



Market-Induced Displacement and Its Afterlives: Lived Experiences of Loss and Resilience

Helga Leitner, Eric Sheppard & Emma Colven

To cite this article: Helga Leitner, Eric Sheppard & Emma Colven (2022): Market-Induced Displacement and Its Afterlives: Lived Experiences of Loss and Resilience, Annals of the American Association of Geographers, DOI: [10.1080/24694452.2021.2023351](https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2021.2023351)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2021.2023351>



Published online: 08 Mar 2022.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Market-Induced Displacement and Its Afterlives: Lived Experiences of Loss and Resilience

Helga Leitner,^{*}  Eric Sheppard,^{*} and Emma Colven[†] 

^{*}Department of Geography, University of California Los Angeles, USA

[†]Department of International and Area Studies, University of Oklahoma, USA

We examine residents' lived experiences of market-induced displacement from informal settlements and of their afterlives in greater Jakarta—the creeping displacement of residents under pressure to sell their land rights to developers and land brokers. We interrogate four aspects of these displacees' afterlives: housing, livelihoods, rentership, and commoning. Displacees relocate to cheaper *kampungs* where they can improve their housing quality. Such individualized gains are counterbalanced by social dispossession: a collective loss of the sociality and mutual aid of *kampung* living. These experiences are unequal, shaped by households' differentiated sociospatial positionalities, their agency and resilience, and the larger political economic context. These differentiated experiences are marked by loss, mourning, and hardship but also by the possibilities that displacees create in resettlement: efforts to maintain and re-create *kampung* ways of life that contest neoliberal world-class urbanism's emphasis on individualism. Conceptually, our findings question the common partitioning of displacement into voluntary and involuntary; highlight displacees' conflicting experiences and practices, taking advantage of the exchange value of land while carving out spaces of mutual aid and care; identify the importance of expanding conceptions of dispossession to encompass social and affective registers; and challenge representations of displacees as passive victims of accumulation by dispossession. *Key Words:* commoning, Jakarta, relocation, social dispossession, urban displacement.

Since the 2008 global financial crisis, with historically low interest rates characterizing the neoliberalizing global economy, urban land has become an increasingly attractive investment option. This has triggered widespread urban and periurban land grabs and related land transformations in cities across the postcolony. Investors and developers, facilitated by national and local state actors seeking to construct world-class cities, are finding creative ways to acquire land for increasingly spectacular planned real estate developments. They take advantage of rent gaps in formal urban land markets but also assemble and assetize informally occupied land, displacing preexisting residential populations. The extensive scholarship on urban land transformations in the Global South has interrogated forced displacement, documenting driving mechanisms, their spatial variegation, and their impact on displacees' afterlives. Yet the enduring impacts of market-induced, creeping displacement of residents from informal settlements, facing pressure to sell land rights to developers and land brokers, has received less attention.

In this article, we examine how households occupying informal settlements (*kampungs*) and holding

land rights in central city and periurban Jakarta experience the process of market-induced displacement and its afterlives.¹ This differs from forced displacement by the state but also from market-induced gentrification in northern cities because the diverse land rights held by residents must be aligned with the capitalist property market (Ghertner 2014). Developers must both persuade residents to sell and pursue legal titling. To date, as Wang (2020) and Elliott-Cooper, Hubbard, and Lees (2020) noted, there is a dearth of evidence about the lived experiences of urban displacement “from the perspective of established, lower-income groups” (Elliott-Cooper, Hubbard, and Lees 2020, 504) in northern and southern cities. The experiences examined here are drawn from a multiyear (2012–2019) interdisciplinary international research project on speculative urbanism (see Methodology), which allowed us to observe the process of displacement and trace displacees to their new locations, focusing on four aspects of their afterlives: housing, livelihoods, rentership, and reconstructing *kampung* ways of life via commoning practices.

This research makes five conceptual interventions into debates on urban displacement. First, market-induced displacement should be considered a modality of urban displacement (rather than voluntary relocation). Second, displacees' sociospatial positionality—their wealth, tenure status, gender, and geographical location—shapes their experiences during and after displacement in unequal ways. Third, challenging the economic dispossession narrative, displacement need not be economically deleterious: Households might end up better off than before. Fourth, it is essential to attend to the social and affective as well as economic aspects of dispossession: Households that benefit economically from displacement might experience social dispossession. Fifth, displacees also display considerable resilience, challenging social dispossession by seeking to reproduce their pre-existing practices of mutual aid and sociality: *kampung* ways of living that challenge global urbanist norms of individualism and competition. Taken together, this implies that attention to displacees' experiences and actions is important for how we theorize displacement, challenging any inclination to simply apply off-the-shelf theoretical frameworks.

Although our study confirms that displacement is a deeply traumatic experience, it also points to the possibilities that residents can find in resettlement: improving housing conditions and continuing to carve out commoning practices and ways of living that counter global urbanism's emphasis on individualism. Attending to displacees' lived experiences and practices thus opens up new lenses through which we can better capture such alternatives and their possibilities.

The next section proposes market-induced displacement as a distinct modality of displacement, summarizes existing scholarship on the afterlives of urban displacees, and argues that attending to displacees' experiences and practices raises questions about the adequacy of gentrification theory and accumulation by dispossession for theorizing urban displacement. It concludes with a brief summary of the research methodology. We then analyze the experience of market-induced displacement as narrated by our interviewees. Third, we interrogate the unequal experiences of residents' afterlives, in terms of housing, livelihoods, rentiership, and re-creating *kampung* ways of life. Concluding, we reflect on the theoretical implications and larger lessons learned from the lived experiences of market-induced displacement.

Urban Displacement: Modalities, Afterlives, and Theorization

Scholars have identified a variety of modalities of urban displacement: straightforward evictions through economic and extraeconomic force (Bhan 2009; Brickell, Arrigoitia, and Vasudevan 2017; Roy 2017), compulsory development-induced displacement and resettlement (DIDR) programs in which qualifying residents are offered replacement housing or compensation by the state (Satiroglu and Choi 2015; Shaw and Saharan 2019), and gentrification-induced displacement (Zhang and He 2018; Elliott-Cooper, Hubbard, and Lees 2020). From our research in Jakarta, we argue for consideration of a fourth modality: market-induced displacement, where residents are approached and pressured to sell any tenurial rights they hold to their properties (Leitner, Nowak, and Sheppard forthcoming).² Although residents might initially refuse, broader structural conditions and the actions of developers and land brokers on the ground make it difficult to resist pressures to sell, which they come to see as the only option. Examining gentrification, Marcuse (1986) dubbed these displacement pressures.

Compared to the other three modalities, gentrification-induced displacement is most ambiguous. It overlaps with the other three modalities presented earlier because what counts as gentrification-induced displacement depends on how gentrification is defined. Early users of the term described gentrification occurring through market-induced displacement via the rent gap (Henig 1981). Over time, as gentrification scholars broadened its definition, gentrification-induced displacement was extended to encompass development-induced displacement and forced eviction. Most recently, Elliott-Cooper, Hubbard, and Lees (2020) defined gentrification-induced displacement as a form of violence: an unhoming characterized by the dissolution of the link between people and community and their homespace. Ghertner (2015) challenged the expansion of the gentrification analytic, however, arguing that it suppresses key contextual differences characterizing Indian cities—especially tenure diversity (various rights to use land without owning it)—that require “a different, and more rigorous set of analytics than that offered by gentrification theory” (Ghertner 2015, 554), such as urban revolution, enclosures, and accumulation by dispossession (Ghertner 2014).

The scholarship examining afterlives of displacement in southern cities is largely focused on forced eviction and DIDR, documenting the disparate and unequal experiences of resettled household members. Displacees identify improvements in housing quality and cleanliness for those qualifying for replacement housing (Shaw and Saharan 2019) and value their status as property owners (Hammar 2017) but in other ways find themselves less well off than before. Resettlement sites often are far away on the urban periphery, making it hard to reconstruct livelihood practices, pay rent and other housing costs, and retain employment, particularly given the lack of public transport (Abebe and Hesselberg 2013; Tuti and Mawar 2018). In Ahmedabad, India, Patel, Sliuzas, and Mathur (2015) reported that apartments were poorly maintained, displacees experienced financial difficulties paying bills and maintenance costs, school and food and vegetables were more expensive, and there were fewer income-generating opportunities. In north Jakarta, Tilley, Elias, and Rethel (2019) reported that evicted women resettled in public housing experience a reinforced gender hierarchy and disintegrating social networks of mutual aid. In short, states repeatedly fail to make good on promises of improved livelihoods. Class also matters: Better-off and well-connected households are able to prosper substantially after relocation, whereas others are further marginalized, (re)creating distinct class divisions (Levien 2018; Kan 2019).

Forcibly displaced households inventively contest their marginalization. The lack of employment possibilities pushes those with money and property to practice rentiership, accumulating wealth by becoming landlords (Song, Lan-Hung, and Li 2012; Chang 2018; Bose 2021). Elmhirst (2012) detailed how households who were relocated from Jakarta to south Sumatra during the 1980s transmigration program spatially extended their livelihood possibilities by sending household members to work elsewhere. In Delhi, Bose (2021) found that displacees work to transcend their current marginalization and realize a better future, practicing what she called a politics of patience, invoking hope for the future, and spatial strategies of mobility.³

The focus on state-led forced eviction and DIDR in contemporary studies of urban displacement has led to widespread reliance on Harvey's (2003) accumulation by dispossession (AbD) for theorizing displacement associated with urban land transformations.⁴ Yet those

attending to displacees' experiences and practices challenge the adequacy of AbD. Accumulation can occur without dispossession (Shih 2017; Kan 2019), and displacees (not just capitalists) accumulate capital (Doshi 2013; Levien 2018). Residents contest dispossession and commodification (Leitner and Sheppard 2018), reclaim land they were displaced from (Benjamin 2008; Jeffrey, McFarlane, and Vasudevan 2012; Gillespie 2016), and deploy human rights discourses to mount legal challenges.

In the same spirit, taking seriously the experiences and practices of those pressured to sell their property and relocate challenges the capacity of AbD to capture the complex material, social, and affective registers of market-induced urban displacement. As we will show, kampung residents with varied land rights are able to accumulate monetary windfalls, which those with sufficient resources also use to engage in rentiership. These individualized gains are accompanied by social dispossession, the dissolution of social networks and support systems, loss of ready access to preexisting work and livelihood opportunities, and the associated emotional stresses (cf. Elliott-Cooper, Hubbard, and Lees 2020). Yet residents also show considerable resilience, working to overcome such social dispossession through practices of urban commoning, reenacting kampung ways of living.

Methodology

It is perhaps not surprising that afterlives have received less attention than processes driving displacement. Following displacees is extremely difficult unless they are part of a resettlement program, requiring long-term engagement in the field and not a little luck. The empirical research reported here was undertaken at sites in central and periurban Jakarta. With the help of local researchers, we examined informal settlements—kampungs—targeted by developers, studying the displacement process and following displacees to their new places of residence. Between 2013 and 2019, we completed seven rounds of fieldwork in a subdistrict of Kampung Menteng Atas, South Jakarta, and in thirteen periurban kampungs in Cikarang and Karawang on metropolitan Jakarta's eastern periphery. The households interviewed constituted a purposive sample, ensuring the representation of different income groups and genders. We conducted 135 semistructured in-person interviews with residents (in Bahasa Indonesia).

Forty-two of these, drawn on here, were with households that held some form of land right that they could sell, interviewed at their relocation sites. Interviews included soliciting information about changes in their housing conditions, tenure, household composition, wealth, economic activities, and displacees' overall assessment of their afterlives. Interview transcripts, field notes, and debriefing notes were translated, transcribed, and analyzed through iterative coding based on repeated close readings supplemented by NVivo software (QSR International, Burlington, MA, USA). Names are changed to ensure confidentiality. We also made observations in origin and destination kampungs and analyzed documents (newspaper articles and government documents). Multiple return visits and reinterviews allowed us to interrogate kampung households' afterlives: how they respond and adapt to the constantly changing sociomaterial landscape. Tracing central city displacees was challenging, taking two years to gain access to displacees at their new homes. The breakthrough was accomplished by our research assistants Dian Tri Irawaty and Wahyu Astuti, who organized an invitation to attend a migrant *arisan*.⁵ After presenting our research to its members, we were invited to visit displacees in their new homes.⁶ Recruiting periurban displacees was much easier, because they moved relatively short distances to newly established kampungs that we were able to identify. These difficulties, however, made it impossible to trace and interview displaced renters.

Experiencing Market-Induced Displacement

The creeping evacuation of kampungs and uprooting of multigenerational households selling their homes contrasts starkly to the visibility and violence of forced evictions. Developers and land brokers approach households individually, often collaborating with local officials⁷ in persuading residents to sell.⁸ They urge residents not to disclose negotiation details to their neighbors, yet rumor and speculation percolate as neighbors learn about others' sale prices and gauge what they can negotiate. Low-income and indebted households, needing quick money, feel pressure to sell quickly or resort to what is called *cangkok*: selling part of their land to another resident at a lower price, who then receives part of the proceeds when it is sold (field notes, September 2016). Those who do not immediately need money hold

out for windfall profits, an incredibly lucrative opportunity (Leitner and Sheppard 2018). Residents of Menteng Atas who waited until 2019 received close to 20 million IDR/m², compared with just 10 million IDR/m² in 2013.⁹

Negotiated land prices are lower in periurban Jakarta (up to 5 million IDR in 2019) but with a much steeper land price gradient between origin and destination. For example, residents displaced in 2012 and 2013 from Rawa Banteng Lama to Rawa Banteng Baru (still surrounded by paddy fields) could sell their land for 1.8 to 2 million IDR and buy for 150,000 to 300,000 IDR, a 90 percent reduction over just 2.8 km. Whereas central city displacees scattered across the city, some staying nearby (no more than 3.5 km) and the remainder relocating much further out (14–30 km), periurban displacees moved much shorter distances (3 km or less), often following one another to another kampung (field notes, 2014–2019).

As households successively sell and leave, their homes are demolished and the land enclosed, the sociomaterial environment disintegrates, and nature returns (Figure 1). In the following vignettes, displacees reflect on their experience of displacement.

Ibu Dewi (40 years), born in Menteng Atas like her parents, moved in again with her mother after multiple displacements. In December 2013 they were one of the last to sell on their street: "At first everyone wanted to stay ... that was the plan. But people have different needs. If they are given the money, one by one left." The developer offered 10 million IDR/m² for their 27 m² property, much more than neighbors received in the early 2000s (2 million). However, the kampung felt deserted as more and more people moved out and there were snakes when it rained. It was "not comfortable anymore."

Similarly, Ibu Reza (71) eventually decided to leave because it no longer felt comfortable: Outsiders threw garbage on vacant land around her house, burglaries became frequent, and snakes were invading. Displacement seemed inevitable: "We all have to move, whether we want it or not, because the developer wants to buy all the land." (Interviews, September 2016)

Ibu Andin, living in periurban Rawa Banteng Lama, was repeatedly approached by brokers to sell the land to Jababeka: "[I] did not want to sell, but the land around us had already been cleared and we no longer had good accessibility to the house, so we decided to sell in 2012." (Interview, July 2018)



Figure 1. Market-induced displacement in Menteng Atas, 2018. *Source:* Photo by authors.

Interviewees commented on the difficulty of collective negotiation and relocation because of the different needs of individual households and the pressure from brokers. We observed only one case where kampung residents relocated collectively: a periurban kampung whose RT negotiated a collective land swap:

46 families joined a land-swap facilitated by the RT, relocating to a new site just 500 m away. A large food corporation planning to build a new factory on the site of the kampung and adjacent paddy fields had acquired 19 ha of land in the area, including their former kampung and the relocation site. Households joining the land swap were allocated the same size of land in the new location as their old home. However, each household had to negotiate compensation for reconstructing their homes individually with the company. To determine compensation payments, residents told us that the company conducted a survey and developed a model house of $6 \times 9 \text{ m}^2$ that cost 42.5 million IDR to build. This became the standard

payment for displaced families. (Group interview, July 2019)

Summarizing, it would be inaccurate to characterize residents who sell their property under various inducements and pressures while watching their kampung disintegrate as willingly resettling. As Pak Agung reflected:

We did not want to move actually, but we needed to, and even if we stayed there longer, our houses would be demolished anyway. So we had to move. (Interview, August 2016)

Afterlives of Market-Induced Displacement

Displacees' lived experiences after displacement depend greatly on their predisplacement wealth and tenure status, their gender, and their geographic

location—whether they are in central or periurban Jakarta. Broadly speaking, we examined four aspects of afterlives: the size and quality of housing, livelihood possibilities, the emergence of rentiership as an alternative livelihood possibility, and the desire to reproduce the commoning practices they valued as part of kampung life in the destination kampung.

Housing

Across the board, interviewees with land rights to sell were able to improve their housing conditions after displacement, primarily because they relocated onto cheaper land further away from the center and the periurban frontier. As Ibu Dewi described:

We did not have a bedroom in the old house, because it was too small—27 m² for six people. So only one room for everything. Only one room for my sister-in-law to sleep upstairs. My father slept on a mattress not in a bedroom. The bedroom was too small. We could not breathe. (Interview, September 2016)

She bought a 100 m² house in Lenteng Agung: 70 m² for her family and parents and 30 m² for her brother's family: "I did not look for a fancy big house. ... So ... we found this, and the house is good." She and her sister-in-law described the new house as more spacious and comfortable, her sister-in-law stressing how much she enjoys having her own space.

Ibu Reza upgraded from a 60 m² house in Menteng Atas to a 150 m² house 30 km south in Citayam with four bedrooms, two bathrooms, two living rooms, a kitchen, and a garage, plenty of space for her granddaughter and a maid. After selling his 500 m² land plot in periurban kampung Binong to Jababeka, Pak Bindung could buy 1,000 m² in Rawa Banteng Baru where he relocated his house from Binong and built a new one for his daughter, with space left over to build rental units (see Rentiership; field notes, July 2018).

Central city displacees bought larger houses, or multiple smaller ones after dividing the proceeds up among the extended family occupying the old house. In all cases, the new housing had more space per person and was often newer and better equipped. Periurban displacees had access to affordable large plots of unbuilt land, on which many of them reconstructed a large family compound.

Livelihoods

For displacees, the benefits of roomier housing come with the challenge of reconstructing the livelihood practices crafted while living in their previous kampung. Central city displacees who moved 15 to 30 km away faced the particularly stark choice of commuting an extra one to two hours back to their old job or seeking alternative employment. Women were more likely to leave their formal employment after relocation, resorting to informal economic activities (e.g., cooking meals, starting a small business) or creating income from newly purchased rental housing (see Rentiership). Ibu Dewi quit her job as a domestic worker for three families near Menteng Atas, making 2 million IDR per month, after moving to Lenteng Agung because of the cost and time of commuting. This posed financial problems: "If we are not clever, we can run out of money ... many things are more expensive than before." She now gets up every day at midnight to cook fifty lunches that her husband sells to coworkers. Yet Ibu Dewi's husband and brother-in-law still commute to their 'office boy' jobs back in Kuningan. Whereas her husband previously could walk to work, "He now leaves very early in the morning: 4:30 a.m. in the dawn. He arrives home very late: 9 to 10 p.m." (Interviews, September 2016).

Periurban families moved shorter distances but also faced challenges. Few still farm, but displacees generally had access to menial, unskilled, and often temporary jobs: janitors, cleaners, gardeners, security personnel, and ride-hailing. They repeatedly expressed frustration, however, at being shut out from better paying jobs in adjacent factories: They lacked the required formal education, as Sundanese speakers their Bahasa Indonesia was poor, and they struggled to fill in online applications. Women faced an additional barrier: company policies that preclude women twenty-five years and older from applying for factory jobs. Unable to get a regular job after moving with her family to Rawa Banteng Baru, Ibu Dian joined female neighbors in piecework, trimming rubber shock covers for a nearby machinery parts manufacturer. Cleaning 100 to 140 pieces brought in 7,000 to 10,000 IDR (US\$0.50–0.75) a day. She stopped because the company consistently paid late and now operates a small shop in front of her house (Figure 2), serving drinks and snacks (interview, July 2019). To make ends meet, another family in this



Figure 2. Newly built house with *warung* in Rawa Banteng Baru, 2018. *Source:* Photo by authors.

kampung relies on remittances sent by their daughter working abroad.

Rentiership

For displacees with enough money from their sale, it is common to take up rentiership as an alternative livelihood practice. For less well-off residents, rentiership enables them to reduce precarity; for wealthier displacees it is a lucrative strategy for accumulating more wealth. About 40 percent of central city displaced households we interviewed either rented out rooms in their new house or had purchased a small rental unit. For example, three sisters who bought houses in Lenteng Agung and Citayam (14 and 29 km from Menteng Atas) all left their previous jobs as domestic workers. The youngest sister moved in with her husband and rented her part of the house in Lenteng Atas for 600,000 IDR per month (field notes, August 2016). In periurban Jakarta, open land enables wealthier displacees to build multiunit rental properties (*kontrakans*). Having doubled his land, Pak Bindung built an eight-unit *kontrakan* with the remaining money. His sole source of income, he rents out these 18 m² units for 600,000 IDR per month to migrants from central Java working in nearby factories. He then used the profits to buy another plot where he is building a new *kontrakan* (Figure 3; field notes, July 2018).

Commoning: Challenging Social Dispossession

Displacees expressed a deep loss of the togetherness, neighborliness, and sociality that they had enjoyed in their former kampung (interview, August 2017). Women in particular told “nostalgic narratives” (Gupta and Medappa 2020, 1700) detailing their and their family members’ feelings of loss of sociality and mutual aid, which they consider the principal benefits of kampung living. Displacees do not simply accept such social dispossession, however. In different ways and contexts, they actively seek to recover or re-create the dense, frequently institutionalized social networks of kampung life that provide sustenance and livelihood support to kampung residents: *arisans*, prayer groups (*pengajian*), food sharing, collective fundraising for medical bills, financial support through personal loans, and so on. More than a support system, kampung living is a place-based identity that displacees seek to maintain after relocation.

Displacees make considerable efforts to keep in touch with former neighbors. Several who had left central city kampungs told us that they return on weekends or holidays (interview, July 2017). This was challenging for those who relocated greater distances. A group of thirty-five displaced households created a migrant *arisan* to stay connected to one another. Now dispersed across the city, *arisan* members meet regularly at one of their homes on a



Figure 3. Rental housing (*kontrakan*) in Rawa Banteng Baru, 2019. Source: Photo by authors.

rotating basis, sharing food and drinks. These meetings are a major social event.

Households also sought to rebuild the sociality and solidarity of *kampung* life in their new location, engaging in place making to create a “space of belonging” (Gupta and Medappa 2020, 1693). Women like Ibu Indah joined existing *arisans* and prayer groups: “They really welcome us; they are very kind” (interview, September 2016). Periurban displacees who moved together to start new *kampungs* could readily re-create commoning practices with former neighbors. As Ibu Endah explained, residents did not want to lose their “identity,” naming their new *kampung* after the old one and re-creating their prayer group (interview, July 2018).

Central city displacees often find it challenging, however, to re-create *kampung* life. Displacees from Menteng Atas to Lenteng Agung, such as Ibu Dewi, commented on the individualism in their new neighborhood:

People in Menteng Atas are united. If there are social activities, we save money together for it. We contribute money, we visit our sick neighbors. But here ... people are by themselves. It is not good. ... Here, there was no [Independence Day] celebration. ... I organized it myself. People were grateful.¹⁰ (Interview, September 2016)

Others noted feelings of unbelonging and exclusion from social networks in their new location. Women displaced from Menteng Atas described how their new neighbors keep to themselves, making it difficult to get to know or interact with them. Longer commuting times and extended workdays prohibit displacees from socializing and joining events

(interviews, August and September 2016), making it harder to re-create a sense of community.

Conclusion

Grounding market-induced displacement and its afterlives in the experiences of displaced residents calls into question the common partitioning of displacement into voluntary (presumably beneficial) or involuntary (harmful) and preconceived notions about the impacts of displacement. Residents experiencing market-induced displacement can negotiate when, how, and for what price they are displaced, exercising greater control than those evicted or resettled by the state, yet none of our interviewees freely chose to move. Market-induced displacement can engender individual material success: Windfall profits secured by our interviewees brought improvements (single-family housing, space, rentiership), complicating the emphasis on impoverishment in the displacement literature (Hirsh, Eizenberg, and Jabareen 2020). The negotiating power and economic afterlives of market-induced displacees are highly unequal, however, shaped by households’ differentiated sociospatial positionalities. Those with land rights and wealth are better able to negotiate, taking advantage of the market, whereas those without (e.g., renters) lose their homes and often their livelihood possibilities. Spatially, the availability of open space and a steeper rent gradient mean that periurban displacees find it easier than central-city displacees to relocate and convert their windfall gains into profitable rentiership activities.

Our research identifies different registers of dispossession beyond the economic, which intersect with one another and with improvements in complex ways. Despite material improvements, all interviewees reported feelings of social dispossession—loss of community and homeplace. They did not simply accept social dispossession, though, actively working to reenact *kampung* ways of life after displacement. For them, cooperation, mutual aid, caring for neighbors, and creating places where this can be practiced are essential to urban and periurban life. Displacees’ contestations of global urbanist norms mean that displacements associated with world-class urbanism need not mark the death of *kampung* ways of life. Indeed, attention to afterlives of those situated at the margins reveals the persistence thus far of other ways of living as thriving alternatives to the dominant, highly individualized capitalist mode of urban living.

Acknowledgments

The field research would not have been possible without our collaborators. In particular, we thank Dian Tri Irawaty (UCLA), Wahyu Astuti, Melinda Martinus, Liong Ju Tjung, Herlambang Suryono (Tarumanagara University, Jakarta), Sam Nowak and Dimitar Anguelov (UCLA) for their fieldwork and Michelle Tirtoatmojo for help with transcribing. We also thank Sam Nowak and three anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on earlier drafts. Our special thanks go to the women and men who shared their experiences with us.

Funding

We acknowledge support from the U.S. National Science Foundation (Grant BCS-1636437).

ORCID

Helga Leitner  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2568-6358>

Emma Colven  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4072-6303>

Notes

1. In Indonesia, informal urban settlements are called *kampung*s, the Bahasa Indonesia term for village.
2. In Jakarta, these include formal rights (e.g., use rights, the right to build and freehold) and indigenous (adat) rights.
3. A second body of work on development-induced displacees' afterlives examines displacees' subject-formation and spatial practices (Rogers and Wilmsen 2020).
4. AbD theorizes capitalism as continually creating new accumulation opportunities by commodifying capitalism's outsides through extraeconomic coercion (eminent domain, slum demolition, land grabbing, etc.; Ghertner 2014).
5. *Arisan*, which translates as social gathering and cooperative endeavor, is an informal rotating credit collective. Geertz (1962) documented these in the early 1950s, but they have survived neoliberalization, to be reinvented in new social spaces.
6. This *arisan* was created by displacees and run by women, who thus made up 90 percent of our central city interviewees.
7. *Lurah*, RT and RW. A *lurah* is an appointed official in charge of a Kelurahan (the lowest level of district government). Within Kelurahans, RTs (Rukun Tetangga, neighborhood association) and RWs (Rukun Warga, citizen's association) are locally elected neighborhood representatives.

8. We were unable to interview brokers, who proved highly elusive. They often live in the same *kampung* and are perceived as locals, yet we were consistently unable to secure their addresses or phone numbers from other residents.
9. Menteng Atas residents' income varied widely in our interviews (US\$100–3,000 monthly), as did the size of their property.
10. The previous *kampung* became Rawa Banteng Lama (*lama* translates as "old" in Bahasa Indonesia) and the new one was named Rawa Banteng Baru ("new").

References

- Abebe, G., and J. Hesselberg. 2013. Implications of urban development-induced resettlement on poor households in Addis Ababa. *Ghana Journal of Geography* 5:32–50. doi: [10.4314/GJG.V5I1](https://doi.org/10.4314/GJG.V5I1).
- Benjamin, S. 2008. Occupancy urbanism: Radicalizing politics and economy beyond policy and programs. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32 (3):719–29. doi: [10.1111/j.1468-2427.2008.00809.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2008.00809.x).
- Bhan, G. 2009. "This is no longer the city I once knew." Evictions, the urban poor and the right to the city in millennial Delhi. *Environment and Urbanization* 21 (1):127–42. doi: [10.1177/0956247809103009](https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247809103009).
- Bose, D. 2021. Where is the city in "The Right to the City"? The colliding politics of place-making in a resettlement colony in Delhi's periphery. *Area* 53 (1):38–46. doi: [10.1111/area.12665](https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12665).
- Brickell, K., M. F. Arrigoitia, and A. Vasudevan, eds. 2017. *Geographies of forced eviction: Dispossession, violence, resistance*. Berlin: Springer.
- Chang, I. C. C. 2018. "Actually existing sustainabilities" in urban China: National initiatives and local contestations. *Sustainability: The Journal of Record* 11 (5):216–28. doi: [10.1089/sus.2018.0015](https://doi.org/10.1089/sus.2018.0015).
- Doshi, S. 2013. The politics of the evicted: Redevelopment, subjectivity, and difference in Mumbai's slum frontier. *Antipode* 45 (4):844–65. doi: [10.1111/j.1467-8330.2012.01023.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2012.01023.x).
- Elliott-Cooper, A., P. Hubbard, and L. Lees. 2020. Moving beyond Marcuse: Gentrification, displacement and the violence of un-homing. *Progress in Human Geography* 44 (3):492–509. doi: [10.1177/0309132519830511](https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132519830511).
- Elmhirst, R. 2012. Displacement, resettlement, and multi-local livelihoods: Positioning migrant legitimacy in Lampung, Indonesia. *Critical Asian Studies* 44 (1):131–52. doi: [10.1080/14672715.2012.644891](https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.2012.644891).
- Geertz, C. 1962. The rotating credit association: A "middle rung" in development. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 10 (3):241–63. doi: [10.1086/449960](https://doi.org/10.1086/449960).
- Ghertner, D. A. 2014. India's urban revolution: Geographies of displacement beyond gentrification. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 46 (7):1554–71. doi: [10.1068/a46288](https://doi.org/10.1068/a46288).
- Ghertner, D. A. 2015. Why gentrification theory fails in "much of the world." *City* 19 (4):552–63. doi: [10.1080/13604813.2015.1051745](https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2015.1051745).

- Gillespie, T. 2016. Accumulation by urban dispossession: Struggles over urban space in Accra, Ghana. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 41 (1):66–77. doi: [10.1111/tran.12105](https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12105).
- Gupta, H., and K. Medappa. 2020. Nostalgia as affective landscape: Negotiating displacement in the “world city.” *Antipode* 52 (6):1688–709. doi: [10.1111/anti.12674](https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12674).
- Hammar, A. 2017. Urban displacement and resettlement in Zimbabwe: The paradoxes of propertied citizenship. *African Studies Review* 60 (3):81–104. doi: [10.1017/asr.2017.123](https://doi.org/10.1017/asr.2017.123).
- Harvey, D. 2003. *The new imperialism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Henig, J. R. 1981. Gentrification and displacement within cities: A comparative analysis. *Social Science Quarterly* 61 (3–4):638–52.
- Hirsh, H., E. Eizenberg, and Y. Jabareen. 2020. A new conceptual framework for understanding displacement: Bridging the gaps in displacement literature between the Global South and the Global North. *Journal of Planning Literature* 35 (4):391–407. doi: [10.1177/0885412220921514](https://doi.org/10.1177/0885412220921514).
- Jeffrey, A., C. McFarlane, and A. Vasudevan. 2012. Rethinking enclosure: Space, subjectivity and the commons. *Antipode* 44 (4):1247–67. doi: [10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00954.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00954.x).
- Kan, K. 2019. Accumulation without dispossession? Land commodification and rent extraction in peri-urban China. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 43 (4):633–48. doi: [10.1111/1468-2427.12746](https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12746).
- Leitner, H., S. Nowak, and E. Sheppard. *Forthcoming*. Everyday speculation in the remaking of peri-urban livelihoods and landscapes. *EPA Economy and Space*. Advance online publication. doi: [10.1177/0308518X211066915](https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X211066915).
- Leitner, H., and E. Sheppard. 2018. From kampungs to condos? Contested accumulations through displacement in Jakarta. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 50 (2):437–56. doi: [10.1177/0308518X17709279](https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X17709279).
- Levien, M. 2018. *Dispossession without development: Land grabs in neoliberal India*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Marcuse, P. 1986. Abandonment, gentrification, and displacement: The linkages in New York City. In *Gentrification of the city*, ed. N. Smith and P. Williams, 121–52. Boston: Allen and Unwin.
- Patel, S., R. Sliuzas, and N. Mathur. 2015. The risk of impoverishment in urban development-induced displacement and resettlement in Ahmedabad. *Environment and Urbanization* 27 (1):231–56. doi: [10.1177/0956247815569128](https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247815569128).
- Rogers, S., and B. Wilmsen. 2020. Towards a critical geography of resettlement. *Progress in Human Geography* 44 (2):256–75. doi: [10.1177/0309132518824659](https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132518824659).
- Roy, A. 2017. Dis/possessive collectivism: Property and personhood at city's end. *Geoforum* 80:A1–11. doi: [10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.12.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.12.012).
- Satiroglu, I., and N. Choi. 2015. *Development-induced displacement and resettlement: New perspectives on persisting problems*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Shaw, A., and T. Saharan. 2019. Urban development-induced displacement and quality of life in Kolkata. *Environment and Urbanization* 31 (2):597–614. doi: [10.1177/0956247818816891](https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247818816891).
- Shih, M. 2017. Rethinking displacement in peri-urban transformation in China. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 49 (2):389–406. doi: [10.1177/0308518X16670158](https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X16670158).
- Song, Y.-L., N. C. Lan-Hung, and S.-M. Li. 2012. The place attachment of residents displaced by urban redevelopment projects in Shanghai. *Issues & Studies* 48 (3):43–73.
- Tilley, L., J. Elias, and L. Rethel. 2019. Urban evictions, public housing and the gendered rationalisation of kampung life in Jakarta. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 60 (1):80–93. doi: [10.1111/apv.12209](https://doi.org/10.1111/apv.12209).
- Tuti, R. W., and N. O. N. B. Mawar. 2018. The dilemma of relocation community in Rusunawa at Jakarta. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Education* 6 (11):8044–50.
- Wang, Z. 2020. Beyond displacement—Exploring the variegated social impacts of urban redevelopment. *Urban Geography* 41 (5):703–12. doi: [10.1080/02723638.2020.1734373](https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2020.1734373).
- Zhang, Z., and S. He. 2018. Gentrification-induced displacement. In *Handbook of gentrification studies*, ed. L. Lees and M. Phillips, 134–52. London: Edward.

HELGA LEITNER is a Research Professor in the Department of Geography at the University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90095. E-mail: hleitner@geog.ucla.edu. She has published on the politics of scale, citizenship, and belonging; politics of difference and race relations in urban multicultures; social and environmental justice activism; urban resilience; and most recently on urban land transformations, livelihoods, and finance capital in cities of the Global South.

ERIC SHEPPARD is the Alexander von Humboldt Chair of Geography at The University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90095. E-mail: esheppard@geog.ucla.edu. His scholarship embraces geographical political economy and sociospatial theory, currently focusing on uneven geographies of capitalist globalization, more-than-capitalist practices, southern urban theory, urban social movements, and urban land transformations.

EMMA COLVEN is an Assistant Professor in the Department of International and Area studies at the University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019. E-mail: emmacolven@ou.edu. Her research explores the urban political ecologies of water, real estate development, and adaptation.