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ABSTRACT

The cultural heritage building is one of the characteristics of the Indonesian Nation. Surabaya as a historic city in seizing the independence of Indonesia, making it became City of Hero, which there are many buildings with historical value. Radio Bung Tomo cultural heritage building became one of the historical evidence of arek-arek Suroboyo struggle in seizing the independence. In 2016, there is a reality that the building of Radio Bung Tomo Cultural Heritage has been dismantled by its owner. The demolition of Bung Tomo Radio, which is one of the cultural heritage buildings in Surabaya, received attention from the people of Surabaya and showed some problems in the management of cultural heritage in Surabaya. This research was conducted to describe the phenomenon of demolition of Radio Bung Tomo Cultural Heritage related to the Law No. 11 Year 2010 and Surabaya Regional Regulation Number 5 Year 2005 in Surabaya.

This research uses qualitative research method with descriptive research type. The collecting methods used were interviews and observations to obtain primary data and literature studies to obtain secondary data from publications related to the demolition of Radio Bung Tomo cultural heritage. The method of analysis is inductive that begins from data collection then the researchers do the categorization. The results of this study found several problems related to the demolition of Radio Bung Tomo among them is the coordination of inter-stakeholder has not been established maximally because there is no clear path in the management of cultural heritage, the foundation of policy at the regional level does not refer to the policy at the central level (in this case Surabaya City against Cultural Heritage Act), and lack of supervision from the Surabaya Heritage Reserve Team. Therefore, the necessary policy alternatives include strengthening coordination among related institutions, the revision of regional regulations No. 5 of 2005, as well as the restructuring of the cultural preservation team of Surabaya.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Cultural preservation is part of the nation's identity relating to the history of the nation that certainly is not owned by other nations. According to the institutions No. 10 of 2011 on the articles of general provisions, the Cultural Preservation is a cultural heritage of Heritage Objects, Heritage Buildings, Cultural Heritage Structure, Heritage Sites, and Heritage Areas on land and / or water conserved its existence because it has an important value for history, science, education, religion, and / or culture through the process of determination [3]. Surabaya as an area that had experienced colonization shows the importance of preservation of cultural heritage in arek-arek suroboyo struggle in seizing and defending Indonesia independency.

Indeed, history could build the spirit of a nation to conserve the cultural value of cultural heritage that serve as a proof of nation’s struggle. Long history of Surabaya development has record a lot of historical old building and become the proof of city’s development. Some of the building that is served as a basis of the struggle to defend the nation’s independence is formulated and agreed upon as a symbol of struggle, thus made Surabaya as a city of heroes. Local regulation No. 5 of 2005 becomes one of the proofs of government supports towards the conservation of cultural heritage in Surabaya. Historical building conservation through the regulation stated that the building and/or the surrounding of cultural heritage is one of the culture properties that must be conserved to remind us of our nation identity and national interests. One of the culture heritage building that becomes the historical proof in Surabaya is Bung Tomo broadcasting home also known as radio Bung Tomo, radio Bung Tomo has become one of the place used for Bung Tomo to move arek-arek suroboyo against the invaders. He speaks to burn the passion of arek-arek suroboyo. This building is formally...
established as a culture heritage building in 1996, and the next two years, the mayor’s decree No. 188.45/004/402.1.04/1998 of 101 establishment of culture heritage site in Surabaya is publicly released.

Bung Tomo Radio was a vital communication media back in the day. This radio starts airing since October, 15 1945, 3 days after PPRl formed. In one of the rooms of the house, Bung Tomo along with Ktut Tantri and some of their friends formed Indonesian Republic Rebellion Radio studio with a portable transmitter. That studio is forcefully built because back then, RRI still doubts the involvement of Bung Tomo. In that room, the flame of November 10 war is burned. Hundreds of thousands fighter taking up their arms to fight the invaders, thus making Surabaya renown as the city of heroes. Now, this culture heritage building is no more, it has been demolished by the owner of the building.

This demolition of radio Bung Tomo is considered violating the Law no.11 of 2010 and 2005 Surabaya’s local regulation no.5. This research is become interesting because the culture heritage building that supposedly protected by the authorities is demolished and left no trace of historical evidence. Culture heritage is observed directly by the head of culture and tourism department, culture heritage team, and the district head in the area shows how important the culture heritage is. Thus, in this research, the researcher want to learn phenomenon of Bung Tomo radio demolition that related to the Law number 11 of 2010 and 2005 Surabaya’s local regulation number 5.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Cultural Heritage

According to Law no. 11 of 2010, Nature preserve is a cultural inheritance which is have material form such as Cultural Heritage Object, Cultural Heritage Structure, Cultural Heritage Site, and Cultural Heritage Region in the land and/or water which needs to be preserved because it has an important value for history, science, education, religion, and/or culture trough the determination process. Determination is the status granting of Cultural Heritage to object, building, structure, location or geographical space unit undertaken by the government on the recommendation of Cultural Heritage Experts Team. Cultural heritage itself is controlled by the state but can be owned by an individual as the owner of a cultural heritage. Nevertheless, the existence of cultural heritage is arranged to be preserved based under prevailing rules. In the determination process, enhancement, and removal of cultural heritage conducted by Cultural Heritage Team which is a group of conservation experts from various sciences who have a certificate of competence to provide recommendations on cultural heritage. Beside cultural heritage team, the organizer of cultural heritage conservation also supported by conservation experts and curators. Cultural heritage determination in Indonesia have several criteria that are 50 years old or even older, representing the 50 years old shortest style, has a special meaning for history, science, education, religion, and/or culture; has cultural value to strengthening the nation’s personality.

B. Good Governance

According to UNDP (1997) explained that Good Governance have several characteristics that are legitimacy, freedom to be organized and a participate, as well as press freedom, justice and law supremacy, transparency and bureaucratic accountability, effective and efficiency public sector management, accessibility of adequate information, and cooperative government with citizen. From those characteristics, State Administration Institution of Indonesia Republic (LANRI) reapply the principles of good governance which is participation, law supremacy, transparency, responsiveness, consensus orientation, equality, efficiency and effectivity, and strategic vision [6].

Indonesia Transparency Community (2002) explained that good governance is the agreement between government, community, and private sector in which the agreement constitutes the entire process, system, and institution that equal between all of three sectors. Good Governance more likely too see how the government can be a bridge for the interests of the private sector and community [7].

According to Imawan (2002), good governance is a power sharing by the state in regulating economic and social resources for development community. Economy aspect and social community is the main aspect that power sharing is needed especially in the decision-making. Decision-making need to involve private sector and community. So, based on statements above, then Good Governance is a decision-making system between private government, and community which is concerning the life of country and nation. Therefore, those system require appropriate characteristics according to what is delivered by Lembaga Administrasi Negara Republik Indonesia (LAN-RI) [7].
III. METHODOLOGY

A. Research Approach

The use of qualitative descriptive method is to describe the observers’ written or verbal words in shape, function, and meaning to get the representative data. In order to gain the validity, the data are collected from direct observation research that can be justified.

B. Informant Determination

Researchers use purposive sampling method to arrange the schedule and the criteria of the informant that have been made before.

C. Technique of Data Collection

The author gains the data from in-depths interview and observation as the primary data and it supported by literary source as the secondary data from books and internet.

D. Technique of Data Analysis

The researchers use triangulation technique to establish the degree of trust in data examination. In source triangulation, the researcher uses various sources that focus on the issues. In addition, the researcher also collecting the data through interviews the key informant and documentation. Thus, in checking the accuracy of the data, it is necessary to compare the results from the data collection before.

IV. DISCUSSION

Bung Tomo Radio is one of the historical heritages in Surabaya. It was the place where Bung Tomo used to evoke the struggle of arek-arek Suroboyo at that time. Although it was not the only radio broadcasting used by Bung Tomo, this radio remains a witness to the history of Surabaya. In 1988, Bung Tomo Radio was designated as a cultural heritage building in Surabaya based on Decree No. 188. 45/004/402.1.04/1998. Through the Decree that issued by the Department of Culture and Tourism in Surabaya, Radio Bung Tomo building deserves to be preserved. However, the fact of the building has been destroyed by PT Jayanatha who has bought the building, raised an objection and a conflict for some parties.

The demolition of Bung Tomo Radio, get rejection problem from several parties such as Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) Bambu Runcing Surabaya and some people of Surabaya itself. It is proven by some demonstration (movement) and petition made by some parties as policy advocates in Surabaya. The issue has been resolved by the court with a fine of 15 million and PT Jayanatha offered to rebuild. The problem said to be solved because in 1970s Bung Tomo Radio Culture Reserve has ever been restored. This is what makes the argument of PT Jayanatha. Thus, Bung Tomo Radio heritage buildings cannot be reviewed in Law no.11 Year 2010. However, it can be studied through city regulation of Surabaya No. 5 Year 2005. This reality shows that there are several problems that arise such as:

1. There is no network coordination model between the stakeholders.

Coordination that is not synchronizes between institutions with other institutions. In this case, the institutions are from the Department of Culture and Tourism, Department of Cipta Karya, and the managing of the cultural heritage itself is the owner of the cultural heritage. The lack of coordination has made the Surabaya city governments lost its identity as the City of Heroes. But this event became a valuable lesson for Surabaya’s Government.

2. City regulation of Surabaya city which has not adjusted with the latest law in Indonesia

In preservation of cultural heritage in Surabaya City, the last regulation used as reference has not been referring to the latest law on cultural preservation, Law no. 11 of 2010. But still refers to the Law No. 5 of 1992 on Heritage Objects. This shows that the government's attention to the preservation of cultural heritage has not adjusted to the latest national regulations.

3. The control system on the cultural preservation team is not maximized.

Based on Law no. 11 in 2010, the cultural heritage team has duties to provide recommendations on determination, ranking, and removal of cultural heritage but in the demolition of bung Tomo radio, the cultural conservation team does not give a demolition permit to the building. This shows the lack of control of the cultural heritage team as a team of experts. However, in the supervision of cultural heritage, it is not only the responsibility of the cultural heritage team but also the responsibilities of the relevant government such as the enactment of licensing procedures and the granting of management licenses to individuals.
Policy brief: Problem Solving to Cultural Heritage Conservation

Policy brief could be a solution of cultural heritage problem in Surabaya. Based on data analysis that has been done, the researchers formulate three policy alternatives to solve the problems. The focus of the proposed policy alternatives is not on the rebuilding, but on preventive measures in the future there is no recurrence of similar problems. Also, the City of Surabaya is a city of Heroes with various cultural heritages in it. Here it is:

1. Creating a communication network model between involving sides to prevent miscommunication

   The process of licensing and the result need to be known by the supervisory team. The supervisory team also needs to go to the field to know exactly the activity that is happening in the culture reserve location. The coordination between the lines needs to be strengthened so that problems surrounding the culture reserve location can be minimized. Especially because Surabaya as the City of Heroes, surely contain plenty of historical culture reserve locations that can be used for further development of science. This communication network model is sustainable by a vessel that connects all sides involved in the preservation of culture reserve locations in Surabaya. The aim is to make the management transparent to the communities and in turn the communities can participate in the preservation.

2. Revising parts of Surabaya Regional Regulation No 5 of the Year 2005 to make it align with new policy; Law no 11 of the Year 2010

   First, The concept of culture reserve. According to the Regional Regulation, culture reserve means the building and the surrounding environment. Whereas in the Law, culture reserve includes buildings, structures, sites, and the surrounding environment. This meant for the institutions that handle the licenses and preservation of culture reserve locations have the same concept regarding culture reserve.

   Second, it is the criminal law in Regional Regulation no 5 of the Year 2005 which still use Law no 5 of the Year 1992 about cultural heritages need to be revised to 1 year jail minimum and 15 years maximum and/or a fine of 500 million rupiah at minimum and 5 billion at maximum in accordance with the criminal law in Law no 11 of the Year 2010 about cultural heritages. This is meant for preventive act to make all sides more cautious when handling cultural heritages.

3. Restructuring the culture reserve team to support the maintenance of cultural heritage location in Surabaya.

   Strengthen the culture conservation team by involving professional organizations like Indonesia Archeologist Team, Indonesia Architects Union, Indonesian Historian Communities, and other organizations. The need of e-government mean member of the management doesn’t only come from organizations which specialized in history, but also can come from IT department that can help managing the connection network between all parties as a model of coordinated network between the government and communities.

V. CONCLUSION

Radio Bung Tomo is one of historical evidence in Surabaya. The cultural heritage showed the struggle of Bung Tomo when tried to evoke the spirit of arek arek Suroboyo to freedom. Recently, the demolition Radio Bung Tomo cultural heritage has shown some problems in the management of Surabaya cultural heritage. Good Governance is the concept of decision-making by involving three sectors such as the public sector, private sector, and the community. Radio Bung Tomo should be back on the principles of Good Governance. Cultural heritage team have planned to rebuild that building but the documents the history of Radio Bung Tomo is not complete. There are some problem in this case such as there is no network coordination model between the stakeholders, city regulation of Surabaya city which has not adjusted with the latest law in Indonesia, and The control system on the cultural preservation team is not maximized. Then, there are policy brief that solve the problem such creating a communication network model between involving sides to prevent miscommunication, Revising parts of Surabaya Regional Regulation No 5 of the Year 2005 to make it align with new policy; Law no 11 of the Year 2010, Restructuring the culture reserve team to support the maintenance of cultural heritage location in Surabaya.
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