

“Mixing Security and Tradition of Gated Community in Bali”

Kosuke Hishiyama*

© by the author(s)

(*) Kagoshima University, Japan,

Email: hsym@leh.kagoshima-u.ac.jp

Call: +81-90-1814-0395

Paper presented at the RC21 International Conference on “The Ideal City: between myth and reality.

Representations, policies, contradictions and challenges for tomorrow's urban life” Urbino (Italy) 27-29

August 2015. <http://www.rc21.org/en/conferences/urbino2015/>

The objective of this paper is to clarify the character of Gated Community in Bali, Indonesia from the viewpoint of mixture of security and tradition. From 1980's, researchers and especially communitarians have developed a lot of topics and brought up problems of gated community. However, they have not been enough to clarify what characteristics of gated community were useful for the development of future community or what theoretical contribution could be to community studies. In order to break the deadlock of discussion, this paper will pay attention to the traditional meaning of the gate (*pamesuan / pemedalan*: understanding of outside world) and modern modification of gated communities in Bali.

Preceding Studies and Research Question

In most cases, Gated Community (GC) are criticized by Communitarians (M. Sandel, Z. Bauman, A. Etzioni, or so). Their focus is, market oriented (influence of neo-liberalism), no public sphere, divided from local community (privatization), no chance of political socialization. However, what is the breakthrough of the arguments or prescriptions for such negative characteristics?

In the modern history of the U.S., there have been social and ethnic divide with correlation of social and spatial mobility. These days, with widening of metropolitan region in suburban area, the number of GC increases. One GC has sometimes over 20,000 units based on the vast suburban area. In Southeast Asia, Jakarta has similar elements, vast suburban area, over 20,000 units or so. Different

aspect from the U.S. is application of the way of management based on traditional neighborhood groups. In addition, GC in Jakarta has social and geographical divides among ethnicities inside of the district.

The GC of Denpasar city, in Bali, has more variations and different characteristics. The maximum number of the units is about 600. It is smaller than the case of the U.S. and Jakarta because of the density of the city and difficulty of development of suburb. The location is fragmented in the area between inner city and residential area. Considering it, a starting point of my research question is “what is the social character of the gated community in Bali? ”. I will paraphrase it “what mixture can we see between urbanization and tradition? ”. With this viewpoint, I will analyze three criteria mentioned above, market oriented, dividedness from local community, no chance of political socialization.

Before the analysis, we will see the urbanization and problems of Denpasar as a background of booming gated community. Then, I will share the character of traditional gate in Bali as an example of diversity and publicness of the society of Bali. After it, through the two case studies, I will answer the research question.

Urbanization and Problems of Denpasar

The population of Denpasar city increases from 364,419 (in 1995) to 463,915 (in 2005), 788,445 (in 2010). Consequently, there are a lot of urban problems, shortage of water supply (65 liter/sec. shortage in 2005, 462 liter/sec. shortage in 2010), amount of waste (2,000 – 2,500 cubic meter /day, over 400 trucks arrive at a final

dumping site, the 40% of the disposition of waste is left for each household or community), increase of cars and motorcycles makes heavy traffic jam (small public transportation is almost extinguished).

These urban problems make demands for GC. Considering ecological aspect, amount of waste stop the water of the river and canal. Neighborhood organization for management of the river and irrigation becomes weak. This condition causes floods. Floods make harvesting difficult. Rice fields are changed to residential areas. At last, large lots are prepared for GC.

At the same time, according to our quantitative research, motivation to GC among inhabitants also increases. The research was carried out under the leadership of Professor Naoki Yoshihara of Tohoku University and with the cooperation of the Centre of Japan Studies in Udayana University from August 16 to 28, in 2003, in Bali. The sample size is consisted of 402 neighborhood districts (banjar). It is from a 10% random sampling rate in 4,316 districts. There was a 93.7% collection rate. The objective of the research was to clarify the urbanization of neighborhood organization of Bali. In this questionnaire, there is a question item regarding "theme of discussion in the meetings of neighborhood organization". The most many response was regarding "rituals of temples", the second was "maintenance of temples". The third was "local security keeping activity".

Considering the result, risk society is coming with uneasy feeling based on the Bombing in 2002, 2004, increase of Immigrants, urban problems. To deal with it, traditional sanctions for safety and security are tightened in tourist areas. Some middle

class people remove into the GC. Then, is the GC just like the case of the U.S. or Jakarta?

The meaning of the “Gate” in Bali

Before seeing case studies, I will share the character of Balinese traditional “Gate (*pamesuan / pemedalan*)” in front of the housing lot. This Balinese word means “understanding external place and world”. The gate is composed of mixed features. When we go through the gate, we must go up three or four steps. The width of the gate is about twice as large as the body size of the owner of the house. After the gate, a wall called “*aling-aling*” is set up and we cannot see inside of the lot. We must turn right or left and go down another steps to the ground. This structure is needed to call people attention and give time to keep order and devout. Religious roll of *aling-aling* is to prevent wrong stream of spirit (*arus*).

Structural element of the “gate” is composed of not only just the gate itself but also a wall and front yard (*telajakan*) of it. In *telajakan*, Frangipani, Chumpak, Sandat, Jempiring etc. are planted in order to use for religious rituals. A part of *telajakan* in front of the gate is wide vacant space. It is used for communication among inhabitants and making fowls sunbathing. This whole structure of the “gate” has been a space to adjust mutual relation and action. It can be said that the traditional gate of Bali has been not just *a point* of exclusion of outsider but a kind of *public space*.

However, now, in the era of drastic urbanization, the structure is modified. The social function becomes weak and few physical features remained. In the case of

modern gated community in Bali, what characteristics of traditional gate are installed or not?

Case Studies

We will look at the two case studies of gated community in Denpasar. The term of research is 2008-2012, based on interview survey including mixture of semi-structured, non-structured interview and participant observation. Respondents of interview are inhabitants, leaders of the district and neighborhood organizations, developer, guards. In addition, I refer materials of policy, regulation, and statistical data of municipal governments and developers.

The first example of housing district is composed of 90 units located in a periphery of Denpasar. A developer based on Balinese capital established it and keeps in touch with inhabitants. The philosophy of the management is that traditional elements of Bali are important resource for the living environment and the value of fixed assets. In this case, Balinese tradition is marketized. Relation with outsiders is limited to the registration of inhabitants to municipal government and donations for local people. Regular meetings are held once in a month by the developer but the rate of participation is less than 30%.

The second case is composed of 35 units located in inner city. At first, the area did not have any gate or guards. Narrow alley in front of the district made traffic jam in a main street. An accident (motorcycle gangs ran around) triggered the needs of security among inhabitants. A leader installed a gate and a guard. In addition, He asked

various guards, vigilante groups, police to patrol inside of the district. The gate and guards coming and going between inside and outside contributed to keep a safe playground in front of the gate. Children come together from inside and outside. The guards and gate contribute to control mobility of automobile and resolve traffic jam. Inhabitants came to know each other through communication with the guards and children. The constellation of the element became similar with traditional gate of Bali.

Concluding Remarks

Regarding the viewpoint of “market orientation”, BA-GS is a part of “Cultural Tourism” or investment. PAG is a part of the housing market or temporal destination of mobility. Regarding second viewpoint of “dividedness from local community”, in BA-GS, the developer mediate between inside and outside as a formal roll. In PAG, children, guards and patrol groups from outside mediate communication. Regarding, third viewpoint “no chance of political socialization”, the main concerns of inhabitants is limited within the district in BA-GS. In PAG, it is directed to outside. It is just security matter but through the topics of the security, inhabitants have communication.

I will conclude, not single but various apparatus of safety and security can mediate inside and outside of the gate. In this case, the gate is not just a point for pass but a space for stay and communication. Such constellation of the characteristics is still a core of security based on traditional gate of Bali

References

- Bauman, Zygmunt, 2000, *Liquid Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Blakely, Edward James, and Mary Gail Snyder, 1997, *Fortress America: gated communities in the United States*, Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Dwijendra, Ngakan Ketut Acwin, 2008, *Aristektur Rumah Tradisional Bali: Berdsarkan Asta Kosala-kosali*, Denpasar: Udayana University Press (Indonesian).
- Etzione, Amitai, 2001, *Next : The Road to the Good Society*, Cambridge: Basic Books.
- Federal Highway Administration, 2011, *National Household Travel Survey 2009: Summary of Travel Trends*, U.S. Department of Transportation.
- Geertz, Clifford, 1963, *Peddler and Princes: Social Development and Economic Changes in Two Indonesian Towns*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- , 1980, *Negara: The Theatre State in Nineteenth-Century Bali*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Hishiyama, Kosuke, 2010, "Uneasy society in Indonesia: with special attention co the gated community and CCTV in Bali", *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2 (1): 14-23.
- , 2012, "Gated Community beyond the Gate in Bali", *Living in the Era of Mobility: People, Power, Community*, Tokyo: Yuhikaku (Japanese).
- Leish, H., 2002, "Gated communities in Indonesia", *Cities*, 19(5): 341-350.
- McKenzie, Evan, 1994, *Privatopia: Homeowner Association and the Rise of Residential Private Government*, London: Yale University Press.
- Picard, Michel, 1996, *BALI: Cultural Tourism and Touristic Culture*, Singapore:

Archipelago Press.

Sandel, Michael J., 1996, *"In Search of a Public Philosophy", Democracy's Discontent:*

America in Search of a Public Philosophy, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Setia, Putu, 1986, *Menggugat Bali: Menelusuri Perjalanan Budaya*, Jakarta: Grafitipers

(Indonesian).

Vesselinov, Elena, 2008, "Members Only: Gated Communities and Residential

Segregation in the Metropolitan United States", *Sociological Forum*, 23(3):

536-555.

Warren, Carol, 1993, *Adat and Dinas*, New York: Oxford University Press.