

PAPER • OPEN ACCESS

## Practices of Bali Tourism Development, Threefolding, and *Tri Hita Karana* Local Knowledge in New Order Indonesia

To cite this article: I G Mudana *et al* 2018 *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* **953** 012108

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

## Practices of Bali Tourism Development, Threefolding, and *Tri Hita Karana* Local Knowledge in New Order Indonesia

I G Mudana<sup>1\*</sup>, I B P Suamba<sup>2</sup>, I M A Putra<sup>3</sup> and N W Ardini<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Tourism Department, Politeknik Negeri Bali, Jl. Kampus Bukit Jimbaran, Kuta Selatan, Badung, 80364, Bali, Indonesia Politeknik Negeri Bali

<sup>23</sup>Business Administration Department, Politeknik Negeri Bali, Jl. Kampus Bukit Jimbaran, Kuta Selatan, Badung, 80364, Bali, Indonesia Politeknik Negeri Bali

<sup>23</sup> Faculty of Performing Arts, Institut Seni Indonesia Denpasar

Email\*: [gedemudana@pnb.ac.id](mailto:gedemudana@pnb.ac.id)<sup>1</sup>,

**Abstract.** Tourism in Bali since the establishment of Bali Beach hotel in Sanur, Denpasar City, and I Gusti Ngurah Rai international airport in Tuban, Badung regency, in 1950s and 1960s, experienced a very rapid development of various aspects. Even currently Bali has a very good brand in the international context and was awarded several times as the best destination in the world. Behind the development of tourism that is so industrialized in various fields, such as tourist attractions, hotels, restaurants, travel agencies, transportation, souvenir shops, and so on, and the arrival of abundant foreign tourists, it turns out many major problems occur behind it. In the development of a number of tourist areas during the New Order (Orde Baru) era (1966-1998) for example, there were various controversies that accompanied, especially related to the unbalanced three-pillar relationship (politic-economy-culture), namely the state, investors (tourism industry), and society. That's why this study is to know how and to what extent the tourism development in Bali is practiced during the New Order, especially in 1990's. For that reason, this study is based on the critical perspective of cultural studies to find out which side is dominant in the development of tourism and which side is defeated by the dominant power. Related analysis is done by using qualitative analysis techniques by using eclectically theory of hegemony (Antonio Gramsci) and theory of power/knowledge relation (Michel Foucault). Data were collected through interview, observation, and especially document studies.

The results of the study show that during the New Order era in Indonesia there was an unequal/unbalanced relationship among the threefolding, i.e three pillars: the state (political power), investors (economic power), and civil society (cultural power). In general, the state almost always collaborated with the investors, so that the society did not exist in the relationship of the three



pillars. Getting support from the state, the tourism investors became very dominant and the society was in a defeated position. In the local context, as seen in cases of tourism development that were quite large in Bali, the community was ultimately at a disadvantaged condition. Lack of political will defending the society in tourism development; adverse land sale in the development of tourism facilities; limited employment opportunities in tourism; minimal qualification of knowledge and tourism skills; the development of tourism facilities that damage the physical environment and sanctity that has been preserved by the society; and so forth. Large cases include Padanggalak reclamation (Denpasar), construction of the Selasih golf course (Gianyar), Bali Nirwana Resort, Tanah Lot (Tabanan), and Bali Pecatu Graha (Badung). In such cases, it is clear that the local wisdom of the Balinese community, namely *trihita karana* (the three causes of well-being and inwardness), namely *parhyangan* (the relationship between human and God the Creator), *pawongan* (the relationship between human and human) and *palemahan* (the relationship between human and nature), is not executed properly because each party, especially the dominant parties, has its own ideology and interests in the tourism development.

Keywords: Bali tourism development, New Order, three pillars, *tri hita karana*.

## 1. Background

Bali Province during the New Order (1966-1998) was a tourist destination in Indonesia with its massive and non-stop tourism development. If in this period it was (in the context of Indonesia) full of discourses of *pembangunan nasional* (national development, in Bali of *pembangunan pariwisata* (tourism development) as part of the *pembangunan nasional* itself. Tourism is generally identified to be able to improve the living standards and welfare of Balinese people. Bagus (1999) for example described that the development of the tourism industry is able to develop various other sectors, such as agriculture and small industries as it is a catalyst for the acceleration of community change into industrial society.

Since the completion of the construction of Bali Beach Hotel in Sanur area, Denpasar, and Ngurah Rai International Airport in Tuban, Badung, during the 1950s and 1960s (belonging to Old Order or Orde Lama), tourism in Bali in the later (New Order) period had changed and developed into a modern industry that provides a variety of tourist needs. Tourism has become an industry (Mudana, 2005). It was no doubt that, from year to year, since the end of a bloody tragedy named G/30/S/PKI (1965) more and more tourist, especially foreign tourists, visits Bali. Seeing the existence of tourist arrivals like that, the tourism development is realized by developing various components such as tourist areas, tourist objects and attractions, hotels, travel agencies, transport business, souvenir shops, golf courses, and various supporting facilities in many places which are considered prospective for the development of related business. This later order (period) was accomplished through the deregulation of the direct aviation policy to Bali in the early 1980s (the period of Governor Ida Bagus Mantra) followed by the opening of large-scale investment in tourism in the late 1980s (the period of Governor Ida Bagus Oka).

In the early 1990s, as a pre-eminent sector, tourism really became the backbone of the Balinese economy, although it was undeniably increasingly marginalizing the previously

dominating agricultural sector. *Kompas* (July 10, 2003) noted that about 60% of Bali's Gross Regional Domestic Product (GRDP) and 78.4% of Bali's economy are supported by the tourism sector. Data of GRDP of Bali Province 1990-1999 shows that Bali's economic growth rate which was in its fluctuating tendency due to various complex factors is high enough and reached 8.86% (1990), 8.29% (1991), 8.73% (1992), 8.88% (1993), 7.51% (1994), 7.93% (1995), and 8.16% (1996). The growth declined drastically to 5.81% (1997) due to the economic crisis in Indonesia and even -4.04% (1998) with the ongoing 1998 reform movement (*gerakan reformasi*) and only increased again to 0.67% in the following year.

Having natural, cultural, and human leading capital and because of the intensive and extensive tourism development from time to time, Bali has long been the most popular tourist destination not only in Indonesia and Asia but also in the world. This province has many times been awarded as the best destination in the world. The last is the one given by TripAdvisor News award which is in 2017 issues a list of 10 tourist destinations (traveller's destination choice) putting Bali (Indonesia) as the top, followed by London (United Kingdom); Paris (France); Rome (Italy); New York City (United States); Crete (Greece), Barcelona (Spain), and Siem Reap (Cambodia). Even when many other destinations have not been "born" yet, Bali has earned the nickname "The Island of Thousand Temple", "The Island of God", and the like.

The number of visits of foreign tourists in the last six years (2011-2016) for example was so significant to show the achievement of Bali in the world tourism constellation. Dinas Pariwisata Bali or Bali Tourism Agency (2017) reported the number of foreign tourist arrivals that continue to increase in those years. In 2011 the number of tourist arrivals reached 2,765,579; in 2012 to 2,892,019 (an increase of 4.91%); in 2013 to 3,278,598 (an increase of 13.37%); in 2014 to 3,766,638 (an increase of 14.89%); by 2015 to 4,001,835 (an increase of 6.24%); and in 2016 to 4,904,175 (an increase of 22.55%). These figures did not include data of 2017 in addition to excluding domestic tourist data.

Above it all, what appears on the surface of tourism in Bali does not necessarily describe the circumstances that really happened. It turned out that the development of Bali tourism, especially those that require big capital/investment, is full of problems and controversy here and there. Almost all development of centers of tourism facilities is carried out with conflict and violence, at least non-physical violence, through the process of hegemony, especially against the community. Even until now the problems of the New Order era is actually not completely finished yet. The most recent and most interesting example to be shown is the case of Benoa Bay reclamation which is considered to threaten the marine physical environment and the sanctity of the bay region (the Balinese Hindu believe that the region belongs to a religious/spiritual one). Although the demands for the cancellation of the reclamation done by elements of the Balinese community are so great, the case can be said to be unfinished to this day because the reclamation is based on Presidential Regulation no. 51 of 2014 on the Spatial Plan of Denpasar, Badung, Gianyar, Tabanan (Sarbagita) region where Benoa Bay is included (in the era of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono).

Collaboration of mutual benefit almost always occurs between the government (state/political pillar) and the investors (economic pillar). Both (the pillars) did a hegemony, that is a subtle persuasion and discourse in order to get consent of the society (cultural pillar) through the knowledge and the meanings that run through the existing powers. Often the hegemony does not stop automatically as those who are hegemonized very often do counter-hegemonic movements through their own knowledge and meanings to emulate.

Therefore, as implied in the title, this study was done for the purpose of knowing and critically describing the practices of tourism development in Bali's tourist destination during the New Order period, especially the 1990s, which was a period of the second president of Indonesia, Soeharto, the Father of Indonesia Development (Bapak Pembangunan Indonesia). So that, in this study it will be explored the facts happened in Bali tourism development to the extent of unfair relations of the three pillars of political-economic-cultural that paradoxically puts the Balinese people is not as the subject of development but commonly subordinated.

Related to this, actually a number of related studies have been conducted by some scholars, such as Suetha (2000), Noorwati (2000), Mardika (2001), Astina (2002), Palguna (2004), Dharma Suteja (2004), Sita Laksmi (2003), and Mudana (2005). Of all these writings, there is no writing that specifically and comprehensively provides the mapping widely and highlight the glory of the New Order era in Bali in the tourism scene. Not all of the mentioned studies have highlighted the ethical meaning of these development practices. That's where this study takes a position.

## 2. Research Methods

This literature review is categorized as part of a cultural studies. This paper examines the phenomenon of tourism, especially the socio-political phenomenon in tourism which is examined from the perspective of the cultural studies. According to Barker, cultural study is a cross-disciplinary or postdisciplinary research area that explores things related to culture or 'maps of meaning' (2014: 61). The culture is called a "map of meaning" because the 'meaning' is something given but object of struggle among related parties. Barker (2014: 61) himself states, meaning or maps of meaning is a kind of "contested meanings", so the idea of meaning is related to ideology, hegemony, and discourse. Thus, among those who produce meaning will compete with each other to fight for the meaning.

The data was collected through interviews, observations, and especially document studies. The data obtained was analyzed using qualitative data analysis, by data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion, as recommended by Miles and Huberman (1992).

For the purposes of data analysis, this study uses the theory of hegemonic by Antonio Gramsci and the theory of power/knowledge relation by Michel Foucault. Given the complexity of the issues discussed, the theories are used eclectically. These two different theories relate to each other because the understanding of Gramsci's hegemony is very close to Foucault's discourse where hegemony is usually run through discourses. Barker (2000: 468) says that ideological hegemony is a process whereby certain ways of understanding of the world become obvious or naturalized so that alternative ways of understanding outside them become unreasonable or unthinkable. All the ways are different and even conflictual discourses. According to Bocoock (1986: 33), the concept of hegemony is related to three areas, namely economic, government (state), and community (civil society).

The theory of hegemony explains the power-style of the ruling bloc that exercises its power in a subtle, sophisticated, persuasive way and targets the minds, through discourses, so that the mastered block often ends up agreeing on its authority over it. In Gramsci's view, the supremacy of the group over the social class appears in two ways, namely domination or oppression usually done by government institutions, and approval through intellectual and moral leadership of civil society in which the latter is called hegemony. Related to this, Gramsci (1976: 57-58) argues,

“The supremacy of a social group manifests itself in two ways, as 'domination' and as 'intellectual and moral leadership'. A social group dominates antagonistic groups, which it tends to 'liquidate', or to subjugate perhaps even by armed force; it leads kindred and allied groups. A social group can, indeed must, have exercised 'leadership' before winning governmental power (this is one of the principle conditions for the winning of such power); its subsequently become dominant when it exercises power, but even if it holds it firmly in its grasp, it should continue to 'lead' as well”.

The theory of power/knowledge relation describes the inseparable relationship between power and knowledge. Foucault (1977: 27-28) explains, “Power creates knowledge ... Power and knowledge are mutually productive ... There is no power without connection to a particular field of knowledge. There is no knowledge that does not contain connection with power”.

In Foucault's (1980) view, power creates knowledge and no knowledge is free of power. Therefore, the discourse entity is very important in understanding its ideas. According to Foucault (2002: 9), discourse is no other way of producing knowledge, along with the social practices that accompany it, the form of subjectivity formed from it, the power relations that lie behind such knowledge and social practice, and the interrelationships between them.

### 3. Discussion

Intensive tourism development in Bali has begun to be considered and planned before the 1990s with the issuance of Bali Governor Decree No. 15 of 1988 about 15 Tourism Area in Bali where the Governor of Bali at that time was Ida Bagus Mantra. The idea of developing Bali tourism in a massive way led Governor Ida Bagus Oka, who led Bali after Ida Bagus Mantra or during two periods (1988-1993 and 1993-1998), increasingly eager to boost Bali's potential by issuing Bali Governor's Decree No. 528/1993 on 21 Tourism Area in Bali. In fact, this decree was approved unanimously by the DPRD Tingkat I Bali (the Legislative Assembly of Bali Province), mostly controlled by Golongan Karya (now called Partai Golkar or Golkar Party) where Ida Bagus Oka is one of its terrace leaders in Bali which in itself replaced Bali Governor's Decree No. 15/1988 on 15 Tourism Areas in Bali from the previous governor.

If the areas covered by previous decree (Governor Ida Bagus Mantra) only Nusa Dua, Sanur, Kuta, Jimbaran, Ubud, Kintamani, Nusa Penida, Ujung, Candidasa, Kalibukbuk, Teluk Terima, Gilimanuk, Candikusuma, Bedugul, and Tanah Lot, in its latest decree (Governor Ida Bagus Oka) covers Nusa Dua, Kuta, Tuban, Sanur, Ubud, Lebih, Tanah Lot, Soka, Bedugul/Pancasari, Sanih Water, Kalibukbuk, Batuampar, Gilimanuk, Candikusuma, Palasari, Perancak, Kintamani, Nusa Penida, Candidasa, Ujung, and Tulamben. The first decree may be considered the forerunner of the tourism business exploitation of Bali's land, culture, and man while the latter's decree may be perceived to perfect Bali's readiness to be exploited by outside capital powers. In other words, in the New Order era, especially in the 1990s, there was the phenomenon of "Bali ready for sale", which is often expressed as "Bali for tourism" as opposed to "tourism for Bali".

With the aim of obtaining local revenue (*pendapatan asli daerah* or PAD) as many as possible, the policy of 21 tourist areas above is poured into Local Regulation No. 4 of 1996 on General Plan of Bali Provincial Spatial (Perda Rencana Umum Tata Ruang or RUTR which this time has been amended by law Number 4 Year 1999). Even many places outside the 21 tourist areas are prepared into various tourist destinations. Among these, Padanggalak Beach,



in Kesiman Village, East Denpasar Sub-district, Denpasar City (Ida Bagus Oka's original village) which was sacred for being a place of ritual *melasti* of local indigenous villagers, and never seen before in the tourism map, was suddenly scheduled to become a new tourist resort, so the local people become confused, upset, and angry. Not surprisingly, because of the many forms of tourism development in Bali that do not take sides with society, entering the last decade of the twentieth century as the strength of New Order was more and more hegemonic and powerful throughout Indonesia, Bali really looks "very touristic". Warren (1993) for example writes that the periods of the late 1980s and early 1990s proved to be a decisive point in the direction of development in Bali and in relations between the central government and the peripheral provinces.

Bali tourism development that does not care about the aspirations of "from below" (society) was not silenced by the community itself. In the midst of the frustration of impartial tourism projects, they judged the weakness of regional leadership as the prime cause. The figure of Ida Bagus Oka is known as a New Order loyalist and is said to have established certain relationships with central officials (in Jakarta) and big businessmen (conglomerates/investors), so that by those who dislike him he is imaged as an intermediary for political pillar (government/state) and economic interests (big businessmen from Jakarta). His name was slipped into "Ida Bagus Oke" or "Pak Oke" (oke means *O.K.* or *okay*) because it is always described "O.K./okay" (agree) in the presence of the rulers and investors. The fact shows, under his authority, can be said almost one by one land in Bali fall into the hands of large investors who almost entirely come from outside Bali. According to Ismawan (1998: 33), high-ranking officials and investors during the New Order era had a "lapar tanah" (hungry for land) disease for business expansion while the community only had the need to live and grow crops. *Tempo* magazine (1-7 December 1998) even reports a temporary list of land owned by the Soeharto family in Bali covering an area of 210.7 hectares. George Junus Aditjondro (1995) also insinuated Bali as a "Jakarta colony" (ruler and/or businessman from Jakarta).

Having a land of 5,632 square kilometers with a population of 2,777,356 people (1990), 2,828,026 (1995), and 3,146,999 (2000) (BPS Bali 2003), Bali is a tourist destination that can not be separated from various complex tourism development problems. Among other things, the main problem that arises is the seizure of space (*ruang*), that is a conflict of interest concerning the use of land. Almost in any such conflict, communities (i.e. the farmers) are forced to succumb to the tourism development and their legal protection rights are set aside so that they are marginalized and alienated from the land. In fact, the land for them is not only a *sekala* or mundane entity (physical, ecological, earthly, social means, and source of livelihood) but also *niskala* (spiritual-religious) one (the land is also a place of ritual). It is well known, the land for the Balinese, who are predominantly Hindus, is closely related to the rituals of *adat* (customs) and religion in addition to the identity of his being Balinese. For generations there is a Balinese belief in the land where he lives. According to Bagus (1996), land in Bali includes the functions relating to each other, namely (1) relating to religion, (2) as the settlement of people, village, *banjar* (sub-village), (3) relating to kinship/family, and (4) to be a source of livelihood. Sugiharta (2003) emphasized that the land issue for Balinese people is "God's problem".

Since the start of the New Order era on March 11, 1966 (the day of the decline of Supersemar), there were five governors who had presided over from Governor I Gusti Putu Mertha (1965-1967). Since the beginnings and development of modern tourism in Bali, there are four governors who have led by Sukarmen (1967-1978), who until recently became the

only governor who is not a Hindu and originated from ethnic Balinese. The realization of Bali Province as one of the largest tourist destinations and with a large number of visits and relatively stable, if not always increasing, happened every year since the leadership of Ida Bagus Mantra (1978-1988). However, it was clear that during the leadership of Ida Bagus Oka (1988-1998), Bali was embraced by big capital from outside Bali, especially from the big capitalists of Jakarta.

Spatial disputes in all tourism development conflicts in Bali, particularly those that occurred throughout the last decade of the twentieth century, as a result of local policies oriented towards the interests of the Center, can be found in cases: (1) Garuda Wisnu Kencana in Ungasan Village, Kuta District, Badung Regency (1993-1994); (2) Bali Nirwana Resort in Tanah Lot area in Beraban Village, Kediri Sub-district, Tabanan District (1993-1997); (3) Reclamation of Padanggalak Beach, in Kesiman Village, East Denpasar Sub-district, Denpasar City (1997-1998); (4) Serangan Beach Reclamation in Serangan Village, Denpasar Selatan District, Denpasar City (1997-1998); (5) Golf Course in Dusun Selasih in Puhu Village, Payangan District, Gianyar Regency (1998); (6) Bali Pecatu Graha in Pecatu Village, South Kuta District, Badung Regency (1998-1999). Except for Bali Nirwana Resort and Serangan, all cases are out of the list of 21 tourist areas. With the massive and intensified resistance of society, only two of these cases can be said to end in triumph for the people, namely Padanggalak and Selasih.

An interesting phenomenon in all these cases is that a number of *supradesa* elite (coming from outside the village where the case took place), and generally living in urban areas of Bali, especially Denpasar. The elites consist of critical intellectuals, students, religious leaders, customary and cultural actors and experts, and non-governmental organizations activists. They are dare to appear to support the disadvantaged farmers through a resistance movement against the tyranny of power that cooperates with the power of capital in the tourism development. Ida Bagus Adnyana Manuaba, I Gusti Ngurah Bagus, I Dewa Gede Ngurah Swastha, I Nyoman Gelebet, Putu Suasta, I Gde Sudibya, I Gusti Ngurah (Alit) Kesuma Kelakan, I Dewa Putu Gandita Rai Anom, and I Made Nurbawa, to name a few only, belongs to the *supradesa* elite. Regardless of the problems of winning or losing and the success or failure of the struggle, the entire resistance movement should be underlined because it was done boldly when the New Order regime was at the peak of its power. Suasta and Connor (1999) argue that the protest movement against tourism developments has given shape and momentum to increase the anger and frustration in Bali focused on exploiting the island for profit by the intertwining interests of government and private investors.

In the context of Balinese tourism development cases, in relation to the relationship between communities and governments that link the investors' existence, the government's position should be neutral or, in other words, not harming the community, if it does not have partiality to them. Hoogendijk (1996: 69-70) very well indicates the position of the state in favor of the entrepreneur (economic pillar or economic power) as below.

"The state is commonly described as a kind of neutral referee between workers and capital, which is a traditional antagonism. But the state is in fact very dependent on the market economy to earn revenue and therefore the state is more servant to the investors than the workers or we call the society in general and the public interest. Therefore one of the difficulties now is how to keep the environment facing economic interests and short-term development".



The mutually filling and giving relationship between society and government and employers is ideally portrayed by Nicanor Perlas (2000) through his threefold ideas known among civil society activists and democracies. The three pillars are civil society, state, and market (or culture, politics, and economy) in a discursive arena that is not diametrically opposed but mutually supportive, encouraging, and giving hope. From this there will be an interaction between society, government, and economy because the three pillars give equal status to culture (the cultural pillar) in the realm of civil society parallel to politics and economy (Wiratmoko, 2001). In the local (Bali) context, the ideas of the three pillars are in agreement with the idea of Karyadi (2003) that formulates the arena of civil society between *pura* (temple), *puri* (house), and market. In this case, *pura* is identified the same as government/state or political pillar, *puri* as society or cultural pillar, and market as the economic pillar. According to Karyadi (2003), the conception of civil society (*puri*) is not an entity separate from the state (*temple*) and market but is an arena where various institutions, state, market, and society interact and organize the self to agree on various things for the common good that accomplish them must be done in ethical, fair and civilized ways.

The policy of the New Order government had brought the society into an economic transformation which was so much grazing land occurred simultaneously with mass-raising engineering through "Gebyar Golkar" whose purpose was to make Bali a "Golkar province" so that all seats were occupied by the Golongan Karya (Bagus, 1999). The situation shows the disharmony and turbulence of relations between the people, the state through the government apparatus, and the tourism industry in Bali due to unfair use of space and land that is closely related to existing customary and religious systems. This disharmony in power configuration causes conflict between the three sides and the resistance movement in response to the unacceptable social reality. Since such unacceptable social realities must be changed, the resistance movement is intended as a means of changing such circumstances. In the local context, Dwipayana (2000) notes, since the 1990s, the relation between *adat* (traditional society), capital, and state has shifted the character of harmony-dominative relationship to a conflictual relationship, as evidenced by the widespread tension involving indigenous landowners, indigenous peoples, countries, and large capital owners in several districts in Bali.

The cases of tourism development in Bali during the New Order became an important lesson of the political culture, in this case, the political culture of the New Order, which was very hegemonic and brought various conflicts of interest, politicized the natural, human and cultural environments that owned or provided tourism potential for the interests of development ideology in line with tourism capitalism.

The cases that occurred marked the inability of the local cultural concept (Balinese) because of the political decision of the state (through the government apparatus) that defended the investors rather than the community. Local culture has provided traditional tools such as *tri hita karana*, the harmony of the relationship between man and God (*parhyangan*), an the environment (*palemahan*), and other man (*pawongan*) for the purposes of the welfare of the universe, in addition to the chess of bhakti teachers, dharma of religious dharmas, and various forms of knowledge other locales. Because leadership is not "ethical of leadership" and in reality only spoils the power of capital, society becomes the victim of tourism capitalism. With such deviated leadership politics, Cultural Tourism as outlined (then) in Perda no. Law No. 3 of 1991 on Cultural Tourism (which is now revised to become Regulation No. 2 of 2012 on Balinese Culture Tourism) is not able to be a guide when cultural tourism is based on Balinese culture, Hinduism and *tri hita karana*, - Balinese man. In addition, the global concept

of tourism development is considered to be quite ideal, among others with the concept of Sustainable Development (Sustainable Development) which can then be translated into "sustainable tourism development", which consists of ecological sustainability (ecological sustainability/"planet"), economic sustainability (sustainability economic/"profit"), and social and cultural sustainability ("people").

The need for the application of political ethics, economic (business) ethics, environmental ethics, and cultural ethics, in this increasingly democratic and global-digital lifetime demands not only civil and political rights but also other rights such as economic rights, environmental rights, and cultural rights. So far it is only known human rights (*hak azasi manusia*) when in fact not only humans who have rights but also the environment or the other more especially in Bali with the principle of *tri hita karana*. *Tri* means *three*; *hita* means material and spiritual prosperity; *karana* means cause). This concept concerns with three things which cause material and spiritual prosperity; they are the harmonious relationship between: human being and his God; human being and other human being; and human being and nature or environment. McChesney (2003), for example, demands the need for civil and political rights related to economic, social, and cultural rights. According to him, all human rights are related to each other (2003: 22). Civil and political rights are in fact incorporated with economic, social, and cultural rights as part of a package, namely the Universal Declaration of Human Rights ... Human rights violations will inhibit the general participation (or democracy) of activists who support social justice and economic, social and cultural rights (2003: 23).

Currently, in the era of reform, a number of elite in Bali who participate in the struggle in the development cases mentioned have succeeded in sitting in the executive and legislative institutions. However, the local people, especially the landowner farmers, still feel that they have been neglected by the power system when the development is done.

Now the era of the 1990s has been gone for one and half decade and politically the New Order is replaced by the era of reformation, the Balinese society remains in a position of losing because the state's political power never wants to fight for it properly. On land issues, there is never a certain present-day policy that makes them feel more justice. Their land will never come back again, which means their fate never changes. The reform era gradually made the more fluid the relationship between previously hegemonic society and government. Of course, the better relationship correlatively affect other relationships, such as economic relations, ecological relationships, and cultural relationships.

#### 4. Conclusion

All of the above descriptions reflect that since the New Order period and especially as the regime's power grew stronger into the 1990s, the relationship between society and government in cases of tourism development in Bali took place unjustly. In fact, it was dominated by authoritarian government power through apparatus government and want to profit from cooperation with the power of capital by ignoring the community. In other words, the development of tourism undertaken does not favor the local community but actually the case is that every development should be aimed at human development (Budiman, 2000: 14). As a part of the Culture-Based Bali Development, Bali tourism development should refer to human beings (the balinese) who become cultural actors (Bagus, 1992). This means that the neglect of local communities with their land and customs and religion in tourism development shows that there is no respect for traditional wisdom or local knowledge such as *tri hita karana* which is the philosophical basis for Balinese human balance in dealing with God (*parhyangan*), nature (*palemahan*), and other human beings (*pawongan*).

The tourism development in Bali which space (land) is utilized by the community as a livelihood, especially in the area that is actually relatively fertile (still productive) and considered sacred, is a kind of social sin. Cases of Garuda Wisnu Kencana, Bali Nirwana Resort, reclamation of Padanggalak Beach, Serangan Beach Reclamation, construction of golf course in Selasih, and Bali Pecatu Graha is directly or indirectly reminiscent of "seven social sins" and world leaders from India MK Gandhi in the 1930s on present-day social ills (Gedong Bagus Oka, 1995) consisting of (1) politics without principles, (2) wealth without work, (3) commerce without morality, (4) education without character, (5) pleasure without conscience, (6) science without humanity, (7) worship without sacrifice.

These seven social sins are suitable for cases of tourism development in Bali, each of which has differences in scale and intensity. The sins are certainly imposed both to the government and the tourism investors or the political pillar and the economic one in the threefolding. In contrast, the people of Bali (as the cultural pillar) cannot be treated the same because in general they are only the victim of the hegemony and the sophistication of discourses that rolled. To them, the sins can only be imposed on a handful of parties, such as village leaders and some local people who participate in other hegemony, so that they are involved in smoothing the process of alienating the land from the farmers (landowners) to tourism projects in a variety of ways, ranging from subtle and hegemonic to scary and threatening tones, such as opening up the "family history" of the PKI (Partai Komunis Indonesia or Indonesia Communist Party, i.e. a forbidden political party in Indonesia since the regime of the New Order) when the peasant community retains (does not want to sell) the land.

In that case, the failure of various efforts of the people (civil society) in the development of Bali tourism can be viewed as a failure of the state because the notion of the state (in the broad sense) includes the people/civil society. The problem is, if the government "has a morality", it should also share the "embarrassment" of seeing its people defeated by tourism development and capitalism. In reality, the shame does not exist. The state is "absent" in the cases. As Dwipayana (2000) acknowledged, the country's dominance of villages (customary villages) is reinforced by the hegemonic cultural construction that the government is a *guru wisesa*, i.e. one of the teachers of the four teachers (in the concept of *catur guru* or four teachers) to be respected. As a *guru wisesa*, the government is considered to uphold the common interest, so that it is never wrong ("Government can do no wrong"). The strong cultural hegemony makes the community (indigenous villagers) "koh ngomong", which means "lazy to speak" or ".

Even the leaders and other parties involved and contributed to the defeat of the community did not pay much attention to the possibilities of bad *karmaphala* that could befall them. *Karmaphala* is a belief system in Bali as people believe that if we do something bad we will automatically get the same thing in the future. In short, time will speak.

## 5. References

- [1] Aditjondro, George Junus. 1995. "Bali, Jakarta's Colony: Social and Ecological Impacts of Jakarta-based Conglomerates in Bali's Tourism Industry". Perth: Working Makalah No. 58, Asia Research Centre, Murdoch University.

- [2] Astina, Ida Bagus Ketut. 2002. “Resistensi Petani Susuan terhadap Pemerintah (Studi Kasus tentang Gerakan Petani di Subak Susuan, Kabupaten Karangasem, thesis, Postgraduate Program of Udayana University, Denpasar.
- [3] Bagus, I Gusti Ngurah. 1992. “Pembangunan Bali Berwawasan Budaya”, *Majalah Ilmiah Universitas Udayana*, 1 (1), p. 1-8.
- [4] Bagus, I Gusti Ngurah. 1996. “Masalah Tanah dalam Pembangunan Khususnya Pengembangan Pariwisata di Bali: Dampaknya terhadap Kehidupan Orang Bali”. Denpasar: Universitas Udayana.
- [5] Bagus, I Gusti Ngurah. 1999. “Keresahan dan Gejolak Sepuluh Tahun Terakhir di Bali Beberapa Catatan tentang Perubahan Sosial di Era ‘Glokalisasi’” in Henri Chambert-Loir and Hasan Muarif Ambary (eds.), *Panggung Sejarah, Persembahkan kepada Prof. Dr. Denys Lombard*. Jakarta: Ecole française d’Extreme-Orient, Pusat Penelitian Arkeologi Nasional, Yayasan Obor Indonesia, p. 609-627.
- [6] Barker, Chris. 2000. *Cultural Studies, Teori dan Praktik* (translation). Bentang: Bandung.
- [7] Barker, Chris. 2014. *Kamus Kajian Budaya* (translation). Yogyakarta: PT. Kanisius.
- [8] Bocock, Robert. 1986. *Hegemony*. Chichester: Ellis Horwood Limited.
- [9] Budiman, Arief. 2000. *Teori Pembangunan Dunia Ketiga* (Cetakan Keempat). PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- [10] Dharma Suteja. 2004. “Konflik Kepentingan dalam Pembangunan Pariwisata: Studi Kasus Garuda Wisnu Kencana Cultural Park di Desa Ungasan, Kecamatan Kuta Selatan, badung, Bali, thesis, Postgraduate Program of Udayana University, Denpasar.
- [11] Dinas Pariwisata Bali (Bali Tourism Office). 2017. “Angka Kunjungan Wisatawan Mancanegara (Foreign Tourist) dalam Enam Tahun Terakhir (2011-2016)” ([www.disparda.baliprov.go.id/id/Statistik3](http://www.disparda.baliprov.go.id/id/Statistik3), downloaded October 14, 2017).
- [12] Dwipayana, AAGN Ari. 2000. “Tanah, ‘Nation-State’ dan Pergeseran Paradigma Kekuasaan di Bali”, dalam Dadang Juliantara (ed.), *Otonomi Daerah dan Sengketa Tanah*. Yogyakarta: Lapera Pustaka Utama, p. 105-132.
- [13] Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (translation). New York: Vintage Books.
- [14] Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge, Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977* (C Gordon, ed.). New York: Pantheon.
- [15] Foucault, Michel. 2002. *Pengetahuan dan Metode, Karya-karya Penting Foucault (Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology, Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984)* (translation) Yogyakarta: Jalasutra.
- [16] Gedong Bagoes Oka, Ny. 1995. “Belajar dari Mahatma Gandhi selama Lima Puluh Tahun Kemerdekaan” in Wayan Supartha (ed.), *Dharma Agama & Dharma Negara*. Denpasar: Penerbit BP, p. 131-153.

- [17] Gramsci, Antonio. 1976. *Selections from Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publisher.
- [18] Hoogendijk, Willem. 1996. *Revolusi Ekonomi, Menuju Masa Depan Berkelanjutan melalui Pembebasan Ekonomi dari Pengejaran Uang Semata* (translation). Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- [19] Ismawan, Indra. 1998. *Pengusutan Harta Soeharto & Trik Pencucian Uang Haram* (Revised Edition). Yogyakarta: Penerbit Media Pressindo.
- [20] Karyadi, Ngurah. 2003. "Memformulasikan 'Arena' Masyarakat Sipil, Di antara Pura, Puri, dan Pasar", *Bali Post Public Daily*, 17 February, p. 7.
- [21] Mardika, I Nyoman. 2001. "Konflik dalam Kebijakan Pembangunan Pariwisata di Pulau Serangan, thesis, Postgraduate Program of Udayana University, Denpasar.
- [22] McChesney, Allan. 2003. *Memajukan dan Membela Hak-hak Ekonomi, Sosial, dan Budaya, Sebuah Buku Pegangan* (translation). Yogyakarta: Insist Press.
- [23] Mudana, I Gede. 2005. "Pembangunan Bali Nirwana Resort di Kawasan Tanah Lot: Hegemoni dan Perlawanan di Desa Beraban, Tabanan, Bali", dissertation, Postgraduate Program of Udayana University, Denpasar.
- [24] Palguna, AA Ngurah. 2004. *Dinamika Masyarakat Desa menuju Civil Society (Studi Kasus Objek Wisata Alas Kedaton di Desa Kukuh, Kecamatan Marga, Kabupaten Tabanan, thesis, Postgraduate Program of Udayana University, Denpasar.*
- [25] Perlas, Nicanor. 2000. *Shapping Globalization Civil Society, Cultural Power and Threefolding*. New York: CADI and Global Network for Social Threefolding.
- [26] Sita Laksmi, A.A. Rai. 2003. "Pengelolaan Pariwisata Berbasis Masyarakat: Studi Objek Wisata Tanah Lot di Desa Beraban Kecamatan Kediri Kabupaten Tabanan", thesis, Postgraduate Program of Udayana University, Denpasar.
- [27] Suasta, Putu and Linda Connor. 1999. "Democratic Mobilization and Political Authoritarianism: Tourist Developments in Bali", in R. Rubinstein and L. Connor (eds.) *Staying Local in the Global Village: Bali in the Late Twentieth Century*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, p. 91-122.
- [28] Suetha, I Ketut. 2000. *Gerakan Sosial menuju Masyarakat Sipil (Studi Kasus Padanggalak Akibat Pariwisata di Desa Adat Kesiman, thesis, Postgraduate Program of Udayana University, Denpasar.*
- [29] Sugiharta, I Nyoman Gede. 2003. "Persoalan Tanah bagi Manusia Bali", *Bali Post*, Sunday, June 1, p. 11.



- [30] Warren, Carrol. 1993. “Tanah Lot: The Cultural and Environmental Politics of Resort Development in Bali”, in P. Hirsch and C. Warren (eds.) *The Politics of Environment in Southeast Asia: Resources and Resistance*. London: Routledge, p. 229-261.
- [31] Wiratmoko, Nick T. 2001. “Kontribusi Kultural ‘Civil Society’ sebagai Elemen Dialektika dengan Negara dan Bisnis”, *Jurnal Politik Lokal & Sosial-Humaniora*, Year II, No. 1, Rainy Season Edition, November 2001-March 2002, p. 121-124.