The Power of Sex Localization Closure in Dolly Surabaya
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Abstract - Dolly is part of the Surabaya city which is located in Putat Jaya District. The money flows in Dolly for a night reached 1 billion rupiah. This fact forced people from some groups to take benefits in Dolly’s economy activities. In other hand, social groups were still strongly maintain the moral aspects from Dolly closure, especially for children rights protection. Children about 14 to 16 years old often became the actors from human trafficking that offered their own friends. Beside that, children at lower ages acted as sex addict from sex media. These findings informed us the Dolly closure were not easy. As Risma, the Surabaya Mayor, Dolly closure was a must that would need a strong effort to manage and control its impacts. The Dolly closing which conducted on 18 June 2014 had economic, social, and politic impacts. The closing program need to be discuss by all aspects in Surabaya. It should be emphasize people from Dolly to have enough skill for their family income.
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INTRODUCTION

The oldest and the first known prostitution localization Surabaya was Bandaran. This localization was located in Ujung Village, Semampir District. Bandaran had 228 commercial sex worker and 18 brothels. Not only in Bandaran, the localization was also found in Banyu Urip which was controlled by China [1]. Localization in Surabaya were not only in the area of Semampir and Banyu urip, but also around Semut Station, Tandes and Bangunsari. Customers at that time were the sailors.

The localization in Surabaya developed after independence period which placed Bangunrejo as one of the largest localization sites in Southeast Asia at the 1950s. Nowadays, Bangunrejo region had been changed to an elite houses complex in Surabaya. Unfortunately, this change did not stop the prostitution movement. Commercial sex workers who used to operate in Bangunsari region eventually moved to the Dolly and other areas.

Dolly is an area about 25 ha which localization blended with unemployment. From 25 Ha area. In Dolly there were a term localization called as "Dolly's village". In this area, people were in poor condition, dirty environment, crowded area, low sanitized houses, and difficult clean water.

In Dolly, the houses that used as guest house were not different with common houses. The guest houses had rooms that could be rent by sex workers such as Wisma Bulan Madu, Wisma Sumber Rejeki, Wisma Bona Indah, Wisma Rama, Wisma Setia Asih 2 and more. Besides houses with rooms, there were also massage parlors that also offered rooms. According to the data in Putat Jaya, Sawahan District, in 2014 there about 284 guest houses, 1449 commercial sex workers, and 208 pimps.
METHOD

This research is a qualitative research that took place in Dolly, Surabaya. Data obtained through in-depth interviews from 10 informants and observations. The data were analyzed qualitatively with an explanatory descriptive model. This method need more effective and intense interaction. The aim of study were to verify the decision making process using triangulation. The researcher collected data and cross-checked the findings to references and evidences.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The Policy of Prostitution in Surabaya

Problem solving related to prostitution had been done by local government. This action was based on regulation in 1953 about prostitution house closing. The regulation was later supplemented with regulation no. 17/DPRDS about binding prevention in 1954. In 1999, the municipality again issued a ban to all prostitution practices.

The plan to eradicate prostitution even its closure until 2010 had not been implemented yet. There were unsynchronize policies between economy and politics interests. The pro-closing party stated that prostitution was a social decreased and no advantages to community. In other hand, for party which strongly support prostitution activity declared that this economy area could increase the worker income also to their neighborhood.

Table 2. Data of Localization. Pimps and Commercials Sex Worker in 2001-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Localization</th>
<th>Pimps</th>
<th>Commercials Sex Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>3.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>7.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>7.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>7.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>8.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>7.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>2.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>2.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>3.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>2.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>2117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1.564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Surabaya Government had firmly prohibited the localization operation based on the Regional Regulation No.7/1999. This rule stated that the prohibition of using the building/place as immoral activities. In addition to the implementation of regulation No.7/1999, Surabaya government closed the localization was based on efforts to stop the prostitution chain and human trafficking. Other reasons for this closure were the low Human Development Index (IPM) in localization area (Public Relations of Surabaya Government, 2017). In 2014, Putat Jaya had 11231 people graduated from elementary school and 6973 people graduated from junior high school.

Some problems arose together with prostitution such as women trafficking, drugs, and people with HIV/AIDS. Based on data, East Java were placed on second for prostitution in Indonesia. The Governor of East Java gave instruction to its lower level to work together immediately looking for solutions. The steps that already conducted were (Letter of East Java Governor dated 30 November 2010 number: 460/16474/031/2010):
1. Closure with no relocation
2. Prevention the increase of new comer at prostitution location.
3. Facilitation growing economy activities at location.
4. Empowering human resources in location.

Dolly's closing had been designed in 2010 by Tri Rismaharini. She declared that the closing were already well planned [3]. Surabaya Government strived to solve the problem in Dolly so their policy would not prejudice people in Dolly. To help reduce the impact, the Municipal Government set up a program targeted for local community. Before the closure, people opened some food stalls, served parking lots, motorcycle taxis and becak drivers, laundry services, shops, and there are people who rent their homes as a place of prostitution.

The closure made this economy activities were declined and no cash flow for some period. Solutions should be taken to rehabilitate the social conditions of the Dolly community especially for children. Children who lived in prostitution location were get used to see the bad sight. In Putat jaya, it was found that children consumed drugs, did sexual activities, alcohol consumption, and other immoral behavior.

By the time the closure, some people in the area were getting angry to the government by doing demontrations. The government policy to handle prostitution was based on East Java Development vision which stated in RPJMD year 2009-2014. The policy was also stated on Law Republic of Indonesia number 21 of 2007 about the Human Trafficking Crime and Governor of East Java Letter dated 30 November 2010 number 460/16474/031/2010.
focused on Prevention and Control Prostitution and Woman Trafficking.

Another implication of localization were the many bars or karaoke employed children. This fact also made Tri Rismaharini conducted a raid on bars in Surabaya. About 21 bars were closed by Tri Rismaharini during her leadership. The closure of Dolly was also proposed by Surabaya MUI in 2009. This was finally delivered by Kiai Abdul Somad to recommend the governor to close the localization.

The proposal was also deliver to Governor office. The dialogue had been prompted by Pakde Karwo and Kiai Abdul Somad to approve the closure. In that time, Surabaya government refused to close prostitution. The rejection carried out by PDI-P Kota Surabaya [4]. According to Commission D, the closing of localization should be viewed from the representative perspective.

Dolly's localization closing process received serious attention from people in Surabaya. The demonstrations flew aggressively which could be held for 2 or 3 times a month. These were made Surabaya City more energize to discuss Dolly closing [5].

According to the chairman of the Surabaya City PDC, Wisnu Sakti Buana believed that by only giving severance pay for commercial sex workers and pimps was not the right solution. The responsibility of the City Government was to ensure the citizen incomes sustainability [5].

Chairman of Commission A of DPRD Kota Surabaya also requested to consider the impact of closing. It was feared that the commercial sex workers from Dolly will open same activities in another areas. Beside that, the commission was also stated there would be an increasement of people suffered in economy income.

The same statement was also conveyed by Chairman of Golkar Party Fraction, Blegur Prijanggono. He said that the closure of prostitution would bring the spread of HIV / AIDS disease not be controlled. It was recommended to prepare facilities and infrastructure before the closing so that people who previously active in Dolly could had income in new place. The argument was also stated by the Chairman of Welfare Commission from Surabaya DPRD, Baktiono. The closing should guarantee the people welfare from Dolly.

On the other hand, the Surabaya City Council Parliament agreed to close. After that, the government would find ways to solve health and coaching problems include feasibility study for the closure. Closing programs should be conducted by government which was not implemented in some areas. The suboptimal willingness of city government to communicate Dolly with the DPRD-Kota Surabaya resulted the ineffectiveness.

PDI-P Surabaya as the bearer of Surabaya Mayor did not provide explanation. After Dolly had been closed by Surabaya City Government, DPRD-Kota Surabaya not yet known the progress. Hearing forums that held by Parliament Surabaya City were never attended by representatives of Surabaya City Government. Masduki Toha, member of D Commission Surabaya City Council Parliament said that he was not as guest invitation. In the process of closing the dolly itself felt by the community there has been no socialization conducted by the City Government. This affected to the sustainability economy income to the people in Dolly.

CONCLUSION

The Dolly closing which conducted on 18 June 2014 had economic, social, and politic impacts. The closing program need to be discuss by all aspects in Surabaya. It should be emphasize people from Dolly to have enough skill for their family income.
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