State and Society in a Post-Authoritarian Indonesian City
A Study of Liponsos Keputih Surabaya

Dini Nurul Ilmiah[1] and Karnaji[2]

[1]*Sociology Department, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia*
[2]*Sociology Department, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia*

Keywords: equality, panopticon, domination of power, resistance

Abstract: This research examines the state and society relationship in the post-authoritarian era in Indonesia. Through the exploration of the Liponsoso Keputih, a shelter for people with social-welfare problems in Surabaya, this paper looks at the panopticon mechanism employed by the shelter and the forms of resistance carried out by the residents in order to understand the relationship between the state's apparatus and the ordinary people in the state-funded shelter. It describes the everyday politics through which power and subjectification occur and how they are reproduced in daily activities. Using a qualitative technique, this research observes the everyday politics in Liponsos Keputih and interviews persons who can relate to the information that this research needs. This work concludes that the state's domination over the people in state-funded social facilities remain, although the demand for an altered approach has grown since the 1998 political and bureaucratic reformation. This is depicted in the surveillance techniques and social control inside the shelter which posits the occupants as the subject of the working power. To a certain degree, it drives the emerging resistance carried out by the occupants who try to escape from the system of power that the shelter produces.

1 INTRODUCTION

The collapse of the New Order regime in 1998 marked changes in many aspects of Indonesian politics and societies. This moment is considered to be the inception toward a democratic society in which prosperity can be built upon the equality found in politics, economy, law, society, and culture in the frame of decentralised power (Aspinall and Fealy, 2003). However, scepticism emerges along with the later progression of democratisation through which, as Nordholt (2003) argues, the distribution of power is sometimes accompanied by a particular form of authoritarianism. The extent to which the equality of the people is upheld is still under question, including for people with social-welfare problems. This has also become an important issue in Indonesia.

In Surabaya, the second largest city of Indonesia, people with social-welfare problems are accommodated in a state-funded shelter called 'Liponsos' (*Lingkungan Pondok Sosial*). The shelter for people with social-welfare problems in Surabaya was founded in 2013 according to the Municipal Decree Number 3, 2013 (Surabaya Government, 2013). It also reflects the implementation of the national constitution in which the state has responsibility for helping people with social-welfare problems. Generally, Liponsos aims to improve people's lives, as they are considered to have social-welfare problems. People with social-welfare problems are an individual, family or community group who, due to a social-economic obstacle, difficulty or disruption, cannot fulfil their (physical, spiritual and social) needs adequately and reasonably. Simply put, society is considered to be prosperous if someone's life is considered to be culturally worthy, while those with lives that are not "worthy" are considered to be people with social-welfare problems, especially those whose existence can be disrupted by the running of the system. Liponsos is not merely limited to those have social-welfare problems in the traditional meaning, such as poverty or disability. It also includes people who have been considered a 'social anomaly or deviant' like homeless people, prostitutes, transgender individuals, beggars and so on.

In Surabaya, there are two Liponsos founded by the municipal government, namely Liponsos Kalijudan and Keputih, known together as Liponsos Keputih. Both are under the supervision of the municipality of Surabaya. People who have been accommodated in the Liponsos are usually referred to as 'a resident'. They come from several regencies in East Java, in which most of them have been the victim of raids in the city of Surabaya by the polisi pamong praja or civil police (Tribun News, 2018). In 2016, Liponsos Keputih had 1536 residents which consist of aging people, the homeless, and people with mental illness. Despite the fact that the Liponsos Keputih annually returns the residents back to their families, the number of its occupants remains high. It is always over the capacity of the building. Liponsos Keputih aims to accommodate 600 occupants, but every year, the residents total more than 1,000 people.

The overcapacity of the Liponsos attracts public attention, such as whether the occupants of the Liponsos are well-treated. Responding to this hesitation, according to their website, the head of social services in Surabaya insists that the Liponsos Keputih is able to accommodate its residents properly. In addition to control over the food quality served to the residents, the Liponsos's management also delivers events and training which aims to empower the residents so then they have non-formal skills that they can employ after their return to society. This is not only to improve the quality of the service that the government provides to the people with social-welfare problems, but also to confirm that the government is changing its approach to social equality issues. The head of the municipal social services asserts that Liponsos Keputih is not 'the place to punish the deviant' but that it is a centre that empowers less fortunate people. This paradigm follows what has been mandated in the 1998 political and bureaucratic reformation, which is that instead of being repressive, the state apparatuses should promote a persuasive approach in society and posit themselves as a facilitator to empower people within the frame of democratic political culture (Ricklefs, 2001).

Within the context of the public shelter in Keputih Liponsos, this article examines the extent to which the changing paradigm of the state-society relationship occurs in the local context where the state and people are in a face-to-face situation with a social services background. In so doing, this article analyses the structural design of the Liponsos Keputih building within which the occupants stay to receive governmental service relating to the

problems that they have. Through the surveillance system that the Liponsos Keputih employs, this article aims to understand how the state treats social-welfare problems. Furthermore, this article also brings to the fore the occupants' experiences inside the Liponsos Keputih to dismantle the position of the occupants as well as to discern the meaning of being 'a resident' in the Liponsos Keputih. Their experiences, to a certain degree, describe the way that they are treated during their stay in Liponsos Keputih.

1.1 Liponsos Keputih Surabaya

Surabaya is the second largest city in Indonesia after the capital of Jakarta. Located on the North coast of Java which links the northern coastal Javanese cities and the Madura Island, Surabaya has functioned as the centre for labour and commodity exchange in the eastern part of Java since the late colonial era (Dick, 2003). Despite losing its prominence since the establishment of Jakarta as the state capital during independence, Surabaya has maintained its position in the Indonesian social-economy since the appointment of the city as the centre of Eastern Indonesia's growing industry. Thus, since the colonial era, Surabaya has become the destination for labour migration, both from the surrounding regencies of East Java and outside the island along with the growing industrialisation before and after independence (Dick, 2003; Peters, 2013).

Overwhelmed with the number of migrants, social welfare has emerged as a problem that the municipal has to deal with. Since the colonial era, land and housing were the major issues that the city experienced when the landless-homeless migrants occupied vacant spots in the city (Dick, 2003; Basundoro, 2010; Colombijn, 2010). It produced sporadic land occupations throughout the city, particularly around public burial places, on the riversides, and along the railway sides. The problem of land and settlement also stimulates the emergence of urban kampung, which is associated with the settlement of stereotyping poor dwellings as the source of urban problems such as crime, dirtiness and irregularity (Peters, 2013; Basundoro, 2013). In the 1980s, the municipal initiated a partnership with poor people to improve their settlements, called the Kampung Improvement Program (KIP). It addressed several issues of the kampung, such as roads, footpaths, water supply, drainage, sanitation and waste management (Silas, 1992). Since then, the removal of such problems in the city has been

gradually carried out to increase the quality of life in the city.

The city's improvement project does not only address the kampung settlements, but also urban public spaces. By the 1997-1998 political and bureaucratic reformation, the city began the clearance of the public space from any form of illegal occupation in search for a green and clean city. This was apparent in the displacement of people, particularly the poor, from public spaces such as street-sides, riversides, city parks, markets and so on (Peters, 2010). It included the removal of pedicabs, street-side food stalls, street vendors, street singers, beggars, and illegal shelters. For the migrants who had no living space, the municipal provided a shelter to accommodate them for a period of time before they returned back to their hometown.

The shelter idea dates back to 1997. Since the improvement projects were carried out, the municipal prepared the shelter to accommodate landless migrants in the city (Rulyani, 2010). The shelter was located in Jl. Keputih Tegal, Keputih, Surabaya. This was the first stage of the Liponsos Keputih. At that time, this was used to shelter people with social-mental problems such as the psychotic, the homeless, beggars, prostitute women, transgender individuals and aging people. Since 2010, the municipal built new shelters to separate people with particular problems, such as a shelter for children and the aging, a shelter for differently abled children, and a shelter for people with leprosy as a few examples. Recently, Liponsos Keputih has also become for people with social and mental problems or people who have been raided for particular reasons.

2 METHOD

2.1 Research Approach

This research is a qualitative study that has attempted to understand the state-society relationship in the democratisation era of Indonesia. In doing so, we have looked at the monitoring, disciplinary, and supervisory practices in a total institution called Liponsos. We used qualitative methods because this type of research is difficult to measure with numbers since it is closely related to social interactions and social processes. To 'expose' the practice of power, it is necessary to have qualitative principles and methods in place that can extract information from the informants.

The reality of Liponsos Keputih is the practice of monitoring and normalising the residents. The inhabitants, who in their daily lives spend their time in the barracks, are always monitored to ensure that they obey the rules. Over-monitoring provokes the emergence of resistance in the Liponsos Keputih, such as the breaking the roof of the bathroom.

During the data collection, we were immediately involved and became part of Liponsos Keputih as volunteers while doing observations as well as the data retrieval process itself. The researchers stayed at Liponsos Keputih Surabaya, sleeping and spending the night in a cell to make a full observation. Over time, researchers got in touch with informants that met the criteria of this study.

The data collection in this study was flexible but always adapted to the conditions of the field. The data was collected through observation and in-depth interviews. First, the researchers did the observation part of the data collection. The observation used all of the five senses. This allowed us to see, feel, and interpret the world along with the various social events and symptoms of it, as the research subjects can see, feel and understand. In its definition, the observation was a primary data collection procedure that carried out by viewing, observing and recording the behaviour and conversation of the research subjects using the observation guidelines. During the observation, in-depth interviews were also conducted. This was to the information needed to uncover the focus of the research.

3 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Panopticon Mechanism in Liponsos Keputih

The design of Liponsos Keputih puts the residents in a restricted space situation. The barracks are made like a cell with iron bars along both the windows and doors. This allows the officers to monitor the situation inside the barracks. This is what Foucault calls a confinement technique (Foucault, 1977). The residents may only exit the cell at the time allowed, for skills training for example. Afterward, the occupants are redirected back to the cell.

In the past, Liponsos used a confinement mechanism inside the large barracks with no partitions. The residents used to live together in the large barracks with a locked gate. This model is inclined toward facilitating communication and planning, including plans to breaking the rules. In 2014, the design of the Liponsos barracks was

thoroughly reset and renovated to be what it is today. The barracks are installed with partitions and categorised into several parts to accommodate different people and their irregularities. They are separated in a clear space. This redesigning of the barracks is quite effective in managing the occupants. It reduces potential resistance and even anarchism in the Liponsos, which used to be carried out by the occupants. With the renovation of the barrack design from the previous era, proven anarchist actions by the residents has lessened. The extensive Liponsos Keputih's barrack design, which in 2014 was then split into several parts, aims to increase surveillance and reduce the number of suspicious communications and networks among the occupants in the barracks.

In Liponsos Keputih, there are particular places for those considered to be breaking the rules. These places are located in sectors A, B, and C. These three sectors are devoted to the occupants who try to break the rules or make chaos inside the Liponsos. The occupants who are involve in these prohibited activities are isolated in particular cells which the officers call 'the prison'. This shows there to be a repressive and corrective attitude for those who cause problems in the barracks. Furthermore, to a certain degree, it also shows the dominant power of the officers of the Liponsos Keputih. They have an absolute authority to define what is right or wrong and to determine the extent to which the occupants deviate or not. In short, the officers have the authority to determine if a person is guilty and the punishment that follows.

By controlling the residents, the officers use this position prestige to gain their obedience. The occupants who roam after doing their obligatory work outside of the barracks (cleaning the barracks, for example) are hinted to by several symbols that the officers can easily do such as movements that tell them to be silent - with their forefinger placed in the mouth. The sign of shaking one's hands makes the occupants automatically understand that they must re-enter the cell. This practice exemplifies how the Liponsos Keputih occupants remain inferior when in front of the officers.

For Foucault, the shifting strategy of punishment, from the openly displayed corporal punishment to the non-physical punishment, indicates that the body no longer needs to be touched as a target of punishment. However, it does not mean that there is no way to control the subject. In addition to the body, another aspect that has become an important tool used to produce a docile subject is called the soul (Foucault, 1977).

The reality that occurs in the Liponsos Keputih can be attributed to Foucault's thoughts. The officers of Liponsos Keputih - especially those who serve as security with a stout, firm and fierce performance - have the authority to supervise and discipline the occupants. With this authority, the officers are entitled to walk around, to monitor the cell's circumstances, to control the cells and to drive the barrack's discipline by enforcing activities and rules.

In the previous era, the occupants never knew that they were being watched by someone in the cell appointed to do so by the officers. He 'recorded' everything that occurred inside the barracks and reported it to the officers. This surveillance method was successful since the officers eventually thwarted all of the occupants' plans to riot.

Nowadays, Liponsos is installed with Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) inside the barracks. The CCTV monitoring system is monitored at the security post, which makes the residents always re-consider if they want to resist. The residents never know when the CCTV is actually turned on and monitored, and when it is switched off. The sign of 'this area is equipped with CCTV' seems to remind them that they are being watched by a camera recorder. The impact of this makes the residents always feel anxious.

This is what can be said of invisible scrutiny. The officers are entitled to know whatever they want about the occupants. By knowing all the activities of the residents, all planned events and models of deviation can be controlled. The officers have mapped out and understand the people's knowledge. According to Foucault, between knowledge and power, there is a particular type of relationship that develops (Foucault, 1977). There is no practice of power that does not bring about knowledge, and there is no knowledge that does not contain power relations. Finally, it can be said that there is the 'conquest' of knowledge and the re-formation of power relations between residents and the staff of the Liponsos Keputih.

3.2 The Form of Resistance to the Panopticon Practice in Liponsos Keputih

The artificial resistance committed by the residents is the expression of a dead-end and simultaneously, as a way out of the rules and a departure from the form of domination in Liponsos Keputih, Surabaya. They are a group that does not have the courage to take risks. This kind of resistance is carried out by groups of residents who have no sufficient resources

and power. They use soft means to express their resistance. Dominated people tend to develop low profile techniques. They appear as if they have no desire to surpass or overthrow the existing power.

Many of the residents do not dare to struggle because of the threat of punishment that they have to endure when breaking the rules. In this case, their repatriation will be inhibited if they try to rebel. They tend to choose to be the subject of the rules even though they do not entirely agree on the claims truth by Liponsos Keputih Surabaya. The raids and the imprisonment of the occupants mean that the occupants consciously agree that they are guilty. Yet, they are aware that the system of power has subjugated them, which in turn forces them to feel guilty. In this case, there is a form of hegemony. The domination that occurs is the beginning of hegemony. According to Gramsci, it works with the idea that enduring the domination of the ruling class is a way of dominating the ruled ones (Bates, 1975).

In Liponsos Keputih, despite the fact that the hegemony has penetrated the occupants' knowledge, it does not entirely work since sometimes the occupants try to escape by resisting the rules. Under this oppression, resistance in various forms and degrees occurs. In Liponsos Keputih, individual hidden resistance is more effective when carried out within the limitations of the barrack. The resistance that they do in the barracks refers to the form resistance that Scott (1985) formulated as a weak struggle which is mostly carried out in their everyday life, such as through speech, gossip and so on.

The rather discriminative treatment of the officers towards the occupants also triggers the emergence of covert resistance. Giving freedom to certain residents (especially the trustees) and not to others causes the residents to feel that they are being discriminated against by officers. The residents express their disappointment through covert and blatant resistance. On the one hand, covert resistance is carried out by cursing the officers when they are not there, cursing the occupants who are treated better or telling the researchers and co-occupants of their treatment. Blatant opposition refers to open resistance, which entails risks. Some of them have tried several times to use verbal resistance in the form of blasphemy, criticisms, protests, and so forth. The extreme resistance emerges when they reach the climax of their discontentment. After repeatedly complaining to the officers, and having been given no freedom - even simply to get out of the barracks for fresh air -, the residents decide to resist. The latest happens is the eviction of twenty-three

occupants from the Liponsos. The latest were street children, which are perceived negatively by the officers.

4 CONCLUSION

The changing political and bureaucratic milieu triggered by the 1998 reformation has been expected to promote a more civil culture in Indonesian social life. The long-reigning New Order regime concealed civic life behind an authoritarian form of government which allowed the state apparatuses to undertake what they wanted so long as they were in line with the leader's will. The moment of the regime change is understood to be the coming of age of democratic culture and the foundation of a better civic life in Indonesia which is committed to upholding human rights and maintaining equality. The state should be less dominant in determining public life. Nevertheless, this does not seem to happen easily since the New Order legacy in Indonesian politics does seemingly not allow lower groups to have an equal treatment and role in public affairs (Hadiz, 2000).

What Hadiz formulates appears in several aspects, including in the social services exemplified in the Liponsos Keputih in Surabaya. As this study shows, the state's domination remains in Indonesian bureaucratic customs. The technology that the power of the state apparatuses employs allows for the reproduction and proliferation of power. Despite resistance, the occupants - as the dominated group - are still subject to being ruled and subject to the state apparatus. This confirms the hesitation that emerges on the democratisation of Indonesia, which would bring in the fulfilment of basic rights for all people.

The technology of power in Liponsos Keputih does not only accentuate the discipline that ensures the working of the Liponsos. It is also the way that the power of the state is reproduced in the living system in the Liponsos. The panopticon mechanism is carried out in a complex manner. Many informants were not thoroughly aware that there were invisible and unconscious monitoring mechanisms, i.e. monitoring through a WhatsApp group coordination, the 'spy' strategy and understanding the deviant residents' habits. This produces domination that, regardless of the democratic norms that Indonesia is working toward, is embedded in everyday life in the Liponsos Keputih in Surabaya.

REFERENCES

Aspinall, E. and Fealy, G. (2003). Introduction; Democratisation, decentralisation, and the rise of the local. In Edward Aspinall and Greg Fealy (eds), Local power and politics in Indonesia; Decentralisationa and democratisation, Singapore: ISEAS, pp. 1-14.

Basundoro, P. (2013). *Merebut ruang kota: aksi rakyat miskin kota Surabaya, 1900-1960an*. Tangerang Selatan: Marjin Kiri.

Bates, T. R. (1975). Gramsci and the theory of hegemony. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 36(2), pp. 351-366.

Colombijn, F. (2010). *Under construction: the politics of urban space and housing during the decolonization of Indonesia, 1930-1960*. Leiden: KITLV Press.

Dick, H. (2003). *Surabaya, city of work: a socioeconomic history, 1900-2000*. Singapore: NUS Press.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of The Prison*. Transl. Alan Sheridan. London: Penguin Books.

Hadiz, V. R. (2000). Retrieving the past for futurue? Indonesia and the New Order Legacy. *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, 28(2).

Nordholt, H. Schulte. (2003). Renegotiating boundaries; Acces, agency, and identity in post-Soeharto Indonesia. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 159 (4), pp. 550-589.

Peters, R. (2010). The wheels of misfortune: the street and cycles of displacement in Surabaya, Indonesia. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 40 (4), pp. 568-588.

-----------. (2013). Surabaya, 1945-2010: neighbourhood, state, and economy in Indonesia's city of struggle. Singapore: NUS Press.

Ricklefs, M.C. (2001). *The history of modern Indonesia since c.1200*. 3rd Ed. Hampshire: Palgrave.

Scott, J.C. (1985). *Weapons of the weak. Everyday form of peasant resistance*. New Heaven: Yale University Press.

Silas, Johan. (1992). Government-community partnership in kampung improvement programs in Surabaya. *Environment and Urbanization,* 4 (2).

Rulyani, Isfihana. 2010. *Penanganan Gelandangan dan pengemis (gepeng) di Liponsos Keputih oleh dinas sosial Kota Surabaya.* Undergraduate thesis, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.