministry by Nirwandar, (2011), and also by Suarhana, (2015); Izawa, (2009) explained that the development of tourism is fundamentally aimed at several honorable objectives as follows: tourism is expected to be able to give a feeling of pride and love to the Republic of Indonesia as a cohesive unit through travel and tourism activities that are carried out by the island nation's citizens throughout the archipelago. The expected impact is that travel can encourage the sense of brotherhood and understanding for the Indonesian citizens traveling to various tourism destinations other than their own place of inhabitants, especially on the systems and philosophies of the societies that they visit, thus encouraging national unity and oneness (Tosun, 2006)

Tourism development also is expected to provide opportunities for all Indonesians to participate and work hard within it. Visitors to tourism areas throughout the archipelago are expected to give an optimum impact on the improvements in the areas' societal welfare. It is hoped that tourism can contribute largely to poverty alleviation in areas that are impoverished in other economical potentials but are rich in natural and cultural wonders appropriate for tourism (Johnson, 1994).

Currently, tourism in modern times has become a basic living necessity for modern societies. For certain

societies, the ability to travel has been linked to basic human rights especially as it relates to the long holidays and paid vacation allowances. Good and sustainable tourism management is expected to give the opportunity for any tourism destination's economy to develop and improve. The use of local materials and supplies in the hospitality service will also give the opportunity for local industries to take an important role in the procurement of goods and services related to tourism. Technological development increasingly intense and complex competition to encourage travelers to visit a certain tourism destination, the need for advance technology especially industrial technology should encourage tourism destinations to develop the ability to apply the latest technology for tourism purposes. In those destinations, rapid technological advancement will happen, expected to be appropriated according to need, which will support other economic activities. In such a case, tourism development should bring a wider, more fundamental impact for the local communities and governments. Tourism will be an inseparable part of the development of a region and will be integrated into the framework of the region's improvements in its peoples' societal welfare (Hjalager, 2002; Murphy, 2005; Pigram, 2005).

The objective of sustainable tourism development, since the very nature of tourism is to offer sights of natural beauty, experiences of cultural richness, and the hospitality of service, very little natural resources should be depleted to achieve such things. This means that the use of natural resources should be kept to a minimum so that when seen in terms of sustainable development tourism can be managed for a relatively long period. Tourism development much expected to truly contribute to the cultural preservation of a nation or region including the conservation, development, and utilization of such national or regional culture. UNESCO and UN-WTO in their joint resolution in 2002 declared that tourism activities are the main tools for cultural preservation. In that context, it is natural for Indonesia to also make tourism development as an encouraging force for cultural preservation in its numerous regions (Di, 2015; Mingst and Karns, 2016).

In this study, the objective of sustainable tourism development in the managing Tourism Attractions based on culture and its heritage will be formulated as research objectives as follows: (1) To conduct irritation index analysis to identify the existence of friction towards the local population as the host in each tourism destination. (2) To determine the difference between a cultural heritage site listed in the World Heritage (Tower of London in England) and a site that is not World Heritage (Tanah Lot Temple in Bali).

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 The Contraction Management and Preservation of Cultural Heritage

The debate on culture nowadays is no longer about expression, imagination, and creativity, but rather addresses culture as a tourism product. According to Hewison, 1988 (quoted by Ho and McKercher, 2010), culture is consumed as a commodity because within it there exists an experiential value. In today's modern society, culture and its heritage are often turned into an economically valuable commodity for the needs and interests of the tourism industry (Graham, 2002); while in reality, the intrinsic value is more than what is commonly assumed as a good or service, resulting in overexploitation of a destination as a tourism product. The treatment of culture and its heritage when seen as a product, if not managed wisely, will cause the buying and selling of tourism as a standardized product that could diminish the meaning of the elements that are intangible and unable to be economically standardized or measured. Graham (2002) strictly stated that when culture and its heritage are seen as an economical resource or capital, the effect is the legitimization of culture and its heritage as merely a product for the tourism industry. Meanwhile, Shackley (2001) supports the notion that travels that put forth culture and its heritage as a product will have an effect on commercialization.

In the context of marketing, the use of culture and its heritage as a consumable product by consumers of the tourism industry is a relative concept, specifically used by tourism professionals and academics. As noted by Ashworth et. al (1994), this phenomenon began in the 1990s. The idea of using cultural heritage as a product began with the purpose of providing consumer satisfaction by presenting tourism as an experience that fulfills the needs of travelers. The approach used is a balanced product and marketing approach that combines the goal of preservation and management of culture and its heritage as a tourism commodity. In its management concept, there are two fundamental differences that are difficult to balance between the principle of managing culture and its heritage with the tendency for conservation and the actual management of tourism with the tendency of commercial tourism. This difficulty is realized when it comes time to determine the pricing mix for a product of culture and its heritage. Gunn (1998) states that a misunderstanding commonly occurs can be regarding the definition of tourism products within a tourism system itself, which often based on a false concept about a tourism product that is something intangible.

As if often the case, there exists a difference between the concept of the providers of cultural tourism products and the consumption concept of the travelers regarding the cultural heritage product due to the difference in the consumption methods. Some travelers truly care about the values intrinsically carried by the cultural heritage sites that they visit, while many others do not care about the values manifested in an object's cultural and heritage elements. To

unify these differing concepts, there is a need for cultural tourism management that is able to combine to the goal of conservation and utilization so that the two can meet in a balanced approach.

2.2 Cultural Tourism as an Industry

Christou, et al., (2006) argue that cultural tourism is the industry able to be planned and controlled, as well as one with a goal to create products that can be marketed. Another argument defines cultural tourism as a mix of two industries, in which cultural heritage takes on a role to transform a locale into a destination and tourism becomes the manifestation of economic activities (Smith, 2005). These concepts can be unified as one; first from the perspective of managing cultural tourism with the objective preservation as “conservation agencies”, while at the same time from the perspective of product management that puts forth the interests of tourism industry practitioners as “user industries” with the tendency towards economically oriented activities (Ashworth, 2013).

To balance the two perspectives, it is necessary to devise a policy that allows for the economic goals to be made without alienating conservational goals. In the end, the conservational goals can be sustainable if supported by appropriate funding and management schemes. In this context, the management should use the concept of Tourism Attractions with its heritage as the sustaining force of cultural tourism (Carter and Grimwade, 1997).

2.3 Measure Tourism Management Using the Index of Irritation

To determine the development of a destination, an analytical tool called the Index of Irritation is used, consisting of four steps or phases: Euphoria, Apathy, Annoyance, and Antagonism. This method refers to a social analysis that measures the impact of tourism from a social perspective. Results from this analysis measure the change in behavior of the members of the local community upon the introduction and development of tourism in their area or region (Butler, 1980; Zamani-Farahani and Musa, 2012).

The Euphoria phase is marked with finding the potential for tourism which is then developed by way of investors coming in and putting the capital for building various business facilities that support tourism, while visitors start to come to the newly established and currently built destination. However, in this stage, the planning and controlling functions are not running optimally (Butler, 1980; Saveriades, 2000).

The Apathy phase is marked with deliberate planning for the tourism destination, especially when it comes to marketing and promotion of the destination. Relationships between the local population and outside communities are built, while visitors who come try to find something special about the destination but are unable to find such (Butler, 1980; Mason, 2015).

The Annoyance phase is marked with stagnation in the management of the destination and reluctance to the point of saturation or boredom. The policymakers try to find solutions by increasing infrastructural development without attempting to decrease the number of visitors to the destination, resulting in the presence of visitors to be seen as an annoyance for the local population (Butler, 1980; Jenkins and Pigram, 2005).

The last phase in the Index of Irritation is the antagonism phase, in which the local population feels social friction openly exists, caused by the presence of visitors and that visitors are seen as the cause for all the problems that occur in that destination. Planning for the destination within this phase is focused on promotion that balances the dwindling image of the destination (Butler, 1980; Prague, et al., 2017).

3. METHOD AND ANALYSIS

The primary data are collected by observation, and interview, in London, and also in Bali Indonesia. This study also uses secondary research available in various scientific publications related to tourism based on cultural heritage. Meanwhile, data and information gathered are analyzed with the analysis tool of the Irritation Index. The result of the analysis is then compared to supporting theoretical framework and previous research results that share similarities to the current research. The analysis is limited by the framework of cultural tourism study (Butler, 1980; Patton, 1990; Lindlof and Taylor, 2017; Hennink, 2020).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The discussion in this analysis utilizes two samples: one listed as a world heritage and one not listed. The listed sample is the Tower of London in England, while the non-listed sample is Tanah Lot Temple in Tabanan, Bali, Indonesia.

4.1 The Tower of London in England

The Massive White Tower is an example of classic architectural work by Militer Norman, whose influence is still widely felt throughout the United Kingdom today. The complex was designed by William the Conqueror to protect London and proclaim his reign. The Tower of London is a grand fort, full of historical significance, which has become one of the symbols for the kingdom built around the white tower. The Tower of London, erected by William the Conqueror in 1066, possesses a universal value to signify cultural quality. This tower was used in its earlier days to control the city of London and its surroundings, while its other function is as an entrance gate into the capital city. The tower is strategically located at a bend of the River Thames that had become an important demarcation point for strength for the city of London, as well as for the strength of the monarchy. In this case, it has a dual purpose, i.e., to give protection for Londoners through its defense and logistical

structure and also to control the citizens (Rowse, 1997; Berg and Byrd, 2002).

The Tower of London is a prime example of a castle-fort from the middle-ages that developed between the 11th and 16th centuries. Subsequently, there were additions made by Henry III and Edward I, yet very innovatively this Tower became one of the most influential towers in all of Europe during the 13th and 14th centuries that still survive today. The castle structure was added onto the right side of the palace complex in the 16th century. The sustained life of the palace has enabled visitors to visit and imagine how kings from the middle-ages lived within the walls of their own fort. The sustainability of the London tower complex has given a meaningful existence for the United Kingdom and the world civilization in general (Rowse, 1997; Berg and Byrd, 2002).

The Tower of London has taken such prominent importance because it is able to illustrate the roles of several institutions within a nation-state from the past and as they continue their roles today. Within the complex, historical records regarding the nation's defense bodies are kept, as well as historical records for the nation's currency that have been used since the 13th century. Official documents and artifacts of historical significance are also stored within the structure, making this tower as England's historical closet (Rowse, 1997; Berg and Byrd, 2002).

4.2 Tanah Lot Temple in Beraban Village, Kediri, Tabanan, Bali

Tanah Lot Temple is located on the southern shore of Bali, more precisely within the village of Beraban, District of Kediri, Region of Tabanan. The existence of Tanah Lot Temple at the beginning related to the spiritual journey made by Danghyang Nirartha or Danghyang Dwijendra throughout the island of Bali. The Tanah Lot Temple was erected in the 15th century by Danghyang Nirartha who was also known as Empu Bawu Rawuh, a prominent historical and spiritual figure who originated from the Kingdom of Majapahit in East Java. Today, Tanah Lot Temple is the prime tourist destination for the Tanah Lot and Tabanan area due to its unique setting on a rocky peninsula surrounded by ocean water. Additionally, Tanah Lot Temple is widely known for its majestic sunset scenes and various Hindu religious ceremonies on several dates throughout a calendar year (Girinata, 2018; Utama, 2018; Utama and Mahadewi, 2014).

4.2.1 Pragmatism for Management and Sustainability

The paradoxical clash between the interests of economic development and heritage preservation, especially in the case of Tanah Lot Temple, has occurred in the past few months and has shown increasingly identifiable tension between the various stakeholders involved. The tension originated since the end of the cooperative contract term on the management of Tanah Lot and Beraban Village, which ended on 1 April 2011 (Bali Post, Nopember 2011). Most of

Beraban villagers expressed the intention for the management of Tanah Lot Tourism Attraction to be handled exclusively by the Government of Tabanan Regency and Beraban Village, while the government officials still intended for the composition to remain assigned back in 2000 and for that contract to be extended without changes, i.e., just a contract renewal from that point on (Jamal, 2002; Mc Kercher and Ho, 2010; Silbaum, 2015).

The villagers of Beraban, through their support committee vying for reform of Tanah Lot management, suggested Tanah Lot be managed exclusively by the local Tabanan government and Beraban village only. The composition of proceeds suggested was 50% for the government and 50% for Beraban village, detailing that 70% of Beraban's portion will be received by the village and the remaining 30% for the Temple (Pura) itself. The Beraban village's portion is further divided into 70% for various temples within the Beraban, which is even further divided into 80% for Beraban Cultural Village, 2.5% for Dangin Bingin Temple, 1% for Bomo Pura, and 16.5% for the remaining villages in the District of Kediri. Meanwhile, the 30% portion assigned for Tanah Lot Temple is further divided to support 8 different temples: Tanah Lot, Pakendungan, Batu Bolong, Jro Kandang, Penataran, Tanjung Galuh, Batu Mejan, and Hyang Api Temples (Bali Post, Nopember 2011).

The analysis is that the management of Tanah Lot Temple has aroused the business interests of the local village population of Beraban and has encouraged their sense of confidence in such a way that they believe in their ability to self-manage this cultural heritage site independently, without the assistance of a private firm. Meanwhile, the private firm that has been business-oriented since the beginning is attempting to keep its successful claim for the development of Tanah Lot even after the initial contract term has expired. The implication is friction within the community that is directed towards group egoism, including egoism of and within the Beraban Village.

The pragmatism of the Beraban Village community tends to be directed towards strictly material interests, while the consideration for the interests of preserving this significant site with its Heritage and Value entrenched within Tanah Lot Temple is still highly doubtful because historically the temple belongs to the Balinese people in general and not just the people of Beraban.

4.2.2 Positioning the Problems of Tanah Lot Temple as Tourism Attraction

The management of Tanah Lot Temple as a Tourism Attraction has reached the Annoyance phase marked with the reluctance in managing the destination that has been increasingly felt there. It could be said that the destination has reached saturation and is close to its carrying capacity. The management of Tanah Lot Temple as a Heritage has experienced a significant shift or commodification of

function. Physically, Tanah Lot Temple as a place of interest for tourism in Bali has accelerated the physical development of Beraban Village as a whole, yet the behavior of the local population that was expected to be Conservers for this site has shifted into Consumers, in this case, they have packaged Tanah Lot Temple as a tourism "commodity" from which to attain the maximum economic benefits. The physical conservation and preservation aspects of the temple have been carried out adequately, yet the cultural preservation aspect along with conserving the intrinsic values within Tanah Lot Temple as a heritage site owned collectively by all the population of Bali has been sabotaged by the members of Beraban Village for merely economic reasons.

4.2.3 The Current Condition of Tanah Lot Tourism Attraction

The management of Tanah Lot Tourism Attraction has yet to implement the concept of Carrying Capacity, which is reflected in the increase of retribution earnings that is measured from the number of visitors from 2005 to 2009. The management of Tanah Lot Tourism Attraction that has yet to implement the concept of Carrying Capacity will enable frictions to happen between visitors vying for prime spots to visit or view certain spots within the temple area in order to best enjoy the main attractions of Tanah Lot such as the sunset, thus decreasing their enjoyment. The increase in sheer numbers of visitors without paying attention to an object's carrying capacity tends to trigger damage for the local environment including physical and non-physical damages to the cultural heritage of Tanah Lot.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Comparing the two sites, one listed as a world heritage, i.e., the Tower of London, the non-listed Tanah Lot Temple in Bali, provides several insights as follows: (1) both sites have a similar strength, namely their uniqueness, but they also have a notable difference, namely that the Tower of London has a universal appeal accepted by UNESCO to become a part of its World Heritage Sites network while Tanah Lot Temple has yet to receive such recognition. (2) Both sites are visited by tourists in large numbers so both share the threat in the attempt of mitigation or conservation, both physically and regarding the intrinsic cultural values of those sites. (3) Both have been modified for the purposes of accommodating the public, even substantially so that they have entered a significant commercialization phase. However, in the case, Tanah Lot Temple such commercialization has created a conflict of management because the site has yet to have a long-term planning scheme, while in the case of the Tower of London such conflict has not appeared because it has been nationally and professionally managed even receiving support and recognition from UNESCO. (4) The interpretation on the Tower of London site has been done nationally as a mandatory site for English historical study for

the nation's students while the Tanah Lot Temple site has yet to be integrated nationally (Day, et al., 2002; Leask and Fyall, 2006; Pedersen, 2002).

Briefly stated, a site that has been proposed to be designated as UNESCO's World Heritage Site should be able to show its uniqueness by paying attention its carrying capacity due to the possibility of an overabundance of visitors, the readiness of its supporting facilities, the readiness of the local population is accepting visitors and everything that is involved with supporting a world heritage site, the expression of the universal meaning of the site, and the planning for the management of the site with conservation as one of its ultimate goals in order to ensure long-term sustainability (Rössler, 2006; Meskell, 2015).

REFERENCES

- I. Adell, N., Bendix, R. F., Bortolotto, C., & Tauschek, M. (2015). UNESCO's World Heritage Program: The Challenges and Ethics of Community Participation.
- II. Ashworth, G. J. (2013). From history to heritage—from heritage to identity. *Building a new heritage: Tourism, culture and identity in the new Europe*, 13-30.
- III. Bali Post, Berita Kabupaten. (2011). "Penyelesaian Konflik Pengelolaan Tanah Lot". Bali Post, 08 November 2011
- IV. Berg, W. K., & Byrd, D. L. (2002). The Tower of London spatial problem-solving task: Enhancing clinical and research implementation. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, 24(5), 586-604.
- V. Boniface, B., Cooper, C., & Cooper, R. (2006). *Worldwide destinations*. Routledge.
- VI. Butler, R. W. (1980). The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: implications for management of resources. *Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe canadien*, 24(1), 5-12.
- VII. Carter, B., & Grimwade, G. (1997). Balancing use and preservation in cultural heritage management. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 3(1), 45-53.
- VIII. Christou, E. (2006). Heritage and cultural tourism: A marketing-focused approach. In *International cultural tourism* (pp. 23-35). Routledge.
- IX. Day J, Fernandes L, Lewis A, De'Ath G, Slegers S, Barnett B, Kerrigan B, Breen D, Innes J, Oliver J, Ward T. (2020). The representative areas program for protecting biodiversity in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area. In Proceedings of the Ninth International Coral Reef Symposium, Bali, 23-27 October 2000, 2002 Oct 23 (Vol. 2, pp. 687-696).
- X. de Serres, F. J. (2002). Worldwide racial and ethnic distribution of α 1-antitrypsin deficiency: summary

- of an analysis of published genetic epidemiologic surveys. *Chest*, 122(5), 1818-1829.
- XI. Di Giovine, M. A. (2015). UNESCO's World Heritage Program: The Challenges and Ethics of Community Participation. *Markus Tauschek (eds.) Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice*, 83.
- XII. Girinata, I. (2018). The implication of tanah lot temple's commodification to beraban traditional villagers. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 8(3), 616-639.
- XIII. Graham, B. (2002). Heritage as knowledge: capital or culture?. *Urban studies*, 39(5-6), 1003-1017.
- XIV. Gunn, A.C. (1998). Issue in Tourism Curricula. *Journal of Travel Research*, 36(4), p74-77
- XV. Hennink, M., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2020). *Qualitative research methods*. SAGE Publications Limited.
- XVI. Hjalager, A. M. (2002). Repairing innovation defectiveness in tourism. *Tourism management*, 23(5), 465-474.
- XVII. Izawa, T. (2009). Tourism Development and Its Social Impacts in Bali, Indonesia in the Post-Soeharto Era. *Memoirs of Institute of Humanities, Human and Social Sciences*.
- XVIII. Jamal, T. B., Stein, S. M., & Harper, T. L. (2002). Beyond labels: Pragmatic planning in multistakeholder tourism-environmental conflicts. *Journal of planning education and research*, 22(2), 164-177.
- XIX. Jenkins, J., & Pigram, J. (2005). *Outdoor recreation management*. Routledge.
- XX. Johnson, J. D., Snepenger, D. J., & Akis, S. (1994). Residents' perceptions of tourism development. *Annals of tourism research*, 21(3), 629-642.
- XXI. Leask, A., & Fyall, A. (2006). *Managing world heritage sites*. Routledge.
- XXII. Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. C. (2017). *Qualitative communication research methods*. Sage publications.
- XXIII. Mason, P. (2015). *Tourism impacts, planning and management*. Routledge.
- XXIV. McKercher, B., & Ho, P. (2012). Cultural tourism and the enhancement of quality-of-life. In *Handbook of tourism and quality-of-life research* (pp. 341-357). Springer, Dordrecht.
- XXV. Meskell, L., Liuzza, C., Bertacchini, E., & Saccone, D. (2015). Multilateralism and UNESCO World Heritage: decision-making, States Parties and political processes. *International journal of heritage studies*, 21(5), 423-440.
- XXVI. Mingst, K. A., & Karns, M. P. (2016). *The United Nations in the 21st century*. Westview press.
- XXVII. Murphy, P. E., & Price, G. G. (2005). Tourism and sustainable development. *Global tourism*, 3, 167-193.
- XXVIII. Nirwandar, Sapt. (2011). "Pembangunan Sektor Pariwisata: Di Era Otonomi Daerah", retrieve on 21 March 2011 from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/35092726/440-1257-PEMBANGUNANSEKTORPARIWISATA1>
- XXIX. Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. SAGE Publications, inc.
- XXX. Pedersen, A. (2002). Managing tourism at world heritage sites. *A practical manual for World Heritage site managers*. ICOMOS.
- XXXI. Pigram, J. J., & Wahab, S. (2005). Sustainable tourism—unsustainable development. In *Tourism, development and growth* (pp. 42-56). Routledge.
- XXXII. Prague JK, Roberts RE, Comminos AN, Clarke S, Jayasena CN, Nash Z, Doyle C, Papadopoulou DA, Bloom SR, Mohideen P, Panay N. Neurokinin. (2017). 3 receptor antagonism as a novel treatment for menopausal hot flushes: a phase 2, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *The Lancet*. 2017 May 6;389(10081):1809-20.
- XXXIII. Rössler, M. (2006). World heritage cultural landscapes: a UNESCO flagship programme 1992–2006. *Landscape Research*, 31(4), 333-353.
- XXXIV. Rowse, A. L. (1977). *The Tower of London*. Joseph.
- XXXV. Saveriades, A. (2000). Establishing the social tourism carrying capacity for the tourist resorts of the east coast of the Republic of Cyprus. *Tourism management*, 21(2), 147-156.
- XXXVI. Shackley, M. (2001). *Managing Sacred Sites*. Continuum, London.
- XXXVII. Silbaum, V. (2015). *Conflict and Cooperation in Cultural Heritage Tourism Development: Tanah Lot (Bali) and Shurijō (Okinawa)* (Master's thesis).
- XXXVIII. Smith, M., & Forest, K. (2006). Festivals, tourism and the complexities of performing culture remaking worlds: Festivals, tourism and change. *Festivals, Tourism and Social Change Remaking Worlds*, Channel View Publications.
- XXXIX. Suarhana IK, Hardini W. (2015). The impact of social, economic and the environment in local community participation of archeological tourism village Bedulu Gianyar, Bali. *Journal of Business on Hospitality and Tourism*. Vol 1(1):12.
- XL. Tosun, C. (2006). Expected nature of community participation in tourism development. *Tourism management*, 27(3), 493-504.
- XLI. UNESCO. (2011). "The World Heritage List". The World Heritage List includes 911 properties forming part of the cultural and natural heritage which the World Heritage Committee considers as having

outstanding universal value. from

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list> retrieve on May 2011

- XLII. UN-WTO. (2005). *Cultural Tourism and Poverty Alleviation: The Asia-Pacific Perspective*. Madrid. 2005: World Tourism Organization.
- XLIII. Utama IG, Mahadewi NM. (2014). The Contradiction of Managing Tourism Objects Based on Culture and Its Heritage. Conference Presentation.
- XLIV. Utama, I. (2018). The Segmentation of Visitor Tanah Lot Tourism Attraction.
- XLV. Utama IG. (2018). Correlation Between Motivations Of Visit Tanah Lot Toward Interest With An Agro Farm Visit In Tabanan Bali. In The 2nd Bali International Tourism Conference (p. 131).
- XLVI. Zamani-Farahani, H., & Musa, G. (2012). The relationship between Islamic religiosity and residents' perceptions of socio-cultural impacts of tourism in Iran: Case studies of Sare'in and Masooleh. *Tourism Management*, 33(4), 802-814.

Biographical note: Dr. I Gusti Bagus Rai Utama, S.E., M.MA., M.A., is Assistant Professor in Tourism at Dhyana Pura University, Bali, Indonesia. He completed his Doctorate Degree in Tourism Studies and Master's degree of Agribusiness (M.MA) from Udayana University, and Master of Arts in Leisure and Tourism Studies (M.A) from CHN Professional University, Leeuwarden, Netherlands (now NHL Stenden), and Bachelor of Arts (S.E) in Development Economic from Mahasaraswati University, Bali, respectively, with research, focus on Economic Tourism, Agritourism, Destination Management, and Senior Tourism.