

Understanding Community of *Kampung* by Learning From *Gotong Royong* and Conflict in Jakarta

Antony Sihombing

Departemen Arsitektur Fakultas Teknik Universitas Indonesia
a.sihombing@eng.ui.ac.id

Abstract

Jakarta is, indeed, a kampung and at the same time a kota. Jakarta is a complex city or city of contrasts: the traditional and modern, the rich and poor, the sacred and the worldly, often standing side by side in this bustling metropolis. Jakarta is a big city and, as well a big kampung. Kampung is the traditional, spontaneous, and diverse form of indigenous urban development in Indonesia which has grown organically and incrementally over many years without planning guidance or regulations, building codes, coordinated service provision. Gotong royong is one of the ancient traditions, the custom of cooperation, mutual self-help, the sharing of burdens, or solidarity in kampung communities. Gotong royong is a central ideological element of Indonesian nation-building or a concept of human relations. Gotong royong is the traditional concept of the relationship among people in kampung, forming its socio-cultural form. At present, however, gotong royong has gradually become less prominent, and even lost from the everyday life of people in kampung. It could be swamped by social conflicts occurring between one kampung and another; or between kampungs and kota. This paper explores the significance of gotong royong and how it works in the socio-cultural form of kampung.

Kata Kunci: Rukun, Gotong royong, Social Conflict, Community

Abstrak

Jakarta adalah kampung dan juga kota. Jakarta adalah kota yang beragam dan kontras antara: tradisional dan moderen, kaya dan miskin, duniawi dan akhirat yang hidup berdampingan di kota metropolitan yang sangat ramai dan sibuk. Jakarta adalah kota besar dan juga kampung besar. Sementara itu kampung adalah permukiman tradisional yang tumbuh spontan dan beragam yang secara organis dari masa ke masa sejak perkembangan kota di Indonesia, tanpa pedoman dan peraturan perencanaan kota dan tanpa pelayanan sarana dan prasarana perkotaan yang memadai dan terkordinasi. Gotong royong adalah salah satu tradisi peninggalan nenek moyang bangsa Indonesia yaitu kebiasaan bekerjasama, kesetaraan, pembagian tugas bersama, atau solidaritas dalam komunitas di masyarakat kampung. Gotong royong juga menjadi idiologi atau konsep dasar hubungan antar manusia bangsa Indonesia. Gotong royong, sebagai konsep tradisional, membangun bentuk sosial-budaya masyarakat kampung. Kenyataannya, saat ini di perkotaan nilai gotong royong semakin menipis bahkan mulai hilang dari kehidupan sehari-hari masyarakat kampung. Apakah hal itu disebabkan akibat konflik sosial yang terjadi antara satu kampung dan kampung lainnya atau antara kampung dan kota? Artikel ini menggali nilai atau konsep gotong royong dan bagaimana konsep itu bekerja dalam kehidupan sosial budaya di masyarakat kampung di Jakarta.

Keywords: Rukun, Gotong royong, Konflik Sosial, Komunitas

1 Introduction

The development of Jakarta has led to tensions and even conflicts between the requirements of a large modern city (*kota*)¹ and the needs of the ordinary citizens who live in the *kampungs*² that make up most of

it. Some of them have been demolished by government, as a consequence of new development. This paper defines what *kampungs* are, and discusses their importance in Jakarta's social, cultural, economic and political development.

This paper is presented by literature reviewing of *kampung*, community, power and conflict and discussing them to tradition of *gotong royong*, *rukun* and social conflict, which occurred in Jakarta today. Section 2 begins with a definition of *kampung* through intellectual debate. Section 3 discusses *rukun kampung*, which is described by: *rukun* (social harmony); *gotong royong* (the traditional concept of relationship); and community as a place and identity. Section 4 discusses social conflicts that have occurred in *kampungs* related to competition caused by social actions or interaction and imbalance or abuse of power in Jakarta's urban development. Section 5 draws conclusions for this paper.

2 What is Kampung?

In *bahasa* Indonesia (Indonesian language), *kampung* (from Malay language) is known as *kampung*. In Indonesian everyday language, *kampung* is also known as *desa*. According to *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* (the Great Dictionary of the Indonesian Language) (1988), *kampung* has almost the same meaning as *desa*. To distinguish them, *kampung* is usually used to describe a traditional settlement in an urban area, and *desa* is used for a traditional settlement in a rural area. Thus, there is no area or settlement in Jakarta named *desa*, but there are more than 600 settlements or areas named *kampung*, and all of them are old settlements, such as: Kampung Ambon, Kampung Bali, Kampung Rambutan, Kampung Melayu, Kampung Makasar, etc. (Kompas, 19 February 2000). However, no new housing area or real estate development has ever been named *kampung*.

Kenworthy (1997) [1] emphasizes that *kampungs* are not squatter settlements or slums. They are tight agglomerations of continuous, organically and incrementally developed self-help housing over many years, built mostly on traditionally owned land in traditional ways, or without planning guidance or building codes.

Kampung is an indigenous concept of housing and community of various sizes, shapes and densities, catering for mostly low and middle-to-low income families at different dwelling price levels. It also generates within itself innumerable home industries, ranging from manufacturing of leather, cloth, and metal goods to various foods and services.

Wiryomartono (1995, p. 171) [2] defines *kampungs* as indigenous settlements where people still practise their traditional ways as in their *desa*, even though they are now in urban areas. In his view, *kampungs* are unstructured, unorganized and informal settlements in the socio-economic system. They can also be thought of as settlements in urban areas without infrastructure planning and urban economic networking. Poverty and poor of quality of life are features of *kampungs*.

Desa and *kampung* can be distinguished through differences in density of population, employment, management, and social, economic and political activities (Geertz, 1965 [3]; Wiranto, 1997 [4]). *Desa*, a settlement in a rural area, has the specific characteristics of being based on agriculture, low density of population, development of natural resources, spreading community pattern, low formal education, unskilled labour, and a simple societal organization and social structure. However, *kampung*, a settlement in an urban area, is influenced by trade and commercial goods, and has high population density, compact community pattern, better education, skilled labour and management of society and companies. *Kampungs* are also influenced by the presence of the *Kota*, the centre for political and economic activities. The original Javanese *kampung* is an off-street neighbourhood in an urban settlement (Geertz, 1965 [3]; Guinness, 1986 [5]).

As discussed by Geertz (1965, pp. 106-107) [3], the transformation of a tradition village into a *kampung* has three main aspects:

First, there was the emergence of a new, semimodern occupational structure which allowed and encouraged people to move off land and into non-agricultural work. Second, there was the atomization of the traditional forms of village social life within the kampongs as the agricultural basis of community integration disappeared, and, coincident with this atomization, the emergence of new forms of social organization to combat it. Third, there was a partial dissolution of village political structure and also a partial reorientation toward urban political leadership. In brief, it was a process of readaptation, not simply of disintegration—as urbanization is so often described.

Jellinek (1991, p. xix) [6] argues that the planners and inhabitants have different perceptions of urban development:

The demolition of *kampung* highlighted the opposing views of kampung dwellers and city planners. The former saw the *kampung* as a bustling hive of activity and a place of hope, a stepping stone to a better standard of living. The latter saw it as a slum whose inhabitants were caught in a vicious circle of poverty. Implicitly, the planners assumed that housing conditions were a good indicator of living standards. If the *kampung* was an escape route from the poverty and hard work of the countryside then destroying it was a mistake. If, on the other hand, it was a poverty trap, then destroying it may have provided its inhabitants with the opportunity for a better life.

Many scholars have described the differences between the real life in *kampungs* and the government's view of them. The scholars believe that *kampungs* and their activities will encourage the informal sector. They even consider that the only one way to wipe out urban poverty is by economic development and giving wide job opportunities to the people in *kampungs*, as happened in London hundreds of years ago (Jellinek, 1991) [6]. In another publication, Jellinek (1999) [6] focuses on the culture of *kampungs*. According to her, culture is an element of mutual self-help whose physical fabric has evolved organically—creating a sense of people. The high population density is coupled with economic diversity. Low

consumption goes with redistribution of resources. Social relationships cannot be separated from economic ties. *Gotong royong*, mutual self-help and exchange, is at the heart of the *kampung* social and economic relationships.



Figure 1:

Little open space *kampung* (top); public space on the lane (bottom)

Source: Photograph by author

The above explanations show that *kampungs* cannot stay alone without *kota*, or vice versa. This paper coins the word *kampung* to express the interdependence of *kampung* and *kota*. *Kampungs* have two major characteristics, which give them strength: on the one hand *rukun* (social harmony) and *gotong royong* (mutual self-help relationship), and on the other, social conflicts. These two characteristics will be discussed in some detail in the next two sections.

3 Rukun Kampung

3.1 Rukun

According to *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* (The Great Dictionary of Indonesian Language, 1988), there are three meanings of *rukun*. The first is *rukun* as a basis, foundation, or principle, e.g. 'rukun Islam' (Islamic principles). The second is *rukun* understood as 'good' and 'peace' in connection with relationships. It also means 'one mind' or 'one interest', or unanimous. The third is *rukun* as association or organization based on mutual self-help and relationships, e.g. *rukun tani* (farmer organization); *rukun tetangga* (community organization or institution); and *rukun kampung* or *rukun warga* (*kampung* or neighbourhood organization in one sub-district). In the discussion in this paper, the second and the third of these meanings are the most useful for explaining community in *kampungs*.

Guinness (1986, p. viii) [5] describes *rukun* as a 'social stratification in *kampung* relationship, residents laid stress on communal institutions and the state of social harmony'. Jay (1986, p. 66) [7] argues that *rukun* refers not only to achieving a communal state (state of being), but also to a process of sharing through collective action (mode of action). Hildred Geertz (1961) [8] describes *rukun* as having the highest value in *kampung* relationships, indicating agreement among a group of people concerning interpersonal conflicts. As she argued:

[*rukun*] is the highest of worth, and on the corresponding moral imperative to control one's impulses, to keep them out of awareness or at least unexpressed, so as not to set up reverberating emotional responses in others... (p. 147)

It signifies a state of agreement, of unanimity in a group concerning its means and purposes, at least in outer behaviour... Thus, in practice, *rukun* actually refers not to mutual aid and cooperation but to the appearance of such and to the absence of overt interpersonal conflict (p. 149).

Rukun Tetangga (RT or community) is the lowest level of organization or association of community in Jakarta, established by neighbouring people who have good and peaceful relationships among them, inter-individual cooperation (Geertz, 1960) [9], or interpersonal relationships (Geertz, 1961) [8] within a clearly defined social context. In accordance with concrete practices of labour and capital exchange (Geertz, 1960) [9], *rukun* is always followed by mutual assistance or mutual self-help, known as *gotong royong* (Guinness, 1986) [5].

3.2. Gotong royong

In Indonesian everyday speaking, *gotong royong* is cooperation between members of a community. In more detailed understanding, it is cooperation springing from a spontaneous attitude of the participants; the cooperation arises from a desire to serve the daily good in a community. Furthermore, in popular literature, the spontaneity and desire to serve the common good the idea of *gotong royong* becomes a special attribute in the national character of Indonesian *kampung* citizens (Koentjaraningrat, 1961, p. 2) [10].

According to Heuken et al, (1991) [11] in Javanese tradition *gotong royong* can have several meanings. The first is 'mobilization of human capital' from outside of the family to help them in cultivation, without using money to pay them. The second is 'mutual self-help among the neighbourhood', to clean up their surroundings or environment, based on public needs. This also happens in *kampungs*, among neighbourhoods, clans, or people who are from the same *desa*. The third is 'mutual self-help among poor people', to overcome their problems temporarily. As a result of poverty, they do not have money to pay workers. The fourth is *kerja-bakti* or 'working-bee',ⁱⁱⁱ mutual self-help to build or construct public projects (public facilities and infrastructure) of society, state, or religion, without receiving any payment.

Gotong royong is cohesive. One cannot have *gotong*, only working or helping, without *royong*, taking together benefit from the work fairly. Or one cannot have only *royong*, getting the benefit, without working and helping. *Gotong royong* is also solidarity.

Modern *gotong royong* is the consciousness of active responsibility in the healthy development of society, so that the strengths, influences, and positions of each person in society are in equity. This spirit echoes in the second principle of *Pancasila*^{iv} (humanitarian and internationalism) and the fifth (social fairness of people). Thus, to develop modern society in developing both of these principles, people and government have to keep maintaining *gotong royong* in society or state to subdue individual interests and abuse of power.

We may distinguish *gotong royong* at two levels, '*kampung* or community level' and 'national level'. In the original narrow sense, it is a social organization of mutual social cooperation existing in traditional society at the *kampung* or community level. Since the Japanese occupation, *gotong royong* has been the main characteristic of RT. *Gotong royong* as the leading tool of the RT's activities is manifested in the area of community solidarity, such as fundraising for the poor, food distribution and collective cleaning operations of the neighbourhood (Niessen, 1995) [12]. *Gotong royong* as a traditional social organization in a group of people refers to a community in that the members are ready to help each other and to cooperate for their common interest (Notoatmodjo, 1962, p. 11) [13]. In the broad and derived sense at the national level *gotong royong* can be a philosophical idea in politics emphasizing mutual social cooperation among diversified components of national and ethnic groups, as well as among different political parties. At this level, the essential components of *gotong royong* are cooperation and coordination.

From the economic viewpoint, *gotong royong* is the traditional economy where

manpower is the specific human capital or social capital known as *padat karya*. According to Dovey, social capital is a collectively owned resource in a social relationship of family, friends, community and society, based on mutual self-help (Dovey, 2002) [14] or 'class membership, institutionalized in the form of exclusive club membership and titles of nobility' (Bourdieu, 1986) [15]. *Gotong royong* as social capital can be transformed into economic capital like *arisan* at a small scale (relatives, clans, communities, neighbourhoods, companies, etc.) and *koperasi* at a bigger scale (big private and public companies, *kampungs*, etc.)

KIP (*Kampung Improvement Programs*) is one form of *gotong royong*. In these projects the community identifies specific needs or problems in the neighbourhood and addresses these by bringing together local funds and labour or social capital. The government gives assistance by providing the appropriate guidelines and standards for the proposed facilities. Although restricted in scope and limited in funds, these projects can successfully solve specific problems in the neighbourhood by relying on the people's own resources.



Figure 2:
KIP in *kampung* Menteng Atas, Jakarta
Source: Photograph by author

Koentjaraningrat (1961, p. 44 [10]) argued that even though *gotong royong* appeared to be in decline in urban communities like Jakarta, people can still try to realize their ideals. People in urban areas, not only those in rural areas, endeavor to make *gotong royong* a true characteristic of the relationship of all Indonesian people. Moreover, Notoatmojo (1962, p. 18 [13]) pointed out

In the community of *desa* or *kampung*, *gotong royong* is the basic thought in the relationship among all members; they voluntarily subject their individual rights to the superior rights of the community.

3.3. Community: place and identity

What is community in socio-cultural relationship among people in *kampungs* in Jakarta? Community is simply a group of people living together (neighbourhood) united by shared interests or socio-cultural background (interest group). Mayo (2000 [16]) considers that community cannot be separated from culture and identity (for example, race, ethnicity, religion, and gender). According to Mayo, the definition of community has two aspects: community related to place (or shared geography) and community related to shared interests. These two meanings distinguish between 'locality' or 'territory' and 'a communality of interest' or 'interest group' (Mayo, 2000) [16]. In other words, place is community of locality and identity is community of interest.

The idea of community relates to: mutual self-help, cooperation (Notoatmodjo, 1962) [13]; social action, competition and conflicts (Weber, 1978) [17]; 'social relationship' (Weber, 1978) [17]; 'community participation' (Mayo, 2000) [16] or 'community initiatives' (Kubish and Stone, 2002) [18] which are influenced by the socio-cultural experience of inhabitants. The words participation, initiative and action show that community is a group of people, who actively consider their challenges and opportunities, influenced by their environment, social, cultural, economic, and political tensions,

or other interests. Social relationship cannot be reached without action.

Tradition or culture is the essential factor forming a particular community or *kampung*. The mutual self-help relationship is a feature of traditional settlements in *kampungs*. Traditions can change with time, but only gradually. 'Traditional, of course, can accommodate a small change but not radical innovation' (Tuan, 1989, p.27) [19]. For example, the mutual self-help relationship among people in *kampungs* has been maintained up to the present; and it can help to solve problems and unite the society of their everyday life. Traditional communities of *kampungs* in Jakarta are inhabited by people with similar interests related to their socio-economic level, clan or relatives, hometown descent; and ethnicity. In Jakarta the names of many *kampungs* are based on ethnicity or home town origin such as Kampung Ambon (original settlement for Ambonese people), Kampung Bali (original settlement for Balinese people), Kampung Makasar (original settlement for people from Makasar).

From my own experience of living in *kampungs* for eight years, they recognize each other in *rukun* (social harmony) in a small area (place or territory). This community is called *Rukun Tetangga* (RT or community). Thus, RT related to place is locality, and related to identity is community of interest. As Mayo (2000, p. 39 [16]) puts it:

Traditional communities, including working-class communities were presented and valorised as tightly knit, characterized by shared values of solidarity and mutuality, based upon face-to-face communications.

Face-to-face communication means that they recognize each other. There is a limit to the size of the community where this can occur. For example, in Jakarta, one community (RT) has a population about 250 people or about fifty households; and most of them recognize each other.

PERPUSTAKAAN PUSAT
UNIVERSITAS INDONESIA

Therefore, community signifies a recognizable group of people who are neighbours or who recognize each other in a limited area or territory; and they have communal interests, which emerge in participation, actions, or initiatives of members to solve their problems and to maximize their strength. In Jakarta's *kampungs*, communities can be known as *rukun tetangga*, the traditional community, which is also formed in a particular place or territory and by the communal interests of the inhabitants. People in these communities (*rukun tetanggas*) also recognize each other; and they participate in community activities through the tradition of *gotong royong*.

4. Social Conflicts

The previous sections need to be qualified by discussing social conflicts among people in *kampungs*. The two concepts (*rukun* and *gotong royong*) of communal relationship in *kampungs* can, for some reasons, be swamped by social conflicts. This tendency will now be discussed in some detail.

4.1. Social Competition

What is conflict? According to the dictionary, conflict is a state of disagreement or argument between opposing groups and opposing ideas or principles (Longman, 1978) [20]. It also means battle, fight, or struggle, or physical confrontation between parties. For Rubin et al (1994, p. 5) [21], 'conflict means perceived divergence of interest, or a belief that the parties' current aspirations cannot be achieved simultaneously'. Thus, there is no action, competition, or interest, without conflict. These writers, moreover, explain conflicts in reference to individuals, groups, and the relations between them (1994, p. 17) [21]:

Conflicts may be more common in relations between groups than in relations between individuals, and more common in relations between individuals who do not see themselves as sharing a common group

membership than relations between those who do.

Competition is a positive force in social relationship in modern society for building better community. On the other hand, as a result of the different social, economic and political interests of government and citizens, the government uses 'legitimation' (Dovey, 1999) [22] to control people to attain their objectives.

Conflict among citizen in *kampungs* also arises as a consequence of too much tension from economic and political interests and also from various problems such as floods, fires, unregulated land, informal sectors, and demolitions of *kampungs*. People try to solve their problems individually or locally. For example, when flood covered Jakarta in the beginning in 2002, there was social conflict between *kampungs* Sunter and Kelapa Gading, to keep their areas or *kampunkotags* free from flood.

As mentioned in the previous section, community has the essential characteristics of cooperation and competition. Cooperation is an essential element of *gotong royong* in traditional communities in *kampungs*; on the other hand, competition is an essential element of modern community. In modern society, particularly in Jakarta's urban society, both cooperation and competition are indicators of urban development. Cooperation tends to increase socialization, while competition tends to increase individualism. It has been proved for a long time that cooperation can keep maintaining solidarity, harmony, and community among people in *kampungs*. Social conflicts in *kampungs* endanger the existence of the community itself. Thus, competition can be a factor destroying peace in social relationship (Notoatmodjo, 1962) [13]. Thus, beside cooperation, in harmony and peaceful relationship in community, there is also found competition. Uncontrolled and unregulated competition will create conflicts between dwellers in *kampungs* or between one community and another, and will destroy order and security. Weber (1978, p. 38)

[17], more comprehensively described the correlation between social relationship, conflicts, and competition. He pointed out that:

A social relationship will be referred to as conflict (*Kampf*) insofar as action is oriented intentionally to carrying out the actor's own will against the resistance of the other party or parties. The term "peaceful" conflict will be applied to cases in which actual physical violence is not employed. A peaceful conflict is "competition" insofar as it consists in a formally peaceful attempt to attain control over opportunities and advantages which are also desired by others. A competitive process is "regulated" competition to the extent that its ends and means are oriented to an order. The struggle, often latent, which takes place between human individuals or social types, for advantages and survival, but without a meaningful mutual orientation in terms of conflict, will be called "selection". Insofar as it is a matter of the relative opportunities of individuals during their own lifetime, it is "social selection"; insofar as it concerns differential chances for the survival of hereditary characteristics, "biological selection".

4.2. Excessive Power over *Kampung*s

Power can be understood in many ways, positive and negative. Wrong (1995, p. 2) [23] modified Russel's definition of power: 'Power is the capacity of some persons to produce intended and foreseen effects on others'. Weber (1978, vol. II, p. 926) [17] defined power as 'the chance of a man or a number of men to realize their own will in a social action even against the resistance of others who are participating in the action'. Laswell and Kaplan (1950, p. 75) [24] argued that 'power is a special case of the exercise of influence: it is the process of affecting policies of the others with the help of (actual or threatened) severe deprivations for nonconformity with the policies intended'. From these three definitions, it is clear that power consists of: a person or people as a subject; groups or parties, who have their own capacity as an object; and capacity, chance, influence, or policy as the agent of power. Power

does not work without ability to impose the sanction (Wrong, 1995, p. 21) [23]. Power exerted by governments is legitimized by the passing of laws.

Conflicts are also caused by excessive power or 'power inequality' in society (Kriesberg, 1982) [24]. Dovey (1999, p. 9) [22] defines power as: '...the ability...to define and control circumstances and events so that one can influence things to go in the direction of one's interests'. Power is not only authority, but it can be distinguished by words such as force, coercion, manipulation, and seduction (Wrong, 1979 [23]; Kriesberg, 1982 [24]; Dovey, 1999 [22]). Furthermore, as Kriesberg (1982, p. 13) [24] explained:

Power ...refers to the ability to influence or to control others or to the actual influencing or controlling others. It may rest on coercion, authority, relative access to positive sanctions, or manipulation. In this work, we use the term power more restrictively. It refers to a person's or group's use (actual or threatened) of negative sanctions (coercion) to induce others to act as the power wielders wish. That is, we are concerned with the force that one side can exert against another, aside from the other side's evaluation of the legitimacy of the force. ...Power depends upon the strength one side has relative to the other side. Power is specific to a given relationship; that is, great force applied against a much greater force turns out to be little power. It is also specific to a particular purpose.

'Legitimation' is the element of authority over public interest (Dovey, 1999) [22]. The *Orba* regime for more three decades maintained their legitimation of economic and political development and stability to control all interest groups or parties in Indonesia. When the government took the side of the small number of conglomerates and opposed most of the common people, it produced suspicions in people, against the conglomerates and against the government. Suspicions caused, by the excessive power of the *Orba* regime exploded into social movements and also social conflicts. *Kota* as a centre of power is also a pressure over *kampung*s. The

government's initiative to demolish and to separate *kampung*s from *kota* is another form of power over *kampung*s. Development without considering the lives of the people in the *kampung*s created social conflict: horizontal conflicts between one *kampung* and another; vertical conflicts between *kampung*s and government.

In Jakarta, conflicts—caused by both competition and 'power over'—between one *kampung* and another, between ethnic groups, or student conflicts, have tended to destroy the traditional relationship of the idea of *gotong royong*. For example, most of the dwellers in *kampung* Manggarai (South Jakarta) complain of insecurity and discomfort. The people in Manggarai are also not safe because of *tawuran antar kampung* (or social conflict between one community and another). According to Suara Karya, 29 April 2000, this conflict has been going on for the last ten years, and has killed approximately a hundred people and wounded hundreds of others. Recently, fights (Figure 4) happened almost every day over petty problems such as the battle for authority and working areas in the Manggarai public bus terminal and train station.

Conflicts did not recognize the boundary between one *kampung* and another, even between one community and another. Moreover, these fights have become a matter of pride among them. They created names for their gangs to show their identity, arising from the *gang* or lane names (Gang Tuyul or little devil; Gang Sayur or vegetable), street names (Menara Air or Water Tower). When a person from one *kampung* is humiliated by a person or group from another *kampung*, it creates a new conflict.

According to Suara Karya (29 April 2000), originally, the Manggarai conflicts happened because of *premanisme* (local gangsters or *kampung* mafia). In Jakartan slang, *preman* is also known as *tukang palak* or *jagoan*. They grew rapidly during the boom time of the Indonesia economy in the 1980s, culminating in the late 1990s.

At that time, many economic poles or trade centre areas were developed in various Jakarta localities, including Manggarai area (Manggarai station and terminal, *pasar* Rumpit and *pasar* Minagkabau).



Figure 3:
Gates and fences in *kampung*, built as a result of the social conflicts in Menteng Atas
Source: Photograph by author

The members of this *preman* group lived together in the *kampung* and set up their local gangster kingdom by recruiting young people from the *kampung*. The *preman* live in or are based on a nearby *kampung*. Every group attempts to defend its territory, so that, it easy for new conflicts to emerge. Wirutomo (2000) [25] argued that the poor, tight, crowded, and stuffy condition of the *kampung*s, and the high level of unemployment are fuel for these conflicts.

5. Conclusions

Kampung is characterized by the concepts and practice of *rukun* and *gotong royong* at the community level. Community is recognized by place or territory (community of locality) and identity or group interests (community of

interests). Community is locality, and the members can generally recognize each other. In *kampungs*, all of people's daily needs are accessible or in walking distance for all.

However, uncontrolled competition and excessive power arouse suspicions among people, which can explode into conflicts: horizontal conflicts (between one community and another or between one *kampung* and another) and vertical conflicts (between *kampungs* and *kota*, or between people and government). These conflicts are the fruit of unfairness. These social conflicts are a serious problem in everyday life in *kampungs*. Previously, *rukun* and *gotong royong* were practiced in the bigger area in *kampung*, but today they only find in community.

Institutionally, *RT* (or community) is the lowest organizational institutions, established on the basis of the mutual self-help relationship. The strength of *kampungs* is community which still maintain the ideas of *rukun* and *gotong royong*, the principles of human relationship among people. Through maintaining *gotong royong*, *kampungs* have been able to overcome their problems and conflicts. Today, the size of *kampung* is community.

Notes

- i. In Indonesia, *kota* has three meanings: the original meaning is *negara* (nation or government); it is also the name of city centre or downtown Jakarta; and the third meaning is urban, city or town. In the second of these meanings it is spelt with a capital K, as Kota.
- ii. Because they express meanings that have no exact equivalent in English, I will retain certain Indonesian words in this thesis. This creates a problem. In Indonesian, words do not have plural forms, whereas in English plurals are formed by adding the letter 's'. Therefore the letter 's' will be added to words such as *kampung* in this thesis to make them plural.
- iii. *Kerja-bakti* means 'working bee' or working together to clean the

environment and to build or construct public facilities or infrastructure without payment.

- iv. *Pancasila* is the five principles describing the ideology of the Republic of Indonesian. The first principle is belief in God'; the second is 'internationalism (humanitarianism)'; the third is 'nationality'; the fourth is 'democracy'; and the fifth is 'social prosperity'.
- v. Orba stands for Orde Baru (New Order), the regime of Suharto (the second Indonesian president), which had governed Indonesia for 32 years until 1998.

References

1. Kenworthy, J., 1997, *Urban ecology in Indonesia: The Kampung Improvement Program (KIP)*, Asian Sustainable Development, Murdoch University, Perth.
2. Wiryomartono, 1995, *Seni Bangunan dan Seni Binakota di Indonesia*, PT Gramedia, Jakarta.
3. Geertz, C., 1965, *The Social History of an Indonesian Town*, Greenwood Press Publisher, Westport, Connecticut.
4. Wiranto, Tatag, 1997, *Bunga Rampai: Perencanaan Pembangunan di Indonesia, (Model Keterkaitan Desa-Kota Sebagai Pendekatan Pengembangan Perdesaan)*, p.326, Grasindo, Jakarta.
5. Guinness, P, 1986, *Harmony and Hierarchy in a Javanese Kampung*, Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York.
6. Jellinek, L., (1991), *The Wheel of Fortune: The history of a poor community in Jakarta*, Allen and Unwin, London, Wellington and Boston.
7. Jay, Robert R., 1986, *Javanese villagers: Social Relations in Rural Modjokuto*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.
8. Geertz, H, 1961, *The Javanese Family: A Study of Kinship and Socialization*, The Free Press, Glencoe, USA.

9. Geertz, C, 1960, *The Religion of Java*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, USA.
10. Koentjaraningrat, 1961, Some Social-Anthropological Observations on Gotong royong Practices in two Villages of Central Java, *University of Indonesia, Jakarta*.
11. Heuken, A.S.J., et al, 1991, *Ensiklopedi populer Politik Pembangunan Pancasila*, Yayasan Cipta Loka Caraka, Jakarta, Indonesia.
12. Niessen, N., 1995, *Indonesian Municipalities Under Jafanise Rules* (in Nas, P. J. M., *Issues in Urban Development: Case Studies From Indonesia*), Research Scholl CNWS, Leiden, Netherlands.
13. Notoadmodjo, M. W., 1962, *Gotong royong in Indonesia Administration, A Concept of Human Relations*, University of Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan.
14. Dovey, K., 2002, *The Silent Complicity of Architecture*, in Hiller J. and Rooksby E. (ed), Ashgate, Burlington, USA.
15. Bourdieu, 1986, *The Forms of Capital*, in J.G. Richardson (ed), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology education*, Greenwood, New York.
16. Mayo, M., 2000, *Culture, Communities, Identities: Culture Strategies for Participation and Empowerment*, Palgrave.
17. Weber, M., 1978, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, University of California Press, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London.
18. Kubisch, A. C. and Stone, R., 2002, *Comprehensive Community Initiatives: The American Experience* (ed.) in Pierson, J. and Smith, J., Palgrave, New York.
19. Tuan, Y. P., 1989, *Traditional: What Does It Mean?* (ed) in Bourdier and Alsayad, University Press of America, Berkley.
20. Longman, 1987, *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, Longman, England.
21. Rubin et all, 1994, *Social Conflict: Escalation, Stalemate, and Settlement*, McGraw-Hil, Inc., USA.
22. Dovey, K., 1999, *Framing Places: Mediating power in built form*, Routledge, London and New York.
23. Wrong, 1995, *Power: Its Form, Bases, and Uses*, Transsaction Publisher, London, UK.
24. Kriesberg, L., 1982, *Social Conflicts*, Prentice-Hall, Inc. London.
25. Wirutomo, P., 2000, in *Suara Karya*, 29 April 2000, Jakarta.