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Abstract. Over the past decades, flood control has been providing the rationale for evictions in Jakarta. Underlying this study is a set of notions where the eviction plan would bring up uncertainty to their commons: the risk of possible destructions of their commons, the uncertainty of livelihood, or the dubiousness of securing a decent amount of compensation. Considering that, this study is trying to identify the scope of commons and commoning in long-envisioned yet unimplemented eviction of RW 04 Bidaracina, Jakarta, as well as to understand its relation to resilience in several forms. We conducted interviews to understand the aspirations of the residents of RW 04 Bidaracina to answer the questions of this research, which concern mainly on how the notions of commoning are manifested in a community expecting a rather uncertain eviction. The result corresponds favourably with existing studies on kampung as urban commons.
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Introduction
1.1. Current Conception of Commons
In general, commons are known as public resources that are used and exploited by groups of people or communities where the commons themselves do not object to the formal sector (government or other formal institutions) and are not capital commodities [1][2], although historically commons refers to pastoral or grazing land for cattle which is used and shared by a community of herders [3]. In 1968, Hardin theorized the popular ‘Tragedy of the commons’: a situation in which users, who have free open access to a resource not governed by shared social structures or rules that govern access, act independently according to their self-interest and cause depletion of the resource, hence destroying the commons and communities that depend on it. Hardin theorized that in order to govern a commons, the community which relies to the commons have to be regulated [3].

The counter idea was proposed by Ostrom [4], proving the importance of the commons while investigating an answer for the well-known theory of “Tragedy of the Commons” by Hardin. Based on Hardin’s dilemma, Ostrom offers 8 principles for how commons can be governed sustainably and equitably in a community, how communities co-operate to share resource use, the public goods and the future of the community [4]. Although the proposed eight principles of governing a commons is
considered to be a successful answer to Hardin’s dilemma, the ‘dilemma’ (i.e. the concept of commons) itself expanded.

In recent years, commons is not only defined as shared physical resource. Harvey has a radical approach that defines commons as a resource that includes not only land or places where it is shared, but also language, social practices and construct, and other intangible social fabric [2]. According to Harvey, commons are fostered continuously as a relationship between certain social groups and environmental aspects (in the form of social or physical aspects) which are considered important for the lives and livelihoods of its users, the commoners [2].

Although the sustainability of commons happened to be essential as being the livelihood strategies for the socio-economic security of informal communities, the term commons has been broadly conceptualized to define multiple extents. The discussion of the idea of commons and commoning has become a broader discussion in the last decade as a criticism of urban planning, where urban planning is heavily inclined towards values of capitalism [2]. However, the understanding of commons and commoning concerning the evictions of riverside kampungs in Jakarta have not been thoroughly assessed, despite the importance of commoning as the strategy of livelihood for the urban informal community: what Simone (2014) conceptualized as “the urban majority” in Jakarta [5].

1.2. Plan for Bidaracina Eviction: A Circumstance to Understand Commons

To define and understand the concept of commons in the context of informal urban settlements in Jakarta, we argued that eviction, an event which could result in eradication of commons, could give us an idea of how informal settlers are thinking about their commons and its relation to their livelihood. As argued by Hellman, informal settlers, many of those who benefit from the commons, are in fact often unaware of the values of the constructed social capital as their own commons: they took it for granted [6]. However, when their commons are threatened by eviction plans, the communities which heavily relied in social capital created and nurtured in kampungs show reactions in different ways. On the one hand, uncertainty of eviction has resulted in residents in several areas that were about to be evicted to delay repairs to the damage that occurred in their homes. In a different case, the uncertainty has not discouraged residents from investing in a private property. On the contrary, citizens will instead make either physical or non-physical improvements or investments. Based on observations made by Hellman, private investments locals make in their dwellings and properties are partly an effort for them to be incorporated into society and to build a sustainable livelihood. In the latter case, commoning might also take shape in the form of ideas and connections to authority, to show gestures of resilience that citizens have. This has been observed by Hellman 2018, Padawangi 2019, and Dovey 2019, which argued that there were more efforts shown by the informal community who were threatened with eviction [6][7][8].

Looking at those instances where communities took actions when their commons are threatened, we saw the eviction plan of RW 04 Bidarcina, an informal neighborhood located on the eastern bank of the Ciliwung river, as an opportunity to recreate the observations. RW 04 Bidarcina and other informal settlements (kampungs) share a common “fate”, that they were labelled as and stigmatized as the cause for flooding.

The underlying force behind Bidarcina eviction, as also was for other evictions, is that of flood mitigation. RW 04 Bidaracina is a kampung located on the eastern bank of Ciliwung river, which has long been haunted with eviction threat with the plan to construct water diversion project to divert excess water flow of Ciliwung river to eastern flood canal (BKT) [7]. The land acquired from the planned eviction is allocated for the construction of the Ciliwung- Easter Flood Canal (BKT) water diversion tunnel, which was planned to be able to divert the flood discharge of the Ciliwung River to BKT has been on the board since 2008 by the Center for the Ciliwung-Cisadane River Basin (BBWSCC) [9]. This development is a way to supposedly protect Jakarta from seasonal flooding (Ciliwung River especially the Cawang – Manggarai Water Gate) by reducing the flow of water during heavy rain to the nearby BKT canal. The diversion tunnel was estimated to evict families in RW 04 and RW 14 Bidaracina.
Research Methodology

With the ever-expanding scope of commons, the first question to be researched is the scope and limitations of the concept of commons and commoning from various literature studies in riverside kampungs, especially in the particular context where the commons themselves are under the threat of eradication. The second objective is to further trace and identify the commons and commoning processes that exist in RW 04 Bidaracina and how they might affect the built environment of Kampung RW 04 Bidaracina, especially the ones related to flood control and how commons could be utilized as a response to urban flooding; utilizing scope of commons gained from the literature review.

The data used in this study are primary data from distance interviews and secondary data from academic literature. We conducted distant interviews with two residents of RW 04 Bidaracina. Secondary data were obtained from the narrative review semi-systematic literature review (SSLR) method, which is a research method designed for topics that were conceptualized and studied by various groups of researchers in various disciplines and which made systematics impossible to do effectively [10]. Because it covers a wide range of topics and different types of studies, the research must be transparent and have a research strategy developed that allows the reader to judge whether the arguments to judge are reasonable, both for the topic chosen and from a methodological perspective [10].

We conducted interviews to two residents of RW 04 who played active roles in contributing to saving their commons from eviction: Pak Edi as secretary of the RW (neighborhood) and Mba Acı as part of the community's legal team. From the interviews with the two residents, we identified commoning in RW 04 and how the commoning process had an impact on the built environment.

Commons and Commoning: Scope and Boundaries in the Context of Kampung

This section discussed literature review regarding scope and boundaries of the concept of commons and the process of commoning in the context of informal urban setting in Jakarta, especially when they are threatened by eviction in the name of flood control. This section explores the notion of commons which not only includes a set of temporary resources - such as clean water, sanitation – but also access to political structures and private assistance and socio-economic security - that together provide sustainable livelihoods [11]. This section also explores the scenario of how commons might be destroyed and how commons and the practice of commoning might hold a significant role in reshaping the urban informal settings of Jakarta, especially in relation to urban flooding.

1.3. Commons and Urban Resilience

In the context of kampung as informal settlement, the identification of commons and commoning can be understood as the resilience shown by the residents. Resilience is defined by Jones as the ability to adapt to change, including its vulnerabilities [12]. Jones' definition centers on the notions of robustness, mitigation, and adjustment. The idea of commoning, in this sense, coincides with the idea of guerilla urbanism, where the sense of commoning also extends to the concept of reoccupying certain urban spaces as a tool for experimenting with various ways to produce a public, creating a mechanism to build inclusiveness for city residents [5]. The appropriation to reoccupy particular space in a city and make changes without the consent of formal administration is analogous with the acts of commoning of urban space.

The residents' efforts to make improvements to their personal and communal properties are a part of the struggle to show their resilience. This corresponds to the studies of Hellman (2018) and Betteridge & Webb (2019), concerning commoning and urban resilience respectively. In this case, residents of Kampung Pulo reflected the importance of a decent property as one of the most reliable evidence that the people living in them were not squatters, in other words, a resilient community. This community effort is a way of making their kampung as a whole to be remarked as a “well-established kampung”, or “a hereditary kampung” because this kind of resilience is very much needed in the process of developing
their resources [6]. Establishing well-built private homes and kampung's facilities also paved the way for various forms of collective visions of ownership and of belonging to the community of their kampung. Despite this, many of those who benefit from the commons are unaware of their values [6].

Kampung improvement for the sake of community resilience may also lead to partial self-destruction by its very own residents, in this case the residents of kampung Tongkol. In the case of Tongkol, the resilience of the community in the form of security of land and property ownership are the result of the community's own attempts to change the image of their kampung from being 'slum' to 'clean and tidy' [7]. Unlike Kampung Pulo, Kampung Tongkol has a more spatial self-help approach to achieving resilience. The resilience shown by the residents of Tongkol Kampung did not have any significant obstructions because the residents even voluntarily evict themselves. Dovey (2019) emphasizes the self-help willingness of the Tongkol community to discover other ways of 'playing politics' which allow results in the form of durability and resilience, even by demolishing and rebuilding the kampung partially [7]. Instead of simply struggling toward the authority of law through the legal advocacy process, 'playing politics' means that they have gained resilience through citizen-based alliances that the residents of Kampung Pulo do not possess.

Social and economic networks are shared resources that are jointly built and utilized by residents. What makes public awareness in forming a sense of community lies in the socio-economic network in the form of family, neighbors, social and religious gatherings, and community groups especially communities based on regional origin from various regions across Indonesia [14]. Apart from the social structure of the social safety net that is considered reliable, the location of the kampung also accounts for livelihood security. This argument is supported in the research of Sari et al. (2018) that 44% of people content to live in a kampung in Jakarta, namely Kampung Pulo, because residents always help each other [15]. Those who are content to live in Kampung Pulo for their strategic location make 42% of the residents, only two percent below the latter opinion [15]. It can be assumed that the socio-cultural and economic aspects do not overshadow each other. This is the embodiment of the notion of near-south, that commoning in Kampung Pulo does not only involve the use and development of shared resources (in this case the social safety net) but also provides a good place for the competition to emerge, where residents the kampung must be different from other residents in competing for a living. The houses of the residents of Kampung Pulo, part of which are used as places of business, are commons with ‘a hint of competition’ as a way for the residents to gain sustenance.

1.4 Assessing Right to The City: Legal Actions to Protect a Commons
In the context of evictions, the struggles of community representatives to file a class-action lawsuit to try to revoke the eviction show the resistance efforts made by them. This kind of resistance shows the awareness of the right to the city and ownership, but in the end, the residents will show another rhetoric: they want to return to their old ways of living and living in a kampung, to live as neighbors, to work together, and to restore the social networks they had previously built in their kampung [13]. Hellman (2018) translates this situation as residents underestimate the presence of neighbors and what is produced from being in a community of neighborhoods as things that are only taken for granted [6]. Solely when the commons and means of commoning were lost, residents could perceive the value of the importance of the social networks they built in their kampung as commons.

Class action lawsuits happened in various occasions, in Kampung Pulo and Bukit Duri to name a few. The two kampungs struggled to assess their right to the city. Unlike the Kampung Pulo case which failed in the class action lawsuit, the DKI Jakarta High Court won the class action lawsuit for residents of Bukit Duri, South Jakarta, regarding the evictions carried out by the Government [16]. This decision strengthens the victory of the residents of Bukit Duri which was decided at the Central Jakarta District Court on October 25, 2017. The victory was however short-lived, but citizens relied heavily on legal aid and advocacy than other commoning practices, showing their determination in saving their own commons.
1.5. NGOs’ Role in Commoning

At some cases, NGOs helped informal communities in governing their commons, and Ciliwung Merdeka was one of the NGOs which stands out. The commoning process in Bukit Duri cannot be separated from the Ciliwung Merdeka NGO. This NGO emerged in the year 2000 to transform the kampung environment in overcoming the problem of gangsters, in addition to the participation of the police and religious leaders and local community leaders. With the help of Ciliwung Merdeka, which ever since 2000 has provided studios for learning, dance, music, and theater; residents succeeded in eradicating the negative stigma of Bukit Duri through a process of social organization and communal activities that were more affordable to their environment [16]. Ciliwung Merdeka not only provides studios for community empowerment, especially for village youth, but also provides what is called Padawangi (2018) as the ability to provide village residents with aspirations [16].

Compared to the commoning of Kampung Pulo, which is more aggressive in opposing the eviction plan, the residents of Bukit Duri generally have a more collective and collaborative effort to maintain social relations that have long been sought in the community. Residents assisted by the NGO Ciliwung Merdeka rejected the evictions by also presenting the idea of a Kampung Susun Manusiawi, a ‘humane kampung flats’ to oppose the old ‘exemplary center’ and to form a new social housing ideal for the riverbank community. This process illustrates the formal-informal synergies related to Ostrom’s ideas on how the commons are managed at a local scale, namely by initiating an ‘institutional framework’ that defines responsibilities and rights between groups. In this case, representatives of the residents of Bukit Duri through the NGO Ciliwung Merdeka demanded their right to remain in their environment, and they felt they had a responsibility to provide a solution—a flat proposal—as an alternative to solving ecological problem, the annual flooding.

1.6. Commodification of Commons: A Commons’ Destruction

At first, commodification and privatization of commons are regarded as a ‘correct’ way to control and manage the use of commons among members of the community, but this is not the case in recent decades. According to Hardin (1968), privatization of commons can help control the use of resources in it by regulating access to its use. This view is based on the individualistic nature of the commons users, where the commons are considered as something that is not limited so that the commons can be used excessively as a way to accumulate capital to the maximum. In other words, privatization as a tool to save the commons is the impact of a paradigm that is still centered on what Lefebvre calls a single power in the form of capital and markets.

Privatization as a response to controlling the use of resources in a commons is opposed by Ostrom (1990) through the view that controlling the use of resources in a commons can be regulated without privatization [2][4]. In some cases, especially small-scale commoning, regulation of resource use in the commons can be done by utilizing existing social capital, such as deliberation and negotiation [2]. The use and development of resources mutually with the existence of commodification and capitalization certainly cannot be considered as means of commoning for the destruction of commons is carried out through commodification and capitalization of commons by the capital or acquisition by the formal sector [1]. Nowadays, privatization is generally not accepted as a solution to govern commons, but rather as a way to destroy it.

However, the accumulation of capital through the commodification of urban commons is not restrained to direct commodification. Urban commons can be habituated even without a direct commodification which makes a commons a commodity. Privatization by the capital and the government or other formal institutions can be a mark of the end of a means commoning that has taken place in a community [1]. The destruction of commons can be inferred from the cases of kampung evictions if the residents could not get a direct benefit from the evictions that were carried out. The privatization of the commons is used as an excuse to save the sustainability of the commons even though in reality capital accumulation continues to occur. This process sacrifices ‘the right to the city’ especially
for marginalized city residents, which in the case of Jakarta are informal citizens. Jakarta's informal communities, especially those living on the riverbanks, often face threats to their city rights in the form of eviction plans in the name of flood control. Kampungs on the banks of the river (which are often referred to as illegal because they were erected on land that extends beyond the river border) experience indirect commodification. What is meant indirectly here is that the evictions are not carried out to commodify the land that is being evicted directly and get benefits in the form of direct capital, the capital will grow around the eviction site as its land value increases, profiting the landlord and not the residents themselves [8]. The increase in land prices around areas that have been evicted for river normalization can indirectly increase the wealth of landowners 'overnight' by selling them, but it may result in gentrification and emptying entire kampung en-masse in the long term (see Padawangi argument from a study in Menteng Atas) [8]. If this happens, the residents will not benefit from the increase in land values. On the contrary, residents would become object of capitalism while at the same time destroying their own commons.

1.7. Commoning as Participatory Solution to Flooding
Flooding is the major issue of kampungs’ eviction, and eviction is becoming the ‘mainstream’ way of dealing with flooding and ‘slum’ in a single strike. Inspite of this, Padawangi and Douglas highlighted participatory initiatives as other ways of dealing with flooding without the compromise of urban commons that the communities have been building and maintaining for decades. Contrary to the idea that eviction and river normalization is the key to control urban flooding, Padawangi and Douglas (2015) affirms that the existence of an active civil society in the midst of spatial marginalization in relation to environmental degradation and mismanagement opens new political dynamics and is potentially gaining possibilities to address floods along with increasing neighborhood resilience (p. 519) [16]. Using the concept of political ecology, Padawangi and Douglas mapped citizens participatory activities and found that Kampung residents, NGOs, and professionals are “increasingly trying to work collaboratively towards common goals of building flood-disaster-resilient communities” (p. 550) [16]. It does not mean the complete quelling of the current urban flooding, but it does incremental and small-scale initiatives for flooding. To put it in the framework of commons and commoning, residents of informal kampungs might utilize the already mature concept of building and organizing their commons to not only foster their community, but also as a part of participatory solution to urban flooding. This way, both destruction of commons and regular flooding could be handled in just one move, i.e. to utilize their commons for their own and the city’s public good.

Commons and Commoning in RW 04 Bidaracina
The eviction involves two RWs (neighbourhood communities) in Bidaracina, specifically RW 04 and RW 14. Bidaracina is a kelurahan located in Jatinegara sub-district of East Jakarta, DKI Jakarta. From among the two RWs, the author interviewed two residents of RW 04 who represented their community in their effort to saving their commons from eviction: Pak Edi as the RW secretary and Mba Astriyani (Mba Aci) as part of the community legal team. To identify commons and commoning in RW 04, the author conducted online interviews with the two residents.

1.8. Class-Action
The main discussion developed from RW 04 Bidaracina focuses on how the recognition of property ownership is obtained through lengthy legal contestations as a form of commoning. Apart from the DKI Jakarta government, another petitioner who sued Bidaracina residents to the cassation level was an individual on behalf of Hengky Saputra. The legal processes to obtain property rights are managed particularly in RW 04, whereas in RW 14 (which is also affected by those cassations) there are no such initiatives, according to Astriyani. The success of the class action initiatives by representatives of Bidaracina residents concluded the resilience of the residents of RW 04. The achievement of the community in fighting for resilience in the form of recognition of ownership of land and structures built
on them can be seen in the successes of residents of RW 04 Bidaracina by the means of class action in obtaining compensation.

The importance of the ongoing legal processes was acknowledged by one of the residents of RW 04 Bidaracina, Pak Edi. He usually calls a resident and advocate named Astriyani, who represents the community at the cassations, as the "chief of the tribe". Such acknowledgment indicates that citizens have more confidence for legal support and advocacy over any other forms of commoning practices. Pak Edi further emphasized the success of the legal team, one of which was Astriyani (Mba Aci) as a resident of RW 04 herself, in educating residents to be more appreciative of their right to the city, hence saved their kampung from a catastrophe like the one happened in Kampung Pulo eviction in 2015, where there was a clash between officials and residents resulted from negotiation failure. This was illustrated in 2015 by how the eviction forces which brought police officers, Satpol PP, fire brigade, and ambulance were able to be restrained because of the cohesiveness of residents who were not provoked by rage and carried out anarchist actions, contrary to what happened in Kampung Pulo which was considered 'too bloody' by Edi.

"Our kampung is safe because there is Mba Aci who has volunteered to become a representative. Thanks to her we can educate the residents here, so they can rest easy and not easily provoked. If the residents are provoked, our kampung will be ruined like Kampung Pulo".

The eviction plan made the residents of RW 04 more integrated: they were more organized, got along well with other residents, and becoming more united, as both Astriyani and Edi felt. Nevertheless, Kampung residents often find the presence of RT (rukun tetangga) and RW (rukun warga) initiatives in their kampung as something they only admit for granted, overlooking their value as a form of resource that provides a livelihood for them. To put it in another way, those initiatives are judged merely as a tool to help them in administration and bureaucracy, not as valuable as what the notion of commons was valued by Hellman (2018) in his research. The invaluableness of commons and commoning in RW 04 Bidaracina, according to Pak Edi, lies saliently in the ease of bureaucracy, prevailing over the importance of building and strengthening social networks among the residents. The Urban commons that they have been building decades might be, in fact, overshadowed by the importance of formal and bureaucracy needs.

"Sometimes we see that the advantages and disadvantages can be non-material material. Non-material values cannot be valued with money. That is hard to judge. … After all, the effect is that the administration of documents will be difficult, even though the government has said that administrative matters for the evicted will be made easier but we do not know. … Furthermore, the school children also had to be transferred. Although even when maybe they (the government) will compensate one house to two houses, for example, I still choose to continue to live here"(Edi 2020).

1.9. Incrementality in Kampung’s Built Form

RT 10 RW 04 Bidaracina is located on the eastern bank of the Ciliwung river. To enter RT 10 area from Jalan Otto Iskandar Dinata, pedestrians, cyclists, or motorbike can enter via Jalan Sensus Raya, then continue to Jalan Sensus II. The width of the neighborhood alleyway Gang Sensus II D is less than the primary access road, hence not accessible by car or large vehicle. The organization of streets and alleyways are incremental. According to one of the residents, the alleys in RW 04, particularly Gang Sensus II D, are considered as collective properties and have been relatively in the same layout since around the 1960s. Pak Edi considers the "neat, rectangular layout of RW 04" for the notion that Bidaracina has been around for a long time as part of an office that was later abandoned and then reoccupied.

The residents' efforts to secure the tenure of their land and buildings and their efforts to maintain their commons are considered commoning efforts. According to the two respondents, the condition of the kampung in RW 04 Bidaracina as a commons is its overall impression as a ‘neat’ and ‘visually organized’ kampung. The condition of the kampung, Edi argued, is not as 'shabby' as other urban
Kampungs that have previously been evicted, while referring to Kampung Melayu, Kampung Pulo, and Bukit Duri. The two residents also felt that their kampung was a neat kampung with expressions such as "it's like a housing complex (suburbia-like development)". Another expression is that their kampung is not composed of totally low-income residents, but rather consists of heterogeneous middle-income residents with varying degree of social status.

"In RW 04, the situation is very heterogeneous. There are residents who live in permanent houses, on roads that can be passed by four-wheeled vehicles, have postgraduate education, and can be classified as middle-incomers. However, there are residents who live in narrow alleys and work in the informal sector" (Aci 2020).

Bidaracina was built incrementally and continuously: a *tropotopia* (see Harjoko 2009 for *tropotopia* in kampung) [18]. Spatial transformations occur continuously in RW 04, which commonly prevails in how the land and buildings adapt to the increasing population. Incremental kampung transformations at RW 04 Bidaracina are carried out by either the hereditary owner or by immigrants. Inheritors played significant role in creating and managing their commons, especially when inheritors are very reluctant to move out of their inherited properties. Instead of moving out of their fathers' land because of the shortage of land, they insisted on dividing it for every inheritor. Families who have lived for three generations or more can identify which land belonged to their family and which was then divided and later built by their grantees (this is extracted form Pak Edi's statement when narrating a story of his neighbor). Due to the inadequate land suitable for the construction of large houses in Bidaracina, some of the grantees have built houses on the already divided inherited land. In doing so, for they are dealing with small patch of land, they had to come with ‘creative’ ways to build and manage their resources. The reluctance of the inheritors to move outside and the increase in migrants to RW 04 Bidaracina is the impact of the existing commons in the form of a strategic location. Astriyani, as a third-generation middle-high income resident and at the same time a legal advocate of Bidaracina, still lives in his grandfather's house mainly due to its strategic location.

Alongside the increase in population due to the enlargement of families in RW 04, arrivals of other families to RW 04 Bidaracina is also a key factor in shaping the kampung’s built environment. Some of the lands inherited to some of the inheritors were then sold to individuals outside of the grantee family. Pak Edi for example, who has been living for 15 years in his residence in RW 04, is one of the immigrants. Pak Edi is one of the families who bought a property in RT 10. The land was bought from a person named Nyi Solihat, where she, interestingly enough, was not the original owner of the property but rather the third hand who lived there. He moved to RW 04 Bidaracina mainly for the proximity to the workplace and relatives, and later made a significant transformation of the kampung’s fabric by upgrading his semi-permanent house to a permanent house. He even managed to renovate the house several times ‘at the right times’; at times where necessity met financial capability.

The description of Pak Edi's family as part of an 'urban majority', a concept explained by Simone (2014) as the group shaping the image of the city, is understood from its temporal and dynamic nature. Sometimes the 'urban majority' does not do something based on a clear and planned goal or vision [5]. Pak Edi's family as the "urban majority" does something "at the right time". In other words, the development of both commons and private properties are carried out at the right time, with the availability of resources available at corresponding time. Even though this renovation was aimed at meeting the space requirements for his family, Pak Edi did not deny the role of the renovation he did as forming a kampung image that could make the image of his residence in particular and the image of his kampung, to be perceived better. The house he bought from Nyi Solihat, which initially was semi-permanent (with mostly wooden structure and construction), turned into a permanent house (constructed with concrete and bricks). These do not secure a direct effect on the certainty of land tenure, but rather indirectly, resilience is reflected in the 'tidy' environmental conditions: the environment that Padawangi calls an 'exemplary center', an exemplary center in accordance with the spatial vision of the formal sector.
and the societies affected by it. He even admitted that renovation had also increased his prestige and dignity in the presence of not only his neighbors but also from his colleagues at work.

An exemplary center in the form of a neat or “a kampung that resembles housing complex of middle-high class”, as being said by Pak Edi, makes people who previously did not realize the complexities of land ownership in the kampung will even become more aware of it. The neat appearance of a kampung might “deceive” ordinary people about its status because they will think that a tidy environment is an indicator that a plot of land and building already has a complete certificate of ownership. When they find out that even a tidy and well-organized kampung does not have a title of ownership, residents especially those who dwell in an inherited property from their parents, would question themselves about the status of the land and buildings in which they occupy. This is what Hellman (2018) observed in Kampung Pulo, which the author also observed from Pak Edi’s mindset. A settlement without land title records has some points of resilience in its image. The better the built environment of a kampung, including its shared facilities, the better the perceived image of particular kampung will be.

1.10. The Spatial Trade-offs of Kampung’s Commons
Musala (communal prayer hall) of RW 04 has been a waqf (benefaction) managed by the residents of RW 04 since the 1960s (Aci 2020, personal interview). Musala is managed by the residents themselves autonomously. Pak Edi, who was also a participant in the interview, was also involved. The area around the musala is also a commons whose use is regulated by the RW or musala committee.

This arrangement for the use of commons is temporal and dynamic. Adjustments to the resource in the form of a prayer room and the surrounding alley occur at certain times. The prayer room is usually filled with worshipers during tarawih in the first week of Ramadan, so alleys that intersect with the prayer room must be temporarily closed. Commoning is observed from the use of musala and part of the kampung alleyway as an overflow extension of musala. Apart from that, musala is also sometimes opened for Friday prayers under certain circumstances. If the musala is opened for Friday prayers, the musala is also usually full and uses two alleys to the north and east of it for use. The use of commons and the switching of commons is manageable and can occur loosely. The residents have tolerated the change in the function of their commons from the use of access (roads/alleys) to social uses, i.e. to worship and congregate. Furthermore, this alternation of commons’ function was also recognized and supported by the RW 04 community by providing a canopy covering the alley on two sides of the prayer room that intersected with it. This sort of trade-off occurs because the musala committee and RW 04 residents in general have not been able to divert a large amount of material resources for land acquisition as well as building materials to expand and renovate their musala.
Commons can also be observed from the presence of stall, *warung*, opened by several residents, especially RT 10 RW 04 near Pak Edi’s residence. Warung is privately owned, used for profit, and developed from capital that is "planted" in a settlement so that it becomes a shop. However, as the lines between formal-informal dualism in the kampung is not obvious, the position of warung is on the spectrum between the two poles of formal and informal. Although privately owned and not cooperatively, technically a warung has entered the informal sector because it evades and does not pay taxes, among other things (see Portes & Haller 2004, Tunas 2008). Stalls are understood as commons not because of their ownership, but rather spatially. Spatially, the commons are identified as an extension of the house as a private space to the alley in front of it, and vice versa; alley extension in the form of public space to a part of the house. Opening a shop is a manner of competition of urban majority that sees opportunities in their situation. Near Pak Edi's house, there is a neighbor who opens a shop, and the illustrative sentence he said several times in interviews is "he survived by just putting the table in front of the house to support his livelihood". That sentence can be understood as informality that can grow and prosper by means of seeking opportunity out of competitions in a kampung environment.

![Figure 2 The location of security portal in RW 04](image)

The sense of security can be observed from the kampung level and to a lesser extent, from the level of one family house. Through interviews with Pak Edi, the residents' motorbikes could be parked in front of their respective houses without having to be put inside the house to secure their motorbikes from theft. That is contrary to some cases where residents' motorbikes are usually placed in the house before the house is locked at night, even though the owner of the house has a fenced yard. The habit of storing a motorbike in the living room of the house was not practiced, especially in RW 04. The portal as an additional security element in Bidaracina is only on the main road from the Bidaracina on Jalan Sensus Raya. The portal provides a sense of security for residents of several RWs that have main access from Jalan Sensus Raya to the outside, but not other RT-RT or RW-RW. Teenage brawls from outer RWs have occurred in RW 04 (when a group of teenagers entered through the portal before the portal was closed), but brawls between RTs inside RW 04 and surrounding RWs that have access from Jalan Sensus Raya, according to Pak Edi, has never happened. In other words, streets and alleys inside RW 04 were not ported because the residents perceived that their environment was considered safe and that their relationships were excellent so that residents did not mistrust each other.

1.11. The Destruction of Bidaracina’s Commons
To understand that eviction is a form of capital accumulation, we have to look into why Bidaracina eviction is planned in the first place. The underlying motive for Bidaracina eviction as an effort to control floods is, arguably, one of the steps to provide an indirect capital stimulus as part of a continuous effort so that the capitalist system continues. The eviction of Bidaracina was intended to improve the flow of Ciliwung river when the volume of flow was unusually larger by channeling it to BKT [9], which would not only minimize losses due to flooding in downstream areas but would also increase land prices around the riverbank by minimizing the possibility of great urban flood. This is an indirect control of the capital surplus, using the framework by which Harvey developed. The alliance of the state with capital and the 'creative destruction' of the market creates new space for capitalist expansion and economic growth. Bidaracina evictions are not aimed at directly creating capitalist developments for development projects, but this kind of eviction practice “works by changing the identity attached to a place and thereby increasing the value of land in the surrounding environment (see Leitner and Sheppard 2018)”. In other words, this eviction will ‘open the gate’ for further capitalist development around the affected area, hence will further disrupt the continuous process of commoning that residents built over the decades. Commons will be lost.

Although eviction (which means capital accumulation and further destruction of commons) in dealing with urban flooding seems impossible to go by the board, the last resort would be to utilize RW 04 own commons to save themselves from the destruction of their commons as what was discussed in section 3. Participatory initiatives, as what Padawangi and Douglas argued, residents of informal kampungs might utilize the already mature concept of building and organizing their commons to not only foster their community, but also as a part of participatory solution to urban flooding [16]. To quell the eviction to save RW 04 as a whole commons altogether might be impossible, however, it is very possible that a different kind of commons might still be intact: the social and cultural resources in the form of community initiatives between residents. Kampung residents and soon-to-be former residents, NGOs, and professionals can work collaboratively towards common goals of building resilient communities.

As the certainty of when would eviction and compensation take place remains unclear, as it is perceived by Edi and Astriyani, notwithstanding the increasingly inevitable evictions marked by an appraisal process for compensation that has been planned by the beginning of 2020, commoning will likely end by eviction and displacement. Although there is a possibility where some residents will stay in their old house because they are only partially affected, Bidaracina residents who have been completely evicted will only enjoy very brief and temporary resilience. After the eviction was carried out, the resilience shown by the residents was in the form of recognition of land ownership would be ended in capital accumulation in the form of evictions for the flood prevention project. The land where they live, which Pak Edi described as “invaluable by money” has replaced its meaning into something else, namely something that provides a stimulus for the continuity of the capitalist order under the term of flood control.

**Conclusion**

Despite the limited spatial data that can be collected from the research at RW 04 Bidaracina, the findings are consistent with what has existed in existing studies. Several things can be identified as commons: resources that can be enjoyed physically and non-physically. From the case of RW 04 Bidaracina, the means of commoning is observed from the incrementality both in the formation of their residential circumstances, initiating a business, the formation of spaces for worship, and the form of streets or alleys. Commoning in Bidaracina is essentially all the strategies undertaken by the residents for the development and use of both physical and non-physical resources as livelihood strategy, but that these practices must contribute to the communal benefits of the kampung. The limitation to commoning lies in the privatization/commodification of common resources, of which eviction is one of them. Commoning that existed in kampungs before an eviction can be recognized in different events and highly dependent on other institutions involved in them. The end of their commoning culminates in the
destruction of the commons which are generally due to the privatization and commodification of the commons, especially through evictions.
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