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Abstract: The issue addressed is how to situate the ‘life-world’ of a traditional Balinese village in the context of global tourism which is now worth USD$ 7.61 trillion. This problem has been brought sharply into focus, indeed amplified, by the recently adopted policy of local government in Bali to designate specific villages as tourist sites. Such action appears to be taking place in the absence of any prior studies of the social, environmental and other impacts on local communities. The following paper represents an initial attempt to sketch out the breadth of the problem from the global to the local. The paper first proceeds by examining the conceptual framework of globalisation - fundamentally an economic process, - from which global cultural identities merge. It proceeds to give an overview of policy at a global level starting with the idea of designated United Nations World Heritage sites and the inevitable commodification of ‘place.’ Then the issues and problems that flow from these first sections are discussed. Next, the situation in Indonesia as a whole is brought into sharp relief, focussing on policy and legislation that affect the internationally celebrated island of Bali. Finally, a case study of Penglipuran, a traditional Bali Aga village is discussed taking into account the preceding context. In conclusion, suggestions are made as to the significant research and policy issues that need to be addressed concurrently with the development of the settlement. The study documented in this paper was conducted using phenomenological approaches. It was grounded by researcher’s experiences, gained from her deep involvement in community life as well as physical and site observation activities during data collection period.
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1. Introduction

Globalisation is a historic process that has existed from immemorial time, based upon contemporary knowledge of the planet. In every age commerce and culture have been exported to the fringes of the known world. At the same time, these boundaries have been changing as explorations expanded the understanding of geography, a process allowed by the invention of new technologies – in transport, time, mathematics and other devices. Today we also understand globalisation differently, based on the development of politics, technology, economy and culture. Nevertheless, the global world we now inhabit is vastly different to any previous epoch [1]. It is no longer “known” in the traditional sense – it is now a technological construct [2]. This is due to a singular invention that has compressed space and time, allowing communication to occur instantaneously wherever communications devices are located. It is called the internet.
This phenomenon, now forty years old, has affected in every level of social life. Like all prior inventions, it is politically charged, shifting power into unseen new realms frequently beyond social control as global corporations challenge all existing national boundaries. It is a process qualitatively different from all prior modes, allowing a monumental compression of wealth into fewer and fewer hands [3]. It is a concentration that has increasingly placed the wealth of corporate power ahead to many states, with the capacity to transform national policies in many countries, particularly the Global South [4]. Given the mobility of capital allowed by the internet, where vast resources can be transferred from one site to another in milliseconds, multinational corporations also have an enormous influence on public opinion, to create new forms of imperialism and monopoly practices, and to persuade governments into desired forms of cooperation and action – development policy, investment, social programs and other functions.

In this respect the European Economic Community (EEC) currently going through significant political upheaval, is exemplary. The EEC was not a mechanism devised to improve the lives of inhabitants, to enhance local culture, or to provide better social programs. It was fundamentally a method of accelerating capital formation, promoting state neo-corporatism, and advancing the interests of banks and multinational corporations. The basic mechanisms involved were the free movement of capital across national boundaries, with a similarly open system allowing labour transit-the shared distribution of migrants from developing countries. This effectively reduced the price of wages by undermining existing sanctions and increasing the labour pool. Overall, it secured greater mobility of capital, materials and populations within the EEC.

While prior imperialist practices encouraged e.g. migration from Africa, and India to the UK, and from Algeria and Vietnam to France, more recently migrants to Europe from places like Pakistan, Bangladesh, Turkey, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan and the Middle East, have burgeoned. Within the European Economic Community, the wealthy nations have also imported populations from more impoverished states (Germany is now the fourth largest state of Turkey), as well as from poorer regions of the EEC. The overall trajectory of the process is to import labour predominantly in one direction, for work as economic migrants. The ‘affluent classes’ of more developed nations are then exported to these same countries for pleasure as a function of international globalised tourism [5]. The global economy and its agencies benefit from movement in both directions.

Hence, tourism can no longer be viewed as a disorganised, somewhat random product of personal choice, an extension of the “Grand Tour” of the Victorian period. It represents a new dimension in global economic development. It is driven by private capital in allegiance with local governments who wish to improve their economic viability, reflecting the neo-liberal Agenda and its ideology of state neo-corporatism. While local economies benefit from the tourist tsunami, the overall process further expedites the concentration of global capital. The richest eight people on the planet have a net wealth of $US426 billion ($569.6 billion), equivalent to what is held by the bottom half of the world's population. In Indonesia where Penglipuran is situated, the four top billionaires possess as much capital as the bottom 100,000,000 persons, where the interest on their capital alone could displace these millions from poverty (1).

Precedents had of course existed elsewhere. In the Philippines and Indonesia for example, ‘the crony capitalism’ sponsored by President Marcos, was also the prevailing ideology within President Suharto's administration. Both fused state power with private interest [6,7]. In the case of Bali, this meant that the same clique dominated the entire tourist apparatus via outright ownership, joint partnerships or shareholding investment in tourism operators and businesses, airlines bringing in tourists, ownership of the largest hotels and tourism complexes, commercial outlets and entertainment facilities for over thirty years until his demise in 1998 [8,9]. They also left certain specific forms of dereliction in their wake (Warren 2014). Similar examples are ubiquitous, and arguably exist worldwide. For example in the gambling Mecca of Macao, where a parallel scenario operates under the tutelage of Stanley Ho and other billionaires, as well as their counterparts in Hong Kong. But
today, multinational penetration is vastly better organised and supported, clandestinely or otherwise, by such organisations as the United Nations and its program of designating World Heritage Sites of which Bali has five.

The whole study was conducted using phenomenological approaches, grounded by researcher's experiences gained from her deep involvement during physical and site observation. In so doing, and in the context of globalization, this paper undertakes on a case study of Penglipuran, a Bali Aga village that has been designated a tourist destination. This process is expedited through the collaboration of state, provincial and local government – focussing on Bali as a province of Indonesia, and the local government of Bangli Regency. Within this global context, our focus is one of settlement, culture and tradition [10]. So I begin at the global level by introducing the problematic of the commodification of place and the issues that flow from it in the following method (1) Introduction, (2) The commodification of place, (3) Place and the public realm, (4) Desa Penglipuran and government initiative of ‘desa wisata’ (5). Place and space in Penglipuran, (6) Community administration and social structure, (7) Culture and space, (8) Touristification and cultural conservation.

2. The Commodification of Place

The totalising trajectory of the capitalist system is to commodify all use values as well as human experience [11]. It also has ‘place’ as a target, from Times Square in New York to Penglipuran in Bali. The dominating force is the eternal expansion of capital through control over media and markets such as land, as well as the all-encompassing investment funds that are necessary for the infrastructure of tourism to proceed. It does this by means of the commodity principle - the pivot round which all capital accumulation takes place, superficially between buyers on the one hand and sellers on the other. While the commodity can be seen merely as an object, a thing, also the social relation fundamentally underwrites global capitalist enterprise. It represents the enduring conflict between those who own the means of production, and those who do not.

Exploitation therefore takes place as an inherent part of the system due to the power imbalance between buyers and sellers and the private expropriation of collectively generated profits. Since power is concentrated at the top, the further we descend through the economic hierarchy, the less power individuals have. While trans-national corporations know exactly what they are doing, local governments are frequently naive about local impacts, since resources and background research in tourism are seriously constrained [12]. Working down the ladder, local cultures are clearly the most informationally bereft as to the workings of capital, and to government agencies and non-government agencies (NGO’s) at all scales. This implies that their existence is subject to forces that are not understood; open to exploitation, and rendered culturally vulnerable to externally imposed authorities that do not necessary have their well- being at heart [13]. Or as Piketty says "The price (market) system knows no limits or morality" [3]. In this light it is critical that the people of Penglipuran become informed in significant detail of their legal and political environment prior to any agreements they may be offered.

While the workings of capital are somewhat over-simplified above for the purposes of explaining principles, it must be recognised that there is as much conflict between the component parts of civil society (the state, labour and the law) as there is between the various capitals (industrial, finance, commercial, property etc.)[2]. Here two points are important. First, the above processes do not take place based on friendly or mutual support, but on the basis of conflict and competition. This environment is only set to deepen and we can safely assume that as yet unforeseen consequences will arise. Second, they nonetheless take place over space and time, in places we call cities, towns and villages. Contemporary society has been categorised by Italo Calvino as ‘the New Middle Ages’ where there is competition between urban settlements at all scales greater share in a world of diminishing resources. The onus is then for each settlement to ‘brand’–to differentiate itself from
others, to ensure ‘authenticity’ and thus to offer a unique commodity that can be sold not only to the so-called ‘creative class’, but to national and international tourist audiences (2002, 2007). Penglipuran has just become one such commodity.

Due to the unique culture of Bali, it is clear that the process of commodifying the island’s heritage begun in the Suharto era is likely to advance to levels not previously experienced [14,15]. Given the inadequacies of postmodern theorising, no encompassing explanation of Bali’s position within a globalised tourist universe exist, or as Samir Amin has so eloquently stated ‘The critique of capitalism preceded the faddish critique now offered us by postmodern theoreticians. "I consider Post-Modernism an intellectual non-starter in the sense that it beyond its hype it offers no conceptual instruments capable of transcending the capitalist framework"[16]. So the paper will be informed more generally by political economy. So the question to be answered is ‘how can this process of commodification be constrained to the benefit of local communities, and Penglipuran in particular, without turning the island into another Asian Disneyland’?

3. Place and The Public Realm

As part of the overarching progress of capital accumulation, trans-national corporate power is no longer satisfied with the mere sale of commodities. The commodity principle has been extended to commodifying all aspects of society. This basically encompasses social realms previously excluded from the fundamental activity of commodity production during the post-industrial period. The process now includes many functions previously allocated to the state in the service of big capital such as social services, education, the public realm and space itself. Important to this process, and therefore to this study, is the commodification of culture and cultural products [17–21].

The liberal view of globalisation is that all of this is good since the more business that is generated, the more jobs are available and a greater opportunity for employment is created, and industrialization increasingly mechanised. Supposedly, everyone benefits. While this may contain some truth, historically this has never actually happened since the economic surplus is increasingly expropriated. The fact remains that despite economic development, the structural features of the total system remain unchanged by such ‘progress’ given the absence of increasing social equality [3]. The emerging logic suggests that the commodification of ‘place’ remains a prime target strategy for business in the evolution of a globalised culture that supports endless consumption of unnecessary products [1]. Once industry, commerce and all available land have been privatised, what remains? The sole arena that has not been commodified is the public realm, where places represent the evolution of societies, their histories, cultures, memories, and traditions. Hence the defence of culture qua public space becomes the last bastion of resistance to a commodified world in which Penglipuran is exemplary.

Over the last century, the public realm has remained ‘in public hands’ being administered by the state on behalf of all citizens. But in an era where the neo-corporate state has come into being, one where capital increasingly writes the rules by which it operates, the concept of place and all its inferences become threatened by forces never previously unleashed. From the beginning of the third millennium, there has been rapidly accelerating encroachment by the private sector into social space, for example by renting or otherwise colonising public buildings, spaces, parks, gardens and other venues for private use – many for the promotion and advertisement of commodities. Now we must briefly turn to the abstract and politically charged idea of conservation, in order to understand how the stage is being set in Indonesia and Bali for the development of tourism in small historic communities.

4. Desa Penglipuran and Government Initiative of 'Desa Wisata'

Conceptually, Penglipuran and the government’s concept of desa wisata (village-based tourism development program) must be placed in a larger context. Five sites in Bali have been listed as World Heritage Association (WHA) by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
(UNESCO) as of special cultural or physical significance. These are Jatiluwih rice terraces, *Taman Ayun* Temple, *Ulun Danu Batu* Temple, and Lake Batur and Pakerisan Valley which is a prime example of *Subak* irrigation. Overall Indonesia has eight such sites and there are now over 1000 WHA sites worldwide. While *Penglipuran* is not one of these, the WHA is exemplary as to how *Penglipuran* might be influenced due to its special designation as an important tourism site.

In this regard, criticism of UNESCO’s management and objectives must be noted - ‘Indeed, the World Heritage program has garnered considerably less regard in recent years, and is seen as more concerned with economic and political influence than the stated goals of the Convention’(2). Not only this but criticism of the management and operations of actual locations is ubiquitous ‘If you go to a lot of World Heritage sites and ask for management plans with budgets and priorities, they don’t exist’(3). In addition, the search for the tourist dollar can destroy entire communities. *Kaiping* village in China is an example of this (4), and in Japan when the WHA denoted the The *Iwami Ginzan* Silver Mine special status (a huge hole in the ground) tourism numbers went from 15,000 a year to one million after designation(5). These issues come to the fore in our conclusions about the management and community control over *Penglipuran*’s living heritage.

This living heritage is omnipresent, in that Bali has two distinct cultures, the majority belonging to *Majapahit* origins in Java and who live almost exclusively in the lowlands, and the *Bali Aga* who live almost exclusively in the highland regions. *Penglipuran* is one of more significant native settlements in Bali, belonging to the *Bali Aga* community (Reuter 2002, Suartika and Cuthbert 2017). Administratively, it is part of Bangli Regency of Bali Island, a Province within the Indonesian State. *Penglipuran* has a direct line of descent to another Desa Bali Aga of Bayung Gede, of Bangli Regency, both socially and ritually. Up to the present time, people of *Penglipuran* have had a special and enduring relationship with people of Bayung Gede. Since it is situated around 700 meters above sea level, *Penglipuran* provides a cool and comforting living environment. This quality led some to suggest that *Penglipuran* was recognised by Bangli’s historic Royal Family as a place to seek solace.

Since its designation as a tourist destination in 1993 (confirmed by Bangli Regency’s Decision No. 115 Year 1993), this settlement has been recognized for its unique qualities. These regulatory mechanisms also indicate conformity with those instigated at both national (Indonesia) and provincial (Bali) levels, such as National Regulation No. 10 Year 2009 and No. 50 Year 2011 on National Tourism, and Bali Provincial Regulation No. 3 Year 1991 and No. 2 Year 2012 on Cultural Tourism. Across the island, many villages have been designated, and developed under this scheme. Several Bali Aga settlements have been targeted and equally attract many tourists e.g. Desa Tenganan (of Karangasem Regency) and Desa Trunyan (of Bangli Regency). This is in line with Bali Province Government’s policy to develop potential desa/s (village/s) into tourist destinations-desa wisata(village-based tourist destination). *Penglipuran*’s position has been officially confirmed by Bangli Local Government Regulation No. 10 Year 2014; No. 9 Year 2015 and No. 34 Year 2016. However *Penglipuran* is not alone. Nine other villages of Bangli Regency are included under the umbrella of Desa Wisata.

*Desa wisata*, in theory, is well publicised as part of a capacity building attempt aimed at achieving self-sustained communities (when most have been 'self sustaining' for records of centuries). It promotes every possible tourist interest as a potential economic benefit to the inhabitants, when in reality it must be seen as part of a profitmaking venture of larger interests. How exactly individuals and the community will benefit remains to be spelled out in some detail. In addition, community members are encouraged to participate on the basis of self-interest at every level of its development, a process seriously at odds with the communal and collective nature of the Bali Aga societies in question. Unlike the top-down strategies that were the accepted practice during the *Orde Baru* (New Order) era of the Suharto administration, the *desa wisata* program is formulated as a bottom-up scheme. Such top-down governing practices ended (in theory) following the resignation of the
president in the aftermath of the 1998 economic crisis, that impacted catastrophically on the Indonesian economy (one amongst numerous Asian countries that had to deal with devastating effects of the crisis). The idealistic role advanced by the government in this desa wisata scheme is intended to facilitate the whole process of developing a controlled administrative process while consciously maintaining the prominent position of the community, as both the subject and possibly the object of the whole development process.

The concept of desa wisata development offers the community an idealistic set of circumstances to enhance its own potential. In reality however, the whole process is heavily oriented to exploiting and commodifying every single unique trait the community has available for tourism related consumption. The most obvious example is the generation of significant revenues from entry fees whose function is to open up the entire community to the tourist gaze using the medium of a commodified tourist space in its entirety [10]. Many elements of built form currently regarded as sacred entities will be made accessible to visitors, and setting limits on personal movement will be almost unenforceable. Many current examples exist of domestic transformation in Bali to capture the tourist dollar. Homes become adapted by their inhabitants in their effort to sell things tourists may purchase, including snacks, gifts, or other trophies comforting to visitors. They may also be partially transformed into showrooms for many home industries, such as the production of handicrafts, woodcarving, furniture, and woven materials such as the famous ikat manufactured in other locations. In this case, the function of home is often further extended to accommodate the display of various products not necessarily produced on site, with the expectation of attracting purchases from potential visitors, and it is one short step to the actual rental of accommodation to tourists looking for a ‘genuine’ or ‘authentic’ Balinese experience [22].

While these practices are already widespread in tourist centres such as Ubud and Sanur, the dominant problem is how to contain economic self-interest in Penglipuran and other designated villages now that the practice has been fully established elsewhere. None of the above observations necessarily disagree with the specific interests of the community, nor with the idea of flourishing village life. But it is vital to ask how the desa wisata development program should take place here, given that cultural conservation would necessarily be more constrained than elsewhere on the island. This hopefully coincides with the government’s main goals to generate revenues (somewhat inconclusively stated) —to facilitate every opportunity for the community to achieve an economically self-reliant status; as a method of reviving traditions and local culture; to support the development of a mechanism leading to community capacity building; and of course maintaining each desa wisata’s aptitude to provide tourists with unique experiences undiscovered elsewhere. In order to clarify these confusions and inconsistencies, it is necessary to investigate the reality of Penglipuran culture in greater detail below.

5. Place and Space in Penglipuran

Physically, Desa Penglipuran covers around 112 hectare of land. Around 15 percent is used for homes; 50 percent for dried cultivation related uses; and the rest is dedicated for bamboo forest. All members of the krama desa exercise their right to occupy land for domestic purposes; cultivating agricultural land; and harvesting bamboo from the forest. A strict prerequisite is applied to the latest use. Every harvest has to be approved by the adat, which is acquired through a sangkep (meeting) of karma desa. The most prominent physical feature of Penglipuran is the well aligned traditional gates of Penglipuran compounds. This image emblazons the front page of the official guide to the village (Figure 1).
The Penglipuran settlement forms a linear pattern, oriented north and south. The north is considered hulu (upper side), the most sacred zone, and the south is teben (down side) the least sacred zone. The sacred zone is a site for many temples, and the least sacred zone is where communal setra (cemetery) and Dalem Temple are located. Housing compounds are situated in between these zones, divided into two lines of homes and connected by a rurung gede (main community lane). The whole settlement is surrounded by a bamboo forest and dried cultivated land. An overview of the whole layout of the settlement is presented in Figure 2.

In terms of domestic architecture, the concept ‘home’ in Penglipuran has an original layout which differs radically from both Lowland Balinese and many other Bali Aga settlements. Each compound accommodates several functions represented in structures and buildings. Figure 3 demonstrates the general layout of a home munity. All housing compound have more or less have the same physical configuration. They usually consist of: Family shrine (sanggah), place for worships; Six columned building (bale sakanem), used for ritual purposes; Kitchen (paon), food production and sleeping; Loji building (bale loji), for sleeping and resting; Extended uses (such as toilet, garage, etc.), conditional; Teba (spare/unused land).

Figure 3 and 4 demonstrate the physical configuration of a typical home in Penglipuran. Figure 3 represents two single homes located on both east and west sides of the rurung/community lane.

Figure 4 illustrates a plot that has two sets of homes located on the eastern side of the rurung gede/main communal lane. This is a home of two krama desa who are related, and share one family shrine. In this case, the shrine is located in the middle of both homes. If we look closely at both figures, the family shrine is always placed in the northeastern corner. This parallels the practice of the sanga mandala conception in many settlements of lowland Bali where northeast is the most sacred (utamaning utama) zone.
Figure 2. Layout Plan of Penglipuran Settlement
Figure 3. Spatial Formation of 2 Homes of Two Krama Desa Located on both the Eastern and Westerns Sides of the Rurung Gede

Figure 4. Spatial Formation of a Home of Two Krama Desa (Relatives) Located on the Eastern Side of the Rurung Gede

If we make a comparison with Desa Tenganan Bali Aga, another linear settlement, the sacred part of the domestic spatial formation is that located adjacent to the communal lane (rurung)[23]. This is a reflection of how rurung is viewed within different Bali Aga communities. To the Penglipuran conception, rurung is a space for circulation, while in Tenganan community rurung is conceived as part of many sacred elements within the spatial layout of the village. Thus part of the space close to the pamesuan (a gate to get into the house from the rurung or the other way around) is dedicated for structures pertinent to worship. In order to situate this basic description of the physical place, it is now
necessary to frame the social system that structures the spatial configuration of the village, before assessing the current and potential impact of tourism.

6. Community Administration and Social Structure

The attractiveness of Penglipuran as a thriving tourist destination cannot be disconnected from its status as one of Bali’s native villages. Many Bali Aga villages have been assigned as tourist destinations, but are not as appealing to tourists. Since this unique socio-spatial structure will now have to accommodate government interests at all levels, as well as certain NGO’s, the power relations between the state and the people remains acute [24]. Penglipuran has attributes that others do not possess. In order to more accurately explain its uniqueness, the main elements of the community administration and socio-spatial factors (following) need to be explained in greater detail.

As the case of other Bali Aga communities, Penglipuran is a patrilineal society and does not follow the four caste system widely practiced in Balinese Majapahit communities. Here everybody belongs to a single sudra caste. In this arrangement social interactions and relationships take place in a more egalitarian manner. At present, the community has 233 families. Each has its own housing compound in the centre of the settlement. Community membership is determined by one’s marital status and conformance to the adat, community consensus and codes. Only a married couple can be considered a seat for membership (krama desa). Any unmarried person in the community will be included as part of an existing krama desa of her/his parents.

There are two types of krama desa exist: (i) krama pengarep and (ii) krama roban. Following the meaning of pengarep in Balinese which is foremost in taking responsibility, the first krama constitutes the governing body of the community. Members have central roles in decision making and leadership of the village. They form the core of the community and each is provided with a plot of land allocated for home and land cultivation. There are 76 krama pengarep, and this number is nonnegotiable. Membership is based on seniority (worked out based on the age of one’s marriage) and mastery of all written and unwritten practices and codes of the adat. Membership to this krama pengarep will be annulled when one fails to adhere to the adat. In this case the annulled position will be filled in by the next krama in line. The krama who has his association cancelled will then have to appoint another member as a replacement. This is usually the eldest married son in his family. Krama roban are the extended members of the community. Roban in Balinese means ‘living under the same roof’. Unlike the krama pengarep, the number of this krama desa continues to grow in accordance with population growth. They are the extended families of krama pengarep.

In terms of the governing body of the village, Penglipuran adheres to both the dinas and adat systems. The existence of dinas is a consequence of Bali integration to the Indonesian state. The whole Island is bound to implement state policy. While the adat is a system imbedded within and rooted to local traditions, codes, consensus and communal practices [23]. The organization of the adat systems in Penglipuran is an historic leadership scheme recognized as Ulu Apad. This system has 76 members (kramadesa) representing the whole community. The highest position is held by Jero Kubayan which consists of Jero Mucuk and Jero Kubayan Nyoman.

The next level below Jero Kubayan is Kanca Roras which has 12 members. Like many Bali Aga communities, one’s position in this tradition is solely determined by the seniority of one’s marital status which determines the pecking order. The longer one has been married, the more chance one has to be part of this adat leadership. Thus, where the opportunity for political manipulation and bribery is a common occurrence in the election of dinas leadership members, in this arrangement corruption has little chance of success. Krama no 13-76 will be part of krama patilan. The remaining community members of 167 families are classified as krama roban, as has been mentioned earlier.
7. Culture and Space in Penglipuran

One of the dominant considerations in the designation and allocation of cultural space is the institution of marriage. Overall, there is no restriction to marrying someone from outside the community. *Krama desa* status as well as both duties and rights are maintained. This practice differs from that of another *Desa Bali Aga of Tenganan in Karangasem Regency*. In the latter community, marrying a girl/boy who is not part of local *kramadesa* implies being an outcast. This means one rights to being *krama desa* will be annulled and the member will be asked to live in an area especially zoned for outcasts. Supporting equal rights for women, *Penglipuran* also permits the practice in which a woman decides to marry a man who is not part of a *krama desa* membership and live in the community. In this case, the woman will adopt the male role (*purusha*), and the man will similarly take the role of a woman (*pradana*). Since ritually the woman is now symbolically a man, she will be able to act as such in elections to the *krama pengarep*. This is similar to a widely practiced form of marriage called *nyentana* in many Balinese lowland communities.

Nonetheless, there remains significant social pressure against marrying someone living to the left, the right, or directly opposite one's home. *Penglipuran* people believe that families immediately located next to you are relatives, and one does not marry her/his relative (incest taboo). A clear spatial connection between houses can be observed from the existence of small gates (*peletasan*) connecting one family to another. This connecting *pamesuan* represents level of relationship the inhabitants of a house have with their immediate neighbours. An open *peletasan* means a healthy relationship, while a closed one implies otherwise. This *peletasan* therefore is a social connector as well as a symbol of continuous social ties between homes and their neighbours. Homes of *Penglipuran* often have rain water flowing freely to the adjacent neighbours loop. While this practice is considered unacceptable or even taboo to the neighbourhood life of the Balinese lowland settlements, it is a sign of closeness to the *Penglipuran* community. It is considered anti-social not to conform.

Unsurprisingly, polygamy is also taboo with the potentially serious social consequence of eviction. Those who undertake this practice will be forced from his compound and ordered to live in a special zone called *karang memadu*. Within feminism, conformance to monogamy, may be seen as some recognition and protection to women from all kind of domestic abuse. Alternatively it can also be viewed as a spatial practice, a method of social control, and a conservation strategy. As mentioned earlier, a relatively long narrowed *karang kerti* may not be suitable to contain the family of one husband; more than one wife; and a child or a couple of children. It would definitely be too crowded. If we examine the spatial formation of a *Penglipuran* home, there is only one building (called *loji*) dedicated for sleeping in a compound.

Importantly, the recognition of polygamy means one man creates more than one family. If one compound is dedicated for one family *ipso facto* this implies that one man can inhabit more than one compound. This will lessen the opportunity for his future generation to live in the *karang kerti*. Hence, the prohibition of polygamy is a sustainable practice that the community has consciously developed at all levels of the hierarchy. Further sanction imposed on members practising polygamy are prohibition to enter the main *rurung*, to enter temples, and to get involved in any *adat* activities. All of these sanctions represent social signals designed to prevent polygamy. So far, it has been highly successful. The *karang memadu* has never had any inhabitant/s. It has now been empty for centuries.

Unlike the lowland community, *ngaben*, the cremation ceremony of lowland Balinese is not practiced here. Burial is the norm rather than cremation. Every deceased person will be buried on the day of passing. During a burial procession, a male body will be laid face down, while a female body will be laid face up. The community has a cemetery located on the southern part of the settlement. As is the practice in the lowland *desa adat* (*adat village*), the existence of a cemetery is always accompanied with a *Dalem Temple* (see Figure 2), a sacred space to worship the God Siva-the great destroyer. There is no clear indication if the *Dalem Temple of Penglipuran* is also dedicated to the
same worship. For many reasons – curiosity, voyeurism, novelty or the search for ‘an authentic experience,’ Ngaben ceremonies are a huge tourist magnet. For an important person, lowland ceremonies can draw thousands of people.

Krama desa rights also embody rights for living in the main settlement area; to cultivate a piece of agricultural land; and right to harvest bamboo from Penglipuran forest. Each krama pengarep is given a plot of space to build his home which is called karaang kerti. This right to space comes with a cecatu (a piece of tegalan, dried agricultural land) and rights to harvest bamboo. The latter however can only be exercised upon community consent, which must be acquired through a community sangkep (meeting). So a basic rule of survival for the social system hinges on control over space – that land and social space should under no circumstances be commodified within a capitalist land market [14,23,24].

The spatial provision required for shelter and survival of krama roban is to be accommodated by the adat within the existing karang kerti. It is common to find out that many of the huge teba (a spare land within a housing compound) attached to a krama pengarep’s homes have been developed into housing compounds to shelter krama roban. This practice is permitted and facilitated by the adat. In the case of more space being required, the issue can be addressed in an adat meeting and extra land will be provided given community consent. Being a krama desa entails duties and rights. Duties include krama desa participation in the conduct of ritual ceremonies; adhering to the adat codes and practices, as well as many forms of consenting social relationships and interactions; maintaining the quality of the domestic and non-domestic living environments and every determining element associated with them.

The permit to harvest bamboo will have to meet considerations in regard to the time of harvest and the appropriate use of the material. This permit can be obtained and applied for by both krama pengarep and krama roban. Penglipuran community is extremely protective of their bamboo forest. They use their bamboo for all kinds of different reasons, including building materials for home construction, tools to support land cultivation, as well as bamboo appliances to facilitate their daily needs. The latest use nowadays is extended to production of bamboo-based handicrafts to be marketed to tourists and customers from other communities.

Overall, the people of Penglipuran are noted for a warm and welcoming demeanour. They will leave immediate tasks or preoccupations in order to give assistance to visitors. They welcome tourists to walk around their domestic compound as well as outside domestic sphere. But there is a behavioural norm not to be outside the house (at the rurung) after sunset (around 17:00/18:00 depending on the month). They do not object when the Bangli Local Government encourages the village to open their temple, bamboo forest and their homes to visitors. There is always at least one family member around when visitors come to visit the compound, since most of the krama desa earn their living from land cultivation, and the idea of having no one around the house for security reason is not of concern. How this unique social system interacts with tourism to date is next subject to debate.

8. 'Touristification' and Cultural Conservation

The people of Penglipuran seem to embrace tourism with great vigour and an eagerness to show their homes and neighbourhood to visitors. Up to the recent development, they have made their temples available to tourists and opened their pamesuan (home’s gate) to every single person who is curious about the spatial organization of their domesticity and the built environment of their whole settlement. This includes viewing their bamboo forest; demonstrating how they produce their bamboo crafts; and indicating how their folklore informs their ritual practices, burial processions, arts, and dance. Since the introduction of the tourist industry, their rurung gede has been overrun on a daily basis, either by people moving to the north intending to see their Penataran Temple or by those strolling in the other direction to see their cemetery. In between, people walk everywhere including the parallel houses within the karang kerti.
While the *rurung gede* looks well maintained, many Penglipuran households have had little snack and crafts stalls attached immediately inside the *pemexusan* (gate). This is also the usual practice in the neighbouring Bali Aga village of *Tenganan*, another well known *desa wisata*. In the latter case, such a practice has long rised concerns from both within and outside the community. Some say that the accommodation of the encroaching commercial activities within *Tenganan's* homes and public realms have colonised the intrinsic meanings and values traditionally associated with their culture [25]. On the other hand some argue that the *Tenganan* have the capacity to make choices as to the extent that tourism to intrudes into their village. The fact is, as per the case of other communities across the Bali Island, the *Tenganan* also wish to enjoy the economic benefits tourists may bring to the community.

Learning from this scenario, *Penglipuran* homes are likely to adopt the same strategy. Beginning with the sale of refreshments at the front of their homes, the *Penglipuran* people will expand their home-based business by importing tourists merchandise not necessarily produced in *Penglipuran*. This will provide additional income to that earned from land cultivation and production of bamboo crafts and appliances. This is entirely possible, since many *Penglipuran* people also nowadays work in service areas outside the community. At the same time it will weaken the originality of their culture. Over time the same people may accumulate sufficient savings to finance the enlargement of their home’s *warung* (stall). Again we have the *Tenganan* precedent which is well known for their defensive attitude towards their traditions and unique cultural traits. Entering a *Tenganan* home nowadays, one seldom experiences the original ‘place’. Many elements have been hidden by sarongs, statues, handicrafts, and other form of tourist merchandises. We do not need to wait for long for this to happen in *Penglipuran*, particularly when there is currently no mechanism to prevent it.

The people of *Penglipuran* conform to a strict communal schedule in which every *krama desa* has to work together on a weekly basis to clean the neighbourhood. The cleaning and maintenance of ritual places is however done on every *purnama* (full moon) and *tilem* (dark moon) day. At the same time maintaining the practice of their traditions and culture that make the whole settlement a well visited tourist destination is also on the hand of the community. These all are not cost-free duties. On the other hand, one may also argue that tourist development has created jobs for the *Penglipuran* youth, supported *Penglipuran*’s home-based bamboo production, and contributed to the whole social and ritual life of the community. These benefits have been shared by one and all.

Nonetheless, tourists who come for a brief visit, will inevitably impact on local people, bringing new perceptions, aspirations, and behaviour. This is an unavoidable part of the whole process of globalization, as when local people wish to acquire the novelties tourists bring with them, from electronic devices to clothes and other accoutrements. When basic needs are met, as they are in *Penglipuran*, desire becomes the driving force, one that has no set limits. Hence, there is also no limit to the amount of cash that can satisfy it. Every extra rupiah from the flourishing tourism industry becomes the driving force rather than the inherent cultural economy. At present, there is no prohibition to prevent this, apart from each individual’s conscious aspiration to maintain the original state of her/his home and community. However, many queries arise here, including: How much longer will culture, tradition and collective social life prevail over the commodity space of the market mechanism? How can the community truly acquire total control over its own existence and the economic benefits that flow from it? How are the boundaries between community life and tourism desires to be established? Culture is a dynamic process – how are we to distinguish between culture and economy? How much change is too much in terms of tourism either contributing or being destructive to a unique community, such as *Penglipuran*?

The issue of where this whole *desa wisata* development program will be directed is yet to be outlined. Thus, if tourism is to form a sustainable element in community life, all these questions need answered. The responses should arguably be framed equitably both by government and the *krama adat* of *Penglipuran*, and not by a planning bureaucracy driven by urban politics. Such a proposal should be socialized to the targeted communities and well understood by them. Therefore, the idea of tourist
development being a bottom-up and community driven program should be founded on a shared and sound knowledge rather than by financial advantage and foreign exchange. How the tangible and intangible components of the community that generate tourist interests are seen, enjoyed, shared, touched and learned without destroying it in the process, are major concerns in adopting the desa wisata development program.

9. Conclusion

Penglipuran is a microcosm of global forces, national heritage, state revenues and local pride. The latter however does not pay the bills, and in the case of Penglipuran, 60% of funds collected from entries fees contributed by visitors go to local government. A further 20% of it is for the Sekeha Teruna Yowana Bakti (Penglipuran's Youth Association) which is jointly involved in the process of collecting these fees from tourists. The remaining 20% share is for the community. At this point, belief in the idea of a community based equitable system is shattered. Present development everywhere across the Island demonstrates that the desa wisata program is in reality a mechanism to enable local government to collect revenues upon its establishment. Furthermore, the governor has stated that he wants to have 100 villages within this designation. It may be true that this process is a community driven action rather than one imposed by government. But once the destination is set in place by the people, the government steps in and mops up the greatest share of revenue.

This general process is somewhat ubiquitous across Bali Island (and arguably the Indonesian state), one where capital reigns supreme and the mass of the people pay to support it. While the government holds the greatest percentage of collected revenues, daily maintenance and the welfare of the whole settlement and its elements are paid for by the community. In other words any surplus generated and invested by local people is expropriated by the state. In turn, the state acts as caretaker for private capital that directly contributes nothing, yet feeds of the quantum of tourism infrastructure. Abstracting principles from the UNESCO World Heritage Association indicated above, it would appear that Penglipuran must insist on total control over its own cultural assets and their abstraction into commodified tourist items. No government organisation can do this for them. Here we must reflect on a basic principle of capitalism, that is its capacity to destroy the sources of its own success, as it has done with nature (Suartika 2015, Cuthbert and Suartika 2014). So the less outside interference in Penglipuran the better it will be for everyone. This will guarantee that at least in one location, the authenticity of culture and environment will be maintained. After all is this not what tourists come to see?
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