Waves of Destruction
Concerning the Impact and Management of Surf Tourism in Indonesia:
A Comparison between Lombok and the Mentawai Islands

Master Thesis Asian Studies
Robin R.D. Schwidder
1433857
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. G.A. Persoon
Second Reader: Prof. Dr. D.A.F. Henley
IV – II – MMXVI
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. **Introduction** ........................................................................................................................................... 3

2. **Theoretical Framework** ................................................................................................................................. 5
   2.1 Tourism in Developing Countries .................................................................................................................. 5
      2.1.1 Transnational Spatial Relations & The Tourism Industry ................................................................. 5
      2.1.2 Commodification of Nature & Culture ................................................................................................ 6
      2.1.3 The Impact of Tourism .................................................................................................................... 7
      2.1.4 The Life Cycle of Tourism .............................................................................................................. 10
   2.2 Sustainable Tourism .................................................................................................................................. 12
   2.3 Co-Management of Natural Resources .................................................................................................... 14

3. **Methodology** .................................................................................................................................................. 15

4. **Surf Tourism** .................................................................................................................................................. 16
   4.1 The Rise .................................................................................................................................................... 16
   4.2 Current Situation ..................................................................................................................................... 17
   4.3 Sustainable Surf Tourism .......................................................................................................................... 18
   4.4 The Excesses ........................................................................................................................................... 19

5. **Case Studies** .................................................................................................................................................... 20
   5.1 Surf Tourism in Indonesia ......................................................................................................................... 20
   5.2 Lombok .................................................................................................................................................... 21
      5.2.1 The History of (Surf) Tourism on Lombok ....................................................................................... 22
      5.2.2 The Current Surf Tourism Industry ................................................................................................. 23
      5.2.3 The Sasak & Adat ............................................................................................................................ 24
      5.2.4 Sustainable Tourism & Co-Management ........................................................................................ 25
   5.3 The Mentawai Islands ................................................................................................................................. 26
      5.3.1 The History of (Surf) Tourism on Mentawai .................................................................................... 27
      5.3.2 The Current Tourist Industry & Crowding ....................................................................................... 28
      5.3.3 The Mentawaians & Waves ............................................................................................................. 30
5.3.4 Co-Management & the Inclusion of the Locals .............................................. 31
5.4 A Comparison between Lombok & the Mentawai Islands ......................... 33
   5.4.1 Similarities and Differences ................................................................. 33
   5.4.2 Coastal & Marine Tourism Management in Indonesia ....................... 36
6. Conclusion & Discussion ............................................................................. 36
   6.1 Limitations ........................................................................................... 38
7. Bibliography .............................................................................................. 39
1. Introduction

In recent decades, due to globalization, enhanced mobility, and financial freedom in the developed world, there has been an enormous rise of tourism in Indonesia (Harvey 1999; Urry 1990; Harrison 2001). Fuelled by the distant, exotic, and uncrowded waves especially surf tourism is booming and entire coastal areas are transformed to surf enclaves (Mach 2009). Hence, surf tourism is becoming increasingly important in developing countries throughout the world. Indonesia in particular is the best-known, longest lived and highest-volume destination for surf tourism in the developing world with the world’s richest surf fields offering some of the world’s best surfing opportunities (Buckley 2002a; Ponting et al. 2005). Consequently, surfing is nowadays the single most popular water sport in Indonesia (Ardianto 2013). Moreover, another important development that can spur interest in, and popularize surfing among an even wider audience is its current addition to the 2020 Olympic Games in Tokyo (British Broadcasting Corporation 2015). The rise of surf tourism can create significant opportunities for economic growth in these developing countries, including employment opportunities and economic diversification for the local communities. For instance, tourism promotes local development by providing alternatives to a subsistence economy and increases income and standard of living. In addition, surf tourism has the potential to create major cultural, economic and environmental impact that can help conserve native plants, animal habitats, and traditional cultures (Buckley 2002a).

However, as traveling surfers continue to expand their horizon to the most remote places on earth in search for the best waves, they too often have a negative influence on the environment and local communities. The islands are vulnerable environments often confronted with overcrowding leading to the exploitation of resources and huge environmental costs such as the damaging of reef breaks endangering fish species and the pollution of water in general. The islands often contain rich, endemic flora and fauna which can be harmed as well. In addition, local communities are often overlooked and lack any input into the tourism industry as local elites and outside entrepreneurs quickly monopolies the surf tourism operations and related businesses. Hence, there is an unequal distribution of income in the surf destinations which has often resulted in the degradation of social cohesion in these communities and mismanagement of surf tourism in the past has in some destinations resulted in significant deleterious impacts on host communities (Hughes-Dit-Ciles 2009; O’Brien & Ponting 2013).

In the following thesis I will analyse the impact of surf tourism and how it is managed in two different destinations, namely the Mentawai Islands, in the West of Indonesia, and Lombok, in the East of Indonesia. In recent decades, both surf destinations have rapidly grown and, due to the availability of high, consistent and relatively uncrowded waves, they offer the potential for even further growth. Hence, I have come to three research questions that will form the basis of this thesis:

- **What is the impact of surf tourism on Lombok and the Mentawai Islands, Indonesia?**
- **In which aspects do Lombok and the Mentawai Islands, Indonesia differ from each other?**
How is surf tourism on Lombok and the Mentawai Islands, Indonesia managed?

I will try to answer these questions using three theoretical notions in particular. First of all, I will start with the Life Cycle Model of Tourism posited by Butler (1980) which addresses the current stage of tourism in a certain destination and to some extent predicts its future. A second theoretical notion that I will use is the idea of sustainable tourism that can be described as a counter-movement opposed to conventional mass tourism. It is responsible travel focused both on development and conservation of the environment and the well-being of the local people (Dorsey et al. 2004). Through the model posited by Butler (1980) I will be able to analyse the current state of the tourism industry and the potential for sustainable tourism. A third theoretical approach that I will use is the idea of co-management of natural resources. Especially in the field of coastal tourism poor management has often led to deleterious outcomes (Purwaka 2001). Co-management entails that the distribution of rights and responsibilities for management (including exploitation and conservation) are shared among government and individual or collective users (Persoon et al. 2003). On the one hand, this can lead to a better conservation of the environment by including all the relevant stakeholders and making them responsible. On the other hand, it can empower and involve the local indigenous populations by acknowledging their rights and local values. In this thesis I will analyse to what extent the co-management approach is already part of the current tourism industry in Lombok and The Mentawai Islands and what kind of value its implementation can have.

Hence, this thesis will start with a broad, extensive theoretical framework analysing and elaborating on the three theoretical notions mentioned. Subsequently, I will discuss the methodology that I will use to answer my research questions. Moreover, I will give an analysis of surf tourism in general, its rise, the current situation, and its impact. The next section of my thesis will focus on surf tourism specifically in Indonesia. In this section I will also discuss the aforementioned case studies of Lombok and The Mentawai Islands. I will discuss the specific history of (surf) tourism in these areas, the current situation, the role of the indigenous peoples, and the value that the implementation of sustainable tourism and co-management could have on these surf destination. Furthermore, I will compare the two destinations in which I will discuss what the biggest similarities and differences between the two destinations are. Finally, in my conclusion I will try to answer the research questions posed and discuss the limitations and strengths of this thesis.
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In the theoretical framework I will discuss the most important theoretical concepts concerning sustainable surf tourism. First, I will address the general notion of tourism in developing countries. I will discuss this by taking into account transnational spatial relations and ongoing globalization, the commodification of nature and culture, three different kinds of impacts caused by tourism, and the life cycle of tourism posited by Butler (198). Thereafter, I will focus on the idea of sustainable tourism incorporating the notion of sustainable development and sustainable consumption. At last I will discuss the co-management approach in-depth.

2.1 TOURISM IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Tourism in general and in developing countries especially, has an important contribution to economic growth and economic development. For a great number of people it has become one of the most important means of income. However, tourism does not only have an economic influence on host communities, it can also have social, cultural and environmental influences, which are often negative (Yang et al. 2013). Especially in remote, vulnerable areas tourism can have deleterious impacts.

2.1.1 TRANSNATIONAL SPATIAL RELATIONS & THE TOURISM INDUSTRY

An important characteristic of tourism is the ongoing notion of globalization. According to Castells (2011) globalization is one of the most important features of our time influencing and shaping the lives of locals making them intrinsically part of a global context. Therefore, it is important to analyse these spatial relationships in order to understand how things work in a local context (Pletsch 1981). The local and the global are thus inherently interlinked and what happens at one pole can have a big and direct influence on the other (Friedland & Boden 1994).

In line with this Harvey (1989) describes the world of today as a world in which both space and time have been compressed. Nowadays we live in a spaceless space and timeless time (Castells 2011). Due to technological innovations such as the Internet, airplanes, mass media and telephones the whole world has shrunk in proportions and it has become easier to visit remote places at the other side of the world. However, this notion of globalization can be seen as a paradox: The world has become smaller and larger at the same time (Friedman 1990). On the one hand, it has become smaller in that you can travel anywhere in less than 24 hours, on the other hand, it has become larger in the sense that through the Internet and mass media we know more about exotic and remote places “and thus more easily recognize our mutual differences” (Eriksen 2010). Both facets of this paradox have caused the rise of one industry in particular: The tourist industry. Due to the increasing demystification of our lives we want to experience something different from our own daily experience, something ‘exotic’ and authentic, and technological innovations such as the airplane have made these authentic places more available and accessible (Rex 1974). Thus, in recent years, the number of tourists travelling abroad has already passed the 1
billion mark (Eriksen 2010). The thing that makes the tourism industry a special industry is that it brings the local and global context together. The tourism sector provides a service instead of a product; therefore, the consumer has to be present at the place where the product is produced encountering and influencing the local context (Hall & Lew 2009). Therefore, it is important to focus on the local-global nexus and its dynamics. This can be done through a place-based approach that necessarily considers how the local responds to the engines of globalization (Biersack 2006: 19). Hence, place is inherently relational never sealed from an outside beyond and to study place is to “move from hermetically sealed sites of autonomy to relational spaces of connection and articulation” (Moore 1998: 81).

2.1.2 COMMODIFICATION OF NATURE & CULTURE

Following World War II a new kind of society began to emerge with new kinds of consumption practices, "a new moment of late, consumer capitalism" (Jameson 1985: 204). One aspect of this rise of consumer capitalism is tourism, which the academic world started to address from the 70s and 80s "as expressions of postmodernist rather than modernist culture" (Uriely 1997: 983). Aspects of postmodern tourism are: "[T]he growing attraction of nostalgia and "heritage tourism", the flourishing of nature oriented tourism and the increase of simulated tourism-related environments" (ibid.). Unknown, ‘exotic’ cultures and beautiful nature have been commoditized and maintained and gained a certain value by attracting tourists from all over the world. As already mentioned in section 2.1.1, a new desire has arisen to tour the distant, exotic, and unknown (Urry 1990). Thus, differences and "Otherness" have become consumable tourism commodities and there is a tendency of the commodification of local resources (Cole 2007; Biersack 18: 2006). "Commodification is the process by which objects and activities come to be evaluated primarily in terms of their exchange value in the context of trade, in addition to any use-value that such commodities might have" (Watson & Kopachevsky 1994: 646). Nowadays, everything has acquired a price and a monetary form making everything for sale including humans and nature (Nevins & Peluso 2008: 14-15). This commodification of goods in which everything is objectified, is something that is experienced in the whole social realm and thus also entails tourism. People use certain goods to construct a certain cultural and social identity and thus tourism has become an objectified mean to be part of this identity (Miller 1995). This resonates well with Rex’ notion of a world where everyone is alienated due to demystification and modernity and that a way to deal with this feeling of alienation is through the adventure industry to get a certain kick (1974). Combining this with a wealthier life, financial freedom and technological innovations leading to enhanced mobility in especially the developed world, this has led to a flourishing tourism industry (Harrison 2001). In addition, in the academic literature tourism is to some extent described as a new form of neo-colonialism in which wealthy nations project their desires onto less developed nations. “As a result, tourist destinations become ‘tourist spaces’, defined by their ability to attract customers” (Dorsey et al. 2004: 756). In the literature this is to a great extent seen as a bad thing in which the local community is dominated and marginalized by outsiders (Watson & Kopachevsky 1994). Therefore, it is essential to balance the needs of the guests and the hosts, and to allow the local communities to define their own priorities (Hitchner et al. 2009: 198).
2.1.3 THE IMPACT OF TOURISM

According to Hall & Lew (2009) the impact of tourism can be defined as changes ‘in a given state’ related to tourism over time and this can be either for the good or the bad. What makes tourism impacts special is that, due to its diffuse nature, it is not only about the direct tangible effects of a specific tourist event. On the contrary, “[i]mpacts emerge in the form of altered human behaviour, which stems from the interactions between the agents of change and the sub-systems they impinge” (Mathieson & Wall 1982: 14). Consequently, this makes it hard to measure the impact of tourism. Another aspect of tourism impact that contributes to the latter is that its evaluation is often depended on value judgements contested by different stakeholders. What is regarded as a negative effect of tourism by one stakeholder may be seen as a positive impact by another (Hall & Lew 2009). Despite this challenge, there is an overall agreement that ‘good tourism’ should meet the needs of hosts, guests, and the environment. Because tourism is such a complex industry it is also difficult to manage the impacts of tourism from a single point of authority. “Instead, many different organizations, representing different interest groups” should combine their efforts and “address different aspects of travel and tourism” (ibid.: 281). A proposed strategy to make this work is presented in section 2.3.

In the academic literature the impacts of tourism are often considered in relation to specific socio-cultural, environmental or economic impacts described below and depicted in Table 1. However, these impacts usually have an interrelationship and overlap (ibid.). In the economic domain there are four major positive tourism impacts (Mill & Morrison 2009). Tourism can contribute to foreign exchange earnings through for instance the selling of goods and services, such as guiding and food, that satisfy the needs of visitors. Through this tourism can also create and diversify employment opportunities and this can lead to an increase of local income in general. Moreover, to fulfil the needs of the visitors tourism can also stimulate infrastructure and facility development (Mill & Morrison 2009; Hall & Lew 2009; Vanhove 2011). The economic impact of tourism can also lead to negative impacts such as leakages, the phenomenon when tourism revenues are lost to other countries’ economies; seasonal unemployment, due to the seasonal character of tourism; inflation and increased cost of living in general, because of a rise in food prices; and increasing inequality, because often some actors will profit from tourism while others will not. Another negative effect has to do with enclave tourism which happens when a huge amount of tourists are focused in a small geographic area which can lead to a shortage of facilities for both tourists and locals. In order to overcome these negative impacts high involvement of the locals in tourism planning and practice is necessary and an equal distribution of revenues is needed (Mill & Morrison 2009; Hall & Lew 2009; Mitchell & Ashley 2010).

The second domain tourism impacts is the socio-cultural domain. Tourism can have a positive impact on the socio-cultural domain by encouraging the preservation and restoration of cultural heritage and by keeping local traditions alive. Moreover, tourism can lead to education opportunities and competence diversification among the locals. Especially on the empowerment of women tourism can have a great impact by creating new employment opportunities. However, tourism can also have negative socio-cultural impacts.
For instance, tourism can lead to the dilution of local heritage, culture, and local customs when these are contested by the tourist industry. Furthermore, tourism can lead to the commercialization of human relationships which is a key aspect of the hospitality industry (Eriksen 2010). Two other negative outcomes of tourism are increased crime, by people who feel deprived, and increased prostitution. The social-cultural impacts are hard to manage properly, although attention should be given to education opportunities and a revalue of local traditions and cultural heritage (Mill & Morrison 2009; Hall & Lew 2009).

The last dimension that tourism impacts is the environmental. In the academic literature there are numerous examples of how tourism can contribute to the conservation and protection of endemic flora and fauna and how tourism can offer a sustainable, alternative means of income for the locals (Buckley 2002a). Moreover, tourism can create environmental awareness and a greater understanding among both the locals and the tourists through educational programmes (Fallon 2001). However, tourism can also have deleterious impacts on the environment through vandalism, littering, and pollution. Furthermore, large amounts of tourists can lead to overcrowding causing the exploitation and destruction of natural habitat and destroying the self-sufficient livelihoods of indigenous peoples (Mill & Morrison 2009; Hughes-Dit-Ciles 2009; O’Brien & Ponting 2013). The management of the environmental impact of tourism asks for a good collaboration among all the relevant stakeholders involved (McConney et al. 2010; Plummer & Fennell 2008; Plummer et al. 2012; Trau & Bushell 2001). This will be further discussed in section 2.3.
**Table 1: Impacts of Tourism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts of Tourism</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Socio-Cultural</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
<td>• Employment opportunities&lt;br&gt;• Diversification of employment&lt;br&gt;• Growth in local income&lt;br&gt;• Increase in foreign exchange earnings&lt;br&gt;• Stimulation of infrastructure &amp; facility development</td>
<td>• Preservation and restoration of cultural heritage &amp; revival of local customs and crafts&lt;br&gt;• Education opportunities&lt;br&gt;• Competence diversification&lt;br&gt;• Empowerment of women</td>
<td>• Conservation and protection of natural habitats and wildlife&lt;br&gt;• Increased environmental awareness&lt;br&gt;• A sustainable alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>• Leakages&lt;br&gt;• Seasonal unemployment&lt;br&gt;• Inflation&lt;br&gt;• Increased cost of living&lt;br&gt;• Increasing inequality&lt;br&gt;• Shortage of facilities&lt;br&gt;• Enclave tourism</td>
<td>• Dilution of heritage, culture &amp; local customs&lt;br&gt;• Cultural deprivation&lt;br&gt;• Commercialization of human relationships&lt;br&gt;• Increased crime&lt;br&gt;• Increased prostitution</td>
<td>• Vandalism&lt;br&gt;• Littering &amp; pollution&lt;br&gt;• Exploitation and destruction of natural habitat and livelihoods&lt;br&gt;• Overcrowding and traffic congestion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The tourist life cycle model posited by Butler (1980) is a model that focuses on the rise and development of mass tourism in a destination (Butler 1980, Plog 1974). It is based on the idea of evolution and tourist areas are described as dynamic, evolving and changing over time. The preferences and needs of the visitors can change, there can be gradual deterioration and possible replacement of the physical environment and the change (or even demolition) of the original natural and cultural attractions that originally attracted visitors (Butler 1980). Initially, a small amount of adventurous visitors will come to a tourism destination restricted in numbers by lack of access, facilities, and local knowledge. As more and more facilities are provided, awareness grows and the destination becomes more accessible in general, causing visitor numbers will increase. Through marketing and further facility provision the area’s popularity will grow even further. Eventually, however, visitor numbers will decline as levels of carrying capacity are reached. This can be due to environmental factors such as land scarcity, water quality and air quality, of physical plant such as transportation, accommodation and other services, or of social factors such as crowding or resentment by the local population. As the attractiveness of the tourism destination diminishes, because of overuse and the impacts of tourists, its initial success can lead to its own demise (ibid.). Butler (1980) describes this process in several specific stages depicted in Figure 1.

*Figure 1. The Tourist Life Cycle Model (Butler 1980)*
Nelson (2008) has used the model in the context of the life cycle of surfing sites.

- First of all, there is the exploration stage, characterized by a small number of tourists following irregular visitation patterns, attracted to the area by its unique, pristine and different natural and cultural features. Facilities will be low and contact with the local residents will therefore likely to be high. Moreover, the arrival and departure of tourists would have little impact on the economic and social life of the permanent residents (Butler 1980). Regarding surf tourism, a secret surf spot is discovered without any amenities and the surf tourist has to “go feral”.

- The second stage is called the involvement stage. In this stage visitor numbers will increase and some local residents will provide services and goods primarily or even exclusively for visitors. Contact between visitors and locals will remain high and even intensifies. Market parties will also become involved advertising specifically to attract tourists. A tourist season can be expected to emerge and adjustments will be made in the social patterns of the local residents involved in tourism. Furthermore, some level of organization in tourist travel arrangements can be expected and the government and public agencies will be approached to provide or improve transport facilities (Butler 1980). Regarding surf tourism, a few locally-run surf camps and a few concessions are established. Moreover, local residents can provide services such as guiding the surf tourists to good surf spots and provide meals and shelter for the tourists (Nelson 2008).

- The third stage is called the development stage and reflects a well-defined tourist industry shaped by heavy advertisement in tourist-generating areas. Due to the rise of external involvement local involvement and control will decline rapidly. Particularly large, more elaborated and modern accommodations provided by external organizations will supersede the locally provided facilities. Changes in the physical appearance of the region will become prominent and natural and cultural attractions will be developed and marketed. It can be expected that not all of them will be welcomed or approved by all of the local population. The number of visitors will outweigh the number of local residents at peak periods. In addition, imported labour will be utilized and the type of tourist will also have changed as a wider market is drawn upon (Butler 1980). Regarding surf tourism a well-defined tourism industry is developed with advertisements in all the large surf magazines. The local population will become less present and the presence of resorts and charter boats owned by large multinationals will emerge (Nelson 2008).

- The fourth stage is called the consolidation stage in which the increase in visitor numbers will decline, although total numbers will be still increasing outweighing the number of permanent residents. Almost all of the area’s economy will be tied to tourism. Marketing and advertising will be wide-reaching. The large number of visitors and the lack of control will create discontent and opposition among permanent residents and result in some deprivation and restrictions upon their activities (Butler 1980). Regarding surf tourism, tourism will become the dominant
feature of not only the local economy, but the whole environment including social life and nature (Nelson 2008).

- The fifth stage is called the *stagnation stage* in which the peak of visitors will be reached. The capacity level of the area will be reached or exceeded leading to environmental, social and economic problems. The area will be well known, but no longer be in fashion. Natural and genuine cultural attractions will probably have been superseded by imported ‘artificial’ facilities. The type of visitor can also be expected to change towards the organized mass tourist (Butler 2008). Regarding surf tourism, surf tourism will slow down and the carrying capacity will be reached. This can eventually lead to crowding at the surf breaks causing frustration and (violent) conflict between surfers (Ford & Brown 2006). Hardin (1968) describes this phenomenon as the ‘Tragedy of the Commons’. High quality waves are a valuable resource and open-access to valuable resources will inevitably lead to overuse ruining the individual surfer’s experience (De Alessi 2009; Feeny et al. 1990; Mach 2009). Hence, the area is no longer a new hotspot, and is often overbuilt. Moreover, when the maritime environment is heavily damaged surf tourism will no longer be the main mode of entertainment, but other beach activities will become more prominent (Nelson 2008).

- The sixth stage can be *decline* or, on the other hand, *rejuvenation*. In the decline stage the area will become out of fashion no longer able to compete with newer attractions and the area will face a declining market, both spatially and numerically. If it is accessible to a large numbers of people it will increasingly be used for weekend or day trips. Property turnover will be high and tourist facilities will be replaced by non-tourist related structures. Local involvement in tourism is likely to increase again at this stage as residents are able to purchase facilities at significantly lower prices as the market declines. Ultimately, the area can become a veritable tourist slum or lose its function as a tourist destination completely (Butler 1980). Regarding surf tourism, decline results as surf tourist choose other destinations due to higher and more frequent waves or overcrowding (Nelson 2008).

Rejuvenation can also occur. Although this stage will never be reached without a complete change in the attractions on which tourism is based or when advantage is taken of previously untapped natural resources. Regarding surf tourism, this can be done by attracting a different kind of tourist. For instance, families who want to experience surfing for once (Nelson 2008).

### 2.2 SUSTAINABLE TOURISM

As already mentioned by Butler (1980), the tourism industry is far from perfect often exploiting the host destination and dominated by a few, often foreign based powerful transnational corporations (Mann 2014). The wishes of the local residents, especially in developing countries, are often overlooked and even neglected. In the *development stage* introduced by Butler (1980) local populations are already barely involved in tourism
planning or participating in the implementation of tourism projects. Consequently, the industry has to some extent contributed to the marginalization of many people, but also the destruction of nature. Especially all-inclusive holidays are often operated by transnational tourism corporations. Mann (2000) describes in his article how the World Bank has estimated that 55 cent of every dollar spent on holidays in developing countries returns to the West. Moreover, a big part of the remaining 45 cent flows in the pockets of the business élites in the capitals. Hence, despite a flourishing tourism industry, the host destination often remains poor, “receiving either an unfair and low return or suffering from deterioration of their living caused by negative effects of the tourism activity” (Ardahaey 2011: 208; Tourism Concern 1999).

As a counter reaction, new, more sustainable forms of tourism have emerged such as ecotourism, pro-poor tourism and sustainable tourism focused on an equal distribution of revenue and the conservation of the (natural) environment. Sustainable tourism is “[t]ourism that takes full account of its current and future economic, social and environmental impacts, addressing the needs of visitors, the industry, the environment and host communities” (United Nations Environment Programme & World Tourism Organization 2005: 11-12). Most characteristics of sustainable tourism are in direct contrast of conventional mass tourism (Cater 1993). Activities include locally owned, small scale businesses with a more even distribution of profits. Sustainable tourism has three important aspects: 1. The environment, both built and natural in which optimal use is made of environmental resources, safeguard “essential ecological processes and helping to conserve natural heritage and biodiversity”; 2. The economic life of communities and companies; which ensures long-term economic operations and benefits that are "fairly distributed, including stable employment and income-earning opportunities and social services to host communities, and contributing to poverty alleviation"; 3. And the social, focused on the impact of tourism on host cultures with respect for the social-cultural authenticity of host communities and conserving their cultural heritage and traditional values (Ponting 2001). Key in this is a long-term focus in which all the relevant stakeholders are involved such as local community members, government officials, tourism operators and NGOs sharing a common goal (Towner 2014). The participation of local community members is vital because the local knowledge regarding the local conditions is a valuable resource that can create awareness of local and regional issues (Tosun & Timothy 2003). The implementation of sustainable tourism is a continuous process that requires constant monitoring. “Sustainable tourism should […] ensure a meaningful experience to the tourists, raising their awareness about sustainability issues and promoting sustainable tourism practices amongst them” (Ponting 2001).

As already has been mentioned, an important aspect of this new form of tourism is nature oriented tourism. Developing countries are often the last havens of unspoiled nature and have a wide range of natural assets such as secluded beaches, coral reefs and unique, endemic flora and fauna (Cater 1993). Hence, a more ecologically responsible form of tourism has emerged ensuring the protection and conservation of the natural environment. This tendency of environmentalism and environmental awareness has become more and more important since the 1970s. As came forward in section 2.1.2, the conservation of nature
in general has gained more importance because nature has been commoditized due to its value to attract tourists (Lanfant & Graburn 1992). In addition, for the tourists travelling abroad there has also become a tendency to preserve nature and to become more global sustainable consumers. In this context, Albers & Myles (2009: 14) suggest that the protection of the coastal and marine environment is a global imperative: “Beaches are a key tourism attraction for destinations around the world [...]. In terms of their geomorphology, beaches are considered the most dynamic environments on earth. Successful beach tourism provides a destination with a huge competitive advantage, but it requires robust partnerships across stakeholders to protect the natural resources and use it in the most sustainable way”

2.3 CO-MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

A proposed strategy to acquire such a robust partnership across stakeholders is through the co-management approach. In the last decades, co-management received increasing attention, both in developing and developed countries and is increasingly becoming common in Asia and elsewhere (Fischer et al. 2014, Persoon et al. 2003). Co-management can be seen as a reaction to the predominantly top-down conservation projects and the continuing deterioration of environmental conditions of the past. However, throughout the years co-management has had many definitions. According to Persoon et al. (2003), co-management means that the distribution of rights and responsibilities for management (including exploitation and conservation) are shared among government and individual or collective users. Singleton (1998: 7) defines co-management as “the term given to governance systems that combine state control with local, decentralized decision making and accountability and which, ideally, combine the strengths and mitigate the weaknesses of each”. The World Bank defined co-management in 1999 as “the sharing of responsibilities, rights and duties between the primary stakeholders, in particular, local communities and the nation state; a decentralized approach to decision making that involves the local users in the decision making process as equals with the nation-state” (The World Bank 1999: 11). Altogether, there is a lot of diversity in the definitions and no single model of co-management has emerged (Pinkerton & Weinstein 1995). This is because of all the different conditions, historical circumstances and needs and demands that exist within communities (Hauck & Sowman 2001). However, all the definitions have a common underpinning. They regard co-management as some sort of agreement, a partnership between public and private actors.

Nevertheless, especially in the field of natural resource management co-management can be a successful and necessary strategy (Borrini-Feyerabend et al. 2000). Co-management is seen as an alternative management strategy that merges the interests of the state to achieve efficiency and sustainability with local community concerns for control, self-governance and active involvement (Hauck & Sowman 2001). Dialogue, discussion and negotiation is necessary among the parties involved and intensifying the number of people involved in the practice of resource management is not seen as necessarily negative (Plummer & Fitzgibbon 2004). An important aspect of co-management involves the emphasis on property rights. These refer to ownership, control, users, and responsibilities pertaining to a particular resource (Burger et al. 2001). In the past the local people, as an inheritance of colonial times, were often treated unjustly and the natural resources state-
owned (Persoon et al. 2003). Close ties between policy-makers and private companies has led to large-scale logging and land conversion leading to alarming conditions of the environment and the breakdown of local systems of management. Eventually, local communities lost the resources they had managed over long periods of time (ibid.).

Therefore, through the emergence of environmental organizations and non-governmental organizations working together with local groups attention is drawn to the involvement of indigenous peoples or local persons to address fundamental issues of human rights and conflict (Zimmerer 2000; Castro & Nielse 2001; Faust & Smardon 2001). According to Yandle these claims are essential, stating that “[…] the foundation of a strong bundle of property rights is necessary for the development of a co-management regime” (Yandle 2003: 181). Co-management inherently requires decentralization of management authority from the national to the local level. It is about power sharing between the different actors involved (Carlsson & Berkes 2005). Co-management presupposes some sort of agreement between the parties involved, this agreement, however, often evolves; it is thus rather a process than a fixed state (Beck 2000).

In the field of (coastal) tourism, co-management can also be used as a component of sustainable development (McConney et al. 2010; Plummer & Fennell 2008; Plummer et al. 2012; Trau & Bushell 2001). Co-management is able to bring the various interests and actors together fostering joint accountability. “When stakeholders become involved as co-managers, they are less likely to act solely in their vested interests if they know they will, at least to some extent, be held accountable for the consequences of their decisions” (National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy (Canada) (NTREE) 1998: 19-20). Hall (1999: 277) observed that the need for coordination “has become one of the great truisms of tourism planning and policy” partially due to limited or declining capabilities/budgets by government (Hall 2000), but also because they provide a possible strategic advancement, such as pooling resources and realizing competitive advantages (Plummer & Fennell 2009). Consequently, collaboration has received considerable attention as a management strategy in sustainable tourism (Plummer et al. 2008). The co-management of protected areas and the use of locally managed tourism to generate income for both indigenous communities and environmental conservation have been successful in a number of instances throughout the world (Trau & Bushell 2001). Hence, it is argued that indigenous co-management of protected areas is closely aligned with principles of sustainable tourism and the ethics of sustainable development (Trau & Bushell 2001). “As knowledge is shared and parties grow to trust each other, the desire to work together toward operational sustainable management of the oceans environment is likely to deepen” (NTREE 1998: 30).

3. Methodology

This thesis is exclusively based on a literature survey in which academic, secondary data will be reviewed through the university library of Leiden and Wageningen University and a range of information sources such as the OPAC system, Web of Science, The Royal Library of The Netherlands, bibliographic databases and Internet search engines. The key terms are predominantly focused on surf tourism in Southeast Asia, but also contain sustainable
tourism/consumption/development and co-management of natural resources. Moreover, relevant literature that I have read during my years at University will be used when applicable.

4. SURF TOURISM

In this part I will discuss the origin, rise and costs of surf tourism in general. According to Fluker (2003: 6), “[s]urf tourism involves people travelling to either domestic locations for a period of time not exceeding 6 months, or international locations for a period of time not exceeding 12 months, who stay at least one night, and where the active participation in the sport of surfing, where the surfer relies on the power of the wave for forward momentum, is the primary motivation for destination selection”.

4.1 THE RISE

Surfing finds its origin deep in the roots of a number of Pacific cultures. These include Hawaii, Polynesia, and Peru (Kampion 1997). Surfing was an important cornerstone of Hawaiian culture and kings and chiefs were known for their surfing ability (Marcus 2009). However, due to the strict rules of Protestant missionaries arriving in the beginning of the 19th century the practice of surfing was almost wiped out (Lazarow et al. 2008).

‘Rediscovered’ in the beginning of the twentieth century in Hawaii, it was not until the mid-1950s that surfing once again became popular (Booth 2004). Since the middle of the twentieth century, in the period after World War II, the global surf tourism industry has grown significantly (Martin & Assenov 2008). According to Booth (2004), the main obstacle to the development of surfing had largely to do with technology, that is, the material of the surfboards. Back in the days the surfboard was made of solid wood, heavy and cumbersome. Due to this early surfboards were not only difficult to transport, but also only suitable for the highly experienced rider. In the mid of the last century Californian-based surfers invented shorter, lighter and highly manoeuvrable hollow boards made of balsa wood and later foam combined with fiberglass. The development of both boards and wetsuits made surfing more accessible to the common people (Lazarow et al. 2008).

Popularized through Hollywood beach films, surf music and specialised surfing magazines the surf industry quickly diffused around the world and is now practiced on all the shores of the planet that provide ideal conditions (Booth 2004, Steinman 2003).

One of these movies released in 1964 was called The Endless Summer. In this movie the director and avid surfer Bruce Brown decided to take two famous surfers on a worldwide quest to find the perfect wave in previously un-surfed areas. The documentary depicted their travels to ‘empty’ waves in New Zealand, South Africa, Tahiti and Ghana and “showed images of indigenous tribal people’s enthusiasm and warm response to the activity” (Mach 2009: 27). Its reception in theatres was overwhelming with numerous sold out venues. Moreover, the documentary popularized surf travel inspiring surfers to experience uncharted, exotic, remote territories. “The documentary disseminated the idea that the world is a big place with seemingly endless coastlines and there are rewards for
being adventurous and traveling to surf” (ibid.) Hence, the documentary popularized the desire to travel to remote, unspoilt areas in order to experience a ‘pure’ surfing experience. Or as Ormrod (2005: 42) states: “What everyone picked up was the beauty of surfing, the harmonious union of man and nature, the adventure implicit in riding waves no one surfed before, and the sense of freedom to be found away from civilization’s complexity”. As a consequence, a wave of surf tourists started to spread all over the world.

### 4.2 CURRENT SITUATION

As already mentioned, surf tourists entail those people that stay at least one night at a certain location with as primary purpose to surf (Fluker 2003). This practice can be divided in two components. On the one hand, there is recreational surf travel in which surfers plan their own trips, use their own transport and equipment, and stay in local accommodations or their own tents. The trips may be long or short, domestic or international, but expenditure per person per day remains typically low. Recreation surf travel has been practiced throughout time and is as old as surfing itself. On the other hand, there is commercial all-inclusive surf tourism in which tour operators plan and package all the logistic aspects of the trip, generally including transport, accommodation and food. The operators often provide even the boards and other necessary equipment. The clients have to pay a predetermined price for the tour, as for any other kind of tour. Only in the last two decades commercial surf tourism has come into prominence (Buckley 2002a).

Nowadays, surfing has a global and mainstream appeal with continuous media attention attracting a large amount of people (Martin & Assenov 2008). Over the past decade, a number of authors have tried to estimate the total number of surfers globally. Estimates range from around 10 million (Buckley 2002a), to 17 million (Atkins 1997). Other estimations suggest that the global surfing population is somewhere between 18 and 50 million (Lazarow et al. 2008). The enormous popularity of surfers has led to considerable crowding at local surf breaks (Buckley 2002a). Hence, prominent surf breaks throughout the world are overcrowded with surfers leading to ‘surf rage’ and ‘localism’ (Ford & Brown 2006; De Alessi 2009). Localism is the incidences when surfers start to claim a particular break were they have surfed a considerable amount of time and dictate control over how the wave is used. The activities were surfers are fist fighting with each other, or there is leash cutting mostly aimed at inexperienced surfers, is called surf rage (Mach 2009). Because of the fact that many surfers want to avoid the stress involved with these local breaks, crowding contributes to a large extent to the motivations for surfers to travel to more remote areas (Buckley 2002a). Those practitioners who can afford to do so travel to high-quality uncrowded sites giving rise to luxurious amenities such as surf charters and surf lodges around the world. Also the increasing number of magazines and documentaries fuel the demand by illustrating these destinations giving rise to a continuously growing worldwide industry (ibid.). Another important development that can spur interest in, and popularize surfing among an even wider audience is its current addition to the 2020 Olympic Games in Tokyo (BBC 2015).
4.3 SUSTAINABLE SURF TOURISM

In recent decades, surfing has become a multi-billion dollar global industry with the potential of sustainable economic growth (Dolnicar & Fluker 2003). Hence, surf tourism is currently bringing tourism development worldwide and it is associated with economic, social and environmental benefits to host destinations contributing to a healthy society (Lazarow et al. 2008). For this reason, coastal sites all over the world are now trying to market their surf culture recognizing the economic and environmental benefits that can be associated with a growing surf market. As a consequence, surf tourism can contribute to sustainable development by providing an economic and employment alternative to logging and large-scale plantation agriculture. This can eventually provide funds for education, health and disease control for local residents (Buckley 2002a). Especially in a developing nation where “access to basic services, resources, and infrastructure is limited, surf tourism can have a large positive impact” (O’Brien & Ponting 2013). This resembles the notion of Ponting & O’Brien (2015) who state that sustainable surf tourism fulfils the needs of surf tourists whilst also respecting the current and future social, cultural, economic, and ecological welfare of the local people.

In general, surfing is seen as environmentally sustainable because the sport inherently depends on a natural resource (waves) (Reis & Jorge 2012). Through this strong dependence, interaction and connection with nature, being one with the natural world, surfers care more about and protect this natural world (Brymer et al. 2009).

“You’re not going to protect something that you don’t appreciate and that you don’t care about. So you have to make people care and there is […] no better way to make somebody care about it than to participate in it, with it. And they get a feeling – ‘Hey, I care about it! What’s going on […] how can we help it?” (Bartlett 2008).

Thus, practicing surfing can facilitate an engagement with the natural world and lead to more environmental awareness (Brymer et al. 2009). The founders of surfing, the Hawaiians even have a word for this state ‘Ho'pu'pu,’ or the experience of becoming one with a wave when surfing (Poirier 2003).

Another issue is that “surfers are among the earliest to get ill from contaminated waters and thus they are proactive and on the forefront of environmental issues” (Martin & Assenov 2008). Surfers are the first to get sick if there is too much sewage in the water, to notice reefs dying, and to be affected by water pollution such as oil spills, agricultural run-off and industrial pollutants. “It’s fair to say that […] surfers should be natural environmentalists” (Dick-Read 2007). This has led to the rise of a great number of globally influential surf related NGOs such as The Surfrider Foundation, The Groundswell Society, Save the Waves Coalition, Surf Aid International, Waves for Development, Greensurf, and Surfers Against Sewage Ltd (Martin & Assenov 2008). According to Dolnicar & Fluker’s (2003) study on surf tourism demographics, surfers consider the environmental quality, local culture and remoteness as very important. In consequence, this makes surfers ideal candidates as sustainable tourists conserving the natural environment and channelling foreign currency into remote areas (Mach 2009).
Surfing inherently depends upon coastal recourses. The coastal resources, the ocean waves, and the coastlines need to make the waves break, however, these are limited and good surf breaks are scarce (Martin & Assenov 2008). Crowding is not only harming humans, as previously mentioned, but is also becoming a severe threat to the sustainability to surf tourism (ibid.). For instance, Hinch & Higham (2011: 129) note that crowding and environment damage are two interrelated processes that “compromise the quality of the [surf] tourist experience (particularly) where naturalness forms an important, perhaps central, element,” as is the case with surfing. Moreover, crowding can lead to the growth of waste and can contribute to growing problems with crime and prostitution (Buckley 2002b). These problems all get exacerbated as surf tourism grows (Mach 2014). And although, as have been mentioned, surfing can be seen as a sustainable activity with surfers as ‘natural environmentalist’, surf tourism is largely disjunct from the cultures of host communities and often fails to bring meaningful benefits to popular destinations, but nevertheless exploits the local resources (Buckley 2002a; Mach 2009). As Barilotti (2002: 37) observed “most surfers travel not to experience another culture […] the indigenous people are an obstacle or a friendly nuisance to sidestep on the way to water” (Ponting et al. 2005). Hence, there is an unequal distribution of income in these surf destinations. Due to a lack of knowledge and resources the local communities are unable to compete with foreign entrepreneurs (Mach 2014). Consequently, when managed insufficiently surf tourism can lead to negative social and environmental impacts and become a severe threat for the host destinations (O’Brien & Ponting 2013).

It is even argued that, especially in developing countries, the influx of surf tourists creates a new kind of colonisation causing disturbance and contaminant to the rooted local (Anderson 2014).

“[S]urfing tourism has a history as a colonizing activity. Surfers tend to venture into areas previously unvisited by mainstream tourists, opening up new routes and new systems of development – surfing tourism has nudged unprepared destinations down the slippery slope to large scale industrialized tourism and its related issues” (Ponting et al. 2005).

An important factor in this is that the surf industry in developing countries is often dominated and marketed by foreign business interests (Ponting 2007). Especially commercial all-inclusive surf tourism can be seen as a threat (O’Brien & Ponting 2013). This kind of tourism is traditionally charted-based through which surf tourists pay to stay aboard vessels and rarely venture ashore. Or it exists of land-based surf resorts operated as enclaves with little meaningful interaction with local host communities (Buckley 2002a; Buckley 2002b). Both boats and resorts can have a deleterious impact on the environment. On the one hand, boats can damage reefs if they anchor and boats pump sewage out at sea which enhances algal growth (Buckley et al. 2014; Shakeela et al. 2014; Warnken & Byrnes 2004). On the other hand, resorts can cause major modifications to reefs, with engineering construction including overwater accommodation and modify island vegetation and fauna considerably (Buckley 2006). Concerning the latter, this has much to do with the fact that many tourism enterprises, attracted by the rising surf industry with a great potential for
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4.4 THE EXCESSES

Surfing inherently depends upon coastal recourses. The coastal resources, the ocean waves, and the coastlines need to make the waves break, however, these are limited and good surf breaks are scarce (Martin & Assenov 2008). Crowding is not only harming humans, as previously mentioned, but is also becoming a severe threat to the sustainability to surf tourism (ibid.). For instance, Hinch & Higham (2011: 129) note that crowding and environment damage are two interrelated processes that “compromise the quality of the [surf] tourist experience (particularly) where naturalness forms an important, perhaps central, element,” as is the case with surfing. Moreover, crowding can lead to the growth of waste and can contribute to growing problems with crime and prostitution (Buckley 2002b). These problems all get exacerbated as surf tourism grows (Mach 2014). And although, as have been mentioned, surfing can be seen as a sustainable activity with surfers as ‘natural environmentalist’, surf tourism is largely disjunct from the cultures of host communities and often fails to bring meaningful benefits to popular destinations, but nevertheless exploits the local resources (Buckley 2002a; Mach 2009). As Barilotti (2002: 37) observed “most surfers travel not to experience another culture […] the indigenous people are an obstacle or a friendly nuisance to sidestep on the way to water” (Ponting et al. 2005). Hence, there is an unequal distribution of income in these surf destinations. Due to a lack of knowledge and resources the local communities are unable to compete with foreign entrepreneurs (Mach 2014). Consequently, when managed insufficiently surf tourism can lead to negative social and environmental impacts and become a severe threat for the host destinations (O’Brien & Ponting 2013).

It is even argued that, especially in developing countries, the influx of surf tourists creates a new kind of colonisation causing disturbance and contaminant to the rooted local (Anderson 2014).

“[S]urfing tourism has a history as a colonizing activity. Surfers tend to venture into areas previously unvisited by mainstream tourists, opening up new routes and new systems of development – surfing tourism has nudged unprepared destinations down the slippery slope to large scale industrialized tourism and its related issues” (Ponting et al. 2005).

An important factor in this is that the surf industry in developing countries is often dominated and marketed by foreign business interests (Ponting 2007). Especially commercial all-inclusive surf tourism can be seen as a threat (O’Brien & Ponting 2013). This kind of tourism is traditionally charted-based through which surf tourists pay to stay aboard vessels and rarely venture ashore. Or it exists of land-based surf resorts operated as enclaves with little meaningful interaction with local host communities (Buckley 2002a; Buckley 2002b). Both boats and resorts can have a deleterious impact on the environment. On the one hand, boats can damage reefs if they anchor and boats pump sewage out at sea which enhances algal growth (Buckley et al. 2014; Shakeela et al. 2014; Warnken & Byrnes 2004). On the other hand, resorts can cause major modifications to reefs, with engineering construction including overwater accommodation and modify island vegetation and fauna considerably (Buckley 2006). Concerning the latter, this has much to do with the fact that many tourism enterprises, attracted by the rising surf industry with a great potential for
economic profit, prioritized speed of development above environmental and social sensitivity. “In many cases, hotel effluent was piped directly into the sea and sensitive materials were often used in the construction of many hotels and restaurants” (Mach 2014; Mach 2013).

5. CASE STUDIES

In this part I will discuss surf tourism in Indonesia in general before focussing on two specific case studies, namely Lombok and the Mentawai Islands. In recent decades, both surf destinations have rapidly grown and, due to the availability of high, consistent and relatively uncrowded waves, they offer the potential for even further growth. I will assess the specific histories of these surf destinations, the impact of surf tourism on the environment and local communities, and give a practical application of the theoretical framework. At last, I will compare both cases and analyse in which aspects they differ and resemble each other.

5.1 SURF TOURISM IN INDONESIA

Indonesia is the best-known, longest lived and highest-volume destination for surf tourism in the developing world with the world’s richest, consistent surf fields offering some of the world’s best surfing opportunities where good surfing is possible approximately 290-320 days per year (Buckley 2002a; Ponting et al. 2005; Espejo et al. 2014). Geographically, the islands of Indonesia have more than 80,000 kilometres of coastline from 13,600 islands, many of them directly exposed to powerful sea swells, providing in numerous opportunities to surf (Lueras & Lueras 2002). In the last three decades, surf tourists have heavily influenced how once water-shy Indonesians now view their spectacular beaches and surging sea (ibid.). Moreover, as mentioned in section 4.3, surf tourism brings sustainable, alternative, economic and social development opportunities to a broad range of coastal areas in Indonesia reducing poverty and providing funds for education, health and disease control for local residents (Buckley 2002a). Hence, surfers were initially seen as godsend on both rock and reef islands with poor soil quality providing an economic alternative to logging and plantation agriculture (Lueras & Lueras 2002, Buckley 2002a).

The most well-known destination to surf in Indonesia is, without any doubt, Bali. In the mid-1960s Australian surfers were the first to bring surfing to the Indonesian archipelago undertaking pilgrimages to Bali. Indonesia is in relative close distance of Australia and therefore rather accessible to the surfers providing a chance to gain temporary freedom from their crowded home breaks and experience a new, unknown culture (Mach 2009). In the 1960s and 1970s surf media documentation of a high-quality surf break at Uluwatu spurred the mass colonisation of Indonesia’s surf breaks by Australian surfers (Ponting et al. 2005; Abraham 1996; King 1996). After the media exposure of Uluwatu, surf tourism in Indonesia began to flourish and was first targeted by the wider tourism industry in the 1970s (Ponting et al. 2005; Bartholomew & Baker 1996). However, through the years Bali has become crowded and decidedly touristic. Especially, Kuta has evolved into an
international travel industry phenomenon in which surfers were the catalysts soon followed by the masses leading to hedonistic excesses (Ponting et al. 2005). Massive development has taken its toll on the island’s beauty with beaches often polluted and sewage dumped in the ocean.

Bali lost its status as the only place to surf in Indonesia as a group of Australians headed northwest of Bali and discovered the quality surf breaks on Pasangan Island (Mach 2009, Warshaw 2004). Other, more adventurous surfers headed to the far West discovering the high-volume waves of Nias and the Mentawai Islands (Mach 2009). As surf tourism popularized surf camps and charter tours emerged in the 1980s and by the end of the decade the luxurious, all-inclusive trips got established including charters full of professional surfers to surf breaks in the Mentawai Islands (Ponting et al. 2005; Ponting 2008). Nowadays, surfing has become a well-established part of Indonesia in which Bali functioned as the first stepping stone to the rest of the Indonesian Archipelago such as Lombok and the Mentawai Islands, which will be discussed in depth in the next section (O’Brien & Ponting 2013; Lueras & Lueras 2002).

5.2 LOMBOK

In close proximity, east of Bali, lies the island called Lombok (depicted in figure 2 in blue). Nevertheless, compared to verdant Bali Lombok is much drier and tougher. The indigenous Sasak even named Lombok Bumi Gora, which literally means “The Dry Farmland” (Lueras & Lueras 2002). Not much is known about the history of Lombok up until the 17th century. However, the island seemed to be fragmented with several small states ruled and inhabited by the indigenous Sasak. Because of this fragmented characteristic and the lack of unity amongst the small states, neighbouring islands such as Bali made several attempts to conquer the island (Bras 2000). In the beginning of the 17th century Bali succeeded in its attempts with forces occupying the western part of the island. By 1750 Balinese managed to occupy the whole island of Lombok. In general the Balinese lived in relative harmony with the Sasak until the Dutch colonized Lombok in 1984 defeating the Balinese (ibid.). The islands became an integral part of Indonesia from 1949 onwards with the overthrow of the Dutch colonizers (Fallon 2001).
5.2.1 THE HISTORY OF (SURF) TOURISM ON LOMBOK

Although Indonesia and in particular Bali developed rapidly due to tourism, Lombok was not able to profit from this. Relying heavily on agriculture Lombok stayed very vulnerable as showed in the famines in 1966 and 1973. Tourism emerged in Lombok in the beginning of the 1980s; however, it was predominantly controlled and initiated by national politicians and outside investors. The local indigenous population, on the other hand, did not participate in, and gained little benefits from the tourism industry. The first starred hotel in Lombok opened near the beach of Senggigi in 1989 and within ten years more than thirty hotels had followed and tourism had become an integral part of Lombok (Fallon 2001). The tourism sector has provided alternative work and income opportunities; however, it has also resulted in some negative consequences such as resource scarcity and land issues (ibid.). Especially the poorest segment of the population of the island suffered from this because they have the least power to confront the multinationals dominating the tourist industry. As a consequence, natural resources such as wood of the forests are looked upon as the last resort to sources of income (Sudardi & Hatta 1998). Lombok is heavily promoted as “Bali-Plus”, “What Bali Used To Be”, “New Bali” or “The Other Bali” by the national government and the tourist branch, as such; many resorts in Lombok resemble the enclave resorts of Bali dominated by foreign multinationals without any linkages to host communities (Fallon 2001; Shaw & Shaw 1999; Lueras & Lueras).

Due to the economic fall of the late 1990s Indonesia got hit hard and Indonesia received its fair share of the recession leading to a great degree of social unrest and eventually serious riots erupted in 2000 as a result of the bad economic situation and outside instigation (Fallon 2001). Because of the Bali bombings in 2002 and 2005 the tourism industry in Lombok got struck even more showing its dependence on the tourism industry of Bali. In the following years, the tourist industry in Lombok has even gone into decline (Hampton & Hampton 2009). Hence, Lombok is considered as one of the poorest parts of Indonesia with
resource scarcity and a lack of proper education facilities (Fallon 2001; Sudardi & Hatta 1998). The only segment of tourism that seems to endure in Lombok is surf tourism (Hageman 2006).

5.2.2 THE CURRENT SURF TOURISM INDUSTRY

As already mentioned, Indonesia has some of the best waves in the world and the island of Lombok is no exception to this rule. Due to the fact that the popular and accessible island of Bali is in close proximity, Lombok has been able to become an increasingly popular destination for surf tourists (Hageman 2006). Despite its rising popularity and fame among surfers all over the world (Buckley 2002a) Lombok’s high quality waves are still relatively uncrowded offering an accessible alternative for surfers who want to avoid the overcrowded waves of Bali (Hageman 2006). However, there is an emerging industry of charter boats coming from Bali with surf tourists who stay on their vessels and therefore have no economic impact on Lombok (ibid.). Surf tourism in Lombok is mostly centred in Kuta with the highest concentration of surf tourists and most facilities for surf tourism. Lombok offers a huge amount of surf spots along the coast with the best and most popular waves along the West and South coast near Kuta. Less developed and less crowded surf spots can be found near the Eka region. Also the popular mainstream tourist hotspots of Senggigi and the Gili islands have some surf potential; however, they are often avoided by surf tourists.

Hence, Lombok offers a range of surf destinations attracting different segments of surf tourists consisting of, on the one hand, radical adventures seeking uncrowded and pristine destinations and, on the other hand, luxury surfers who seek comfort and high quality waves (ibid.). Roughly put, the industry consists of commercial, all-inclusive tourists and the independent travelling surf tourist as presented by Buckley in section 4.2. The former are predominantly Japanese who arrange their complete, package deal trip from Japan (Towner 2014). Although the Japanese spend a relatively large amount of money on their trip the host community profits are low due to the fact that a high level of earning is expatriated outside the destination. Moreover, the resorts which they visit are often foreign owned and have low linkages with the locals. However, these tourists do have money to spend desiring high-quality uncrowded sites. As already argued in section 4.4, especially this kind of tourism can form a threat for host destinations because both resorts and charter boat vessels, the main elements of an all-inclusive trip, can have a deleterious impact on the environment. On the other hand, there are the independent travelling surf tourists who plan their own trips, use their own transport and equipment, and stay in local accommodations (Buckley 2002a). Expenditure is relatively low (ranging from €45 to €170 a month), but their interaction and involvement with the locals is typically high (Hageman 2006).

When using the Tourist Life Cycle Model presented by Butler (1980) and discussed in depth in section 2.1.3 it can be argued that Lombok, although the islands is already well-known as a high-quality surf destination, is still developing as a tourist destination and therefore remains in the third stage, or development stage. Amongst others, the Bali bombings caused a large setback in visitor numbers, however, surf tourism endured and terrorism threats where even characterized as “part of the adventure” (Lueras & Lueras 2002).
Opposed to Bali Lombok can still be seen as uncrowded, nevertheless, the surf spots in West Lombok are already very crowded especially due to charter vessels lying in the bay (ibid.). Another characteristic of the *development stage* is the already high involvement of (often foreign) outsiders in the tourist industry and the declining involvement of the locals (Nelson 2008; Butler 1980). This is especially illustrated in Senggigi which is overbuilt with foreign hotels representing the resort enclaves of Bali. Also Kuta, the unofficial surf centre of Lombok, is becoming more crowded with surf shops selling and renting equipment and offering surf tours. Moreover, the natural attractions, especially the waves, are marketed throughout the world in surf magazines and through surf documentaries. However, on other, rougher parts of the islands the locals are still very involved offering facilitating losmen for the more adventurous, independent travelling surf tourists (Lueras & Lueras 2002). The operation of Lombok’s new international airport completed in 2011 has the potential to increase the island’s popularity as a tourist destination (The Jakarta Post 2014).

---

### 5.2.3 The Sasak & Adat

Lombok is heavily populated by the indigenous Sasak (85%) with small minorities of Balinese and Chinese. The latter have an important role on the island owning and controlling much of the trade business. The Sasak are predominantly Muslim and the importance of this is illustrated by Lombok’s reputation as the ‘Island of the Thousand Mosques’ (Bras 2000; Fallon 2001). However, the Sasak are also adhered to the customs (adat) of wetu telu that is a mixture of Balinese Hinduism, Islam, and indigenous animist belief. The adat are the traditional customs, norms and regulations of the Sasak people and most of the village life is still based on the adat including events such as weddings, funerals and feuds (Schellhorn 2010; Bras 2000; Hageman 2006). Moreover, through their own adat the locals create an own identity and consciously distinguish themselves to the customs of recent migrants and foreigners. The adat comes with a lot of responsibilities toward the family or community for the Sasak and villagers are often busy with the preparation of big events resulting in very hard and long working days. This can cause a conflict between cultural responsibilities and commitments, and the demands of the tourism sector.

“Conflicting demands can lead to tensions between adat and the service culture of modernity” (Schellhorn 2010: 128). Hence, the adat responsibilities can create a cultural barrier for the Sasak to their involvement in tourism development. Due to these cultural responsibilities and cultural obligations outsiders and migrants often describe the Sasak as “lazy” because of their low presence within the formal economy, rather than their actual workloads and productivity (ibid.). However, for the Sasak “the “newer” demands of the tourism industry take second place” (ibid. 129).

As already mentioned, the Sasak benefit little from tourism and particularly women struggle to access the new development opportunities that tourism offers (ibid.). In general, benefits flow to foreign multinationals, migrant entrepreneurs, and to men. For instance, among women, there is often a general lack of education and English language forming a major obstacle to involvement in the tourist industry (ibid.). Moreover, there are also economic, ethnic, and the aforementioned mentioned cultural barriers among the Sasak that form massive constraints to become part of the industry causing high poverty rates (ibid.).
Another issue currently present in the area is related to the natural environment. The interests of the local Sasak, who are afraid that the natural beauty and the wildness of the area is tamed and destroyed by big investors, and the national and market parties, who are mainly interested in profit, are competing often leading to conflict. Especially land rights are causing conflict and may develop into a crisis situation undermining the sustainability of the growing tourism industry (Fallon 2001).

5.2.4 SUSTAINABLE TOURISM & CO-MANAGEMENT

As already presented in 2.2, the tourism industry is currently far from perfect exploiting and marginalizing the host destination and often dominated by a few foreign based transnational corporations (Mann 2000). The wishes of the locals are often overlooked and even neglected. As already came forward in section 5.2.2 and 5.2.3, Lombok is no exception to this rule. The current industry is dominated by foreign multinationals and small-scale private enterprises in tourism are usually controlled by entrepreneurial migrants often exploiting the Sasak and even using them as a cultural attraction (Schellhorn 2010; Kamsma & Bras 2003). Moreover, due to their cultural commitments the Sasak are rarely involved in tourism planning or participating in the implementation of tourism projects because they are often characterized as ‘lazy’ and ‘unproductive’ (Schellhorn 2010). Consequently, the industry has, to some extent, led to the marginalization of the Sasak “suffering from deterioration of their living caused by the negative effects of the tourism industry” (Ardahaey 2011: 208). Currently, there is considerable poverty in the area, particular among the indigenous Sasak: “Access to health care and education are inadequate, especially for women; illegal logging threatens the forests; and water must be shared among a great many people and enterprises” (David et al. 2005: 11). Hence, the issues related to surf tourism are not that different from the problems caused by normal tourism. These are, for example related to poverty, land disputes, scarcity of resources, and the increase of waste and social-economic discrimination by large entrepreneurs (Fallon 2001). These issues can mostly be found in the more crowded and developed surf tourism areas such as Kuta or Senggigi, but also Ekas has to deal with some emerging challenges (Hageman 2006).

Currently, however, there exist a lot of barriers that prevent the successful implementation of sustainable surf tourism in Lombok. As presented in section 2.2, sustainable tourism is “tourism that takes full account of its current and future economic, social and environmental impacts, addressing the needs of visitors, the industry, the environment and host communities” (UNEP & WTO 2005: 11-12). Hageman (2006) describes the situation in the small village of Ledang Terak situated in the southeast of Lombok. The village can be considered a poor village with approximately 150 inhabitants who live of their own land. In 2002 the Heaven on Planet resort got established near the village noticing the huge potential for surf tourism due to the high quality waves and beautiful natural surroundings. Next to poverty two other big concerns are present in the village; the lack of education, and resource scarcity such as water shortage and arid agricultural land. According to the villagers, a lot has changed with the arrival of the Heaven on Planet resort providing linkages with the local community. The most significant change is a new, alternative and sustainable means of income through employment opportunities in
construction, gardening, cooking, cleaning, the selling of handicrafts, security work, and cultural tours to the village. However, a lot of these jobs were only a short period of time available and more experienced and educated migrants have acquired the best paying jobs. “The owners of the Heaven on Planet resort stated that there is a lack of general skills among the local population to work in the tourism industry such as work ethic and sufficient English vocabulary” (Hageman 2006: 51). Another issue in the area has to do with waste which is connected to the establishment of the resort, but also with garbage piling up in the village. Hence, although the establishment of the resort can bring sustainable development through sustainable tourism, the host community and the environment, two key concepts in the definition of UNEP & WTO are still a serious issue in the village of Ledang Terak, although there is some real potential for the implications of sustainable surf tourism.

As mentioned in section 2.2 and 2.3 an important characteristic of sustainable (surf) tourism is the involvement of all the relevant stakeholders, including the local community members, government officials, tourism operators and NGOs which can be done through the co-management approach, extensively explained in section 2.3. To summarize, co-management means that the distribution of rights and responsibilities for management (including exploitation and conservation) are shared among the government and individual or collective users (Persoon et al. 2003). This also includes the involvement of indigenous peoples such as the Sasak or the Villagers of Ledang Terak in the management and planning of the tourism industry in order to generate income for the indigenous communities and establish environmental conservation (Trau & Bushell 2001). In Ledang Terak there has to be a better distribution of rights and responsibilities among the tourists industry (the owners of Heaven of Planet), the local government (who are not really interested in developing Ledang Terak (Hageman 2006)), and the local indigenous community (which is currently still marginalized). Fallon (2001) describes for instance how co-management, through co-operative power relationships and consultation with the local Sasak people, has resulted in the successful implementation of sustainable tourism in a different part of Lombok in which the resort conducts extensive in-house training for English language skills and other standard hotel skills training recognizing the adat of the locals and creating continuing backward linkages between the hotel and the local community for mutual benefit. Hence, the Ledang Terak case shows that the implementation of proper co-management is needed to reach sustainable surf tourism, and this is eventually mutual beneficial for the locals, the government and the Heaven on Planet resort. For instance, this can be done through education opportunities empowering the local Sasak and recognizing their adat, a collaborative waste management system and more involvement of the local government creating and supporting social development opportunities (Schellhorn 2010).

5.3 THE MENTAWAI ISLANDS

Approximately 2000 kilometres northwest of Lombok is the Mentawai Archipelago (depicted in figure 3). The Mentawai archipelago consists of four main islands and many smaller islands approximately 150 kilometres off the coast of west Sumatra (Ponting 2001). Traditionally, the islands were inhabited by the indigenous Mentawaian living in small
autonomous settlements along the banks of the rivers (Persoon 2003). At the beginning of the 20th century the Dutch established a military post on the islands introducing a system of village heads on the communities. During WWII, the Dutch fled and after a short period of Japanese occupation Indonesian military and civil servants took control formally freeing the archipelago from colonial rule (Bakker 1999). From 1979 onwards the small settlements became administrative villages that belonged to two sub-districts and fell under the jurisdiction of one main district with its capital on the mainland of Sumatra. In 1999 the Mentawaian Islands became a regency with its own administrative centre situated on the island of Sipora (Persoon 2003).

Figure 3. The Mentawai Islands

5.3.1 THE HISTORY OF (SURF) TOURISM ON MENTAWAI

Initially, Siberut, the biggest island of the Mentawais, had been a destination for tourists attracted by the culture of the indigenous Mentawaian because of their colourful tattoos and elaborated religious system including extensive rituals and the rich endemic flora and fauna available on the island (Buckley 2002b; Persoon 2003). As an alternative to the intensive logging industry the possibilities of tourist development were recognized in the master plan “Saving Siberut” (McNeely et al. 1980). However, until then visitor numbers remained low due to strict restrictions for tourists to move around on the island (Persoon 2003). From 1980 onwards conditions started to change fuelled by the worldwide ecotourism boom (Mach 2009). Small adventurous groups of backpackers came to the island and participated in jungle trekking. For many of them the trip turned out to be a success encountering the traditional ‘Stone Age’ culture and a diversity of endemic species (Buckley 2002b; Persoon 2003; Ponting 2001). Through these experiences Siberut was successfully branded by the Provincial Government of West Sumatra as a uncrowded and unspoilt tourist destination making it into all Indonesian tourist guides as a must visit destination (Persoon 2003; Mach 2009, Buckley 2002b). However, the tourist industry, and especially the tourist guides consisted predominantly of Minangkabau, mainlanders from West Sumatra while the locals
only received a small bit of revenue (Persoon 2003; Mach 2009). Hence, poverty numbers remained high and tourism failed to deliver meaningful development in the area (Mach 2009).

While the tourist sector in the Mentawai Archipelago was still largely aimed at jungle adventure in 1980 a group of Australian surfers decided to head northwest of Bali in search for unknown surf breaks. They ended up camping around the Mentawai Islands for five weeks surfing a multitude of different waves (Warshaw 2004). For the following ten years word of mouth led to scattered groups of surf tourist to camp on the Mentawai islands by night and explore the waves by day. From 1993 onwards salvage diver Martin Daley recognized the potential for surf tourism and began to use his salvage boat to take charters full of professional surfers to the islands (Ponting 2008). Pictures were sold to magazines and a film came out showcasing the diversity and high quality of waves in the area.

In 1994, inspired by the success of Martin Daley and benefiting from the increased exposure by surf films and featured in thousands of advertisements and dozens of travel articles, two Australian-owned companies, Surf Travel Company (STC) and Great Breaks International (GBI) entered the surf market offering similar live-aboard boat excursions as Martin Daley (Mach 2009; Ponting et al. 2005). From 1995 the increased demand for surfing in the Mentawai Islands fuelled operator numbers rapidly to a point of saturation (Ponting 2008). In the period between 1995-2000 the industry grew exponentially from 3 boats to 27 official charter boats, one land based resort, a handful local boats carrying surf tourists, and several home stay facilities (ibid.). Of the 27 official boats 19 (70%) were foreign owned by Daley, STC, GB, and Good Sumatran Surf charter (Mach 2009). These four influential surf companies began to integrate their services and marketing efforts creating an oligopolistic competition. Consequently, this has made it hard for smaller local entrepreneurs to enter the market dominated by large companies. In 2000, overcrowding became a serious issue and the market saturation began hurting visitor numbers (Dolnicar & Fluker 2003). Industry operators had too much to lose and began pushing for regulation limiting the number of operators bringing surfers to the waves. Hence, a zone agreement permit policy got implemented monitoring and controlling crowds encompassing all the important surf breaks (Mach 2009; Persoon 2003).

5.3.2 THE CURRENT TOURIST INDUSTRY & CROWDING

Through the years the Mentawai Islands have become known as the ‘best of the best’, a surfing ‘wonderland’ with numerous, consistent, high-quality waves in an uncrowded and unspoilt environment (Ponting et al. 2005; Lueras & Lueras 2013). In the high season (May to September) when waves are up to 10 or 12 meter experienced surfers from Australia and America are the main customers. In the low season, when waves reach a height of 5 meters, there are increasing numbers of Japanese and European surfers. Opposed to jungle-trekking, which is a kind of ‘back to basics’ tourism, surfing offers luxury services for high prices of up to $275 a day and the Mentawai Islands are currently the flavour of the month (Persoon 2003; Ponting 2001). These tours consist of 12-14 days on a luxurious charter boat “fully equipped with air-conditioning, sleeping facilities, a bar, GPS equipment, depth sounder,
radar and fast Zodiac dingkys (Persoon 2003: 259). For the entire duration of the trip the surf tourists stay on the vessel never setting foot on the island apart from a couple of hours on the beach meeting few if any of the islanders (ibid.). Existing surf tour operators have effectively saturated the recreational capacity of the Mentawai surf breaks (Buckley 2002b). On the other hand, although low in numbers, there is also an influx of independent travelling surf tourists (Towner 2014). Independent travelling surf tourists reach the islands while making little use of the formal tourism industry, camping on land, staying with villagers, or chartering fishing and cargo boats on a low budget, but making use of the same surf breaks as the luxury vessels (Ponting 2011). Consequently, the influx of a large number of surf tourists has made crowding a serious problem near the best surf breaks (Mach 2009). Hence, claims over resources leads to a lot of tension and conflict in the area between the big foreign based companies, government agencies and the local indigenous people (Persoon 2003).

When using the Tourist Life Cycle Model presented by Butler (1980) and discussed in depth in section 2.1.3 it can be argued that, especially at the supply side, the Mentawai Islands seem to be reaching the fifth stage, or stagnation stage. The recreational capacity level of the archipelago is nearly reached and surf tourism is causing a negative social and environmental impact (Ponting et al. 2005; Ponting 2012; Mach 2014). However, mass tourism is still not that common on the Mentawai Islands and amenities remain very basic (Buckley 2002a; Ponting 2012). Moreover, the local people gain little from surf tourism as the tour operators are predominantly foreign or Minangkabau. In addition, surfing takes place in an area which is largely out of sight of most Mentawaians (Persoon 2003). This is the result of the high number of charter boats with low linkages to the islands themselves. Consequently, development remains low. However, the surf tourism is currently going through a transitional phase in which the industry dominated by charter boats is replaced by a resort-based industry (Towner 2014). Nevertheless, crowding has become a serious problem at the surf breaks with a high influx of surfers from the charter boats and from the resorts on the islands. Moreover, as already mentioned, both boats and resorts can have a deleterious impact on the environment. On the one hand, boats can damage reefs if they anchor and boats pump sewage out at sea which enhances algal growth (Buckley et al. 2014; Shakeela et al. 2014; Warnken & Byrnes 2004). On the other hand, resorts can cause major modifications to reefs, with engineering construction including overwater accommodation and modify island vegetation and fauna considerably (Buckley 2006). As described by De Alessi (2009), Feeny et al. (1990), and Mach (2009) in section 2.1.3, high quality waves are a valuable resource and open-access to valuable resources will inevitably lead to overuse ruining the individual surfer’s experience. This ‘Tragedy of the Commons’ described by Hardin (1968) is currently happening in the Mentawai region as the quality of the surf experience is diminishing due to overcrowding at the surf breaks ruining the unspoilt, uncrowded image of the region.
As already came to the fore, the indigenous local communities living on the Mentawai Islands are predominantly the Mentawaians. However, the most economically and politically powerful ethnicity living on the islands are the Minangkabau, who originate from Sumatra (Ponting 2001). The diet of the Mentawaians consisted mainly of the staple food sago supplemented with hunting and gathering and the domestication of pigs and chickens (Bakker 1999). The most remarkable part of this system is the lack of fire. Vegetation is not burned after it has been cut providing a protective layer for the fertile soil. This facilitated a steady plant and fruit growing process (Persoon 2003). Traditionally, the spirituality of the Mentawaians was based on pantheistic beliefs, allowing all things to have a soul including plants, rivers, and natural forces (Ponting 2008; Mach 2009; Persoon 2003). However, considerable changes have taken place forced by the Indonesian governments’ pursuit of national unity (Bakker 1999). Some characteristics of the Mentawai culture were viewed as impediments to development. Hence, the aim was to eliminate the ‘backwardness’ in the area and to instil a sense of ‘Indonesianness’ (Ponting 2001). The government forced the Mentawaians to abolish their traditional religion and advocated the conversion to an official religion. Due to the fact that pigs were a staple food, Christianity prevailed (Bakker 1999).

As already mentioned in section 5.3.2, most tourism business operations in Mentawai Islands are controlled by outsiders, especially Minangkabau from West Sumatra, who view the Mentawaians as primitive and backward in urgent need of development (Persoon 2003). The Minangkabau settlers feel culturally superior to the Mentawaians in almost all aspects of life. Some of the most “primitive” elements of the local Mentawaiian culture, according to Minangkabau ideas, are the religion (not considered as a “religion” in the proper sense of the word), the raising of pigs, body decorations (tattoo), the lack of labour specialization, and the lack of formal education. The Mentawaians are also said to lack a future orientation; they supposedly live too much on a day-to-day basis. The Minangkabau settler cannot understand why the Mentawaians refuse to imitate them or why they do to learn from them. For most of them, [the Mentawai Islands are] a “wild” place inhabited by “wild” people who do not want to become modern” (Persoon 2002: 446).

However, the Minangkabau also recognized and exploited the value of the traditional Mentawaiian culture as culture tourism became to emerge (Ponting 2001).

Traditionally, for the Mentawaians, waves, inhabited with an own soul, were never considered as something that could be owned. Therefore, sea and waves were never conceptualised as resources which access had to be regulated (Persoon 2003). However, due to the high influx of surf tourists and surf operators the situation is changing and claims of ownership are being made and compensation for their use is demanded. Moreover, apart from the ownership issues and small number of local boatmen and homestays, local people remain completely outside the surfing business. “They cannot be guides or porters, they cannot sell food or handicrafts, and they cannot make money by having their picture taken as in the case of adventure tourism” (ibid.). In contrast, most surfers do not travel to experience another culture. Hence, the indigenous people are characterized as an “obstacle or a friendly nuisance to sidestep on the way to water (Ponting et al. 2005). Consequently,
poverty numbers remain high leading to malnourishment and health surveys determined the situation to be “critical” (Towner 2014).

5.3.4 CO-MANAGEMENT & THE INCLUSION OF THE LOCALS

As already presented in 2.2, the current tourism industry is far from perfect, on the one hand, exploiting and marginalizing the host destination and often dominated by a few foreign based transnational corporations (Mann 2000). The wishes of the locals, on the other hand, are often overlooked and even neglected. As already came forward in section 5.3.2 and 5.3.3, The Mentawai Islands are no exception to this rule. Especially local involvement in surf tourism remains low and many locals do not have very strong feelings about surfing (Persoon 2003). Surf tourism in the Mentawai Islands is currently dominated by foreign multinationals and the local tourism businesses are owned by Minangkabau (ibid.). Moreover, crowding at the surf breaks is becoming a serious problem in the region (Buckley 2002b). Hence, initially, the surf industry brought little development opportunities, improvement of living conditions or material infrastructure to the island (ibid.). However, due to the involvement of NGOs and the local government things are starting to change (Ponting & O’Brien 2013).

As presented in section 2.2, sustainable tourism is “[t]ourism that takes full account of its current and future economic, social and environmental impacts, addressing the needs of visitors, the industry, the environment and host communities” (UNEP & WTO 2005: 11-12). Vital in this is the involvement of all the relevant stakeholders, including local community members, government officials, tourism operators and NGOs (Towner 2014). As already mentioned the most serious challenges regarding the sustainability of surf tourism are the saturated recreational capacity (crowding) of the surf breaks and the lack of involvement of the locals (Ponting 2001). The key strategy to make these aspects more sustainable is through “active management of tourist numbers, activities and infrastructure, as well as other land uses, in the Mentawai Islands” (Buckley 2002b: 435). Thus, proper management of the surf tourism industry itself is required (Ponting 2001; Pointing & O’Brien 2015).

As already has been mentioned in section 5.3.2, currently there exists a power struggle among surf operators themselves and between surf operators and the local communities over who has the right to control the surf tourism market and waves, because crowding is becoming a serious problem (Towner 2014; Ponting 2008; Ponting & O’Brien 2014). “The result has been a series of public relations battles and attempted management schemes, which have ultimately been unsuccessful for all parties concerned” (Towner 2014: 87). Towner (2014) describes the situation in a few villages in the Mentawai Islands, amongst others Silabu and Ebay. Ebay is a small village positioned on the northern side of The Nyang Islands in close proximity of the southern tip of Siberut and near a key surf break. With approximately 50 to 100 residents it is a very small village while Silabu has approximately 500 residences. In Ebay, increased visiting numbers of surf tourists has resulted in the construction of several homestays and other facilities providing several well-paying jobs for the locals who function as homestay or charter boat owners or as wageworker at the surrounding surf resorts (ibid.). Silabu is located 5 kilometres from the coast on the western
side of North Pagai and, compared to Ebay, relatively undeveloped and poor with little tourism exposure located several kilometres away from the surf break. Moreover, there is little outside influence and the residents live in small shacks on a subsistence diet. The presence of the NGO SurfAid and donations from the local resort has helped to build community projects including irrigation systems and a new community health centre.

On the one hand, the local community members of Ebay were very supportive of surf tourism and believed that it changed their life in a positive way. On the other hand, the local community members from Silabu were a lot more negative concerning tourism complaining about the bad influence that the surf tourists had on the children. It thus seems that the local community with the highest level of engagement with the tourist industry and the highest financial benefits also have the highest positive attitude towards the tourist industry (Ritchie & Inkari 2006; Dyer et al. 2003). Another issue in Silabu is the unequal distribution of income in which especially male local elites benefit from the tourism industry. An interesting observation is that the Ebay villagers, with a high exposure of tourists, still believed that there are not enough tourists while the villagers from Silabu, with a low exposure of tourists feel that they have too many tourists. A possible explanation of this is that the tourists visiting the surf breaks near Silabu stay on the charter boats while the tourists visiting Ebay also visit and stay in the village (Towner 2014).

Residents from both villages believed that they were left out of tourism planning processes and criticized the current government planning and management of the surf tourism industry that neglected the needs and interests of the local population. Hence, there seems to be inadequate regulation by the local Mentawai government. Moreover, communication between the relevant stakeholders involved, including the local government, the operators and local communities seems to be low. Another barrier that forms a massive constraint for local participation is the lack of hospitality training and language issues. There is a lack of tertiary institutions that offer tourism courses or government-run workshops. “Comments made by local community members [...] highlighted that the need for increased education and tourism industry training was universally important” (Towner 2014: 230). Moreover, the foreign-owned surf charter boats and surf resorts were also characterized as a barrier to community participation in the surf tourism industry. Hence, currently there is a limited level of collaboration between the relevant stakeholder groups.

The implementation of a co-management approach, extensively explained in section 2.3, can do this. To summarize, co-management means that the distribution of rights and responsibilities for management (including exploitation and conservation) are shared among the government and individual or collective users including the industry and local community stakeholder groups (Persoon et al. 2003). Co-management integrates government policy, sound business practices, customary laws and local territorial rights (Towner 2014). Hence, there should be greater participation of the local community members in the planning of surf tourism and more intensive communication between the relevant stakeholders in order for sustainable surf tourism to be successful. The local government can support the participation and involvement of the local communities by focusing on social development and implementing tourism hospitality workshops and
language courses. Moreover, the local linkages of foreign-owned resorts and charter boats should also become stronger, because among surf tourists and local communities there is a willingness to encounter each other (ibid.). This can, on the one hand, benefit the local community due to a bigger distribution of revenues; on the other hand, it can enrich the tourism experience of the surf tourists and make them more aware of the local issues in the region. Another result will be that the undeveloped village of Silabu will become more involved in the tourism industry. This will, on the one hand, lead to more development in the specific village; on the other hand, it can reduce crowding by distributing the surf tourists over a greater number of high quality surf spots.

5.4 A COMPARISON BETWEEN LOMBOK & THE MENTAWAI ISLANDS

In this section I will compare the cases and analyse and discuss the biggest similarities and differences. Subsequently, I will discuss coastal and marine tourism management and the management of natural resources in general in Indonesia.

5.4.1 SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

When analysing and discussing both cases by using the theoretical framework there seem to be a lot of similarities between the Mentawai Islands and Lombok. One of the most prominent and worrisome similarities is that both surf tourism destinations are relatively undeveloped with a low inclusion of the local indigenous peoples in the surf tourism industry. As a result, both destinations still have high levels of poverty. The surf tourism industry in Lombok and The Mentawai Islands are heavily dominated by foreign owned charter boats and luxury resorts that often have low linkages to the local indigenous communities. Thus, in both cases surf tourism has had a negative economic impact leading to leakages and increasing inequality. The positive economic impact that surf tourism can have is negligible in both cases because employment opportunities were only present for a short term and are currently dominated by migrants, such as the Minangkabau in the Mentawais. This has also led to negative socio-cultural tourism impacts. The influx of migrants has resulted in the marginalization of the indigenous peoples. The traditional values of the latter are in both cases neglected and the indigenous peoples are characterized by the migrants as “primitive” and “lazy”. Moreover, the culture and traditions of the indigenous peoples have been recognized as a cultural attraction leading to its exploitation by entrepreneurial migrants. Furthermore, both the resorts and the charter boats can have a deleterious impact on the environment damaging reefs and dumping or burning their waste and sewage. Although, as is illustrated in the case of Ledang Terak, waste management is also a problem for the indigenous Sasak. Another problem has to with land rights and the ownership over resources. Due to the influx of migrants the indigenous peoples have to redefine their meaning of resources and claim land rights. An example of this is how traditionally the Mentawaians never considered waves as something that could be owned. However, nowadays claims are being made and compensation for their use is demanded. Both cases show how these claims over land rights have resulted in tension over resources and on-going conflict between the different stakeholders involved. The urged for economic
profit has often led to the marginalization of indigenous peoples. Hence, both in Lombok and in the Mentawai Islands there is a need for social development such as educational opportunities, hospitality workshops and language courses among the indigenous peoples in order for them to become more involved in the surf tourism industry. At the moment, the lack of education and the English language barrier is forming a major obstacle in their inclusion in the surf tourism industry.

Nevertheless, there are also some differences between the two destinations. First of all, when applying the model posited by Butler (1980) Lombok is still in the development stage. The surf tourism industry is still undeveloped and crowding is currently not an issue. The Bali bombings and terrorist threats have an important role in this diminishing the attractiveness of the Bali region, including Lombok. As a consequence, it has spurred interest in the Mentawai region as a surf destination. Hence, when using the model posited by Butler (1980) the Mentawai region is reaching the stagnation stage, especially at the supply side. Surf breaks are overcrowded with charter vessels and the recreational capacity is saturated. Tourism has thus led to a negative economic impact causing a shortage of (surf) facilities. It is a perfect example of the tragedy of the commons. Currently, both regions seem to be poorly managed by the Indonesian government with indigenous rights neglected and a rising level of conflict over valuable resources between the stakeholders involved. As already argued, the implementation of a co-management approach could be a valuable alternative for both locations. However, until now the Indonesian government has failed to implement such an approach.
### Table 2: The Impact of Surf Tourism on Lombok & the Mentawai Islands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts of Surf Tourism</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Socio-Cultural</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lombok</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employment opportunities*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diversification of employment*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Growth in local income*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leakages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increasing inequality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentawai Islands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employment opportunities*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diversification of employment*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Growth in local income*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leakages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increasing inequality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shortage of (surf) facilities**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These positive economic impacts are often negligible due to the fact that these are only present for a short term and later dominated by migrants. **The only big difference between both cases is the shortage of (surf) facilities on the Mentawai Islands.*
5.4.2 COASTAL & MARINE TOURISM MANAGEMENT IN INDONESIA

Through the years Indonesia has a history of managing its marine and coastal resources poorly (Purwaka 2001). Denying the indigenous communities access to resources and neglecting the needs and rights of the indigenous peoples has resulted in a considerable degree of conflict between the government and local communities (Down to Earth 2000). The focus of the Indonesian government has been predominantly on maximising profits, “and being largely uncoordinated they often overlap and are incompatible with local-level management schemes” (Towner 2014: 85). Hence, the local governments have “minimal decision-making power, lacking clear authority to manage the coastal resources in their regional areas” (Towner 2014: 85). Moreover, the local governments lack any resources themselves and are “solely dependent upon funding from the central government, which maintains its financial and political control” (Towner 2014: 85; Siry 2011: 470). Through the years several laws have been implemented in Indonesia promoting “the integration of customary laws and local territorial rights into local government policy, as well as encouraging community-based and collaborative approaches to managing coastal resources”, however, as illustrated in both cases presented, these have been largely unsuccessful in empowering the indigenous peoples (Towner 2014: 86; Siry 2011: 471). Successful co-management of marine resources, which are key in surf tourism, should empower the host population, promote learning and adaptation processes for the indigenous peoples, and allow all relevant stakeholders to participate equally and share responsibility in negotiation and management decisions (Jentoft 2006; Siry 2006). Consequently, sustainable management of resources requires management systems “that move beyond regulatory regimes” by involving the relevant stakeholders as trustees of the oceans (NRTEE 1998: 30). As of yet, in Indonesia, self-regulation and active participation in coastal and marine management strategies by indigenous peoples in the tourism industry have not yet materialised therefore a greater involvement of the local communities is needed and the gradual implementation of a co-management approach is required (Towner 2014). Hence, it is argued that “[t]he success or failure of these new oceans management initiatives may well be determined by the success of co-management arrangements and stakeholder participation in policy development and implementation” (NRTEE 1998: 30).

6. CONCLUSION & DISCUSSION

In this thesis I have tried to analyse and discuss the impact of surf tourism on two different destinations in Indonesia, namely Lombok and the Mentawai Islands. I have done this by using three theoretical notions: The life cycle model by Butler (1980), the notion of sustainable tourism and the co-management of natural resources approach. What comes to the fore in this thesis is that in recent decades surf tourism has become an integral part of Indonesia. Surfing has become the single most important water sport in Indonesia due to the availability of high quality, consistent and relatively uncrowded waves. Lombok and The Mentawai Islands are two surf destinations that have become relatively dependent on the surf tourists and surf tourism has the potential to become a genuine alternative to reach economic development.
However, when discussing the first research questions raised – *What is the impact of surf tourism on Lombok and the Mentawai Islands, Indonesia?* - the rise of surf tourism is not only considered as a positive development. Both in Lombok and the Mentawai Islands the surf tourism industry has some deleterious outcomes. Key in this is that the surf tourism industry, especially the luxurious resorts and charter vessels, are dominated by a few, foreign-based transnational corporations that have low linkages with the local, indigenous communities causing huge leakages. Moreover, wageworkers are often migrants who are often better trained and have more knowledge of foreign languages than the locals. Therefore, the employment opportunities and increase of income caused by tourism development are negligible and poverty numbers remain high. The high influx of migrants can also have a negative impact on the socio-cultural domain. The indigenous locals are often culturally deprived and their culture and traditions exploited. In addition, both the charter vessels and the resorts that dominate the current surf tourism industry can have a negative impact on the environment by damaging reefs or dumping their rubbish and sewage. Hence, the surf tourism industry has both a negative impact on the local, indigenous communities and on the natural environment.

However, when discussing the second question - *In which aspects do Lombok and the Mentawai Islands, Indonesia differ from each other?* - a few differences come to the fore. These are predominantly the result of the current stage of the tourism industry. On the one hand, in Lombok the surf tourism industry is still relatively undeveloped, although the industry is already dominated by a few foreign operators. Especially the Bali bombings and terrorist threats caused a setback in tourism development. On the other hand, the bombings and terrorist threats have spurred interest in the Mentawai Islands, causing crowding around the best quality surf breaks, a shortage of (surf) facilities, and a high degree of conflict between the tourism operators. Hence, the recreational capacity of the surf breaks seems to be reached.

This connects with the third research question raised: *How is surf tourism on Lombok and the Mentawai Islands, Indonesia managed?* As already described, in both case studies there are numerous conflicts and disputes between the stakeholders involved in the surf tourism industry. These conflicts and disputes revolve predominantly around rights over resources and land. In the Mentawai case study there are conflicts among the tour operators themselves and between the tour operators and the indigenous peoples concerning the surf breaks. Crowding has become a serious issue around the surf breaks challenging the surf experience of the surf tourists. Hence, the recreational capacity at the supply side seems to be reached. However, the islands themselves are still rather undeveloped and the indigenous peoples benefit little from the surf tourism industry. The surf tourism industry thus seems poorly managed providing little opportunities for the indigenous peoples. Among the indigenous peoples there is a need for social development, but until now the Indonesian government fails to provide educational opportunities and language courses. Moreover, the indigenous communities have to be actively involved in tourism planning, acknowledging their values and granting them rights and responsibilities. In general, in Indonesia coastal and marine tourism have been management poorly. As repeatedly mentioned, the co-management approach could be a successful management strategy to
implement sustainable surf tourism. Key in this is the sharing of rights and responsibilities and the involvement of the relevant stakeholders, especially the indigenous peoples, as the trustees of the ocean.

6.1 LIMITATIONS

Although I have tried to give a coherent and comprehensive image of surf tourism on the Mentawai Islands and Lombok, some limitations have to be taken into account. First of all, most of the empirical data from Lombok have been collected in 2006. Therefore, the data can be to some extent outdated. In 2011 Lombok’s new international airport have been completed. This can have spurred interest in surf tourism industry and tourism in general on Lombok. Moreover, since the most recent Bali bombings already ten years have passed. Probably tourists will not avoid Lombok anymore because they are afraid for terrorist threats. Therefore, there is a big chance that the current tourism industry is more developed than presented here. Furthermore, it is important to recognize that surf tourism only has an impact on specific areas on the Mentawai Islands and Lombok, namely where surf breaks are present. Hence, one should be careful to generalise the impact of surf tourism to the whole of Lombok and the Mentawai Archipelago. Another limitation has to do with the focus of the existing empirical data. The emphasis has been predominantly on humans, while the environment has never been the key unit of analysis. More research is needed in this specific domain to give a more comprehensive image of the whole impact of surf tourism. Moreover, the role of the surf tourists themselves has rarely been the unit of analysis, although it was part of Towner’s research in 2014. Likewise, in this specific domain more research is needed.
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