

Borobudur Heritage Diplomacy of Indonesia as Nation Branding Strategy under President Joko Widodo Administration

Ratu Alma Adiba¹, Ignatius Agung Satyawan²

{almaratu18@student.uns.ac.id¹, agungsatyawan@staff.uns.ac.id²}

International Relations Study Program, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Jalan Insinyur Sutami 36 Surakarta 57126¹, International Relations Study Program and ASEAN Study Center, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Jalan Insinyur Sutami 36 Surakarta 57126²

Abstract. Indonesia is a country of a thousand heritage, renowned for its outstanding root of civilizations. In contrast, Indonesia today has less awareness of heritage, implied to aggravated governance, cross-sector and level issues, poor tourism utilization, less cultural promotion and weak authority to the site control and claim policy. Borobudur is one of the world heritage included as a Super Priority Tourism Destination, which has long become the arena of political heritagization along with many international actors. Despite its deteriorating value, Borobudur holds the key to the state's multi-track diplomacy and national identity. In 2017, under President Joko Widodo Decree, Badan Otorita Borobudur (Borobudur Authority Agency) was created to integrate command on institutions, followed by progressive development as the government aims to construct a nation's brand through heritage. This paper analyses the efforts of Borobudur Heritage Diplomacy as a tool to form Indonesian nation branding.

Keywords: Heritage Diplomacy, Tourism, Nation Branding.

1 Introduction

Heritage is crucial to building every nation's history and identity, which functions as the root of people's knowledge, and sociocultural, and political ethics preserved on the state sovereignty. Indonesia was known for its glorious past, reflected in substantial tangible and intangible cultural heritage. Borobudur was one of the world heritages of Indonesia by UNESCO (the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) in 1991. It contains an outstanding universal value to the world, as it represents the architectural masterpiece, monumental Buddhist art of the 8th century AD, and the most considerable Buddhist heritage in the world.

The contestation of Borobudur occurred since the colonialization era in the 19th century when the Dutch Archaeologist President, Isaac Groneman invited King Chulalongkorn from Thailand with eight trollies of Borobudur artifacts to be exchanged and presented at the Dutch Royal Kingdom heritage exhibition in the world trade forum in 1930 [1]. By that time, heritage has been a political issue in many new states to gain independence, including Indonesia. Borobudur's multiple *in situ* restoration finally began in 1907 with Van Erp initiation [2]. The first Indonesian heritage order was made in 1992 Heritage Act 5 in accordance with *Monumenten Ordonnantie Staatblad* 515 in 1934 for heritage preservation. The zonation system finally came into force under JICA (Japan International Cooperation Agency) Master Plan in 1972 to manage the tourism sector in Borobudur [[3]. In 1973, the Indonesian government built a partnership with UNESCO and several states funding for the second restoration by forming a non-structural Indonesia National Committee for UNESCO [4]. The legal framework constitutes effectively with management policy in President Decree 1 in 1992, confirming the jurisdiction of the World Heritage Zone under the Borobudur Conservation Office by the Educational and Cultural Ministry, the State Minister for State Owned Enterprises and Local Government.

Under the UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage 1972, President Soeharto's decree implemented the centralism policy to adhere to Dutch *Ethisce Politiek* spirit with marginalization and heritagization reflected in Borobudur colonialism legal framework. Heritagization refers to constructing pasts into the present time to fulfill current needs [5]. Therefore, this process aims to make inhabitants in a specific place feel that the heritage is still relevant [6]. However, heritagization also indicates a selection process to reduce a functional space into a restricted area to achieve economic profit [7]

The significant impact of Borobudur contestation is the people and surrounding area of Borobudur. Borobudur became the poorest village in the region, with less land-owned community, agriculture yield, economic status, and local social distortion after the zonation policy [8]. At the same time, the actors and function of Borobudur became broader to the community, governmental and non-governmental organizations, and religious entities. Many developments, planning and promotion, is controversial with local people, such as the central zonation system with buffer zone by UNESCO and the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) in 1979 and the Art Market Universe of Java by UNESCO in 2003. The people and folks of Borobudur claim the Borobudur identity as a tangible and intangible heritage or cultural landscape called "*saujana budaya*" with dynamic relation of natural and human activity included as a whole, not only the site and the surroundings. This aspect is a heritage factor to the socio-historical and multicultural existence with many beliefs.

On the other hand, the concept of Heritage Diplomacy has not widely known in Indonesia, and similarly, Indonesian heritage is less familiar in the world. The heritage developed in the field of tourism, but the mindset building about the importance of heritage in research, economics or diplomacy has not yet been understood by the people. The government's concern for governance and authority is weak because Heritage Diplomacy does not have any precise observation, work field and definition adoption in the governmental structure in the Foreign Ministry.

This paper reviewed the issue of Borobudur Heritage Diplomacy into three classifications: the tourism-preservation dispute, the conflict response and the heritage diplomacy. The first

classification examines the factor causes of contestation in Borobudur issue, including the process and important momentum of Borobudur heritagisation. The second part explains the motivation of policy transformation and major progress and instruments taken to adapt the new strategy by the government. The final result is the goal and evaluation of the new order of Borobudur development conducted to the constructivist theory of Heritage Diplomacy and nation branding from tourism, economic, political, and socio-cultural perspectives.

2 Theoretical Framework

Cultural Heritage is an object or location containing outstanding material and structure as the value of human activity or evidence in the past [3]. The concept of heritage has been epistemologically constructed since the end of the 20th century, but the phenomena widely spread in the public discourse of contemporary society. The paradigm change through heritage dialog and literature enables the openness of variable scope and diplomacy actors to develop reciprocal relations between states, the official government, and people. Conceptually, it has a supremacy power in deconstructing power-related structure hierarchy in the global community. By that means, Heritage Diplomacy can be both used as soft power and hard power diplomacy [9]. Cultural Heritage in diplomacy refers to high-level negotiation and forum of states related to their connection in the past. Many theories of heritage diplomacy are mainly formed by the decolonization approach, which widely affects cross-sector governance, the nation's cultural promotion, and the politicized arena. On the contrary, it can be a prosperous subject of diplomacy to collaboration, exchange, and many cooperative partnerships [10].

Heritage Diplomacy theory commonly encompasses preservation agents, such as world heritage listing by UNESCO, funding donations and sending heritage professionals supported by external actors to the strategic value of a state, artifacts exchange, and exhibition activities as the promotion tools and keeping bilateral mutual relation. The implementation of heritage diplomacy has impacted many sectors in the 21st century, including political, economic, social and cultural diplomacy. By this means, Heritage Diplomacy sincerely asserts the impact of a nation's history and its role in the world and interacts with international acknowledgment of its civilization. Re-activating heritage could be prosperous by reflecting heritage and history to international or public policy and investing high capital in connecting the urban society to the past through museums, festivals, and other activities to recall the nation's identity [11]. Constructivism focuses on the idea and thoughts as the main building of the system more than the material power [12]. Physical elements do not have any value without intellectual elements. As a historical construction, a state or system with changing ideas and norms will transform dynamically because the actor must respond to the changing social structure. History will have significance to those who construct and live within it. Therefore the actor must take the role. Constructivism states that an actor's only active identity is when it actively explores and interacts with other actors and society through many discourses.

The concept of nation branding by Simon Anholt in 1996 means to manage and build the nation's reputation to elevate the strategic advantage by applying the company branding technique on a state level [13]. The index of nation branding consists of governance, export commodity, tourism, heritage, immigration and investigation. The state will keep rebranding itself through a campaign to

global society to gain a good perception of a state brand image. Most states use a national branding strategy through the tourism sector, targeting the quantitative tourism visitor and the profit of sustainable investment [14]. This study employs the Heritage Diplomacy and Nation Branding concept as an analytical framework. Heritage Diplomacy explains how the Indonesian government used cultural heritage as country diplomacy to affirm the state's authority and generate a mutual relationship with international actors in the Borobudur Heritage Diplomacy. The nation branding concept determines the view of tourism development as a national identity in Indonesia in Joko Widodo Administration.

3 Research Method

This study applied the qualitative method using a conceptual framework to analyze the data research. The data collection technique is a documentation study, collecting information refers to the document related to the study of Borobudur Heritage Diplomacy in primary and secondary documents. The author collected the primary documents from the direct interview and the official websites of the Governments of Indonesia and UNESCO. Meanwhile, the secondary documents were gathered from several books, journals, research and news from valid media sources. This study also implements triangulation to process data with more than one type through observation, methodology, sources and theory. The result will be analyzed by qualitative descriptive method to determine the Borobudur Heritage Diplomacy as Indonesian Nation Branding under President Joko Widodo Administration.

4 Result and Analysis

The contestation of Borobudur management is mainly formed from the different points of view of history and vision of the heritage sought by UNESCO, the government, and the people. UNESCO mainly focused on viewing Borobudur as a monument. Meanwhile, the government is mainly absent in the first restoration and only work on tourism management. While this contradictive view of UNESCO and the government caused problematic status in Borobudur, the people of Borobudur never had a chance to preserve the cultural heritage nor gain profit from tourism. The theory of constructivism explains the minor role of Indonesia since the first restoration of Borobudur Temple Compounds by the Dutch colonialization. The restoration of Borobudur temple occurred in three periods, including one that was taken after the iconoclasm act in 1985 with a terror bombing. Indonesian people and international legitimation of the Indonesian government became weaker and followed by a long period of ignorance.

Indonesian government could not see heritage as an idea more than a material resource. Corresponding to the theory, the system is made by ideal power, which is stronger than material resources. The material source is meaningless without intellectual power, as projected by the utilization of heritage which views Borobudur as a tourism object without any ideal role in the manifestation of heritage. Heritage diplomacy shows the indicator of interacting actors and their relation to the heritage because history and Borobudur will have significance for those who construct

and give meaning to it. Based on the Heritage Constitution Numb. 11 2010 explained that heritage utilization is optimized for the people's interest. Practically, this order was hard to conceive because there is no structural formation enable to connect people and inter-organization and a lot of conflict of interest regarding the benefit of the Borobudur high-profit tourism sector. After the minor role of restoration in Borobudur, the preserving act and heritage management, the Indonesian government must face a chaotic heritage environment to reconstruct and restructure important agents. The Borobudur Conservation Office has ordered a rule of carrying capacity under UNESCO instruction because of the broken indication in the temple compounds. This instruction was never coming into force until 2022 when the central government took place in the decision-making of the tourism management office. In this case, the government of Indonesia only focused on viewing heritage as a material resource.

Many states started to construct heritage diplomacy into their international policy into a wider scope, such as a political, economic, and cultural partnership. And based on the contestation above, Indonesia must find a solution to reconstruct a new order in Borobudur as a strategic heritage zone. As the multi-level and cross-sector dispute, the strategic plan to arrange the structure is building a new system made by the central government. The need to claim sovereignty and authority must take place within heritage diplomacy on an official and unofficial actor. A state itself must comprehend a new idea of heritage into its vision and policy, by spreading a nation's branding internally and to the international policy. The government under Joko Widodo announced the Borobudur Authority Agency in 2017. It was a progressive strategy because it was used to integrate command of previous Borobudur governance in many different instances. Borobudur Authority Agency settled in the same program as National Tourism Strategic Zone to have an authoritative power under the existing subject and actors from Borobudur contestation, domestic and international. Different from the previous legacy, President Joko Widodo understood the importance of national identity, which relies on heritage, and how to manage them. The National Strategic Zone shows the high priority of heritage and the significance of central government authority to take place. Borobudur Authority Agency aims to widen the scope of tourism management not only to the Borobudur as a site but also to developing the whole region to gain economic profit and tourism advantage, involving local cultural communities and people.

The function of Borobudur varied from its heritage status, religious site, and tourism sector. Borobudur holds the key actor of Indonesian multitrack diplomacy, namely religious track. Borobudur has been the biggest Buddhist pilgrimage site in the world for more than 1000 years from international visitors. Borobudur International Conference was held every year in the Waisak momentum with a peace, pluralism and multicultural theme. Borobudur becomes a symbol of tolerance, inspiration and harmony of beliefs. By this sector, Borobudur holds significance in the world religion study center and contributes to peace-building diplomacy. Another heritage diplomacy function of Borobudur is the conservation project and *in situ* training with Borobudur Academia. The Borobudur latest conservation with professionals followed by the community formation to help another state's conservation project, namely International Coordinating Committee in Angkor, Cambodia. Indonesian contribution to this diplomacy has increased the partnership between the two countries [15]. Indonesia enhances the Borobudur heritage diplomacy to world recognition through the Memory of the World program by UNESCO. This program has the purpose of facilitating the preservation of the world documentary heritage, universal access

funding, and increasing world awareness of the significance of heritage. The Borobudur Conservation Archive was acquired in the Register of International Memory of the World in 2017 [16].

Nation branding has been implemented through many tourism programs, but the promotion is less managed. This is caused by no governmental policy supporting programs in other sectors than tourism, such as international policy, cultural reforms, and economic partnership, even though the discourse of heritage started to arise. The educational side of heritage was implemented in the tourism sector, with a heritage-saving mindset to be spread over a new generation. In this case, the Borobudur has been widely known, but the heritage context is a part of people's knowledge. This could be an obstacle to gaining successful nation branding, so the promotion of Borobudur heritage must be run in a massive program. Government must also need to invest a high capital into the development of Borobudur, not only in physical construction but more in the human capital knowledge of the heritage. Heritage Diplomacy was considered conservative and had less function, but it can be activated to make impacts with branding strategy in the tourism sector.

Practically, the deconstruction of Heritage Diplomacy should be followed by the construction program to make a new order to be developed in the nation branding system structure. Borobudur as diplomacy can be fully developed because the nation presents itself in the interest of heritage. The heritage was activated diplomatically. With the increasing debate and context discourse, heritage mobilization as diplomacy also developed. The heritage with cultural and historical sectors integrated to add the weight of diplomacy for contemporary international relations. The motivation above shows the significance of heritage diplomacy activation, which becomes the reason for governmental structure reforms. Government must take the key role in directing and constructing heritage by managing them through branding strategy. Tourism could be a strategic sector to bridge heritage diplomacy and nation branding. Finally, the goal of this policy by heritage diplomacy and nation branding is to form a national identity.

The contestation in Borobudur defines the sustainable tourism issue between local government authorities, international organizations and local people. The social and cultural tension between the government, communities and local people has adhered to the passive tourism development in Borobudur. Hence the need for social opinions and input should be a priority in the heritage building phase. The urge to settle a massive building development should be capable of transmitting the down-to-up study field approach, as criticized by The International Field School on Borobudur Cultural Landscape Heritage, by means of the tangible economic preliminaries. It must be confirmed that the national branding strategy is not merely focused on the stakeholder brand proposition but managed as an architecture of relationship between a mother brand and various sub-brands from tourism and business [17]. The Indonesian government should reflect on this phenomenon as an input to form a national strategic policy and not ignore the need for national identity accretion. This contestation shall bring another sector influenced because it is the core sovereignty issue as it correlates to many interests. Furthermore, the strategy to form national branding as a tool is derived through heritage diplomacy because the context of brand identity comes from the heritage conceptual body. The tourism sector needs heritage diplomacy to activate, accelerate and increase the value of sustainability through a management system.

Nation branding concept delivered by many representatives from government, commerce, organizations, tourism and media. Indonesia needs recognition that is practically effective as it has been in a heritagization area for too long in global competition, facing domestic and external markets. Not only to attract tourist, but the brand must also have a wider objective to stimulate investment and export and increase international political influence as it bridge to a stronger international partner. Borobudur has been an icon of Indonesia, including in image and figure in public diplomacy to promote the tourism sector. Meanwhile, the management of heritage sustainable tourism is not implemented enough and simplified as a one-sector scope solution. Therefore, it is proven that management issues in Borobudur tourism should be tackled above and under level through nation-scope diplomacy and socio-economic scope branding. Heritage can only be confirmed as sustainable and preserved if it is constructed and used through re-civilization and value activation. Borobudur is the main legitimation that shows the root and character of Indonesia that comprise values and principles such as religious, social, and cultural tolerance, educated, and a rich and prosperous identity that is renowned in a global society. As a symbol of nation branding, it can adapt and function more than just as an architectural monument to gain predicate or to commemorate through cultural event activities.

Borobudur gains the most attention of Indonesia and international political stakeholders, and it holds a major influence not only in the past but also in the future. It is yet problematic but can be used by activating asset potentials that require cross-sector cooperation to manifest a scheme of a conceptual framework through diplomacy dialogue through the international acknowledgment process. The Indonesian government must emphasize a coherent strategy to tackle the sustainable tourism contestation and the heritage authority issues and bring an economic standard solution. Finally, Indonesia needs to internalize the value of heritage in many sectors and shows its identity to enhance nation-building through nation brandings, such as international and national policy, economic acceleration through tourism and socio-cultural movement. The step to heritage diplomacy activation in tourism could untie another sector's potential through a connecting sector. The final result of the Indonesian government's effort in heritage diplomacy and nation branding relies on the culture inflow in the National Tourism Strategic Zone, which has been conducted through many heritage activities, such as education, cultural programs, and independent conservation studies. The Borobudur Authority Agency is widely coordinating to ensure the tourism program in the zone. The minor development was still found in the governmental policy to raise local economic status through heritage branding and promotion. Another non-tourism actor must be invited to build a partnership and use diplomacy in many ways. People, as the important actor of heritage diplomacy, must also be well informed about the massive development and national vision within the heritage branding. The government also must open a way by which people could adapt and participate in the economic, cultural and political development of tourism. The state is directing to international society, and it should bring the identity of a nation which relies on people.

5 Conclusion

Borobudur is one of Indonesian heritage which has long become an arena of politics with many interests. Within the tourism framework, this site control was underlying in many subjects with

different interests and contributed a conflict factor one and another. The development of Borobudur heritage along with the environment is considered failed and hard to be resolved, projected to cross-level and sector actors, including international representatives. Therefore, Heritage Diplomacy is significant to open up the dialog coherently with the state as the main actor. The concept of heritage diplomacy by Tim Winter and nation branding by Simon Anholt help the understanding of the analysis of Indonesian Borobudur Heritage policy reforms by President Joko Widodo Decree. The strategy is used to diminish the factors contributing to the dispute of tourism management in Borobudur, but also, at the same time, re-order a new strategy and view of a nation under a new idea of national heritage. This contestation between many level actors could be undertaken through a Heritage Diplomacy program through tourism policy and national branding. The government needs to spread the mindset to domestic people and promote the brand as it reflects the nation's identity.

The analysis of previous national branding and diplomacy efforts by the Indonesian government resulted in the need to take heritage diplomacy seriously by making national and international programs. Many phases should be carried out, which started with building a mindset of heritage-focused development. Government should build a system and structure related to the heritage and its advantage in the future. This policy can be raised through nation branding by tourism development as the existing and sustainable sector. The contemporary world needs diplomacy of heritage and nation brand to open discourse that leads to mutual partnership relation, to be acknowledged and give a contribution to the world. Nation brand is the conceptual framework that can effectively be used to elevate the value of Borobudur in the concrete sector. By this means, tourism as the gateway of both policies could make a wider impact than just a localized arena attraction. Sustainable heritage is important because it is a symbol of nation sovereignty and identity. It also has an outstanding value to be a national spirit and a capacity as a brand to be spread. People with intellectual power should construct shared ideas of heritage diplomacy on a wider scope and function in the political, economic, educational, social and cultural sectors.

References

- [1] D. A. Tanudirjo, *Transending the Culture-Nature Divide in Cultural Heritage: Views from the Asia-Pacific Region, Canberra*. The Australia National University Press, 2013.
- [2] P. T. W. Candi, "Borobudur International Festival 2017," 2017. www.borobudurpark.com.
- [3] B. Pedia, "CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE 1972," 2018. <http://borobudurpedia.id/convention-concerning-the-protection-of-the-world-cultural-and-natural-heritage-1972/>.
- [4] M. Anggriani, "The Role of UNESCO in Conserving Borobudur as World Cultural Heritage Site in 2011--2017," 2018.
- [5] J.-K. Park, H.-S. Tae, G. Ok, and S.-Y. Kwon, "The Heritagization and Institutionalization of Taekkyeon: An Intangible Cultural Heritage," *Int. J. Hist. Sport*, vol. 35, no. 15–16, pp. 1555–1566, 2018, [Online]. Available: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09523367.2019.1620734?scroll=top&needAccess=true>.

- [6] P. Å. Nilsson, "Impact of Cultural Heritage on Tourists. The Heritagization Process," *Athens J. Tour.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 35–54, 2018, doi: 10.30958/ajt.5.1.3.
- [7] K. Walsh, *The Representation of the Past: Museums and Heritage in the Post-Modern World*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- [8] J. Wanadya, "Heritagisation of Borobudur: A conflict between Western heritage legacies and local heritage practices," Leiden University, 2019.
- [9] T. Lähdesmäki and V. L. A. Če ginskas, "Conceptualisation of heritage diplomacy in scholarship," *Int. J. Herit. Stud.*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 635–650, 2022, doi: 10.1080/13527258.2022.2054846.
- [10] C. Clopot, "Heritage Diplomacy: ECHOES European Colonial Heritage Modalities in Entangled Cities," 2020. <https://keywordsechoes.com/heritage-diplomacy>.
- [11] T. Winter, "Heritage diplomacy," *Int. J. Herit. Stud.*, vol. 21, no. 10, pp. 997–1015, 2015, doi: 10.1080/13527258.2015.1041412.
- [12] A. Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*. 1999.
- [13] S. Anholt, "Nation-brands of the twenty-first century," *J. Brand Manag. 1998 56*, vol. 5, no. 6, pp. 395–406, Jul. 1998, doi: 10.1057/BM.1998.30.
- [14] L. H. Teslik, "Nation Branding Explained | Council on Foreign Relations," 2007. <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/nation-branding-explained> (accessed Nov. 06, 2022).
- [15] W. Djojonegoro, "Peran Pelestarian Borobudur di Kancah Internasional," 2020, [Online]. Available: <http://boishc.borobudurpedia.id/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Prof.-Dr.-Ing-Wardiman-Djojonegoro-Indonesian-Diplomacy-Policy-for-Safeguarding-Angkor.pdf>.
- [16] Balai Konservasi Borobudur, "Penyerahan Sertifikat MoW Arsip Konservasi Borobudur," *Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset dan Teknologi Direktorat Jenderal Kebudayaan Balai Konservasi Borobudur*, 2018. <https://kebudayaan.kemdikbud.go.id/bkborobudur/penyerahan-sertifikat-mow-arsip-konservasi-borobudur/>.
- [17] K. Dinnie, *Nation branding: Concepts, issues, practice*. 2008.