



International
Indonesia
Forum

2014 Working Paper Series

Volume 2

Cultural Practices and Grass Root Democracy Strengthening:

A Case Study in Two Communities' Collective Recovery

in Indonesia's Post-Disaster Situations

Laila Kholid Alfirdaus

Editors: Christopher A. Woodrich and Frank Dhont

Recommended Citation: Alfirdaus, Laila Kholid. "Cultural Practices and Grass Root Democracy Strengthening: A Case Study in Two Communities' Collective Recovery in Indonesia's Post-Disaster Situations." *International Indonesia Forum, 2014 Working Paper Series 2* (2014).

Cultural Practices and Grass Root Democracy Strengthening: A Case Study in Two Communities' Collective Recovery in Indonesia's Post-Disaster Situations

Laila Kholid Alfirdaus

Government Department, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Diponegoro University,

Semarang, Indonesia

laila-alfirdaus@undip.ac.id

Abstract

The communities' experiences of recovery in Kaliurang, Yogyakarta, following the 2010 Merapi eruption, and Padang, West Sumatra after the 2009 earthquake, have provided us with important lessons for locally driven democracy development. Monthly meetings and discussions, reinforced with the communities' engagement in reconstruction activities in Kaliurang and inter-ethnic collaboration to reactivate the local economy in Padang, provide possible answers to the pessimism regarding the future of peace and democracy in Indonesia. The serawung (socializing), sengkuyung (embracing others) and gotong royong (working collectively) practiced in the daily lives of the community of Kaliurang are seen to not only speed up the recovery processes, but also to contribute to the building of democracy. Similarly, raso pareso (tolerance, self-control and mutual understanding), as applied by the community of Padang, have made the relations between ethnic groups conducive to the speedy recovery of the local economy. Although recovery has not yet been 100% successful, the minimized fragmentation due to the communities' willingness to understand, give and share through the above-mentioned cultural practices is evidence of the prominence of locally developed democracy.

Keywords: Disaster, Recovery, Cultural Practices, Grass-root and Democracy.

Background

This article discusses grass root democracy strengthening through communities' daily practices in the context of collective recovery in post-disaster situations in Indonesia. This paper underlines that community practices in daily life can be an important seed for developing democracy. Collective recovery, in fact, is not only about the government giving economic benefits, such as housing resettlement, home-industry reactivation, and traditional market rejuvenation; indeed, such a view could inhibit local democracy strengthening through the process of deliberations initiated by communities.

The existing discussions on democratization in Asian developing countries generally show skepticism, rather than optimism, given the massive oligarchy, state control, and corruption in these countries. This is in spite of (indeed) the good progress in election

competition, media liberation, and decentralization. Christian von Luebke (2011, p. 6) argues that the strong presence of oligarchy in these countries' political structure, as well as the rampant cases of corruption in the midst of political transition, has become the main causes of stagnancy in the development of democracy. In von Luebke's view, the weak rotation of executives in the government offices following *reformasi* in 1998, in addition to the dominance of a few elites in parliamentary bodies, contributes to the stunting of democracy development in Indonesia. This implies, for instance, that law enforcement that is often resisted by the elite, as in the case of Bank Century bailout (von Luebke, 2010, p. 81). In Chaiwat Satha-Anand's view (in Hadiz, 2006, p. 169), authoritarianism in Asian countries is still experiencing positive growth, under the guise of democracy, as the remaining practices indicate state oppression by elected governments.

Two opposing views that are still relevant for the discussion of democracy development in Indonesia are offered by Benda and Faith.¹ Benda indicates that the difficulty of democracy development in Indonesia derives from the fact that Indonesia does not have a culture of democracy. Benda refers to Indonesian culture as "very Asian", featuring communalism, feudalism and a hierarchy, none of which match the principle values of democracy – equality, transparency and participation. Many scholars that do not agree with Benda, one of whom is Faith, who argues that it is not a matter of culture that explains democracy's difficulty in developing in Indonesia. Rather, he believes that the lack of education is the explanation. Optimistically, Faith expresses the belief that better education will advance the development of democracy in Indonesia.

As such, we must ask a crucial question: what is Indonesia's potential for developing democracy? This paper was written to answer that question. From fieldwork in two disaster zones in Indonesia, namely Kaliurang, Yogyakarta, and Padang, West Sumatra, this paper argues that community daily life practices of collective recovery entail, at the grass root level, an important seed for public deliberation that is crucial for democracy development. Utilizing local culture and its values of tolerance, mutual understanding, and mutual sharing, communities are involved in the process of public deliberation, participation, and social transformation – all of which are crucial in democracy strengthening. In Kaliurang, *serawung* (socializing), *sengkuyung* (embracing others) and *gotong royong* (working collectively) have become the keys for community disaster governance. In Padang, *raso pareso* (tolerance, self-

¹ In a discussion of "Sejarah Sosial Politik Indonesia [Indonesian Social and Political History]" course with Cornelis Lay and Amalinda Savirani, Politics and Government Department, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta, 2000.

control, and mutual understanding) has led the people to be more welcoming of others (particularly the ethnic Chinese), and to collaborate with others in rejuvenating the local economy through traditional markets following the 2009 earthquake. This has extended to other aspects of life, and thus community collaborations are not only crucial for reactivating the local economy, but more importantly for lowering the possibility of social friction due to ethnic (and religious) differences.

Fieldwork was completed in two areas. It was conducted in Kaliurang, Yogyakarta, between October 2013 and January 2014, several years after the 2010 eruptions of Mount Merapi, and in Padang, West Sumatra, between October and December 2013. Kaliurang is the name of a region near Merapi volcano which consists of several villages. The villages (*desa*) and sub-villages (*dusun*) visited during fieldwork were Palemsari, Glagahsari, and Panguk, all of which were in Cangkringan sub-district. During the course of this fieldwork 23 people living in those villages (and sub-villages) were interviewed. This included a mixture of respondents, including those severely and less severely affected; men and women; lay people and village leaders; Muslims and non-Muslims; and young and old. In Padang, field research was conducted in two large traditional markets, namely Pasar Raya and Pasar Tanah Kongsu. These markets were chosen because they are where people from different racial and religious background meet and interact. In order to gain further insight, the researcher also visited sites such as the Chinese *Kampung*, Catholic School, *kongsu* office, and media office. About 30 people were interviewed, consisting of persons of Minang, Chinese and Javanese heritage; *Kongsu* leaders; academics; legislature members of Chinese ethnicity; school teachers; high school students; and journalists. This sampling also took into consideration the positions of men and women; young and old; and rich and poor.

The Social Characteristics of Kaliurang and Padang Community

The Kaliurang region includes three sub-districts (*kecamatan*): Pakem, Cangkringan and Turi, in which some villages are quite near the volcano's peak. Such villages are located in the areas most prone to damage from eruptions.¹ In Pakem sub-district, such villages include Purwobinangun (consisting of *Dusun* Turgo, Kemiri, and Ngepring) and Hargobinangun (consisting of *Dusun* Kaliurang Barat, Boyong, Kaliurang Timur, and Ngipiksari); their populations are 8,579 and 8,289, respectively (2010). In 2011, Pakem's total population was found to be 38,361. Villages in Cangkringan sub-district that are very close to the volcano include Umbulharjo (consisting of *Dusun* Kinahrejo, Pangukrejo and Gondang), Kepuharjo (consisting of *Dusun* Kaliadem, Petung, Jambu, and Kopeng), and

Glagaharjo (consisting of *Dusun* Kali Tengah Lor, Kali Tengah Kidul, Srunen, and Singlar). The total population in Cangkringan sub-district is 33,162 (2011). Meanwhile, in Turi sub-district, villages that fall into the risk zone include Wonokerto and Girikerto (consisting of *Dusun* Ngandong, Tritis, and Ngangring), with populations of 8,904 and 7,712 respectively in 2010. The total population of Turi in 2011 is 40,183.

Most of people in these villages are farmers or raise cattle. The people of Kaliurang are known as some of the best producers of cow milk. However, since the 2010 eruptions of Merapi, the productivity of farming and cattle raising has not been optimally restored. Areas used for farming and cattle raising were mostly destroyed during the eruptions; little remained afterwards. Presently, some people have been earning a living by entering new professions, working in local disaster tourism as jeep or *ojek* (motorcycle) drivers, while they await the reactivation of the agriculture and cattle production sectors. Vegetable farming, home industries, and logging are have also been developed.

Living for centuries as farmers has led the community to have close relations with one another. As with many rural Javanese in Yogyakarta (and other regions of Java), the people of Kaliurang are highly attached to their neighbors. Collectiveness is an important form of social relations (1994), especially in times of crisis (Durkheim 1984: 77). Referring to Tönnies, (2001) the people of Kaliurang can be said to be *gemeinschaft*, with relatively personal and intimate relations. That these people are, ethnically, mostly Javanese, and are unified by Javanese traditions such as *selamatan* (offerings for peace and grace seeking) and *nyadran* (praying for dead family members), exemplifies the *gemeinschaft* type of society. These rituals require collectivity. As Durkheim argues, the tradition that binds people in these rituals, a sort of collective activity, has firmly established solidarity between the members of society. Their Islamic faith is another important aspect of this society, although they keep their Javanese traditions which are sometimes contradictory to aspects of Islamic teaching. Religious and village leaders are equally important in the community's social life, because they run everyday practices of rituals and village governance, both of which are inseparable from the villagers' lives.

Meanwhile, Padang district consists of 11 sub-districts, namely Bungus Teluk Kabung, Lubuk Kilangan, Lubuk Begalung, Padang Selatan, Padang Timur, Padang Barat, Padang Utara, Nanggalo, Kuranji, Pauh, and Kototengah, with a total population of 819,740

(2006); up to 3% of them are Chinese.² Most of Chinese community resides in Padang Barat, Padang Selatan and Padang Timur, all of which are quite close to the coastal areas, and appear to be the most plural areas in Padang.² The focus of this research is on these areas, where the most interactions between the ethnic Chinese and Minang occur. Unlike the Kaliurang community, in which farming is the dominant source of income, in Padang, especially in Pondok (a name for the Chinese residential area, including some of the areas of Padang Barat, Padang Selatan and Padang Timur), the most common occupation is trade. It can be said that Pondok is the shopping center of Padang, consisting of small, medium and large scale shops. Consequently, it contributes most to the running of local economy of Padang.

Padang itself is identified with the Minang (a shorter form of Minangkabau, referring to both the ethnic group and culture). Although Padang is an urban area, its population is still deeply attached to Minang culture and tradition, which are boldly identified as matrilineal and Muslim. It seems to be a commonly held rule that, to be a Minang, one must also to be a Muslim. Converting to Christianity or another non-Islamic religion will lead a person to no longer be recognized as Minang. In spite of the transformation of the Minang family form from an extended one to a nuclear one, familial bonding in Padang—and other areas in West Sumatran—is still strong. Therefore, determining Padang to be simply *gemeinschaft* or *gesselschaft* (Tönnies 2001), as we have done with the community of Kaliurang, is not easy. Although Minang culture does not put as much emphasis on collectiveness as Javanese culture, it also places religion, and within it the idea of identity sharing and collectiveness, in a place of honor.

In addition, referring to Durkheim's idea of organic solidarity (1994), social relations in Padang have become need-driven, so that interest plays a crucial role. In this sense, having relations with others must have a purpose or rationality. Unlike in the Javanese community, social relations are not for the sake of collectiveness itself – including with the closest neighbors in their *kampung*. Social relations should bring advantages, be it for material wealth, knowledge, skills, etc.³ Therefore, it should not be a surprise if we find that the Minang having close trading relations with the Chinese, although both live separately in different residential areas, and (more importantly) embrace different religions, something that is very important in Minang social life. Although the ethnic Chinese have lived in Padang

² Formal data on the size of the Chinese population is not available. This data provided here is based on the number of registered members in the two *kongsi*. An interview with Gani, a prominent Chinese figure, in May 2014 in Padang reveals that a single *kongsi* may have about 10,000 members.

since the colonial era, religious differences continue to play a role, creating a strong wall between the two. Interestingly, this distance does not apply to the world of trade.

Post-Disaster Recovery in Kaliurang and Padang Communities

Yogyakarta and Padang face different disaster risks. Yogyakarta is prone to eruptions of Mount Merapi, storms, and earthquakes, whereas Padang is prone to earthquakes and tsunamis. The ways in which communities deal with the impact of these disasters are also different, given their different social characteristics. While the role of neighbors is of primary importance in Yogyakarta, in Padang, individuals and family take the greatest role in recovery (aside from the government). The subchapter below briefly discusses the 2010 Merapi eruptions in Kaliurang, the 2009 earthquake in Padang, and the community recovery efforts in response to these disasters.

In Kaliurang, the most threatening disasters are eruptions of Mount Merapi, which generally occur at least once every four years. Merapi is located on the border of Central Java and Yogyakarta Provinces, spanning four districts in the provinces (Magelang, Klaten and Boyolali in Central Java and Sleman in Yogyakarta). It has erupted numerous times, including in 1872, 1994, 2006, 2010, 2012, and 2013. Amongst these, the 2010 eruption has been the biggest, causing the most significant losses in society. The 2010 eruption occurred between 26 October and 6 November, leading to a death toll of 353; around 400,000 people in both Yogyakarta and Central Java Provinces were evacuated. Pre-eruption activity had started by September 2010, and post-eruption volcanic activity remained until late November 2010. Less intensive lahar followed until several months afterward.

In Padang, intense earthquakes occur commonly, and have a significant effect on the city's population, in part because the centers of economy and government are situated in areas to which earthquakes pose a greater risk. Frequent earthquakes, as occurred in 2002, 2007, 2009, and 2010, have forced the local government to move its center to the higher grounds surrounding Bukit Limau Manis. The 2009 earthquake caused 383 deaths, and a massive number of destroyed buildings. It can be said that the political climate during the emergency period was heated, triggered by the issue of discrimination against the ethnic Chinese, who were affected most by the earthquake. The issue further stressed the already difficult relations between the Minang and Chinese. Generally, dissatisfaction was mainly addressed to the government, which moved very slowly despite the large amount of money available for post-disaster recovery. Nevertheless, discrimination was not the only face of Padang after the 2009 earthquake. In some sites, different ethnic communities were involved

in collaboration and sharing, showing optimism for future peace in Padang. The remainder of this chapter briefly describes the emergency and recovery phases in Kaliurang and Padang, following the 2010 Merapi eruption and 2009 earthquake, respectively.

Emergency (up to 3 months following the disaster). In Kaliurang, during the emergency phase, neighbors played crucial roles (together with family members) in saving people. Actions by neighbors were usually spontaneous. When people fled their homes, some offered space for others in their vehicles, letting them know that their fellow neighbors still cared about them.⁴ In addition to spontaneous action, there was also organized action, especially involving *dusun* members. The young men in the *dusun* cooperated to carry women, the elderly, and children to shelter from their dangerous homes. Those young men cooperated with their neighbors who owned cars, or military officers, in order to provide vehicles for mobilizing the residents.⁵

Meanwhile, in Padang, individuals and members of the nuclear family were crucial during the emergency situation. Community members focused on their own families. NGOs, student volunteers, religious organizations, humanitarian organizations, and cultural groups played crucial roles during the recovery phase, providing food, clothes, medicine, and assistance for cleaning up the ruined buildings. Chinese organizations (*kongsi*) were among those with the largest role in helping people survive the difficult period after the earthquake. Regarding this, Bayu, a Minang man, said, “Not only homes... people also lost jobs. The most difficult thing is losing hope. Women whose husbands worked as tailors in traditional markets feel it hard, there is no income for the destroyed stalls. The government’s aid is only Bulog rice, which is not good for consumption. The earthquake only caused further complexities.”⁶

First phase of recovery (up to a year after disaster). During the first year after the eruption, most residents of Kaliurang stayed in shelters, either those provided by the government, religious organizations, or universities. People still relied on the help of the others, for they had neither home nor income to maintain their daily lives. Those who still had houses were busy removing the volcanic ash or fixing destroyed parts of their homes. *Gotong royong* (working collectively) was still rare for these people, who were focusing on their family and cleaning their homes. Within three or four months, those with less damaged houses could start a “normal” life and run their businesses. Meanwhile, those who no longer had a home stayed at shelters while trying to earn money as *ojek* drivers, small-scale traders, and vegetable farmers. At this phase, both people with damaged and destroyed houses faced hardships in generating income, compared to when they had been active in agriculture and

cattle production. Being an *ojek* driver and earning Rp. 40,000.00 – Rp. 50,000.00 (US\$ 3.5-4.5) a day, for instance, could not make them as prosperous as running a business in agriculture and cattle production. However, with no other choice, many people had to accept this position.

In Padang, people had to make a living with the limited assistance from the government in the midst of destroyed public facilities. The cleaning up and handling of traditional market was very slow, not only in regards to the ruined shops and roads, but also in regards to the dead people within the market. Meanwhile, the community of Padang is highly reliant on traditional markets as a basis of their economy and daily lives. Consequently, the sense of returning to a “normal” life did not develop in this phase. The reconstruction of Pasar Raya has not been completed, even four years after the earthquake. Voluntary activists and religious and humanitarian organizations remained the main actors for helping the people dealing with their hardships. Chinese organizations (*kongsi*) were, again, among the most crucial in helping people provide basic needs.

Second phase of recovery (2 years after the disaster). Entering the second year after the eruption, most people in Kaliurang had already returned to their homes or relocation areas. In this year, people started to reorganize themselves by reactivating the RT (*Rukun Tangga* or neighborhood organizations), *dusun*, and *desa* structures. Monthly meetings began to be held again, allowing them to organize social activities. In addition to individual activities in respective households, people also conducted activities at the community level. Activities at the community level were particularly aimed at fixing such public facilities as bridges, public roads, mosques, meeting houses, and so forth. Gradually, people began to recover.

In Padang, the second year meant the beginning of the reconstruction program. The people of Padang began to get busy forming groups, based on their familial relations, to access financial support from the government to fix their homes. Unfortunately, the Chinese were excluded from government assistance, as they were deemed to be rich enough already that they were not entitled to post-disaster assistance.

Third phase of recovery (3 years after disaster and onwards). Entering the third year of recovery, it seemed that life had begun to become “normal”. People in the shelters started to be relocated in new areas, mainly with assistance from the government. Some community members rejected being relocated and chose to stay on their own land, with the risk of not being given any assistance by the government. Others proposed *bedhol desa* relocation (relocating without significantly changing the composition of population, allowing people to

live with their former neighbors) to the government. Still others just accepted what the government gave them. In this phase, people seemed to become accustomed to their new professions in the tourism sector, either as jeep drivers, *ojek* drivers, tourist guides, or sellers at *warung* (small shops).

In Padang, the third phase of recovery has not yet been reached. The government still carries out its housing reconstruction programs. Traditional markets are still not fixed; rather, the setting of trading stalls is becoming more unorganized, creating traffic jams inside the city. Nevertheless, trading activities have gradually begun to normalize, although growth is not as high as before the earthquake. The number of ethnic Chinese in Padang has decreased, because some have moved to the other cities in Sumatra (i.e., Jambi or Pekanbaru), or Java, (i.e. Jakarta and Bandung) for safety reasons.

Problems in Social Relations during Emergency and Recovery Phases

Kaliurang: Differences Beliefs in Religion and Tradition

Fieldwork indicates that there are three crucial problems in the Kaliurang community, both before and after the eruption. First is the issue of conversion to Christianity. Second is the existence of the Muslim minority wing, MTA. Third is the relationship between the older and younger generation, especially in regards to tradition and religious practices.

Firstly, Christianization has been a contentious issue in Kaliurang since long before the 2010 eruption.⁷ The issue has become more urgent since then, as a church situated in the safe zone near Kaliurang provided shelter to Merapi survivors.⁸ In the city center, Duta Wacana Christian University (Universitas Kristen Duta Wacana; UKDW) also provided shelter and staple foods for the survivors. During the first year of recovery, Christian organizations were also very active in assisting the Kaliurang residents with staple foods, medicine, and clothing. This eventually led to hardline Muslims from Yogyakarta alleging that the church was trying to persuade the Merapi survivors to convert to Christianity from Islam through material temptation. Muslims who sought shelter in church were intimidated and forced to leave by these hardliners. As such, the situation during the first days of the emergency phase was full of tensions.

Responding to this, some respondents argue that the allegation is clearly not true. Some respondents being placed in UKDW, for instance, state that the university provided better place for temporary stay.⁹ The rooms were clean, the toilets were clean, the water supply was sufficient, medical needs were well provided, and students were available there to assist the IDPs.¹⁰ Similarly, those who stayed at the Banteng church considered it a decent

place to live, at least compared to the sport stadium in Meguwa, the neighboring sub-district of Pakem and Cangkringan, which was provided by the government. However, most importantly, these respondents testify that in these places they were free to conduct their 5 daily prayers, as usual for Muslims. They were allowed to use water for *wudlu* (cleaning the body with water before praying), and use rooms for praying.

Ny. Sulistiyo said, “Finally, we stayed at Duta Wacana (Christian University), with Bethesda Hospital to the south. We were in groups there. I got some assistance, from Duta Wacana, I mean. It consisted of cooking oil, rice, bread, and so forth. While staying there, I, as a Muslim, was free to conduct *shalat* (daily prayers). Those who wanted to pray in the mosque or in the church were fine. A colleague even gave me prayer clothes because I did not bring any. Alhamdulillah...”¹¹ Regarding this, Marwan said, “I stayed at, what is called? (asks her female colleague, who is collecting for grass in front of her), Banteng Baru. It is Banteng Baru Church. In the church, we used to use a room for *shalat*.”¹² Marwan added, “It is odd to say that we were forced or persuaded to convert to Catholicism. How could people tempt us to embrace Catholicism while at the same time providing us with a room for *shalat* in the church during our stay there?”¹³

Another crucial problem is the potential friction between Muslim members of the community, involving the majority and dominating wings versus the minority one, namely NU and Muhammadiyah versus MTA. This issue arose just after the community began settling down after the 2010 eruption. NU and Muhammadiyah’s relations are not free from problems, but with the introduction of MTA in the Muslim community, tensions became higher than before. This is because MTA members refused to attend neighbors’ invitations for *tahlilan* and *yasinan* (Qur’anic studies and recital). Suhadi said, “Members of society, from wherever they are, are invited. However, MTA members are not, because they do not want to attend *yasinan*.”¹⁴ The MTA members argue that such praying methods are forbidden by their teachings, because they are not based on prophet Mohamad’s teaching through *hadits* and God’s instruction in the Qur’an.

Although the root of these tensions is religion, issues later expanded to social relations. As a *gemeinschaft* society, non-participation in community activities is not recommended. This makes social relations more difficult, including when the community used *gotong royong* (working collectively) to fix public facilities after the eruption. Sutarno said, “(About MTA) ... Not long time ago... and this is not a rumor. There was a person that made our social life a bit worrisome, I said worrisome. He, how do you say, used to attend *yasinan* or *tahlilan* we conducted, as our tradition in *kampong* (neighborhood environment),

before he embraced MTA. However, after he joined MTA, he refused to participate in (such activities). He argued that these activities are against their faith. He said that the practices (of *yasinan* and *tahlilan*) are (triggered) by evil.”¹⁵ Sutarno added, “And, then... When his family member died, it was only his religious group that were allowed to deal with (the matter). However, neighbors kept coming. It is because, we, as neighbors, felt responsible. So, we kept, kept, kept coming, and if were allowed, we would have dealt with the matters related to commemoration. Nevertheless, as he had his “own group”, and didn’t acknowledge us as citizens of this *kampung*, he let his group come. There were so many people there, handling the commemoration. So, we stepped back, let that group handle it. He does not come, nor does he invite us—his neighbors—for *tahlilan*, as he refuses to do so based on his beliefs.”¹⁶

Finally, tension is also present between the younger and older generation, especially in regards to the everyday practice of rituals that are rooted in Javanese tradition. This includes, for instance, the practices of *nyadran* and *selametan*. *Nyadran* is an activity before and during Ramadhan (the Islamic month of fasting) to send prayers to dead family members, but it usually also followed by offerings and food distribution. Meanwhile, *selametan* is a ritual to seek God’s blessings, either as an expression of gratitude to God, or a prayer for God to grant salvation. Wuriyanti said, “Tensions between the older and younger generations remain strong. You know, it is difficult. The older men often persuade the younger men to attend *kenduri* (*selametan*). If there are ten members of the community, they want those ten people attending. Despite disagreements, the younger men ultimately came to respect to the older ones. But, they came with different intentions. It is because they know that in their religion, *kenduri* is not compulsory. There are many *kenduri* here. There are four during Ramadhan. Yesterday, we just attended a *kenduri* for commemorating (the birth of) a cow.”¹⁷

In the context of recovery phases, religious activities such as *kenduri* or *selametan* are inseparable from the daily lives of the Kaliurang community. They pray for those who were killed by the eruption, and also ask for grace and salvation for those who God allowed to remain alive through the eruption and afterwards. Both *nyadran* and *selametan* require the participation of a number of people, and therefore the rituals are collective in the nature. The problem between the relationship between the younger and older generation stems from their different perceptions about the practices of *nyadran*, *kenduri* and *selametan*. The older generation feels that it is still very important, while the younger one feels that it is not relevant to the people’s needs. First, it takes a lot of money and time. Second, it is thought to be *syirik* (a betrayal of God). Although the tensions have not yet cleared, the practices continue even today.

Padang: Discrimination against Ethnic Chinese

Unlike in Kaliurang, in which the issue of Christianization is strong, in Padang it is the issue of discrimination against the ethnic Chinese which was evident during the emergency period. At first, discrimination against the ethnic Chinese in Padang after the September 2009 earthquake was thought to be a mere rumor. A text message, as reported by *Jawa Pos* on 5 October 2009, spread widely. It said, “Tell the world, stop the donations to West Sumatra!!! Primordialism and racism are happening there. The Chinese people are not allowed to have food, and were forced to buy food aid. My family was there!!! Please send this message to the world so they know the truth!!!” Media responses to the issue were massive, and as such it became the concern of the local government. A Dutch radio station broadcasted its interview with Rina, a female Chinese resident who said, “We are safe, but our house is destroyed. It needs major reconstruction, because it is no longer safe to stay there. However, until now there no assistance has been distributed. They (the government) evacuated (the victims), but outside the Chinatown area, like those in surrounding companies (and hotels). (Meanwhile), people were killed within the (Chinese residential) area, but they did not get any help.”¹⁸

Things became more complicated after the government officers gave a reactionary statement instead of responsive action. Sudarto, an NGO activist, stated that Fauzi Bahar expressed disappointment towards the Chinese, for the government felt that it had already helped the Chinese by evacuating the victims found in Ambacang Hotel and helping Yayasan Prayoga (a Catholic school foundation). However, although the hotel owner is ethnic Chinese, most of the victims were Minang. Meanwhile, those who were trapped under the ruined houses in Pondok were left unassisted. In addition, although Yayasan Prayoga is Catholic-based, it is not affiliated with the Chinese. Therefore, it is inappropriate for the government to claim it assisted the Chinese, while it actually did nothing.¹⁹ Corroborating Sudarto’s testimony, Amir, editor in chief of the online newspaper *Padang Today*, said that the government has not fulfillid its mission to resolve tensions which arose between different ethnic groups during the emergency. Rather, they became part of the problem.²⁰

To make things worse, government officials used apparent acts of assistance for the ethnic Chinese as political capital. Elisa, a Chinese student, said, “Fauzi Bahar is just too much. Why did he have to act like that, carrying a sack of rice in his back in Pondok, and have it broadcasted by TV stations? For me, it is just exaggerating. Honestly, there was no aid to assist the people of Pondok.”²¹ Regarding this, Veridiana added, “I was informed that

there was no government assistance at all. Once more, the government assumes that the ethnic Chinese will work by themselves to get everything done.”²² Bayu clarifies this, saying that the conditions in Pecinan were severe, yet the residents of Pondok did not receive any help because they were considered to already be rich enough. Many Chinese were wounded and trapped in collapsed homes, but left unassisted. This has been a sensitive issue in the city.²³

Reinforcing Bayu’s statement, M. Nur, a male Chinese juice seller, said that the government assumed that the ethnic Chinese are already rich. This led the government to be insensitive towards the complexities in the Chinese neighborhoods.²⁴ There were thousands of Chinese residents that needed help, including M. Nur; while he sells fruit juice from a cart, his neighbor sells cold sugarcane juice.²⁵ Similarly, Albert said that the Chinese are like other Indonesians. Some are rich, but many are poor.²⁶ Albert gives several examples, noting that there are ethnic Chinese who work as parking guards, street newspaper sellers, and house maids. These poor Chinese people had no idea how to reconstruct their ruined homes after the earthquake.

However, there are many people that think the issue during the emergency period is not about discrimination against ethnic Chinese. It is about the usually slow performance of the government.²⁷ This view seems to dominate Minang residents, especially who also feel the very slow response of the government to the disaster impact. Ratna, a female Minang resident, said, “If only the government were quick in spreading aid, we might recover soon. We need almost 6 months to smile again. The first three months was still very scary. Things get slowly better just afterwards. Currently, Padang is more managed. Previously, it is just like a dead city.”²⁸

Ratna, a Minang resident, expresses a view that the lack of assistance for the ethnic Chinese does not indicate a problem. She says that it is not a surprise that many Chinese left Padang during the emergency period, and states that the Chinese did not need any help because they were already covered by insurance, and could thus reconstruct their buildings quickly. Having insurance meant that they did not deserve the government aids. Moreover, she says, the Chinese are known to be greedy and materialistic.²⁹ They are also identified as exclusive;³⁰ some support Christianization,³¹ and play cards to gamble (prohibited in Minang culture).³²

In response to this, Ines, a female Chinese, said that her ethnic group are often looked at differently because of the way they worship. Minang Muslims often ask her about praying in front of statues, which, for her, is the way to pray.³³ Similarly, Susi, another female

Chinese, said that it is not only the Chinese who are exclusive. The Minang also generally socialize only with their fellow Minang.³⁴ Another critical question is raised up by Albert, who asked whether Chinese are exclusive or being excluded. In fact, the Chinese are often perceived to be second-class citizens.³⁵

Cultural Practices as Strategies to Deal with the Issues of Social Relations during the Emergency and Recovery Phases

Serawung, Sengkuyung, and Gotong Royong in Kaliurang

Interviews indicate that people use their cultural values to respond to issues faced in social relations. These cultural values contain messages of tolerance, mutual understanding, self-control, and mutual assistance, and are the key to the relatively peaceful relations between neighbors in Kaliurang. Being asked about the problem of religious differences, Maman said, “We should build mutual understanding in ourselves”.³⁶ Marwan commented that, when dealing with the tension between religion and tradition in her community, “Religion is about individual faith, what you personally believe, so respect for others is necessary. I do not heed people criticizing my religion. I pretend to not hear what they say. That’s it. Things will be ok.”³⁷ It seems that not heeding negative commentary regarding religion, as done by Marwan, is a common strategy in reducing the potential for conflict. Marwan is not alone; her strategy is also used by Sutimah,³⁸ Eni Anggraeni,³⁹ Ny. Sulistiyo,⁴⁰ and Ny. Bagio.⁴¹ Saryono is the only respondent who addressed the *kampong* regulations about having relations with one another, referring to *kampong* life in the relocation area.⁴²

These people understand that living peacefully is necessary, and thus it is their responsibility to make peace a reality. Peace is not only an end, but also a means. It is needed to support other aspects of life. Sarah, a Christian woman, said, “Living peacefully makes us relaxed. There is no... what is it... If our minds are relaxed, we can work spiritedly.”⁴³ Critically, Marwan added, “So what?! If we do not live in peace, so what would we like to do? There is no need for, and no advantages to, conflict.”⁴⁴ She asserted, “There is no problem at all, so what is the point of being in conflict. If there is a problem, we should be patient, and we can talk.”⁴⁵

Therefore, the people of Kaliurang try as much as possible to maintain good relations with the others. Their ways of doing this are, in the local language, called *serawung*, *sengkuyung*, and *gotong royong*. Ahmad Syarief, a newcomer and a student at an Islamic boarding school in Kaliurang, said, “The term is *sengkuyung* (socializing) with society. It is

like lifting each other's burdens. We are newcomers here. It would be impolite if we didn't want to [participate in social life]. In Javanese, this is called *serawung*.”⁴⁶ Affirming these views, Sarah said, “During Christmas, our Muslim neighbors also participate in keeping everyone safe. Similarly, when our Muslim neighbors celebrate Eid Al-fitr, the Christians join in ensuring the safety of Kaliurang. So, we share social tasks. At Eid Al-adha, Christian neighbors are also there [in the mosque]. The meat is distributed evenly.”⁴⁷ Efforts to strengthen the relations between neighbors are also promoted by village leaders. Sarah and Ahmad Syarief both gave the village government's monthly jogging exercises, involving all the members of the community, as an example.⁴⁸

Ramijo explains having good relations with their neighbors is pre-condition for recovery, particularly as the need is so great. People need to cooperate without taking issue with their differences, so that they can quickly overcome their challenges.⁴⁹ In his *dukuh*, people are aware that they must work collectively in order to recover quickly. He gave his community's collective land purchase, for independent relocation, as an example.⁵⁰ From Ramijo's explanation, it becomes clear that what is meant by *sengkuyung* resembles the idea of mutual assistance, although a literal translation of *sengkuyung* would be “to embrace”, “to hold”, or “to accompany”. More precisely, the term means to help lift each other's burdens, making them lighter. The sense of social exchange is therefore much clearer.

Sengkuyung is not only practiced in terms of (independent) relocation, but also in managing and reactivating social activities. To support the development of public facilities such as mosques, security posts, early child education buildings, or waste boxes, there is a rule which states that land may not be bought individually. It must be financed collectively, or with the assistance of the government or the other private/non-profit organizations.⁵¹

People in that *dukuh* also established rules regarding waste management, in which organic and non-organic waste must be separated. They use the system of *shodaqoh sampah* (waste charity), in which recycled goods are sold to support the activities of the Posyandu (Pos Pelayanan Terpadu—a monthly women-supported activity for improving the health and nutrition of infants and children under age five). The waste that cannot be sold is collected and used as fertilizer in gardens in the community. As Ramijo said, the new system is very good at educating people, since now people do not throw away their waste sporadically. Living in a new location, with limited land, and in houses that are very close together has made the people learn about tolerance, understanding, and solidarity. Ramijo admits that organizing people is never easy, but in order to ease the recovery process people must negotiate and reach compromises.⁵²

In addition to *sengkuyung*, people also practice *gotong royong* in tackling their hardships after the eruption. *Gotong royong* means collective work, or mutual assistance (Bowen 1986). The purpose is similar to *sengkuyung*: to deal with difficulties or burdens collectively. Ahmad Syarief said that *gotong royong* is needed for people to manage public facilities like the water supply, and to maintain the cleanliness of the environment.⁵³ Affirming Syarief's opinion, Ny. Bagio said that *gotong royong* is conducted twice a month. For women, it can be conducted up to four times a month, cleaning roads and cutting grass.⁵⁴

Nevertheless, Ahmad Syarief explained, relations with neighbors from different religious backgrounds are only considered in terms of social matters (*gotong royong*, trade, neighborhood life, etc.), not in terms of faith. His term was *muamalah* (social relations—relations with human beings), and he said that it should be differentiated from *aqidah* (faith—relations with God). “We could not cooperate in *aqidah*, like attending Christmas celebrations or inviting Christian neighbors to our Eid Al-fitr rituals. I am sorry, for you is your religion, and for me is mine [this is a reference to the Qur'an: *lakum diinukum wa liya diin*]. However, in social life, we do not have any problems. We continue our interactions. It is as the Qur'an says: ‘And, you have to help one another in truth and goodness and not in sin and badness’ [reciting the Qur'an].⁵⁵

Raso Pareso: a Foundation of Tolerance and Mutual Understanding Building in Padang

Although the relations of the Minang and Chinese are not free from problems, there is still space for them to interact: trade at the traditional market. Such daily interactions have helped reduce the potential for conflict in society. In regards to this, Erniwati said that, although religion still limits Minang and Chinese relations, generally there are no significant problems between the two.⁵⁶ She added that there seems to be an unwritten consensus in trade, allowing the Minang to handle retail while the Chinese handle distribution. This view is confirmed by Albert, who states that the Chinese and Minang need each other.⁵⁷ Although they compete with one another for business, they also realize that they are inter-dependent. The Minang realize that they need the Chinese because they need to learn about business, as explained by Montosori.⁵⁸

Collaborating in trading, in fact, not only helps the two ethnic groups to run the local economy, but also to recover from the disaster that struck them in 2009. When people faced hardships during the emergency, it was Chinese organizations (HTT and HBT)⁵⁹ that helped them survive, in addition to the aid distributed by companies, donors, NGOs and other humanitarian organizations. Through their *kongsi* organizations, the Chinese collected aid

from their fellow Chinese throughout Indonesia, and even foreign countries. Albert said that his organization allocated some money to help non-Chinese residents. About one quarter of the charitable funds were distributed to non-Chinese residents, be they Minang, Javanese, Batak, Jambi, etc. The other three quarters were used to help the members of his organization reconstruct their houses and reactivate their business.⁶⁰

Albert's testimony is confirmed by a Minang trader at Pasar Tanah Kongsu, who said, "Yes, there was aid distributed by HTT, HBT. Members of the Minang community gained some. There was no different between Chinese and Minang. Both the Chinese and Minang were given aid packages. There was also aid from churches, which was also accessible to Muslim victims of the earthquake. In Tanah Kongsu, all the traders and residents got aid from HTT. There was no difference at all."⁶¹ When asked why the Minang were willing to collaborate, despite the issue of religion, Sirmis explained, "The term is *raso pareso*. It is same with *sungkan* (in Indonesian, an unwillingness to hurt others' feelings). Therefore, the Minang could still have good relations with others (although tension is there). Nevertheless, it all depends on individuals. If we are good to the others, others will be good to us. Thus, visiting the others when there is a death or illness is common. That is *raso pareso*."⁶²

Literally, *raso* is feel, while *pareso* is from the Indonesian word *periksa*, means to check, to clarify. According to Nusyirwan (2011), *raso pareso* (in Bahasa is *rasa-periksa*) is a balance between emotion and rationality, in which feelings must be held in check with rationality, i.e. logic, evidence, and long-term considerations. *Raso pareso* is closely linked to *alam takambang jadi guru*, which refers to the idea that nature is a teacher for people. This emphasizes the need to be sensitive to one's social and natural environment. In the application of *raso pareso* and *alam takambang jadi guru*, some ethical teachings have been described. For instance, there is the concept of modesty, in which the strong are prohibited from committing to war, the rich from asking for help, and the poor from feeling undermined. *Pepatah petiti* (all sorts of proverbs) are also used for expressing the feeling of anger—and happiness—to avoid physical disputes when there are disagreements. The Minang perceive social integration, as well as a sustainable life, as among the most significant issues in their lives (Hadler 2009). In *raso pareso*, an individual should consider evidence, as well as the others' views in arguing and making decision (Yulika 2012, 165).

Not willing to blame the Chinese for tensions which sometime arise in Padang, a female trader in Pasar Raya said that everything depends on the individual. Being good will gain goodness, and vice versa.⁶³ Affirming her, Yani, a female Chinese trader, said that things depend on individuals no matter what. She believes that everything will be fine so long

as people are good to the others and maintain the way they communicate. Therefore, there are many people that can become good friends despite different ethnicities and religious identities.⁶⁴

A male Minang trader in Pasar Tanah Kongsu explained the ability to adjust to one another. As an example, he said that he often jokes with his Chinese fellows when buying and selling, and as a result he has good relations with them despite their different religions. He said that the Chinese are good at human relations.⁶⁵ Another male trader in Pasar Tanah Kongsu said that people have to be flexible in their relations with others. In trading, for instance, sometime buyers do not bring enough money. As such, he prefers letting his buyers take the goods they want to buy, and come back later to pay the rest; this maintains good relationships between sellers and buyers.⁶⁶

Agreeing with these two men, Hendra Makmur added that the same thing applies to everyone. He thinks that, so long as both parties are able to adapt to one another, there will be no critical problem.⁶⁷ Albert agreed, saying that the Chinese also try to adjust themselves to the Minang. For instance, they speak Minang instead of Mandarin. However, Albert admitted that Chinese need to be more open to other ethnic groups, and need to not worry as much. There is an equal need for the indigenous residents to accept the Chinese as their neighbors, and not as guests. He said that nobody can choose from whose uterus they are born; people could not choose to be Chinese, Minang, Javanese, etc.⁶⁸

Strengthening Democracy from the Grass Roots

Most of the respondents in Kaliurang said that village governance, including village disaster governance, has improved since the recovery phases. As Sumarni and Budi Susanto asserted, although the economy has not yet recovered, relations with neighbors have improved, as they can quickly identify ways to resolve problems in their social lives.⁶⁹ In order to organize the *dukuh* governance, people conduct regular meetings, at least once a month, discussing the issues of security, water supply, and infrastructure development. They also cooperate more intensely in areas that are economically productive. Saryono said that, in order to quicken economic recovery, people have worked cooperatively in groups to plant vegetables, although this means they have to delay cattle production.⁷⁰ In Wuriyanti's *kampung*, female community members are organized into KWT (Kelompok Wanita Tani—female farmers group) and manage mushroom farms. They are assisted by the local government in running this activity.⁷¹ In Ramijo's *kampung* (a relocated area), the collective recovery process has ensued since the community members were staying at the temporary

shelters.⁷² The people organized themselves to discuss issues related to recovery, such as rebuilding houses, fixing destroyed roads, cleaning up the surviving homes and public facilities, and so forth. They quickly made realized these plans, with financial support from the government. In order to generate income, they began to work as *ojek* drivers, guiding visitors to Kinahrejo (the *kampong* most affected by the eruption), as well as developing associations for tourism workers and *warung* (stall) traders. They later established a jeep rental business, which has continued to grow.⁷³

Through regular meetings, people are not only trying to solve problems related to society. They also strengthen their social engagements and learn about governing themselves based on democratic principles, including governing disaster-related issues. Although women are usually segregated from the male-dominated afternoon forums (a situation which still needs attention and improvement), the role of women in community development should not be neglected (Adeney-Risakotta 2007, xi): they provide contributions in the forms of bearing children, maintaining their health and nutrition through Posyandu activities, and producing income through female farmer groups and home industries.

Finally, the principles of *serawung*, *sengkuyung*, and *gotong royong*, all of which require the participation of the community members, have contributed in strengthening community relations, including those between groups with different religious backgrounds. This has reduced the potential for conflict and social fragmentation. As can be seen from the daily lives of the people of Kaliurang, although issues related to religious differences are strong, Kaliurang has yet to experience any significant conflict.

In Padang, the advantage of maintaining social relations during the emergency and recovery periods is mostly in terms of reactivating local trade and in keeping the peace. Unlike Kaliurang, social engagements in Padang are not viewed in terms of *kampong* governance. Rather, since people live separately and generally meet only during working hours, the greatest advantage of having good relations in Padang is the reduced potential for conflict. Although it sounds minimal, at least compared to Kaliurang, this is significant for a city like Padang, which faces complex issues of ethnic differences, religious differences, and political complexities.

Dealing with this, Erniwati (2007 and 2011) considers the relatively conducive relations between Minang and Chinese, despite the issue of religious difference, to be a strange phenomenon—in the positive sense. One may think that the Minang, as a community that strictly adheres to Islam, would not be willing to interact with non-Muslim Chinese, when in fact, the two ethnic groups are tightly linked to Chinese (especially in business).

This, as Erniwati argues, has a calming influence on the daily social relations between the two groups, in which people do their best not to enflame conflicts, despite being challenged by their differences and social segregation.⁷⁴ This is supported, as Erniwati points out, by the fact that the mass violence against the ethnic Chinese in Java (as in Jakarta, Surabaya, Surakarta, and Semarang, among others), and in other parts of Sumatra (as in Medan), did not occur in Padang. As Susi, a Chinese woman, mentioned, some Minang people even protected the ethnic Chinese when there was an attempt to provoke an attack on the ethnic Chinese.⁷⁵ Such active solidarity between the different ethnic groups, as shown in Tanah Kongsi Traditional Market, has aided the relatively speedy recovery of ‘normal’ trade.

Conclusion

From the discussion above, it can be seen that the recovery experiences of the communities of Kaliurang and Padang after the 2010 eruptions of Mount Merapi and 2009 earthquake, respectively, highlight some crucial lessons in peace keeping. *Serawung* (socializing), *sengkuyung* (helping neighbors) and *gotong royong* (social cooperation) in Kaliurang and *raso pareso* in Padang are social practices that are crucial in maintaining community peace, in addition to building senses of tolerance and volunteerism that are useful in the recovery phases. Culturally and locally based practices, as such, have let the mechanisms of community collaboration and conflict resolution – including in disaster recovery – work.

Of course, this does not mean that those communities are free of problems. However, such tensions are lessened through communities’ willingness to share and build mutual understanding through the practice of cultural values they learn from their society. As a result, these communities do not only recover, but also maintain peaceful lives and further build local democracy. This exemplifies the crucial role of the local community in building democracy through their daily practices (Mohanty 2007, 18). With their attachment and engagement with their fellow neighbors and environment, members of the communities are encouraged to build tolerance, mutual understanding, and self-control. The collectivity and collaboration which feature in their social relations have encouraged them to be a responsible, yet helpful, individuals. This challenges the skepticism of Huntington (1993) on Asian democracy for Asian people, who he claims to be strongly bound by primordialism and communalism.

This is not to claim that Kaliurang and Padang are a perfect example of peace keeping and democratic strengthening in local level. There is still the potential for friction, especially

because of religious differences and differences in perceptions (between ethnic groups and generations) regarding tradition and religion. However, the way in which the people manage their relations with the others is worth noting. The Kaliurang community's experience of giving and sharing in response to a potentially fragmenting issue, as well as the social hardships during the recovery period, reminds us that there is still potential for building democracy from the grass root level (Isaac and Heller 2003, 87). Similarly, the willingness of the Minang and Chinese to adjust to one another and to forget their differences has helped them maintain Padang's peace. These small yet important experiences increase our optimism regarding the development of democracy, particularly in the face of the pessimism which results from the growth of oligarchy within the formal and procedural democratic system (von Luebke 2011, 2).

References

- Adeney-Risakotta, Farsijana. "Prolog: Perempuan Merefleksikan Diri." In *Perempuan dan Bencana: Pengalaman Yogyakarta*, edited by Farsijana Adeney-Risakotta, ix-xii. Yogyakarta: Selendang Ungu Press, 2007.
- Bowen, John. "On the Political Construction of Tradition: Gotong royong in Indonesia." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 45, no. 3 (1986): 545-561.
- Durkheim, Emile., *The Division of Labour in society*, translated by WD Halls. Hampshire: Macmillan, 1984.
- Durkheim, Emile. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, translated by Karen E Fields. Sydney: The Free Press, 1995.
- Erniwati, E. *Asap Hio di Ranah Minang: Komunitas Thionghoa di Sumatra Barat*. Yogyakarta: Yayasan Ombak, 2007.
- Erniwati, E. *Cina Padang dalam Dinamika Masyarakat Minangkabau: dari Revolusi sampai Reformasi*, PhD Dissertation. Jakarta: History Program, Faculty of Cultures, University of Indonesia, 2011.
- Hadler, Jeff. *Muslims and Matriarchs: Cultural Resilience in Minangkabau through Jihad and Colonialism*. Singapore: NUS Press, 2009.
- Heller, Patrick, and Isaac, Thomas. "Democracy and Development: Decentralized Planning in Kerala." In *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Democracy*, edited by Archon Fung and Erik O Wright, 77-110. London: Verso Press, 2003.
- Huntington, Samuel. "The Clash of Civilisations?." *Foreign Affairs* 72, no. 3 (1993): 22-49.
- Mohanty, Manoranjan, et al. *Grassroots Democracy in India and China: The Right to Participate*. New Delhi: Sage Publication, 2007.
- Nusyirwan, N. *Manusia Minangkabau: Iduik Bajaso Mati Bapusako*. Yogyakarta: GRE Publishing, 2011.
- Rodan, Garry. *Transparency and Authoritarian Rule in Southeast Asia: Singapore and Malaysia*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Satha-Anand, Chaiwat. "Fostering 'Authoritarian Democracy': The Effect of Violent Solutions in Southern Thailand." In *Empire and Neoliberalism in Asia*, edited by Vedy R Hadiz, 169-187. London: Routledge, 2006.

- Tönnies, Ferdinand. *Community and Civil Society*, edited by Jose Harris. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Von Luebke, Christian. *Democracy in Progress – or Oligarchy in Disguise? The Politics of Decentralised Governance in Post-Suharto Indonesia*, Discussion Paper Series No. 15. Freiburg, Germany: Department of International Economic Policy, University of Freiburg, 2011.
- Von Luebke, Christian. “The Politics of Reform: Political Scandals, Elite Resistance, and Presidential Leadership in Indonesia.” *Journal of Southeast Asian Affairs* 29, no. 1 (2010): 74-94.
- Yulika, Febri. *Epistemologi Minangkabau: Makna Pengetahuan dalam Filsafat Adat Minangkabau*. Yogyakarta: GRE Publishing, 2012.

-
- ¹ MNC TV News “Lintas Petang”, 2010, “Status Naik Jadi Awas, Warga Diungsikan [As the Status (of the volcano) Turns to be “Watch Out!”, the Community (surrounding the volcano) are moved out].”
- ² The number of population in each sub-district is 59895, 61003, and 84231.
- ³ Interview with Montosori, editor in chief, Padang Express, on 22 November 2013, in Padang.
- ⁴ Interview with Ny. Sulistiyo on 2 January 2014, in Kaliurang, Yogyakarta.
- ⁵ Interview with Sutarno on 22 December 2013, in Kaliurang, Yogyakarta.
- ⁶ In the transcript of Perhimpunan Aksara, 2010.
- ⁷ As Ahmad Syarief said in the interview on 8 January 2014, in Kaliurang.
- ⁸ As said in interview with Isparmi on 2 January 2014, in Kalirang, with Mbah Gito on 2 January 2014, in Kaliurang, and with Ny. Sulistiyo on 2 January 2014, in Kaliurang.
- ⁹ As Budi Susanto said in the interview on 8 January 2014, in Kaliurang.
- ¹⁰ Interview with Budi Susanto on 8 January 2014, in Kaliurang.
- ¹¹ Interview on 22 January 2014 in Kaliurang.
- ¹² Interview on 8 January 2014 in Kaliurang.
- ¹³ Interview on 8 January 2014 in Kaliurang.
- ¹⁴ Interview on 2 January 2014 in Kaliurang.
- ¹⁵ Interview 22 December 2013 in Kaliurang.
- ¹⁶ Interview on 22 December 2013 in Kaliurang.
- ¹⁷ Interview on 8 October 2014 in Kaliurang.
- ¹⁸ As can be seen at <http://archieff.rnw.nl/bahasa-indonesia/article/penduduk-kampung-cina-padang-didiskriminasi>, published on 30 September 2009.
- ¹⁹ Interview on 20 June 2010 in Padang.
- ²⁰ Interview on 23 November 2013 in Padang.
- ²¹ Interview on 29 June 2010 in Padang.
- ²² Interview on 25 June 2010 in Padang.
- ²³ Transcript of Perhimpunan Aksara 2010.
- ²⁴ Interview on 26 June 2010 in Padang.
- ²⁵ An estimated income for juice sellers is Rp. 20,000–50,000 (US\$1.8–3.5) a day.
- ²⁶ Interview on 20 November 2013 in Padang.
- ²⁷ As Febrin and Erniwati said in interviews on 25 June and 26 June 2010 in Padang.
- ²⁸ Interview on 29 June 2013 in Padang.
- ²⁹ Interview with Ratna on 29 June 2010 and a female trader in Pasar Raya C on 13 November 2013 in Padang.
- ³⁰ Interviews with Sirmis on 18 November 2013, Suwarni on 13 November 2013, Faizal on 14 November 2013, all in Padang.
- ³¹ Interview on 16 November 2013 in Padang.
- ³² Interview on 22 November 2013 in Padang.
- ³³ Interview on 20 November 2013 in Padang.
- ³⁴ Interview on 15 November 2013 in Padang.
- ³⁵ Interview on 23 November 2013 in Padang.
- ³⁶ Interview on 8 January 2014 in Kaliurang.
- ³⁷ Interview on 8 January 2014 in Kaliurang.
- ³⁸ Interview on 8 January 2014 in Kaliurang.

-
- 39 Interview on 8 January 2014 in Kaliurang.
40 Interview on 2 January 2014 in Kaliurang.
41 Interview on 10 October 2013 in Kaliurang.
42 Interview on 20 October 2013 in Kaliurang.
43 Interview on 8 January 2014 in Kaliurang.
44 Interview on 8 January 2014 in Kaliurang.
45 Interview on 8 January 2014, in Kaliurang.
46 Interview on 8 January 2014 in Kaliurang.
47 Interview on 8 January 2014 in Kaliurang.
48 Interview on 8 January 2014 in Kaliurang.
49 Interview on 12 October 2013 in Kaliurang.
50 Interview on 12 October 2013 in Kaliurang.
51 Interview on 12 October 2013 in Kaliurang.
52 Interview on 12 October 2013 in Kaliurang.
53 Interview on 8 January 2014 in Kaliurang.
54 Interview on 10 October 2013 in Kaliurang.
55 Interview on 8 January 2014 in Kaliurang.
56 Interview on 20 November 2013 in Padang.
57 Interview on 20 November 2013 in Padang.
58 Interview on 22 November 2013 in Padang.
59 HBT is Himpunan Bersatu Teguh, whereas HTT is Himpunan Tjinta Teman. Both are cultural organizations.
60 Interview on 20 November 2013 in Padang.
61 Interview on 21 November 2013 in Padang.
62 Interview on 18 November 2013 in Padang.
63 Interview on 14 November 2013 in Padang.
64 Interview on 17 November 2013 in Padang.
65 Interview on 21 November 2013 in Padang.
66 Interview on 21 November 2013 in Padang.
67 Interview on 21 November 2013 in Padang.
68 Interview on 20 November 2013 in Padang.
69 Interviews on 8 January 2014 in Kaliurang
70 Interview on 20 October 2014 in Kaliurang.
71 Interview on 15 October 2013 in Kaliurang.
72 Interview on 12 October 2013 in Kaliurang.
73 Interview on 12 October 2013 in Kaliurang.
74 Interview on 20 November 2013 in Padang.
75 Interview on 15 November 2013 in Padang.