

# Unjust Decision Making Resulting in Marginalization of the Powerless Prostitution Community in Silir-Semanggi of Solo

Sudarmo<sup>a</sup>

## Abstract

The city government of Solo has made a decision that street vendors operating in the city's Revolution Monument in Banjarsari Square for years must be relocated to the new built traditional market, called *Pasar Notoharjo*. This study utilized ethnographic methods, a combination of methods including observation, in-depth interview, focus group and the unobtrusive method including collecting written information. The study showed that the decision of Solo city government which tended to privilege street vendors' interests resulted in the life chance of prostitution was deteriorated and marginalized. The city government has accommodated street vendors' demand to remove the organized prostitution community operating in Silir-Semanggi of Solo since 1960s as one of requirements for their relocation to this area, where the new built traditional market with more than one thousand kiosks was provided for street vendors. The procuresses' demand to obtain their rights of the land they occupied for more than 20 years on behalf of their legal ownership failed due to administrative, bureaucratic and legal obstacles. Prostitutes were inhumanly chased away by the city government apparatuses in collaboration with the police from the site of operation in 2006 and it resulted that the social and economic lives of procuresses and prostitutes got worse since their prostitution activities in this location were totally forbidden and unfinished. Both procuresses and prostitutes were marginalized because they did not have links to the powerful stakeholder who were able to protect their rights. Their health was in danger because the city government's concern to their activities was limited in particularly since 1998 when the location was formally closed by Solo mayor of the new order.

## Keywords

Decision making, marginalization, citizen participation, development, government agenda

The city government had prepared the sub-village of Silir in the *Kelurahan* of Semanggi for relocating many of the street vendors. It was incorporated in the sub-district of Pasar Kliwon. Silir had grown to be a major place of prostitution in Solo since the 1960s. Most of the residents of Silir lived on either public land (land owned by either the national or city government of Surakarta) or private land, called *tanah persil* where the real owner had not used it for long

time. Most residents in this area did not have a formal license for the ownership of the land they lived on.

---

<sup>a</sup>Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia

## Correspondent Author:

Sudarmo, Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Sebelas Maret University, Jl. Ir. Sutami No. 36A Surakarta, Indonesia, Post Code: 57126  
E-mail: sudarmo63@yahoo.com

In this area, there were officially 63 procurers with 187 women having prostitution as their main occupation (Bernas October 15, 1997) but according to the local residents there were about 200 prostitutes. In fact, the former Mayor Imam Sutopo of the New Order regime had formally closed this location through the issuance of the Mayoral Decree No. 4623/094/1/1998 dated August 27, 1998 (Suara Merdeka April 19, 2002). Before the city government closed this prostitution place the city government promised to provide financial compensation of Rp1 billion from the 2000 Local Budget (APBD) but it had never been provided (Suara Merdeka June 9, 2003). The area where they lived was popular called *resosialisasi-Silir* or *resos-Silir*.

The current city government had a plan to develop Solo city, and consequently, one of its areas, the Monjari where numerous street vendors had occupied this area in particular since early 2000s must be relocated to Silir sub-village because this was one area which was part of the development of Solo. However, most street vendors were not willing to be removed until the city government was willing to provide facilities for their business and remove prostitution in this area as they demanded on November 22, 2005 (Sudarmo 2008).

In this new location, within an area of 1.1 hectare, the Solo government constructed 1,018 kiosks, each of 2 × 3 metres. The government also intended to complete the construction of this market with other facilities including a *mushola* (worshipping place for Moslems), a management office, an internal corridor 3 metres wide, lavatories, a green line, an area for a loading dock (*bongkar muat*), a circle road inside the market, a main gate, and side doors for the market (Suara Merdeka January 2, 2006), but due to financial shortage, the city government did not construct the lavatories until September 2006. Eventually, the city government could construct all kiosks and other facilities as the street vendors had requested after the Regional Representative Council (*Dewan Perwakilan*

*Rakyat Daerah* [DPRD]) approved the provision of a larger budget allocation to the government. All of this construction required almost Rp 10 billion (Sudarmo 2008). This construction was named the *Notoharjo* Market, and a place where the street vendors in the Monument at Banjarsari area called *Monjari* would be relocated.

This paper argued that the city government's decision to relocate of street vendors from *Monjari* to Notoharjo Market in Silir where prostitution practices operated for long time and tended to favour street vendor interests had resulted that prostitutes' and procuress' life chances declined. They were not only marginalized in terms of exclusion from decision-making process but also economic accesses. Their migration to Silir based on the old local government era decision which enabled them to live in peace in this area for more than 20 years had been suspended due to the current city government's program which required them to remove from their site of operation.

## THEORETICAL REVIEW

Since 1960s Solo had an organized prostitution operating in Silir Semanggi. Many of them were not local people who migrated to Solo. According to Lee, there were four main factors associated with migration: (1) factors associated with the area of origin; (2) factors associated with the area of destination; (3) intervening obstacles; and (4) personal factors (Lee 1966: 47-57). Most migration has happened because of the economic motive to make the migrants' livelihood better although it does not easy as the new situation is always uncertain and unpredictable. As they were people who did not have legal authority of ownership to the land they occupied, they would have impediments in taking part in the process of decision-making regarding their site of operation in this area.

Citizen participation is an important dimension in

decision-making. It is a taking part or involvement and it may include distinct and complex meanings. Based on the work of Ralph M. Kramer on *Participation of the Poor: Comparative Community Case Studies in the War on Poverty*, Nasikun defined participation in three categories. The first category is where “participation requires the involvement of the poor citizen in the process of decision making which is represented by their representatives in coalition together with the government agents and non-government organizations, and other leaders of interest groups”. The second category is where “participation means the poor citizen is placed as the main consumer of a development program and therefore their interests and advisory must be heard and considered by policy makers”. The third category, what Nasikun called “radical participation”, is where “the poor people are seen as the constituency of a development program which is politically ‘powerless’” and “therefore they need stimulation and support”. In this category of Nasikun’s, their powerlessness is the factor causing them to remain in poverty and only through mobilization of them and their organization as an effective pressure group will be able to influence the process of decision-making that has effects on their lives (Nasikun 1990: 99-100). These categories are based on political ideologies of what activism is possible and desirable. Participatory approaches need to be used in such a way that people are empowered, rather than being used as window dressing by the powerful.

Participation of citizens in policy process may face a range of obstacles: (1) strong control of power relations by the state; (2) lack of citizen organization support; (3) lack of participatory skill; (4) lack of government political will; (5) lack of awareness for participation; and (6) insufficient financial resources at the local level (Gaventa and Valderrama 1999: 8-10). Gaventa and Valderrama concluded that, although citizen participation “is about power and its exercise by different social actors in the spaces created

for interaction between citizen and local authorities, control of the structure and the process for participation including defining spaces, actors, agenda and procedures, is usually in the hands of government institutions and can become a barrier for effective involvement of citizens” (Gaventa and Valderrama 1999: 8).

Despite their involvement in decision-making process, the “acts and process of participation... sharing knowledge, negotiating power relationships, political activism and so on—can both conceal and reinforce oppression and injustices in their varied manifestations” (Cooke and Kothari 2001: 13). This is to underline that as the city government has its own agendas or goals, the city government may use a variety of ways to materialize or achieve them, including oppression, eviction or other ways which are unjust. The decision-making would then be basically still dominated by the city government or even be carried out through adopting a top-down approach which centralizes the decision-making in the hands of the city government which represents the city government interests or agenda which may differ from what the street vendors demand, prefer and think (Sudarmo 2008: 25).

Relocation program as part of development is believed to be “progress towards a complex of welfare goals such as the elimination of poverty, the provision of employment, the reduction of inequality and the guarantee of human rights” (Turner and Hulme 1997: 6). However, it is not always the case because development is “a two-edged sword which brings benefits but also produces losses and generates value conflicts” (Goulet 1992: 470). This suggests that Solo’s development which may take the form of change from informal to formal business sector through relocation could privilege elite stakeholders for their own benefits at the expense of a marginalization of powerless community such as prostitutes and procuress from their site of operation or their occupation without providing the best

alternative for their sustainable livelihood (Sudarmo 2008). According to Schaffer and Smith (2004: 2), marginalization implies the issue of human rights. To overcome this issue, the city government needs to provide a “protective security” (Sen 1999) and adopt “capability approach” (Nussbaum 2000).

## **RESEARCH METHOD: TRIANGULATION AND THE ETHNOGRAPHIC APPROACH**

The study was a descriptive qualitative research, not statistical hypothesis-testing. It used an ethnographic method, involving several periods of fieldwork using participant observation, spending much time watching people, talking with them about what they were doing, thinking and saying. This approach was designed to gain an insight into the street vendors’ viewpoints and the way they understood their world, and included triangulation by using several approaches to people and to topics from different directions. Those approached were selected on the basis of both purposive and snow-ball sampling. This was combined with interviews of local people who were not street traders and with detailed content analyses of secondary research and local newspapers.

Ethnography may utilize several qualitative research methods in collecting information from the ethnographer’s informants, including in-depth interviewing, using of focus groups or collecting written information (as an unobtrusive method) (Liamputong and Ezzy 2005: 174). In applying ethnographic methods the author used a triangulation method which is typically a combination of methods including observation, in-depth interview, focus group and the unobtrusive method. As Denzin argued, “by combining multiple observations, theories, methods, and data sources, a researcher can hope to overcome the intrinsic bias that comes from single-methods, single-observer, and single-theory studies” (Denzin 1989: 307). Thus, these methods allow the author’s research to: “(1) obtain a variety of information on the

same issue; (2) use the strength of each methods to overcome the deficiencies of the other; achieve a higher degree of validity and reliability; and (3) overcome the deficiencies of single-method studies” (Sarantakos 1998: 169). In this research the author used both data source triangulation and triangulation methods. For its data source triangulation this research obtained information from various informants including members of Solo’s legislature, officials of various sections of the Surakarta government organization, formal traders, street vendors, road users and other relevant stakeholders; and for its triangulation method, this research combined use of in-depth face-to-face (and phone) interview, focus group, documentary analysis, and participant observation (Liamputong and Ezzy 2005).

Combined with observation, the author used in-depth interviews. According to Sarantakos, this method was a very valuable technique because it allows the researcher to study relationships in a relaxed unstructured way, where there is less chance of being misunderstood and more opportunity to check inconsistencies and to obtain accurate answers (Sarantakos 1998). During the in-depth interviews, these questions were presented as part of a discussion rather than as a pre-structured questionnaire, and the author was actively involved and encouraged the respondent to talk and converse about the research issue under discussion. The use of this technique was productive as, “it allows flexibility, continuity of thought, freedom of probing, evaluation of behavior during the interview, and interest in all aspects of the opinions of the respondent including those not in the areas covered by an interview schedule” (Sarantakos 1998: 264).

## **DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS**

The following section discusses histories of migration of prostitution to Silir, relationship between them and the city authorities and its leader, reasons for their

removal from their site of operation, and the impact of government policy to relocate street vendors to Silir on the life chance of prostitution activities.

### *Reasons for Migration and Life Chances in the New Destination*

The procuresses of *resos*-Silir had occupied this state-owned land since 1960s based on the earlier Mayoral Decree No. 361/I/Kep (Suara Merdeka June 9, 2003), but many of them had died and most current residents were their children or their generations (Sudarmo 2008). Some others had even had sold their land to others without legal license more than 20 years ago (Sudarmo 2008). According to Sarto Sarjoko, a resident of one of the smaller sub-sections of the area, about 85 percent of the residents of the *resos*-Silir in particular those who lived in several of the sub-sections had occupied the public and private land for at least 20 years. He said that many of them had lived there for more than 20 years because their houses elsewhere had been demolished when the project of Bengawan Solo was constructed in the 1980s under new order of Solo's Mayor (Wawasan February 8, 2006). The following is the account of a resident of one of the sub-sections of *resos*-Silir:

We moved here together with my parents when I was still very young, may be when I was about 3 or 4 years old. Now I am about 49 years old. This area was a remote area and far away from the city and with no electricity. We constructed a well by ourselves for a water supply. Most people lived in this area were the new generation and we followed our parents' occupation as procurers until now. Many of us also married prostitutes. All our prostitutes were uneducated, unskilled and poor. They mostly came from outside Solo. We have been here for more than 40 years. Our community together constructed the road surrounding our neighborhood to connect it to the main road with our own money. Before 1998 we lived peacefully, enough income and we were happy and this place was alive during the day and evening but our peacefulness was disturbed when Mayor Imam Sutopo in 1998 closed our occupation because the city government saw us as sources of social disease, immoral and making violations of God's law but we did not really close our occupation because we just kept our survival. Since then

our visitors have declined drastically but we still do it hidden because the Mayor did not meet his promise to provide compensation for us and we continued until the Slamet Suryanto administration finished. But we were totally closed in July 2006 by current Solo Mayor and our lives started declining. (Adopted from Sudarmo interview on September 14, 2006; Sudarmo 2008)

According to the Agrarian Law of 1960, people who had lived on the public land for at least 20 years were eligible to have the land they occupied registered in their name. Residents of the *resos*-Silir also recognized that they had built the infrastructure of their *kampung*, such as the residential road connected to the main road costing a million rupiah, with their own money without any city government subsidy (Sudarmo 2008). The head of the former Solo Police Resort, Police Lieutenant Colonel Imam Suwongso had questioned the closing of *resos*-Silir as a place of prostitution, because, as he pointed out, the economic condition was declining and the opportunities for employment were rare. He said:

They work as prostitutes mostly due to stomach need (economic) reasons. If now the city government is compelled to close this location, the prostitutes will practice illegally outside this location. It will create a new problem. But if it is the city government decision, we are ready to control them if the city government demands we do it. (Bernas August 26, 1998)

### *Conflict Between the Powerless and the Powerful*

The leader of the procurers, Philip Rachmat, more popularly called Usik, together with all procurers opposed the closing of the *resos*-Silir for prostitution, because they felt that they were the supporters of the Golkar<sup>1</sup> and had contributed to Golkar's winning in the election of 1997. He said, "Our struggle is not small, we have spent 40 million rupiah, we also put our lives in danger due to threats" (Bernas August 26, 1998). Usik accused the head of Solo's DPRD in the period of 1994-1999, Raharjo, of being inconsistent in

keeping his promise to protect the prostitution, and Usik and his group asked Raharjo to resign from the Golkar party. Rahardjo provided three options for resolving the problem regarding the residents of *resos-Silir*: (1) the houses of the residents of *resos-Silir* would be demolished and they would be relocated to a new place; (2) their housing would not be demolished and they could keep them as places for prostitution; and (3) the *resos-Silir* prostitution would be closed and their houses and the land they used would become the property of the residents of *resos-Silir* and they would be eligible to have legalized land certificates on behalf of their names as the legal owners. The residents of the *resos-Silir* chose the last option, but the Golkar party ignored its promises. Usik said that, "When we asked him, Rahardjo replied of his own will by saying that 'the struggle for helping the procurers and prostitutes is not similar to those of the workers'. His statement was really discriminatory and discredited us" (Bernas August 26, 1998).

The city government's intentions to finish the practices of the *resos-Silir* prostitution as, it argued, resembling a "societal disease" and with a negative connotation, was strong; and the city government also encouraged the Moslem community to construct an Islamic centre in this area. The Indonesian Council of Religious Scholars (*Majelis Ulama Indonesia* or *MUI*) also supported the city government's intention to wipe out the prostitution through its Letter of Recommendation No. 60/DP.MUI/X/1997 which the secretary of the Surakarta MUI signed on September 22, 1996 and sent to the chief of the Solo DPRD (Bernas October 15, 1997).

The residents of the *resos-Silir* were also not free from Islamic group intimidation. The Islamic paramilitary group (*Laskar Islam*) called itself the *Koalisi Ummat Islam Surakarta* (Coalition of the Surakarta Islamic Community) had threatened them. About 200 members of this group wearing white uniforms moved from the Kartopuran, an area where

the *pondok pesantren*-Al-Islam (*santri* area) was established, driving motorcycles and pick-up vehicles, and entering and intimidating many night entertainment places and "dim" restaurants in Solo, including the *resos-Silir*; and this group was involved in conflicts with the local residents of Silir who were enjoying their leisure time at the traditional simple food-stalls (Tempointeraktif October 18, 2005).

Despite these challenges, threats and abuse, the procurers' community of the *resos-Silir* continued to struggle for their demand to have ownership of the land they had occupied since 1960s legalized in their names until finally the administration of the current Solo administrators produced a plan to provide the land for them coupled with the relocation of street vendors from the 45 Monument at Banjarsari to Semanggi. The Vice Mayor recognized that at this moment the land certification team had been mapping the area of *resos-Silir*. The city government had by then almost finished mapping one of the six neighborhood associations level sub-sections of the area. He announced that, "In particular, in RT 1 of the RW.VII Semanggi, the complex of the former *resos-Silir* the mapping is almost finished" (Jawa Pos-Radar Solo April 5, 2006).

Members of the current city government desired to close down the *resos-Silir* prostitution by providing the land as compensation to the residents. The residents of the *resos-Silir* had promised that if the city government met its promise to provide them each with 300 square metres of land they would leave this occupation and use the land certificates for obtaining loans from the banks for opening new businesses other than prostitution. As Usik said, "Basically our demand is simple. Give us the land certificate on the land we have occupied on behalf of our name and we will change our occupation. With this legal ownership certificate, we can obtain capital from the bank for business and use this certificate as bond. If it is materialized, all occupant of the *resos-Silir* will leave this occupation as procurers" (Suara Merdeka April 19,

2002). In addition to the plan to provide the land for them, the city government also made an ultimatum that by July 10, 2006 this place must be clean from prostitution practices (Suara Merdeka January 2, 2006).

### *Policy Outcome*

In relation to the street vendors' demand for removing the prostitution as one of the requirements for their accepting the relocation to Silir, as discussed earlier, the city government had made an ultimatum that July 10, 2006 was the last day that prostitutes could live there. The procurers had agreed to the Mayor's instruction as long as the city government provided a parcel of 300 square metres of land for each procurer who had occupied it for more than 20 years and granted him or her with a formal certificate as the legalization of land ownership.

However, it was not easy for the procurers to obtain the land because they had to meet several requirements. According to a member of faction of the Welfare Peace Party (*Partai Damai Sejahtera*) and the local legislature's, Commission I, if the current status of the land was as a city government asset then transferring it required the agreement of the local legislative Assembly. Moreover, the provision of this land for them should not break the Local Law No. 8/1993 about the General Plan for the Urban Design of Surakarta City (Wawasan February 8, 2006).

There were another options offered by other assembly members. For example, Reni Widyawati, of the Democrat Party (*Partai Demokrat*), argued that rather than the land certification on behalf of the occupier, the city government could build more kiosks for them or employ them to manage the market assets; employ them as parking attendants and cleaning service workers as a way to empower them in the development of south Solo (Wawasan February 8, 2006).

Despite this, the city administrator had tried to meet the requests of the residents of *resos*-Silir.

However, an investigation by the National Land Board (*Badan Pertanahan Nasional* or *BPN*), the office with authority to issue the promised land ownership certificates, showed that 96 families occupied the Silir area. Some were procurers, others not, and were occupying 27,000 square metres; 15,200 private land (*tanah persil*), 10,800 of city government concession land (*tanah hak pakai*), and 2,250 of national state land (*tanah negara*) (Solo Pos May 17, 2006). The Balikpapan could not provide certificates for those occupying the privately owned land. Among 63 procurers living in the area, 2 had obtained a certificate and 22 had sold their land, while 16 were occupying state-owned land, 30 privately-owned land and 15 city government concession land (Solo Pos November 16, 2006). The National Land Board could only process the applications of those on national state land. Processing the applications of those on the concession land was more difficult because it required a prior agreement between the Surakarta Municipality government and the Local Assembly (Solo Pos May 17, 2006, June 21, 2006), and the local legislators had asked the city government to delay the land provision to the applicants. The city government could not work alone as it could not make the necessary decisions without the agreement of the Assembly (Solo Pos July 18, 2006, August 1, 2006).

The processing of the 10 applicants who were occupying state land was given priority because their cases was relatively easy (Solo Pos July 6, 2006). However, the procedures was still not easy as they had supposed, with only two procurers, obtaining the symbolic certificate of land ownership from the BPN on July 22, 2006, after each of them had paid to this office a total of 7 million rupiah, Rp 5,301,000 for the correct acquisition cost for the land and construction, Rp 1,165,000 to the state treasury and Rp 602,000 for operational costs (Jawa Pos-Radar Solo July 26, 2006). The others who lived on the privately owned land and the concession land were in trouble. According to Ari Machkota, a BPN official, this was not only due to the

complicated procedures required but also to their financial incapacity because the process would require between 3 and 5 million Rupiah depending on the size of land they were applying for (Solo Pos November 15, 2006), and this did not include the additional fees for the state treasury and operational costs that could be as much as another Rp 2 million (Solo Pos November 15, 2006).

Also, the city government had broken the agreement it had been made with the procurers and prostitutes. They had agreed that the prostitutes would leave by July 10, 2006 but the city government officials in cooperation with police and non-procurer local people had actually chased them away on June 23, 2006 (Solo Pos November 14, 2006) three weeks before the due date, coming when they were sleeping. Each of the prostitutes only obtained Rp 50,000 (about AU\$ 7) from her procurer for a transportation fee. This money was basically the prostitutes' own money which they had previously contributed to their procurer because each of them had an obligation to always provide Rp 500 per visitor she served. A procurer could thereby obtain Rp 2,500 per night; and the total cash before they closed had reached an estimated almost Rp 50 million (Solo Pos November 14, 2006). The city government basically had promised to provide Rp 1 million as a financial compensation to each prostitute but this had never materialized.

The prostitutes were scared and under pressure. They did not have enough money to finance themselves after they were forced to leave; most were uneducated and unskilled poor people who became prostitutes to enable their families' survival. A procurer gave the following account:

About 12:30 a.m. when we all slept because we had no visitors since the city government had announced the closure of our occupation, many policemen came together with the city government officials and local residents. We were scared because they knocked the door loudly and we were woken up suddenly. All prostitutes cried because the

policeman and the local residents spoke roughly and treated us like animals, they treated us inhumanely. We were under pressure. The policemen drove all prostitutes out but they did not have enough money for even the transportation fee to return home. They were uneducated, unskilled and unemployed, and they were really poor. They had responsibility to look after their parents and children. I pitied them. The police also made a threat to us that they want to arrest and send us to jail if we did not close our prostitution business. We were really scared and tormented. The city government did not provide any compensation for the prostitutes; we gave money for them but very small amount just for transportation fee to their home. We also did not know how we would live in the next few days, because until now we did not get the land certificate for us because it was difficult to proceed. (Sudarmo 2008)

The leader of the procurers and prostitutes colluded with the power holders of Solo by encouraging them to close the prostitution businesses. Since he had been dissatisfied by Golkar in the election of 1997, he had joined with the the Indonesian Democracy Party of Struggle (*Partai Demokrasi Indonesia Perjuangan* [PDIP]) and became the right-hand man of candidate of Mayor and Vice Mayor in encouraging his community members to support them in the election of June 2005 of Solo's mayor. The demand by the leader of prostitution community on behalf of all procurers of *resos-Silir* for the city government to provide land certificates to them was encouraged by the fact that he was occupying at least 13 parcels of land of 300 square metres each, and his demand was positively responded to by one of the Solo power holder because it was also part of the reward for him for his efforts on behalf of the victorious mayoral team. He had also always encouraged the other procurers to leave their houses, hoping they would sell their properties to him, and after that he asked the city government to help him by providing the certificates of the land ownership in his name.

The closure of the prostitution businesses had caused the procurers' life to deteriorate; and they lived in economic trouble because they were unemployed

and they did not have a certain income anymore.

One women procurer commented:

After the current city government totally closed our occupation, our life is really tragic. We have no permanent income, no occupation and no employment. For keeping our survival we sold our possessions. I sold my furniture, electronics, clothes and whatever I had. Before everything was sold, I tried to get a casual job to collect used newsletters and sell them to the broker but I could not stand it because it was too heavy because my physique is not strong enough and I got back pain. About two months I worked as a used newsletter collector. Then I changed to find another casual job. I tried to pick the frangipani flowers in a cemetery in a remote area in Sukoharjo, Boyolali and Klaten and sold them to the broker but our income was minimal because in two weeks I only got 2 kilo of dried frangipani flowers at 15 thousand rupiah per kilo. The broker did not allow me to sell the wet flowers to him because he only wanted the dried flowers. I was also frightened because I had to work in the silent, dark and scary cemetery and I always worried when I started to sleep in the evening because I was worried about having a bad dream and I could not sleep almost every evening. Only about two weeks I could stand as a frangipani flower collector. I tried to find another job, now I have become a casual washer and ironer in two households with total income of Rp 30,000 per week but my income is uncertain because my boss sometimes does not need me continuously; my income also declined when I was sick as I could not work. My husband also became a casual worker with an uncertain income because he is not physically strong enough; he is uneducated and unskilled like me. But several others who are physically strong could sell clean water to the Notoharjo market.<sup>2</sup>

Since the current city government totally closed the *resos*-Silir, most prostitutes now prostituted themselves in the street in the Kelurahan of Gilingan and the surrounding area of the Tirtonadi Bus Station with low prices and unsafe practices. They were also working without any of the medical checks or controls by the city's Health Office which they had when they operated in Silir, in particular before 1998; so that they were susceptible to be infected by sexually transmitted diseases such as gonorrhea and HIV and to transfer these diseases to their customers. Only very few of the prostitutes were still hiding in *resos*-Silir

but under pressure, not only by the city government, but also by the local people who were anti "society disease". The street prostitute usually only obtained 75 percent of the total cash paid by their customers; another 25 percent went to the mediators and for a security fee (Sudarmo 2008).

In Solo, until the end of October 2006, according to official figures 49 people had been infected by HIV and 21 people were positively suffering from AIDS. According to UNAIDS, an institution of the United Nations for AIDS resolution, for every person suffering from HIV there will be at least 100 infected by AIDS (Solo Pos December 1, 2006).

The provision of the land ownership certificates had resulted in the jealousy of other non-procurer residents at Semanggi who had similarly occupied the concession land and privately owned land for more than 20 years and demands that they should also have the same treatment. They even opposed the provision of the certificates for the procurers due to jealousy. A resident of RT 01/RW 07 of Semanggi said:

If the city government will provide the ownership right certificate for the residents in the area of former Silir prostitution, it should provide equal treatment for the residents in other RT including the residents of Kenteng. If there was a prerogative attitude toward them, it may result in unfairness that may encourage social conflict. (Solo Pos June 24, 2006)

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

This paper discussed how the marginalization of procurers and life chances of prostitute occurred due to city government privileging the street vendors' demand that resulted in the prostitution community strongly banned and removed from their site of operation, and they were marginalized. Marginalization of this community can be seen as an injustice treatment by the state and powerful community to them and it may undermine their human rights to have the economic access for their survival.

Problems of social justice can be alleviated or solved by implementation of “capability approach” which provide ways on the realized functionings (what an individual prostitute or procurer is actually able to do) or on the capability set of alternative she has (her real opportunities).

The city government implementing a policy on prostitution removal regarding its policy on street vendor relocation should take into account any issue related to procurers’ and prostitutes’ sustainable livelihood, their family, their children and their older parents.

## Notes

1. Golkar was the well-organised and resourced government party during the New Order period and, by a range of means, would always win elections. After the fall of Soeharto and the New Order in 1998 Golkar became an ordinary political party although with much “baggage” both against and in support of it.
2. Interview with Tuti, a woman procurer at Silir Semanggi, on December 17, 2006 (Rp 30,000 equals to about AU\$ 4).

## References

- Cooke, B. and U. Kothari. 2001. “The Case for Participation as Tyranny.” In *Participation: The New Tyranny*, edited by B. Cooke and U. Kothari. London: Zed Books.
- Denzin, N. K. 1989. *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gaventa, J. and C. Valderrama. 1999. “Participation, Citizenship and Local Governance.” Background Note Prepared for Workshop on Strengthening Participation in Local Governance. Institute of Development Studies, June 21-24.
- Goulet, D. 1992. “Development: Creator and Destroyer of Values.” *World Development* 20(3):467-475.
- Lee, E. S. 1966. “A Theory of Migration.” *Demography* 3(3):47-57.
- Liamputong, P. and D. Ezzy. 2005. *Qualitative Research Methods, Oxford*. New York: University Press.
- Nasikun. 1990. “Partisipasi Penduduk Miskin Dalam Pembangunan Pedesaan: Suatu Tinjauan Kritis.” In *Beberapa Aspek Pembangunan Orde Baru, Esei-esei Dari Fisipol Bulaksumur*, edited by A. Z. Abar. Ramadhani, Solo.
- Nussabaum, M. C. 2000. *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sarantakos, S. 1998. *Social Research*. 2nd ed. South Yara: MacMillan.
- Schaffer, K. and S. Smith. 2004. *Human Rights and Narrated Lives: The Ethics of Recognition*. Palgrave, Macmillan.
- Sen, A. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Sudarmo. 2008. “Governance of Solo’s Street Vendors: A Critical Analysis Base on Empirical Research.” Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Flinders University Adelaide.
- Turner, M. and D. Hulme. 1997. *Governance, Administration and Development, Making the State Work*. London: MacMillen Press Ltd.
- “Beri Kami Sertifikat Warga Silir Bubar...” (Give us Certificate Residents of Silir Move out...). *Suara Merdeka*, April 19, 2002.
- “Diprioritaskan 10 Pemohon Tanah Negara di Salir” (Priority Over 10 Applicants for the State Land in Silir). *Solo Pos*, July 6, 2006.
- “Kejar Tenggat, Lembur Siang Malam” (Lose no Time, Overtime Day and Night Works). *Jawa Pos-Radar Solo*, April 5, 2006.
- “Komisi I: Tunda Sertifikasi Tanah Silir!” (Commission I: Delay the Land Certification of Silir). *Solo Pos*, July 18, 2006.
- “Lho Sertifikasinya Kok Pilih-Pilih?” (Why Discriminating Certification). *Jawa Pos-Radar Solo*, July 26, 2006. Retrieved August 7, 2006 ([http://jawapos.co.id/index.php?act=detail\\_radar&id=133249&c=108](http://jawapos.co.id/index.php?act=detail_radar&id=133249&c=108)).
- “Masa Razia Kafe dan Diskotek di Solo” (Mass Seizes Cafe and Discotheque in Solo). *Tempointeraktif*, October 18, 2005. Retrieved April 20, 2006 (<http://www.tempointeraktif.com/hg/nusa/jawamadura/2005/10/18/brk,20051018-68149,1d.html>).
- “Masih 150-an Pelacur Praktik” (There are Still 150 Prostitutes Opening Their Practice). *Suara Merdeka*, June 9, 2003.
- “Penutupan Silir Sudah Final, Warga Silir Desak Mundur Ketua Golkar” (The Closing of Silir is Final, Silir Residents Insist the Leader of Golkar to Resign). *Bernas*, August 26, 1998.
- “Penyertifikatan Tanah Silir Jangan Undang Persoalan Baru” (Land Certification of Silir Should not Create a New Problem). *Wawasan*, February 8, 2006. Retrieved March 27, 2006 ([http://www.wawasandigital.com/show\\_archives.php?subaction=showfull&id=1139396728&archieve...](http://www.wawasandigital.com/show_archives.php?subaction=showfull&id=1139396728&archieve...)).
- “Proses Sertifikasi Tanah Bekas Resos Silir Terancam Molor” (The Process of Land Certification of the Former Area of Silir Prostitution is Threatened of Becoming Longer and Longer in Time). *Solo Pos*, May 17, 2006.

- “Prostitusi Silir = WTS Jalanan, Siapa Mau Dirikan Pesantren” (Silir Prostitution = Street Prostitution, Who Wants to Bulid a Moslem School). *Suara Merdeka*, April 19, 2002.
- “Relokasi PKL, Silir Tutup Total, Pendaftaran PKL Ditutup Akhir Januari” (Relocation of Street Vendors, Silir is Permanently Closed, Registration of Street Vendors is Closed). *Suara Merdeka*, January 2, 2006.
- “Rencana Penutupan Resos Silir MUI Minta Segera Direalisasi” (Plan for Closing Silir Prostitution, MUL—The Indonesian Council of Religious Scholars Want it to be Materialized). *Bernas*, October 15, 1997.
- “Sertifikasi tanah Silir Terganjil Dana” (Land Certification of Silir Faces Financial Problem). *Solo Pos*, November 15, 2006.
- “Soal Sertifikasi Tanah Eks Resos Silir, Janji Pemkot Terganjil Grand Design” (Regarding Certification of Former Prostitution Land of Silir, City Government’s Promise Faces Obstacles Due to City Grand Design). *Solo Pos*, June 21, 2006,
- “Soal Sertifikasi Tanah Negara, Dewan Kembali Peringatkan Pemkot” (Regarding Certification of the State Land, Regional Representative Council Remind City Government). *Solo Pos*, August 1, 2006.
- “Soal Serifikat Tanah, Warga Silir Minta Pemkot Bersikap Adil” (Regarding Land Certification, Silir Residents Demand the City Government to be Fair). *Solo Pos*, June 24, 2006.
- “Tajuk: Jangan Sekedar Melihat Pada Angka-angka” (Editorial: Do Not Only Based on Statistics). *Solo Pos*, December 1, 2006.
- “Warga Silir Siapkan Dana Untuk Sertifikasi” (Residents of Silir Prepare Fund for Certification). *Solo Pos*, November 16, 2006.
- “Wawali: Sertifikasi Tanah Masih Diproses, Eks Mucikari Silir Tagih Janji” (Vice Mayor: Land Certification is Being to Processed, Former Procureses Ask for His Promises). *Solo Pos*, November 14, 2006.

## Bio

**Sudarmo**, Ph.D., lecturer, Department of Public Administration of the Faculty of Social and Political Science, Sebelas Maret University; research fields: public administration, public policy.