

Double Spaced: Abstract Labour in Urban Kampung

Jan Newberry

Department of Anthropology

University of Lethbridge

4401 University Drive

Lethbridge, Alberta T1K 3M4

jan.newberry@uleth.ca

Abstract

Although kampung means village in neighbouring Malaysia, in Indonesia, it refers to dense neighbourhoods in cities. These neighbourhoods represent a community form reproduced through governance across various regimes but also through daily exchanges and support between inhabitants. Based on fieldwork in Yogyakarta, central Java, this paper considers the form of labour represented by these spatial enclaves and its connection to the reality of a community form produced both through administration as well as a local structure of feeling. The relationship of these imagined communities to questions of abstract labour is considered along with their relevance for contemporary urban anthropology.

[community, governance, informal sector, labour, urban anthropology, Indonesia]

The streets of Solo describe the boundaries of vast residential neighborhoods. Alleyways that run off the main streets penetrate these neighborhoods....Javanese neighborhoods, especially those in the center of the city, are not homogeneous. They contain the places of the wealthy and the noble as well as the shanties of the poor, and also, often, small factories, repair shops, and other businesses. The walls, then, hide what they protect, and they protect a great variety. To someone who is not familiar with the neighborhood, what is behind the walls is unknown. They create a pervasive sense of a "somewhere else". . . , a pleasant mystification (Siegel 1986:125-126).

Kampung is a word that resonates immediately with most Indonesians, but this resonance varies by class and by history. Whether slum or pleasant mystification, kampung often seem doubled, functioning always in two registers, operating always in two dimensions. It is the doubled sense of kampung as both social and spatial formation that prompts the present inquiry into kampung as an economic modality.

Scholarly attention to the Indonesian kampung is overdue. Although these urban neighbourhoods are found throughout urban areas in the archipelago, they are taken for granted and rarely subjected to consideration beyond attempts to improve them. Yet, they are a pervasive part of urban life in Indonesia, perhaps especially Java, the focus of this inquiry, where urban densities are among the highest in the world. The relevance of these urban enclaves for a 21st century urban anthropology relates both to the history of the discipline and its possible futures.

The interpretation of kampung as closely knit communities in urban settings harkens back to the importance of community studies in early urban anthropology. Histories of Javanese kampung community suggest a hybrid form, at once attendant on the administrative needs of various regimes and on the nostalgia for imagined forms of rural community cooperation and consensus exploited in the name of governance.

Although the historical unpacking of the kampung community as a social, political and economic form is not the primary subject of this inquiry, elements relate to the central focus of this consideration, namely, the current reality of kampung communities as the spatial organization of specific forms of labour. Given concerns with the consequences of new forms of globalization for the spatial dimensions of capital, the stability of the kampung as the materialization of a particular organization of labour is quite remarkable. Recent scholarly concern with globalisation and the rise of the middle class in Southeast Asia and Indonesia has generally overlooked these urban enclaves of small-scale producers, who seemingly run the gamut from lumpenproletariat to petty-commodity producers, the majority existing at the edges of the formal labour market. The abundance of micro-enterprises within kampung is evidence of the importance of house-based economic practises for the great bulk of urban Javanese. While susceptible to analysis as micro-enterprises, as petty-commodity production, and as the informal sector, the approach taken here is instead to relate the community form to forms of labour organization to illustrate not only the relevance of labour and production in understanding these urban neighborhoods but also the significance for urban anthropology of the contemporary scholarly concern with space.

I have previously considered how kampung manifest a particular political rationality of urban governance which amplifies and extends their function as spatial containers for a reserve army of labour, just as the daily experience of kampung social reproduction amplifies and extends the local structure of feeling of home community (Newberry 2006). The question of reserve labour identifies two key components in the following analysis. First, this approach to kampung labour is one informed by a Marxian understanding of the labour process, a position that has fallen out of favour, particularly in an era marked by critiques of such “modernist” theories. Yet, some of the concepts from the Marxist toolkit are being re-engineered to take into consideration changing conditions of production. Here, the concept of abstract labour is engaged to suggest a process of appropriation of surplus value that is general and that generalizes human labour, yet one that simultaneously reserves and entraps specific forms of kampung labour. Making use of one particular reading of abstract labour (Chakrabarty 2000), the spatial consequences of the kampung as the materialization of particular forms of labour is considered. Meshing this reading with contemporary approaches to space and labour explains both the reproduction of kampung in an era of flexible labour and the advantage of placing urban anthropology within urban studies broadly construed.

Kampung as Urban Villages

The Malay word kampung is generally taken to mean 'village' but in Java it is more commonly applied to urban entities, to parts of towns and cities. Initially, it meant 'compound', most typically the walled yards, gardens, and residences of well-to-do

families (Reid 1979:5) and it was long used thus in Yogyakarta for the residential compounds of princes, nobles, and other dignitaries. In fact, the Sultan's palace itself was once recognized as a complex of kampungs. Yet today the majority of Javanese take kampung to mean primarily something akin to 'home community' while a better-off and more genteel minority tend to interpret it more decisively as 'slum' (J. Sullivan 1992:20).

To use the word kampung in Indonesia is to say a lot. The etymological association with compound is often noted, as is the history of the development of named kampung as ethnic enclaves in port cities and as guild neighbourhoods in inland kingdoms (for overview, see J. Sullivan 1992). The names of many kampung gesture to these pasts even as they represent a history of occupation and growth in colonial cities such as Batavia, coastal cities such as Surabaya, and court towns such as Yogyakarta, where one might just as easily find a kampung named to refer to its original Chinese or Arab inhabitants as one named for court lamplighters. Interpenetrating ethnic and occupational definitions of kampung are those related to administration and governance. Although kampung appear to be informal and unstructured settlements, these neighbourhoods have been and continued to be organized on a number of levels.

Yogyakarta, a court city in central Java where I have conducted ethnographic fieldwork since 1992, is a city of named kampung organized around the main palace compound of Sultan Hamengkubuwana X.¹ Like other sultanates, the Yogya kraton displays a logic of orientation and boundaries that mirror heaven and model society. The walls of the kraton mark its north/south orientation, which is extended through the *alun-alun*, or open squares, to point toward the

powerful poles of the south sea and Mount Merapi to the north. In some contrast, the development of kampung neighbourhoods appears to represent little in the way of rational design. The boundaries of many are given by major streets, although these may be marked by walls as well. Kampung represent a spatial segregation of the lower class in contrast to those living in larger, better built houses that line streets and that have been associated in the past with the Dutch and with Chinese Indonesian businesses. Kampung in this context are understood to be the quarters for the *wong cilik* (Jv.), the little people (Guiness 1986, 1991; J. Sullivan 1980, 1992).² This spatial separation is marked as well by differences in housing density and construction and the size of the alleyways that thread through these neighbourhoods.

In Kampung Rumah Putri³ where I have done most of my fieldwork and where the alleyways are generally wider and the number of better houses proportionately higher than downtown kampung, the tiny residences of some kampung dwellers are often hard to see. These range from single rooms in larger buildings to shacks that appear to the side and behind larger houses, mimicking, in a sense, the pattern of development of kampung themselves behind the larger street-side houses of the wealthy (Guiness 1991). The density of occupation in kampung is noticeable, even for an island that is home to more than 60% of the 250 million people living in Indonesia. Although most kampung have at least one alley that is wide enough to accommodate automobiles, kampung are better understood as traversed through a series of paths that range from shoulder-width allowing for foot traffic up to bicycle and motorcycle width. As Kellett et al. (2001:8) note, “these pedestrian scale alleyways form the key spatial component of the *kampung*,” and they are intensively used as extensions of dwellings, but also for productive and

collective activities.

Kampung footpaths illustrate the ambiguity of private space and the density of traffic and habitation in these neighbourhoods, as they frequently cross directly in front of thresholds and windows. Beyond the challenge to any easy divide between public and private space in these urban enclaves, the presence of small-scale home industries in houses further muddles any easy division of space even as they reiterate the tightly packed character of these neighbourhoods. Networks of relations, commercial, familial, neighbourly, make use of these paths daily, and their overlaps and absences are telling markers of neighbourhood relationships.

Kampung life is a flow of resources, including money, aid, and services, between households related through kinship, proximity, need, and networks of exchange, often networks managed by women (Brenner 1995, 1998; Newberry 2006; N. Sullivan 1994). Many scholars have noted the dense networks of exchange and support evident in these kampung neighbourhoods, including the *arisan* (the rotating credit association or neighbourhood lottery), the ritual, communal meal known as *slametan*, and the social fund for the ill and poor (Brenner 1995, 1998; Guinness 1986, 1991; J. Sullivan 1980; N. Sullivan 1983, 1994). Kampung residents make reference to this ethic of helping one another, of cooperation, and an equality of purpose and life style. The boundaries of kampung culture are repeatedly remarked upon by kampung dwellers who describe the kampung as close and neighbourly, based on harmony and mutual support, and frequently compare it to the broken (*dipecah*) social life of new suburban developments.

This kampung ethos is extended through its use as an index of social class and poor

neighbourly conduct. To be accused of not being sufficiently *kampung* suggests an aggressive and middle class individuality out of keeping with local values. This ethos relates as well to a felt sense that *kampung* members are well known and familiar, and that outsiders are not readily incorporated. *Wong kampung* (Jv.) or *kampung* person can suggest humbleness and community spirit, while the term *wong kampungan* (Jv.), that is, person with a characteristic *kampung* mentality, carries pejorative connotations of small-minded localism. Indeed, “*kampung*” serves as a class referent in common speech that has few class markers other than those associated with royalty and the hereditary occupational categories of Dutch colonialism.

The structure of feeling (Williams 1977) that is central to life in the *kampung* is tied up with the sense that *kampung* are the site of traditional forms of cooperation, consensus, and neighbourliness. These values resemble very closely those associated with the ideal peasant village. In fact, in Malaysia, “*kampung*” refers directly to rural villages, and the resonance with a rural village imaginary is clear (Thompson 2006). In Indonesia, the word *kampung* is more often used to describe urban neighbourhoods. Even so, the ambiguity of the Malay word *kampung* for the Indonesian case is neither coincidental nor trivial. The use of a word associated with rural life to discuss urban neighbourhoods signals the overlapping character of administration in these areas.

The administration of rural areas in Indonesia was built upon the presumptions of a functioning, egalitarian community of producers, and the question of whether an egalitarian, self governing peasant village was a traditional social form or a Dutch colonial invention is equally longstanding (Antlov 1995; Breman 1980, 1988; Burger 1957; Kano 1979). Scholarly work on

class differentiation and critiques of Geertz's (1963) notion of shared poverty and agricultural involution have shown that the search for origins tells us more about those who desire to find the traditional village than it does the social organization of rural areas (Kahn 1985; Kemp 1988; Goh 1998; Schulte-Nordholt 1987). The search for the origins only repeats the error of the Dutch who were looking to document "traditional" social forms and neglects the reality of this model of community as a form of governmentality and modern statecraft (Kemp 1988; Newberry 2006; Rigg 1994; see also Dumont 1966).

What has received less attention is the evidence that, despite the sense of historicity that clothes much of kampung life for its residents, the development of these urban communities is as much a product of sociological and political imagination and the needs for administration as was the peasant community. Sullivan, for example, concludes that kampung in Yogya have always existed as "elements of a rational administrative plan and de facto units of a state system" (1992:24). He suggests that kampung outside the walls of the Sultan's palace were used for royal tax farming, later to become the homes of the *wong cilik*. In the late 19th century, Raffles consolidated the village as the basic rural administrative unit, and Dutch reforms in the early 20th century produced administrative structures in both rural and urban areas led by unpaid headmen. Japanese war-time occupation elaborated the urban administrative structure and reinforced the role of kampung as an administrative rationality, even as it continued its Janus-faced quality. As in Japan, local leaders served two masters: their neighbours who chose them and the higher political authorities who recognized them (Falconeri 1976:35; see Bestor 1989 and Garon 1997 on the neighbourhood section system in Japan). Yet kampung were not always the site of a

pacified, administrative functioning. During the nationalist era, residents “developed a sense of community and view of the world which found expression in many of the concepts of the Indonesian awakening of the twentieth century” (Van Niel 1979:118; see also Siegel 1998).

It was under Suharto’s New Order regime (1966-88), that the administration of village-like units in rural and urban areas reached its apotheosis. All of urban Indonesia, until the recent era of democratic reform in the late 1990s, was divided into a neighbourhood section system. Groups of 10 - 20 households were numbered and their populations managed and accounted for through a popularly selected unpaid leader. Six of these small Harmonious Neighbour sections (*Rukun Tetangga*, RT) make up the larger Harmonious Citizen section (*Rukun Warga*, RW), also run by an unpaid, locally chosen head (a man in most cases). These units remain in urban Java, despite the changes in governance due to regional autonomy measures in the era of *Reformasi*, or reform, following the end of Suharto’s rule.

The New Order government of Suharto (1968-97) used and reproduced the nostalgia for rural community as a means to administer urban localities through its neighbourhood section system, deliver social welfare and to organize residents to follow the principles of *gotong royong* or mutual self-help in the running of their own affairs (Bowen 1986). Consequently, urban kampung mimic all the traits of the ideal peasant community, including those traits associated with the so-called closed corporate peasant community of mid-century anthropological analysis (Wolf 1957); that is, these communities exhibit rotation of civil leadership among unpaid, popularly selected leaders, a closed attitude towards outsiders, wealth-leveiling mechanisms, and communally held property. One might quibble with the degree of importance of these traits in

daily *kampung* life, but there is no arguing with their existence as a part of a particular knowledge practise mobilized especially by the New Order government or their acceptance by *kampung* residents.

Kampung, then, represent a culture of administration but are just as clearly a structure of feeling (Willams 1977; see also Adorno 1990). The brief sketch of the history of kampung as administrative forms does not contradict this felt sense of community. Rather daily acts of exchange by neighbours and close kin reinforce a local ideology of community. This imagined community has proved to be powerful not only for Java, and for much of Indonesia, but also for urban anthropology as a discipline. Early Chicago studies of the city began from the assumption of a traditional rural village as signifying other, as evident in Redfield's folk-urban continuum (1941), Oscar Lewis's consideration of community in the city (1959; Hannerz 1987), and Herbert Gans 1962 book *Urban Villagers*. Chicago sociology's relationship to Mexican ethnography shows the Mexican peasant community, an anthropological staple, should be understood in terms of its relationship to emerging theories of urbanization, urbanism, and the city (Hannerz 1987). Even more, early theories of cities as interdependent communities following an ecological model (Park and Burgess 1925) find their Javanese doppelganger in Clifford Geertz's analysis of the ecology of agricultural involution and shared poverty in Javanese peasant villages (1963).

Given the centrality of the ideology of the breakdown of the traditional social order to early theories of the city, from Weber to Durkheim to Töennies, perhaps it is not surprising that the continuing dissolution of the rural is fundamental to the making of the urban. Yet, in fact, kampung exist on a number of levels: as named neighbourhoods, as a social unit, as an

administrative unit, as a lifestyle, and a space where all of these combine. Kampung are a palimpsest showing traces of various historical moments, while contemporary popular connotations turn on the doubled character of kampung: its inward aspect as home community and the outward aspect as slum. Beyond these dimensions of the kampung as urban spatial form, as administrative rationality, and as moral community, its reality as an economic form supports and reproduces this sense of community as well.

Small Industries

The continued reproduction of these imagined communities across colonial, military occupation, authoritarian, and newly democratic regimes in Indonesia challenges the standard model of spatial dispersion of labour and production under conditions of late capitalism. The disarticulation of production away from a Fordist model of national concentration in urban centres to international economies of scope organized and coordinated virtually between dispersed points of production has been described, famously, by David Harvey (1990). The general spatial dimensions of flexible accumulation indeed do hold true for parts of Indonesia, which has served as a source of low-waged, flexible labour, easily acquired and just as easily shed, in export processing zones (EPZ) for various transnational and corporate capitalist concerns. Growth in manufacturing between the late 1960s and the onset of the Asian financial crisis of the late 1990s was impressive (average growth rate of 12.4% per year), and manufacturing's share of the economy grew from 10.3% to 25% between 1970 and 1996 (Berry, Rodriguez, and Sandee 2001:364). Clearly, Indonesia's competitive advantage relies on its

labour surplus economy (Hadiz 2002), and Southeast Asia has generally played a role in the provision of cheap, largely female labour on global assembly lines (Wolf 1992; Hill 1991) and the export of female labour as domestics throughout Asia and the Middle East.

Since 1994, when restrictions on foreign ownership were relaxed, this labour force in Indonesia has been enclaved in EPZs that ring the major cities of Medan, Jakarta, and Surabaya. This rural and peri-urban aspect of flexible labour in the periphery under late capitalism finds its opposite in the erasure or expulsion of the working class from cities in the developed core, whether the information city (Castells 1989), the ex-urban city (Castells 2000), the global city (Sassen 2001) or the militarized carceral complex of de-industrialized city cores (Wacquant 1996, 2001). The role of the *kampung* as an urban organization of labour and administration flavoured with a strong resonance of the rural village poses an interesting question, then, about the role of cities in an era of new forms of global capital.

The economic world of the *kampung* is a dense and interconnected one. Residents are involved in innumerable exchanges, many of these taking place within and between households based on kinship and proximity. These exchanges include money, services, gifts, and even children.⁴ Beyond these exchange relationships, *kampung* are also the site of a significant amount of production through small industries, known as *kerajinan kecil* locally. Kellett et al. (2001) use the term micro-scale home-based enterprises (HBE) to describe these industries that blur and reconfigure the “spatial and conceptual boundaries between work and home, between production and reproduction” in order to generate income and sustain themselves. Berry et al. (2001) follow the Indonesian Central Statistics Agency (BPS; www.bps.go.id) which defines

micro-enterprises as those with 1-4 workers (although BPS documents use the term cottage industry for these very small enterprises), small enterprises as those with 5-19, medium enterprises as those with 20-99, and large enterprises as those with over 100 workers.

Although kampung are often the sites for the entire range of micro, small, and medium enterprises (even some large ones), the focus here is on the cottage industries or the micro-enterprises. Although Berry et al. document minimal growth in micro-enterprises between 1975 and 1996 (0.2%), these enterprises continue to dominate in number of workers. Micro-enterprises represented 75.4% of workers in manufacturing in 1975 (3,900,000 workers), 49.3% in 1986 (2,714,000 workers), and 39.9% in 1996 (4,076,000; Berry et al. 2001:365). Without disputing their argument that economic dynamism lies with small and medium enterprises, the statistics offered by Berry et al. also suggest another important trend: the surprising persistence of micro-enterprises as a large percentage of employment in the manufacturing sector. As they note, “in 1996, 40% of all workers were found in units of under 5 workers” (Berry et al. 2001:365).

A complete inventory of the small-scale industries in Kampung Rumah Putri, my old kampung neighbourhood, or any kampung for that matter, is likely impossible, in part because so many of these house-based industries seem to bloom overnight and disappear just as quickly, and in part because of the relative invisibility of these enterprises that are often quite small and sited within kampung houses. In my original census of my near neighbours (plus a smaller sample from a nearby kampung; Newberry 1997), 50% of the households reported some kind of house-based micro-enterprise (30 of 60 households). For those reporting, income from these enterprises

ranged from 20 to 120% of other income earned outside the home (N=11) and from 19.3 to 54.5% of total household income. The simple majority in both cases falling between 20 and 50%. These numbers are very small, and the problem with accurate reporting of wages is obvious in a sample with only 11 of 60 households reporting actual figures. More often the kind of work was described (seamstress, masseuse, food stall operator) with the report that the money earned was enough for daily needs (*untuk kebutuhan sehari-harian*, or *cukup*, enough). A broader view of the role of small-scale enterprises is provided by government measures of nearly a half million of these enterprises (409,814) employing over 800,000 people in the special district of Yogyakarta in 2004 where the population is a little over 3 million.⁵

In general, these house-based industries are based on self-exploitation and family labour. Fixed capital is low, if not non-existent. Wages often include in-kind payment and food. These enterprises can include true entrepreneurial concerns, with a family starting a small business out of the home. The fibreglass statue maker in my block was one example of this kind of business. The husband of the family hired two workers to make statues in a small shed next to his house. His wife cooked lunch for the workers, and the children of the family pitched in as need be. This kind of kampung business most closely matches petty commodity production. Other examples included a puppet maker, a bedspread and fabric craft maker, and a drum kit business.

Just as often these enterprises were even smaller, not even rising to the definition of petty-commodity producer offered by Smart and Smart (2005) as employer of the labour of others. Frequently, these activities occupied only a small space within a house and required only part-time labour along with occasional family help, such as the many small dry-goods stalls,

often called *warung*, which might be nothing more than a shelf in a front room or on a front porch from which a woman, typically, sells mosquito coils, soap, cigarettes, matches, and other small sundries. Another example was a name card business run out of my neighbour's house. Started by an unemployed son, this small business occupied less than a meter of space in a small hallway next to the kitchen.

In the small compound around my rental house, there were three kin-related houses including five households. Four men earned the low wages of Indonesian civil service, and one worked as a store clerk; a fifth received a small army pension. In only one household of five did the formal wages of a father and son provide sufficient income. Even so, this household included a woman engaged in a micro-enterprise cooking peanuts to order. She also helped manage a small dry goods stall in the local market begun with the aid of money and training from the Indonesian government. The other son started the name card business next to his mother's kitchen. In the house next door, the retired army officer cooked peanut candy for sale. His married daughter worked sporadically as subcontracted labour. One son cut hair for neighbours and later became a spiritual healer. Next door, one daughter-in-law worked as a seamstress out of her house sewing clothes on order for the local puppet maker. Another daughter-in-law made and sold *jamu*, traditional health tonics, from her house as well as in the local market. From a total of 15 adults in these five households, six received a formal wage or pension, and seven earned money in micro-enterprises.

Local subcontractors could count on ready labour when projects emerged: finishing work on leather hand bags, the stuffing of kapok into pillows, and the bundling and packaging of craft

goods. This labour was just as easily dismissed to be re-absorbed by the kampung when the job ended. One of the chief characteristics of the form of labour and work described thus far is the ease with which it is taken up and then abandoned. More precisely, the labourer is taken up and just as easily abandoned without any of the aspects associated with formal employment. Few people within the kampung are working within the formal sector, and many people are under-employed. The level of disguised unemployment, especially male unemployment, appears to be high, while the majority of small, house-based enterprises are begun and managed by women.

Despite a history of active income-generation by Javanese women of the lower classes (Brenner 1995, 1998; Carey and Houben 1987; Papanek and Schwede 1988; Stoler 1977; D. Wolf 1992), the New Order regime was quite successful in re-placing women's work within the home and the community in service to a developmentalist ideology that emphasized the two-child family and the stay-at-home mom through PKK (*Pembinaan Kesejahteraan Keluarga*, Support for the Prosperous Family; Newberry 2006). All married women in Indonesia are considered to be members of PKK, a well-known feature of the Suharto era that continues to function in the *Reformasi* era. This national organization of housewives as unpaid, local social welfare workers mirrors the male administrative hierarchy that reaches from the level of six households up to the national level. In fact, the programs of PKK are assimilated to the village-like structure of administration described above in both rural and urban areas. PKK ideology and the associated programs have achieved no small degree of success, especially in Java where the programs were begun before being extended to all of Indonesia.⁶

What has received much less comment is that PKK's programs also encourage women to

work for *tambahan suami*, income to supplement the husband's wages, in a variety of small-scale, informal sector, house-based enterprises for which the government offers courses and small monies. The programs of PKK deliver no-cost and low-cost social welfare inputs at the most local levels, but they also encourage small, house-based industries to support and reproduce the unemployed and under-employed labour within the kampung. In this way, the administration of urban communities in Java institutionalizes women's support and reproduction of surplus labour.

The articulation of communities of reproduction with spatially dispersed centres of production is not a new one. Meillassoux's (1981) analysis of the articulation of African sites of labour's reproduction with France's employment of migrant labour is perhaps the most famous example of the articulation literature of the 1970s. Feminist scholars, including critics of Meillassoux (Harris 1984), have challenged the idea of a division between reproductive and productive labour (see Moore 1988 for an overview). In the case of Indonesia, it is clear that labour in EPZs and in the mega-city of Jakarta is subsidized by rural and urban communities of reproduction. What the current case offers is not simply a return to this issue, but a reconsideration of the constitution of community and its durability under new conditions of global production. The durability of the community form may follow from its ability to both facilitate the flow of capital and to provide the medium in which capital is enacted (Joseph 2002; Creed 2006:3). In a very real way, to understand class in Java, and parts of Indonesia, requires an understanding of kampung community.

Questions about class in Indonesia and Southeast Asia have often centred on export-

processing zones and the nascent industrial working class, enclaved and feminized, that has emerged in tandem with these transnational enterprises (Beeson and Hadiz 1998; Hadiz 1997, 2002; Ong 1987; Wolf 1992). More recent attention to class in Southeast Asia has concerned the emergence of a middle class, and much of this attention has been on the consumption practices of a new transnational class (Dick 1985; Kahn 1991; Robison 1996; Shiraishi 2004). There are serious limitations to a strictly consumption based definition of class, including the fact that a politically significant professional and educated middle class emerged to play a role in Suharto's fall (Heryanto and Mandel 2003). The kampung residents who are sending their children through high school, who have perhaps a motorcycle for transport, and are increasingly able to buy televisions do not match the emerging picture of middle class consumption, but neither are they the suffering poor. The question then becomes what kind of a class analysis is suitable for understanding urban kampung?

In David Harvey's now 15 year old treatise on flexible accumulation, he describes one of the paradoxical effects of new global forms of capitalism and their spatial effects: the revival of domestic, familial, and paternalistic labour systems. As Harvey notes, although Marx assumed that these forms of labour would be driven out under advanced capitalism, they persist. As he says:

Re-reading [Marx's] account in *Capital* strikes home with a certain jolt of recognition. We there read of the ways in which the factory system can intersect with domestic, workshop, and artisanal systems of manufacture, of how an industrial reserve army is mobilized as a counter-weight to workers' power with respect to both labour control and

wage rates. . . of how capitalists foster the spirit of competition amongst workers, while all the time demanding flexibility of disposition, of location, of approach to tasks (1990:187).

The patterns of labour in the kampung across economic and political regimes suggest that these urban neighbourhoods are the site of self-exploitation in the production of surplus value.

Whether considered as a flexible response to new forms of capital (Rothstein 2005) or a retrenchment of old forms of exploitation (Gates 2005), these forms of production often depend on familial and female labour (Smith and Narotzky 2005). How are we to understand the class dynamics of these tiny, house-based businesses that seem to rely not only on the work of women within the household but also the administration and management of communities?

Abstacting Labour

Perhaps it is not surprising that issues of class and labour have returned in an era framed by questions of whether new global forms of capital represent disjuncture or stability and by the desire to compare labour across space. This return has been marked by the effects of significant theorizing about the nature of modernity, including challenges to Marxist analyses of class as profoundly modernist and essentialist. In response, Gibson and Graham posit class as “the social process of producing and appropriating surplus labor (more commonly known as exploitation) and the associated process of surplus labor distribution” (1992: 113; see also Wolff and Resnick 1986). By reconceptualizing class as the social process of surplus value appropriation, the household, as well as locally significant exchange practices and the structures of local

governance subsidizing these modes of self-exploitation, can be placed within a complex nexus that includes both capitalist and the non-capitalist forms, giving neither logical nor historical priority (Gibson and Graham 1992: 121). The analysis of the feminization of the low-cost Indonesian workforce on the global assembly line can then be considered alongside kampung labour.

The organization of kampung labour suggests this process of appropriation involves reserving surplus labour. Characterizing kampung labour as *reserved* provides a different approach to flexibility in the labour process that moves beyond dichotomies between male and female labour, private and public, or informal and formal labour. Even more, it suggests a process of entrapment (Bauder 2001) of labour that operates by logic different than that of enclaved factory labour in peri-urban areas. Rather than enclaving young female workers in bounded areas around factories in EPZs, kampung are home to labour, young and old, male and female, held in reserve when not actively deployed Jakarta and other sites. This entrapment does not represent any pre-capitalist versus capitalist divide, but a labour process resistant to such designation and yet ideal for the rapid mobilization and release of low waged labour. Even more, the reserve function of the kampung cannot be disentangled from its role as a moral community or as a form of governance.

Kampung labour, like kampung community appears double: on the one hand, the result of a general process of labour's cheap and flexible reproduction in a labour surplus economy, and on the other, the specific relations of exchange and support within home community. Recent reconsiderations of abstract labour seem to turn on this doubled aspect of labour in Marx's

analysis: its commensurability across domains but also its concrete manifestation as specific social relations, or as Castree describes “its ontological nature as social and universal” (1999:149-50).

In Chakrabarty’s reconsideration of abstract labour (2000; following Postone 1993), the distinction between abstract and concrete labour lights up the contrast between universal human rights and local difference. His conjunctural analysis offers a means to relate the labour of the kampung to local processes of differentiation and simultaneously to a more general logic of accumulation and surplus value production in countries organized through new forms of global capitalism. At the centre of Charkabarty’s analysis is a comparison of two histories of capital. The first, History 1, describes the antecedents to capital “posited by capital itself as its precondition” (2000:668). These antecedents can only be known and identified retrospectively as central to the life processes of capital and its reproduction. Free labour is one example – both a precondition of capital’s development and its invariable result (Marx 1978:451; cited in Chakarabarty 2000:668). This is a universal and necessary history, according to Chakrabarty, “the backbone for the usual narratives of transition to the capitalist mode of production” (ibid.). Balanced again History 1 and the historical emergence of reserved surplus labour in kampung is the stubborn specificity of kampung social networks and the socially embedded character of its labour forms, amenable to appeals to tradition on the part of both citizen and state alike. To make sense of this, we must turn to Chakrabarty’s History 2: the histories of difference and social relations which do not contribute to the logic of capital but “can actively be intertwined with the relations that do” (2000:669).

As suggested earlier, the search for the origins of these forms of community sentiment and practise runs the risk of recreating the search for the primordial village. Yet it is this structure of feeling, felt to be historically given by kampung residents, that is the condition of possibility for self-exploitation in the production of surplus value, particularly on the part of women. It is the local perception of the history of kampung as home to people who support one another and who make-do by sharing and supporting one another that sponsors the very acts of exchange that support kampung members as mobile and flexible labour characteristic of the kampung.

So whatever the history of capital in Indonesia and the multiple forms of labour that become part of its reproduction, for kampung dwellers, their ways of life are historically specific. Indeed, one could describe kampung as a form of local historical consciousness. Consequently, like Chakrabarty's History 2, kampung labour destroys "the usual topological distinction between outside and inside that marks debates about whether the whole world can be properly said to have fallen under the sway of capital" (2000:671). Forms of kampung labour cannot be simply subsumed into capital. And while their relationship to capital may range from opposition to indifference, kampung social life, rather than merely being a function of capital, may also serve to interrupt the totalizing thrusts of History 1. The habitus of kampung life, Chakrabarty's History 2, is "embodied in the person-cum-laborer's bodily habits, in unself-conscious collective practises, in his or her reflexes about what it means to relate – as a human being and together with other human beings in the given environment" (Chakrabarty 2000:671-2). Even more, the habitus of kampung labour and its character as embodied memory allows for the possibility of dwelling. That is to say, History 2 allows for human belonging or "worlding" despite the global

logic of capital.

Attention to dwelling is particularly appropriate here in a consideration of the kampung as residence, as a form of labour organization, as a community, and as a structure of feeling.

Kampung are particular “worlds” whose everyday rhythm seems to have little to do with the pulses and cycles of a global capitalism. Yet, it is clear that the patterns of make-shift work and community support of the unemployed and under-employed produces a particular kind of labour force. These are not docile bodies in the sense of factory discipline, but instead bodies that dwell within the socially enclosed space of a community that both explains and reproduces this particular kind of labour, both recapitulating capital as well as interrupting its dynamic.

The space of kampung community can be understood then as both a relation of production and a force of production, following Syngedouw (1992). The repeated precipitation of structures of exchange and support between neighbours and within families are the use values of kampung labour as a relation of production, while the mobilization and reproduction of surplus labour in the kampung also constitute it as a force of production. The structure of feeling that is the kampung is the precipitate of both aspects (Williams 1977). Bauder usefully applies structure of feeling to a process of labour segmentation that “often coincides with the spatial entrapment of women, minorities and low-income families” (1992:38). Residential inequalities are produced so that workers are segmented, not only by social difference in the form class, race, and ethnicity, but also spatially, by place of residence (1992:40). This spatial entrapment has symbolic dimensions as well. That is, neighbourhoods like the kampung are also “expressions of culture” that are “negotiated in and through the context of place” (1992:42) that consequently may shape

labour market identities (1992:43). In his analysis of place as an important, constitutive factor in the division of labor, Bauder shows that “work and social meaning are mutually dependent and jointly feed cycles of reproduction of labor,” providing a “micro-level conceptualization of place on the neighbourhood scale” (1992:46).

Urban kampung are the space for the reproduction and support of particular forms of labour and labour processes. Historical and history making, these spatial enclaves provide the matrix for meanings that support their reproduction as social forms and as the site of self-exploitation in the production, distribution, and consumption of surplus value. The spatial reproduction of this kind of labour depends not on class in traditional Marxist analysis but on forms of difference that are locally meaningful even as they succumb to forms of governmentality that place women in the household, reproducing their families and their community. Kampung are forms of labour entrapment that serve a segmented labour market that includes as well enclaved industrial labour. In part, the product of layers of historical service as a form of labour exploited in rounds of capitalist accumulation, kampung are also the precipitate of structures of feeling that are not-capitalist even as they serve as elements of the life process of capital. Entrapment then is not stasis but the process of reserving labour, a process that at once recapitulates capital and interrupts it. And one that allows for kampung to be both the space for dwelling and the space for a structure of feeling that draws on local habitus and historical consciousness.

Double Spaced: Urban Kampung Labour

What can urban anthropology bring to this analysis of kampung as both an organization of labour and a space for dwelling? The doubled character of the kampung moves this analysis beyond any easy divide between anthropology in the city and anthropology of the city, as Fox conceptualized it. Rather than an undignified scramble to find substitute savages in the city (Fox 1977), a 21st century urban anthropology must account not just for the movements of cosmopolitans, but also for those who dwell. The resonance of the kampung as rural village in the city provides an ironic twist on Ferguson's analysis of urban dwellers in Zambia on the African Copperbelt, the other significant site in the development of urban anthropology. Ferguson documents urban Africans returning to villages for the purposes of reproduction and support in the context of abjection and de-industrialization (Ferguson 1999), bringing Meillassoux full circle. These reversals of fortunes in the rural/urban divide suggest the complexity of contemporary urban anthropology. Former urbanites return to African villages as an imagined and remembered community, often unmoored from actual experience. In the process, the deeply intertwined natures of city and countryside are remade again.

Fox's contrast of anthropology in the city versus anthropology of the city does serve to contrast an urban anthropology that began as method extended to a new space with an urban anthropology that begins with the city and derives its methods accordingly. In recent years, the most muscular studies of the urban seem to derive from outside of anthropology, with geographers, city designers and planners, and cultural studies scholars influenced by the visual and performing arts. Whereas Fox lamented the lack of the city's presence in early urban anthropology focused on urban "folk," recent research is lamentably lacking in people as the city

looms as artefact, plaza, boulevard, and park. The doubled character of kampung, both History 1 and 2, space and social relation, suggests a third way for urban anthropology “between the antinomies of modern and after-modern modes of theorizing capitalism and class” (Castree 1999:139). Urban anthropology must account not only for the persistence of community as a political and sociological concern, but also for its reality in the lives of those who dwell and labour within these urban spaces.

References

Adorno, Theodor

1990 Culture and Administration. *In* Philosophical Streets: New Approaches to Urbanism.

Dennis Crow, ed. Pp. 27-51. Washington, DC: Masionneuve Press.

Antlov, Hans

1995 Exemplary Centre, Administrative Periphery: Rural Leadership and the New Order in Java.

Dordrecht: Curzon Press.

Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS-Statistics Canada) www.bps.go.id, accessed November 29, 2006

Bauder, Harald

2001 Culture in the Labour Market: Segmentation Theory and Perspectives of Place. *Progress in*

Human Geography 25(1):37-52.

Beeson, Mark and Vedi Hadiz

1998 Labor and the Politics of Structural Adjustment in Australia and Indonesia. *Journal of*

Contemporary Asia 28(3):291-310.

Berry, Albert, Edgard Rodriguez, and Henry Sandee

2001 Small and Medium Enterprise Dynamics in Indonesia. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic*

Studies 37(3):363-84.

Bestor, Theodore

1989 *Neighborhood Tokyo*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bowen, John

1986 On the Political Construction of Tradition: Gotong Royong in Indonesia. *Journal of Asian Studies* 45(3):545-561.

Breman, Jan

1980 *The Village on Java and the Early Colonial State*. Rotterdam: CASP, Erasmus University Rotterdam.

1988 *The Shattered Image: Construction and Deconstruction of the Village in Colonial Asia*. CASA, Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publications.

Brenner, Suzanne

1998 *The Domestication of Desire: Women, Wealth, and Modernity in Java*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Burger, D.H.

1957 Structural Changes in Javanese Society: the Village Sphere. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, Southeast Asia Program, Modern Indonesia Project.

Carey, Peter and Vincent Houben

1987 Spirited Srikandhis and Sly Sumbadras: the Social, Political and Economic role of Women at the Central Javanese Courts in the 18th and early 19th Centuries. *In Indonesian Woman in Focus: Past and Present Notions*. Elsbeth Locher-Scholten and Anke Neihof, eds. Pp. 12-42. Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publications.

Castells, Manuel

1989 The Informational City: Information Technology, Economic Restructuring, and the Urban Regional Process. Oxford: Blackwell.

2000 The Rise of the Network Society, The Information Age: The Economy, Society, and Culture, Vol. I. 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell.

Castree, Noel

1999 Envisioning Capitalism: Geography and the Renewal of Marxian Political Economy. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geography, New Series*, 24(2): 37-158.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh

2000 Universalism and Belonging in the Logic of Capital. *Public Culture* 12(3):653-678.

Creed, Gerald

2006 *The Seductions of Community: Emancipations, Oppressions, Quandaries*. Santa Fe: School of American Research.

Dick, H.W.

1985 The Rise of a Middle Class and the Changing Concept of Equity in Indonesia: An Interpretation. *Indonesia* 39:71-92.

Dumont, Louis

1966 The 'Village Community' from Munro to Main. *Contributions to Indian Sociology* 9:67-89.

Falconeri, G. Ralph

1976 The Impact of Rapid Urban Change on Neighbourhood Solidarity. *In Social Change and Community Politics in Urban Japan*. J.W. White and F. Munger, eds. Pp. 31-59. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press.

Ferguson, James

1999 *Expectations of Modernity: Myths and Meanings of Urban Life on the Zambian Copperbelt*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fox, Richard G.

1977 *Urban Anthropology: Cities in their Cultural Settings*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall

Garon, Sheldon

1997 *Molding Japanese Minds: The State in Everyday Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gates, Hill

2005 Petty Production: The Enduring Alternative. *In Petty Capitalists and Globalization: Entrepreneurship and Economic Development*. Suny Series in Anthropology Studies of Contemporary Issues. Alan Smart and Josephine Smart, eds. Pp. 23-44. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Geertz, Clifford

1963 *Agricultural Involution: The Process of Ecological Change in Indonesia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gibson, Katherine and Julie Graham

1992 Rethinking Class in Industrial Geography: Creating a Space for an Alternative Politics of Class. *Economic Geography* 68(2): 109-127.

Goh, Taro

1998 *Communal Land Tenure in Nineteenth-century Java: The Formation of Western Images of the Eastern Village Community*. Canberra: Department of Anthropology, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, the Australian National University.

Guinness, Patrick

1986 *Harmony and Hierarchy in a Javanese Kampung*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.

1991 *Kampung and the Street-side: Yogyakarta under the New Order*. *Prisma* 51:86-98.

Hadiz, Vedi. R.

1997 *Workers and State in New Order Indonesia*. *Routledge Studies in the Growth Economies of Asia*. London: Routledge.

2002 *Globalization, Labour, and Economic Crisis: Insights from Southeast Asia*. *Asian Business and Management* 1:249-66.

Hannerz, Ulf

1982 *Exploring the City: Toward an Anthropology of the City*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Harris, Olivia

1984 Households as Natural Units. *In* *Of Marriage and the Market: Women's Subordination Internationally and Its Lessons*. K. Young, C. Wolkowitz, and R. McCullagh, eds. Pp. 136-55. London: Routledge, Kegan Paul.

Harvey, David

1990 *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Heryanto, Ariel and Sumit Mandel, eds.

2003 *Challenging Authoritarianism in Southeast Asia: Comparing Indonesia and Malaysia*. London: Routledge Curzon.

Hill, Hal

1991 The Emperor's Clothes Can Now Be Made in Indonesia. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies* 27(3):89-127.

Joseph, Miranda

2002 *Against the Romance of Community*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kano, Hiroyoshi

1979 The Economic History of Javanese Rural Society: A Reinterpretation. *The Developing Societies* 17(4): 3-22.

Kahn, Joel

1985 Indonesia after the Demise of Agricultural Involution: Critique of a Debate. *Critique of Anthropology* 5:69-96.

1991 Constructing Culture: Towards an Anthropology of the Middle Classes in Southeast Asia. *Asian Studies Review* 15(2):50-56.

Kellet, Peter, Wendy Bishop, Graham Tipple and Justine Coulson

2001 Networks of Exchange and Co-operation: Reinforcing Traditional Values through Economic Activities in an Indonesian Kampung. *In* *Traditional Environments in a New Millenium: Defining Principles and Professional Practise*. H. Turgut and P. Kellett, eds. Pp. 63-68. Istanbul Technical University.

Kemp, Jeremy

1988 *Seductive Mirage: The Search for the Village Community in Southeast Asia*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Lewis, Oscar

1959 *Five Families: Mexican Case Studies in the Culture of Poverty*. New York: Basic Books.

Marx, Karl

1978 *Theories of Surplus Value*, vol. 3 Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Meillassoux, Claude

1981 *Maidens, Meal and Money: Capitalism and the Domestic Community* [French edition, 1975]. London: Cambridge University Press.

Moore, Henrietta

1988 *Feminism and Anthropology*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Newberry, Jan

1997 *Making Do in the Imagined Community: Domesticity and State Formation in Working Class Java*. Dissertation submitted to the Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona, Tucson.

2006 *Back Door Java: State Formation and the Domestic in Working Class Java*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.

Ong, Aihwa

1987 *Spirits of Resistance and Capitalist Discipline: Factory Women in Malaysia*. Albany, New York: SUNY Press.

Papanek, Hanna and Laurel Schwede

1988 *Women are Good with Money: Earning and Managing in an Indonesian City*. In *A Home Divided: Women and Income in the Third World*. Daisy Dwyer and Judith Bruce, eds. Pp. 71-98. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Park, Robert E. and W. Burgess.

1967[1925] *The City*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press..

Postone, Moishe

1993 *Time, Labour and Social Domination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Redfield, Robert

1941 *The Folk Culture of the Yucatan*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rigg, Jonathon

1994 *Redefining the Village and Rural Life: Lessons from South East Asia*. *The Geographical Journal* 160(2):123-135.

Robison, Richard

1996 The Middle Class and Bourgeoisie in Indonesia. *In* The New Rich in Asia: Mobile Phones, McDonalds and Middle-Class Revolution. R. Robison and D.S.G. Goodman, eds. Pp. 77-101. London: Routledge.

Rothstein, Frances Abrahamer

2005 Flexibility for Whom?: Small-Scale Garment Manufacturing in Rural Mexico. *In* Petty Capitalists and Globalization: Entrepreneurship and Economic Development. Suny Series in Anthropology Studies of Contemporary Issues. Alan Smart and Josephine Smart, eds. Pp. 67-82. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sassen, Saskia

2001 The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Scott, James

1998 Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Schulte Nordholt, Nico

1987 From LSD to LKMD: Participation at the Village Level. *In* Local Leadership and Programme Implementation in Indonesia. Philip Quarles van Ufford, ed. Pp. 47-64. Amsterdam:

Free University Press.

Shiraishi, Takaishi

2004 The Rise of New Urban Middle Classes in Southeast Asia. Discussion paper from Research Institute of Economy, Trade and Industry. Electronic document, <http://econpapers.repec.org/>, accessed January 4, 2005.

Siegel, James

1986 Solo in the New Order: Language and Hierarchy in an Indonesian City. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

1998 A New Criminal Type in Jakarta: Counter-revolution Today. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Smart, Alan and Josephine Smart

2005 Petty Capitalists and Globalization: Entrepreneurship and Economic Development. Suny Series in Anthropology Studies of Contemporary Issues. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Smith, Gavin and Susana Narotzky

2005 Movers and Fixers: Historical Forms of Exploitation and the Marketing of a Regional

Economy in Spain. *In Petty Capitalists and Globalization: Entrepreneurship and Economic Development*. Suny Series in Anthropology Studies of Contemporary Issues. Alan Smart and Josephine Smart, eds. Pp. 45-66. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Stoler, Ann Laura

1977 Class Structure and Female Autonomy in Rural Java. *Signs* 3(1):74-89.

2002 *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sullivan, John

1986 *Kampung and State: The Role of Government in the Development of Urban Community in Yogyakarta*. *Indonesia* 41 (April):63-88.

1992 *Local Government and Community in Java: An Urban Case-Study*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.

Sullivan, Norma

1983 *Indonesian Women in Development: State Theory and Urban Kampung Practice*. *In Women's Work and Women's Roles: Economics and Everyday Life in Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore*. Lenore Manderson, ed. Pp.147-172. Development Studies Centre, Monograph No.

32. Canberra: Australian National University.

1994 *Masters and Managers: A Study in Gender Relations in Urban Java*. New South Wales, Australia: Allen and Unwin.

Swyngedouw, Erik. A.

1992 Territorial Organization and the Space/Technology Nexus. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series*, 17(4):417-433.

Thompson, Eric

2006 Rural Villages as Socially Urban Spaces in Malaysia. *In Globalisation and the Politics of Forgetting*. Yong-Sook Lee and Brenda S.A. Yeoh, eds. Pp. 63-82. New York: Routledge

Van Niel, Robert

1979 From Netherlands East Indies to Republic of Indonesia, 1900-1945. *In The Development of Indonesian Society: From the Coming of Islam to the Present Day*. Harry Aveling, ed. Australia: University of Queensland Press.

Wacquant, Loic

2001 Deadly Symbiosis: When Ghetto and Prison Meet and Mesh. *Punishment and Society* 3(1):95-134.

Williams, Raymond

1977 *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wolf, Diane

1992 *Factory Daughters: Gender, Household Dynamics, and Rural Industrialization in Java*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wolf, Eric

1957 Closed Corporate Communities in Mesoamerica and Java. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 13:1-18.

Wolff, R. and S. Resnick

1987 Power, Property and Class. *Socialist Review* 16(2):97-124.

Notes

1. Ethnographic fieldwork in this neighbourhood was conducted in 1992-3, 1996, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2004, and 2006.
2. Unless otherwise indicated, foreign words included here are in the national language, Bahasa Indonesia, while Javanese words are noted with Jv.
3. The name of this kampung is a pseudonym.
4. *Anak angkat* (literally lifted child) refers to a pattern of informal fosterage that moves children between households based on differences in relative prosperity and numbers of children in a household. Often such children are shared between kin-related households.
5. The Daerah Istimewah Yogyakarta (DIY) is considered a province, although it is smaller in size than many.
6. The ten important programs of PKK include: 1) comprehension and practical application of Pancasila (the national ideology); 2) mutual self help; 3) food; 4) clothing; 5) housing and home economics; 6) education and craft skills; 7) health; 8) development of cooperatives; 9) protection and conservation of the environment; 10) health planning (read as family planning).