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Abstract: This paper critically examines the effort of managing authenticity in a politically-related historical site where dissonant sites and contesting discourses evolve surrounding it. The Pancasila Sakti monument signifies the dawn of Indonesia’s New Order, the more-than-three-decade-ruling regime in Indonesia. Built in 1967, it has become one of the popular tourist sites in Jakarta, the capital city, to this day. Following the regime’s fall in 1998, maintaining the monument’s authenticity may have become problematic. Contesting discourses and dissonant sites enfold its attempt to maintain its hitherto dominant narration of Indonesian history under the regime. The aim of this article is to explore how the proliferation of contesting discourses and dissonant sites affect and are responded to by the site’s management in order to maintain their version of the truth. These dissonant sites, along with their specifically contesting political stances, can possibly create contra-narrative discourse which directly impacts on the visitors’ authentic experiences. Using a qualitative case-study research approach, this study inextricably intertwines the staging and recreation processes of the sites’ narration, as well as an analysis of political contestation behind the settlement of the site as the disclosure of a national historical narration of Indonesia has concurrently evolved. This study also focuses on several attempts provided by the site’s management to extend its authenticity. The findings contend that managing authenticity of the politically-related site is imperative, not only for the sustainability of its micro-level narration but also - more importantly - of macro-level national history.
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Introduction

Built in 1967-1973, the Pancasila Sakti Monument is located in the sub-district of Cipayung, East Jakarta. Covering an area of 14 hectares, it has become one of the largest memorial sites in Indonesia. The building of the monument was under the initiative and control of the New Order regime (Orde Baru) to commemorate what it called the “30th September Indonesian Communist Coup”. There are three areas in the monument: first, the area comprised of the Pancasila Sakti Monument that consists of the Sumur Maut (the Well of Death), Rumah Penyiksaan (the House of Torture), Dapur Umum (the Public Kitchen), and monument Pancasila Sakti (the Pancasila Sakti Monument); second, the Museum Pengkhianatan PKI (Indonesian Communist Party’s Betrayal Museum) that houses 34 dioramas describing communist movement in some areas of Indonesia from 1945 to 1974; and third, Museum Paseban Monument Pancasila Sakti (Pancasila Sakti Museum Hall) that displays 16 dioramas about the events that occurred in September, 1965. History books under the New Order regime presented a standardized narration of the history of September 1965: that is, six high-ranking military generals were kidnapped, tortured and murdered on the evening of 30th September, 1965, in the village of Lubang Buaya, the site of this monument. The perpetrators of these killings were said to be members and sympathizers of the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI). Part of the circulating narration, be it via history lessons in school, popular media, such as novels and films, and word of mouth, charged members of the Gerwani (Gerakan Wanita Indonesia, Indonesian Woman’s Movement). Members of this radical post-Independence woman’s movement were said to have participated in the torture while performing an illicit dance called Harum Bunga (fragrant flowers). In the weeks following September 1965, then Lieutenant-General Suharto, took charge of the attack on PKI members and sympathizers based on a presidential order called Supersemar (Surat Perintah Sebelas Maret / Order of March the Eleventh) signed by the president at the time, President Sukarno. As the original document is still missing to this date, there remains speculation on the authenticity of the letter. Nevertheless, Suharto employed harsh actions to establish order in the country and ensure that the ideology of communism would not arise again. To eradicate communism, he ordered the killing and imprisonment of hundreds of thousands of members and suspected associates of PKI and Gerwani without trials. Suharto assumed the presidency of the republic in March, 1967.
The Pancasila Sakti monument became an important historical site for the regime to resolve its nationalist history and reinforce its anti-communism doctrine. In September 1967, Suharto pronounced October 1st to be *Hari Kesaktian Pancasila* (Sacred Pancasila Day), and ordered a nation-wide commemoration. Following the completion of its building, every year of the New Order regime, Suharto led a state ceremony at the Pancasila Sakti Monument. After the production of a state-funded film, *Penumpasan Pengkhianatan G30S/PKI* (The Eradication of the 30 September PKI Coup) (Noer 1984), the commemoration of this day was supplemented with the airing of this film on the state-owned television station, *Televisi Republik Indonesia* (TVRI), on the eve of October 1st. In addition to this, at the end of every September, schools asked their students - as young as elementary school - to watch this movie at their own expense (Heryanto 2006). It was reported that the blood and violence exhibited in the film were traumatic for many young students. An internationally accredited short film, *On the Origin of Fear* (Filemon 2016), taking account on this traumatic experience, tells a story about a dubber involved and reconstructs the dubbing process used in the film *Penumpasan Pengkhianatan G30S/PKI*.

Some things have changed since *reformasi* (reform) in 1998, which signified the fall of the 33-year old New Order regime and which was initiated by a series of acts of public violence across the capital city of Jakarta and other regions. Presently in today’s ongoing *reformasi* era, students are no longer required to watch *Penumpasan Pengkhianatan G30S/PKI* and television stations do not broadcast it. Furthermore, debates about whether school history textbooks should be rewritten with regards to the involvement of PKI in the September 1965 turmoil have begun to appear (Arta 2012). Academics have started to openly rework the New Order’s 1965 history through research and seminars, although this has not been completely without restraints. One of these is a book that analyzes the cultural violence of the New Order; that is, how the regime legitimized anti-communism through film and literature (Herlambang 2015). Films contesting the New Order’s nationalist historical narratives of PKI and its impact have circulated, including *Mass Grave* (Rambadetta 2001), a documentary that shows people’s rejection of the burial of alleged PKI members in their village in Wonosobo, Central Java (also see Heeren 2012). Two recently produced - both celebrated and condemned - films, *The Act of Killing* and *The Look of Silence* (both produced by Joshua Oppenheimer in 2012 and 2014, respectively) also offer different perspectives by looking at the
historical narratives of PKI and the New Order’s involvement in the violation of human rights during its inception. The emphasis on the torture of the victims in the film *Penumpasan Pengkhianatan G30S/PKI* that has also been widely circulated through history books and word-of-mouth has been called into doubt as various reports have leaked the ‘original’ report of the victims’ autopsies, which do not mention such cruel treatment or torture. On 10th-13th November, 2015, an International People’s Tribunal on the 1965 Crimes against Humanity in Indonesia was held in The Hague, the Netherlands, opening hearings about the accusations that Indonesian authorities were responsible for killing hundreds of thousands of alleged Communists in 1965.

The above account shows that the opening of the media world during reformasi era has shown a defamation of the New Order. Concerned by the film, *Penumpasan Pengkhianatan G30S/PKI*, people have started openly criticizing it. Yet a twist to the story occurred in 2017. Public opinion is divided. On the one hand, there has been some support and movement to promote and encourage people, especially the youth, to watch the movie *Penumpasan Pengkhianatan G30S/PKI* as a way to learn about this pivotal episode in Indonesia’s history. It was no less than the commander of the Indonesian military, General Gatot Nurmantyo who proposed this initiative. On the other hand, there have been others who found the movie to be too violent and one-sided in favor of the New Order. Amidst all of the contesting narratives of PKI and the New Order’s histories, the Pancasila Sakti Monument is still one of the promoted tourism sites in the province, and still interprets these historical events as it has since its inception. How does the monument manage its ‘authenticity’?

The question regarding efforts to sustain authenticity in a post-authoritarian society is based on one main stake: that is, concurrent with the relatively open public sphere, the rise of dissonant heritage sites apparently creates contra-narrative discourses that contest the once dominant narration of the concerned site. This may directly impact the management of narration deliverance of the site. The aim of this paper is to analyze how, in the face of contesting discourses of 1965 Indonesia, the Pancasila Sakti Monument manages the authenticity of its once-dominant narration in order to sustain its legitimacy during the post-New Order era. This endeavor has become an increasingly complex path to take, as the current visitors of the museum are exposed to contesting discourses through public media which is relatively more open. The study also aims to fill in a gap in tourism research by showing the operation of “power in tourism in
a systemic manner” (Church and Coles 2007, p. 272). The study interconnects with the processes of authentication, commodification and cultural change as Indonesian politics and historical narrations have evolved in regards to the emerging discourse associated with contra-military narration. The findings present an original approach to apprehending contesting political discourses in Indonesia and possible impacts on the sustainability of authenticity as an important element in the development of tourism. The conclusions and recommendations are stipulated at the end of the paper.

Managing Authenticity

Historical aspect in each historical tourist attraction are subjectively interpreted by society, organizations, cultural groups and even governments through interpretation and meaning-making practices (Henderson 2016; Timothy and Boyd 2003). In the heritage context, interpretation practices are always political (Ratz 2006); the politically-related heritage sites can also be used to encourage a sense of national identity for visitors and the local community (Ranger and Hobsbawm 1983; Rogers 1996). In an authoritarian regime, the state’s control of the heritage interpretation can become one of the instruments to support their political agenda. Nevertheless, there is no power without resistance (Foucault 1990, p.95). In a context of a post-authoritarian regime, the emergence of contesting discourses can further shake the dominant regime’s hegemonic interpretation of politically-related tourism sites. Yet again, in response to the contesting discourses that threaten the once-dominant interpretation of the sites, the question is not how and why its supporter “needs to establish a knowledge” of it, but rather how they materialize it and, conversely, how it is used to support their political agenda (Foucault 1990, p. 97). The way the dominant interpretation can serve the objective of its supporter to uphold its power over knowledge is by sustaining its authenticity as the source for legitimacy in view of the site’s visitors. Managing the site’s authenticity in accordance to its supporter’s ideology and political agenda is thus parallel to the endeavor to maintain the power relationship.

In contemporary discourse of tourism development, authenticity is related to the way in which genuineness or originality of attraction is served to the tourist to create an authentic experience of their visit, based on the narrations delivered (Wang 1999; Tiberghien and Xie 2016). The effort to deliver narrations using several artificial tools potentially creates a model of performative authenticity
(Knudseen and Waade 2010), which is constructed as such in terms of the power of ideological narration in the beginning. The essence of the authentic experience is located in the constructed narration and the way in which the narration is presented even if the toured objects are not inherently authentic (Wang 1999). However, the use of artificial displays still can encourage an authentic sense of place if the constructed narrations are dominant.

Therefore, constructing perceived authenticity appears in the management stage of the authenticity life cycle (Xie and Lane 2006) by restructuring and improving the supporting elements of the toured object (Tiberghien and Xie 2006). In this stage, the effort to encourage the visitors’ sense of authenticity enables several improvements, both substantial and not, to enhance the visitors’ sense of authenticity. This improvement could be mechanical reproduction that degrades the ‘aura’ of toured objects (Benjamin 1968). In the case of the Pancasila Sakti Monument, the loss of its aura may be attributable to the surfacing of dissonant heritage site and contesting discourses. In addition to this, such effort in creating authenticity by adding red paint at the edge of the Well of Death, on the contrary, may generate ‘hyper-reality’ (Baudrillard 1994; Eco 1986), leading to the emergence of questions regarding its authenticity.

**Methodology**

This study uses a qualitative single case study methodology (Merriam 1988). The Pancasila Sakti Monument provided the major source of data for this study, supplemented with the collection of data related to contesting political discourses. Employing a qualitative exploratory approach, the data were collected through random sampling, semi-structured interviews using open-ended questions with seven visitors and two officers at the Pancasila Sakti Monument. The interviews were conducted after the visitation activities to gain more details of the visitors’ answers based on their experiences. In addition, to deliver a comprehensive explanation of the research topic, this paper uses several documents as secondary data. The authors also joined two guided tours in the monument to obtain information about the site’s interpretation.2

In analyzing the data, this research uses thematic analysis, which is a flexible method for analyzing data regarding its compatibility with both essentialist and constructionist paradigms (Braun and Clarke 2006). Interview transcripts, field notes and literature studies related to the research topic were used to
support the thematic development. Therefore, the researchers have developed the narration by using interpretive analysis of the themes, which will be delivered as discussion materials in this paper.

Case Study and Discussions of Findings

Pancasila Sakti Monument

The Pancasila Sakti Monument emerged as a political tool to legitimize the New Order regime (Ashton et al. 2012). It marks the dawn of Indonesia’s New Order and was built to support the regime’s ideological and political power against communist ideology, which prior to 1965, had considerable political support from the Indonesian populace, particularly amongst laborers and farmers (Anderson 1987). The monument has become one of the most promoted tourist sites in Jakarta, the capital city of Indonesia. The thick and adamant narration of its interpretation clouds visitors, exhorting them to believe that there was an ‘abortive’ coup initiated by the Indonesian communist party in 1965. The narration continues that, thanks to the Indonesian military led by Lieutenant General Suharto, who later became the second president of Indonesia, the coup was successfully crushed.

After being settled as a historical monument in 1973, this monument has become a heritage tourism attraction. In 2017, it was visited by 89,277 visitors, which was an approximately 8% increase of total visitor numbers when compared to 2016 (Monumen Pancasila Sakti 2018). This monument is under the management of the History Center of Indonesian National Army that is also responsible for managing seven other museums and monuments related to Indonesian military development and history. The content of the guided-tour’s narration is also under its direction.

This dominant narration of the New Order era is adamantly delivered and argued in the Pancasila Sakti Monument, using both outdoor exhibitions - at the Well of Death, the House of Torture, the Public Kitchen and the Pancasila Sakti Monument - and indoor exhibitions in the Indonesian Communist Party’s Betrayal Museum and Pancasila Sakti Museum Hall. The building of this museum, as revealed by a tour guide, was to commemorate and acknowledge the fallen heroes of the revolution and to remind the public of the latent danger of communism:
The deliberate use of artificial blood at the Well of Death - which is complemented by a red-colored light bulb - as well as on the statues of several generals and their clothes displayed in the dioramas, is to enhance the “dramatic sense” of the visualizations. These displays - the bloody death well and the bodies of the generals - correspond to the narration about the cruelty of the Indonesian communist party as presented not only in the museum, but also in various educational venues prior to the visit. Similarly, several objects and possessions of the murdered generals on display in the Indonesian Communist Party’s Betrayal Museum, the museum inside Pancasila Sakti Monument complex, are exhibited to enhance the sense of originality of the revolution. This clearly represents the state of performative authenticity.

**The Well of Death**

The Well of Death is in the center of the Pancasila Sakti Monument. Ontologically, the museum was built and developed on and around the area where generals’ corpses were found in the kampong (village) called Lubang Buaya. Six generals and one lieutenant were killed on the night of 30th September, and six of the corpses were thrown into the Well of Death. This event has become the main narrative discourse of the monument that supports the New Order’s narration of the viciousness of the Indonesia Communist Party; the very basis of its claim to power (Wieringa 2003).

The well is 50 centimeters in diameter and has been equipped with several additional components, such as the artificial blood and a red-light bulb. The authentication of the well as the center of the historical claim provided by the site is reinforced by the callous narration of the tour guide of the murders.
The first (to be dumped into the well), head first, was Brigadier General D.I. Panjaitan. The second was Major General M.T. Haryono. The third was Lieutenant General A. Yani. The fourth was Brigadier General Sutoyo Siswomihardjo. The fifth and sixth, tied together, were Major General S. Parman and Major General R. Suprapto. The last was Lieutenant Pierre Andreas Tendean. Although they were already dead, their corpses were in shreds; they were riddled with bullets. After the corpses were attacked again, the well was covered with rubbish, cassava leaves, rotten rice, and pieces of banana stalks (tour-guide’s narration 2018).

Figure 1. Group of visitors listening to the guide’s narration around the Well of Death. Source: the authors.
This act of narrating a visual image of the event appears to be an important aspect in managing the site’s authenticity (Castéran and Roederer 2013). With the addition of a red light and red paint surrounding the well, this particular site in the museum area becomes the center of the claim to truth about the PKI coup. This site is also the most reworked object in the museum area; a representation of the ‘more real than real’ staged authenticity.

There are several photographs depicting the process of excavation of the corpses from the well that show the conditions of the corpses after being tortured and buried, on display in the Indonesian Communist Party's Betrayal Museum. At the entrance of this museum, visitors will see an iconic photograph of Lieutenant General Suharto supervising the excavation process of the generals’ corpses. The narration offers proof of torture and the participation of members of Gerwani in torturing the generals. The official Visum et Repertum report provided by the Indonesian Army is also on display. Figure 2 and 3 show the body of General D.I. Panjaitan after being excavated and the plaque of the official Visum et Repertum report from the Indonesian Army, respectively.

Scenes illustrating the torturing of the generals are displayed at the House of Torture (see Figure 4). Through the addition of elements such as artificial blood, images of the generals and communist party members, recorded dialog taken from the torture scene of the Penumpasan Pengkhinatan G30S/PKI film, and the communist party badge logo, this display delivers a visual depiction of the torturing of the generals. There are also several statues of Gerwani members participating in the torture of the generals.

However, the debate regarding how the generals were killed remains unresolved (Anderson 1987). The debate also raises many questions contesting the supreme authority of the New Order regime, particularly concerning corruption, mass killings, human rights violations, and gender-based violence culminating in mass riots and rapes against women of Chinese descent during the May 1998 upheaval. May 1998 was a chaotic moment for Indonesian political stability, as public pressure for President Suharto to retire peaked. Suharto’s resignation opened opportunities for the disclosure of truth regarding the mass slaughter that followed the alleged aborted coup in 1965. These attempts for disclosure allowed the emergence of contesting narratives of the New Order regime.
In 2013, a monument commemorating befallen victims of the May 1998 riots was built by the Jakarta city government in cooperation with the National Commission on Violence against Women. There are several exhibitions in the monument containing recollections from the victims of the 1998 political turmoil, displayed in one of the buildings of the National Commission on Violence against Women’s office. Along the foundation of these exhibitions, there are tour packages that visit sites related to the chaotic period of the 1998 reformation movement and the fall of the New Order regime.

![Image of a body post-excavation](image)

**Figure 2.** The body of D.I. Panjaitan, post-excavation. Source: the authors.

Contesting narratives of the New Order regime have also appeared in several academic narrations and films. There have been numerous seminars and published articles that criticize the New Order regime for violating human rights by slaughtering communist party members and sympathizers (Anderson 1987; Herlambang 2015). Two films, *The Act of Killing* (2012) and *The Look of Silence* (2014), both produced by Joshua Oppenheimer, deliver historical narratives of the New Order’s involvement in the slaughtering of communist party members and sympathizers. New autopsy evidence and several other
confidential documents have also revealed that the attempts to eradicate communism in Indonesia at that time were supported by secret cooperation between Indonesia’s New Order regime and the government of the United States of America in the interest of developing large-scale investments and businesses (Roosa 2006).

The efforts to reveal the historical truth inextricably intertwine with the attempts for disclosure at the end of Suharto’s regime, which ended in chaos with numerous cases of rape, deaths during the riots, looting, massive public demonstrations, and military and police violence towards university student protesters. The disclosure of the historical truth of the New Order regime’s germinal period ushered in with the mass slaughtering of communist party and Gerwani members is entangled with attempts to reveal the historical facts of the New Order’s closure with the revelation of, again, acts of violence and killing by the regime in its final days.
One thing that we need to be aware of, is the latent danger [of communism]. Let us not be easily provoked, either from the outside or the inside. Moreover, the government has tolerated the emergence of PKI offspring, like RDP [a member of the House of Representatives] who held a reunion in Surabaya [East Java]. The aim of PKI is to undermine the state and so we must keep a firm grasp of Pancasila (tour-guide’s narration 2016).

Moreover, an officer of Pancasila Sakti Monument also revealed that she knew about *The Act of Killing* and *The Look of Silence*, films directed by Joshua Oppenheimer that offer a different historical narration regarding the Indonesian military’s effort in retaining national political stability:
These two films emerge as threats to Indonesian nationalism as they promote an improper story of government efforts in eradicating the communist ideology that was threatening national ideology and was contrary with Pancasila ideology. Through this museum, we try to deliver historical facts that communism is our enemy and Indonesian nationalism should be maintained through Pancasila to advance the development of Indonesia (interview with a monument officer 2018).

The management’s stance in perceiving true historical narration could raise questions regarding visitors’ perceptions of the authenticity of the museum’s displays, in light of the contesting discourse proliferated through the media. The question of sustainability of authenticity is essentially determined from the “management stage” as the fifth stage of the authenticity life cycle (Xie and Lane 2006). The authentic toured objects that are managed by the organization, in this case, the History Center of Indonesian National Army, are contested by other recent circulating and dissenting discourses through the narration or the presence of other opposing-politically-related tourism sites. Dissonance in heritage, as an inherent trait intrinsic to all ‘heritage’ (Turnbridge and Ashworth 1996), can potentially decrease the performative authenticity level that ontologically depends on the social, cultural and spatial aspects of the sites. Dissonant sites can inevitably enhance the rise of new paradigms in the perception of the authenticity of the objects.

**Questioning authenticity in the discourse contestation**

Based on an interview with an officer of the Pancasila Sakti Monument, in the need to maintain the political discourse provided, the Indonesian Army provokes the emergent consideration of “Revocation of Communism” by promoting an “anti-communism” campaign, followed by the head of the Indonesian Army, General Gatot Nurmantyo, directing students to watch the state-funded film *Penumpasan Pengkhianatan G30S/PKI* every 30th September. In the post-New Order period, this movie was broadly rejected by Indonesian politicians and leaders, including the presidents following Suharto’s resignation, because of its ambiguous content of historical truths and its many violent scenes. However, in 2017, as anti-communism discourse resurfaced and found its niche in political practices in anticipation of the 2019
We know that the generals were sadistically murdered by the perpetrators. I agree and am aware about who the real perpetrators of the coup were. Some might say that the debate regarding who the main actors of the coup were is still unresolved. It would be very good for us Indonesian citizens to know the historical truth to resolve the current unstable political condition in Indonesia (interview with a visitor 2018).

General Election, this movie was once again promoted. As in the case of the Pancasila Sakti Monument, in light of the resurfacing of the anti-communism discourse, so-called “historical experts” from the Indonesian Army can be employed by tourists to provide interpretation services on the site while touring the museum, as stated by an officer of the Pancasila Sakti Monument:

We received an increase in the number of visitations after there was a campaign by the head of the Indonesian Army, General Gatot Nurmantyo, to watch the film *Penumpasan Pengkhianatan G30S/PKI* as an effort to prevent the possibility of a communist resurrection. We think that after all of the stories regarding the historical truth of the communist coup in Indonesia, we presently have some historical experts from the History Center of Indonesian National Army who are available as guides for the tourists (interview with a monument’s officer 2018).

Contrastingly, most visitors of the Pancasila Sakti Monument are also aware of the polemical truths, as they have already been exposed to not only the state-sponsored, formal history lessons at school, but also to the more popular, dissenting facts about 1965, before visiting this site. They are also aware that the artificial blood and red paint and lights are used in the displays to create a dismal atmosphere. In the explanations of the objects and possessions displayed in the museum, the visitors agree that they (the objects and possessions) are original and are displayed to give clear descriptions of what happened when the so-called coup took place. However, they are concerned about the circulating debates on the genuineness of the story. An elementary school teacher admitted that he was aware of the contested discourse and was in doubt about the truth of the sites’ narration, which impacted his perspectives on the authenticity of the sites’ displays:

We know that the generals were sadistically murdered by the perpetrators. I agree and am aware about who the real perpetrators of the coup were. Some might say that the debate regarding who the main actors of the coup were is still unresolved. It would be very good for us Indonesian citizens to know the historical truth to resolve the current unstable political condition in Indonesia (interview with a visitor 2018).
A different perception of authenticity of the museum’s displays was stated by a student of a state university in Jakarta, who questioned whether the exhibitions were genuine or imitations:

Personally, I have doubts. I am not sure about the authenticity of the generals’ clothes, objects and the stories behind them; whether they are true or not. I am aware that there are many stories claiming to be the historical truth - the Indonesian military version, and there are also many stories and news regarding Suharto’s political narration; that he tried to claim his political power by creating such a narration against the Indonesian communist party movement (interview with a visitor 2018).

Moreover, regardless of the authenticity of the toured objects, a tourist from the province of Jambi, Sumatera, argued that the anti-communist campaign might potentially be used as a political tool to claim military supremacy in Indonesian political contestation:

I come here with my wife because we used to spend our time seeing the exhibition of generals who became victims of the PKI coup. I know that the debates of who directed such coup remain indecisive. We know that presently there are so many postings on Facebook, online media and twitter presenting information that basically the Indonesian military and Suharto played crucial roles in creating the coup. I assume that the anti-communist campaign has a political agenda, but the most important thing is that we have to keep nationalism in our hearts (interview with a visitor 2018).

It is, therefore, important for the management to re-examine the situation where visitors have started to doubt the authenticity of its displays and the narration as they have already been exposed to contesting discourses of the toured objects and their history. It is also worth noting that such contestation could enhance the national political conflict as heritage sites play a role in preserving collective past memories (Urry 1990; Lowenthal 1998). However, these heritage sites could be challenged by the proponents of contesting discourses proposing their version of disclosures of historical truth (Fyfe and Macdonald 1996).
Conclusion and recommendation

The focus of this paper has been on the analysis of managing authenticity efforts at the Pancasila Sakti Monument. The attempts to manage authenticity concern the proliferation of contesting discourse that reveal opposing versions of the historical truth. The management responded to this situation by relying on official historians from the Indonesian Army to create the content and deliver the site’s narration. However, the visitors to the site are also aware of the contesting discourse and have not decided which narration is authentic. They believe that the generals were killed and perceive the toured objects as authentic, however they raise questions regarding the true perpetrators of the tragedy.

The visitors’ cognitive dissonance appears as an important consideration here. The visitors arguably have some discursive cognition that impacts the meaning-making processes. Therefore, the development of heritage sites along with dissonant heritage sites could potentially impact visitors’ perceptions of the sites’ authenticity. As authenticity appears as an important element of tourist attraction (Tiberghien and Xie 2016; Zhu 2012), Chhabra (2012) proposes “dissonant heritage strategy paradigm” that highlights the need to identify social inclusion practices and cultivation of a shared sense of heritage, identity and belonging with the aim to thoroughly examine untold stories from cross-section of communities. The grounded purpose of this strategy is to obtain a multidimensional understanding to apprehend conflicts and “suggest protocol and programs to build and promote a harmonious sense of place and object-centered (true to the original) authentic identity and enhance quality of life” (Chhabra 2012). This approach can possibly be applied to gain a macro-narration of national history that put aside political interests of dominant groups.

The need to develop new research projects related to the dissonant site is also important. This research elaborates the contesting site around Pancasila Sakti Monument as dissonant sites that disrupt the existence of the monument discourse. On the other hand, positioning the Pancasila Sakti Monument as a dissonant site against the flourishing anti-New Order discourse, requires further research to be conducted to deliver a more comprehensive explanation of the sustainability of authenticity in different perspectives. All in all, the most important thing is that heritage begins to “reflect a holistic story of the past” (Timothy and Boyd 2003).
Notes
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1. The Pancasila Sakti Monument refers to the entire complex of the site, which consists of three areas, as will be discussed in the following account. Throughout the article, the authors will identify which particular section is referred to for the sake of clarity.

2. All the tour guides are members of the Pusat Sejarah Tentara National Indonesia (History Center of Indonesian National Army).
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