

Media Liberalization and Its Impact on Indonesian Democratic Society: Human Security Perspectives

Ali Maksum,¹ Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia
Surwandono, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia
Nur Azizah, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Abstract: This paper attempts to examine media liberalization and especially its impact in the post-Suharto regime from the human security point of view. Furthermore, this paper seeks to explain the development of media liberalization in Indonesia and its impact on civil rights in regards to obtaining genuine information and the quest for true and reliable information. An increasing number of top businessmen owning media companies, following political and economic liberalization, have been one of the most important phenomena over the course of past few years. The acquisition of media companies by businessmen and politicians will indirectly influence the content of news reports. As the main element of democracy, media must be neutral. However, amid of capitalization of media, media bias has been commonly happening in Indonesia. Overall, the media has failed in their responsibility to keep a neutral position, and this is a violation of ethical journalism. This partisan media emerged especially in the post-Suharto administration due to the deep involvement of politician-media owners who are behind the news transmissions.

Keywords: Media, Businessmen, Liberalization, Democracy, Human Security

Introduction

The fall of the military regime in 1998, followed by *reformasi* (reformation) era—after thirty-two years under the Suharto regime in Indonesia—became a catalyst for political changes. The *reformasi* was one of the common terms that influenced people's minds and discourses. Reformation also impacted the implementation of the liberal decentralization, which gave regional parliaments and governments more authority to manage local politics. It is also implied that people are able to control and directly express their concerns, including their human security concerns, to government in district levels (below the provincial levels) (Eby Hara 2007). In this context, the new wave of democratization gives opportunity to people at all levels to express their concerns and political expressions freely. The new government was forced to conduct liberalization of media and information, since the Suharto regime strictly controlled all political life of the people of Indonesia. Since then, the political and, subsequently, media environment in Indonesia changed dramatically from authoritarian and under strong state control to the current situation, which is categorized as a liberalization era, a highly competitive market, and a significant decrease of state intervention (Tomsa 2007). Suharto's successor President BJ Habibie eventually realized that he was in a difficult political situation, and was forced to accommodate the people's aspirations. Therefore, President Habibie finally issued the act on liberalization of media called "Undang-Undang Kebebasan Media UU No. 40/1999" with the approval of House of Representatives (*Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat* [DPR]).

Nevertheless, almost twenty years after the *reformasi*, the situation is significantly different and arguably far from the reformation's expectation. Media as the frontier of democracy and political reformation has been "occupied" by politician-capitalists who are greedy and ambitious with their own political agendas. To some extent, the democratic institution has been "hijacked"

¹ Corresponding Author: Ali Maksum, Jl. Lingkar Selatan, Kasihan, Bantul, Department of International Relations, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, 55184, Indonesia. email: amaksum@gmail.com

by political elites who is supported by the media owned by politicians-capitalist business. This led to the growth of political oligarchy in Indonesia (Irhani 2016). Consequently, Indonesian citizens were deprived from their rights to obtain trustworthy and reliable information. After the first general election in 1999, media industries began to be more market oriented. It peaked in 2009 when “the majority of Indonesian journalists have a greater interest in covering political issues, particularly an obsession with the political manoeuvres of the ex-generals during the 2009 election” (Sebastian and Gindarsah 2011, 30). At the same time, there so many political issues that are fundamentally critical for grassroots interests, which should be addressed by media—such as basic daily prices, agriculture, and others—rather than political issues. In other words, the media has been missing their ethics, namely, to “educate” people, provide responsible information, be independent, and far from political interest. In reality the media has exploited people’s emotion in order to gain profits. Then, in the open era, the harmonious lives of Indonesians is also threatened by media extremists, especially those who allegedly have relations to the political groups. Interestingly, in the rapid change of information technology amid social media, “mercenaries” have emerged in social media to provoke and create propaganda to affect the public. In Indonesia, those who get paid to make social media propaganda are called “buzzers.” In fact, “buzzer” has become a new attractive profession with high salaries that has prompted many people to join a particular political block to gain economic advantages (Ningrum 2013). Thus, where is the truth? Where is the responsibility of the media? Although the people have voices to oppose some issues, the media industry has been “occupied” by interest groups and some tycoons who have built cooperation with political parties. We believe that the people’s rights have been threatened by some greedy politicians and opportunist media tycoons.

At this point, the “manipulation” of media indicates that “the process of democratization in Indonesia is far from complete; and although the basic outlines of its constitutional order are beginning to emerge, neither the relative powers of the legislative and executive branches nor their combined ability to govern has been established by the new political system” (Schneier 2009, 295). In fact, Indonesian people have been forced to “accept” what has been published from the editor’s desk. The media is now working a political job rather than conducting journalism. In this context, this article enriches previous literature as much has been written on Indonesian politics, and the media mainly focuses on political discourse per se (Sen and Hill 2007; Susanto 2013; Harahap 2013; Fusalhan 2014; Muktiyo 2015; Istarno 2016). In previous literature, there was no specific discussion on media and human security issues in Indonesia. Therefore, the main objective of this article is to establish the link between the human security concept and the liberal media in Indonesia. In the next section, we explore more about the concept of human security related to the rights of the people to gain educative information rather than manipulative news.

Media in the Human Security Perspective

One of the major trends in the study of contemporary international relations is the shift from a state-centred paradigm to a broader analysis, taking into account the increasing role of non-state actors. Security studies are not only in terms of state per se, but also include the study of threats toward people’s rights and political marginalization that can also be defined as a part of security. Scholars have conceptualized human security in various definitions and aspects. Taylor Owen (2004, 383) argues that “by refocusing our attention on the issues affecting the most people, human security gives political voice to the otherwise politically marginalized.” Specifically, according to Taylor Owen (2004), human security is the protection of the vital core of all human lives from critical and pervasive environmental, economic, food, health, personal, and political threats. Meanwhile, according to Newman (2001, 239) “human security is ‘freedom from want’ and ‘freedom from fear’: positive and negative freedoms and rights. Human Security is a normative, ethical movement and it also rests upon self-inflicted empirical reason.”

In the context of sociopolitical life, human security is connected to the basic rights of citizens and the impact of the government's public policies toward social life. Unsurprisingly, "the literature on these subjects is rich not only in analysis of particular problems and causes, but also in implications for public policy" (Hampson 2008, 230). At times, this will mean that human security should operate less as a policy agenda within existing political structures and discourses than as a radical critique of those practices (Bellamy and McDonald 2002).

Meanwhile, Bajpai (2000) explicitly highlights that security is symbolized by the protection from the threat of disease, hunger, unemployment, crime, social conflict, political repression, and environmental hazards. Simply by treating human security as a policy agenda, most criticisms of this approach have departed from the way security is constituted and operates in the international system: they necessarily obscure the political nature of security. Thus, McDonald suggests that researchers have to turn against government's policy implementation and its impact toward human security. McDonald (2002, 284) also points out that "one of the alternative security policy agendas is competing for policymakers' attention and subsequent implementation."

Once policy makers have been targeted, the challenge for analysts addressing prescriptive approaches to security is to outline why a particular discourse is consistent with the interests of that actor, and how that actor might go about implementing or "operationalising" that particular policy agenda (McDonald 2002, 284). It became clearer that some problems related to human security, such as manipulation through media, were a part of the impact of the government's policy agenda. To be sure, McDonald (2002, 284) suggests that

if a problem is a security threat, this will make it an issue of high political priority, and will mean that security mechanisms are used to address this threat. While more nuanced traditional approaches to adjudicating between competing security agendas note the importance of context (for example in terms of varying perceptions among actors of the world and their places in it, the overall picture is still one of policy makers choosing definitions of security to which they will adhere.

In the case of media roles in Indonesia, after years of *reformasi*, the agenda which consisted in liberating information and expression has deviated to misleading practices. In order to protect people rights the government should implement "rights-based and risks-based administration and policy-making focusing on citizenship rather than on business models of serving customers will be more effective for achieving sustainable security and sustainable development" (Khagram, Clark, and Raad 2003, 306). In Indonesia, the political voice of businessmen and interest groups has been "louder" than the people's voice. In these cases, the government should give priority to "state building and strengthening activities" and not only exclusively or primarily supporting non-governmental organizations (Khagram, Clark, and Raad 2003, 306).

A responsible media equally helps in socialization of people toward citizenship, democratization of the state and political society, institutionalization of civic culture through unfettered flow of information, and rationalized use of power in social relations (Yadav 2001). Furthermore, Yadav (2001, 5) insists that media should be more attentive and "perform vital tasks of informing, socializing, communicating and articulating the power of the public and preparing them for social transformation and good governance."

It was common that during times leading up to or during conflict the media have a responsibility to inform the public in a way that allows them to make a rational judgement about the government's actions. However, most of the rhetoric at these times tends to be propagandistic and combative in nature. (Hutchinson 2008, 35)

William Hutchinson gave an important suggestion regarding the role of the media during the conflict, which potentially threatens human security. Hutchinson's argument was crucial as a guide to media companies as well as to the government apparatus in handling "news" in a

democratic and liberal era. By quoting some experts in political media, Hutchinson wrote that media or journalist should:

Avoid blaming people, or focusing only on the suffering of one group and ask questions that make uncover common ground. This approach was also promulgated by Chomsky (1994) who stated that there was a need for the media to propose peaceful choices and highlight the implications of war rather than just a binary propagandistic approach. As well as the approach which consists in presenting news, the integrity of journalists and media outlets reporting should be maintained. Some reporters such as Anderson (1993) believe that the "truth" must be told despite the consequences, whilst others such as Bell (1998) argue that, whereas he was trained to believe in objective, balanced and dispassionate reporting, this is was no longer his opinion and that, apart from the "truth," reporting should also be principled. The implication of his argument is that a subjective, moral angle should be included. Ward (1998) counters this view with one that states that reporters must not be moralising but dispassionate in the sense that preconceptions, interests, or passions must not bias their journalistic output. (Hutchinson 2008, 35)

Hutchinson's statement indicated that media should be neutral with whatever the condition and situation appear to be. When we talk about the political reformation and transformation movement, the role of university students is to be synonymous with "agent of change." Hence, in the contemporary era, we have to say that the media is the "agent of truth." In doing so, it is difficult because "the communication industries have demonstrated how media corporations have helped to cultivate capitalist/consumerist ideology, legitimize governmental or political expedient to corporate interests and circumscribe the scope of deliberative, democratic participation" (Shaw 2011, 251). The following cases are an empirical verification of that statement.

The 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center in New York and on the Pentagon near Washington, DC for instance, were shocking global media events that dominated public attention and provoked reams of discourse, reflection, and writing. These media spectacles were intended to terrorize the US, to attack symbolic targets, and to unfold a terror spectacle of Jihad against the West, as well as to undermine the US dominance on the global economy. The World Trade Center is an apt symbol of global capitalism in the heart of the New York financial district, while the Pentagon stands as an icon and centre of US military power (Kellner 2004, 41). There are many speculations regarding 9/11, including from those who think that it is a direct consequence of the revival of Islamic fundamentalism to those who assert that it was a conspiracy implemented by the US government itself. In his attempt to make a rational analysis, Douglas Kellner stated that "Osama bin Laden and various groups denominated Al Qaeda have used spectacles of terror to promote their agenda in a media-saturated era and how two Bush administrations have also deployed terror spectacle to promote their geo-political ends" (Kellner 2004, 42).

Douglas Kellner's statement is also in line with Alyson Bailes's argument that in such situation businessmen may takeover or interfere into government's policy (Bailes 2008). Maybe it has brought about so-called "affairs" between government and businessmen to implement some projects, such as those named "national project or development." This maybe quite rational because according to Bailes (2008, 17), in the EU's case, "business has taken over a further set of government functions, albeit at varying speeds in different parts of the West (and beyond), as a result of state policies of denationalisation, privatisation and opening domestic markets to full foreign competition (notably in the EU's Single Market)." It means that in EU's case, the private sector has gone beyond the role it had formerly been given.

Finally, Bailes (2008, 18) emphasized that "business activity (including some things done by legitimate companies and not necessarily defined as illegal) can also be responsible for a number

of threats to—and weaknesses in—societal security, whereby business actors damage each other, the interests of citizens, and the viability and authority of the state.” Thus, it becomes clearer that the case of media in Indonesia is in keeping with this theory because the media liberalization has departed and deviated from the original mandate of *reformasi*. The meaning and essence of liberalization and democracy has been altered. The principle of Democracy, which entails the importance of ethics and moral values, has been corrupted by some “pragmatic groups” to obtain personal benefits. Consequently, civil rights became marginalized and the “truth” has been occupied by interest groups and entrepreneurs who cooperate with political activists.

The Development of Media in Indonesia

Soon after BJ Habibie became Indonesia’s third president, he had been forced to take a strategic policy to handle economic crisis and settle some particular issues. One of his policy priorities was to release political prisoners and formulate a freedom of expression law. It was undeniable that Suharto’s restriction policy toward media in Indonesia was one of the political tools he had to transform in order to strengthen his own power. Suharto created the so-called “Dwi Fungsi ABRI” or “Dual Function” as a guard and implementer of his regime policies. Through Dwi Fungsi ABRI, “the military claimed both a national defence role and a more pervasive mission of ensuring the political stability essential to economic development” (Schneier 2009, 296). Moreover, Dwi Fungsi ABRI also was legitimated by Suharto’s regime and was involved in the “non-military fields—the legislature, bureaucracy, regional government, to name but a few—and also encouraged the repression of government critics, political parties, a free press and other vestiges of civil society” (Schneier 2009, 296).

Under the New Order regime, the government only recognized the media that were committed to support Suharto’s policy. Among the mass media recognized as “speaker” and under Suharto’s control were Televisi Republik Indonesia (TVRI; Television of the Republic of Indonesia), Radio Republik Indonesia (RRI; Radio of the Republic of Indonesia), Harian Kompas, and Harian Suara Karya (Mallarangeng 2010). Conversely, those media who attempted to “criticize” or report the government’s weakness and incapability whether regional or sub-regional were banned and the management teams were arrested by the authorities. Among the national media that were repealed by New Order’s regime under the Indonesian Ministry of Information Act, No. 123/1994 were Tempo, Editor, and Detik (Triwardani 2010). Moreover, some journalists were arrested while reporting and releasing news that was deemed as threats to “national security.” Such a case occurred in 1996 against a journalist named Fuad Muhammad Syafruddin (Udin) of local media in Yogyakarta, Central Java, in the so-called Akhbar Bernas. Udin was arrested and allegedly murdered by military authority after his criticism toward military and New Order through his publication. Some analysts strongly alleged that Udin’s demise was under intelligence and military operation (Hikmawati, Gusman, and Naimah 2012).

Analysts confirmed that this was part of Suharto’s strategy to preserve his military power. David Hill pointed out that “immediately after the coup in October 1, 1965, Major General Suharto and his New Order which also was declared by himself, started to restrict all the mass media in the country” (Kusumaputra 2011). According to Suharto, media restriction was enforced in order to permit the government to fight against the “communist threat” (Roosa 2008). Although the international situation changed after the end of the Cold War, Suharto still maintained that communism was a national threat. This could be substantiated by the existence of a Command of Operation of Security and Order Restoration or Komando Operasi Pemulihan Keamanan dan Ketertiban (Komkamtib), which was established in 1965 and which lasted until the collapse of Suharto in 1998, albeit the name has been changed into Bureau of Coordination for Enhancement of National Stability or Badan Koordinasi Bantuan Pemantapan Stabilitas Nasional (Bakorstanas) (Roosa 2008). Under these agencies, mass media were controlled and their publications that the government deemed to be threats were banned.

The Media in the post-*Reformasi* in Indonesia

Once *reformasi* took place in May 1998 after a mass demonstration in Jakarta—the capital of Indonesia—the situation dramatically changed. As successor of Suharto after the resignation of the latter, Habibie was urged by Indonesian citizens to implement political action in various sectors as well as to enact a free press act. This was accomplished by BJ Habibie's regime in collaboration with House of Representatives (DPR) in 1999 after the issuing of a free media act namely UU No. 40/1999 as mentioned earlier.

The rise of *reformasi* had transformed the social and political structures in Indonesia. Freedom of speech became a new political tradition in Indonesia. The spirit of *reformasi* paved a way for Indonesia citizens to enter a more liberal and open era. The *reformasi* era has stimulated the emergence of many publications such as magazines, tabloids, and books without the need of permission from the authorities as well as many new publishers that exploit "people's emotion" and market demands (Zada 2011). Since then, the growth of the mass media industry was significant and subsequently followed by the increase of the number of mass media companies.

According to Purba (2006), during the New Order era, Suharto's regime only approved 321 applications for publication. On the contrary, the *reformasi* caused an increase in the number of approvals that was twice as many as during the New Order. This indicates that in the post-*reformasi* era the role of media had increased in Indonesian democracy and political development. However, the function of mass media had been altered because mass media were not only reporting, discussing, or criticizing, but they were also exploited by interest groups to gain political support in national election in 2009 (Sebastian and Iisgindarsah 2011). It was contradictory with the vision of a free press put forward by the *reformasi* in 1998. The aim of the establishment of a free press was to accommodate people's aspirations. However, this objective had undergone substantial change since some of the mass media were more profit-oriented. According to Amir Purba (2006), the government did not have full authority to control the media. Consequently, the role of business practitioners had substantially increased so that "the contents of mass media, notably news, were prone to be more pragmatic and not objective in order to gain financial benefits rather than to educate and give useful information to the people" (Purba 2006, 43).

While observing the development of the media industry in Indonesia, one may denote a slight decrease of media news quality and ethics degradation. Mass media, which act as a tool of expression in the democratic era, have been altered and occupied by mass media entrepreneurs and capitalists. The recent phenomena demonstrate that some of the owners of the media companies were "national top businessmen." Among them, some are affiliated with a political party such as Surya Paloh, Hary Tanoesoedibjo, Bakrie family, and others. Below is a non-exhaustive list of popular businessmen and tycoons who "occupy" national mass-media.

Table 1: The List of Mass Media in Indonesia under Businessmen Control

Media	Owners	Affiliation
RCTI TV; Global TV; MNC TV, iNews TV, MNC Radio Networks (100 radio stations all over Indonesia)	Hary Tanoesoedibjo (MNC Group)	Chairman of Partai Indonesia Raya (Partai Perindo) and former member of Partai Nasdem, Partai Hanura. As of September 2019, he is the 1,941st richest man in the world, number thirty-one in Indonesia in 2018, and is known as a partner of President Donald Trump with the total worth nearly USD 1.1 billion (Forbers Magazine 2019c).
Indosiar TV, SCTV, O-Channel TV,	Eddy Kusnadi Sariaatmadja (Elang Mahkota Teknologi)	In 2018, Forbes listed him as the 26th richest man in Indonesia with the total worth about USD 1.29 billion. While as of March 2019, he reached #1717 as wealthiest man in the world (Forbes Magazine 2019a).
Kompas TV, Kompas.com, Harian Kompas, the Jakarta Post, Kompas-Gramedia Publisher	Jacob Oetama (Kompas-Gramedia Group)	The twenty-first richest person in Indonesia in 2016. (Globe Asia 2016).
ANTV, TV One	Anindya Bakrie (Viva Group)	Bakri Group and Abu Rizal Bakrie, the chairman of Partai Golkar
JTV Surabaya; Batam TV; Riau TV, Jawa Pos	Dahlan Iskan (Jawa Pos Group)	Minister of State-Owned Enterprises (BUMN) during President Yudhoyono regime and was the presidential candidate under Partai Demokrat at 2014. He is the nintieth richest man in Indonesia 2016 (Globe Asia 2016)
Trans TV, Trans 7	Chaerul Tanjung (CT. Corp.)	Former Coordinating Minister for Economics in the President Yudhoyono's cabinet. As of September 2019, he is the 568th richest person in the world and number seven Indonesia in 2018 with the total worth USD 3.9 billion according to Forbes Magazine (2019b).
Metro TV, Media Indonesia	Surya Paloh (Media Group)	The Founder of Partai Nasdem, the ninety-first richest people in Indonesia (Globe Asia 2016)
Jak-TV, the Jakarta Globe, Republika, Radio One (5 FM stations)	Eric Thohir (Mahaka Group)	The owner of NBA basketball club Philadelphia 76ers, the US Major League Soccer D.C. United, and Persib Bandung FC in Indonesian League. Among the richest people in Indonesia.

Source: Adapted and modified from Purba (2006, 44) unless noted otherwise.

The data above illustrate the fact that ten national TV stations are owned by businessmen as well as political activists. In detail, RCTI, Global TV and MNC TV, which are under MNC Group, are owned by Hary Tanoesoedibjo, who is the former patron member of Partai Nasdem. Following his disputes with Partai Nasdem, on February 17, 2013, Hary announced that he had left the Nasdem party and joined the Hanura party (Hati Nurani Rakyat) to sit as vice-patron of the party, and now he has established a new party called Partai Indonesia Raya (Perindo) (The Jakarta Post 2019). Previously, when he was in Nasdem, he argued that "I am optimistic about

the prospect of the party and I believe that Nasdem have a big chance to be number one party in the next general election” (Setyawati 2012). While the founder of Partai Nasdem itself, namely Surya Paloh, occupied Metro TV (Media Group) as one of the most famous news channel TV stations in Indonesia. Meanwhile, TV One and ANTV are also under control of a business network of the incumbent chairman of Partai Golkar, Abu Rizal Bakrie. Albeit the business is run by his son, one can assume that it will indirectly bring political message of Partai Golkar. In Partai Nasdem’s case for instance, a party which has been around for less than a year, advertisements have been significant, particularly in Metro TV and MNC Group compared to other parties. According to a Jakarta based institute, Lembaga Survei Indonesia (LSI) or Indonesian Survey Institute, Partai Nasdem is one of the most popular political parties in the recent survey (Kahar 2014). Some have argued that the achievement of Partai Nasdem was largely due to advertisements broadcasted through the media regularly, minute by minute, along with various versions and characters such as a worker version, a student version, a train officer version, a security guard version, and a young executive. As a result, Metro TV has been strongly warned and ordered to stop the Nasdem advertisements by the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (KPI, Komisi Penyiaran Indonesia) (KPI 2014).

The acquisition of media companies by businessmen and politicians will indirectly influence news content. Obviously “the content tends to support their ideology and interest” (Purba 2006, 44). Another blatant example is the emergence of anti-Malaysia sentiment in contemporary bilateral relations. According to Des Alwi, who was the key figure in Indonesia-Malaysia peace process in the post confrontation, “some issues became more complicated because they have been blown up by pragmatic TV stations in order to gain an advantage” (Othman et al. 2009). Meanwhile, Harun (2009) argues that during Ambalat tension, Indonesian media have become powerful instruments in shaping public anger and stimulated the raise of anti-Malaysia sentiment along with ‘*Ganyang Malaysia*’ or ‘Crush Malaysia’ slogans. Ambalat tension between Indonesia and Malaysia emerged in 2004 concerning border disputes between the two countries due to the ambiguous demarcation line in the Sulawesi Sea area. It was also admitted by the Malaysia Foreign Minister at that time, Syed Hamid Albar, that the tension between Indonesia and Malaysia was due to the propaganda by national media (Forbes 2014). The “political interference” in the Ambalat case through mass media was very likely to happen. Because, according to Schofield and Storey (2005, 1):

The media has been swift to latch on to the dispute as a place to promote patriotic enthusiasm, which has served government concerns by distracting public attention from the controversial and unpopular fuel price hikes, averaging 29 percent, implemented from March 1, 2005. In a sense, therefore, Ambalat has proved a useful pressure valve for the government from domestic concerns.

Hence, the raise of anti-Malaysia sentiment was upsetting because the media have jeopardized the harmonious relationship between Indonesians and Malaysians. Some Malaysian scholars argued that “we unconsciously have been given too many negative images in the relationship between the two nations. While at the same time, the relations between the two countries were actually very close in several areas such as cultural relations, economics, sports, etc.” (Dollah and Mohamad 2007, 83).

The terrible impact of the media in Indonesia reached its peak in 2014 until now, when we have a strongly divided society in conjunction with the presidential election. The media has been deliberately separated into two mainstreams, namely pro-Joko Widodo and pro-Prabowo. There were news media, as indicated in the previous table, that have declared directly or indirectly their support one of the candidates. For instance, Metro TV, Kompas TV, The Jakarta Post, Kompas, Media Indonesia, Jakarta Globe were clearly pro-Joko Widodo. Meanwhile, the media that obviously indicated to be pro-Prabowo is only TV One. Furthermore, the TV One branch office in Jogjakarta got raided and assaulted by Joko Widodo’s supporters during the campaign days

due to the accusation of the TV One that Mr. Joko Widodo and the PDI-P Party were communist (Prabowo 2014). This situation continued in the last Jakarta's gubernatorial election when the incumbent governor Basuki "Ahok" Purnama gained massive support from the mainstream media in Indonesia. Consequently, Indonesia citizens have been splitting up and feeling suspicion toward each other. Those who support Basuki are categorized as pro-Indonesia, pro-pluralism, and tolerance, while those who support Anies Baswedan are categorized as anti-Indonesia, anti-pluralism, and of intolerant groups (Sebastian 2017). This situation was obviously created and propagated by the media in Indonesia.

Meanwhile, the role of media, notably television, was changed dramatically and altered to be infotainment media. The gossip news was more popular and interesting to the audience than news reports. Furthermore, unqualified television programs like gossip to mystical programs became more dominant on the screen than educational programs (Ariefyanto 2012). It indicates that mass media have manipulated and abused people in the pursuit of particular interest. Moreover, the concept of "bad news is good news" seems to have become a new paradigm among mass media in Indonesia. The gossip, which is basically a matter of personal intimacy, does not deserve to be published, whereas the most urgent issues for the society are marginalized (Ariefyanto 2012). This was in total contradiction with the ethics of the media based on the principle that states their publications should be idealist, independent, and put forward smart ideas in order to educate people. This idealistic vision of the media's roles is crucial to society since they can foster a critical audience and critical listeners who are independent and critical thinking (Dahlan 2011).

Unfortunately, many media leaders are still framed by business tradition, namely applying market logic in the publication industries. In doing so, journalism has downgraded to become an economic machine with its main goal being the increase in profits. Economic pragmatism forced mass media to adopt a "short-cut" way in order to fill the demand of media management. Consequently, the management of television and electronic media has been forced to increase the rating of news products to improve the company's profit. Meanwhile, the management team of printed media are making every endeavor to make "advertisement space" to those who will advertise their products. According to Dahlan (2011), not only do journalists need to learn journalism ethics, but also the owners and shareholders of the media institutions. It is very crucial to make a synergy between needs and interests, demand and supply, in order to protect civil rights by providing quality and honest information (Dahlan 2011).

Conclusion

This paper concludes that irresponsible media is part of human security studies. Indeed, media—which have been increasingly occupied by businessmen, politicians, and interest groups—have indirectly marginalized civil rights while developing a tendency to be more profit-oriented. Society has lost their rights to gain truthful, honest, and responsible information. The evidence has shown that some information was manipulated in order to gain political advantages. Unconsciously, society has been forced to receive and consume information which allegedly has been "manipulated" by such interest groups. Moreover, the impact of increasing freedom of the media has been exploited by those who will jeopardize people's harmonious lives, especially politicians as well as businessmen. In general, society has not gained responsible and objective information yet because of the businessmen, politicians, and interest groups' control over the media.

Acknowledgement

The authors thank to Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta for funding this research and anonymous reviewers of this journal for constructive comments.

REFERENCES

- Ariefyanto, M Irwan. 2012. "Perkembangan Media Massa Di Indonesia" [The Development of Mass Media in Indonesia]. *Republika*, May 23, 2012. <https://www.republika.co.id/berita/rol-to-school/tim-jurnalistik-sma-se-jakarta-timur/12/05/23/m4gq6k-perkembangan-media-massa-di-indonesia>.
- Bailes, Alyson. 2008. "What Role for the Private Sector in 'Societal Security'?" EPC Issue Paper No. 56. Brussels: The European Policy Centre's Programme on EU Integration and Citizenship, European Policy Centre.
- Bajpai, Kanti. 2000. "Human Security: Concept and Measurement." Kroc Institute Occasional Paper No.9. Notre Dame, IN: Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, University of Notre Dame.
- Bellamy, Alex J., and Matt McDonald. 2002. "'The Utility of Human Security': Which Humans? What Security? A Reply to Thomas & Tow." *Security Dialogue* 33 (3): 373–77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010602033003010>.
- Dahlan, Abdul Choliq. 2011. "Hukum, Profesi Jurnalistik Dan Etika Media Massa" [Law, Journalist, and Media Ethics]. *Jurnal Hukum* [Journal of Law] 25 (1): 394–411.
- Dollah, Ramli, and Ahmad Mosfi Mohamad. 2007. "Perdagangan Tukar Barang Malaysia-Indonesia: Potensi Dan Cabaran" [the Malaysia-Indonesia Trade Exchanges: Challenges and Opportunities]. *Jati: Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 12 (4): 83–106.
- Eby Hara, Abu Bakar. 2007. "Promoting Women Security as Human Security: Indonesian Women Attempt to Find Their Place in the Newly Indonesia Democracy." In *The International Development Studies Conference On "Mainstreaming Human Security: The Asian Contribution"*, edited by Chantana Banpasirichote, 1–22. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Forbes Magazine. 2019a. "#1717 Eddy Kusnadi Sariaatmadja." *Forbes Magazine*, March 4, 2019. <https://www.forbes.com/profile/eddy-kusnadi-sariaatmadja/#43650e6e48e4>.
- . 2019b. "#568 Chairul Tanjung." *Forbes Magazine*, September 23, 2019. <https://www.forbes.com/profile/chairul-tanjung/#10e8356e4f2b>.
- . 2019c. "#1941 Hary Tanoesoedibjo." *Forbes Magazine*, September 23, 2019. <https://www.forbes.com/profile/hary-tanoesoedibjo/#89ced4e44370>.
- Forbes, Vivian Louis. 2014. *Indonesia's Delimited Maritime Boundaries*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Fuslhan, Afif. 2014. "Kapitalisme Media Dan Komodifikasi Agama: Pesan Di Balik Cerita Sinetron Religi Pesantren Dan Rock'N Roll Season 3" [Media Capitalism and Commodification of Religion: Message from the Religious Movie of Pesantren Dan Rock'N Roll Season 3]. Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga, Yogyakarta.
- Globe Asia. 2016. "GlobeAsia: 150 Richest Indonesians (June 2016)." *Globe Asia*, July 1, 2016. <https://jakartaglobe.id/context/globeasia-150-richest-indonesians-june-2016>.
- Hampson, Fen Osler. 2008. "Human Security." In *Security Studies: An Introduction*, edited by Paul D. Williams, 279–94. London: Routledge.
- Harahap, Machyudin Agung. 2013. *Kapitalisme Media Ekonomi Politik Berita Dan Diskursus Televisi* [Media Capitalism of Economic Political News and Television Discourse]. Yogyakarta: Aura Pustaka.
- Harun, Ruhana. 2009. "Heating Up The Battle: The Role of the Media in the Souring of Malaysia-Indonesia Relations." *Journal of Media and Information Warfare* 2: 37–62.
- Hikmawati, Ari, Islah Gusmian, and Elvi Naimah. 2012. "Tafsir Al-Qur'an Sebagai Praktik Kritik Sosial: Kontribusi Syu'bah Asa Dalam Penafsiran Al-Qur'an Di Indonesia" [The Interpretation of the Qur'an as a Practice of Social Criticism: The Contribution of Syu'bah Asa in the Interpretation of the Qur'an in Indonesia]. Laporan Penelitian Bermutu Kompetitif [Report for Highly Competitive Research]. Surakarta: Institut Agama Islam Negeri Surakarta.

- Hutchinson, William. 2008. "Media, Government and Manipulation: The Cases of the Two Gulf Wars." In *The 9th Australian Information Warfare and Security Conference*, edited by William Hutchinson, 35–40. Perth: Edith Cowan University.
- Irham, Muhammad Aqil. 2016. *Demokrasi Muka Dua: Membaca Ulang Pilkada Di Indonesia* [The Two Faces of Democracy: Re-Reading Local Direct Election in Indonesia]. Jakarta: Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia.
- Istarno, Rino. 2016. "Kekuasaan Pemilik Modal Dalam Struktur Kapitalisme Media (Studi Ekonomi Poitik Produksi Konten Surat Kabar Radar Banten)" [Capitalist Power in the Media Capitalism Structure: The Case Study of Economic Political News Content of Radar Banten Daily]. *Lontar: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi* [Lontar: Journal of Communication Science] 4 (2): 63–76.
- Jakarta Post, The. 2019. "Hary Founds Own Political Party." *The Jakarta Post*, February 9, 2015. <https://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2015/02/09/hary-founds-own-political-party.html>.
- Kahar, Suyatno. 2014. "Pencitraan Politik Partai Nasdem Melalui Iklan Di Televisi" [Political Image of Nasdem Party Through Advertising On Television]. *Jurnal Humanity* [Journal of Humanity] 9 (2): 72–84.
- Kellner, Douglas. 2004. "9/11, Spectacles of Terror, and Media Manipulation: A Critique of Jihadist and Bush Media Politics." *Critical Discourse Studies* 1 (1): 41–64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405900410001674515>.
- Khagram, Sanjeev, William C. Clark, and Dana Firas Raad. 2003. "From the Environment and Human Security to Sustainable Security and Development." *Journal of Human Development* 4 (2): 289–313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1464988032000087604>.
- Kusumaputra, Robert Adhi. 2011. "Pers Di Era Orde Baru Alami Kepahitan" [The New Order's Journalism Was Terribly Bad]. *Kompas.Com*, August 12, 2011. <https://tekno.kompas.com/read/2011/08/12/18423593/pers.di.era.orde.baru.alami.kepahitan>.
- Komisi Pentiaran Indonesia (KPI). 2014. "Teguran Iklan Kampanye 'Partai Nasdem' Metro TV." [Warning Notification for "Nasdem Party" Campaign in Metro TV]. Published April 4, 2014. <http://www.kpi.go.id/index.php/id/edaran-dan-sanksi/31995-teguran-iklan-kampanye-partai-nasdem-metro-tv?start=6&detail3=5207>.
- Mallaranggeng, Rizal. 2010. *Pers Orde Baru: Tinjauan Isi Kompas Dan Suara Karya* [New Order's Journalism: The Content Analysis on Kompas and Suara Karya]. Jakarta: Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia dan Freedom Institute.
- Mcdonald, Matt. 2002. "Human Security and the Construction of Security." *Global Society* 16 (3): 277–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537320220148076>.
- Mohamad Redzuan Othman, Md Sidin Ahmad Ishak, Jas Laile S. Jaafar, Adrianus Meliala, and Sri Murni. 2009. *Setengah Abad Hubungan Malaysia-Indonesia* [Half Century of Indonesia-Malaysia Relations]. Shah Alam, Malaysia: Arah Publications.
- Muktiyo, Widodo. 2015. "Komodifikasi Budaya Dalam Konstruksi Realitas Media Massa" [Commodification of Culture in the Construction Reality of Mass Media]. *Mimbar [Pulpit]* 31 (1): 133–22.
- Newman, Edward. 2001. "Human Security and Constructivism." *International Studies Perspectives* 2 (3): 239–51. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1528-3577.00055>.
- Ningrum, Dewi Widya. 2013. "Buzzer, Profesi Kerja Yang Menjanjikan Di Media Sosial" [Media-Buzzer, the New Prospective Job in the Social Media]. *Liputan 6*, August 23, 2013. https://www.liputan6.com/tekno/read/673139/buzzer-profesi-kerja-yang-menjanjikan-di-media-sosial?utm_expid=.9Z4i5ypGQeGiS7w9arwTvQ.0.
- Owen, Taylor. 2004. "Human Security—Conflict, Critique and Consensus: Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-based Definition." *Security Dialogue* 35 (3): 373–87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010604047555>.

- Prabowo, Danang. 2014. "Massa PDIP Rusak Biro TV One Yogyakarta" [PDIP Supporters Assaulted TV One Station Yogyakarta]. *Sindonews.Com*, July 3, 2014. <https://daerah.sindonews.com/read/879332/22/massa-pdip-rusak-biro-tv-one-yogyakarta-1404362268>.
- Purba, Amir. 2006. "Perkembangan Kehidupan Pers Dari Masa Rezim Orde Baru Ke Masa Rezim Reformasi" [The Development of Journalism from New Order Regime to Reformation Regime]. *Jurnal Wawasan* [Journal of Vision] 12 (1): 40–46.
- Roosa, John. 2008. *Dalih Pembunuhan Massal: Gerakan 30 September Dan Kudeta Suharto* [Pretext of Mass Killing: The 30 September Movement and the Suharto's Coup]. Jakarta: Institut Sejarah Sosial Indonesia dan Hasta Mitra.
- Schneier, Edward V. 2009. "Reformasi and the Indonesian 'War on Terror': State, Military and Legislative-Executive Relations in an Emerging Democracy." *The Journal of Legislative Studies* 15 (2/3): 294–313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13572330902933508>.
- Schofield, Clive, and Ian Storey. 2005. "Energy Security and Southeast Asia: The Impact on Maritime Boundary and Territorial Disputes." *Asia Quarterly* 9 (4). <https://ro.uow.edu.au/era/724/>.
- Sebastian, Leonard C. 2017. "Who Wins Jakarta Election: Does It Matter?" RSIS Commentary No. 071. Singapore: S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies. <http://www.rsis.edu.sg/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/CO17071.pdf>
- Sebastian, Leonard C., and Iis Gindarsah. 2011. "Assessing 12-Year Military Reform in Indonesia: Major Strategic Gaps for the Next Stage of Reform." RSIS Working Paper No. 227. Singapore: S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies.
- Sen, Krishna, and David T. Hill. 2007. *Media, Culture and Politics in Indonesia*. South Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Setyawati, Endang. 2012. "Pengusaha Media dan Kepemimpinan Partai Politik (Studi Kasus: Hary Tanoesoedibjo sebagai Ketua Dewan Pakar Partai Nasdem)" [Media Entrepreneurs and Political Party Leadership (The Case Study: Hary Tanoesoedibjo as Chair of the Nasdem Party Expert Council)]. *Jurnal Politik Muda* [Journal of Youth Politics] 1 (1): 55–66.
- Shaw, Padmaja. 2011. "Free Media, Labour and Citizenship Rights in a Democracy." *Observatorio (OBS) Journal* 5 (1): 245–65.
- Susanto, Eko Harry. 2013. "Media Massa, Pemerintah Dan Pemilik Modal [Mass Media, Government, and Capitalist]." *Jurnal Komunikasi* [Journal of Communication] 6: 477–484.
- Tomsa, Dirk. 2007. "Party Politics and the Media in Indonesia: Creating a New Dual Identity for Golkar." *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 29 (1): 77–96. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25798815>.
- Triwardani, Reny. 2010. "Pembreidelan Pers Di Indonesia Dalam Perspektif Politik Media" [The Ban against Indonesian Media from Political Media Perspectives]. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi* [Journal of Communication Science] 7 (2): 187–208.
- Yadav, Lal Babu. 2001. "Role of Media in Promoting Good Governance." Paper presented at the Telegraph Weekly/FES National Level Media Seminar, Kathmandu, Nepal, December 20, 2001. <http://jdhr.org/publications/media-and-development/Role%20of%20Media%20in%20Promoting%20Good%20Governance.pdf>.
- Zada, Khamami. 2011. "Wajah Radikal Penerbitan Islam Di Indonesia [Radical Face of Islamic Publishers in Indonesia]." *Jurnal Indo-Islamika* [Indo-Islamic Journal] 5 (1): 1–19.

The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences: Annual Review examines the nature of disciplinary practices and the interdisciplinary practices that arise in the context of "real world" applications. It also interrogates what constitutes "science" in a social context, and the connections between the social and other sciences.

The journal explores the distinctive disciplinary practices within the sciences of society, and examines examples of these practices. In order to define and exemplify disciplinarity, the journal fosters dialogue ranging from the broad and speculative to the microcosmic and empirical. While considering the varied interdisciplinary, trans-disciplinary or multidisciplinary work across and between the social, natural, and applied sciences, the journal also showcases interdisciplinary practices in action. The focus of papers ranges from the finely grained and empirical, to wide-ranging multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary practices, to perspectives on knowledge and method.

The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences: Annual Review consists of articles considered to be of wide interest across the field.

Six thematically focused journals also serve this Research Network:

- *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Organizational Studies*
- *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social and Community Studies*
- *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Educational Studies*
- *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Civic and Political Studies*
- *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Cultural Studies*
- *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Environmental Studies*

The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences: Annual Review is a peer-reviewed, scholarly journal.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Ali Maksum: : Assistant Professor, Master of International Relations and Program Secretary of Department of International Relations, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Surwandono: Associate Professor and Head of Master of International Relations, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Nur Azizah: Associate Professor, Master of International Relations and Head of Department of International Relations, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia