ABSTRACT
The study has the point of departure to elaborate the discussion on the possibility for a globalized city of the future to integrate its local-specific characteristics into a greater urban structure. Based on a study of existing local-specific cultural elements in the Jakarta kampongs, this paper tries to identify the potential of these traditional elements for a greater socio-cultural and economic urban transformation. Based on historical studies, this paper concludes that there are at least three local-specific urban elements which are most likely to have significant influence on the character of Jakarta in the future: the function of the kampong as mixed-use area for living and working, the traditional life on the streets as the “connecting” and the “communicative” network of the urban system, and the various local-economy markets which are spread throughout the city. Based on in-depth studies about several old urban kampongs in Jakarta, the paper demonstrates how these “traditional” kampongs as urban elements from the past are surviving and thriving as mixed-use living and working environments. These kampongs are able not only to strengthen their economic roles citywide i.e. as provider of job opportunities for unskilled migrants, but also to provide those same migrants with affordable shelter. In general, we can conclude that such urban kampongs are playing a role in supporting the socialization process of the new migrants. Without a doubt, this on-going adaptation process would be able to deliver superior results if the ruling elites and the municipal government were conscious of the important roles these kampongs play. To make this possible, the ruling elites of the city must make some modifications in their concept of governance and formally recognize the kampong’s role in improving the quality of city life and in contributing to a sustainable city-future with strong local-specific characteristics.
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THE URBANIZATION OF THE CITY OF JAKARTA AND ITS IMPACTS

Almost at the same time the percentage of the world’s urbanized population is passing the 50%-line in 2009, about half of Indonesia’s 220 million population was already urbanized. It has been projected that with an average increase of more than 2.5% yearly until 2025, the Indonesia’s urban population will reach 220 million. This would equal 64% of the total population (The World Bank, 2013). Angel (Angel, 2012) estimated the urban population in Indonesia to be around 100 million in 2010, ranking the country as fifth globally, after China, India, USA and Brazil. In contrast to the World Bank, Angel (Angel, 2012) projects that the total urban population of Indonesia in 2050 will be only around 190 million, remaining fifth globally after China (1,135 million.), India (765 million), USA (370 million) and Brazil (210 million).

Unlike urbanization in already developed countries, future urbanization of newly developing countries like Indonesia will likely occur without the support of sufficient public services, which is mainly due to weak governance structures. The GOI (Government of Indonesia) is on the one hand not able and on the other hand not willing to come up with a strategy that could effectively respond to the overall pressure of urbanization in Jakarta and other large urban areas in Indonesia. Since the year 2000 when the Decentralization Law (Law Number 32/2004 on Local Government) was implemented, the central government has basically retreated from urban governance, and matters such as housing and spatial planning have been relegated to the local level. Yet the metropolitan and regional governments of Jakarta and its surrounding areas are not equipped to handle the challenges of urbanization. They lack the financial resources, the legal-institutional capacity and the qualified human resources to anticipate and manage the complicated processes and impacts of urbanization (UN Raporteur, 2013).

On the other side, the emerging role of the private sector in urban development has generated a complicit relationship between the ruling elites and the municipal government such that the private sector has become defacto the main provider of various urban services such as education and health care. This is at the obvious cost of marginalizing the lower-income urban population. This trend continually widens the gaps between socio-economic groups. Without firm leadership from the municipality in such matters, the private sector will continue this trajectory and thus establish a modern city void of any socially integrated human settlement (Santoso, 2007).

THE MAKING OF MODERN JAKARTA

With over 600 years of history, the urban structure of Jakarta is in fact a superimposition of urban elements from different historical periods with widely divergent social and economic motives, the resulting urban fabric today has partly harmonious but also widely contradictory elements. The city of Jakarta proper has a total area of 657 sqkm but the surrounding metropolitan area Jabodetabek creates a total of about 3000 sqkm. During the night, Jakarta has about about 10 million inhabitants but during the day, the population swells to around three million from Jabodetabek commuters. The center of the city is occupied by what Marcuse and van Kempen call “the new citadels”, or “exclusionary enclaves” of the rich and extremely mobile upper class. Hundreds of towers dotting the skyline have shaped this image of a Citadel, which stands out from the rest of the city. With maximum building density, these towers sprout up in the middle of low-rise landed housing inhabited by all groups of different socio-economic strata, such that transitions between urban functions and social strata are
blurred. Some of the old city areas are now occupied by new elites, professionals, and highly paid managers, all surrounded by poorer population. This mixed characteristic is typical of the CBD area of many Asian big cities like Bangkok, Manila, Ho Chi Minh, etc. and demonstrates the need for better visual, morphological, and functional understanding with regard to the complexity of its structure.

[Fig.1]: The Citadel of Jakarta around CBD area

It was Soekarno who created the basic structure for a modern Jakarta as the capital of the new born Indonesian nation during his rule. Between 1959 to 1965, a number of iconic buildings of the modern city were constructed: Sarinah building, the first multistorey department store in Indonesia, Wisma Nusantara, the first earth-quake secured high rise office tower, Hotel Indonesia, the first 5-stars hotel, Senayan, the first modern sport center for the Asian Games III 1962, and Istiqlal, the central mosque. This modernization process was once again accelerated during the proceeding era of Soeharto, when the military gained political control over all Indonesian cities. This control was legitimized through the argument that Indonesia needed political stability for economic growth. During Soeharto’s 30 years in power (1968-1998), Jakarta became an object of economic growth based on Foreign Direct Investment. To do this, Jakarta willingly accommodated the footloose foreign capital by providing for all of its hard-core needs (Fainstein,1990; Friedmann, 2007). The national Government prepared legal systems to provide transparancy in licensing procedures, taxation, capital flows, and business operations. The growth of export / import manufacturing required new infrastructure such as international schools, modern hospitals, hotels, conference rooms, exhibitions halls, and of course luxury appartments, leisure and sports facilities.

The privatization of urban development which took place in the inner city by demolition of low density housing areas displaced older buildings with higher-valued commercial ones. On the outskirts of the city, the full privatization of urban development caused the disappearance of the concept of integrated “socially-mixed new town” projects. With literally hundreds of private housing estates, each according to its own target market, there is an uncontrolled growth pattern of unpredictable social and environmental impacts. This same uncontrolled pattern is becoming a typical trend for all metropolitan cities in Indonesia, i.e. Surabaya, Bandung, Medan, Makassar. The dimension and the complexity of the urbanization process in Indonesia is continually growing far beyond the management capacity of any city government.
Transformation and Restructuring of Jakarta in the Global Context

Economic restructuring on a global level has direct impact on internal situations and developments at all levels of urban structures. (Sassen 1990; Burgers and Engbersen, 1996; Van Kempen and Marcuse, 1997; Van Kempen and Marcuse, 2000; Agyeman, Bullard and Evans, 2003; Soja 2010). Sociologists and geographers now agree that the structural transformation of spatial patterns takes place on different spatial levels, firstly on the level between cities in the same country, secondly in the relation of the city to its hinterland, and thirdly in the internal structure of a city. The causes of changes within cities can to a large extent be traced back to developments that take place outside cities on higher spatial levels, be they regional, national and more significantly also global (Marcuse/van Kempen 2000). A small number of ruling and political elites are acting as local partners to create the political legitimization for turning the city into an instrument for global-oriented economic growth and thus dismantling the function of the city as a social institution for its inhabitants. Concerning the changing position of the localities in the globalizing city, we need to go deeper into the details of the actual process of urban transformation. Which structural systems behind these spatial systems are actually being transformed? The following will argue that at least three basic city forms are affected by the aforementioned restructuring process.

The first transformation is the relation between cities within the same country. It should be highlighted that through the globalization the function of “national system of cities” as tools of the state to balance the welfare on regional and country level has lost its relevance (Young, 1990, Harvey 1990). The
“national system of cities” was the most frequently implemented instrument of the national state to balance between regional economic development and social equity. The cities have two different but compatible functions, as provider of locations for capital investment and as provider of social goods for the inhabitants. Through state-sponsored interventions, the discrepancies between economic regions should be reduced by upgrading the infrastructure in the underdeveloped regions or cities. Further, equal opportunities should be achieved by upgrading of public services in the underdeveloped cities. This old concept, well known under the jargon “equity in opportunities” is not relevant anymore since a substantial part of public services are commodified and commercialized, including basic education, health service, life insurance, and retirement benefits. In the last two decades under the influence of neo-liberal ideology, the state systematically withdrew from its function as the caretaker of social justice on national level. The concept of city as part of national welfare system is substituted through individual competition between cities, where each city has to take care of itself. Thus, on a platform of worldwide competition, cities are concentrating their energy on upgrading their international competitiveness through commoditizing local assets (including natural environment and urban land) and human resources to the maximum possible (Sassen, 1990, Logan and Harvey, 1987, Friedmann, 2007).

The second transformation is the changing relationship between the city and its hinterland, which is in fact not specific to newly developing regions. In general, cities today are no longer the economic and social-cultural center of their hinterlands. Almost all urbanists have the same position regarding the overall dominant position of urban culture, and from this point of view the difference between city and hinterland no longer exists (Marcelloni, 2007; Corboz, 1998). The role of a city like Jakarta as a market place for products from the hinterland is substituted by its role as a consuming city for all kinds of products from any where in the world. For example, imported fruits penetrate the local-traditional markets and destroy the local agrarian production, and mass-produced industrial products overtake the small-scale housing industry. The cultural contradiction between the cosmopolitan culture of the city and the local culture of the village has gradually disappeared. The city penetrates the rural areas with imported values and cultures, so that rural cultural life imitates that from the city. Today the village in the rural area is not the opposite of the city, but more subsystem of it. In most of the industrial-developing countries, farmers are not independent anymore as they have become a marketing target of the chemical and machine industries. Farmers must then follow what is predetermined by the agro-industrial big players. In the last two decades, Indonesia’s agro industry has grown very fast and significant parts of the hinterland have been transformed into agro-industrial plantation estates. In the system of “PIR” (small farmer as core production unit), farmers are actually acting as subcontractors working on the field. The majority of their output is for export or for raw inputs to the expanding food industry. In short, the formation of city and its hinterland as a spatial-ecological entity does not exist anymore, and this is also the case of Jakarta with respect to its hinterland (Marcelloni, 2007).

The third transformation process is the restructuring the city itself, which actually began during the Soeharto regime in the late 1960s. After a short pause due to the 1997-1998 monetary crisis, the spatial restructuring of the inner city has been accelerated. After the 500% devaluation of local currency in 1997, the interest of foreign investors to buy property in Jakarta was greater. So after a short break, the original domestic land-use in the inner city continually converted into large-scale offices or commercial buildings, often combined with apartment blocks. This reduction of the inner-city housing stock led to an inner-city population decrease. The Kecamatan (districts) of Gambir and Tanah Abang that are located in the center of Jakarta lost more than 40% of their population just from
1980 until now. In the same period, the number of central Jakarta residents fell from 1.4 Mio. to less than 0.9 Mio. (Santoso, 2007).

The real estate business became an important driver for the city’s economic growth. Lot by lot, the strategic areas of the inner city were acquired by land speculators to be reassembled into bigger lots and eventually sold to big developers. At these strategic locations, private investors are playing the dominant role regarding when and what should be developed, and in most cases the big developers are opting for large scale mixed-use superblocks with maximum building density and functional variety including office, apartment, hotel, entertainment, and even hospital facilities. Each of these superblocks has a floor-area ratio of 7 to 8 with a total floor area more than 1,0 million square meters. This process has weakened the economic position of micro, small and medium enterprises in the city as indicated by the disappearance of low-rise individual shophouses. The recomposition of small lots into a limited number of big lots caused the domination of land ownership in the inner city by big capital. From 1998 until recently, the total floor area of shopping centers in Jakarta has increased nearly four times, from 1.3 Mio. to around 5,0 Mio. square meters. The proliferation of private spaces for recreation has widened the socio-cultural gap between the new lifestyle of the upper-middle class who are living isolated within the gated communities and super-blocks, and the rest of the urban population who do not have the financial means to partake in these pseudo-public spaces. In the absence of municipal regulators, the private developers are virtually free to develop at will and the local interests are most certainly disappearing from the decision making criteria. Balanced development in the greater metropolitan region also cannot be achieved because on the one hand the local government does not have the tools to control the changing of the land use, on the other hand the private sector is driving development without heed to the public at large. The metropolitan area is in fact fragmented and segregated, spatially and socially.

The impact of this state of affairs has created often irreparable damage, as seen for example in increasing social descrepancies and environmental degradation. Genuinely public space is extinguished and individual services are semi-privatized, resulting in the disintegration of the social safety net for lower income inhabitants (Harvey, 1993; Sheppard, 2007). The urban realities shaped through globalization as outlined above are in deep contradiction with the idea of a good city as a compact spatial entity which is dedicated social cohabitation.

THE ROLE OF TRADITIONAL URBAN KAMPONGS IN MEDIATING THE URBAN TRANSFORMATION

In this following section is a discussion about the role of Jakarta’s traditional kampongs in mediating the migrants’ adaptation to urban life. From the very beginning, Jakarta has been a trading city rather than a production city. Its existence was accordingly dependent upon international trade. It was precisely this flourishing international trade which drew people from all over the world, including Chinese, Indian, Japanese, Arab, Portuguese, Spanish, English, Turkish, Armenian, Jewish, Persian, as well as from the region including Bugis, Bajo, Malay, Javanese, Balinese, among others. In accordance with the heterogenous situation, local rulers applied a decentralized urban administration system whereby the city was divided into a number of specific ethnic settlements, each with a high degree of territorial autonomy. Throughout the last four centuries, starting from its first formation as an international-cosmopolitan trading center in 1525, Ja(ya)karta was always subject to the economic
agenda of a ruling elite. Therefore the economy of the city was always dependent upon on the ebb and flow of international markets. For this reason, the relationship between city and hinterland economically and social-culturally was undeveloped from the very beginning. This reality calls out to a latent-subliminal (colonial) perception among the people that Jakarta is not responsible for its underdeveloped hinterland. The city is also not responsible for the low quality of education and skills of migrants coming from rural areas. This decentralized urban system in its modified form was actually taken over by the Dutch. In the colonial period, the people who lived in the kampongs (niet bebouwde kom), were the ones responsible for the wellbeing of incoming migrants. The municipality recognized only Dutch and Europeans as citizens, and the incoming migrants from the hinterland should be accommodated in one of the indigenous kampongs. This historical background might be the main reason why the municipality of Jakarta does not pay too much attention to the wellbeing of the migrants. Further, to a certain degree, the inhabitants of Jakarta don’t have empathy for the problems of the new coming migrants either. The situation is rather strange given the fact that more than 60-70% of Jakarta’s inhabitants are not born in the city.

The kampongs as an integrated working and living environment actually has its origin in Jakarta’s history. Following the same argument as above, the people who lived outside the kampongs quarters did not have the right to stay in the city. The city was not for everybody. The individual right to stay in the city never existed in 1000 years of Jakarta history. This right to stay in the city had to be mediated by someone already establish in the city (Simone, 2012). This intermediate “agent” could be a relative, an old school mate or someone providing a place to stay.

The large number of small business enterprises, such as garment producers, catering business, wet market vendors, small scale contractors, food stands, traditional herbal producers, recycling business, and almost all kinds of home industries, are nearly 100% dependent upon new migrants. One example is the production of “tempe” (sojabean cake) and snacks/cookies in Kampong Rawa, both of which provide jobs for new migrants. These migrants get paid much less than the minimum salary but normally are provided shelter in a simple dormitory by their employer in the same location. For the low income groups in general, and for the incoming migrants in particular, finding a job and affordable shelter in the kampongs is practically the only option. The migrant has to go to the kampong because it is connected to the traditional street life, and through this, a network to the whole urban system. It is also possible that through mediation of peoples in the kampong, they can find their first job outside. Those business entities engaging new migrants with underpaid salary do so mostly because they cannot afford to pay more if they want to keep competitive. The other strong argument for low salary is that the jobs don’t require any special qualifications. The migrants are dependent on this kind of employment generally for their first three to five years in the city.

Imagine a character named Mr. Wonogiri arriving from Central Java to become a relatively succesfull producer and seller of meatballs. Wishing to expand his business, he asks his friends from his old village to send him people wishing to migrate to Jakarta. After an appropriate transition period, the new migrant becomes a full member of the meatball fleet from Mr.Wonogiri. Before he has sufficient income to rent a separate living space, the new migrant stays in the dormitory near the location of the meatball production. In the case of a catering business, garment production or other home manufacturing, the employees are provided simple dormitory by their employer, so that they can save on rental cost. For those who can afford to rent rooms, these are normally a shared sublet room amongst one to two other friends. The rental amounts are vary from 350.000 to 600.000 rupiah (35 to
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60 U$) per month depending on the size of the unit and the other facilities. Some have toilet, bathroom and a small kitchen for each unit but most have to share with other tenants. Some have separate entrance but most are simple rooms inside the building, sometimes even without a window.

As described above, the urban Kampongs Of Jakarta Are Functioning As The Intermediary Agency Of Urbanization, starting with providing jobs and shelter for the new migrants. For them, this is where their very first socialization process take place. This important function has a strategic role, because behind the kampong no other urban institution assumes a role in helping the migrants adapt to city life. The interesting question is which factors are most responsible to make the kampongs able to contribute to the process of urbanization. From the previous analysis mentioned above, it is clear that the economic activities of the kampongs play a strategic role in securing the existence of the kampongs as intermediary agents. The micro-economic activities in the kampongs are providing an important link between the local inhabitants and the city’s economic network. In Kampong Tambora, for example, the textile and garment home industries are normally subcontractors of much bigger traders in Jakarta’s Tanah Abang wholesale market. Almost every year in Tambora alone there are 600 to 700 new coming migrants registered. About the same number are leaving, mostly because they found better working opportunities outside. Some of the workers of this home industry are even, through their existing network, moving to Taiwan for low-wage jobs.

Each kampong has to find its own most flexible way to develop economic activities. There is no general strategy for doing this, but the results show that the uniqueness of each kampong is playing an important role. Each kampong has to find the products or services which can deliver the highest value added for the city. But through their economic activities, the kampongs are contributing solutions to the challenges of urbanization. The role of the kampong an agent in the process of urbanization is strongly related to the existence of small and micro enterprises within the kampong area. As the golden era of the garment home industry in Tambora was over in the 1980s (due to competition from China), the people of Tambora moved to textile printing which was able to compensate for loss of business. Comparative studies in different kampongs in Jakarta have shown that there are endless variations on how the kampong can provide the small business enterprises with appropriate locations and their employees with appropriate shelter, so that nobody has to sleep on the street. Is this a kind of primitival preindustrial relation between the master and his assistants?

In the kampong enterprises, there are multiple specific relationships between the empoyer and the employee. In one case, almost all the employee are young single women, in another case almost all the worker are male and coming from the homeland of the owner. In the third case, all the workers are specially trained, well-paid and long-term employees and well paid. But in the most cases, the workers are all underpaid and understand the jobs as transition until they have something better. This social situation makes it difficult to identify the basic pattern of the spatial organization of these kampongs. It seems that regarding the spatial organization, the most important thing for all these kampongs is to maintain flexibility at all cost. But this flexibility means that in some locations, the quality of environment is sub-standard, especially since there are no accepted minimal standards for living and working spaces. In some locations, the inhabitants and the producers achieve some consensus, but in many cases the conflicting situation is not even discussed. It is in general unclear who or which institution is responsible for solutions for these kinds of problems.

The other function of the Urban Kampongs (is) As Provider Of Space for Social Cohabitation can be demonstrated in how the inhabitants organize and functionalize their space and place. In his study
about Jakarta, Santoso (2010) drew a conclusion that one of the specific characteristics of the urban kampongs is the different grades of semi-public spaces; from the almost absolutely public to almost 100% private. Through the creation of these highly differentiated types of social spaces, the thoroughly heterogenous inhabitants demonstrate their ability to develop appropriate spatialities for the benefits of collective cohabitation. The following will discuss the different types and characteristics of semi-private and semi-public spaces, not only to understand the adaptation process for overcoming infinite handicaps but also to see the manifestation of a way of life from these communities. From the photos of the first type of communal space (Figure 3,4 and 5) it can be recognized how the inhabitants are providing sitting facilities in front of their houses which are located along the narrow street.

These sitting facilities provide the possibility to utilize the street as interactive communal space. Especially in the late afternoon, the whole alley becomes the center of community activities. It is to underline also that at the same time this semi-public area is substituting as a children’s playground. In this case it is a simple thing to believe that the main reason why the neighborhood needs these kind of spaces is because their houses are too small. However, the idea to extend their living area by providing the narrow alley with sitting facilities is not the only innovation. Indeed in their small houses, the deficit of space is valid for almost for all activities. In other locations, we can see how the inhabitants are using the front of their houses for any kind of functions like storage, cooking, parking, laundry dryer, etc (Figure 4). One case shows that a number of houses provide sitting facilities. This indicates the existence of a common idea from a number of people to convert the alley into a community space. Another example of this first type of community space is the green alley. In this case, the community members very clearly manifest their ideas about a good neighborhood.

The second type of the communal space is accomplished at some suitable location, which is originally provided for other functions. The first example for this type of community space is in front
of small shops or eating places selling drinks and snacks. The sitting facilities are also originally provided for the customer, but in reality not all the visitors are coming because they want to eat or to drink something. In reverse, they are rather going to drink because they want to meet each other. In more narrow alleys, the communication comes up not only among the visitors but between the visitors and the inhabitants of the surrounding area. This second type of community space is for example to find in guardhouses of the neighborhoods [Fig.9]. These guardhouses are, considering their function, mostly built in strategic locations. But in fact, not all guardhouses are suitable as a meeting place.

What are the main criteria for a pure guardhouse to become a communal meeting place? It starts with an appropriate physical condition, it follows that one person brings a bamboo mat for sitting on the platform, followed by another person coming with a tea set and the final person is bringing some interesting photographs to hang on the wall. In one particular case, there were people buying a fish aquarium including lighting equipment and also singing birds for a cage. These accessories all together upgrade significantly the quality of the meeting place [Fig.9]. Like in other cases, the critical point here is that the meeting area was a common idea from several members of the community. Of course, not all spaces are executed with the same intensity. In some it is stronger than in other places, and the number of the persons who are sharing the same idea is also varied.
The **third type** of community space is something which is related to a traditional value about the importance of social solidarity between people living in the same neighborhood. The existence of this traditional value can be traced back to the concept of “Mancapat” from the ancient tradition of old javanese rural settlements (Santoso, 1983). It is still unclear why this tradition of solidarity among neighboring settlements, which is in various forms to find in almost every primitive vernacular village society in Indonesia, does not exist on the city level (Santoso, 1983). This view about solidarity among neighbors of different social groups is, however, still alive at least in the kampongs until today. A well-off community member may choose to dedicate part of his land for the community benefit. It is not unusual to find spaces in the middle of a high-density kampong dedicated to community activities, including a badminton court, children’s playground or private school, all built on donated land. What also quite often to find is land donation for building a mosque following the conception of *wakaf* land. In this case the persuasion of the donor might be guided by religious motivation.

The **fourth and last type** of community space is the most complex one. It appears to be an implementation of a flexible function concept, but the utilization of space is not fixed for one particular function. Even the original main function becomes a minor matter.

In some areas within the kampong one particular segment of street is covered by simple construction using thick plastic sheet (Figure 8). Each during working hours, the space is utilized by one of the inhabitants to produce something. A similar constellation can be found in front of a mosque, but the utilization is limited to during the Friday prayer. When in use for production activities, the traffic function of the street is rendered ineffective. At another time, the kampong streets with overhead protection against rain or sun are obviously suitable to be used as meeting points, children’s playground or other community activity. In the case of transforming the street into a temporary football field, traffic is only suspended until the football game is over. This case of temporary football field on the street cannot be understood only as a result of deficient space in that particular kampong. Looking at the field in more detail, the use of well constructed goal gates and of a heavy truck to block the street are evidence that the condition is thoroughly planned. This leads to the conclusion that constellation is by no means an adhoc situation initiated by individual young people. All these facts are giving us the persuasion that the constellation is actually a result of community action initiated by...
a number of people with the same idea. Imposing a temporary blockade on a certain segment of the public street for a wedding party or other traditional occasion is long a custom in Jakarta. And again here it is not enough to explain these phenomenon through the lack of suitable and affordable spaces. The more valid explanation is that the people have another understanding about the relationship between space and its function which is obviously grounded in their social-cultural value system. How this system might be in detail is yet under-researched, but it is clear that kampong inhabitants’ understanding of space contains a stronger social consciousness compared to those living in more regulated spaces.

RETHINKING IN THE RESTRUCTURING OF RELATION BETWEEN LOCAL AND GLOBAL

The interesting question is: can the function of the kampong mentioned above be reconstructed on macro-level of the city? The existing kampungs contribute to the process of urbanization. For that reason, the strengthening of the kampong’s economic basis is needed to secure that its role. There are many ways to improve the local economy in the kampong. The city of Surabaya, for example, is taking the uniqueness of each kampong as the starting capital to provide value-add products for the city as a whole. Instead of continuously working on a standardized upgrading program, the Jakarta city government should be implementing a “kampong to kampong” empowerment strategy, focusing on improving specific physical-environmental conditions which can directly improve the local economy. But is this kampong to kampong empowerment strategy sufficient to support the role of the kampong in mediating the urbanization? Anther question is related to the role of the kampong as provider of job opportunities for unskilled migrants. In most cases, the migrants finding work in the kampong can also find affordable shelters in the same location. Without any doubt, this on-going adaptation process would deliver better results if the responsible ruling elites were aware of the importance of local-specific characters of the kampongs and were able to develop ways to support the process. To make it possible, the city must change its hasty and bias conclusions about kampong life and recognize its role as contributor to a sustainable future city with strong local-specific characteristics.

The globalization of cities takes place through radical transformation of the existing urban structure. The new globalizing city often has a conflict with local urban tradition because the transformation is mainly initiated from outside. Transformation of traditional urban structures is usually qualified as a negative impact of globalization. The traditional city-elements are not recognized as something valuable, except to be exploited economically. From the globalization point of view, the existing urban tradition is categorized as something similar to “natural resources” whereby its economic potential should be exploited. This can be through revitalized tourist attractions or as supporting elements to the new, globally inspired structures. Most of Asian urbanists and planners ignore that the existing “traditional-urban” structure is actually a result of inhabitants’ efforts to define their own urban life economically, socially and ecologically. Actually, all these traditional structures are already going through a complicated process of “adaptation” (Maliq 2013). The majority of modern Asian cities don’t even try to create a relationship between the traditional and the modern city, neither by referencing traditional urban elements in new developments and nor by incorporating the new elements with the traditional ones to create a whole. Often, the public only protests against the expropriation of the peoples from their cultural roots were only coming up when the eviction is applying physical force, as in the case of Peking in preparation for the 2008 Olympics. It seems that for some people, it is not about demolishing of old city and they accept the demolition of traditional
settlements if it is done in a softer way. In terms of their relation to tradition, contemporary Asian cities fall into two groups. The first consists of cities which are totally ignoring their local traditions. The “generic city” of Shen Zhen, the “text-book modernized city” of Singapore, the “technologically-oriented” like Hsin Chu are examples. The second group consists of cities like Jakarta, Bangkok, Hongkong and Ho-Chi Min City, which are still accepting the existence of old traditional elements as part of their reality, albeit in differing intensities.

SUPPORTING SELF DETERMINATION OF THE KAMPONG INHABITANTS

What are the consequences of rethinking the relationship between local and global urban elements for the urban policy in Global South cities like Jakarta? First, it is important to discuss changes to accepted planning principles when be applied to cities like Jakarta, most particularly for traditional settlements like kampongs. Lefebvre (1991) once underlined that the principle “the right to the city” should not only be understood as a struggle for being ‘inscribed in space’ but as a struggle for ‘self determination’. The specific question is, then, which planning programs should be implemented to support the process of self determination under the conditions discussed in this paper? Sassen suggested the creation of an integrated entity so that the global is no longer remote or abstract but it becomes grounded (Sassen: “hit the ground”). Friedmann has the opinion that self determination could be promoted if the planning itself is conducted as an open process, and the planners are willing to learn from the experiences of the inhabitants. Experimental planning or action research are the most appropriate methods to promote mutual learning between planners, experts and inhabitants.

On the spatial-territorial macro level, the main question is how to provide appropriate urban policy to promote development which is “decentered”, “privileging regions” and promoting “localities” (Friedmann). Regarding the parts of urban infrastructure that are relevant for the kampong economy, the planner should consider that something already constituting a reminder of a way of life and being together could have taken place but did not. Every planning program should contain efforts to diminish the handicaps and provide better change for inhabitants to materialize that which has not yet taken place. Maliq said that to promote self determination, we have to keep things open, not become too settled, and to allow any kind of mixed structure, diversities, heterogenities to mix and become more stable structures. Additionally, the planner is not the maker, but only acting as mediator and facilitator. If we project this principle onto the condition in the kampongs of Jakarta from political-legal point of view, then we have to implement “specific interpretation on legal status”, a kind of “lex specialist” for the land and territory of the kampong, which is different from the rest of the city. But this “lex specialist” should have the characteristic of “positive discrimination”. Spatial-territorial wise, positive discrimination can be in the form of a moratorium on building in particular traditional settlements to protect them from becoming subject to land speculation. Within this area, an “autonomous planning right” could be established, to facilitate possibilities of self determination. A status of “lex specialist” should not have a “defensive character” in terms of protecting the kampong from outside intervention. A special spatial-territorial status should also provide the possibility to implement new systems of technologies, appropriate for the existing human resources to regulate and to manage. For example, production process should be improved through energy efficient and water saving technology, and through recycling of waste water and garbage. Quality of living environment should be improved through applying of principles of green construction, using local building materials, traditional constructions-methods, etc. If all these activities are implemented there is still no
guarantee to bring fragmented things, originated in non-local circuits, ‘to hand’ in place and that “brings place and relation or communication together in a single frame” (Read, 2007).

This new structure of place can provide the glue that binds identities and collective technologies, creating a new entity, but only if the local inhabitants are able to control the transformation process. This can be achieved only if in every change of production method or of kampong environment, the local producers and inhabitants are involved. For every implementation of new technologies and construction methods, the inhabitants of the kampongs must be empowered to be more than passive users. To improve the quality of human resources, the kampong community needs a training and learning center, integrated as part of a neighborhood center that should be managed by self-organizing community units. In this center, new technologies and management methods should be introduced using learning-by-doing methods. The trial of new kind of technology for example should be implemented if the producers or the inhabitants are interested and involved. In a later phase, the neighborhood center can develop a kind of Community Information Center (CIC). Through this CIC, learning process can be disseminated among community members and wider audiences.

STRENGTHENING THE RELATION OF THE CITY TO THE HINTERLAND

How much the internal structure of the kampongs can be strengthened is significantly dependent on how much the city itself is relying upon non-local forces, because localities in general, city or part of it, are in the position of adjusting to forces beyond their control (Fainstein, 1990). On the city level it is important that the markets are open for products from the kampongs and their small-scale producers and manufacturers. The municipality must have some regulation so that, for example, kampong or hinterland tofu producers are not standing in open competition with industrial tofu producers. The city of Jakarta should take concrete steps to revitalize the production of vegetables and fruits in the city’s hinterland and evacuate specific functions like processing of agrarian products, storage and warehouse, materials depot, and similar functions out from the city, so that the hinterland can regain part of their supporting role.

In terms of spatial-territorial structure, the main question is how to reduce the private sector domination in urban development on the outskirts of the city, especially in relation to the ecological consequences of urban sprawl. The only possible strategy is to declare part of hinterland as “non-transferable space” or as unbuildable space and, following Marcellino (2007), to decouple this area from the development process dynamic. This strategy can be implemented for part of the inner-city territory as well to secure the reliability of the city’s ecological system.
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Notes: The Copyright of all the photos belong to Tarumanagara Urban Laboratory