# *Slum Politics* di Jakarta: Komparasi Wilayah Kumuh di Karet Tengsin dan Guji Baru berdasarkan Teori Gerakan Sosial Perkotaan

# Slum Politics in Jakarta: Comparison of Slum Areas in Karet Tengsin and Guji Baru based on Urban Social Movement Theory

**Dafiq Febriali Sahl[1], Nurisha Kitana[2]**

[1,2]Universitas Indonesia
Email: dafiq.febriali@ui.ac.id

**ABSTRAK**

*Kota adalah realitas kompleks yang merepresentasikan perebutan ruang dan sumber daya politik, ekonomi, dan kebudayaan di tengah keterbatasan dan kontingensi dalam mewujudkan keadilan bagi semua warga kota. Hak Atas Kota dan Gerakan Sosial Perkotaan yang ditemukan dalam literatur-literatur politik perkotaan secara eksploratif akan membantu penelitian kualitatif-deskriptif ini untuk memahami realitas perebutan hak atas kota melalui gerakan sosial perkotaan di Karet Tengsin dan Kampung Guji Baru, DK Jakarta. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode pengumpulan data primer dan sekunder. Data primer diperoleh dari hasil wawancara 3 narasumber, 2 orang aktivis Tim 9 dari Karet Tengsin, dan 1 orang aktivis Serikat Perjuangan Rakyat Indonesia (SPRI) di Kampung Guji Baru; dilengkapi dengan observasi langsung selama kurang lebih 1 bulan di kedua wilayah tersebut. Data sekuder, seperti literatur dari buku-buku, jurnal ilmiah, dan pemberitaan media akan membantu penelitian ini menginduksi realitas empiris gerakan sosial perkotaan oleh warga pemukiman kumuh di Jakarta. Hasil penelitian membuktikan adanya perbedaan pada model, tipe, dan tuntutan perjuangan hak atas kota antara gerakan sosial perkotaan yang dimanifestasikan oleh Tim 9 di Karet Tengsin atau Serikat Perjuangan Rakyat Indonesia (SPRI) di Kampung Guji Baru. Fakta-fakta empiris juga menyimpulkan secara deskriptif mengenai pemerintah Jakarta yang belum sepenuhnya mampu untuk memenuhi hak atas kota, terutama pemukiman dan penghidupan (konsumsi kolektif) yang layak.*

**Kata Kunci**: Karet Tengsin, Guji Baru, Gerakan Sosial Kota, Hak atas Kota

**ABSTRACT**

*The city is a complex reality that reflects the struggle for political, economic, and cultural spaces and resources amidst limitations and contingencies in achieving justice for all city residents. The concepts of the Right to the City and Urban Social Movements, as explored in urban political literature, serve as an exploratory framework for this qualitative-descriptive research. They help to understand the struggles for the right to the city through urban social movements in Karet Tengsin and Kampung Guji Baru, Jakarta. This study employs both primary and secondary data collection methods. Primary data were gathered through interviews with three key informants: two activists from Tim 9 in Karet Tengsin and one activist from Serikat Perjuangan Rakyat Indonesia (SPRI) in Kampung Guji Baru. These interviews were further supported by direct observation conducted over approximately one month in both areas. Secondary data, including literature from books, scientific journals, and media reports, complement the analysis and provide insights into the empirical realities of urban social movements by slum residents in Jakarta. The findings demonstrate distinct differences in the models, types, and demands of struggles for the right to the city as exhibited by Tim 9 in Karet Tengsin and SPRI in Kampung Guji Baru. Moreover, the empirical evidence*

*descriptively concludes that the Jakarta government has yet to fully realize the right to the city, particularly in providing access to adequate housing and sustainable livelihoods (collective consumption).*

Keyword: *karet tengsin, guji baru, urban social movement, right to the city*

## INTRODUCTION

Jakarta, as the centre of economic and political growth, should ideally be a viable arena for all to seek their fortunes, but the reality of Jakarta's experience speaks otherwise. The researcher explored how SPRI fought for the rights to the city for the people of Kampung Guji Baru. This research also explores urban social movements in Karet Tengsin, Tanah Abang, Central Jakarta. Broadly speaking, this research examines urban activism and the fulfilment of collective consumption in Karet Tengsin Village, which is located behind Karet Bivak Cemetery; and also about Guji Baru, West Jakarta. Based on data from the Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS) related to slums in 2017, Karet Tengsin Village, Central Jakarta, especially RW 07 and 05 with 24 neighbourhoods are categorised as slums. Slum indicators based on BPS (2017) are population density and poor-quality buildings, poor lighting and ventilation, irregular building layout, poor water and latrine conditions, and so on.

According to Article 1 paragraph (13) of Law No. 11/2011 on Housing and Settlement Areas, the definition of slums is settlements that are unfit for habitation due to building irregularities, high levels of building density, and the quality of buildings and facilities and infrastructure that do not meet the requirements. Therefore, based on Governor Regulation No. 90/2018 on Improving the Quality of Settlements in the Framework of Integrated Settlement Area Arrangement, Karet Tengsin Urban Village is one of the targets for medium locations. In particular, RW 05 and 07 are included in the programme. Severe slum areas exist in many areas in Jakarta such as Tanah Tinggi, Penjaringan, or Kalibaru. The Pergub refers to the right of city residents to a good, decent, safe, and healthy residential area in Law No. 11/2011 on Housing and Settlement Areas. Urban slums are an indication that the basic rights of city residents have not been fully or equally fulfilled.

Based on the results of direct observations in the field, in-depth interviews with key figures of the movement, and the study of urban political literature, it was found that the condition of the people of Kampung Guji Baru (West Jakarta) and Karet Tengsin (Central Jakarta) reflects the failure of the city government in fulfilling the Right to the City (concept from Harvey, 2008; Lefebvre, 1968) which is evident from urban poverty, in the form of densely populated settlements (*slum dwellers*) and there are still many residents who do not have clarity on the legality of land so that some of them are *squatters* (residents of buildings without land ownership; as a typology of *slum areas* from Mike Davis (2006), *Planet of Slums* and other urban literature). The urban poor are increasingly squeezed in the middle of the center of national economic growth, the Special Region of Jakarta. Poverty and struggle are the defining themes of their daily lives as they strive to meet their basic needs and social necessities amidst economic growth engines that have yet to address the issue of socio-economic disparities effectively.

Amid the social challenges faced by the slum community, particularly in their interactions as city residents with the city government, two urban social movements have emerged or developed in response to these issues: the emergence of Team 9 in Karet Tengsin and the development of SPRI in Kampung Gege. Further details on these movements will be elaborated in the discussion chapter. Despite their similarities and differences, Team 9 and SPRI are both part of what Manuel Castells (1983: 291) defines as an Urban Social Movement—a movement aimed at transforming the fabric of the city. Additionally, in line with Susan F. Fainstein and Clifford Hirst's understanding as cited in Judge et al. (1995: 183), these movements are not class-based but challenge the government's role in producing and distributing power and resources unequally.

A study from Sanjaya and Shiki (2016) on community movements or organizations in *slum dwellers* in Indonesia, especially in Yogyakarta with its Pamerti Code Community, and Bukit Duri,

Kampung Pulo with the Ciliwung Merdeka community, explains that social movements are driven by increasing awareness of socio-economic and environmental issues. There must be an understanding that slum communities must be empowered in a community to help themselves in overcoming collective socio-economic problems. The study of Charlos Roy Fajarta (2013) found the important role of community leaders, Mr. Sugianto and Moh. Huda, in the emergence of the city's social movement to fight evictions in illegal settlements (*squatters)* in Tanah Merah in the 1990s, which became the forerunner of the United Tanah Merah Communication Forum. In the case found in Tanah Merah, the movers of social demands are formal local apparatus such as RT and RW. This fact explains the importance of leadership (even from formal structures such as RT and RW) in organizing an urban social movement to seize the right to the city, namely the right to residence and its legalization.

Manuel Castells (1983: xv) also builds on the premise that "the demand for social goods and services (collective consumption), has triggered a series of urban protest movements in the last decade, which, in very different contexts, call for urban reform and imagine alternative cities" based on his empirical research on *squatters* in Germany, the Netherlands, and several Third World countries. Based on the facts found for the case of slum settlements in Karet Tengsin, it shows that there is structural neglect, or negligence of the government in meeting the needs and social rights of its people, especially Karet Tengsin. However, this problem does not necessarily trigger or mobilize people to carry out an urban social movement to demand welfare for them, or what Castells (1983) calls collective consumption, namely goods and services that are directly and indirectly provided by the state (p. xviii).

Theoretically, the non-fulfillment of social rights that include collective needs or even the improvement of slums can allow people to consciously organize themselves to demand these rights in collective actions, such as the one that succeeded in Guji Baru Village. Such a phenomenon, in contrast to the lack of citizen activism and urban social movements in some other Jakarta slums, is presumably "structural pacifism" and "conditioned helplessness", even though the enabling factors are already available (the non-fulfillment of rights to a decent village). This study will question the differences and similarities of the form of urban social movements between the Karet Tengsin residents related to the issue of land legalization and housing construction assistance funds after the 2012 fire and the residents of Gege Village related to the social protection of the urban poor today.

## RESEARCH METHODS

The data collection method from this is an in-depth interview with a resource person or informant who is selected *purposively*, namely informants who are considered to have sufficient knowledge and experience about the phenomenon being researched. In addition to interviews, primary data were collected by means of participant observation in which the researcher was gradually involved in the social life of the community (*insider* or the community being studied), so that it was close enough to observe the social life of the participants in relation to the fulfillment of urban rights and urban social movements.

## Informants and In-Depth Interview Guidelines

Table 1. The following are the informants who will be interviewed, along with the research questions:

| Report | Research Questions (General theme) |
|---|---|
| Two RT Chairmen as well as Activists of Team 9 Karet Tengsin | 1. What are the social problems faced by the community regarding a decent life in terms of houses, garbage, septic tanks, clean water, and other life facilities? |
| Chairman of RW and Activist of Team 9 Karet Tengsin | 2. The history of problems related to the relationship between the Tengsin community and the government after the 2012 fire? <br> 3. How do citizen groups fight for their complaints about public facilities and the management of the city of Jakarta? <br> 4. Team 9 Social Movement in 2012. <br> 5. Did the people of Karet Tengsin participate in social movements such as |

| | |
|---|---|
| Child-Friendly Integrated Public Space (RPTRA), Karet Tengsin Village | demonstrations, advocacy, or hearings to the local government that Team 9 was temporarily fighting for? <br> 6. What are the complaints about the fulfillment of social needs of the community by the current government? How are forums and citizen organizations organized to discuss common problems? |
| SPRI Activist Kampung Guji Baru | 7. Social problems faced by the people of Guji Baru. <br> 8. The relationship between SPRI and the community and the government in the urban social struggle. |

## Data Collection Activities

Table 2. Based on the data collection agenda (observation and in-depth interviews) documented by voice recordings, the researcher has carried out a series of field trips with the following details:

| Day/Date | Venues and Activities | Details and Results |
|---|---|---|
| Tuesday, 1 October 2024 | Karet Tengsin Village. Field trip: Initial observation of the settlement location, meeting *the gatekeeper*, and looking for potential informants. | The Chairman of RT, RW, and RPTRA administrators are willing to be interviewed. Especially the RPTRA that we interviewed briefly. |
| Saturday, October 12, 2024 | Karet Tengsin Village. Going to the field: Interview with the Head of RT. | The resource person gave contact and approval to be interviewed a second time. |
| Monday, October 21, 2024 | Karet Tengsin Village: In-depth interviews with 2 RT heads. | The interview lasted for more than 1 hour for each resource person and provided 2 diverse perspectives so that it became a data triangulation. |
| Saturday, 2 November 2024 | Interview with SPRI Activists in Guji Baru Village, Duri Kepa Village, Kebon Jeruk District, West Jakarta | The interview lasted for more than 2 hours and the resource person provided comprehensive data for urban activism in Guji Baru Village. |
| Saturday, November 9, 2024 | Data validation and deepening. | In-depth interviews with the two Karet Tengsin Team 9 Activists. Video creation for presentations. |
| Thursday, November 14, 2024 | Data validation and deepening | In-depth interview with SPRI activists in Kampung Gege. |

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Urban Politics: The Right to the City and the Urban Social Movement

The study of political power in urban areas can be framed within two theoretical frameworks or empirical perspectives: pluralist and elitist (Judge, Stoker, Wolman, eds., 1995). Floyd Hunter's (1953) research on Atlanta provides an example of the elitist model, where political power is concentrated in a small minority of economic elites—wealthy families, prominent business figures, and corporate leaders—who influence political policies behind the scenes (in Judge, Stoker, Wolman, eds., 1995: 15). In contrast, Robert Dahl's (1961) study of New Haven and similar cities in the United States illustrates a pluralist perspective. Dahl depicts urban political power as distributed or fragmented among civic and political groups in a differentiated, open, and democratic manner. Unlike the stratified and exclusive nature of the elitist model, these various political groups interact, compete, and influence one another in shaping political policies and decision-making processes (see also G. Jordan, 1990; Polsby, 1980).

While it is fair if not to deny entirely that there is an elite minority influencing decisions and policies, the reality of pluralism defended by Dahl (1989) is a theoretical framework derived from his Politarchical democratic building; when power is held by many relatively equally powerful autonomous elements. The framework describes the empirical facts of policy-making and political decisions in Western liberal democratic regimes (Judge, Stoker, Wolman eds., 1995: 16; Dahl, 1989). However, Floyd Hunter (1953) identified senior executives in key businesses as the chain of actors in influencing Atlanta government policymaking in Judge, Stoker, Wolman eds., 1995: 39). C Wright Mills (1956) studied elitist theory nationally with an emphasis on developing bureaucracy causing decision-making in the US to become centralized in bureaucrats and executives, large corporations, and the military (in Judge, Stoker, Wolman eds., 1995: 37).

The theoretical framework of the right to the city can be traced to one of Henri Lefebvre's writings, the French Marxist sociologist, entitled *Le Droit à la ville* published in 1968 or in English as *the Right to the City* (translated 1996); a chapter of the book entitled *Writing on Cities.* The need for cities, according to him, is the need for quality or decent places, places of simultaneous and meeting, places where exchange will not go through exchange rates, trade and profits (pp. 57). Furthermore, Lefebvre (1968) said that the right to the city or the right to city life is the right to freedom, the right to participation, and the right to residence and habitat (pp. 73, 78).

David Harvey in his article entitled *The Right to the City* (2008) provides a theoretical framework that he obtained from studying the urbanization process in various major cities of the world in relation to the growth of capitalism; then the position of the right to the city in the process of urban transformation as part of human rights. According to him, the process of urbanization is the result of the mobilization of surplus value by capitalism and its distribution is in the city government, which is also partly in taxes, that is, when the capitalists will reinvest their surplus by developing cities and consumption centers to obtain more surplus (p. 24, 26). This condition occurs in the Gulf states, such as the UAE, when surpluses obtained from oil or petrodollars are used to build mega-urbanization in Dubai or Abu Dhabi superblocks (Harvey, 2008: 30; see: Kyriazis *et.al.*, 2017).

Urbanization or urban transformation is the process of absorbing surplus capital (Harvey, 2008: 33) or what Henri Lefebvre (2003) said in *The Urban Revolution* that urbanization is the center of capitalism's survival, of course the distribution of surplus is carried out by investment to create land for the production of new capital, but often by eliminating people's rights to cities. The surplus distribution process to form cities follows the logic of neoliberalism that integrates the state and corporations, so that the process is more on the side of corporations and the upper class (Harvey, 2008: 38). The right to the city became limited to the political and economic elite who wanted to build the city according to their expectations. Then there were social movements to fight for the right to control the use of capital surpluses to build cities that would later affect the underclass, poor, and marginalized communities. The right to be involved in decisions in the process of developing cities that use capital surpluses is one of the important rights to cities, in addition to freedom to access city resources, as Harvey (2008) says:

> "… greater democratic control over the production and utilization of surpluses. Since the process of urbanization is the main channel for the use of surpluses, building a democratic management of its distribution in urban areas is the right of the city" (pp. 37).

Urban social movements are part of a new social movement that is not class-based, has a participatory ethos, and opposes the role of government in distributing resources unevenly (Judge, Stoker, & Woman, 1995: 183). Manuel Castells, who conducted a study of urban social movements in *The City and The Grassroot* (1983), was a movement that wanted to make urban life democratic-participatory. While urban structures tend to be the result of the mobilization and demands of the lower society, urban social movements are mobility that produces the effect of transforming urban structures, cultures, and systems (p. 291).

Chris Pickvance (1985) said that leadership, money, and time are important resources for the success of an urban social movement, or any movement. Meanwhile, Pickvance (1995)

argues that there are two urban contexts that explain the decline of urban social movements, in the sense of the inability of movement organizations to mobilize participants: when there are budget constraints accompanied by market ideology that demands *a minimum-state* on the role of social welfare, which can reduce the participation of movements demanding the responsibility of state welfare, as SPRI. Then when there is privatization of public services and the absorption of organizations and movement leaders into the service provision sector; Pickvance (1985) gives an example of a case where the government co-opted movements by employing movement leaders into government projects.

Manuel Castells (1983) argues that the narrow (parochial) and fragmented nature of urban movements that divide society into specific issues makes urban movements limited and difficult to form broader coalitions (p. 391). Mancur Olson, who builds *the resource mobilization theory* (RMT), argues that individuals will only engage in collective movements if the individual benefits outweigh the disadvantages: rational considerations in maximizing self-interest. In addition, political passivity in urban politics can occur in the context of clientelism when it is the state (government) that co-opts the urban poor with "small concessions" e.g. in the form of services and subsidies, while the elite group gets the lion's share of privileges and income, such as 'forcing' the poor to remain poor (see: Walton, 1998; Eckstein, 1977).

There are several dimensions that will be compared from the urban social movement in Karet Tengsin and in Guji Baru Village based on the theories contained in the literature on urban social movements. Pickvance (1985) divides 2 forms of 'interest aggregation' in urban social movements, namely pressure groups and protest groups. The pressure group wants to change certain policies but accepts the political system, while the protest group is rejecting the rule of the games (p. 32). Furthermore, Pickvance (1985: 39) divides 4 types of urban social movements based on the following demands: (1) *movements for the provision of housing and urban services.* The community demanded state intervention in terms of consumption where such provisions did not exist, for example the squatter movement that demanded the rights to land, water, electricity, schools, and clinics; (2) *defensive movements.* Movements that oppose "physical threats" to housing and the environment, such as demolition, urban renewal or commercial redevelopment; (3) *movements over access to housing and urban services.* When the government has met the needs of collective consumption, then this struggle is access to the collective consumption facilities; (4) m*ovements for control and management.* Communities demand participation in urban planning, for example in running schools, for self-management of public housing schemes, for neighborhood councils, and for lower (or higher) council expenditures.

In addition to the dimension of the purpose of social movements, there are several types of social movement organizational movements from Donatella D. Porta & Mario Diani (2006) in their book *"Social Movements: An Introduction".* There are 2 types of social movement organizations that will be used as a comparison between Team 9 in Tengsin and SPRI in Kampung Gege. The first type, according to research conducted by Porta & Diani (2006: 145), are *professional movement organizations,* which have what Mc Carthy & Zald (1973) call "*leadership that devotes full time to the movement, with a large proportion of resources coming from outside the disadvantaged groups that the movement claims to represent"* (pp. 20). The second type is grassroots movement organization, described by Porta & Diani (2006) as a model that "combines a strong participatory orientation with a low level of formal structuring". The grassroots model of organization relies on the volunteerism of members to join this model movement based on solidarity incentives, and most importantly, often grassroots organizations are concerned with local issues (pp. 149).

Table 3. Based on the theoretical basis of urban social movements that have been presented previously from several literatures, a comparison of urban social movements between Karet Tengsin and Kampung Gege is formulated as follows:

| Dimensions of Urban Social Movements | Tim 9 Karet Tengsin | SPRI Kampung Guji Baru |
|---|---|---|
| **Struggle Model / Interest Aggregation Method (based on Pickvance, 1985)** | *The protest group*, because Team 9 wants to question the rules of the game given by the government (land ownership claims) that can harm them directly. Hearings, deliberations, and negotiations with the government to fight for the decision on assistance and certification of residents' land. | *Pressure groups,* which encourage the maximization of welfare policies to the Jakarta DK government (e.g. the Family Hope Program) |
| **Types of Social Movements (based on Porta & Diani, 2006; Carthy & Zald, 1973)** | Organization of grassroots movements Citizens' Internal Initiatives. It is a local issue (disaster assistance and land certification for Tengsin residents). There is no process of structuring and formalizing the movement. Only for short-term interests. | Professional social movement organizations. Have professional leadership and be funded by constituent contributions (citizens and activists). External support from SPRI as an organization that has a management structure. |
| **Collective *Consumption and Individual Benefits* Based on Castells, 1983; Olson, 1968; Pickvance, 1985)** | It is part of *the Movements for the provision of housing and urban services* and is a defensive movement in protecting residents against physical threats, namely the potential for evictions and demolition. Legalizing the land and rejecting the city's unilateral claim that their land was the Karet Bivoak burial area after the 2012 fire. Fighting for financial assistance to rebuild houses that had burned down in the 2012 fire. | SPRI leads to a type of *movement over access to housing and urban services*, because it fights for people's access to collective consumption, especially in the fields of welfare, settlement and health. It is also not spared from *the Defensive Movement* in opposing evictions and land claims by the government, and also still demanding collective and private consumption rights. |

The practice of urban social movements from people in the slums of big cities to demand welfare and security for a decent life is the practice of *"Slum Politics",* which has the equivalent of the concept offered by Piven & Cloward (1977) as the *Poor People Movement* or the Cloward-Piven Strategy which talks about political crises as a strategy of struggle for the urban poor, or. In the book *Social Theory and Urban Question*, referring to the thinking of Rex & Moore (1967), the class struggle framework also involves the struggle to gain access to residential property. The political context of slums is actually part of the politics of urban poverty in general, a socio-economic struggle in the provision of equitable housing, but this study seeks to provide specific notes and phenomena from the Jakarta experience. Likewise, Rex & Moore (1967) saw that the scarce and desirable distribution of housing resources created new patterns of inequality of life opportunities, for example in his case study in the housing system of Birmingham, England.

Rex & Moore (1967) argued that the urban process is a conflict between different stratifical groups that want the same type of housing. However, it is important in this study to bring the context of the urban poor to a more specific subject, namely the poor living in what Mike Davis (2006) calls the *Planet of Slums*, cities that have densely populated settlement points and often

go hand in hand with the deficit of fulfilling the basic and collective rights of their settlers. *Slum Politics* is nothing more than the process of consolidation of urban social movements that emerge, purpose, and operate from, for, and by the poor in the slum-dweller. The issues brought up also include the right to decent housing and self-defense from the economic-political forces that are interested in the removal of their buildings. Access to housing, especially in the suburbs, should also need to be criticized in relation to the equality of access from different social groups; and what Rex and Moore (1960s) call the struggle for access to housing as an urban resource is correct in this case.

## Urban Social Movement in Karet Tengsin, Central Jakarta

Karet Tengsin Village is located in Tanah Abang District, Central Jakarta. Reporting from the official website of Tanah Abang District (2024), the Karet Tengsin Village area has an area of 153.43 hectares. This village consists of 8 Neighborhood Units (RW), and 67 Neighborhood Units (RT). Karet Tengsin Village has eight RWs which are a combination of RWs that no longer exist such as RW 01 and RW 10. The proportion of the male and female population is quite balanced. The number of male populations is 12,127 people and female population is 11,406 people. The total population of Karet Tengsin Village is 23,533 people, with the most populous RW being RW 7 (Tanah Abang District, 2024). In this Slum Politics research, the Karet Tengsin area is interesting because the existence of the area is very close to the Sudirman-Thamrin area, which is the center of the economy both in Jakarta and in Indonesia. Even though it is close to Sudirman-Thamrin, the Karet Tengsin area is a densely populated area and tends to be slums, so the social gap seems to be very contrasting because it is only separated by TPU Karet Bivak.

Most of the residents of Karet Tengsin work in the informal sector, such as traders, laborers, *online motorcycle* taxis, vegetable traders, construction workers, casual workers, and domestic workers. Based on the results of interviews with the heads of local RTs and RWs, around 70% of the people of Karet Tengsin still live under poverty, even not a few of them are extreme, while the middle class is 30. But what is clear is that the average income of the people of Karet Tengsin is far below the Jakarta Regional Minimum Wage. This social inequality seems very real, where a small part of the population in the surrounding Sudirman-Thamrin area enjoys prosperity, while the residents of Karet Tengsin are trapped in a slum and dense environment.

Slums in Karet Tengsin arise due to rapid urbanization that is not balanced with good spatial planning. The area is experiencing serious problems in terms of sanitation, access to clean water, security, and infrastructure fulfillment. Floods and fires also often threaten this area, making living conditions in Karet Tengsin even more vulnerable. Houses in this area are often built informally and are classified as less livable because they are very narrow. This condition makes the researcher question the welfare of the residents. Unfortunately, the residents of Karet Tengsin do not have the awareness to carry out a long-lasting and organized urban social movement, especially in the struggle for city rights for now as carried out by Kampung Guji Baru pioneered by SPRI. Residents in the region tend to be forced to accept their current conditions and consider the situation normal in large cities, moreover they have no other choice in living their lives in the center of the capital.

Based on the results of in-depth interviews, Karet Tengsin residents have experienced major fires twice. The first fire occurred in 1995 and the last in 2012. The first fire (1995) prompted the construction of Flats I and II of Karet Tengsin Residents around 1996; On the 1st-4th floors are prioritized for fire victims and on the 5th-11th floors for the general public. Then in the last fire in 2012, some of the residents' houses and even the market was devoured by fire. Residents were then forced to sleep in the Karet Bivoak cemetery to evacuate temporarily. According to the Jakarta Fire Department, 405 houses, 200 shops, and 565 families were affected by this fire (The Jakarta Post, 2012).

When the residents of Tengsin wanted to build their houses again, based on the interview information, the residents' land was claimed by the government as cemetery land and belonged to the government, whose claim location included part of the settlements that had been inhabited by residents. In fact, the cemetery land has predetermined boundaries. As a result, residents who were victims of the fire did not dare to rebuild their houses because they were

worried that they would be evicted or demolished by the government, coupled with the land mafias at that time. The status of most land at that time was cultivated land, that the community did not have a certificate of ownership of the land on which they built their houses. In fact, most of the residents have lived for approximately 20 years in the Tengsin Rubber Land which according to Article 24 Paragraph (2) of Government Regulation 24/1997 that proof of rights can be done if the residents have used the land for 20 years.



*Figure 1.* The Karet Tengsin slum area is surrounded by *super-blocks* in Jakarta. It can be interpreted from the photo above that social inequality is still an unresolved socio-political problem (Author's documentation)

Based on interview information, in addition to being claimed by the local government as cemetery land, the status of cultivated land also results in the hampering of assistance for victims from social services and public housing offices and residential areas. The aid fund was initially to help residents build houses after the fire, but ultimately failed due to the obstruction of the status of cultivated land. Eventually, social movements were formed to fight for 1) clarity of their land rights (property rights) or as *Defensive Movements,* i.e. movements to oppose the threat of demolition and eviction (if matched with Pickvance's classification of urban social movement demands (1985: 39) and the second to fight for government assistance to build houses post-fire. An initiative emerged to form a team called TIM 9 as a citizen force to fight for the right to their residence or what Pickvance (1985) called Movements *for the provision of housing and urban services*. This team consisted of the Chairman of RW 07, RT, 1, 2, 3, 4 (some of whom had been interviewed), and 4 community and cultural leaders such Betawi figure. They are not only dealing with the state (provincial governments, cities, and Regional People's Representative Councils), but also dealing with mafias who offer easy land settlement in an illegal and instant way (with a large amount of money). However, Team 9 refused to use this method and preferred to struggle by means of hearings and negotiations that were carried out periodically against the Kelurahan, District, Mayor and DPRD, Ministry of PUPR, or what the source said was "Rebellion according to procedure".

The residents of Karet Tengsin are entitled to a decent place to live and habitat as a right to the city in Lefebvre's view (1968: 73-78). In the book *Theories of Urban Politics* (2009), there is a concept in the politics of urban development by Major David Rusk about *city-county consolidation*, which is a policy from the city government to provide affordable housing in the suburbs (sub-urban) to deconcentrate poverty in the city center and distribute the area (pp. 114). Currently, a small number of residents have enjoyed land certificates or certificates for their houses, while around 80% more residents still have not received their land certificates to date. However, at that time, residents' lands had begun to be measured by land institutions, but complicated bureaucratic registration then prolonged the land certification process. Residents

have been calm on the one hand because the land has been measured, but residents have not yet received the assistance promised by the government to build houses so that residents have to build their own houses by way of debt. There are also not many residents who want to live in flats, which according to some residents are "all S" in size, which means Rumah Susun *"Sangat Sederhana Selonjor Saja Susah".*

Team 9 can be called an urban social movement even though it is a very small community because it is a collective force that is formed for the formulation and struggle of citizens politically against the city government and the DPRD against the distribution of social goods or to borrow the term urban collective consumption from Castells (1983), namely in this context is the clarity of the status of the residents' land and assistance to build the houses of the residents of Karet Tengsin that have been affected fire in 2012. From a theoretical perspective, the model of aggregation of interests by Team 9 is nothing but what Pickvance (1985) described as a *Protest Movement* Group that rejects political decisions (*The Rule of the Game)* from the government (in this case the city and also the center) which are felt to be contrary to the interests and interests of the people of Karet Tengsin.

Team 9 in the theoretical lens of Porta & Diani (2006) is a grassroots organization that "combines a strong participatory orientation with a low level of formal structuring" (pp. 149). It can be known that Team 9, even though it has a chairman, conducts deliberatives almost every day to solve the problem of residents' fear in rebuilding their houses after the 2012 fire. Porta & Diani (2006) explain that the grassroots organizational model relies on the volunteerism of members to join this model movement based on solidarity incentives, and most importantly, often grassroots organizations are concerned with local issues (pp. 149). In this theoretical lens, Team 9 is a grassroots organization that focuses on local issues, namely the rights to the land they live in, with the strength of solidarity between residents, RT, and RW Karet Tengsin.



*Gambar 2. Team 9 vest uniform (Author's documentation photo).*

Since 2012, Team 9 as a collective force to fight illegal land claims that have been used or cultivated by residents as settlements (cultivated land) that had been claimed as the burial ground of Karet Bivak. The main demand of Team 9 succeeded in suppressing and protesting against the government claiming residents' land as cemetery land, so that some of the residents have obtained their ownership certificates and some others have had their land measured, although the demand for the post-fire village development assistance fund plan has not been successful until now. Team 9 and the residents on the one hand have calmed down because the residents' land has been measured even though not all residents have been certified (because they have to queue and so on bureaucratically), but on the other hand Team 9 is also tired of

fighting for the assistance to build houses that are expected to be given by the government, so that currently, practically Team 9 is no longer operating.

**Urban Social Movement in Kampung Guji Baru (Gege), West Jakarta**

Kampung Gege is a densely populated village nestled amidst the glittering cityscape of Jakarta. This research aims to provide empirical insights derived from explorations into the phenomenon of urban rights and the struggles of urban social movements in Kampung Gege (also known as Guji Baru Village), Duri Kepa Village, Kebon Jeruk District, West Jakarta. The challenges faced by the residents of Kampung Gege are as complex as those experienced by the people of Karet Tengsin. These social issues revolve around unmet basic needs, including inadequate housing, unclear land ownership status (cultivation land), unemployment, child stunting, limited access to healthcare, withheld diplomas affecting education, difficulties in obtaining population documents (such as birth certificates), and uneven distribution of welfare assistance. For instance, assistance from the Family Hope Program (*Program Keluarga Harapan* or PKH) is often criticized for being insufficiently distributed, with eligibility criteria perceived as overly restrictive. These issues are addressed—at least in part—through the efforts of the Indonesian People's Struggle Union (*Serikat Perjuangan Rakyat Indonesia* or SPRI). According to Pickvance (1985) categorization, the demands of urban social movements like SPRI can be classified as movements aimed at ensuring the provision of housing and urban services, as well as improving access to these services for urban residents (Movements for the provision of housing and urban services and Movements over access to housing and urban services, pp. 39).

Social movements provide *collective goods* for the members of the society they fight for (Castells, 1983: 293). Initially, the people of Gege were quite passive in matters between residents, only caring about their own interests so that they were narrow. However, SPRI seeks to form a collective awareness that welfare problems are not a problem of a few families, but a problem for one village, so overcoming it requires joint and coordinated efforts, in this case SPRI which also teaches the ability to organize movements. Initially, a passive but (secretly) society needs and enjoys the collective consumption of the results of collective struggle, similar to what Manuel Castells (1983) said is *a free-rider* in a social movement, that is, an individual who is not involved in a social movement but enjoys the collective results of the movement. However, after SPRI activists have proven to provide direct benefits for the community to be able to access public services and even help families who ask for help in simple matters to social affairs in the context of city policies, the awareness is embedded in every individual that community organizations such as SPRI are important for the welfare of the Gege community itself.

Cities that can be assumed to have, even become centers, services from education, transportation, health and many other welfare expenditures invested in cities, in fact have not provided optimal benefits for the urban poor. Bacon & Eltis (1978) said based on his study in the UK that welfare spending could increase but it was the middle class rather than the urban poor who enjoyed it because the middle class enjoyed more concrete forms of spending, from administrative costs, commuter facilities, higher education assistance, and health services (in Saunders, 1981: 223). This is a problem of seriousness and accuracy of urban policy targets.

The SPRI organization entered and made its first approach to the people of Kampung Guji Baru in the early 2000s. For areas that are already covered, at least each regional unit (either village or village) has at least one SPRI coordinator. Broadly speaking, SPRI plays an important role in advocating and pioneering and building the courage of the people of Kampung Gege to fight for their rights to the government. In this case, if matched with the form of *inteterst aggregation* from Pickvance (1985: 39), SPRI is classified as a pressure group (not a protest group), namely as a subject that puts pressure on the city and central governments in the context of fulfilling and facilitating the collective consumption rights of Gege residents (*collective consumption* borrowing a term from Castells, 1983). In addition, SPRI focuses on three things in its movement in addition to mass protests, namely research, discussions (grand meetings), and education to the public regarding people's rights and how the public can access them. For welfare assistance from the government (PKH, health card, elderly card, education, and others), for example, there are criteria for the Integrated Social Welfare List from the Ministry of Social Affairs which is adjusted to the findings of SPRI if there are many community members whose

conditions need assistance but it is difficult to be included in the criteria for receiving social assistance. Then for the proposal of Local PKH from the Jakarta APBD which is encouraged by SPRI so that the distribution pays more attention to local needs intensively.

In "War Against Poverty", a term from Fox Piven & Cloward (2011) to describe interest organizations that fight for services for low-income communities, SPRI has added an empirical picture to Fox Piven & Cloward's (2011) argument:

> "Influence in urban politics is not only won at the polls, but also through the ongoing activities of organized interests, such as trade unions, homeowners' associations and business groups. These groups oversee the complex operations of municipal government agencies, recognize issues and regularly assert their viewpoints through meetings with public officials, attending hearings and the like, and by exploiting a wide variety of channels of influence over the government" (Piven & Cloward, 2011: 281-282).

As an urban social movement organization, SPRI is a model of *Professional Movement Organizations* based on the typology of social movements McCarthy & Zald (1973: 20) and also Porta & Diani (2006: 145) which in these organizations have a professional leadership structure: the leader works fully for the movement. In this case, the SPRI coordinator devotes his time to coordinating the demands and needs of the community in *real time*. Then the SPRI movement resources are obtained from contributions called "Dana Juang" from the community and activists for the needs of the movement such as demonstrations and others. The community and activists provide contributions in the hope that the contributions can be used to fight for the collective rights of the Gege community itself. This fund is also a form of effort to maintain the independence or independence of the SPRI movement itself. Although it is a professional movement organization, SPRI also has the characteristics of the Grassroots Movement Organization from Porta & Diani (2006) because it relies on solidarity-based participation from the residents of Kampung Gege and local issues such as the distribution of Local PKH. This means that the organizational typology of the Grassroots and Professional movements is not mutually exclusive, and although the two can be distinguished, it is possible that in one case there is a social movement organization that has a wedge in both types.

In addition to fighting for the fulfillment of *urban services* for the residents of Kampung Gege, SPRI has long been a *Defensive Movement* or a social movement of the city that fights against physical threats such as demolition or commercial reconstruction of the city from Pickvance's analysis (1985), in this case it is the same as Team 9. Based on interview information, around 2005-2010 the government had issued a letter to dismantle or a Demolition Order (SPB) to Gege Village. The community thinks that there are land mafia and companies that want the land of Gege residents and collude with certain individuals to sell residents' land without the knowledge of Gege residents. Residents, with their cohesiveness, staged massive demonstrations against political actors suspected of being involved in the demolition and eviction of this village, especially to pressure the Village Head, Governor, and Mayor to revoke the demolition letter or SPB in 2010 (see: Boyle, 2010a). Some village officials who are considered by residents to participate in selling residents' land can no longer occupy positions as formal officials. As well as quoting a little story from the comprehensive story told by Boyle (2010b) about the eviction of Guji Baru:

> Recently I met up with Sitompul and other activists from SRMI [Now SPRI] in the slum settlement of Kampung Guji Baru, in West Jakarta. The clearing in which we met was significant. It was the rubble-strewn site of a shanty home that had been destroyed in the midst of a prolonged and ongoing attempt by "land mafia" to clear this three-hectare former swamp which now is home to about 3000 poor people. Gangsters have been sent to try and burn out the residents on several occasions but have been beaten back by the well-organised and militant residents (Boyle, 2010b). Further: "Developers want to build multistorey towers on this land [Guji Baru] to house yet more giant

shopping malls and apartments to cater for the wealthier minority in this megacity." (Boyle, 2010b)

Facing the residents of Gege, the mafias who wanted the land of Kampung Guji Baru used paid thugs to intimidate and violence the residents so that they would leave their village and hand over their land. The forces of thugs who wanted to commit violence and intimidation for land acquisition actually lost in the face of fierce resistance from Gege residents, each of whom was a "hero". With cohesiveness and courage or also intersecting with the anger of the Gege residents, including the SPRI (formerly SMRI), in fighting against the forces of the alliance that wanted to uproot the residents from their residences (even though it was still cultivated land, the residents had lived in the village decades ago), finally made the Gege residents survive. Coalitions or alliances that move in the interests of the mafia and economic power form a network between formal political forces (government at some level) and including thugs. The goal is none other than to dismantle and evict Gege residents. On the other hand, Gege residents and SPRI activists are a solid and coherent force in fighting the "eviction alliance". With years of struggle through various demonstrations and negotiations, Kampung Gege has been able to survive until now. Boyle (2010b) confirms the data obtained by the researcher by calling: *"Our demands are: 1. Reject unilateral eviction. 2. Eradication of land mafia. 3. Give the residents land certificates".*

## CONCLUSION

A city serves as a political, social, business, economic, and cultural arena. Upon closer examination, Jakarta continues to be marked by persistent poverty and ongoing struggles. Decent housing, reliable access to food, easily accessible healthcare for the underprivileged, and ensuring that children do not drop out of school—based on observations and interviews conducted by researchers—still demand greater commitment from the city government. Urban social movements, particularly the struggle for resources and justice, are critical and can be understood in the context of *Slum Politics* as explored in this study. Urban governance and the equitable distribution of urban economic surpluses, such as welfare fund allocations, remain contentious issues. Slum areas like Karet Tengsin and Guji Baru have yet to experience revolutionary improvement, despite decades of regional elections in Jakarta and changes in gubernatorial leadership. The ongoing struggle for equitable urban rights by the slum communities in Karet Tengsin and Guji Baru exemplifies *Slum Politics*—a political process driven by residents of slum areas aimed at transforming urban governance into a system that is fair and prosperous for all.

The connection between urban social movement theory and empirical data is explored through a comparative analysis of the urban social movement model (interest aggregation method) and the demands of the movement, particularly as described by Pickvance (1985). This analysis also incorporates the typology of social movement organizations from Porta and Diani (2006). SPRI (*Serikat Perjuangan Rakyat Indonesia*) is categorized as a professional urban social movement organization, characterized by professional leadership, a structured organization, sustainable financing, and an active role as a long-term pressure group advocating for the right to the city, particularly in Kampung Gege. The residents of Kampung Gege have also engaged in protests and resistance against alliance forces attempting to displace them from their homes. In contrast, Team 9 represents an urban social movement in the form of a grassroots organization. It consists of residents and is led by neighborhood leaders (RT, RW), as well as cultural and religious figures. Team 9 is a defensive social movement, mobilized to protest and resist the threat of eviction by the government following the 2012 fire incident.

Neither the Team 9 movement nor the SPRI movement has placed significant emphasis on collective demands for control and management of the city, as outlined by Pickvance (1985). Instead, their focus remains on demands such as preventing evictions, contesting land claims, and urging the government to enhance the provision and accessibility of funds and welfare facilities as part of ensuring the Right to the City for Jakarta's residents.

---

As a critique, the concept of the Right to the City, as defined by Harvey (2008), which emphasizes greater democratic control over the production and utilization of surpluses (absorbed in the local government budget), has not been a central focus for either Team 9 or SPRI. However, SPRI has made efforts to expand the aggregate number of beneficiaries and increase the budget allocation for welfare programs (e.g., Program Keluarga Harapan or PKH) provided by the Jakarta government.

## REFERENCES

Bacon, R. and Eltis, W. (1978). *Britain's Economic Problem: Too Few Producers*. Macmillan.

Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS). (2017). *Pendataan RW Kumuh DKI Jakarta 2017.* BPS DKI Jakarta.

Boyle, Peter. (2010a, March 27). *Indonesia: Slum residents resist eviction*. Green Left. https://www.greenleft.org.au/content/indonesia-slum-residents-resist-eviction

Boyle, Peter. (2010b). *The Peoples Democratic Party and Indonesia's poor majority*. International Journal of Socialist Renewal. https://links.org.au/peoples-democratic-party-and-indonesias-poor-majority

Castells, Manuel. (1983). *The City and The Grassroot.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dahl, Robert A. (1961). *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Dahl, Robert A. (1989). *Democracy and its Critics*. London: Yale University Press.

Davies, Jonathan & David Imbroscio (eds). (2009). *Theories of Urban Politics* (2nd Edition). Sage.

Davis, Mike. (2006). *Planet of Slums.* London: Verso.

Eckstein, Susan. (1977). *The poverty of revolution: the state and urban poor in Mexico. Princeton.* University Press, Princeton.

Fajarta, Charlos Roy. (2013). Gerakan Sosial Masyarakat Kota dalam Memperjuangkan Legalisasi Permukiman Liar: Studi Kasus Pemukiman Kampung Tanah Merah Jakarta Utara. *Tugas Karya Akhir*. Depok: Universitas Indonesia.

Harvey, David. (2008). The Right to the City. *New Left Review,* 53, p. 23-40. https://newleftreview.org/issues/ii53/articles/david-harvey-the-right-to-the-city.pdf

Hunter, Floyd. (1953). *Community Power Structure*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Jordan, G. (1990). The pluralism of pluralism: an anti-theory? *Political Studies, 38*(2): 286-301.

Judge, David, Gerry Stoker, & Harold Wolman (Eds). (1995). *Theories of Urban Politics*. Sage Publication.

Kecamatan Tanah Abang. (2024). Geografi Kelurahan Karet Tengsin. https://pusat.jakarta.go.id/kec-tanah-abang/kelurahan-karet-tengsin. Diakses 13 Oktober 2024 pukul 23.48 WIB.

Kyriazis, Apostolos, Ahmed Almehairi, Ibrahim Al Seri. (2017). The Morphology of Abu Dhabi's Superblocks: A Modernist Vision. *Athens Journal of Architecture, 3*(4), 373-394.

Lefebvre, Henri. (1968). "The Right to the City", dalam *Writings on Cities* (Trans. by Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas). Blackwell Publishers. Hlm. 147-160.

Lefebvre, Henri. (2003). *The Urban Revolution.* Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.

McCharthy, John D. & Mayer N. Zald. (1973). The Trend of Social Movements in America: - Professionalization and Resource Mobilization. In M. N. Zald and J. D. McCarthy, *Social Movements in an Organizational Society.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction. pp. 337–91.

Mills, C. Wright. (1956). *The Power Elite*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Olson, Mancur. (1968). *The Logic of Collective Action.* New York: Schocken.

Pickvance, Chris. (1985). The Rise and Fall of Urban Movements and the Role of Comparative Analysis. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 3*(1), 31–53.

Piven, Frances Fox & Richard Cloward. (2011). The Weight of the Poor: A Strategy to End Poverty. *New Political Science, 33*(3), 271-284,

Peraturan Gubernur Nomor 90 tahun 2018 tentang Peningkatan Kualitas Permukiman dalam Rangka Penataan Kawasan Permukiman Terpadu. Berita Daerah Provinsi Daerah Khusus Ibu Kota Jakarta.

Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 24 tahun 1997 tentang Pendaftaran Tanah Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 59 tahun 1997

Polsby, N.W. (1980). *Community Power and Political Theory* (2nd edn). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Porta, Donatella D. & Mario Diani. (2006). *Social Movements: An Introduction.* Blackwell Publishing.

Rex, J., and R Moore. (1967). *Race, Community and Conflict.* Oxford University Press.

Sanjaya, Kurniawan & Kimiko Shiki. (2016). Slum Improvement and New Community-based Organizations in Indonesia: Case Studies of Ciliwung Merdeka in Jakarta and Pamerti Code in Yogyakarta. Penelitian informasi regional: Buletin Institut Studi Informasi Regional, Universitas Ritsumeikan.

Saunders, Peter. (1981). *Social Theory and the Urban Question* (2nd edition). Routledge.

The Jakarta Post. (2012, August 8). *Karet Tengsin residents withstand flames*. The Jakarta Post. https://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2012/08/08/karet-tengsin-residents-withstand-flames.html

Undang-Undang Nomor 11 tahun 2011 tentang Perumahan dan Kawasan Pemukiman. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia tahun 2011 Nomor 7.

Walton, John. (1998). Urban Conflict and Social Movements in Poor Countries: Theory and Evidence of Collective Action. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 22*(3), 460–481.

[This page is intentionally left blank]

[This page is intentionally left blank]