Conflict of Jakarta Bay Reclamation: Government Knowledge and Respond
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Abstract: The reclamation of Jakarta Bay is a main debate issue in late few years. Some central and provincial government institutions take different stances on the issue. This research tries to find out, why institution have different stances. This research uses a mix-method approach which is quantitative and qualitative. Data is obtained from in-depth interviews to stakeholders who are 3 experts from central government and 3 experts from provincial government. Furthermore, the data analysis is conducted with AHP to find out knowledge of 6 experts about what for reclamation is. AHP also find out, what they respond, pro or cons in conflict of Jakarta Bay reclamation. The results of the analysis from the central government show that the knowledge of experts seen Jakarta Bay Reclamation as social and environment issue (42.7%) and they choose to cons-reclamation (75.7%) for the respond. While the provincial government indicates that the knowledge of Jakarta Bay Reclamation is about Economical Issue (54.8%) and choose pro-reclamation (85.7%) because it will have a positive impact. This different perception becomes an obstacle in resolving the Jakarta Bay reclamation conflict.

1. Introduction
The reclamation project was initiated from the 1985-2005 DKI Jakarta Spatial planning which stated that it needed to be reclaimed on a small scale in Penjaringan, Pademangan, Ancol, Pluit (pearl coast) to meet the growing land needs of Jakarta residents. However, during the administration of President Joko Widodo and Governor Basuki Tjahya Purnama, this conflict was strengthened again with the issue of environmental damage, marginalization of certain groups, regulatory authority and corruption in the Jakarta Bay Reclamation project. Several central and provincial government institutions took a different attitude to the issue.

Some parties who agree with bay reclamation, consider that reclamation is the best way to deal with land necessary that are increasingly difficult to obtaining now. Through the reclamation process, the land can be used as a commercial area which will have a positive impact on regional revenues. On the other hand, those who object are still in the principle that reclamation is a form of environmental destruction that must be prevented for any purposes.
The obscurity of the Jakarta Bay reclamation policy with the existence of pro-contra among government institutions has caused confusion among the people, especially those who feel the direct impact. Communities whose economies depend on the waters of Jakarta Bay, such as capture fishermen and pond fishermen who have not received certainty of how their lives will be [1]. The government's indecisiveness in dealing with conflicts between institutions also questions the credibility of the government in guaranteeing investment in Indonesia. The total investment value of 40 billion dollars will certainly harm developers, especially when several islands have been formed and existing shop buildings have been built [2]. In addition, the violation of environmental permits also shows that the environmental impact control is not guaranteed. Therefore, the issue of Jakarta Bay reclamation is a complex problem that affects social, economic and environmental aspects.

The issue of Jakarta bay reclamation is actually an environmental problem. However, environmental problems cannot only be seen from an ecological perspective, but also involve social and economic aspects. Environment is defined as a condition or condition that surrounds an organism or group of organisms, or the complexity of social or cultural conditions that affect individuals or communities [3]. This definition provides an understanding that in the environment there is an interaction between humans and nature and its contents to support human life while still observing the lives of other living beings. In other words, understanding environmental issues does not mean producing anti-development thinking. However, how can it be harmonized between the natural environment, the social environment and the artificial environment?

The last few decades, various environmental problems faced by developed countries and developing countries, such as environmental damage, climate change and natural disasters. Generally environmental problems are caused by population growth, wasteful and unsustainable resource use, poverty, and exclude environmental costs from resource use from market prices of goods and services [4]. Current environmental problems have become a global issue because of the awareness that environmental problems are a problem that affects every human life that lives on earth, so that joint handling is needed [5].

The use of sustainable concepts is caused by increasing concerns over the exploitation of natural resources for economic development at the expense of environmental quality [6]. Therefore, a sustainable approach can be explained as a way of life and human concern at this time to safeguard the earth better so that it can be enjoyed by future generations.

The concept of sustainability is one indicator in analysing the Jakarta Bay reclamation policy. Since the emergence of a sustainable development regime, by emphasizing 3 pillars of economic development, social welfare and environmental preservation [7], the concept of sustainability has been widely used to be an indicator of development policies that affect the environment, especially in the third country.

In Indonesia itself, the enactment of Presidential Regulation No. 59 of 2017 concerning Implementation of Achievement of Sustainable Development Goals is one of the benchmarks of Indonesia's commitment in implementing sustainable concepts. Sustainability measures are also used in various studies as an analysis of policies, such as infrastructure development policies [8], land use policies [9], tourism policies [10] to policies regarding coal supply chains [11].

Methodologically, political ecology relates to social practice theory that understands society through the practice of resource users, or actors, and social relations that accompany production processes in line with their existence in space and time, or certain spatiality, and in relationships broader social [12]. The emergence of a post structural view of power, knowledge, and discourse, influences the development of forms of political ecology. The political ecology approach then emerges in highlighting the ways in which representation, narration, and discourse shape how people perceive and behave in relation to the environment.
Political ecological studies question, among other things, which authority produces knowledge to explain a phenomenon related to human relations with nature, what knowledge is generated from a production process, and who can access and who has the right to control production including the results of that knowledge [13]. But this knowledge and discourse can be influenced by the power of the dominant actor. The power of an actor to influence discourse will shape their opportunities to move the discourse, and the potential of policies that emerge from it, in a direction that is more profitable for their perspective [14].

Analysis of the politicization of knowledge is one of the characteristics in political ecology, especially to find out how natural biophysics is represented through knowledge in civil society policies and movements. Forsyth reminded environmental researchers to pay attention to the mechanism of production of knowledge about natural resources that was used to legitimize political economy practices to be deemed appropriate [15].

The political ecological approach of this time has explored how environmental governance initiatives function to change the way in which the subjects of this initiative understand and behave towards the environment, produce different thoughts and actions [16]. Research conducted by Boelens regarding hydro sociality, shows that an understanding of how to formulate and apply modes of water governance and reconstruction of hydro social areas, establishes the relationship of rights and rules regarding water decision making which often result in costs and benefits that are not equal between actors [17]. Deeper, this research concludes that knowledge actively depoliticizes the forms of socio-economic inequality, misidentification, and political exclusion. According to Brosius, the most important thing is not how much is known about the environment, but how humans position that knowledge, and themselves, in a broader contour of power [18].

2. Materials and Method
The objective of this research is to describe conflict on Jakarta Bay Reclamation Management. This research uses a mix-method approach which is quantitative and qualitative. Data is obtained from in-depth interviews to stakeholders who are 3 experts from central government and 3 experts from provincial government. Furthermore, the data analysis is conducted with AHP to find out knowledge of 6 experts about what for reclamation is. AHP also find out, what they respond, pro or cons in conflict of Jakarta Baya reclamation. Criteria are derived from in-depth interview with stakeholder and literature study results such as media analysis. The Hierarchy as seen in Figure 1, will be guide in assessment with the experts. In addition, the comparison will also be drawn between the knowledge and respond of central government and local government.

![Figure 1. The hierarchy of Government Knowledge and Respond](image-url)
3. Results and Discussion

The analysis result of AHP 3 experts from the central government, as shown in table 1, indicates that the knowledge of experts seen Jakarta Bay Reclamation as social and environment issue (42.7%). It’s means Jakarta Bay Reclamation correlate with the environmental problems in Jakarta Bay and as solution for houses in Jabodetabek area. But, from AHP result we also can see that it indicates negative correlation, as seen as they respond that choosing cons-reclamation (75.7%). This finding also explains that according to these experts from Central Government, reclamation is not the suitable solution at this moment. They believe that the provision of housing in Jabodetabek, could still be found for other solutions besides reclamation.

| No. | Criteria                        | Weights  | Ranking |
|-----|---------------------------------|----------|---------|
| 1   | Political Issue                 | 25.1%    | 3       |
| 2   | Social and Environtment Issue   | 42.7%    | 1       |
| 3   | Economic Issue                  | 32.2%    | 2       |

Table 1. Central Government Result

The result of pairwise of whole 6 experts (figure 2), shows that social and environment issue are the important issue that shown in Jakarta Bay Reclamation (42.7%). The difference of respond of Jakarta Bay reclamation is tight, 55.3% for pro-Reclamation and 44.7% for Cons-Reclamation.

The analysis result of AHP 3 experts from the provincial government, as shown in Table 2, indicates that the knowledge of Jakarta Bay Reclamation is about Economical Issue (54.8%). The result also shown in the in-depth interview. Expert B as the official in charge of spatial arrangements in DKI Jakarta stated that from the outset of its allotment, Jakarta Bay reclamation was not a solution to the environmental problems that occurred in Jakarta Bay. So, it’s not correlate with environmental Issue. He also mentions how much the loses of money if the reclamation has been cancel. The Provincial Government, choosing pro-reclamation as the respond (85.7%).

This findings at the provincial level, are clearly interesting when compared to the findings at the central government. If at the central government level it is considered a social and environmental issue, at the provincial level it is considered an economic problem and pro with the bay reclamation. It becomes more interesting when it will be waited on who is actually the final policy maker regarding reclamation whether the central government or the provincial government?

| No. | Criteria                        | Weights  | Ranking |
|-----|---------------------------------|----------|---------|
| 1   | Political Issue                 | 7.9%     | 3       |
| 2   | Social and Environtment Issue   | 37.3%    | 2       |
| 3   | Economic Issue                  | 54.8%    | 1       |

Table 2. Provincial Government Result

| No. | Alternative                    | Weights  | Ranking |
|-----|--------------------------------|----------|---------|
| 1   | Pro-reclamation                 | 85.7%    | 3       |
| 2   | Cons-reclamation                | 14.3%    | 1       |

No. | Criteria                        | Weights  | Ranking |
|-----|---------------------------------|----------|---------|
| 1   | Political Issue                 | 7.9%     | 3       |
| 2   | Social and Environtment Issue   | 37.3%    | 2       |
| 3   | Economic Issue                  | 54.8%    | 1       |

No. | Alternative                    | Weights  | Ranking |
|-----|--------------------------------|----------|---------|
| 1   | Pro-reclamation                 | 85.7%    | 3       |
| 2   | Cons-reclamation                | 14.3%    | 1       |
The different attitudes described earlier are a response to the problems of the Jakarta Bay reclamation. However, there are some interesting things that researchers have found in differences in attitudes from Government institutions. The knowledge held by the Central Government and the Provincial Government of DKI Jakarta shows that there is a similarity of knowledge regarding the initial purpose of making the Jakarta Bay reclamation policy, even though it is delivered in a different language, namely the need for residential land due to the density of Jakarta. Although, settlement allocation is still a debate. The same knowledge is also related to the regulations underlying the policy, namely Presidential Decree No. 52 of 1995 concerning the Implementation of North Coast Jakarta Reclamation by appointing the DKI Jakarta Provincial Government as the authorized institution. But differences in knowledge arise when this policy will be implemented. The issue of violations, corruption, the effects of good and bad and the relevance of flooding and the handling of heavily polluted Jakarta Bay make a difference in perspective. There are two groups, namely the group that considers that the policy does not agree to be implemented, and the group that agrees to be implemented.

Researchers also find out how actors influence institutional knowledge. The difference in knowledge related to the good and bad impacts of the reclamation of the DKI Jakarta Provincial Government in the reclamation of the Jakarta Bay was seen in the Basuki-Djarot government with Anies-Sandi. Thus, in the two governments there appear two different decisions, this indicates that this knowledge and discourse can be influenced by the power of the dominant actor. Agree with what was conveyed by Lightfoot and Burchell that the power of an actor to influence discourse will shape their opportunities to move the discourse, and the potential of policies that emerge from it, in a direction that is more profitable for their perspective.

4. Conclusion
The different forms of attitudes between central and regional governments are determined by how knowledge wants to be placed and how and how strong the authority is in carrying out that attitude. Placement of the right discourse and strong authority will produce a firm attitude to make an action as a manifestation of that statement. However, a more cautious attitude and tendencies towards attitudes that only form opinions will emerge when this institution moves towards it, but that does not mean that this institution does not have the knowledge or authority.
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