Abstract Lefebvre (1974), Bhabha (1994) and Soja (1996), classified the condition of urban marginality as a Third Space, which is an expression of ambivalent reality of urban wealth in a city. Marginality in urban setting is represented through urban slum, a phenomenon that is usually driven by poverty and the unregulated occupation of urban space, which most cities in the Eastern face. The paper will compare approaches of First and Second Space related to the creation of Third Space, especially the notion of the Third Space through the inner-city village of 'Kampung Kota' in Surabaya. It is neither a real slum nor is it a really poor area; the houses are permanently built, and have legal ownership or tenant documents. Yet,
although located in the center of Surabaya it has the social condition of a combination between urban and rural, hence alluding to the notion of hybridization of social, as characterized by the Third Space. While the existence of ‘Kampung Kota’ brings benefits to the city (it is the home of services industry workers mostly working in the central city area) it is also under constant threat as the location has high land value leading to ongoing negotiations and insecurity for the residents. The paper also explores threats of and possible prospects of ‘Kampung Kota’. Keywords: third space, kampung, post-colonial, marginality

Introduction

Marginality in the Third World in urban setting usually associated with condition of slum, informal and poor (Lim 2008). The current condition of ‘Kampung Kota’ in Indonesia is strikingly different to slum area. The term of Kampung and Kota are Indonesian words both mean village/rural and urban. The paper use the term 'Kampung Kota' in order to refer to its originality of dialectic that mostly occurred in Indonesian cities; rural and urban. Historically,

*Surabaya city was initiated by many villages or kampung that emerged as one city.*

Since the Dutch colonization, the

*development of the city only focused on the area around and along streets,*

*the grouped kampungs have survived on location inserted among streets in the urban area (Basundoro 2009).*

‘Kampung Kota’ experiences dialectic of social condition, in terms of history, society and spatiality. Theoretical context of understanding ‘Kampung Kota’ is developed through reading of Lefebvre (1974), Bhabha (1994), and Soja (1996) in exploring production of space. Space is understood not only by its physical characters, but also in terms of time and society as powers in creating the space. Term of ‘Third Space’; or sometimes refer to as ‘Other’, reflects the condition between, or compilation of, the First and Second space: the Western and the Eastern world, the Colonial and Post-Colonial paradigm, and also urban and rural social condition. The paper explores the condition of ‘Kampung Kota’ in Surabaya based on Triad Spatial Concept of Lefebvre and Soja: historically, socially and spatially. The approach also compares the first and the second space condition of the case study, in order to define the unique characters of ‘Kampung Kota’. The significance of the study is to highlight the difference in exploring urban phenomena in the Eastern and Western world. The

*current approach to urban design and planning in Eastern cities mostly comes from Western ways of thinking,*

that brings destruction to the existence of ‘Kampung Kota’ since the Western (classical) approach does not
recognize the urban marginality. Space Production As background theory of space production in this paper, I compare three positions of 'Third Space' based on three authors: Henri Lefebvre in 1974, Homi Bhabha in 1994, and Edward Soja in 1996. Bhabha and Soja clearly mention the term of Third Space, while Lefebvre gave a concept of spatiality positions which includes the character of third space. The three authors focused on space as product of social and cultural action. Lefebvre developed a philosophy of space as social production based on power and practical capabilities (such as religion and politics), while Soja focused on a triad of human sensibility (history, social, spatial). Bhabha highlighted subject positions in terms of cultural identity as a starting point to distinguish colonized and post-colonial approach. The three authors define Third Space in regard to position of cultural identity as determining concept of marginality. Space is understood

not only by its physical characteristics, but way beyond it is time and

society as powers

in creating the space (Soja 1996). The space, or the social space, is not identical and is a process (Lefebvre 1974), and made by society

with their own cultures of multiple elements, histories and subject

position (Bhabha 1994). The space, or in this case is urban space, should be understood as a product of society and history, moreover for 'Kampung Kota' with high dialectic of Modernization and Traditional social life (Harjoko 2009). The power of history, society and culture place a major factor in creating space of 'Kampung Kota' (Cote 2011). Term of 'Third Space' or 'Other' reflects the condition between or compilation of the First and Second space: the Western and the Eastern world, the Colonial and Post-Colonial. Specific characters of the Eastern city give different meaning in reading urban space to the Western city, mainly because of the difference of history and society. A post-colonial city is a spatial product of a civilizing mission representing violence of colonization (Hernandez 2010), which is characterized by its plural society in terms of racial, cultural, and religious (Yeoh 2003). Bhabha (Hernandez 2010) and Yeoh (2003) highlighted the dialectic in reading space and architecture, while Soja (1996) did not focus on the dialectic, but more on the three sides of human sensibility to read a space: space, history and society; or the first, the second and the third. Contemporary issues of urbanism also give different cultural character to the Western and Eastern city, particularly issues of industrialization and urbanization. Characters of the Third Space To understand the notion of Third Space, especially its characters, it is important to define the position based on spatial concept of the first and second space. The figure below compares characters of the First and the Second Space that divides into four categorization: Dialectic Context, Built Form and Space Character, Process of Industrialization, and, Society and Culture. The categorization is developed mainly from grouping of similar characters mentioned by authors discussed Space Production in Post-Colonial paradigm. There is a contrast of both views, and position of creating the Third Space (Figure 4-1). The Third Space is understood by two approaches: in between the two other spaces (Hernandez 2010), and the new possibility of approaching space production that is sometimes both similar or strikingly different (Soja 1996, Lefebvre 1974). It can be seen that the second position includes the first position's approach. The second approach represented in the table in grey area, is Lefebvre's and Soja's theory known as 'Triad Conceptual Space'.
The concept is connecting three conceptual spaces: physical/perceived space – mental/conceived space – social/space of representation, or first-second-third space. In understanding the case study of Surabaya, both approaches will be used because the way to understand the case study should be in free of rigid division of views. In other words, it always keeps the view open. Figure 4-1: The Third Space Position (Source: books interpretation by author) The detailed character of each position referring to the Triad Conceptual Space of Lefebvre and Soja is explained in the figure below. The Third Space is a new possibility to understand and analyze space, according to its spatiality, history and society. The three dimensions will give new insights and unveil the real meaning of spatiality. Lefebvre and Soja give emphasis to the study of marginality, in terms of social product. This is a case study of 'Kampung Kota' in its marginal position in Surabaya city, socially and culturally. In tracing its character, it is important to observe spatial functions in the area in terms of everyday life (first space) and the official plan of the area (second space) in order to understand the social symbols of the area as interpreted by the inhabitants (third space). The paper tries to explore the Third Space character of 'Kampung Kota' in Surabaya city based on the two figures (Figure 4-2) Figure 4-2: The Triad Conceptual Space (Source: Lefebvre’s and Soja’s book interpretation by author) The Case Study: 'Kampung Kota' in Surabaya According to Kresno Murti (2011),

colonization there was a program named 'Kampung Verbetering' which referred to kampung improvement. This paper use the term 'Kampung Kota' in order to refer to its originality in current rural-urban dialectic that occurred in most Indonesian cities. Indonesia is an archipelago country that covers thousands of ethnicities and traditional villages (kampung). Historically, social practices in traditional villages are the main generator in changing society and living space, represented through conditions and relationships of human individuals or groups (Harjoko 2009). Villages emerged to create the city, which was usually under the control of specific social practices, such as a kingdom, in order to strengthen the economic power of the area and empower the kingdom (Handinoto 1996). Figure 4-3: Position and Map of Surabaya (Source: the author interpretation and http://maps.google.com) Surabaya is the second biggest city in Indonesia, with a population of 2,765,908, size of 374.78 km2, and density of 7,400/km2, based on the 2010 census (Figure 4-3).

Surabaya city is more than 700 years old. Villages that were located near the Kalimas River were the originals of the city, which became bigger and bigger supported by Dutch colonization. In the colonization era,

Surabaya became strong in the maritime and business sectors as the
and vice versa (Handinoto 1996). Nowadays, after more than 700 years, the existence of the villages, which is represented by 'Kampung Kota', gives significant meaning to the city, culturally and economically. 'Kampung Kota' are located scattered in and around the central city. There are numbers of 'Kampung Kota' in Surabaya, with some of the names referring to specific ethnicity, jobs, and natural character (Basundoro 2012a), as seen in the map below. In the Dutch era, clustering settlements based on ethnicity was one of town planning strategy to control the city, and kampungs was settlements for indigenous people (Basundoro 2009). The current inhabitants of the 'Kampung Kota', besides the original people, are migrant people who work in the central city and have less support in affording formal houses on the periphery (Pieters 2011). The map below also shows the scattered locations of 'Kampung Kota' inserted in the central city. Figure 4-4: Location of Kampung Kota in Surabaya City Centre (Source: the author interpretation and http://maps.google.com) 'Kampung Kota' as Third Space in Surabaya city In the dialectic of the world context (referring to Figure 4-1), understanding and reading cities in the Eastern world is under the umbrella of the Post-Colonial paradigm. Bhabha (1994) stated that understanding the social worlds is always ambivalent: no entity is pure and the diversity increases. Learning about marginality in 'Kampung Kota', should be related to the past (as pedagogical learning) and to the current condition (as performative learning). The phenomenon of 'Kampung Kota' always relates the history, the dynamic growth and the social life of the city (Cote 2011). 'Kampung Kota' was the embryo of the city (Figure 4-4 and 4-5), and has now become the main location of city worker’s housing because of the accessibility and relatively cheap houses/rooms to be rented. Figure 4-5: Photos of Old and current 'Kampung Kota' (Source: http://www3.petra.ac.id/surabaya-memory and Basundoro, 2009) In some ways, the position of 'Kampung Kota' in terms of the built form and the space character is similar to informal cities, commonly known as slum areas. On the other hand, the formality and legal ownership of properties in 'Kampung Kota' differs from the character of the slum. Most of the houses in 'Kampung Kota' Surabaya have legal documents of ownership (Pieters 2011). Therefore, its position in between the first and the second space becomes clear and reasonable. According to the Surabaya Master Plan 2010, the location of some of 'Kampung Kota' will be changed from residential use to commercial use, and will become vertical social housing (see map below). It makes the position of 'Kampung Kota' formal, abstract, and ordered, as the first space. In some parts of 'Kampung Kota', especially along the paths re-constructed by the local government, the housing typography and structure become formal and are brought under formal housing regulation. Most houses have legal documents of ownership, while some houses that are located off the main street (only narrow alleys between buildings) only have legal rights to occupy the land for a particular period of time (usually ten years). Hence in the first space position, the location is under the control of the government planning strategy, which includes rights to have clean water and sanitation access. Figure 4-6: Surabaya City Plan (Source: RDTRK Tunjungan, 2008, Pemkot Surabaya and the author interpretation) In the second space position, (Figure 4-6 and 4-7) 'Kampung Kota' identifies the built form and the space character as ‘smooth’, ‘kinetic’ (Mehrotra 2010) and ‘shapeless’ (Hernandez and Kellet 2010). The three characters define the built form and the space that are no-regulation of building codes; the shape/form follows the function, and there is no static performance or uniformity. The houses, public buildings and commercial buildings in this area have been developed following the needs of the users, or precisely the society. Some pictures below shows the second space character of 'Kampung Kota' in Surabaya: the smoothness and shapeless-ness is represented through its mixed use of space occupation and also through its physical performance of the buildings and narrow alleys. Some of 'Kampung Kota' in Surabaya is far from slum and dirty condition since the government in the 1970s started a program named Kampung Improvement Program (KIP). The
program provides kampung to clean water, sanitation and other source (such as electricity and telecommunication). Even though the public works approach is not related to the economic and employment opportunities to the society (Harjoko 2009), from this point, we can see that the society has same rights and access to the primarily basic needs of any society in the city. Figure 4-7: Photos of ‘Kampung Kota’ in Surabaya (Source: the author documentation and http://www.journeymart.com/de/indonesia/surabaya.aspx) Related to the process of industrialization, there are two conditions in industrialization era. The conditions are in terms of the product focus and the era of industrialization: money/ commerce is products of the medieval/ modern era (after the industrialization), and works of arts is product of the oriental/ antique era (before the industrialization) (Lefebvre 1996). Recently in ‘Kampung Kota’, there is a shift of social conditions: from society that were focus on non-material, such as togetherness, kinship and family ties, to society that put money and commerce as the priority. For example in people deciding house/ space for rent (rooming houses), now the owner considers the price based on market price on the location (Pieters 2011). Before, personal and social relationships are the most important factor to be considered. Another example is the houses along the main path, designated with high privacy of security. It is shown by high fences and closed gates. It shows that community bond is not giving a sense of security, and an increasing-needs to protect their properties (Pieters 2011) (Figure 4- 8). Figure 4-8: Photos of 'Kampung Kota' in Surabaya showing the real condition of security and privacy. (Source: the author documentation) ‘Cityness’ is a term to express another reading of 'Kampung Kota' (Simone 2010). The term refers to ‘the process’ rather than to ‘the product/ city’, which are a social processes of people and activity to survive in the area. Lefebvre (1996) prefers to use words ‘in-habit’ rather than ‘habitat’ to express the same meaning as Simone’s. Reading ‘Kampung Kota’ in terms of society and culture, should be focused on the people’s process in creating the space/ place in order to survive because of its marginality character (Colombijn and Cote 2011). The culture and the society in 'Kampung Kota' is similar to condition in rural areas, where people have strong sense of the natural environment and always gives interpretation of the environment related to their belief to higher power (Padovan 1999). In the case study, the ties among inhabitants are quite strong, people in the neighborhood knows each other and like to share food and offers helps to their neighbors. The social activity that occurs in the public space is very common, and everyone will give his/ her private space freely to the activity. Prospects and Threats of ‘Kampung Kota’ To define prospects and threats of ‘Kampung Kota’ in Surabaya for the future, it is important to explore current benefits and losses of this phenomenon. The dialectic characters most of times in every country bring both benefits and losses to the society and the local government, like both sides of a coin. The position of reading 'Kampung Kota' is crucial in defining the position of benefit or loss: in some points it is benefit for the society and loss for the government, and it will be different from different view. The paper stands on the position of Lefebvre’s and Soja’s Triad Spatial Concept, as the best position to understand the meaning of 'Kampung Kota'. Historically, 'Kampung Kota' is an important factor in developing the city; it is an origin of the city. Further development of the city is more like ‘star shaped’ development (only focused on the area around and along major streets), therefore the location of 'Kampung Kota' is inserted in the middle of highly development area. For many years, 'Kampung Kota' is out of the government strategy but since the KIP program in 1970s; the area became cleaner and accessed by basic housing services. Furthermore, the current local government (the Mayor) has attention to empower the society through activities in increasing the environmental quality (Figure 4-9). Based on the city’s history, 'Kampung Kota' has a significant position to be preserved and has a good prospect to be developed as a location of city’s identity. Figure 4-9: Photos of 'Kampung Kota' in Surabaya (Source: http://unilevergreenandclean.co.id/en.php/news/read/5/0/1/surabaya) On the other hands, the economic capitalist power of the city let the more power of urban areas slowly evict out the less power in the central city, or move out from the most valuable area in the city (Lim 2008). The inhabitants of some 'Kampung
Kampung Kota' sooner become less and less of original people that experienced the social value of the area; it is changed to migrant people who more concern to the economic value of the area (Basundoro 2012b, Pieters 2011). The migrant people in some points less cares about the social meaning and ties among the inhabitants. Hence, threat to 'Kampung Kota' in terms of culture comes from inside the inhabitant, when they cannot preserve and maintain the unique value of 'Kampung Kota', which is culture and social role. For most low-income workers in Surabaya, ‘Kampung Kota’ is the most affordable area to live; cheap and close, while public transportation is limited and not easily accessible. Based on Basundoro’s study in 2011, ‘Kampung Kota’ is the settlement for most informal sector proprietors in the city, such as street vendor, hawker, and seller in traditional market, and also serviced workers/ labour of malls, offices, hotels, and other works/ pleasures facilities in the central city. And based on Pieters’s study, by 2009 most kampungs contained a new type in the form of rooming houses (rumah kost) since the mall boom in Surabaya. Hence, kampungs is an attractive location for most mall workers, especially young sales promotion girls. The informal economy in most Third World Cities contributes significantly to the city’s economic life, gives benefit not only to the low-income people but also to the higher economic level. The strategic position of ‘Kampung Kota’ making the distribution of informal goods/ service becomes effective and covers almost all area of the city. In this point of view, the existence of ‘Kampung Kota’ is very important to support formal economics consumptions and services (Basundoro 2012b). In the future, it is really depend upon the local government’s position whether to preserve the ‘Kampung Kota’ or diminish it, or more precisely it depends on urban designers and planners’ approach. According to Harjoko (2009), the dual power of modernization and ‘traditional’ culture always in conflicts since planner and urban designers in Indonesia preoccupation the urbanism learnt from Western ways of thinking. The Western ways of thinking put the ‘Kampung Kota’ in unfit position inside the city setting, or out of the place (Simone 2010). Therefore, destruction of ‘Kampung Kota’, in terms on the social role and physical existence, has frequently occurred in many cities in Indonesia. The urgency to consider ‘Kampung Kota’ in planners and urban designers’ view should be framed in the position of Lefebvre and Soja’s Triad Spatial Concept: related to its social, history and society.

Conclusion The best approach to understand the existence of ‘Kampung Kota’ is by applying Lefebvre and Soja’s Triad Spatial Concept. There are some reasons for this: first, the concept is connecting three dimensions of being and space; and second, the concept is free of rigid division of views; while ‘Kampung Kota’ is the Eastern world urban phenomenon that has foundations in dynamic society and culture. It also refers to Indonesian society that has a tendency to feel and sense the environment (nature and built) in an abstract way, reflecting the social rather than physical symbol, mostly in the society that has a unique character of culture and social position (Padovan 1999). Another reason for Triad Spatial Concept application is that the term of ‘Kampung Kota’ reflects the condition of marginality resulting from the ambivalence/ dialectic of urban development and world context. The Triad approach brings us to the conclusion that ‘Kampung Kota’ is in the position of Third Space in the urban setting. The character of ‘Kampung Kota’ in Surabaya is reflected through observation of three different spatial functions: observation of everyday life (first space); study official plan of the area (second space); and exploration of social symbol of the area to the inhabitant (third space). The case study is always in dialectic position: modern - traditional, urban - rural, and, unplanned – planned; whether in terms of culture, social life or building types. The dialectic character brings both prospect and threats to ‘Kampung Kota’ itself. The way of seeing ‘Kampung Kota’ is crucial in defining the position of benefit or loss, net benefit for society and net losses for the government, and vice versa. The role of the urban designers and planners is crucial to preserve ‘Kampung Kota’ have because the dialectic character is always in conflict. The urgency to consider ‘Kampung Kota’ in planner and urban designer’s view should be based on the position of Lefebvre and Soja’s triad spatial concept, in order to protect social meaning and identity. REFERENCES Basundoro, P. 2009, Dua Kota Tiga Zaman: Surabaya dan Malang Sejak Zaman Kolonial Sampai Kemerdekaan (The Two