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BACKGROUND

Bandung is a densely populated city, with a population of over two million squeezed into an area of just 16,662 hectares. In fact, it is said to be home to the most densely populated neighborhood in the world.1 Despite this crowding, Bandung is considered to be a relatively safe city, and in 1990 was even listed in a Time magazine survey as "the safest city in the world." While the statistics upon which this survey was based are highly questionable, the characterization of Bandung as safe is probably not unjustified. Certainly Bandungese, although frequently worried about crime, feel themselves to be living in a far safer environment than Jakarta, Surabaya, or New York City. Nonetheless, it is difficult to find someone who has not been the victim of a crime in the past few years, and when asked, everyone has a crime story to tell.

In this paper, I examine one of the institutions that makes Bandung a safe city, the so-called sidakaming or sistem kamtibmas lingkungan (literally: surroundings security system).2 This term was coined by the head of the Indonesian police in the early 1980s to describe what is, in fact, an extremely old social institution: the policing of buildings and neighborhoods by the community, or by someone directly responsible to the community, rather than by the state. In Bandung, as in most of Java, sidakaming currently takes three different forms: the SATPAM (Satuan Pemantauan, or Security Guard), the so-called HANSIP, and the much older renda (night guard).3 In general,

1 The population density for the whole city is 10,775 square kilometers.
2 Among the police it is also frequently called the sistem wakaurna.
3 While technically called KAMRA (Komunitas Pertahanan, or Peoples' Defense), these guards are generally referred to as "hansip." HANSIP (pertahanan sipil) is the name of a civil defense force that was very active in supporting the government during the 1950s and 1960s when Islamic rebels with nationalist tendencies controlled most rural areas in West Java. Whereas HANSIP guards are civilians organized to deal with emergency situations (war, natural disasters), KAMRA guards are civilians working in a more routine fashion to help police enforce the law.
SATPAM guards are responsible for protecting commercial and public buildings and spaces, while HANSIP and ronda guards patrol residential neighborhoods. In cities like Bandung, where social reproduction is almost entirely mediated by the cash economy, the ronda has become less common than the HANSIP and the SATPAM, as the SATPAM and HANSIP guards are low-paid workers, while the ronda is made up of volunteers providing a non-paid, obligatory community service. Insofar as the ronda persists, it is to be found in neighborhoods where household heads find it easier to perform the service occasionally rather than pay a monthly fee of three or four dollars toward employing someone.

While this paper is ostensibly about siskamling, it is only in the last section that siskamling itself receives explicit consideration. The bulk of the paper is rather spent developing a distinction between two concepts of security that will allow us to assess the import of the apparently minor event of siskamling’s introduction. These concepts are elaborated through an historical and ethnographic examination of forms of security prevalent in neighborhoods and commercial spaces “before” they were enframed by siskamling. It is argued that although much of what defines security in Bandung can be attributed to a concept of security rooted in practices of surveillance, there is another set of practices that obey a quite different logic of territoriality. While the former are apparent in state operations that penetrate neighborhoods, the latter can be seen in institutions like the ronda and in the actions of the local tough or preman.4

NEIGHBORHOOD SECURITY AND THE RONDA

The ronda is a night watch, or guard, that patrols the environs of a village or neighborhood. The term ronda in Indonesian is a loan word from Portuguese, a fact that indicates just how old the practice is. The ronda is typically performed by male heads of households (or their sons) from each neighborhood. These individuals take turns participating in the watch, which means that each person has to perform the service anywhere from once a week to once a month. The number of guards on duty on any one night may range from just a few to over a dozen.

On Java, the ronda is typically organized at the level of the smallest administrative unit. In urban centers now it is inevitably organized by a member of

---

4 I sought to mention that the advent of siskamling in the early 1980s is not the only event I have in mind when I develop the distinction between territoriality and surveillance. Two other events that occurred contemporaneously with siskamling’s introduction also figure prominently in my thoughts; these are the introduction of a new code of criminal procedure that significantly reduced the legal powers of the police, and the state-sanctioned “mysterious killings” (PETRUS) of thousands of ex-convicts or preman. Taken together, these three events had the potential completely to remake the culture of crime and security in Indonesia, from one of territoriality into one of surveillance.

5 It is possible that the ronda is a precolonial institution. Its central instrument, the lenteng, is certainly precolonial in origin. This having been said, the basic idea of the ronda is not peculiar to Indonesia. In Peru, for example, the so-called ronda campesinos of the 1980s had an important role to play in assisting the efforts of both the Sendero Luminoso and the Peruvian military to force villagers to take sides in the civil war. These guard units, originally formed by members of local communities for defense against thieves and rustlers, evolved into an armed civil defense force that rejected encroachments by both the military and Sendero Luminoso.
the Rukun Tidangg (RT) or the Rukun Warga (RW); usually this person is either the head of the RT (kepala RT), the head of the RW (kepala RW), or a person designated by such an authority to be in charge of neighborhood security. The heads of the RT and RW are often locally respected people, either by virtue of being the oldest residents of the area, by having been to Mecca on the haj, or because of their status in the government bureaucracy. They are generally not, however, the key informal leaders of an area. Administering the route involves keeping a roster of routes of households and the days that they have agreed to fulfill their obligation to participate. It can also involve other responsibilities: keeping track of an inventory of tools, making sure the guard post is maintained, and establishing rules for the frequency of patrols and for their routes.

There are two technologies that define the ronda: the pos ronda (rowe the pos iaming) and the kenongan or tong-tong. The ronda is also the yard or the area where members of the ronda gather when they are not out patrolling; it takes a variety of forms, depending on the amount of money or work community members are willing to invest. In its minimal form, very common in rural areas, it is a small building made from wood planks, lengths of bamboo, and a bamboo roof. It measures about three by two meters, and it is often elevated, about a meter off the ground. Usually it is closed at the back and partially open on the ends and the front. The front has a doorway to climb into, and inside there might be a bench to sit on. Otherwise one just sits on the floor. In cities, the pos ronda is often a more permanent structure. Sometimes it is made of brick, sits on the ground, and has old sofas and chairs inside or laid out beside it.

The kenongan is an instrument that hangs in the doorway of the pos ronda, and like the pos ronda, it frequently appears in photographic and textual representations of village and neighborhood life. It is made from a hollowed-out tree branch with a slit down the middle. The slit is about a foot in diameter of the branch, runs lengthwise, and stops short of the ends of the instrument. Kenongan range in size from the length of a hand to a size greater than a man’s body. To produce a sound it is struck with a wood stick. Some of the examples of kenongan one sees are actually carved in the shape of an armless and legless man. Thus, at the top of the instrument, a head is carved with eyes and a nose. The body of the instrument is thus the man’s trunk. At the bottom of the instrument a hole is drilled where the stick is inserted such that it protrudes as an erect phallus.

In Bandung, residential neighborhoods are arranged so that there is one main access point to a thoroughfare and several minor access points to more distant thoroughfares. When one is given directions, it is not in terms of an abstract grid but
in teres of this main access point, the primary location for entering a neighborhood. It is through this access point that almost all traffic flows, and consequently there is inevitably an orderly crowd of break (rickshaw or pedicab) and ask (motorcycles with pockets) waiting for passengers and goods in need of transport. The pos ronda is generally located at this point, or at a location from which one can see a couple of different points of entry into the neighborhood. In special cases, it may be located somewhere else. In one neighborhood in which I stayed, for example, it was explained to me that thieves tended to come from the jomor lampung (neighborhood/quarter) across the river. Thus, the pos kamping was built along that border rather than at one of the four locations where one could enter the neighborhood in a car. To guard against robbery, a gate was also built to block vehicle access from the main thoroughfare at night and "sleeping policemen" (speed-bumps) were installed to slow traffic.

From the pos ronda, the guards on duty keep an eye on the traffic that passes within their line of sight. hawkers, people returning home, cars driving by. With the aid of the speed-bumps and gates, traffic is slowed and re-routed to facilitate inspection. The guards have an impressively able to recognize details that indicate a threat. They may notice a person because he or she is a stranger to the neighborhood (orang asing, orang tidak kenal), that is, someone who is neither a resident nor a regular night-time visitor (and this they know, despite what is sometimes a fair amount of traffic). The same observation is made of cars. But more frequently the threat is described in terms of movements that give cause for suspicion (goyang-goyang mensetrigden). It is the way someone walks or the way a car passes that draws the guards' attention. One also finds this theme in police reports by citizens who have caught a thief red-handed: that which aroused their suspicion in the first place was someone's peculiar movements. The guards extend this way of seeing beyond the pos ronda when they patrol. As they walk or cycle around, they check the streets and each of the houses in their territory, looking to see that everything is in its place. Usually this means making sure things are not left outside a house's fence, gates and doors are closed and locked, curtains are closed, and there are no strangers skulking about. On these outings guards bring along a portable version of the kentingan, striking it as they go. The hollow sound it produces is one of the few sounds to be heard in the city's neighborhoods at night.

**Systems of Light and Systems of Language**

Given the above description, it is tempting to argue that the ronda is essentially a system of surveillance. After all, the ronda routinely and systematically brings an eye to bear on the neighborhood, both through the pos ronda and through the patrols that extend its view. But the ronda's concern with the visual is not reason enough to characterize it as an instrument of surveillance. To show why not, it is necessary to compare the ronda with two other institutions of neighborhood security, institutions that originate in the state rather than the local neighborhood. The first of these is a set of rules and regulations, often passed down by the municipal government, that must be enforced by the kepala RT and RW. While some of these pertain to the administration of the ronda, others do not, focusing instead on the collection of data about residents and visitors. The second institutional form is an apparatus of opersi
operations), performed by the police, the health department, and other authorities. Such operations penetrate the neighborhood, bringing with them a form of organization and an image of order quite different from that developed in the wards. How these two separateness function and compare to one another will be described later. First, however, a few words on what “surveillance” means in the context of this analysis.

Surveillance is usually understood to concern the question of visibility. Benjamin’s prison panopticon, as the instrument of surveillance or excellence, is a technology that allows for prison guards to see without being seen. That is, it aligns prisoners and their cells in a view on an open prison yard to facilitate their inspection by guards who are invisible in their watchtower. In such a system, the prisoners and their cells are constituted as visible (i.e., segmented units of a visible world) by a central power. Yet according to Foucault, the panopticon is more than just a system of ‘light and seeing;” it is a type of location of bodies in space, of distribution of individuals in relation to one another, of hierarchical organization . . . .

In this conception, surveillance relates to more than just prisons and other technologies of seeing. As Deleuze puts it, the “abstract formula” of the panopticon is not so much to see without being seen as to “impose a particular conduct on a particular human multiplicity.” Surveillance in this broader sense is not restricted to the control of visibilities, for although it may employ a system of light that “forms or organizes matter,” it also employs a system of language that “forms or finalizes functions and gives them aims.” The two systems of light and language must be conceived of separately before their interactions are examined. For although the two systems might have the same abstract formula, “the fact remains that they are heterogeneous, even though they may overlap: Between them there is no correspondence or isomorphism, no direct causality or symbolism.” It would thus be a mistake, for example, to presume that prisons and legal codes are enforcing surveillance on the same object, prisoners distribute, organize, and hierarchize prisoners (formed matter) while legal codes distribute, organize, and hierarchize illegitimations (formal functions). The residential neighborhood also interweaves systems of light with systems of language. In the first place, it interweaves state operations with regulations, and in the second place, it interweaves wards patrols with ward stories and gossip. How these four “systems” compare, and whether they can all be characterized as apparatuses of surveillance, will be examined below.

Regulations and Operations

During the late-colonial period Bandung had a reputation for being an exemplary modern colonial city. With the highest concentration of Dutch residents in the Indies and as the site of its only technical university, it was home to many respected architects and urban planners. These architects and planners played an important role in developing the layout of the city and drafting legislation that embodied the ideals of a modern, pluralist colony. In these ideals, the notion of the city figured prominently, with neighborhoods viewed as components that ought to

11 Ibid., p. 33.
12 Ibid., p. 31.
suit the larger whole. The result was a city divided into north and south, with the Dutch living on the hill in the north and Indonesians living in sometimes ethnically divided kampong in the south. In between these two zones lived the Chinese and a few Arabs, who together dominated the commercial traffic that surrounded the main square and train station. Since independence, however, the ideal of a pluralist city has collapsed, and no new totaling vision has replaced it. Dutch municipal legislation has remained largely unchanged, and the logic of urban transformation has become very ad hoc, usually reacting to the pressures of urbanization rather than setting out a vision for the city’s future. One consequence of this has been that the neighborhood has achieved a new prominence in recent times, as it (and increasingly the household), rather than the city, is now the level at which residential ideals are played out. The city itself has become little more than a sprawl of different neighborhoods, interspersed with commercial, military, and government complexes, and tied together by traffic-jammed thoroughfares.

To fully understand how the Kampong neighborhood has taken the form it has, it would be necessary to examine the complex historical interplay between systems of language and systems of light that have taken components of the neighborhood as their object. For the neighborhood, the system of language has consisted of municipal codes, government regulations, adat rules, and educational booklets, whereas the system of light has consisted of short-term operations that compose and recompose visualities. While an in-depth analysis of the interplay of these two systems is beyond the scope of this paper, a few illustrations of how they function are provided below.\(^{13}\)

The system of language has given shape to concepts like kampong, rumah tangga (household), keluarga (family), pelancong (yard in which a house is placed), and individualidentitas (identity papers). Many of these concepts were developed during the Dutch colonial period. Popular books, for example, were published in Sundanese about how to keep a good yard by planting certain types of plants and trees or laying it out in a particular way; government regulations were enforced concerning the administrative separation of races and the collection of census data; municipal regulations were imposed concerning the materials to be used in house construction, the height of fences, the positioning of drains, and the location of hearths; and adat rules were applied to issues such as the clothing that different classes and ethnicities ought to wear or what gestures one had to perform if one met royalty on the street, for example.

In the postcolonial period, many of the regulations and books have fallen into disuse, but the concepts developed in them are often still important. Some, like keluarga, rumah tangga, and identitas, have been refined and developed to meet the needs of a new urban and consumer society. The former two concepts are particularly important in marketing campaigns that emphasize a new, nuclear family lifestyle. Identitas is a concept used by the state that underlies a substantial portion of the daily work performed by reads of the RT and RW. It provides a good example of how the system of language works.

The use of identitas for certain segments of the population began during the colonial period, but with the end of the colonial administrative separation of races, it

---

\(^{13}\) Rudolf Meisch's paper in this volume provides a wonderfully detailed analysis of the technologies of seeing that, during the colonial period, gave form to the types of visibilities I describe below.
has become increasingly important as a means to monitor and control populations. The central technology for this monitoring is the identity card (or KTP (Kartu Tanda Penduduk)) that people are obligated to carry with them at all times. Information on the card includes religion, name, address, place of birth, age, nationality, sex, and identity number.14 If one is "stamped" (disip) as a former member of the outlawed communist party (PKI) or (Communist Party) this fact is also included on the card.15 Recently this individual identity card has been supplemented with a Family Card which each household head is obligated to hold. This card lists all the individuals who reside at a particular address (which implicitly ought to be a "family"). It includes all the information from their identity cards, but also includes new categories of information such as level of education, employment, relation to household head, names of parents, type of family-planning used, and a category for "special deviations" (handicaps). Such information is administered by the kecamatan (district), but is collected through the heads of the RT or RW, just as is census and voter registration data. The sectoral police station often copies this information and creates lists and tables that represent the concentration of the various categories in particular neighborhoods, with special attention paid to political party affiliation as well as the number of resident evacuees and others.16

As a form of surveillance, the system of language at the level of the RT and RW thus takes identity as its object. As the lowest level in the administrative hierarchy, the RT and RW is often used for the collection and verification of this data but is rarely in a position to put it to use. For the RT and RW administration such data collection is a burden that does not have the clear benefits associated with their other tasks like administering the ronda, helping with flood control, and keeping alleys clean. Those who carry the cards express surprisingly little anxiety about how the information might be used by the state. Even those who are "stamped" residents or PKI do not fear their categorization so much as they fear to be a very real blockage to getting work. In relation to identities, the stories people tell are not conspiracy theories but stories about the special channels one used to get one's card. A relative in the police made it faster or cheaper than usual to get the card, or the use of a coco (unofficial middle-man) made it unnecessary actually to go to the government office to do the paperwork. The other stories people tell relate to other, more exclusive forms of identification people might carry: a military Police sticker on a car, an official's name card in one's wallet, a Harley-Davidson club-ID card. These stories all center around how when someone was stopped by the police, the identitas in question facilitated safe passage. Someone who carries such tokens, they say, is "tobii" (nontouchable) to hassle by the lowly police on the street. In conversations with older residents about Bandung's history, however, the question of regulations and identities rarely arises on its own. Far more memorable to these people is the history of visibilities. The detail with which people remember the arrival of something new to the neighborhood, be it a bicycle, a car, or a new police

14 Until the early 1980s information on ethnicity was also included (specifically to monitor ethnic Chinese). Some believe it is still there, but now hidden in the identity number. The identity card is only one of a number of such technologies of surveillance. Another important one is the former Kustiara Rek (Letter of Good Behavior) that is issued by the police and that must be attached to all job applications. This letter marks ex-criminals.

15 KTP-PKI are divided into three categories, A, B, and C. Depending on the degree to which they use thought to have been involved in the communist party.
uniform, is often surprising. When I asked one man about what houses in south Bandung were like in the old days, he replied more or less as follows:

In the Dutch period the houses were off the ground. The floors were made of wood, and the sides and top of blik [bamboo]. At first the walls had two layers with a space in between, and the top [roof] was made with whole pieces of bamboo, open at the end. The problem with this was disease, because katsu bauk [redbugs] would come from the chickens underneath the house (when they had a new chick). But then the problem became the 'ftst' of rats in the walls and the bamboo. So the walls were made with only one layer and the roof bamboo lengths were closed off. If a family experienced a death they would be taken away and dharat [placed in barracks] with other families of victims to prevent it from spreading [spreading]. They would then place a police guard on the house to prevent theft and the spread of the lice. The kids at school would have to line up to receive their suntikan [injections], which in those days were given in the chest, not in the arm. It would leave a red mark.

His reply is typical in that it describes a history of visibilities and in doing so pays particular attention to origins. Origins of the new visibilities are always of interest, and they are the subject of much discussion both at the time of their first appearance as well as subsequently. In the case above, the visibilities of the house are remembered as originating in the Dutch public health operations against pleurisy. Instead, if one sets aside the question of the penetration of consumer goods, general (as they are now called) like the anti-pleurisy drive loans very large as the source of new visibilities in the neighborhood.

Such generalizations are unmistakable in that without exception they create images of the house, kampung, and other objects as they existed "before" and "after" the intervention. As the old man explained, sanitation and disease control under the Dutch were instrumental in the decomposition and reconfiguration of Sundanese houses. There were also highly organized efforts at kampung-verstering (neighborhood improvement) which consolidated hamlets and aligned houses, fences, and ditches in a Eucidian space, sometimes forcing this aesthetic on the local population. Both of these projects were represented in government publications through the use of "before" and "after" photographs, in the postcolonial period there

16 In the early part of the twentieth century, a colonial official described the situation in Sring as follows: "A kampung has fifteen houses, disorderly and close together which is detrimental to the health of the inhabitants. Twelve of the inhabitants place their houses such that they are in the middle of their respective compounds with the front facing the roads, while the distance from one house to another is not less than three Rheinland fields. The third other inhabitants nevertheless categorically refuse to change the status of their houses in their plots because their present status has provided them with luck and will continue to do so. . . . In the territory of Belitung, the inlasiers in general are holding very fast . . . So it is with the three people mentioned above that it happened that one by one they were physically taken by a strong oppressor (politiecommand) to a dark corner and given the necessary kicks. To fast the inlasiers head made up a proces-verbaal [written report] in which it was stated that the kampung verstering shall, according to the rules, be brought through the friendly deliberation of all those concerned." See "Bantaran" in Het Schot en de Politie, from the series Onderzoek Naar de Kleine Weereld der Inlandse Bezittingen op Java en Sumatra (Weerwaarden, F. B. Smart, 1907), p. xi.
has been a number of such operations, the most far-reaching of which has been the family-planning program with its nurses and officials, military personnel, diagrams, condoms, injections and representative data on the birth rate "before" and "after." Nowadays in Bandung, there are two bodies that regularly perform operations on the city streets: the police and the so-called TIBUM (Perwakilan Umum: Public Order). While the police target drugs, alcohol, and people without identity, the TIBUM aim to increase discipline by clearing pedagang tak taxi (pushcart traders), beak, and bangunan liar (wild buildings) out of particular streets. The TIBUM is a police-like body of officers, but unlike the police, it is under the control of the metropolitan government rather than the military. While the police operate to tend to roadblocks, the TIBUM descend upon an area en masse, wearing vests with the name of the particular operation on the back (e.g., CINDI for Gerakan Disiplin Nasional, or the National Discipline Movement). In a very short time they are able to remove any eyesores from the zone they are targeting. In Bandung, as in other cities in Indonesia, the TIBUM operations do not happen just anytime but usually precede the visit of an important official. In anticipation of such visits, trucks and bulldozers are brought around and unfortunate victims watch as their sources of livelihood are destroyed or carted away. Then the street curbs are painted with their white and black checks and everything looks "clean." It is rumored that in Jakarta the entire route to President Suharto's favorite golf course was cleared of street vendors, "after" he expressed anger upon seeing them on one occasion.

What happens to all the moonshine, beak, unlicensed public transport vans, false Levis, weapons, drugs, and so forth that get carted away? This is a question that people frequently ask in the letters column of newspapers. The police say they are destroyed and to prove this they stage rather bizarre spectacles in which such things are burned or crushed by bulldozers and steamrollers. These displays are broadcast on television, where shots of the destruction are intercut with shots of uniformed police officials and their wives, seated in rows, clapping as the spectacle unfolds before them. It may be that the aim of such shows is to establish in the television viewer an identification with the ruler's eye, such that they appreciate the elimination of these eyesores. But this is not what happens. In my experience, viewers tend rather to consider it a waste to destroy perfectly usable commodities. More importantly, and almost without exception, they note cynically that the goods being destroyed are only a small part of what was confiscated, or that the crates being burned are empty and that the remainder—those things not destroyed—are being sold by the police for profit. Thus, although the police may see the spectacle only as a demonstration of the power of surveillance, what viewers see is the generation and appropriation of a surplus. They see a performance in which the state's power (of surveillance) is converted into personal wealth.

In these spectacles, and in the operations that preceded them, the ruler's eye thus plays a central role. Just as for spectacles of destruction takes place for the pleasure of the police officials' eyes, so too is an official eye invoked before an operation is launched, with the TIBUM imagining how the visiting official will gaze upon the results he or she sees on the way from the airport to the hotel, or from home to the golf course. The operation is then planned, organized, and executed with this imagined official perception in mind. What defines the "before" and "after," therefore, is precisely the intervention of the ruler's eye.
Ronda Eyes and Tales

As the ronda guards pitter through their patrols, they too see things in a particular way. Unlike the officials involved in the operations described above, however, they have no interest in classifying, isolating, and eliminating visible attributes. Rather, they are checking things, making sure everything is as it should be. As we have noted, this means doors and gates are closed and locked, valuable goods are put away, and no strangers are prowling about. As there is no public streetfighting, it usually also means that each house has an outside light switched on. But although the ronda creates visible attributes, it differs in two important respects from the operations described above. First, the definition of these visible attributes is not exclusively in the hands of a class of guards, police, or functionaries, but is divided among the members of the community. The identification of visible attributes is thus fragmented, rather than centralized through a single administrative gaze. The rotational nature of the night ronda, combined with the tendency of jempentals (domestic workers) and household mothers to monitor daytime activities, insures this. Second, there is no spectacle of destruction in the ronda. The fragmented eyes of the neighborhood community do not appropriate visible attributes, but evaluate them. Their focus on strangers and unrecognized vehicles thus does not seek to classify, block access to, or destroy these individuals and items so much as to examine their movements in the hope of determining what relation they have to neighborhood residents.

Between the surveillance of visible attributes and the examination of visible attributes in the ronda, therefore, there is an almost complete discontinuity. We do not even find a cooperative relationship by means of which operations constitute neighborhood visible attributes and the ronda monitors them (as would be the case, for instance, with prison architecture and prison guards). Thus, when guards were needed to protect and quarantine disease victims2 homes, it was the police and not the ronda association that supplied personnel. What we find is rather a discontinuity between an apparatus of seeing that operates on the basis of the logic of the penitentiary, and one that does not. The penitentiary actively produces relations between visible attributes through its very functioning, while the ronda just "waits and sees" what relations will emerge.

This is not to say that the ronda is independent of systems of surveillance. Its interactions, however, take place with surveillance's system of language rather than with the system of light evident in operations. Consider, for example, the case of relatives. Nowadays these individuals are monitored primarily through the system of language; names and addresses of relatives appear on a list in the hands of the police and, perhaps, the kpatu RW. But in the old days some shadowy characters were subject to surveillance by the ronda by means of an obligation to carry torches whenever they went out at night so that they could not disappear under the cover of darkness.17 Hence, in Cirebon they became known colloquially as keraum-keraum (flying birds), a term that can also be found in neighboring regions.

17 In some periods, this practice was extended to the whole population, as the following indicates: "If no town or village of Java are the natives allowed to walk after seven in the evening without a light. Some make their umbrellas with torches of small thin split bamboo, made up into bundles, and lit at the end. Others carry about a number filled half-way or two-thirds with water, and the rest with oil, upon the surface of which floats a wick made of pitch, and pierced with a couple of sticks having corks at the end. I saw many carrying these umbrellas in white pocket handkerchiefs, through which the light shone. How they kept them from lighting was always a mystery to me, unless it be that the handkerchief has been previously dipped in some incombustible solution. Some natives carry torches of damar and
Here a category defined by the state's system of language is tied into the receptor's system of light. We see the way in which the system might provide the content for another. In the process, however, a metaphorism takes place; a residuum becomes a firefly. While a residuum is a category for statisticians, psychologists, and criminologists, a firefly is an insect that might fly away unnoticed if it is not induced to alight.

Another example of how the systems intersect is found in the law that dictates that anyone who stays in a neighborhood for more than twenty-four hours must report his or her presence to the local RW (see Law of Order, 1997, p. 10). I provide notice when he or she leaves. In a poor suburb of Bandung, where I lived with a lepa da RW, this monitoring of arrivals and departures constituted a large portion of his work. But the system that this reporting feeds into may vary in different settings. In urban areas the important thing about this reporting is that the visitor's identity is recorded in a book. Whether one does this oneself or by proxy is not overly important. But in a small town I visited, the man I reported to did not even make a note of it. He asked, instead, the usual questions: a guest is asked, such as where I was from or how I came to know the family I was staying with. When I asked whether he should make a note of my identity, he said that it was not necessary. The important thing was that I had visited him, so that if I was seen around, I would be known. The recorded of identity card numbers and other information, he said, was something they did in the cities (in a tone suggesting that they do not understand the essence of the reporting procedure). Here a state regulation to control identities was translated into a different system altogether, one of round, the extract of some indigenous plant, or sticks of wood tied in a bundle and rubbed over with ignitable compounds, which generally give the most glaring but least distasteful light. See W. B. D'Almeida, Life with Jusuf with Sketches of the Javanese, Vol. I (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1866), p. 271.


This, it is a colonial law that has never been taken off the books and which seems to be enforced rather systematically, especially for foreigners. The terms in which this law was first communicated to the local population were as follows: "Rules of Police Punishmets for the Public. A fine of one to fifteen rupiah for: No. 1. He who moves from a kampung to another kampung and does not let the head of the first kampung know.

"No. 2. He who moves to a kampung and does not let the head of the kampung know his name, work, and place of origin, within 24 hours of arriving in the kampung.

"No. 3. He who within twenty-four hours does not let the head of the kampung know that someone not from the kampung is staying over in his house, that is, by telling the kampung head the name of the person, his work, and place of origin. And he who does not tell the kampung head upon the departure of this person.

"Because in each and every region (kampung) it is appropriate for the locals, or people in charge, who are responsible for defending public security (Kemajemengan orang bijak), to be informed when people are coming and going. It is included in these regulations that breaking the rules punish with punishment, so that no one will be reckless enough to leave his place or bring another person into his place without informing the area's leaders or their police. It is also to make searching for evaders or others easier."

that addressed me like the ronda might address me, not as a bureaucratic category but as a guest. In this process of translation, my identities went missing.

Thus, even when it interacts with the state's system of language, the ronda's system of light operates discontinuously with the rules and regulations passed down through the RT and RW. In fact, the ronda itself is not overly concerned with rules and regulations that do not pertain to its own functioning. If one does not report within twenty-four hours, it will not be a ronda guard who reminds one to do so, but rather the head of the RT. Similarly, it is not the ronda that performs ceremonies and voter registration but the RT and RW administration. Instead, as the ronda is embedded in a system of language, it is embedded as one of the language's objects, not as one of its instruments.

This discontinuity between the ronda and surveillance is even more pronounced if one considers the ronda's own "system" of language. The ronda's "system" of language is very informal, consisting of gossip, stories, and conversation. The gedu in particular is where men gather and chat (ngaranji). The Sundanese author Mohammad Ambrì captured this aspect of the ronda beautifully in his 1932 story entitled "Munjung." 20 This story follows the discourse between men at a guard post as they come and go from their turns patrolling. It is dreamy conversation, following associations, drifting from story to story, from speaker to speaker. The chat is this case, however, all "centers around the same thing: how so-and-so got rich or beautiful by making a pact with a spirit." 21 In other words, it is talk about the way in which things invisible to the normal eye (spirits, people-as-animals) explain the appearance and disappearance of visibilities (money, beauty, wealth). 22 One of the tales, for example, tells of two men, Islam and Suta, who go off in search of a keramat (sacred spot) where it is said one can marry a spirit and become rich. Upon arrival they meet with the keramat's jurukunci (gateskeeper) who takes them through the forest to the site of the keramat.

When they arrived at a large stone, the jurukunci stopped and said, "Here is Sanghian Lawang [the name of the keramat]. We must first burn invense here while scattering offerings of money, as much as you want, one or two cents if you wish. While I burn the incense the two of you must close your eyes." "Alright," they both replied. Islam really closed his eyes, as the jurukunci had ordered. But Suta did not. Rather, he gazed upward, watching two sparrows hopping together as if in love. When the jurukunci invited them to walk onward, Islam opened his eyes. His view had changed.

20 Translated into Indonesian by Aji Rosidi with the title Memajit Slamun. Memajit means "to worship" while slamun means both "invisible" and "a human who has taken the appearance of an animal." See M. Ambrì, Memajit Slamun (Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya, 1977).

21 For example: the neighbor who turns into a pig that goes and steals loose change from nearby houses; the spirit that provides money that when spent will be returned as double the value that is spent; the man who is given money by a person so tiny that he can pass through any hole that a ray of light can pass through; allowing him to break into houses to steal money.

22 Theories of inner power (tenaga dalam) emphasize that it can affect the physical world but not the reverse.
What was called Sangkliang Lawang was a huge gate, with a straight wide road leading to an immense palace ... 23

The two enter but only Istam is received by the spirit for marriage. When they leave,

Istam is very pleased, because he had got what he wanted, he would be rich.
When they had passed out of Sangkliang Lawang, he looked back, but all that was visible now was a thick forest, the straight wide road to the palace could be seen no longer. All that could be seen in the direction of the palace was a pointed, rocky mountain. As for Sa Suta, he just shivered, saying nothing to Istam or to the peunutuk. Since leaving, what he saw had not changed; on the way there and on the way back it was just the same. At Sangkliang Lawang he had not seen the wide straight road ... 24

In this story it is emphasized that the normal eye will be unable to see the powers that generate visibilities. So as the rondo guards patrol their neighborhood, creating and evaluating visibilities, they supplement this activity with talk that points to a world that cannot be grasped by their activity.

Not all rondo stories deal with the supernaturals. In my experience, the rondo is also a favored place to exchange stories about thefts and attempted thefts in the neighborhood and its surrounding area. Such stories describe the appearance of suspicious characters, the event of the crime, and the response of the community. Usually they circulate not only among the rondo but among household mothers and pemangku. Like the stories about spirits, this idle chatter is not concerned with ordering and disciplining populations so much as with accounting for appearances and disappearances. It does not attempt surveillance but describes what is beyond surveillance. 25

In sum, we have distinguished four apparatuses that pertain to security in the Bandung neighborhood. The first is an apparatus of operations in which authorities suddenly descended upon the neighborhood to recompose its visibilities so that they conform to some idealized image. These operations are oriented around the eye of the ruler, and may provide the occasion for spectacles that convert state power into personal wealth. The second is an apparatus of rules and regulations that operates through government administration, utilizing the KT and RW to realize its objectives. This apparatus serves to monitor and control categories of persons (identitas). The third apparatus works through the pos rondo and the eyes of community members; it monitors and controls visibilities in a fragmented and routine way, evaluating them and asking a particular interest in their relationships. Finally, there is the rondo's system of language, a system that provides oral accounts of events and appearances that escape those apparatuses previously described. While the former two apparatuses are aply called systems of surveillance, the latter are not.

23 M. Ambri, Memori Silwan, pp. 21-22.
24 Ibid., p. 22.
25 Perhaps it is precisely these types of stories that the Dutch collectors are "dead" to when they come to depend solely on their technologies of seeing (see Metz and in this volume).
Comparing the ronda to systems of surveillance is a useful way to establish how it differs from these systems, but such a comparison is only of limited value in trying to unravel the character of ronda security itself. A robust understanding of ronda security can only be achieved by analyzing another form of power, one that functions quite differently than that of surveillance. To unearth this power it is necessary to examine the characteristics of first other icon of the ronda: the kentengan. My own interest in the kentengan came about as a result of irritation. In a middle-class neighborhood in which I lived, every night as I was drifting off to sleep the kupon would pass by and strike the metal electricity pole just outside my window, producing a loud clanging noise that would jolt me out of my sleep with a real start. For a time, this nightly occurrence came to stand for all my frustrations at living in an environment where peace of mind was so hard to come by. Then I began to wonder what function this practice could possibly have. As I questioned people, the first thing that became clear was that the electricity poles were standing in for the kentengan which guards sometimes carry sound at night and strike, producing a jarring, loud sound. The second thing that became clear was that there was no single answer as to my question of what purpose this practice served. The replies I received were as follows:

1. It is music that the guard plays "just for fun." (song)
2. It is to warn off potential thieves and robbers by indicating to them that the neighborhood is being patrolled.
3. It is to ensure no one sleeps too deeply by periodically waking them up.
4. It is to communicate back to the pos ronda that the patrolling watchman is still there.
5. It is a call to the owner of a house who is then supposed to reply with a shout, and then perhaps give the watchman something to drink.
6. It is a way to mark the passage of time.

Music and Warnings

The kentengan, like so many other tools and arts (e.g. pencet silat or the kris) in Indonesia, blur the line between functionality and expression. The kentengan may be found both in pragmatic circumstances such as the pos ronda and in artistic circumstances such as Sundanese musical band performances (calung). But using the kentengan to make music during the long ronda nights is not unheard of. Unlike during a calung, however, it is done "just for fun," as an elderly gentleman with fond memories of the ronda's music once put it.

The ronda's music, although just for fun, is nonetheless important. At night, when the sounds of work disappear and vestigialities retreat into shadow, the sounds of the kentengan appear as a song, a song that keeps the darkness at bay. The song is little more than a gathering together of sounds into a rhythm since the kentengan does not produce many tones. Yet this gathering of sounds creates an ephemeral

28 Other substitutes for the kentengan I have seen hanging in the pos kandang are a car wheel rim and an empty WWII rocket shell.
order, a tempo in the night. The player of the music traverses the neighborhood, giving coherence not just to a temporality but to a milieu in which all the nearby dwellings are drawn together. This milieu is not yet a territory, just a loose clustering of households held together by the sounds they share. The sounds of the milieu only becomes "territorialized" when the sound becomes a mark, a mark that stakes out a territory.27 It might be, for example, that the song, or the musical beat takes on a particular character, a character specific or exclusive (there) to that place.28 It is doing so it creates a boundary separating here from outer, another from non-member. For anyone with a desire to satiate, the beat is a signal a territorial claim. It is in this sense that the sound of the kentogger is heard as a warning signal telling thieves and robbers that the neighborhood is guarded.

Constituting and Challenging Territoriality

However, the beating of the kentogger is not primarily about marking a territory in relation to threats from the outside. Thieves might, in fact, be helped by the sounds of the kentogger since they would know exactly where the patrolling guard is and thus not have to worry about being caught unsavagely while breaking into a house. The kentogger finds its key territorial function, rather, in being an activator: it activates territorializing forces and keeps them alive. It does this by preventing people from sleeping too deeply and, therefore, keeping them alert and attentive.29 In relation to this function, when one hears the kentogger at night, one does not feel relief that the neighborhood is being guarded but rather a fear that an impending threat is nearby; one thus thinks about whether all the doors are closed and locked as they should be or whether anything has been left outside by mistake. As the roza guard passes through the neighborhood striking the kentogger, thus, he wakes up or activates a whole series of territorial relationships that might otherwise have slipped away into disuse.

What does it mean to activate territorial relationships? In Bundung one can identify two examples of contexts in which territorial relationships are fully activated: the kramat and the kohal body. The kramat is a place, usually off in a forest

27 The distinction between the milieu and the territory is elaborated in G. Deleuze and F. Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991), pp. 311-321.
28 The song is like the same sense that a regional food or clothing is like it gives expression to an exclusive constellation of qualities. Food that is thus Sunda, for example, is made from local products and cooked using local implements.
29 It is almost entirely prevalent that people immediately wake up all sorts of hub-bub, and making certain that all is in order. Frequently such wakeness is the occasion for the discovery of a digging-under and then; one time the roza trapped a that busy digging a hole. Also, suspected persons receive a search from the patrolled in the middle of the night in order to see if they are busy or off on some obscure adventure." See "Chernobyl" in Der Recht en de Politie, from the series Onderzoek Nieuw de Minderen Voormalige de Indonesische Sovjet op Java en Malyasia (Wetterenreden: F. B. Smits, 1971, p. 16.

If dream is what prevents people from waking up, the kentogger is what prevents them from sleeping. But even, when they do sleep, and dream, people are not always free of the kentoggers. I say this because the only dreams people ever mentioned to me were dreams about they. It is almost as if in letting go and sleeping deeply, a feeling of loss is generated which produces a dream about the loss effectually by letting go.
or in a cemetery, where a spirit resides. As we have seen above, the keramat is not visible to ordinary people. Nonetheless, it can exert its powers over anyone who passes by its locale. To avoid inadvertently being possessed by a spirit, therefore, people recommend that any trip to the forest or cemetery should be preceded by a request for permission to enter (see uses the same terms for this that one uses daily upon entering someone else’s house: "puliten" or "permisi"). Otherwise one’s entry will be interpreted as a challenge (tartangan) to the power of the spirit. Moreover, one should never urinate in these places because that draws the eye of the spirit. The keramat is watched over not only by a spirit but by a jurukunci. This person lives nearby and is the one who takes care of the keramat. It is he who holds the "key" to the keramat, so visitors who come in search of special powers must ask him: what offerings need to be made to the spirit and what specific actions performed in order to have their wishes fulfilled.

While the keramat is a territory by virtue of being occupied, the kebel (invulnerable body) is a territory by virtue of being protected by an ilmu (magical science). Like the keramat, the kebel body describes in interstitiality, an interstitiality which by definition is unmarkable or impermeable to foreign objects. One becomes kebel in one of three ways: by being made so by a powerful person like a dukun (shaman), by going through a series of rites like recting mantra, fasting, and submerging oneself in water; or by carrying or wearing a jatun (talisman), which might take the form of a magical piece of writing, a tattoo, or a piece of clothing that has been invested with supernatural Power. The result is that if one is shot, stabbed, chopped, or struck, no mark will be made, no penetration of the skin will occur, or sometimes, no pain will be felt. A young lawyer, for example, told me of how when he was in high school he went to a dukun in Tasikmalaya to be made kebel. The dukun recited a mantra and touched his body. When this was done he took a golu (machete) blade and cut a piece of paper with it to demonstrate that it was sharp. He then chopped and sawed at the lawyer’s arms and chest which caused pain but left no mark at all.

Like the keramat, one of the characteristics of the kebel body is that it can be penetrated if one can only figure out the proper technique. Police and criminals alike talk in terms of finding the weakness (menari kelehmahane) of the invulnerability. A policeman I talked to, for example, told of how he once tried to beat up a robber with a metal pipe but that it had had no effect whatsoever. The policeman then searched for information on what sort of invulnerability the man was using. When he got the information he consulted a dukun who could tell him what the kelehmahane (weakness) of that art was. He then returned to beat up the robber, but this time used the twig of a palm leaf. The robber fell and writhed in pain, later claiming that each touch of the twig had brought a terrible burning sensation.

In the magical realm, if one wants to constitute, enter, or find the weakness of a territory, one will inevitably require the aid of a specialist. Such specialists can create effects like those associated with a keramat or make spaces kebel. A dukun, for example, can be asked to perform rites for one’s household territory to keep it secure. One such rite makes a house invisible to anyone intent on breaking in. Another rite makes the thief confused after he enters the house, causing him to wander around in

---

30 The notion of "Power" as a substantive force that invests people and things, has been elaborated by Benedict Anderson within his essay entitled "The Idea of Power in Indonesian Culture" in Language and Power: Exploring Political Cultures in Indonesia (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990). In terms of his analysis, Power could be defined as "the capability of territorializing." Thus provides a theory or map of particular territories.
circles until the owner returns and releases him. Thieves also use such specialist knowledge (timu) to determine what day and time they should strike, where they should enter from, and in which direction they should make their escape.31 There are also some thieves known to be able to cast spells on houses that cause all the occupants to fall into a deep sleep (tipar), making the removal of valuables much easier.

Self-defense courses often emphasize the development of a sixth sense which will make it possible for the practitioners to either perceive any object or space that is "filled" (dalam) or to fill them oneself. This is similar to having an eye or a nose for territoriality. One guru demonstrated this sixth sense to me by having a friend of mine, who was his student, "fill" one of two spoons. Out of site of the guru, the student concentrated his energy on one of the spoons. The guru was then given the spoons and by passing his hand over them and using his sixth sense, he could identify which of the two was "filled." He explained that the practitioner of this art must be careful because others can sense this power, and if one strays into someone else's territory, it may be taken as a challenge. In such circumstances, one should utter the name of one's guru to avoid problems.32

In sum, the territory is described as something that is capable of being inhabited or occupied. The key relation that must be maintained is thus between the inhabitator and the inhabited, or perhaps, between the occupier and the occupied. The territorial mark expresses an active relation between inhabitator and inhabited, as does the inability of an outsider to mark or to penetrate the territory (at least, without being subjected to the territorial power). Such an active notion is perceivable to those who utilize their sixth sense. There are three possible orientations toward such an active territoriality: one may submit to it (menerima), one may challenge it, or one may search for its fast weakness. As each territory has its own particular characteristics, any of these orientations may require special knowledge.

When a territorial relation is not fully activated, it invites challenges. The term frequently used for such a state of affairs is kolemgahan or inattentiveness. It is a condition that thieves and tricksters prey upon. Daydreaming is one of the most common expressions of kolemgahan. As an elderly gentleman described it, when a woman daydreams (melamuk) her body is empty of thoughts (keboong), "like a car left with its engine running but without a driver." Such emptiness is dangerous because, like the car left running, it invites occupation by another. Possession of someone's body by another spirit is described as an accidental or unintentional entry (kemasuk). To prevent this spirit possession, a person who is daydreaming will almost always be chastised for it in a tone of voice that calls them back. "EH, jangan Ngelamuk!" (EH, stop daydreaming!), or just "EL!" and a clap of the hands. The territory of a house too may be kemasuk, for example by a thief. But the thief will not succeed at breaking in if the house is already fully occupied. The following story, told to me by an engineering student, illustrates the relation between inhabitation—or what I would call presence—and security.

32 Students are marked by their gurus, just as a neighborhood is flagged by the ketapang. Students display this mark, a sign of the care of their guru, by being disciplined in following his orders and advice.
Last night Upog stopped by. He and Titik got to talking about ghosts. Upog told a story about how the house he has in Kopo has a ghost that watches over the house. When he bought the house the former owner explained that the house was guarded by a makibik balus [supernatural creature] so even if it was left empty and unlocked, it would be safe. Last week a thief broke in [making much] but was caught because the house was protected.

In Upog’s neighborhood they have a ronda, which is done on a rotational basis. That night two of Upog’s friends were taking their turn at the ronda. One would stay at the post and the other would patrol around, striking the ketromen as he went. When he passed Upog’s house the first time he didn’t see anything unusual but when he came back he saw his friend, who was meant to be on duty at the post, outside the house. He asked why the guard had left the post and the guard answered that there was a making [thief] in the house, and told him to get the people [mawarabi] to surround the house. So he ran back to the post to gather people together but when he arrived was shocked to see his friend waiting at the post.

“How did you get here?” he asked his friend. His friend said that he hadn’t gone anywhere, that he had been there at the post the whole time. The first guard then figured that it must have been someone else who had warned him. They then got people out and circled the house, and some went in and caught the thief. The thief was then beaten by the people. When he would try to get up someone would come over and say “You’re a thief, ya?” and then hit him again. By the end of it the thief’s face was completely wrecked [branched]. After all this the guy on the ronda started wondering who it was that warned him, since there was nobody else on the ronda that night, and he was sure he had recognized his friend at the time. They realized that it must have been the makibik balus who had taken the form of his friend to warn him, so that he wouldn’t be scared. After the thief had been handed over to the person in charge of “karamasan,” a man from ABK [Angkatan Benempan Rembukndul], the thief too described how he had gone in with the desire [baya] to steal but that after he had gone in he got confused. He had entered through the roof, but once he was in he couldn’t figure out how to get out again as the door was locked. And then he got really tired and wanted to go to sleep. Finally, when he was about to try to leave he looked out and saw that the house was surrounded, although at this time, says Upog, the people hadn’t yet arrived. It was the makibik balus again. Upog says that the making knew how to get in because he was actually a friend of Upog’s who lived a few blocks over and had helped him put up the antenna on the roof. So it seems that while he was helping he was also taking note of how to get in. Then when he knew Upog was out of town for a week, he broke in.

In this interesting story, Upog explains that his house is secure when he is not living there precisely because it is not really empty, but is inhabited by a presence [the guard] that guards (daa yong pi tightly). The presence was strong enough that the thief became confused and slept.

The ketromen thus does the same for the house that the “jangan nyeglam” does for the body: it calls forth the presence, pulling it back and making it fully occupy its
territory. Hence, when the guards make their rounds, people wake up and think about their house, or sometimes, ghost guards appear and express their awareness of a thief.

What is a bit unusual about this process is the incredible impermanence of the territories activated. That is, territorial claims do not “take” very well on inanimate objects, tending instead to fade away if not repeatedly renewed. This can be seen in a number of very different circumstances. Take, for example, the case of moveable possessions. Although laws of private property provide for ownership until the good has been legally transferred, there is a strong non-legal tradition that goods not attended to may justifiably change hands. It is not unlike the swidden fields of old when one’s possession of the field depended upon keeping it cleared. If one left it fallow and plants began to grow wildly within it, someone else might come along and take possession of it. Similarly, if one takes insufficient care of one’s things, leaving them out in the living room, for instance, rather than keeping them hidden in a cupboard in one’s room, they may well go missing. And one can only blame oneself for being careless. Also, if one lends something to someone, one cannot expect that it will be returned. It could well be that it receives great care from the borrower and ends up de facto becoming hers (I know of many cases in which goods as large and as valuable as cars have changed hands in this way).

To sum up: the primary territorial relationship can be described as one of presence. This presence may be rendered in natural or supernatural terms, but the underlying principle remains the same. On a day-to-day basis, this presence makes itself felt through qualities that evidence a care of, or attentiveness to, one’s surroundings: responsive eyes, a well-groomed garden, “things in their place.” For example. If these qualities, these territorial marks, are not maintained on a regular basis, presence dissipates and the territory loses its consistency. The kentongan, in preventing deep sleep, functions to prevent this loss of consistency.

Interpolation, Communication, and the State

There are times, however, when the kentongan not only activates relations of territoriality but demands a response. That is, as the renda guard passes in the night, the inhabitant of the house ought to reply with a shout (“jipe”) to indicate that he or she is awake and on guard. Sometimes the renda guards also hope to be provided with some coffee and crackers. In some cases, this practice is attributable to strategies of surveillance. For instance, ex-convicts used to be subjected to special monitoring by the renda to make sure they were in their homes and not out making trouble. This monitoring was done first of all by placing a special black mark on the ex-convict’s house to distinguish it from the other houses. Secondly, each time the renda passed by making a racket, a reply from the occupant would be noted by placing a token on a board by the house to indicate that the house had been checked and that the occupant was home. Village regulations would dictate how many times the renda had to pass by the house each night and the village head would check the tokens in the morning to make sure the job had been done. But in other cases, the reply is not so much part of an effort to subject the occupants of the house (or the renda guards) to surveillance as it is the expression of a supra-household territoriality. That is, as long as the renda only served to activate territorial ties but did not demand a response, the neighborhood had the characteristics of a milieu rather than a territory; it was nothing more than a clumping together of household territories (like when the
ronda music was just for fun, and had not yet become a khus song). But when the kentongan demands a response, the households are made to signify their belonging to a larger territory. The response indicates that the household, as a quality of the neighborhood, is being cared for, like the trimmed lawn indicates that the household is cared for. In this new configuration of relations, the household does not so much lose its territoriality, but is, rather, subordinated to the territorial power of the neighborhood, which (like the household) is watched over by the ronda.

The subordination of the household territory to the neighborhood territory is expressed by a debt relation. The ronda is not the primary mechanism for extracting this debt, but it does play some part. As we have seen, for example, the call of the kentongan demands a response from occupants of the household. The response may be in the form of a shout or in the form of a provision of coffee. On special occasions, the call may demand more, such as cooperation in refurbishing the pos ronda, paving a street, or dredging a canal. Indeed, the very method the kentongan has been used to call forth the population has sometimes been extremely elaborate. A particular pattern of kentongan beats might bring people out with particular tools, or it might indicate the presence of a specific threat which the people ought to prepare for. It is said that in some areas of Java (e.g., Kediri), the pattern of codes is extremely sophisticated, such that there is a particular signal for every imaginable danger, including a danger that can be sensed but whose form is not yet apparent. The greater the specificity of the warning, the more the kentongan takes on the function of an instrument of communication rather than an activator of territorial relations. As a wake-up call, the kentongan merely activates relations, leaving the determination of threats and the mode of response up to the discretion of individual households. As an instrument for conveying warnings and orders, however, the kentongan is capable of calling forth very particular forms of collective action.

Moreover, the employment of the kentongan as a means of collective communication in general, and warnings in particular, has no historically been restricted to use within a single neighborhood. Long before the introduction of clocks into peoples' homes, for example, villages and neighborhoods throughout Java were using the kentongan to beat out the passing of an abstract and universal time. Also, long before the advent of the telephone, news of a fire could be carried almost instantaneously across long distances by using the kentongan to relay messages from village to village, neighborhood to neighborhood. The importance of such communication should not be underestimated. At the turn of the century, for instance, a Dutch official found the kentongens a most effective way to catch kereb (water buffalo) rustlers for within a very short time of the theft being reported as many as ten thousand people could be mobilized to catch the thieves.

One should be careful, however, about jumping to the conclusion that the kentongan has inevitably evolved from an instrument of local character into an instrument of state power. Schulte Nordholt provides an interesting example of a contrary tendency in the nineteenth century, when the kentongan was used by desa (village) heads to warn the population that government officials or police were coming to search for stolen goods. From the pattern of the signal, the population would know which goods ought to be hidden away to avoid being confiscated. In

this case, the kentongan protected local thieves by warning them of the danger of the colonial state.

When the kentongan becomes an instrument of communication rather than a territorial mark or an activator of territoriality, it enters into a whole new series of relations. One can compare, for example, the two extremes of the kentongan’s design: the first being a small instrument that the roda guards carry around on their patrols (Sundaese: koprek), the second being a body-sized instrument with a phallus that hangs in the guard post or in front of the desa head’s house (Sundaese: kohok). The former might be used to scare away thieves by flagging the territory or to activate multiple territorialities by bringing them into a rhythmic relation to one another (without creating a center). In contrast, the latter functions both as a center that interpolates the zone around it (a kind of exogenous zone) and as an instrument of relay and distribution, allowing for the grouping of zones adjacent to one another. The latter instrument is no more territorial for being fixed and immobile, but rather is “determinateized” in the sense that it has ceased to be a flag and has become a conveyer of language. As a conveyer of language it no longer expresses territoriality as itself but acts as a vehicle for a more abstract form of territoriality, that of the state, and perhaps even, of the nation. This is clearly, for example, in the cases when the kentongan is used as a clock that beats out the passing of a universal time. The kentongan’s ability to function as an interpolator is expressed by its fusion with a body of phallic Power. The result of this fusion is an instrument capable not only of relaying and distributing messages, but of using a language of Power to consolidate and distribute masses of people. Between these two extremes stands a middle function in which the kentongan neither occupies the territory nor constitutes a component in the territory occupied, but instead brings the occupier and territorial components into relation with one another. That is, it keeps people awake and induces them to take care of themselves and their possessions, but it does not bring them out of their houses.

THIEVES

The call that brings people out of their houses at a run is a beat on the kentongan that means a thief has been spotted, or more often, the sound of someone shouting “maling.” The thief is the most talked about criminal in the neighborhood level, and it is the protection against thieves that provides the roda with its raison d’être. Indeed, thieves are the most despised of creatures. According to inmates at Bandung’s prison, it is easier to return to one’s community after serving time for murder than it is after serving time for petty theft.

34 There are areas of Indonesia where the messages gotten out on percussion instruments (gongs as well as kentongan) are said to form a language in which particular combinations of beats form neither messages nor words, but rather syllables. These syllables are partly a representation of an oral language and partly a prearranged code.

35 The Serikat Islam used the kentongan to call people out to rallies and to convey messages. Could we not see in the kentongan a kind of proto-newspaper (universal time news, calls to rallies, and in the “unweighted community,” a kind of large-scale territoriality that sees the great sakti, Sukarno, as a kentongan? On “imagined community” see B. Anderson, Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism (London: Verso, 1983). Or the composition of Sukarno’s voice to a cowbell, see Siegel’s paper in this volume.
Thieves in Indonesia is thus unlike kidnapping in the Philippines, as described by Carol Hau in this volume. As this printed work shows, kidnapping presupposes that the object of "thief" is commodious, a fact victims must recognize when the demand for ransom is made. With such demand, the theft is not of course an armed robbery, but rather a theft of persons, as they wish. In Indonesia, victims tend to tell stories not about the value of the thing stolen, but about how thieves got in and out.

As the police often know in which modus operandi was particular to which gang, they could immediately reduce their list of suspects to a couple of dozen people. As many of these as possible would then be invited in to the police station and forced to reveal who was responsible.

"The three implements which are seemingly indispensable for contumacious use are the whips, the lemnas, and the taliens. The first is a short pole, about four feet in length, upon the top of which are tied two pieces of wood, so placed as to meet in an acute angle, and open towards the ends, like the distended jaws of an alligator. They resemble in shape, color, and size the fangs of a venomous reptile. They effectively serve the purpose of detaining any runaway around whom they are fixed, lacerating the flesh in a terrible extent should he offer the slightest resistance."

"The man into whose keeping the bandy is confined is called upon to set on the escape of the prisoner. In pursuing him he runs at full speed, endeavoring to fix the instrument round the neck, arm, or leg of the pursued, who, as soon as he feels the sharp thorns encircling his body, generally comes to a full stop. Should he prove, however, one of those determined ruffians who are dead to all feelings of pain, another instrument, the maskum, is brought into play. This heavy-looking weapon, which is of a very formidable aspect, consists of a bar of iron in the shape of a small sword, attached to the top of a two or three feet long. The third of these singular instruments is the tsop, which is as simple in its construction as the use to which it is put is novel. It is in the shape of a pitchfork, the points of which are purposely
include anyone who happens to be around to hear the shout. Once the thief has been captured, he is dilemuk (warrented, alghebu (punished), or in ex-convict slang, digulung (literally: defeated, eradicated). As Siegel has pointed out, what is important about this is that the thief’s face or body show the marks of the beating. 39 The bruises and swelling are always mentioned in the stories told afterward. This marking is done not viciously but directly by each person. As Bjo¿ described it in the case presented above:

When he would try to get up someone would come over and say “You’re a thief, pah?” and then hit him again. By the end of it if the thief’s face was completely wrecked (hencur). Everyone needs to get in a punch. In one neighborhood I lived, the treatment did not end there. The thief was then stripped and given 2 signs to wear that said “ Says running” “I’m a thief,” and was paraded around the neighborhood for everyone to see.

What is the order restored by this beating? Siegel’s book has already provided an extremely interesting response to this question. The solo neighborhood’s sense of “community,” he argues, is expressed not through ties of kinship nor through shared economic interests but through a shared concern with security. What people say distinguishes their neighborhood from others is that it is “a safe neighborhood, one that thieves are afraid to enter.” 40 For residents, especially roja guards, the figure of the thief thus provides a name for that which stands “outside” the neighborhood, for that which threatens the community. In beating the thief, the residents enact a way of relating to this outside world, a way of addressing it. Siegel compares the beating to a kind of language: whereas it is proper to speak low javanese to one’s neighbors and high javanese to one’s superiors, “it is proper to beat a thief.” 41 In solo then, what defines both security and neighborhood identity is adherence to the proper order, an order that is not only linguistic and hierarchical. By speaking to the thief in the proper way, the rojaese seek to restore the hierarchy that the thief had offended. The success of this restoration is achieved when the thief behaves in a way that in javanese society indicates respect: he feels something (pain) that terror and respect make him hold back (the remains silent during the beating). He has, as they say, been “taught his lesson” (lapad).

In Bandung, a similar process is at work, but there is an important difference. Whereas in solo, security is defined by adherence to a linguistic hierarchy, in Bandung it is defined by submission to territorial power. One can distinguish two made blin. This is certainly the most humane-looking of the three, and it is by this process that the one first tried against the dilemuk. The object for which it is used is that of bringing the pursued down on his knees, and thus effectively stopping his further progress. This is accomplished by thrusting the open space between the pursers against the elbows—from the back or course—and so compelling the man by the force and suddenness of the attack, to make a genuflection the result of which is, that he becomes an easy prey to the pursuer. In the interior of some gardens there are some other weapons, or surbali, such as the tamba or long spear, but none of them so ludicrously novel as those I have just described.” See D’Almeida, Life in Java, pp. 22-22.

40 Ibid., p. 39.
41 Ibid., p. 48.
moments in the act of beating. In the first moment, the naming of the thief is followed immediately by a punch. The thief is suspected to the word-punch. The purpose of this punch does not differ greatly from the purpose of striking the kentingan or clapping to startle someone who is daydreaming. It territorializes the thief, using pain to pull him back from a place outside normative sociality. In the second moment, the reaction of the body to the word-punch is evaluated by a spectator’s eye that “jumps” back and forth between the bruise and the body and between the sign and the face.42 The “success” of the word-punch at territorializing the body is evidenced by the bruised face, for the bruised face shows that the body can be marked. (It is, in fact, this mark-body relation, sensed by the jumping eye, that defines a territorial visibility.)43 What is “eliminated” in this beating is a body upon which a territorial mark did not take hold, in essence the possibility of failure in establishing a territorial relation. Replacing the feared non-territorial body is a body that is fully territorialized in two senses: it is fully occupied and it is marked by a territorial power (in being beaten and not cared for it is marked as coming from “outside”). Thus, as Siegel has shown, the beating of the thief is a gesture that simultaneously identifies the threat the thief represents and expels him from the community. But the “hierarchy” that is established in this process is not necessarily a hierarchy of speech levels. In Bandung, where neighborhoods are often linguistically heterogeneous, neighborhood security and identity are not synonymous with the maintenance of a distinction between speech levels. In linguistic terms, the most we could say is that the beating of the thief restores the possibility of language, for it emphasizes that the mark has significance.44 What gives it significance is not language but territorial power. The beating of the thief is a demonstration of this power.

There are, consequently, fundamental differences between the spectacle of the thief’s beating and the spectacle of surveillance described earlier. First, the capture of the thief is not a planned operation in anticipation of an official’s visit but a rather spontaneous reaction to a disturbance. Second, the “elimination” of the thief is performed not for the eye of the ruler nor in front of an identifying or cynical public, but by the public itself. Each person gets his or her kick in and peers at the results. The social order constituted in this process is not a state defined order in which the creation of visibilities is mediated by the ruler, but is, rather, an order of mass participation. Finally, the relation of the two spectacles with regards to their respective threats is very different. The spectacle of surveillance presumes an image of order from the beginning, treating visible discrepancies from this order not as threats so much as eyesores. In doing so, however, surveillance hides the possibility 42 On the jumping eye, see G. Deleuze and F. Guattari, Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia (London: The Athlone Press, 1984), p. 204.

43 In this sense, it may have been a misnomer to call the visibilities created in the context of the renda a mechanism of surveillance. For the eye of the renda is a territorial eye: it differs in nature from the eye of state surveillance. The fragmented visibilities of the neighborhood pertain to territoriality not to surveillance.

44 From the standpoint of my analysis, the hierarchy of speech levels would necessarily be a secondary elaboration of a territorially based hierarchy. Language can only begin where territoriality leaves off. Territoriality is the power that brings into relation a mark and a body. Language then supplants the mark and embeds it in a system of abstruse differences, just as the kemamping’s music that was “just for fun” was uprooted and embedded in a system of signification.
that mediation will fail, that signs will be treated as empty or meaning (the empty cranes). In a word, it hides territoriality. It does so because territoriality de-
naturalizes the mediation the ruler's power depends on, always treating it as open to challenge. The territorial spectacle, in contrast, hides nothing. What it does is to eliminate the possibility of a body on which territoriality cannot express itself. 45

JAWARA

If the thief exemplifies a figure that searches for the weakness of a territory, the figure that exemplifies a challenge to the territory is what the press, public, and police in Banjung refer to as the premun. 46 And what inmates from the local prison call the jawara. As the inmates describe it, the jawara is someone who originates in provincial villages and towns (daerah), making a name for himself there before moving into the big city. He can be young or old, large or small, but he frequently sports tattoos ("otat") 47 and is said to be kebal. Upon arrival in Banjung the jawara picks a site to "plant his flag" (mendirikan bendera), usually the asun-asun (central square), a bus terminal, the train station, a market, or some other location with lots of commercial traffic. He finds out which jawara controls that area already and then challenges him to a duel (jantet). The duel usually involves the use of hard weapons, such as golek ("ulat gonam") (machete), samurai swords, knives ("sikim"), and clarit

45 From the standpoint of many thieves and some police officers, however, the association of the maling with a non-territorial body is not justified. For in fact, the act of theft is precisely an expression of the thief's form of territoriality. It is just that this territoriality is not defined in terms of a plot of land, but instead in terms of technique. One of Banjung's celebrated cases of theft illustrates this point. During the colonial period someone would periodically break into the most secure houses, banks, and vaults in the city, usually taking nothing, but leaving behind a chisel. At that time, Banjung had its first prihub ("native") police commissioner. None of the Dutch police could make headway in determining who was responsible for these embarrassing acts. But the commissioner realized that the thieves were taking place only on a particular day of the Jawane calendar and by consulting a divination manual he determined when the thief would strike next. On the night in question he set up roadblocks in the city and succeeded in catching the man responsible. Upon interrogation, the man explained that he performed these thefts in order to take anything but because he had inherited his bits from his father that had to be put to use on particular days or it would be lost forever. The thief just happened to be that used for breaking in and out of secure buildings. Thus, in this case the territorial relation is not defined in terms of a spirit and a body, or an owner and a plot of land, but between: a technique and a line of descent. Only by caring for this relation, by regularly putting into use the inheritance from his father, could misfortune be avoided. Perhaps understanding this dilemma, the police commissioner arranged to have the man's son sent to be schooled outside of Java, far from his father's influences. As it turned out, however, the boy and his parents died shortly after. This case is described in H. Kunto, Seremah Berga di Banjung (Banjung: Granesia, 1986), pp. 353-358, and S. Kolopaking, Tjetjat Geerten (Bakamjogja: Balai Pembiitdina Administrasi, 1969), pp. 29-41.

46 The term premun is sometimes used to refer to any ex-convict or criminal, or to mean civilian, but these are not the senses in which I use it here.

47 The terms enclosed in inverted commas are those used by the inmates. They are also a term, or premun language.
"CR" (suckle). The name of the winner of the duel circulates so people know who it is that "owns that area" (panga dereh oha), who it is that must be respected (ellegant). In owning an area, the owner establishes or takes over the right to collect on the debt that people have simply by virtue of living or doing business there. This debt is resolved by paying to the jenar a percentage of any commercial activity that takes place in his territory. People who operate businesses in the area pay protection money, transportation vehicles pay a fee for the use of the roads, parking attendants pay a portion of their income, street vendors pay a rent. Even pocketeers who successfully extract a wallet from passersby through the area feel obliged to pay the jenar a tenth of what he takes, even though the jenar is not their boss. The money that is collected is called tribute (upeti) or "preman" (jeth preman: preman's allotment) and is generally collected not by the jenar himself, but by his underlings (nkuk buk or "bemos"). Indeed, tribute is the right name for it: it is the fee paid under duress for the right to live or do business in the jenar's domain.

The people most frequently targeted for this fee are people deemed to be foreign in some sense. As they are not considered "natives" of the land, their debt to the territory is all the greater. This is especially so for the "Chinese," as they are both outsiders and deeply dependent on local business. But prihenti ("natives") too can be considered foreign to a territory. The following story, drawn from statements to the police by both a mugging victim and a suspect, provides an impression of how basic this orientation is, especially for small-time preman:

At first No and Dani went out for a ride on a motorcycle. When we were finished we headed home by way of Veteran street but were caught in the rain. So we stopped and took shelter at the scene of the crime, and as we were sheltering there at the side of the road, a person called Idang showed up and asked us something and stood by our motorcycle. Then he disappeared and returned shortly with Ewiti who asked Dari. "What are you up to?," to which we replied we were taking shelter. Then they introduced themselves and asked where we were from, and "Do you like to use drugs or not," to which we answered no, and then they offered us cigarettes but we said we had some. Then they advised us not to take shelter there because it is dangerous with loss of drunk people so you could be taxed. They advised us to move the motorcycle into the alley, at which point we became suspicious and Dani immediately started the motorcycle and invited me to go but I couldn't cause Ewiti already held me in a strange hold. (His wallet is then stolen.)

Ewiti describes what Idang does after first seeing the two guys:

Idang came to my house and invited me to go out and explained that there were two strangers (ang aing) taking shelter on Veteran street. Then he suggested we tax them, saying "Usung paje we" (bundanes: Let's just tax them), so with that intention I grabbed my Carter knife, and we went out...

---

Like the ronda guards, these preman take a special interest in strangers. For the preman, however, strangers are not so much a threat as an opportunity; in this case an opportunity to collect rent (on the shelter, as it were). This despite the fact that the "strangers" in the above case are pribumi who live just a kilometer away from where they were mugged.

For the jawa, the territory is defined very much in terms of land. One might think then that his power would be limited to things like "taking shelter" and so forth. But what is impressive about the jawa is his ability to territorialize any activity that passes through his domain. No matter how deterritorialized the activity is, he always manages to find the points at which it must locate itself within his domain, and he uses these moments as his leverage for extracting tribute. Even forms of commerce that are "national" in character, or are in the hands of multinationals, cannot avoid dealing with him. For example, the expansion of the telephone system, an activity that obeys a logic of blueprints, capital, and bureaucratic power, and which treats territories only as nodes in a web of relays, is territorialized by the jawa at two points: public phones and cable installation. When the man comes to collect coins from the pay phone, he is charged a "parking fee" that amounts to a significant percentage of the income from the phone. Similarly, when Telkom wants to lay down cables in an area, those cables will be tampered with if a fee is not paid. While the jawa is a territorial power in a spatial sense (i.e., the aspect of land transactions that involved a new resident actually moving in rather than simply the legal transfer of a title), he is also territorial in the more general sense described above. That is, he occupies his territory, developing relationships with its elements and taking care of them. If one of his underlings is detained by the police, it is the jawa who pays the bribe to spring him. If one of the businesses he extracts tribute from is bothered by someone, it is the jawa who comes forward to offer protection. This is why the public's relation to him is always somewhat ambivalent. On the one hand, the jawa is resented for the extra economic burden he places on people, but on the other hand, there is always an attempt to keep up good relations with him.49

In sum, the jawa takes over a territory by challenging it. Like the large-bodied ketengen, he subordinates households and businesses to his encompassing domain of authority and presence. Because he "owns" the area, anyone who passes through it, lives, or does business in it is forced to acknowledge his presence, often by paying a rent. This rent is all the higher for people deemed not to be natives of the area.

One of the few jobs open to jawa after they have served time in prison is as security guards, often for Chinese businessmen. Yet even as hired hands they retain a certain independence from their boss. One land baron I visited used preman for guards. When I arrived they blocked my path, looked me up and down, and barked "Yu mau ke stasiun?" (Who do you think you're coming to see?), followed by some questions about my business there. They then escorted me into their boss's house.

49 The following comments by pedageng kali limu (pushcart trader) about preman in Tanah Abang, Jakarta, are typical: "To sell here you really have to be good at dealing with preman. If they already know you, they don't ask for too much, and not every day. And there is an advantage to having them around. Now no pickpockets have the guts to operate here." Or, "If we are good to them, they don't hassle us. People say that they used to be quite tough. They used to order one of their underlings to collect protection money. If it wasn't given then the seller would be called or taken to the back of the market and be beaten up." See A. Purwanto and M. Gatotro, "Kalau Preman yang Dituding," Deteksit & Romantika 25/26 (February 8, 1997), p. 34.
always staying close and emphasizing how much space they took up. As I frequently visited the house, I found it useful to spend time getting to know them. While it was possible to become "friends" with them, it was an odd kind of friendship, punctuated by occasional challenges and threats. With their boss it was clear that when it came to questions of territory (i.e., the physical side of land transactions rather than the legal one), it was they who told him what to do. Also, if they felt a guest was acting unreasonably toward their boss, they would shout at the guest without taking note of whether or not their boss had been offended. Their boss was their territory, and any threat to him was a threat to them.

For all his independence, however, the junta is not necessarily a free man (patria). Precisely because he is so good at keeping a grip on an area and extracting tribute, he is often a necessary component in the maintenance of state power and the collection of taxes. In recent years, the relation of preman to the state has usually been expressed as one of "backward" or "backward" (backing), which refers to the way in which preman receive protection from members of the Armed Forces in return for regular payments of rent (renton). There are some preman who have such backing, and others who do not. Thus, like the ruda-kengung, the junta or preman may tend toward independence from the state or may be "deterioralized" and put into the service of the state.

SESTEN KEMANAN LINGKUNGAN

Until the late 1970's, the ruda and the preman (or preman-like security guards) were the central forms of local security in Bandung. On the surface at least, the advent of siskelit appears to have changed this. The ruda is now much less common than the HANSIP, and almost all government and commercial buildings are kept secure by SATPAM. Indeed, in less than twenty years, both HANSIP and SATPAM guards have become central characters in urban culture, both in everyday life and in television shows set in the city.

The economic backdrop for this change was the wave of industrialization and commercial growth that swept Indonesia in the 1970's. On the one hand, this meant a deepening penetration of the cash economy, making the non-paid ruda a bit of an anachronism. On the other hand, banks, factories, markets, chain restaurants, and housing complexes sprawled up everywhere, squeezing out old kampungs and local businesses. Accompanying the emergence of these new commercial spaces was a


51 Superficially, this relation seems to replicate the preman's relation to businesses in his area. But it is not so simple. The militiam brings into play a whole other power, that of Officer/Police, which differs from both territoriality and surveillance. An analysis of the fixed relation is thus beyond the scope of this paper.

52 To give some idea of the numbers involved: In the police district I studied there was a population of seventy-one people. They had eighty-three pas kening (240 SATPAM, and fifty HANSIP). The police force itself had just fifty-two officers.
growth in private security services which often used military and plain-clothes men, development that caused the government some concern. However, the increase in commercial activity provided plain-clothes men with new sources of income and increased power.\(^53\)

The introduction of stiking was an attempt by the New Order government to impose state control over local security practices. It was an offshoot of a larger government program, called KOPKAMITB (Operations Command for the Return of Security and Order, or Komando Pemulihan Keamanan dan Keterbinaan), which aimed to increase military control over local populations.\(^54\) Unlike KOPKAMITB, however, stiking was not targeting political opponents so much as plain-clothes men. As the founder of stiking, Awaluddin Djamin, described it, “We definitely did not want to have the same thing happen in Indonesia that happened in other countries. In Japan, for example, the Yakuza forced protection on business people. Such a situation can give rise to excesses that are difficult to overcome. The same was true in the early days of the mafia in the United States.”\(^55\) Preventing the growth of non-state security services entailed two strategies: efforts to subject security guards to surveillance, and efforts to make surveillance, rather than territoriality, the principle of urban security. Such strategies were not new, as state surveillance had long been trying to find a way to subvert and dominate territoriality. But the case of stiking offers an unusually clear example of just what the limits of surveillance are when it comes up against a tradition of territoriality.

The first thing stiking did was to provide a new framework for thinking about urban security.\(^56\) Within this framework, the security of commercial and public buildings is made comparable to the security of neighborhoods. The basis for the comparability was the similarity between the SATAPM and the HANSIP, both of which

\(^{53}\) In public consciousness, at least, the late 1970s and early 1980s are remembered as the peak of plain-clothes men.

\(^{54}\) KOPKAMITB was a product of the 1965 failed coup. It was an operation first headed by Soeharto, and later by Soemarto and Suharto, the aim of which was to eliminate the communist threat and to return national security and order. It was known for its abuses of power. Soeharto disbanded KOPKAMITB in 1968.


\(^{56}\) The key word in kameraman lingkungan is aman, the Indonesian term for secure. Aman, however, has a slightly different set of connotations than does the equivalent English term. It is used to refer to a state of affairs in which a thing, place, or person is untraceable rather than fixed in place. It is thus often better translated as safe. For example, building a high fence that prevents people from constantly visiting one’s house makes one feel aman. The opposite of a neighborhood that is aman is one that is marah. Marah means both an unsafe area and a state of affairs in which emotions are easily touched or disturbed. The opposite of feeling safe is feeling fakir or fearful. Like the English term “secure,” aman thus has both a physical and a psychological frame of reference. Unlike the English term, however, aman cannot refer to economic or social security. That aman refers to a state of untouchedness is even clearer when the root is transformed into a transitive verb mengaman. This term is used most frequently by the police and the military to describe the act of making secure, in the sense that something or someone has been removed or separated from its former setting. A criminal or an inquirer of a riot, for example, has been made secure when he or she has been captured and placed in a cell. Liquor and illegal weapons are also made secure (confiscated) by the police. Kameraman, or safety/security, is used both as a qualifier for agents of security and as a noun in its own right. “Call security,” for example, is “Panggil kameraman” (sebaran is also used in this sense).
which are salaried and uniformed guards. The ronde, a far older institution, entered into this system as just another way of organizing neighborhood security, with the same functions as the HANSIP.

What makes kisingam differ from prior attempts to subject local security to a regime of surveillance is that the model originated with the police, rather than with local government. Consequently, its systems of language and light unfold not through the administrative structure of the RT and RW, so much as through the division of the police responsible for the “Guidance of Society” (Pimpinan Masyarakat, or BIMMAS).57 These systems take a variety of forms. The pos kaming are now counted, inspected, and classified according to their facilities. It is noted, for example, what building type the pos has, and whether it has weapons, maps, flashlights, or beds, for instance. Based on this information, the police then work together with HANSIP and ronde guards to improve the facilities by making recommendations to the heads of RTs and RWs (it is they who must find a way to pay for improvements, salaries, and other responsibilities). In some pos kaming one now finds maps of the area, lists of important residents, lists of residents, and rules for the patrols. These visual cues and guidelines mimic those found at the local police station. Similarly, the pos kemenangan that is usually to be found in the parking lot or lobby of commercial establishments is subject to similar monitoring, and recommendations are made to SATPAM employers if facilities are found to be lacking in any essential respects.

It is not just facilities that are subject to surveillance. SATPAM and HANSIP guards are also counted and classified according to the education and training they have received. Frequently they receive training directly from BIMMAS. There are three month and one month training courses provided for SATPAM by the police, and more than half of SATPAM guards in Bandung have attended these. Such courses are mostly to military training, combined with some advice about how to make reports to the police and what procedures to follow when one catches a thief. While the HANSIP does not have such a specialized training course, in principle its members gather with those of the SATPAM once a week at the police station for training (in practice not so often). Moreover, both sets of salaried guards are “controlled” on a regular basis by members of BIMMAS at their posts. On these informal occasions, the police gather information about threats for their intelligence reports and give advice to the SATPAM and HANSIP guards.

To distinguish them from ordinary civilians, SATPAM and HANSIP guards wear standardized uniforms and carry identification issued by the police. The SATPAM’s uniform consists of black pants and a smart white shirt with logo on the arms and a label on the front saying “SATPAM,” while the HANSIP uniform is comparable but army green in color. Such paraphernalia are objects of pride for the guards. When I visited the home of one satpam who lived in a village an hour and half from his Bandung office, I noticed that his certificate of graduation from the one month SATPAM course was prominently displayed on his wall. When I pointed it out, he took it down and proudly showed me the photo of himself on it and the signature of the supervising police official.

For HANSIP guards, the question of official recognition is most apparent during the provincial competitions for best pos kaming. These competitions are speculate in

57 In addition to its work with kisingam, BIMMAS is also involved in training and working with youth groups.
which police brass inspect the posts, rank them, and provide prizes to the most exemplary posts. In one neighborhood in which I lived, the hansip talked about this for a couple of weeks before the event. The year before they had won only second prize, which they attributed to the fact that the pos was complete except that it still had no toilet. To prepare for the upcoming inspection the pos was repainted and cleaned up, and banners exhorting skating were hung out. On the day of the visit the guards wore smart uniforms and shiny boots. On this particular occasion the officials did not end up coming, to the great disappointment of the hansip. After a little while, the banners were taken down and things returned to normal.

Thus, local security is itself one of the primary targets of state surveillance under the skating. The pos kaming and its guards are categorized and entered into a whole system of tables, charts, and regulations. In addition, they are entered into a system of light in which the pos kaming and the guards' uniforms appear in all their cleanness before the eye of the visiting official. This spectacle, however, is not one of elimination, as it was with the steamrolling of break and push carts, but of recognition. The prize in this case goes to the best image of "after." The ronda is only exposed to these forces indirectly. Although it is entered into the sistem (by being noted in the police data books), BIMMAS usually does not examine the guards directly, but focuses instead on the RT or RW official in charge of the ronda's organization. This official is provided with guidance about how best to administer the ronda, what equipment should be provided, and so forth. The rotational character of personnel participation in the ronda makes any more direct involvement with the guards too difficult.

In addition to making local security an object of state surveillance, the skating takes a number of steps toward making surveillance the basis for practices of local security. Unlike the ronda, for example, the hansip and the satpas are permanent, salaried workers. The hansip's salary is paid by the residents of the area he patrols, whereas the satpas's salary is paid by his or her business's boss. In body cases the guards usually live outside the area they patrol, coming in only for nightly or daily shifts. In principle, such an organization of neighborhood security could lead to the HANSIP becoming a kind of police force, with control over viabilities being separated from the community and concentrated in the eyes of guards trained and certified by the state. And indeed one can identify a tendency in this direction. HANSIP guards can often be heard complaining about residents' lack of discipline in locking up or keeping gates closed in a way that ronda guards would not be heard complaining. Also, HANSIP guards treat strangers in much the same way as police officers would. But unlike the police they never give orders to residents or institute operations on local viabilities. In large part, this is because they are employed directly by the community members. Each month they are painfully reminded of their dependency as they must themselves knock on each door in the neighborhood, soliciting contributions to their salary. In this regard they differ fundamentally from the police.

For the satpas, the situation is different. Satpas are hired by a boss to monitor the comings and goings of strangers (customers, guests, etc.) and to monitor other employees. They are never placed in a position in which they have to ask for money from the people under surveillance. Consequently, satpas often have a very different stance toward the public than do hansip. In factories, for instance, they frequently take the liberty of body-searching workers as they leave, in order to insure nobody is stealing materials or products. In some government and corporate buildings all
people who enter must write their identity in a book along with the time they enter and leave. Sometimes they are made to wear a badge that identifies them and the floor they are going to. In these respects, satpam are far more likely to create and appropriate identities and visibilities than are janitor.

If on a formal level sitting has functioned to segment and categorize urban spaces, to assign them particular types of security personnel, and to bring them under the control of the police, on an informal level territoriality persists to a striking degree. We have already seen a number of examples of this: the power of krail identities, like a Harley Davidson club membership, to withstand the police’s demand to see a state identity card; the tendency of people to interpret the category of eco-PKI not as an abstract identity but as a brand of cap; the prevalence of self-defense schools that emphasize territorial power and perception rather than purely “physical” fighting skills; the failure of spectacles of surveillance to establish the public’s identification with the eye of the ruler. Other examples of persisting territorializing forces are found in the day-to-day interactions people have with their local satpam or janap. Employees at banks, for example, are careful to acknowledge the satpam when they enter the office each day, exchanging a few words even if they do not have to “report.” Students at the Bandung Institute of Technology go further, establishing relations of debt with their satpam by providing him with training in computers in return for being allowed to stay in college buildings through the night, an activity that is in violation of campus rules. In doing so, they show their satpam the same type of respect they would a premun, and they expect the same protection in return.

In all these examples, what distinguishes practices of surveillance from those of territoriality is the role played by mediation. With surveillance, mediation always occurs in advance of an encounter, predefining the terms in which the encounter will take place. Exactly what form the mediation takes varies; it may be that people are expected to see spectacles through the eye of the ruler, that they are expected to pay security guards through the intermediaries of the state, or that they are expected to recognize individual identities through systems of meaning established in police files. Whatever form mediation takes, however, surveillance always locates it outside the sphere of encounter and naturalizes its power to define the terms under which encounters take place. Territoriality, in contrast, knows nothing of externally defined power relations. Power is only meaningful inside as it is directly present in the encounter. Its legitimacy is not derived from some outside authority but is based on evidence of force. There is thus a kind of immediacy in territorial practices that practices of surveillance lack: the immediacy of a power that challenges as opposed to one that presents power relations as natural and always already achieved.

* * *

If there is anything that could be called a culture of security in late New Order Bandung, it is the constant battle between surveillance and territoriality. Surveillance works on territoriality by hiding it and segmenting it. It boxes territoriality in, creating smaller and smaller domains within which it is allowed to operate. As with the deterritorialized kampungan, it then seeks to establish mechanisms for bringing these discrete domains into a larger piece, thus making them of service to the state in the process. Territoriality, in contrast, always seeks the moments at which
surveillance must touch down, the moments at which mediation can be short-circuited and power localized. It treats eks-Pil not as a category but as a cap, and the thief not as a criminal but as something less than human. In doing so, it desanctifies the power of surveillance, challenging the ruler to do battle in territorial terms.

In large part, it is this battle that makes living in late New Order Bandung so interesting and so oppressive. For just as surveillance has caused instruments and representatives of the state to appear in almost every setting, so too has territoriality made these appearances feel unnatural, like something of an intrusion. The result is a world where power can never be forgotten, where it is always “in your face.” For agents of the state, such a situation poses a dilemma, for it is never nice to be thought of as an intrusion. Nowhere is this dilemma clearer than in the hensus, the figure of neighborhood security-who wears a uniform required by the police, but who must ask the community for the money to pay for those very same uniforms.

In early December 1996, just before a series of anti-Chinese and anti-government riots broke out in West Java, I happened to be home when the local hensus came to collect his dues. As usual, he came with his clipboard, which had a letter from the head of the RT verifying that the request for money was legitimate. He could have asked me to read the letter, or pointed to the authorizing signature of the kepala RT, as he sometimes did. Instead, when I opened the gate, he pushed the clipboard at me, pointing to the sum I owed. When I invited him into the yard to have a seat while I found the money, he just stood there rigidly on his side of the gate. When I returned with the money, I passed it to him with a bow of my head, which he acknowledged with a nod. He then turned around and, without saying anything, went on to the next house. The hensus and I, in this case, defined neighborhood security not as surveillance but as territoriality. The payment was not a salary but the payment of a debt, like the juresm paid to a priest. As in Ujo’s story, the territorial ghost had made its appearance, and when it did, it took the form of a hensus. For Ujo, this appearance was reassuring, because it meant his house was secure from thieves. For me, however, as a foreigner in the neighborhood, it was more than a little disconcerting.