Iqtishaduna: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Jurusan Hukum Ekonomi Syariah
Volume 7 Nomor 1 Juni 2025
P-ISSN: 2615-241X & E-ISSN: 2686-0503
Halaman 29-41

IMPLEMENTATION ASPECT OF LAW NUMBER 11 OF 2010 IN EFFORTS TO IMPROVE THE ECONOMIC WELFARE OF THE COMMUNITY IN RELATION TO THE CONSERVATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE

Erwin Mansyur Ugu Saraka[1], Muhammad Yaasiin Raya[2], Syarifuddin[3]
Universitas Hasanuddin[1], Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar[2],
Institut Agama Islam Negeri Manado[3]
Email: erwin.saraka@unhas.ac.id[1], yasin.raya@uin-alauddin.ac.id[2] ,
syarifuddin@uim-makassar.ac.id[3]

Abstract
The transition from Law Number 5 of 1992 on cultural heritage to Law Number 11 of 2010 occurred because the previous law was deemed no longer aligned with the developments, demands, and legal needs of society. Therefore, a replacement was necessary. Moreover, Law Number 11 of 2010 is more focused on the involvement of the community in the management of cultural heritage. This aspect forms the basis of this research, which aims to examine the implementation of the law in relation to the preservation of cultural heritage for the enhancement of the economy and the well-being of society, as outlined in the articles of the law. Literature studies, legal analysis, and case studies are the methods employed in this research. Data analysis is conducted qualitatively with an inductive approach, alongside explanatory analysis to draw conclusions. As a result, several explanations within the articles of Law Number 11 of 2010 prioritise the enhancement of the economy and the well-being of society, both in terms of the paradigm of cultural heritage preservation and its management as an integrated effort to protect, develop spatial planning (zones), and utilise cultural heritage effectively. Furthermore, efforts to improve the welfare of the community through the management and utilisation of cultural heritage must be proportionate to the efforts made for its preservation.
Keywords: Cultural Heritage, Law, Preservation, Community Welfare

A. INTRODUCTION

Cultural heritage encompasses both tangible (material) and intangible (immaterial) assets possessed by a community or society. These assets are passed down from generation to generation as a result of a selection process undertaken by the community[1]. Broadly, cultural heritage can be understood as the entirety of cultural legacies that hold significant value for history, science, technology, and the arts. Such heritage is not only collectively owned by a particular group, but also evolves dynamically over time. In the legal context, Law No. 11 of 2010 concerning Cultural Heritage, specifically in Chapter 1, Article 1, which outlines general provisions, defines cultural heritage as comprising various elements of cultural

[1] Logan, William S. (2007). "Closing Pandora's Box: Human Rights Conundrums in Cultural Heritage". In Silverman, Helaine; Ruggles, D. Fairchild (eds.). Cultural heritage and human rights. New York, NY: Springer, pp. 3-29.

property. These include artefacts, buildings, structures, sites, and cultural heritage areas, whether located on land or in bodies of water. All of these elements require preservation due to their substantial value for historical and scientific purposes[2]. Therefore, understanding and safeguarding cultural heritage is essential for maintaining the identity and cultural wealth of a society.

In Indonesia, the development of the preservation and utilisation of cultural heritage cannot be separated from the underlying aims and objectives, which are guaranteed through a legal and political framework established by regulations. Regulations concerning cultural heritage have existed since the Dutch colonial era, as evidenced by the policy known as the *Monumenten Ordonantie*, enacted through *Staatsblad* 1931 No. 238 in 1931. This policy emerged as an effort to document and collect ancient relics in the archipelago, a process that had already begun in the mid-17th century.

Further development occurred with the establishment of an archaeological institution in the early 18th century, known as the *Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen*, founded in 1778. This institution became the precursor to the Elephant Museum (now the National Museum) in Jakarta. Thus, the history of these regulations and institutions reflects a sustained commitment to the preservation of cultural heritage in Indonesia, which is an integral part of the nation's identity and history. Moreover, the existence of these regulations and institutions underscores the importance of management based on research and education to ensure that cultural heritage remains relevant to contemporary society

The *Monumenten Ordonantie* of 1931 served as the regulatory and legal foundation for the protection of cultural heritage in Indonesia until the New Order era. Specifically, the Netherlands issued *Monumenten Ordonantie No. 19 of 1931* as the legal basis for safeguarding archaeological artefacts[3]. Although this regulation existed, during the New Order regime, characterised by its pragmatic, materialistic, and economically driven orientation, no clear objectives were established regarding the collection, management, and preservation of cultural heritage based on community participation. As a result, public interest in the management and preservation of cultural heritage objects was limited. Conversely, society's attention was predominantly focused on the commercial exploitation of these artefacts. This shift in focus reflects a lack of appreciation for the historical and cultural value of such heritage, where many individuals preferred to seek personal gain rather than contribute to sustainable preservation efforts. This situation illustrates the significant challenge of raising public awareness about the importance of cultural heritage and the need for responsible management.

On the other hand, during the enforcement of the Monumenten Ordonantie of 1931, several significant steps were taken in the protection of cultural heritage. Various buildings, museums, mosques, and churches were designated as protected cultural heritage objects by the state. This indicates that, despite the challenges, there were still genuine efforts at the institutional level to preserve cultural heritage.

[2] Indonesia, U. U. R. (2010). Cagar budaya. pp. 3-4.

[3] Wibowo, D. A. (2017). Penegakan hukum bagi pelaku kejahatan terhadap benda cagar budaya di kota surakarta. *Wacana Hukum*, p. 23.

Such designations were crucial in ensuring that cultural heritage objects remained safeguarded from the threats of damage and neglect.

Further down the regulatory hierarchy, this legislation extended to the regional level with the issuance of Governor's Decree No. 475/1993 of the Special Capital Region (DKI) of Jakarta on 29 March 1993, which designated several historical buildings as cultural heritage objects. One example is the Candra Naya building, which was included in the list of cultural heritage buildings in DKI Jakarta under serial number 30. This designation was an enhancement of Governor's Decree No. CB 11/1/12/27, issued on 10 January 1972[4]. The process of designation, involving public officials and relevant agencies, reflects a collaborative effort to protect cultural heritage, marking an important step towards improved cultural heritage management in Indonesia.

Following the end of the New Order era, the Indonesian government issued new regulations regarding cultural heritage, namely Law No. 5 of 1992 on Cultural Heritage Objects. This law replaced the earlier regulation, *Monumenten Ordonantie No. 19 of 1931*, established during the Dutch colonial period[5]. As the first heritage law enacted after independence, the purpose of this legislation was to preserve cultural heritage by reaffirming the state's responsibility for the protection, development, and utilisation of such heritage.

In Law No. 5 of 1992, the concept of cultural heritage is not explicitly defined; however, it is clear that cultural preservation involves efforts that are primarily focused on static protection. This is evident in the strict limitations placed on development and utilisation activities deemed potentially harmful to cultural heritage. While this regulation establishes important measures for safeguarding cultural heritage, the approach taken is more centred on conservative protection and does not provide room for innovation in its management. Although the preservation efforts undertaken by the government are positive steps, this regulation is still lacking in terms of community involvement. All preservation efforts appear to be more oriented towards government policies, with the government as the primary decision-maker, while public participation in the development and utilisation of cultural heritage has yet to be fully optimised. Therefore, it is crucial for the government to explore more inclusive approaches, where the community can play an active role in the preservation and utilisation of cultural heritage, ensuring that preservation is sustainable and beneficial for society.

On 24 November 2010, Law No. 5 of 1992 was replaced by Law No. 11 of 2010 on Cultural Heritage. This change reflects the need to adapt regulations to social developments, public demands, and legal requirements that are more relevant in the modern era. Prior to this, three years earlier, Law No. 5 of 2017 had been enacted, focusing on the advancement of culture, particularly concerning intangible cultural heritage.

The transition from Law No. 5 of 1992 to Law No. 11 of 2010 indicates that the previous law was deemed inadequate for addressing emerging issues in the context of cultural heritage preservation. Law No. 5 of 1992 tended to give the

[4] Widayati, N. (2003) p. 89

[5] Eryudhawan, B. (2017). Urban Conservation in Jakarta since 1968. *SPAFA Journal*, *1*. p. 20

impression that the development and utilisation of cultural heritage objects could threaten their preservation if not managed strictly. This created a tension between the concept of preservation and the practices of development or utilisation, which could potentially damage cultural heritage. With the enactment of Law No. 11 of 2010, it is hoped that a better balance will be achieved between the preservation and development of cultural heritage. This regulation is designed to accommodate the need for more holistic management, where the utilisation of cultural heritage is not only permitted but also directed to support its preservation. Therefore, it is crucial for both the government and the public to collaborate in formulating strategies that can ensure cultural heritage remains relevant and beneficial for future generations.

Furthermore, Law No. 11 of 2010 places greater emphasis on efforts to improve the welfare of society through various aspects of cultural heritage preservation. This focus constitutes the primary objective of this research, which aims to analyse the implementation of the provisions within the law, particularly the articles it contains. It is important to note that the regulations dating back to the Dutch colonial era, as well as those established by the current government, have yet to fully accommodate active public participation in preservation efforts.

The lack of attention to public involvement indicates that cultural heritage preservation efforts remain top-down, where decisions are made by the government without incorporating the voices of the community. This is unfortunate, given that the communities residing around heritage sites are the ones most directly affected by the existing policies. By involving them, it would not only strengthen awareness of the importance of preservation, but also open opportunities for economic growth and the overall well-being of the community.

Therefore, this study seeks to examine the extent to which Law No. 11 of 2010 can encourage a more inclusive and sustainable management and utilisation of cultural heritage. On one hand, cultural heritage preservation must be able to provide economic benefits to local communities, while on the other hand, community participation in management will foster a sense of ownership and responsibility for their cultural heritage. Through a more participatory approach, it is hoped that a synergy will emerge between heritage preservation and the improvement of community welfare.

B. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research was conducted using a literature study method, which involved a series of activities related to the collection of reference data, reading, note-taking, and managing research materials relevant to the case and issues being addressed. A legislative review method was also employed to examine the development of regulations regarding cultural heritage, as well as case studies on the implementation of cultural heritage laws. During this research process, the collected data were then analysed qualitatively using an inductive approach. The analysis was conducted by presenting a range of data directly, which was then explained in an explanatory manner to reach a holistic conclusion. The focus of the analysis is on the implementation of the law in the context of efforts to improve community welfare. Thus, this research aims not only to evaluate existing regulations but also

to provide recommendations that can support more effective cultural heritage management, which benefits society.

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Law No. 11 of 2010 on Cultural Heritage consists of 13 chapters and 120 articles, along with their explanations, covering various aspects related to cultural heritage. This law regulates general provisions, principles, objectives, and scope; criteria for cultural heritage; ownership and control; discovery and excavation; the national cultural heritage list; preservation; duties and authority; funding; supervision and investigation; criminal provisions; transitional provisions; and closing provisions. Furthermore, to implement this law, regulations have been extended to the regional level, both at the provincial and district/city levels, through the issuance of regional regulations governing the preservation and management of cultural heritage.

Although the objectives of implementation in each province may vary and are tailored to the specific conditions and needs of each region, this reflects an effort to adapt the regulations to the diverse local contexts. Additionally, a direct derivative of the Cultural Heritage Law can be seen in Government Regulation No. 66 of 2015 on Museums, which was enacted to implement the provisions of Article 18, paragraph (5) of the Law. This regulation is essential for ensuring that museum management is conducted effectively within the context of cultural heritage preservation. More recently, Government Regulation No. 1 of 2022 has addressed various aspects of cultural heritage preservation, including registration, preservation, area management, incentives and compensation, supervision, and funding[6]. This underscores the government's commitment to enhancing the effectiveness of cultural heritage preservation in Indonesia.

A significant change in Law No. 11 of 2010 on Cultural Heritage can be seen in the effort to improve the welfare of society and its involvement in all activities related to cultural heritage, which was previously not accommodated by earlier regulations. This change embodies the mandate of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, specifically in Articles 20, 21, 32, paragraph (1)[7], and 33, paragraph (3)[8]. This is reflected in the implementation of various articles and explanations within the law.

1. Paradigm of Cultural Heritage Preservation

In point D of the recitals of Law No. 11 of 2010 on Cultural Heritage, it is emphasised that:

---

[6] **Peraturan Pemerintah (PP) tentang Register Nasional dan Pelestarian Cagar Budaya** was issued on 3rd January 2022 in the Official Gazette No. 1/2022, Supplement No. 6756. Available at: jdih.setneg.go.id; p. 89

[7] **Article 32, paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia** mandates that "The state advances the national culture of Indonesia in the midst of world civilisation, guaranteeing the freedom of the people to preserve and develop their cultural values." (Indonesia, P.R. (2003). Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia.

[8] Article 33, paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution, which states: "The earth, water, and the natural resources contained therein are controlled by the state and are used for the greatest prosperity of the people" (DECISION No. 58/PUU-VI/2008, mkri.id was first indexed by Google in May 2017)

> ""With the shift in the paradigm of cultural heritage preservation, a balance between ideological, academic, ecological, and economic aspects is required in order to enhance the welfare of the people."

This paradigm shift considers various aspects, with the primary goal of enhancing community welfare. More deeply, this change is inseparable from the evolution in the field of archaeology, particularly with the emergence of the concept of cultural resource management (CRM). This concept emphasises the importance of sustainable and responsible management of cultural heritage, with a focus on benefiting society[9]. In the context of cultural resource management, community involvement becomes a key consideration in heritage management. This aspect is crucial, especially in efforts to improve the local economy, both for those directly involved with cultural heritage and for those indirectly affected. By involving the community, heritage management not only focuses on conservation but also creates economic opportunities that can enhance overall welfare.

Therefore, an inclusive and participatory approach to cultural resource management is expected to yield dual benefits: preserving cultural heritage while empowering local communities. This is crucial to ensure that communities are not merely spectators, but active participants in the preservation of their cultural heritage, which in turn can support local economic development and improve their quality of life.

The paradigm of cultural heritage preservation is currently undergoing a significant transformation, where utilisation no longer serves merely as a means of protection but also as a tool to support sustainable development. Within this framework, community welfare is integrated into the preservation process, making it a holistic approach that differs from the previous paradigm, which tended to focus solely on protection[10]. This shift in the definition of "preservation" moves the focus from a narrow protective duty to a system that combines protection, utilisation, and development into an inseparable whole. Consequently, the responsibility for cultural heritage preservation is increasingly being allocated to the community. This is important because involving the community is expected to enhance their active participation in safeguarding and managing cultural heritage, as well as strengthening the connection between preservation and local welfare[11].

Furthermore, in Article 3 of Law No. 11 of 2010 on Cultural Heritage, one of the objectives of preservation is explained in point (d) as follows:

a) To preserve the cultural heritage of the nation and the heritage of humanity.

---

[9] Chandra, D., & Hum, S. (2018). Mitigasi Bencana dalam Konteks Pelestarian Cagar Budaya. *Indonesiana Flatform Kebudayaan*. p. 1

[10] Sujana, A. (2017). Adaptasi Bangunan Cagar Budaya Perspektif Indonesia. In *Seminar Ikatan Peneliti Lingkungan Binaan Indonesia (IPLBI)* (Vol. 1, pp. 083-090).h 89

[11] Sapto, A., & Mashuri, M. (2015). Pengembangan Wisata Terpadu Berbasis Cagar Budaya. *Jurnal Sejarah dan Budaya*, *8*(2). p. 5

b) To enhance the dignity and honour of the nation through Cultural Heritage.
c) To strengthen the national identity.
d) To improve the welfare of the people; and
e) To promote the nation's cultural heritage to the international community.

The paradigm shift in cultural heritage preservation highlights a primary focus on community involvement, particularly in the context of enhancing welfare. This should be understood and applied by all parties involved, including researchers, preservationists, and tourism sector developers. By actively engaging various stakeholders, cultural heritage preservation can become more effective and impactful.

Furthermore, this change is in line with the provisions outlined in Article 3, point (d) of the Cultural Heritage Law, which emphasises that one of the main objectives of cultural heritage preservation is to improve the welfare of the people. Therefore, community involvement is not merely an additional aspect, but a crucial element that must be integrated into every step of the preservation process.

2. Cultural Heritage Management

The concept of management in the new law can be found in Article 1, General Provisions, point 23, which defines that:

> "Cultural heritage management is an integrated effort to protect, develop, and utilise cultural heritage through the regulation of planning, implementation, and supervision to enhance the welfare of the society."

Cultural heritage management is closely linked to efforts in protection, development, and utilisation. This process involves various stages of planning and implementation, followed by continuous supervision, all aimed at achieving the primary goal: the welfare of the people. This underscores the importance of involving the community in every aspect of cultural heritage management, while still considering the overarching goal of serving the public good. Every form of management that is planned must always prioritise the welfare of the community as an integral component. In this context, active community participation not only enriches the management process but also ensures that the outcomes of such management can provide tangible benefits to their lives. By involving the community, cultural heritage management can be carried out in a way that is more responsive to local needs and aspirations.

A study conducted by Nurcahyo (2015) on cultural heritage management in the city of Sawahlunto indicates that there are still weaknesses in aspects such as planning, organisation, implementation, and supervision. This highlights the need to enhance synergy in cultural heritage management, involving all stakeholders, and, most importantly, ensuring that the community is involved from the planning stage through to evaluation. Community involvement in cultural heritage management today is aimed at ensuring that these efforts provide tangible benefits to the welfare of the people living around the heritage sites, as they are the rightful owners of these cultural legacies.

Furthermore, Mulyadi (2014) emphasises that the success of cultural heritage management is highly dependent on active community involvement. Every initiative in cultural heritage management must be designed with the goal of having a positive impact on the welfare of the community. If a management effort fails to deliver benefits to the community, it can be considered a failure in its implementation[12]. Thus, an inclusive and participatory approach is key to creating effective and sustainable cultural heritage management, where the community is not merely an object but also a subject in the process. It is crucial for all parties involved to understand that cultural heritage management is not just an administrative task, but a collaborative effort aimed at empowering the community and preserving cultural heritage. Through active community involvement, cultural heritage management is expected to achieve the desired success and provide lasting benefits for the local community.

Therefore, it is essential to understand and implement cultural heritage management clearly and sustainably, involving the community at every stage—from planning and implementation to evaluation—in accordance with the provisions set out in Article 1, point 23 of the Cultural Heritage Law. Community involvement not only strengthens the management process but also ensures that their needs and aspirations are effectively accommodated. Furthermore, the improvement of community welfare should serve as the primary benchmark for assessing the success of cultural heritage management. If the management effort leads to tangible positive impacts on the welfare of the community, it reflects the effectiveness and success of the applied strategy. Thus, cultural heritage management should not solely focus on protection and conservation, but also aim at community empowerment, which in turn strengthens the relationship between cultural heritage and the local community.

3. Utilisation of Cultural Heritage

The utilisation of cultural heritage is an integral aspect of its preservation, wherein cultural heritage is leveraged to provide benefits to the community. This highlights that cultural heritage is not merely viewed as an object to be protected, but also as a resource that holds the principle of utility. In the Cultural Heritage Law No. 11 of 2010, the principle of utility is outlined in Article 2, as explained

> "The 'principle of utility' refers to the idea that the preservation of cultural heritage can be used to promote the welfare of the people, particularly in areas such as religion, social affairs, education, science, technology, culture, and tourism."

Cultural heritage sites hold significant potential for utilisation across various cultural sectors, including religion, social affairs, education, science, technology, and tourism. When managed with a focus on preservation, the utilisation of these sites can bring positive outcomes for local communities,

[12] Mulyadi, Y. (2014). Pemanfaatan Cagar Budaya Dalam Perspektif Akademik dan Peraturan Perundang-undangan. *Makalah untuk kegiatan Sosialisasi Undang-Undang*, (11). p. 1

particularly in terms of economic growth. For example, heritage sites in Bali have made a substantial contribution to the local economy. In Bali, the sustainable use of cultural heritage has proven to have a positive impact on the tourism sector. Every year, the number of visitors, both domestic and international, continues to rise, making Bali one of Indonesia's leading tourist destinations. This not only boosts the local economy but also contributes to the long-term welfare of the Balinese people.

Another example is the use of the Borobudur Temple, which has contributed to the local economy through the involvement of communities in managing tourism, particularly through homestay initiatives. The model of utilising heritage sites for community welfare should be grounded in the principles of preservation and the cultivation of local historical awareness. One way to achieve this is by organising events such as the city's anniversary celebrations, which highlight the significant values of local history, architecture, and enduring cultural traditions. Through this approach, the use of cultural heritage not only brings economic benefits but also strengthens the identity and cultural consciousness of the community towards their heritage[13].

Furthermore, in addition to the principle of "usefulness", the utilisation of cultural heritage is also outlined in Article 1, point 33, which states:

> "Utilisation refers to the use of Cultural Heritage for the greatest possible benefit of the people, while maintaining its preservation."

While the utilization of cultural heritage aims to enhance community welfare, it is crucial to maintain a focus on the preservation aspect. Any efforts to make use of cultural heritage must prioritize its sustainability. The benefits derived from cultural heritage for the public should go hand in hand with conservation efforts, ensuring they reinforce each other. Moreover, cultural heritage can also serve as a valuable resource for research and advancing knowledge. For instance, the Maros Pangkep prehistoric site, home to the world's oldest known rock art[14], the Sangiran archaeological site, a global research hub[15], which plays a key role in heritage conservation studies in Indonesia, all contribute to this. Through research, we can not only expand our understanding of history and culture but also develop improved strategies for preserving cultural heritage for future generations. In this way, the utilization of cultural heritage provides not only economic benefits but also enhances scholarly knowledge and contributes to the safeguarding of cultural heritage.

---

[13] Suprapta, B. (2016). Model pemanfaatan cagar budaya untuk kesejahteraan masyarakat studi kasus Event Malang Kembali. *Jurnal Sejarah dan Budaya*, *10*(1), 11-30. p. 27.

[14] Aubert, M., Brumm, A., Ramli, M., Sutikna, T., Saptomo, E. W., Hakim, B., ... & Dosseto, A. (2014). Pleistocene cave art from Sulawesi, Indonesia. *Nature*, *514*(7521), p. 223-227. Based largely on the emergence of figurative or representational art in cave paintings and sculptures around 40,000 years ago.

[15] Dennell, R. W. (2001). From Sangiran to Olduvai, 1937–1960: The quest for "centres" of hominid origins in Asia and Africa.

4. Spatial Planning (Zoning) of Cultural Heritage Areas

Article 73 of the Cultural Heritage Law, particularly in point 4, explains the significant role of spatial planning (zoning)[16] as an opportunity to enhance the well-being of the community[17],

1) The zoning system regulates the use of space in Cultural Heritage areas, both vertically and horizontally.
2) Vertical zoning can be applied to the natural environment above cultural heritage sites, both on land and/or in water.
3) The zoning system referred to in paragraph (1) may consist of:
   a. core zone;
   b. buffer zone;
   c. development zone; and/or
   d. support zone.
4) The determination of the area, layout, and function of each zone is based on a study, prioritising opportunities to improve the welfare of the people.

As an example of implementation, the management model of Ngawen Temple has been developed with a spatial approach based on zoning and the distribution of existing potentials in Ngawen Village. This model aims to empower the local community by utilising local potential, thereby improving the welfare of the people of Ngawen Village while preserving the Ngawen Temple[18]. The application of zoning for community welfare enhancement is also evident in the zoning analysis for the development centre of Majapahit Village. In this case, the area is divided into several zones, including Jatipasar Village and Sentonorejo Village, which function as buffer villages to support the tourism infrastructure of Majapahit Village. The macro development guidelines provide general direction for the three zones to mutually support and connect with tourism activities, creating synergy that benefits the entire area.

Moreover, the creation of zoning serves as an alternative solution to address the challenges of cultural heritage conservation. For instance, the Banda Aceh City Government has implemented a community development programme around the tomb sites in Banda Aceh to ensure the sustainability of preservation efforts while empowering the local community. Thus, the role of zoning in spatial planning is crucial for enhancing the welfare of the

[16] Zonasi cagar budaya memiliki tujuan utama untuk menetukan wilayah situs serta mengatur atau mengendalikan setiap kegiatan yang dapat dilakukan dalam setiap zona. Penetapan wilayah-wilayah zonasi mengacu pada nilai arkeologis dan keaslian lingkungan masa lalu yang merupakan satu kesatuan pada masanya (https://kebudayaan.kemdikbud.go.id/bpcbbali/) diakses 2 juli 2024 pukul 21.45 WITA

[17] Undang Undang Cagar Budaya nomo 11 tahun 2010. h. 76

[18] WIDIASARI, A. (2020). *MODEL PENGELOLAAN CANDI NGAWEN BERBASIS PEMBERDAYAAN MASYARAKAT* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Gadjah Mada).

community, while simultaneously safeguarding and maintaining the integrity of existing cultural heritage sites.

D. CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion above, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The transition from Law No. 5 of 1992 concerning Cultural Heritage Objects to Law No. 11 of 2010 concerning Cultural Heritage introduces a new approach to the preservation of cultural heritage in Indonesia. The previous law primarily focused on the protection, management, and utilization of cultural heritage, with a government-centric approach. In contrast, the new law emphasizes the active participation of local communities in the preservation process, with a focus on enhancing both their economic prosperity and overall welfare, whether they are directly involved with cultural heritage or not.
2. The application of Law No. 11 of 2010 in boosting the economy and welfare of local communities is reflected in several articles within the law. These articles are explained in detail and can be grouped into four broad categories: the preservation paradigm for cultural heritage, the management of cultural heritage, the utilization of cultural heritage, and the spatial planning (zoning) of cultural heritage areas.
3. Although the enhancement of welfare and economic development is integrated into Law No. 11 of 2010, it is crucial to emphasize that the management and utilization of cultural heritage aimed at improving community welfare must always align with conservation efforts. This is vital to ensure that both objectives support each other, rather than conflicting, thus ensuring the long-term sustainability of cultural heritage and the well-being of local communities.

REFERENCES

Theses and Dissertations:

NURCAHYO, N. T. (2015). *Evaluasi Pengelolaan Cagar Budaya Kota Tambang Sawahlunto* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Gadjah Mada).

Wedatama, A. A., & Mardiansjah, F. H. (2018). Pengembangan Homestay Berbasis Masyarakat dan Pemanfaatan teknologi Informasi pada Kampung Homestay Borobudur.

WIDIASARI, A. (2020). *MODEL PENGELOLAAN CANDI NGAWEN BERBASIS PEMBERDAYAAN MASYARAKAT* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Gadjah Mada).

Journal:

Aliflyantera, J. (2016). *Arahan Pengembangan "Kampung Majapahit" sebagai Desa Wisata pada Kawasan Cagar Budaya Kecamatan Trowulan, Kabupaten Mojokerto* (Doctoral dissertation, Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember Surabaya).

Aubert, M., Brumm, A., Ramli, M., Sutikna, T., Saptomo, E. W., Hakim, B., ... & Dosseto, A. (2014). Pleistocene cave art from Sulawesi, Indonesia. *Nature*, *514*(7521), 223-227.

Chandra, D., & Hum, S. (2018). Mitigasi Bencana dalam Konteks Pelestarian Cagar Budaya. *Indonesiana Flatform Kebudayaan*.

Dennell, R. W. (2001). From Sangiran to Olduvai, 1937–1960: The quest for "centres" of hominid origins in Asia and Africa.

Eryudhawan, B. (2017). Urban Conservation in Jakarta since 1968. *SPAFA Journal*, *1*.

Hastuti, N. T. (2002). HUKUM CAGAR BUDAYA DAN KORESPONDENSINYA DENGAN PERLINDUNGAN BANGUNAN PENINGGALAN KOLONIAL BELANDA DI INDONESIA. *Perspektif*, *7*(4), 231-238.

Mulyadi, Y. (2014). Pemanfaatan Cagar Budaya Dalam Perspektif Akademik dan Peraturan Perundang-undangan. *Makalah untuk kegiatan Sosialisasi Undang-Undang*, (11).

Qadri, F., & Sufyan, S. (2021). KEWENANGAN PEMERINTAH KOTA BANDA ACEH DALAM PELESTARIAN MAKAM YANG TELAH DITETAPKAN SEBAGAI CAGAR BUDAYA. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Bidang Hukum Kenegaraan*, *5*(4), 253-262.

Sapto, A., & Mashuri, M. (2015). Pengembangan Wisata Terpadu Berbasis Cagar Budaya. *Jurnal Sejarah dan Budaya*, *8*(2).

Sidiq, S. S., & Huda, A. (2015). *Pengelolaan Fasilitas Objek Wisata Cagar Budaya Makam Raja Kecik Di Desa Buantan Besar Kabupaten Siak* (Doctoral dissertation, Riau University).

Silverman, H., & Ruggles, D. F. (2007). Cultural heritage and human rights. In *Cultural heritage and human rights* (pp. 3-29). Springer, New York, NY.

Sujana, A. (2017). Adaptasi Bangunan Cagar Budaya Perspektif Indonesia. In *Seminar Ikatan Peneliti Lingkungan Binaan Indonesia (IPLBI)* (Vol. 1, pp. 083-090).

Suprapta, B. (2016). Model pemanfaatan cagar budaya untuk kesejahteraan masyarakat studi kasus Event Malang Kembali. *Jurnal Sejarah dan Budaya*, *10*(1), 11-30.

Wibowo, D. A. (2017). Penegakan hukum bagi pelaku kejahatan terhadap benda cagar budaya di kota surakarta. *Wacana Hukum*, *23*(1).

Widayati, N. (2003). Candra Naya antara Kejayaan Masa Lalu dan Kenyataan Sekarang (Hasil Penelitian tahun 1994-1998). *DIMENSI: Journal of Architecture and Built Environment*, *31*(2).

Legislation:

Indonesia, P. R. (2003). Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia.

Indonesia, R., & Indonesia, P. R. (1992). Undang Undang No. 5 Tahun 1992 Tentang: Benda Cagar Budaya. *Lembaran Negara RI Tahun*.

Indonesia, U. U. R. (2010). Cagar budaya. Undang Undang No. 11 Tahun 2010 tentang Cagar Budaya.

Nomor, Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia. "tahun 2015 tentang Museum." (66).

PUTUSAN Nomor 58/PUU-VI/2008 mkri.id

Website:

https://kebudayaan.kemdikbud.go.id/bpcbbali/) “tentang zonasi cagar budaya ” diakses 2 juli 2024 pukul 21.45.