ABSTRACT: Historizing a collective life requires moments of time which construct a shared memory, moments in time that have brought a revolutionary change in the collective life, moments of marking that shared life in the progressive time sequencing, and moments of repetitions of what has been lived and experienced in that collectiveness. Without a moment of revolutionary change, the finding of that moment in history would seek into other forms of acknowledgement. Accordingly, the Pekalongan city in Central Java has a significant role in the development of batik production in Indonesia; and so, in 2011, this city was launched as the “world batik city” by the government. This gesture was made to re-activate the dynamics of life in Pekalongan as it has experienced a decline in its industrial productivity. Other local potentials that support the characteristics of Pekalongan as a batik city have also been re-activated and upgraded, such as conserving the local batik kampongs, “Kauman” and “Pesindon”, to be part of the national batik tourist destination areas. This writing will analyze how the life in Pekalongan underwent its historical process and how the external and internal factors interacted and weaved the various texture of life as it became the local color and identity of Pekalongan. Qualitative analysis methods are used in this writing to redefine what is commonly understood as a process of historization, and how this understanding can be used to look at the different contexts of life in Pekalongan. The finding of this research will show other possibilities that can be explored in the process of redefining and historizing the life of this city.
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INTRODUCTION

In 2006, the local community in Pekalongan, Central Java, Indonesia – along with a group of academicians, cultural critics, local government, and other interested parties – was set to decide on the date of finding of the city. But, the process that had been done through series of seminars and academic discussions finally ended in an unresolved conclusion on the exact date of the city’s first establishment. The unconclusive result has led to the formation of a special team to continue the process of establishing the history of the city. This special team, then, settled on the date of 1st April 1906, as the day of birth of the city according to the 1906 Staadblad (government official gazette) Legislation No.124, which had defined the area of afdeeling (section) Pekalongan to become gemeente (city) Pekalongan. The areal boundary of the afdeeling itself had been determined by Staadblad No.73 of 1874. The formation of...
gemeente Pekalongan in 1906 had included the election of H.J. Kunneman as the first burgermeester (mayor) of the city (cf Wertheim et al. eds., 1958; Pemkot Pekalongan, 2007; and Margana & Nursam ed., 2010).

The unconclusive result of the previous process before the formation of the designated team has shown the many differences of opinion on when the city had started originally. These differences have also shown the difference in the understanding of the history of Pekalongan, and the perception of a history of a city in general; and so, therefore, this writing will first discuss the understanding of “history” within a pattern of life and then reflect back on the issue of how the history of a city, and the history of Pekalongan in particular, can be delineated.

HEIDEGGERIAN UNDERSTANDING OF HISTORICITY

According to Martin Heidegger (1985), what is understood as the past as part of history can be seen in four different categories. The first is all that has passed and no longer have their existence, and all that has passed and do not have any relevance to the present. The second category is all that is in continuation with the past and have their existence in the present. It is a process of becoming in which the past does not have a priority from the present nor the future, it is a process of a singular continuum. The third category sees history as a totality of entities that changes in time, including the change in nature and in culture that differentiates human space from nature. The fourth category is what has already been understood in the discipline of history (Heidegger, 1985).

From those four categories, it can then further discern how the perception of the beginning of a life in a certain environment can be conceived and viewed from various points. This writing will review how the formation of the city of Pekalongan in Central Java, Indonesia can be comprehended in different contexts, through the articulation of the city’s administrative systems, through the articulation of its cultural-socio-political space, and through the articulation of its socio-economic territory.

The Articulation of Pekalongan’s Administrative Framework. The boundary of afdeeling (section) Pekalongan administration was defined by the Staadbld (government official gazette) No.73 of 1874. After the administration was changed into gemeente (city) Pekalongan in 1906, the city’s governing system was later again transformed in 1929 into the autonomous staatsgemeente (municipality) Pekalongan (Wertheim et al. eds., 1958; Pemkot Pekalongan, 2007; and Margana & Nursam ed., 2010).1

In this system, the city has its independent rights to form its own legislative body, which in 1929 was consisted of eight Dutch representatives, four Indonesians, and one representative of far eastern origin (Setyaningsih, 2005). The area is now currently known as the Kotamadya (municipality) Pekalongan.

The Articulation of Cultural, Social, and Political Spaces. Before the formation of staatgemeente (municipality) Pekalongan, the colonial governing system which always had two sets of governance, the Dutch colonial and the native system, had made their impacts on the city’s town plan to locate the governing establishments. The existence of two alun-alun (public open space) in Pekalongan was the result of the dual system, where the south alun-alun was the center of the Kabupaten (regency) administration, and the north alun-alun as the center of gemeente (city) Pekalongan (Bappedakot Pekalongan, 2006).

Diana Budhi Setyaningsih (2005) has recorded the initial formation of the city’s morphology, which had been induced by its position at the intersection of sea transportation from the Java sea and the inland transportation systems, which had been formed since the Sultan Agung’s period of reign (1613-1615). This intersection of two transportation ways had made Pekalongan as a strategic location to be the rest point for the army and so, in 1811, the inland path was

1See also, for example, “Pekalongan”, available online also at: www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/pekalongan [accessed in Bandung, Indonesia: April 9, 2015]; and “Sejarah Terbentuknya Pemerintah Kota Pekalongan”, available online also at: www.pekalongan.go.id/Profil-Kota-Pekalongan/terbentuknya-pemerintah-kota-pekalongan.html [accessed in Bandung, Indonesia: April 9, 2015].
THE SPATIAL FORMATION OF PEKALONGAN

Figure 1:
The Early Formation of Pekalongan City
further constructed to be the main post way (de grote postweg) by the Dutch Governor-General, H.W. Daendels (Setyaningsih, 2005).

Diana Budhi Setyaningsih (2005) also recorded the physical formation of Pekalongan city within the period of 1906-1939; and from those records, the sequences of the formation can be traced from a network of transportation systems, to the construction of the city centers, and the later development along the banks of Pekalongan river (Setyaningsih, 2005). Figure 1 illustrates these sequences of the city’s physical construction until its further development of residential clusters, which gave the city’s another layer of texture.

From the figure 1 illustration, it can be seen that since the beginning of its residential constructions, the city of Pekalongan has shown the existence of political, social, and cultural dynamics according to its geographical context. The formation of the Dutch residential area, the Arab kampong, and Pecinan (Chinese) area, including their religious establishments as the extensions facility of each pattern of life, had given the city the texture of politics, social, and culture articulation of space (Margana & Nursam ed., 2010; and Zaenuddin, 2014).

Until now, no specific data has been found that can give the exact information on when the Arab kampong and the Pecinan area were first established in Pekalongan, but as the Dutch dwellers entered the Nusantara (Indonesian archipelago) territory through the paths of trade, so did the Arab and Chinese dwellers arrive in the area. Trading interactions with the Arab and Chinese ethnics can be traced back to the 6th century, according to various documents from the time of Sriwijaya and Majapahit kingdoms (Zaenuddin, 2014).

One source indicates the name “Pekalongan” has its origin from the word “Halong”, which later transformed into the local dialect and became “Pekalongan”. There is no more detail that can explain whether the emergence of the name “Halong” is the indication of the first arrival of the Chinese traders. Other sources say that the name “Pekalongan” simply originated from the word kalong (bat), which later was given affixes because of the abundant number of bats in the area (Bappedakot Pekalongan, 2006; and Bilal, 2011).

Diana Budhi Setyaningsih (2005)’s records have also shown the similarities between Pekalongan’s town planning to the model of city in the Islamic Mataram kingdom, where the main public open space (alun-alun) always consisted of a mosque and the city’s governing establishments. The oldest record of Pekalongan’s physical data is found in Staadblad (government official gazette) No.73 of 1874, and during that period, the reign of the Islamic Mataram under the rules of Amangkurat II has declined and served under the authority of the VOC (Vereenigne Oost-Indische Compagnie) Dutch colonial. But, even before the decline of the kingdom, data about Pekalongan area has never shown any strong impact from the Mataram kingdom, unlike the cities in the east Java region (Setyaningsih, 2005).

According to the above facts, it can be concluded that the formation of Pekalongan city was done through a method of repetition from the existing pattern of cities, a method that is commonly used in vernacular constructions, and not through a deliberate method of town planning with a comprehensive analysis and future plan (Wertheim et al. eds., 1958). The location of Pekalongan, which is situated at the intersection of various transportation systems, has given the dynamics to the further formation and articulation of this city until the city was developed into an established settlement.

The local sugar crops, which was part of the area’s natural wealth, has given its own texture to the city’s life and has its supreme time in the 1920s. Eventhough Pekalongan was never much impacted by the Mataram kingdom, nor the ruling VOC, the area local potentials managed to construct and form its own life and its own culture (Zaenuddin, 2014).

The articulation of the life in Pekalongan city was not only induced by the interactions with external factors, but also by the dynamics of its internal factors. Diana Budhi Setyaningsih (2005)’s records of the city’s architectural styles in 1906-1939, again show a significant shift in the construction methods by the Chinese ethnics, where
the earlier method was done by repetition of familiar elements; and in the colonial time, it has changed into an adaptation of the contemporary Dutch construction method (Setyaningsih, 2005).

The analysis in Diana Budhi Setyaningsih (2005)’s writing has to be reviewed through several conditions, which were not established before. The clustering of an ethnic group into an undiversified singular component will ultimately over-simplify the reality of the complexity in a collective life, and so will the assignment of a cultural product to the clustering of a certain “style”. In architecture, a style of construction can only be established through a period of sedimentation, where the method is developed, disseminated, and finally established. Choosing a certain method of construction can be a process of exploration of other possibilities to find a better solution, or it is simply an acknowledgment of a good quality in another solution (Setyaningsih, 2005).

On any account the self-articulation of an individual or a particular community through a cultural product is certainly cannot be regulated as a constant relation. Other records of Pekalongan physical condition have also shown the use of colonial style by another ethnic group. Documentations of several Arab dwellers demonstrate the use of the Dutch colonial style during that period. See figures 2 and 3.

Documentations on the physical condition of the buildings, during the period of 1906-1939, show the use Dutch colonial style by citizens of a certain economy strata rather than the use of that style by a certain ethnic group, who wanted to relate themselves as part of the city’s elites. It was more of an effort to position oneself within the context of a social construction, a natural conduct by a social being in every pattern of life in any era (cf Day, 1972; and Gie, 1993). See figures 4 and 5.

Documentations of the city’s physical construction also show the difference of construction method by a group of people from a different economy background. Records of the batik kampongs *Kauman* and *Pesindon* (strongly Islamic religious) demonstrate the variety of use in building materials and the
way the inhabitants articulate their living space (Musman & Arini, 2011). The freedom from the necessity to position their space in the city’s social construction had given the kampongs’ dwellers the freedom to express themselves in various ways of constructing, and as a result had given the city its own unique layer of texture. See figure 6.

**The Articulation of Socio-Economy Space.** The shift in Pekalongan’s physical construction can be used as a reference for another way articulating one’s space in life. Space articulation through a constructing method, which was initially a way of articulating one’s position in a social construct, has later become merely a language of a commodity, aka “a style”. This phenomenon can be used as a comparison to another way of articulating space, which has always existed as an instrument of commerce in Pekalongan area (Bappedakot Pekalongan, 2006).

Diana Budhi Setyaningsih (2005)’s records noted that Pekalongan has been one of the centers of batik trading since 1850. There is no further explanation though in her writing of when exactly the knowledge of batik emerged in Pekalongan (Setyaningsih, 2005). There is actually no accurate details on when this knowledge emerged in the Nusantara (Indonesian archipelago) area.

The *canting* (small dipper used to apply wax in batik process)’s technique was estimated to be found in 12th century, and this estimation was based on the finding of Prajnaparamita statue in 13th century, which is decorated by a specific floral pattern that has a close resemblance to the batik *grinsing* method. There is also no specific details on how the textile trading of that time interact with the local *canting* technique (Fraser-Lu, 1986).
The arrival of the Arab, Indian, and Chinese traders in Nusantara has been recorded since the time of Sriwijaya and Majapahit kingdoms (Lombard, 2008). Various patterns and textile products must have interacted with the local culture of that period. There is also no data recording of how batik products arrived in Pekalongan area, but the city's geographical position on the intersection of sea and inland transportations has made the area an ideal place to establish the production of batik. The center of power held by the Mataram kingdom was not close enough to give a strong influence to the development of batik in Pekalongan, unlike the condition of batik development in the area of Solo and Yogyakarta (cf Doellah, 2003; and Situngkir & Dahlan, 2009).

Batik development in Pekalongan was more stimulated by the dynamics in trade and the process of articulating a collective identity within the context of various ethnicity and socio-culture. The articulation of these intersections, which later is known as the “authentics” of Pekalongan batik. If this process or articulation is traced back to its origins, then the understanding of these specific characteristics will be blurred and diverge. Jlamprang batik, for example, is widely known as one of Pekalongan's authentic batik pattern, but if the origin of the pattern is traced, then, the understanding of the authenticity itself will disperse (Sumarsono et al., 2013). See figure 7.

Jlamprang pattern is said to have its origin from the Indian patola pattern, which was not exclusively used in textile production. As the pattern was brought by the Indian and Arab traders to Pekalongan, this pattern was later adopted by the locals as the Islamic geometrical pattern and was used to produce the currently known as Batik Jlamprang Pekalongan (Asa, 2006). This illustrates how an understanding of authenticity, identity, and ownership of a cultural product can be questionable and is highly contextualized.2


The Jawa Hokokai batik, another type of authentic batik of Pekalongan, has its own story of origin. This type has actually gained its peculiar name from an administrative organization during the period of Japanese occupation in Indonesia (1942-1945), which had their duty to serve the Japanese authority (Asa, 2006). The visual element in this batik type, that can be related to Japanese culture, is the cherry blossom (sakura) but the element itself is only a small portion of detail in the Hokokai pattern, in comparison to the other visual elements, such as butterflies or peacocks, or the most significant pagi-sore (morning-evening) pattern, or buketan (bouquet) pattern (cf Susanto, 1980; Hein, 2002; and Pradito, Jusuf & Atik, 2010). See figures 8 and 9.

Those visual elements were more an articulation of the batik makers themselves
in the social context of a Japanese occupation. This narrative background of Jawa-Hokokai batik cannot be comprehended through the visual elements themselves, but it is actually the naming of “Jawa-Hokokai” that holds the history of this type of pattern, a history of tensions and relations between competing authority, actors of commerce, and self-articulation of the various people involved (Purnomo, 2008).

If the establishment of batik culture and production is viewed within a greater context beyond the boundary of Nusantara (Indonesian archipelago), it can be seen that the establishment was not caused by the physical boundary alone, but another context of space within the region had nurtured the process of the establishment. In the period of time, from 12th century to 17th century, the period when the technology and the culture of batik emerged, developed, and fully established (Lombard, 2008), the dynamics of textile production and trade were much influenced by external factors.

The main materials of cotton and silk, for instance, were largely produced and traded abroad, the Nusantara archipelago had never had a primary role within that space of production, but the geographical location of the archipelago gave an amount of flexibility to the trading systems; and, as a consequence, brought the external influences into the area (Ricklefs, 2005). Within this greater context of textile production and trades, along with the global dynamics of power play, it is interesting that this technology of waxing and dying could be established within such a long period of time, when in other places this specific technology had been abandoned or vanished. It was actually the space of power and authority in the archipelago that had made the technology lived and fully established.

The Javanese center of power, the keraton (palace), was then regarded as the authority that guided and determined that values of moral conduct and beauty. The development of batik culture in the archipelago has to be considered within these established values. The process of batik production, which involved coloring, dying, wax-drafting, did train and give an education of the mind in subtlety, in heighting the senses and the sensibility to relate to other human beings and nature.

It was the highest standard of culture of that time, and it is still valued until now eventhough other techniques of making batik, such as stamping and printing, have also been used. The tensions between the space of technology, trades, and socio-culture have always been the defining factors of how a collective life live and dwell.

**PEKALONGAN WORLD BATIK CITY**

Heideggerian understanding of the past as part of human history gives the basis for the analysis of how the various contexts of Pekalongan’s physical articulations can give various perceptions of when and how the city began (Heidegger, 1962). The decision of the city’s anniversary, in 2006, was actually part of the national program to rejuvenate and
revitalize the city of Pekalongan as part of
the national batik culture and industry. The
program was launched in 2011, when the city
celebrated its 105th anniversary, according to
the decision made in 2006, and the new logo of
Pekalongan World Batik City was made public
to celebrate the anniversary. The decision on
the city’s date of birth was not based on the
context of a revolutionary event, but more of a
legislative process by the authority to establish
the life in the area (Lefebvre, 1974).

The Heideggerian understanding of
historicity acknowledges the past as a
continuity and, therefore, it does not have a
more prominent role from the present nor the
future. It is more important to understand how
human being can relate himself to a thing of the
past and vice versa, in order to comprehend
further of what history is. A celebration of
a collective life is a time to remember the
values of a shared life and bring about their
presentness (Heidegger, 1962 and 1985).

Before the date of birth of the city of
Pekalongan was decided in 2006, celebrations
of the collective life in Pekalongan were done
according to ethnicity, religion, or national
memorials. If a city, such as Pekalongan, had
its day of anniversary based on the time the
area was defined administratively, then the
celebrations of the collective life in the city
needs to find other bases of a shared life to
esteem a more profound values of a collective
life and relate them to the presentness of their
everyday life.

Batik culture that has been part of
Pekalongan’s life since 1850, before the
boundary of afdeeling (section) Pekalongan was
registered in 1874, has experienced a major
shift in its socio-cultural context. The launching
of Pekalongan World Batik City program itself
demonstrated the significant decline of batik
culture in the life of the city. Other efforts
have been made to sustain this part of life
in Pekalongan, such as the opening of Batik
Museum of Pekalongan in 2006, the opening of
a batik technique and industry study program
at a local university, and also the conservation
of the two batik kampongs: Kauman and
Pesindon (Strongly Islamic Religious).

These are efforts to institutionalize the
values of the shared life in Pekalongan, but
just as in other institutionalizing efforts,
the presentness of the values can only be
demonstrated in the collective everyday life.
If this presentness is non-existant, then the
instituted values are simply part of the past
with no relevance to the ongoing context of
life. The institution of batik culture, through
a formal education and conservation of the
respected establishments, still has to redefine
the instituted values within the context of the
current industry, if that presentness or
contemporariness is to be preserved. These
efforts of redefinition are still in its process
and, therefore, still to be reviewed.

_Historizing the Everyday Life._ The early
formation of Pekalongan city has shown
other contexts of space which are in need of
restoration. The traders path which began
the life in this area, and the beginning of batik
culture and production in Pekalongan, have
deteriorated physically after the downturn
of its economy. The seaport area, which was
originally used as the main entrance for
trade, is now only used for fishing trade. The
same condition also occurred in the inland
transportation paths that are now mainly used
as the intercity connections.

Redefining spaces of life can be done
through the everyday spaces, as well as
through the communal celebrations and
festivities (Heidegger, 1962; Lefebvre, 1974;
and Benjamin, 1999). This redefinition is
closer to Heideggerian concept of the past
as part of human history and historicity

Michel de Certeau (1984) has also stated
that the relation between man and place
is in the memory. The appropriation of the
everyday spaces does not only construct the
presentness of the past, but also the memory
of a place. This everyday life appropriation is
dependant on how the spaces are experienced.
The wandersmanner in Michel de Certeau
(1984 )’s writing is a user of space who
only lived his spatial experience through
the daily activities. He is a type of user who
lives on a fragmented space and never has
the view of the spacemaker or the rulers of
space. Wandersmanner writes his spatial
construction through the daily activities
without being able to read the space that
he creates in his everyday life (de Certeau, 1984).

On the contrary, Walter Benjamin (1999)’s flâneur is the type of space user who uses his senses as he experiences the city, discerns the faces that come across his path, he is the hidden observer amongst the crowd in public places. Within the fragmented urban space, a flâneur appropriates his everyday life through his sense of tactile. In his experience, a flâneur not only stores the perception in memory, but also discovers the hidden memories of places he interacts with (Benjamin, 1999).

The town plan of Pekalongan city has similarities to the cities built during the Islamic Mataram period, but later development of the city is more elaborated by its position at the intersection of various transportation modes (Ricklefs, 2005; and Lombard, 2008). It is also the factor that gives Pekalongan its texture of multi-ethnicity and religions. The non-existence of a dominant government system has caused the city’s prominent establishments spread around the various locations of the city.

The city’s position at the intersection of various transportation systems has given a significant feature of the place, but it is also the feature that fragmented the integrity of its space. The various modes of building constructions in Pekalongan have also added the fragmentation of the spaces and so, therefore, there is no definite climax/anticlimax in the city’s spatial configurations.

The geographical pattern of Pekalongan city has actually possessed what is termed by Christian Norberg-Schulz as the “natural classical order” (Norberg-Schulz, n.y.). The river path that cuts across the city and connects the city’s life to the natural life beyond its boundary, also creates the inland patterns for dwelling places which further elaborated the characteristics of Pekalongan. The intersection of the river way with other inland transportation systems adds another layer to the physical feature of Pekalongan.

If many cities have been organized with manmade axes, the city of Pekalongan has its uniqueness in the organic axis of its geographical pattern. The heritage buildings that spread along the river path have the potential to construct a more definite space narrative for its viewers. When the space of nature has beginning to disappear from the everyday life of urban dwellers, a path of nature which cuts across the daily life of a city will create a memory of a place before the establishment of urban dwelling. A memory of a past in the existence of a presentness would naturally gives that overlapping experience of a journey in time (Norberg-Schulz, n.y.; and Lombard, 2008). See figures 10 and 11.
CONCLUSION 4

Historizing a collective life requires moments of time which construct a shared memory, moments in time that have brought a revolutionary change in the collective life, moments of marking that shared life in the progressive time sequencing, moments of repetitions of what has been lived and experienced in that collectiveness. Without a moment of revolutionary change, the finding of that moment in history would seek into other forms of acknowledgement.

The registration of afdeeling (section) Pekalongan area was the first form of acknowledgement of the existence of this collective life. The tendency to seek for a moment of history within the linearity of time sequence is usually emerged out of the necessity to view process and progress in a form of life. Nevertheless, if the process of historizing a life is to be understood as positioning oneself within the dynamics of a system, then, the understanding of linearity itself can be contextualized within various forms of situations, such has been experienced in the process of historizing the city of Pekalongan.

Whether it is in the linearity understanding of history, or the understanding of one’s position within the dynamics of a multifaceted system, historizing a collective life is an act of constructing a collective memory as the bases of shared agreements on the understanding of the life lived upon which can be continually revalued within the period of time of that shared life. Defining a territory is part of the process of defining a lived space, but if that territorial space has already beyond the space of a communal space and can no longer be experienced in the everyday life of that community, then there cannot be a perpetual understanding, hence no memory construction, of the existence of the territorial boundary.

If the process of historizing a shared life is understood as the positioning of that life within the dynamics of a system, then appropriating the everyday space is as significant as those conducted in the communal celebrations and festivities. Pekalongan as a city and as a living space for batik culture, as well as part of the national trading systems, requires the appropriating of its everyday spaces to reconstruct the memory of its shared life, and evaluate those shared values in its process of historizing the life in Pekalongan.5
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