This chapter will explain how print and broadcast journalism during the New Order were affected by Bakhtinian heteroglossia, and how the institutional structures, journalistic concepts and programme genres of radio during Reformasi have reflected characteristics of Bakhtinian carnival. Firstly, it will analyse how the New Order regime used the concept of development journalism and different forms of legislation as tools to establish monologism as the dominant mode of discourse in the Indonesian public sphere. Secondly, it will discuss several strategies employed by journalists, audiences and other groups in civil society in heteroglossic reaction against the officially approved discursive monologism. Thirdly, it will identify alternative journalistic concepts and organization forms that have been developed during Reformasi, some of which have a dialogical character.

I will specifically focus on four institutions that have had considerable impact on the reform of the Indonesian radio landscape due to the nationwide scope of their broadcasts, training programmes, and other activities including the organization of competitions for radio stations. These institutions are Kantor Berita Radio 68H, Internews Indonesia, the Indonesia Media Law and Policy Centre and the Indonesian branch of the Friedrich Naumann Stiftung, which all have connections with or are aided by foreign organizations. In line with my discussion of the introduction and development of the idea of the public sphere in Indonesia, the case-studies will confirm that Reformasi cannot be understood as merely a local, uniquely Indonesian phenomenon, but has to be situated in the field of dynamic interactions between regional, national and international social, political and cultural forces.

The New Order and development journalism

During the New Order, Radio Republik Indonesia (RRI) and Televisi Republik Indonesia (TVRI) had monopolies on the production of news broadcasts.
Commercial radio and television stations were obliged to relay the RRI and TVRI news bulletins and only allowed to produce so-called ‘soft’ news of their own, or news that was at least 24 hours after an event and never before any official reactions were known (Kitley 2000:255; Sen and Hill 2000:128). Soft news was also different from ‘hard’ news in style and content, as it was not supposed to contain harsh criticism of government affairs (compare Hjarvard 1998:216).

RRI and TVRI’s style of broadcast journalism was a specific interpretation of development journalism, designed to serve New Order’s five-year Pembangunan (‘Development’) programmes for advancing the country’s economy. ‘Development journalism’ is an international concept, which allegedly has its roots in a seminar on the relationship between broadcasting, education and development organized by UNESCO in Bangkok, May 1967 (Tobing 1991:27). It was fully developed by the members of the Press Foundation of Asia (PFA) – a Manila-based non-profit organization for the training of journalists from Asian countries – who attempted to employ ‘Western media ideology – including the separation of press and state – to advance their profession and, in turn, the development of their countries’ (Tobing 1991:27-8). Journalism according to the original PFA concept did not rely merely on government sources reporting the positive effects of their own policies and activities, but had an independent and investigative character (Tobing 1991:47).

During the 1970s and 1980s, development journalism further evolved in the context of UNESCO debates on the imbalances in the global distribution of information resources. In these debates, Third World representatives pleaded for replacing or modifying the Western capitalist notion of ‘free flow of information’ with the new notion of ‘balanced flow of information’ in order to create and support a New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO). They argued that one of the ways in which NWICO could be achieved was through strict government control of the media (McPhail 1987:77, 105). Western UNESCO members, particularly the United States, were abhorred by the idea of national media borders and referred to article 19 of the United Nations’ Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which guarantees freedom of opinion and expression as well as the right to use any type of medium to search, receive and distribute information.
The protesting Western nations ignored the idea that inequalities in information resources can indeed lead to so-called ‘media imperialism’ (Ansah 1986), ‘electronic colonialism’ (McPhail 1987) or ‘communications diplomacy and propaganda’ (Hale 1975), and have the same impact as mercantile or military colonialism. Using radio, television or other media, nations no longer need to occupy or be physically present in other nations in order to dominate and influence their economic, cultural and political systems (Jurriëns 2004:12-4). Media imperialism includes the Frankfurter Schule notion of the ‘aestheticization of politics’, which refers to genres that are alluring and effectively hiding ideological messages, such as advertisements and entertainment programmes (Hale 1975:xiv).

Specifically regarding journalism, media scholar Paul Ansah (1986:65-6) has identified the following indices of media imperialism.

The imbalance in the flow of news between the North and the South; the distortions in the news about developing countries; the preponderant influence of the transnational news agencies; and the paucity of the horizontal flow of news among developing countries in the South, thus compelling people in those countries to see one another from the perspective of foreign correspondents whose value systems, ideological options and even prejudices are often reflected in the reports. (Ansah 1986:65-6.)

Apart from promoting national economic development, development journalism has also functioned as a tool for Third World countries to fight media imperialism, pursue cultural and informational autonomy and establish solidarity ties with other developing countries (Kitley 2000:178). At the same time, however, the national governments of many of these countries, including Indonesia, have used the developmental and anti-imperialist aspects of development journalism as an excuse to control the media and silence the opposition (Tobing 1991:35, 47). The Indonesian journalist and novelist Mochtar Lubis, who was a member of UNESCO’s NWICO commission, clearly referred to his own country when he declared that it was

hypocritical that members representing some Third World countries demanded a balanced flow of information at the international level, but denied the same thing domestically, where information is vertical – one way – from the top down to the people (McDaniel 1994:287).

Philip Kitley (2000:190) considered the development journalism of TVRI news programmes as ‘rituals of power’ and part of the ‘public relations’ activities of
state officials and departments responsible for official development projects. According to Kitley (2000:204), the way in which the programmes represented members of the public was merely ‘a rite of incorporation, endlessly reinforcing the view that development is for all, while still maintaining the position that there is a complex, graded hierarchy of state officials whose job it is to control and manage, not on their own behalf, but pro bono publico’. In other words, TVRI’s interpretation of development journalism was a form of monologism disguised as dialogism.

RRI applied this style of journalism in current affairs programmes as well as special bulletins on rural development. Programmes such as ‘Siaran pedesaan’ (‘Village broadcast’) and ‘Jam rumah tangga’ (‘Household hour’) were broadcast during the evening hours and contained information about the panca usaha, or ‘five endeavours’ of the Department of Agriculture and topics considered relevant to rural women such as health, family planning and food preparation (McDaniel 1994:224). To ensure that the public would take notice of this type of information in radio broadcasts and other media, the government organized formal Listener, Reader and Viewer Groups (Kelompok Pendengar, Pembaca dan Pemirsa) best known by the acronym of Kelompencapir (McDaniel 1994:239, 299).

During the early 1990s, the Department of Radio, Television and Film claimed that each of the approximately 72,000 Indonesian villages and cities had their own Kelompencapir. The groups discussed developmental information received from the mainstream media and participated in practical projects such as the building and maintaining of fish cultivation systems or chicken flocks (McDaniel 1994:239). Annual competitions were held for radio listeners to encourage greater participation in local development projects and facilitate the evaluation of radio programmes. In these contests, listeners had to answer questions about law and development and demonstrate skills related to village community life, such as the diagnosis of livestock illnesses, the preparation of foods and the tapping of rubber (McDaniel 1994:239-40).

The RRI programmes and off-air activities may have helped local communities in dealing with developmental issues. At first sight, the programmes, contests and listener discussion groups also seem to be similar to some of the interactive programmes and activities of the post-New Order period, such as the Friedrich Naumann Stiftung contests for radio stations (later in this chapter) and the Global FM contests for radio listeners (Chapter VIII). However, while today the public is often dialogically involved in the production of radio programmes and the organization of developmental activities,

---

4 These include better irrigation, use of high-yield seeds, use of fertilizers, fighting disease and pests, and improved soil cultivation, see McDaniel 1994:224.
they were denied any serious creative opportunities or management responsibilities in monological, New Order-style development journalism. During Reformasi, broadcast journalism has also moved from the ‘government-say-so journalism’ of the Suharto period and closer to the original Press Foundation of Asia (PFA) development journalism concept, which values the government watchdog function of journalists as much as their developmental potential (Tobing 1991:47).

Control and contestation

Echoing some of the international debates on NWICO, New Order’s official view on the press was that it had to be ‘free but responsible’ in contrast to the ‘libertine’ and ‘irresponsible’ Western press. This meant that the press had to act as a guardian of Pancasila5 and avoid sensational reporting about ethnicity, religion, race and ‘inter-group’ (that is, class) relations (suku, agama, ras and antargolongan, respectively, commonly abbreviated to the acronym SARA).6

Apart from promoting development journalism, the government used formal legal means and government institutions, particularly the notorious Department of Information, to control the written press, radio and television (Hill 1995:63-5). Indonesian media institutions were obliged to have official print or broadcasting licences, while their employees had mandatory membership of government-controlled professional organizations. The government could ban media institutions or force them to self-censorship by withdrawing, or threatening to withdraw, their licences. Journalists who did not follow the official rules ran the risks of intimidation, prison or even death (Sen and Hill 2000:56, 67-9; Hill 1995:37-54).

Newspapers and magazines could only be published by companies with a Surat Izin Usaha Penerbitan Pers (SIUPP, Press Publishing Company Permit) and journalists had to become members of Persatuan Wartawan Indonesia (PWI), which functioned as the only official Indonesian journalists’ association from 1969 until 1998 (Sen and Hill 2000:53, 55; Hill 1995:67-73). Commercial radio stations had to become members of Persatuan Radio Siaran Swasta Nasional Indonesia (PRSSNI, Indonesian National Association for Commercial Broadcast Radio), which was responsible for broadcasting

5 Pancasila (‘the Five Principles’) is Indonesia’s state ideology promoting the following five values: 1. Belief in the one and only God, 2. Just and civilized humanity, 3. The unity of Indonesia, 4. Democracy guided by the inner wisdom of deliberations of representatives, and 5. Social justice for all the Indonesian people.

licence recommendations and functioned as the only official private radio organization from 1977 until 1998 (Lindsay 1997:113-4; Sen and Hill 2000:87-8). When commercial television came into being during the late 1980s and early 1990s, broadcasting licences all went to family members and close business partners of Suharto (Kitley 2000:230-1).

In spite of the ideological and legal restrictions on the media, the New Order could not prevent the alternative journalistic ideas and practices that were developed in Indonesia or introduced from abroad. While the bureaucracy used the counterbalancing of international information as a pretext for curbing domestic journalism, civil society used international news sources as a means to break free from the shackles of national propaganda and identity formation. In other words, the monoglossic boredom of official culture was resisted and renegotiated by the heteroglossic energies in society, which were inspired by unpredictable combinations of international, national and regional influences.

International news providers entered the country in several ways. Spill-over transmission from Malaysia and Singapore could easily be picked up by standard television equipment in the Indonesian border regions of North Sumatra and West Kalimantan (Kitley 2000:220-1). Ironically, this spill-over was facilitated by Indonesia’s prestigious Palapa satellite. Palapa was launched in 1976 and turned Indonesia into the third country in the world, after the United States and Canada, with a domestic satellite. It was able to cover the whole archipelago and proved to be extremely successful in building national awareness (Kitley 2000:46-54). In the 1980s, affluent Indonesians who had installed their own satellite dishes could receive foreign news services transmitted by international satellites (Kitley 2000:221-4; Sen and Hill 2000:116-9). Foreign news and culture was also accessed on video cassette (McDaniel 1994:276-80; Kitley 2000:217-20) and later VCD and the Internet.\(^7\)

Initially, the Indonesian policy makers attempted to stop unwanted foreign influences from penetrating and ‘corrupting’ Indonesian culture by taking measures such as a ban on commercials on national television (Kitley 2000:63-71). When they understood the ineffectiveness of those measures, they agreed with the establishment of domestic commercial television, which was believed to be easier to control and capable of distracting the attention of the Indonesian public from foreign information providers (Kitley 2000:229). Another incentive for domestic commercial television was Suharto’s business partners, who urged the president for the expansion of commercial opportunities in the field of the media.\(^8\)

---

\(^7\) Hill and Sen 1997, 2005:33-54; Sen and Hill 2000:194-211.

\(^8\) According to the critical radio and television talk show host Wimar Witoelar (1997:158), Suharto’s business partners were not interested in television as such, but only regarded the
Many Indonesian radio listeners tuned in to international broadcasters such as Radio Australia, Radio Nederland, BBC London, Deutsche Welle and Voice of America in order to enjoy different topics and viewpoints than the ones from RRI and other domestic media. In 1996, Jakarta-based Institut Studi Arus Informasi (ISAI, Institute for the Studies on Free Flow of Information) published a book with transcripts of international radio broadcasts that were recorded by Mohamad Sunjaya, a radio host and journalist from the commercial radio station Mara in Bandung. Sunjaya’s (1996:vi) description of his experience of listening to the foreign channels after the 1994 shock-banning of the three esteemed current affairs magazines Tempo, Editor and DeTik (Hill 1995:41-3) illustrates the relevance of these channels to Indonesian listeners, especially in times of crisis.

Fortunately I had the hobby of listening to foreign radio stations such as Radio Australia, Radio Nederland, BBC London, Radio Voice of Germany (Deutsche Welle) and Radio Voice of America (Voice of America). I received the information I was hoping for from these foreign radio stations, which reached Indonesia with their broadcasts. During the period after the banning [of Tempo, Editor and DeTik], I listened to the news and comments from the foreign radio broadcasters daily. At dawn, sometimes still feeling sleepy, I listened to the quality comments from Joss Wibisono in his studio in Hilversum, the Netherlands. Until night-time, I listened to the news and interviews presented by Liston Siregar or Panusunan Simanjuntak [both at BBC London]. I took them with me wherever I went, I listened to the foreign radio broadcasts all day long. (Mohamad Sunjaya 1996:vi.)

Until the 1998 Decree from the Minister of Information, which officially allowed Indonesian radio to relay foreign broadcasts, these international news providers could only be listened to in private, if not in secret. Since the Decree, many commercial stations have made the international relays an integral part of their broadcasting schedules and also used the foreign journalistic styles as a source of inspiration for the production of their own news programmes.

As early as the late 1970s, Sunjaya with some of his colleagues from West Javanese radio pioneered so-called ‘alternative radio journalism’ (jurnalisme radio alternatif), or journalistic alternatives to RRI’s monological development journalism. In 1979, they founded the Lembaga Produksi Siaran (LPS, Broadcast Production Institute) division of the PRSSNI branch in West Java. LPS produced a daily ten-minute ‘Jurnal radio’ (‘Radio journal’) on regional current affairs, which was co-produced and broadcast by the regional PRSSNI

---

The programme was tolerated by the local political rulers, in spite of its news content and probably due to its cleverly chosen journal format. Interestingly, Sunjaya (1996:vii) called the journal a form of ‘development information’ (informasi pembangunan), as it included information that came from and was targeted at community life in the West Javanese cities and villages. Unlike RRI’s development journalism, which Sunjaya preferred to call ‘salon journalism’, LPS’s programme combined an informal style with a critical approach, closer to the original PFA development journalism concept. Sunjaya was fired as editor-in-chief of LPS in 1991, after ‘Jurnal radio’ had reported on student demonstrations in Bandung.

Another example of heteroglossic resistance during the New Order was the establishment of AJI in 1994. AJI was founded by former journalists from Tempo, Editor, DeTik and several other media in protest against the 1994 bans and as an alternative to PWI (Sen and Hill 2000:55). Tempo journalists also continued the publication of their magazine on the Internet, a medium that was virtually beyond the control of the government. The Tempo editors even won two court cases challenging the Minister of Information’s authority to impose the ban, although the Supreme Court eventually upheld the Minister’s appeal (Sen and Hill 2000:6). The editors’ bravery in going to court received much sympathy from the general public, including several military leaders and members of parliament (Hill 1995:42-3).

During Reformasi, the Indonesian news media have continued to contest New Order’s cultural legacy by employing the latest communication technologies, establishing or strengthening bonds with international media organizations, redefining development journalism or developing alternative journalistic concepts and practices. News broadcast organizations with international links, such as Kantor Berita Radio 68H, Internews, Indonesia Media Law and Policy Centre and Friedrich Naumann Stiftung, seem to have followed in the footsteps of the international radio channels that provided the Indonesian audience with alternative information and viewpoints during the New Order. A main difference with the pre-1998 situation is that foreign information sources, international journalistic cooperation and local non-governmental news media are now officially accepted, integrated parts of Indonesia’s re-opened public sphere.

KBR 68H and Internews Indonesia; Independent journalism, peace journalism, transparency

Kantor Berita Radio 68H (KBR 68H, Radio News Agency 68H) and Internews Indonesia are two radio news agencies, which were founded in Jakarta in 1999 and 1998, respectively. Both institutions made use of the enhanced freedom of speech and liberal media legislation of the early Reformasi period to secure their spot in Indonesian broadcast journalism. They do not actively broadcast, but produce programmes to be broadcast by client stations, usually commercial radio, which can receive the programmes on CD or via satellite or the Internet. The programmes include news bulletins, features and current affairs talk shows. Apart from producing programmes, KBR 68H and Internews Indonesia also organize broadcast journalism courses and provide equipment and funding to local radio stations. With their nation-wide network of client stations, they have become serious competitors of RRI and its regional branches.

KBR 68H was established with funding from The Asia Foundation, the Media Development Loan Fund and the Dutch Embassy, among others. The agency covers its operational costs with funding from international governmental and non-governmental organizations and with income from commercial activities. Internews Indonesia was founded as part of the US non-profit organization Internews Network. The network has twenty offices worldwide and is also active in states of the former Soviet Union and other (former) conflict areas such as Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Israel, Palestine, Timor Loro Sae and Iran. Its donors include the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the Dutch Government, the United States Information Agency (USIA), the Ford Foundation and Rockefeller Financial Services.

KBR 68H was founded by a community of internationally trained, cosmopolitan Indonesian journalists, artists and intellectuals who call themselves Komunitas Utan Kayu (Utan Kayu Community). Apart from the radio news agency, they run the radio station Radio 68H, the discussion, training and publishing centre ISAI, the art gallery Galeri Lontar, the theatre group Teater Utan Kayu (TUk, Utan Kayu Theatre) and the bookshop Toko Buku Utan Kayu (Utan Kayu Bookshop), which are all based at 68H Utan Kayu Street. Goenawan Mohamad built the infrastructure for this community in 1994, when he bought four shops at Utan Kayu with the intention of creating a place for journalists and others to meet. This was a reaction to the banning of Tempo, which was headed by Mohamad as editor-in-chief. The formal structure of the Utan Kayu Community gave protection to those Tempo journalists who decided to go underground, uphold their own journalistic standards and continue publishing their banned magazine in electronic form on the Internet.
A poster illustrating Kantor Berita Radio 68H's connectivity between radio and satellite technology
The Utan Kayu complex and community revive memories of the infrastructure and ambience of the eighteenth century coffee houses, salons and table societies discussed by Habermas. At the centre of the complex is a *kedai* or small restaurant, surrounded by the theatre, the gallery, the bookshop, and the publishing and radio production facilities. The *kedai* is the place where Indonesian and foreign journalists, artists and scholars come together in order to have a coffee or a meal and participate in critical debates about topics such as journalism, art, literature, politics, religion and class. The conclusions or consensus reached during some of these discussions are made public through the radio broadcasts, current affairs magazines, literary works, theatre plays, paintings, sculptures, journalism courses, handbooks, interviews, speeches and other media of the Utan Kayu community.

In 2001, KBR 68H had a network of more than two hundred radio stations that made use of its programmes, while Internews Indonesia distributed its broadcasts to more than fifty radio partners nationwide. KBR 68H enables the exchange of information between different regions in Indonesia by broadcasting programmes produced by its regional client stations, thus providing listeners in Manado, North Sulawesi with news that was produced in Aceh, and listeners in Aceh with news from Bandung, West Java, for instance. This type of information-sharing constitutes a serious challenge to RRI’s infrastructure of regional branches, which was the only national radio network permitted during the New Order.12

KBR 68H proudly makes the listeners aware of its extensive information network, as in the following jingle for the news bulletin ‘Kabar baru’ (‘New information’).

‘Kabar baru 68H’. ‘Kabar baru’: listen to it carefully. Every hour from 6 a.m. until 9 p.m. Western Indonesian Time on your radio. A variety of reliable, independent and topical information, arriving faster from various corners of the fatherland. ‘Kabar baru’: economic problems, politics and social turbulences in various regions from Aceh to Papua. Listen to it carefully. Exclusively from Kantor Berita Radio 68H, Jakarta.13

Member stations also try to gain prestige and commercial benefit from their cooperation with KBR 68H. Suara Padang, for instance, always mentions the strong ties between ‘Jakarta’ and ‘Padang’ – or, implicitly, the political and

---

economic centre and the regional periphery – when announcing a ‘Kabar baru’ relay from KBR 68H: ‘From S. Parman Street 188 [the Suara Padang address] this was a syndication of Radio Suara Padang and Kantor Berita Radio 68H, Jakarta.’


Internews Indonesia has produced similar programmes. From 1999 until 2001, it had weekly features about topical socio-political problems: ‘Kilas balik’ (‘Flashback’), gender issues: ‘Jurnal perempuan’ (‘Women’s journal’) and the position of marginalized groups in society: ‘Mata hati’ (‘The mind’s eye’). In 2001, these were replaced by three other programmes, which were about the environment: ‘Sahabat alam’ (‘Friends of nature’), public affairs: ‘Suara bangsaku’ (‘The voice of my nation’) and health: ‘Sehat Indonesiaku’ (‘My healthy Indonesia’), respectively.

With their institutional structures and programmes, KBR 68H and Internews Indonesia have presented themselves as ‘third way’ alternatives to government and commercial organizations. They are dedicated to representing the interests of the Indonesian public and promoting independent journalism, as illustrated by the following statement on KBR 68H’s website.

The Internet and satellite are only tools. What matters is the people behind these technologies. Radio 68H is supported by professional journalists who really understand the function of journalism. We are here to serve the interest of the public and meet its right on information. Amidst the euphoria of freedom, we are aware of the importance of clear, honest and clarifying information. Our journalists are trained to develop an independent attitude, to refuse to submit to [state] power or financial interests.

This discourse is the discourse of Reformasi, expressed by people looking for a definitive break with Indonesia’s totalitarian past and trying to steer the new process of reform. At the same time, it resembles or repeats the discourse of

---

16 A striking aspect of their statement is that satellite is considered merely a tool. As discussed
international NGOs, including the concepts of independent journalism, civil society and the public sphere. The international Internews Network website, for instance, also contains statements about supporting ‘independent media in emerging democracies’ through ‘innovative television and radio programming and internet content’. The institutional structures and journalistic practices of post-New Order institutions such as KBR 68H and Internews Indonesia can only be fully understood within the total spectrum of regional, national and global forces.

In their statements, KBR 68H and Internews Network both mentioned independent journalism as a key instrument for the press to serve the public interest, promote democracy, and uphold other Reformasi ideals. Independent journalism can be seen as one among several alternatives to the monological, government-controlled development journalism of the New Order. It can also be seen as a generic genre consisting of several subgenres, which each have their own style and focus points, but all share the value of journalistic independence.

KBR 68H and Internews Indonesia have also promoted their own version of another form of journalism that has come to the fore since Reformasi, so-called ‘peace journalism’. Peace journalism can be considered as either an individual genre or one of the subgenres of independent journalism. The Internews Network website indirectly referred to peace journalism in the latter sense, by mentioning the usefulness of independent journalism as a tool ‘to reduce conflict within and between countries’. The role of the media in conflict resolution has become prominent after the multiple outbreaks of communal violence in the Moluccas, Kalimantan, Sulawesi and other regions in the late 1990s.

National and international organizations have promoted peace journalism and related journalistic concepts about more specific problems, such as multicultural conflicts and discrimination against women, through the organization of workshops and the publication of books. For instance, the Indonesian NGO Lembaga Studi Pers dan Pembangunan (LSPP, Institute for Press and Development Studies) has published a series of journalism handbooks in cooperation with The Asia Foundation and USAID Jakarta, including titles such as Jurnalisme damai; Bagaimana melakukannya? (‘Peace journalism; How to conduct it?’, 2001), Konflik multikultur; Panduan bagi jurnalis (‘Multicultural before, during the Suharto regime the introduction of the domestic Palapa satellite (1976) was a highly prestigious project designed to serve the equally prestigious project of nation-building, see Kitley 2000:46-63. The people involved in KBR 68H, representing a turn from the state to civil society, critically examine to what extent such projects are serving the public interest.
conflicts; A guide for journalists’, 2000) and Konvensi tentang penghapusan segala bentuk diskriminasi terhadap perempuan; Panduan meliput bagi jurnalis (‘The convention for the abolition of every form of discrimination against women; A reporting guide for journalists’, 1999).19

In one of her articles, Patricia Spyer (2005) illustrates how independent journalism and peace journalism have been translated from abstract concepts promoted by international and national NGOs into concrete Indonesian journalistic practices. The article focuses on the moral dilemmas of domestic journalists working in the Moluccas and other conflict areas in post-Suharto Indonesia. On the one hand, these journalists feel they have the right and obligation to freely report on a conflict. On the other hand, they are prepared to make compromises on their journalistic principles in order to minimize the risk of their reporting causing a conflict to increase. According to Spyer (2005:153), this moral dilemma has led to a ‘proactive, stripped-bare form of reporting’, which is devoid of any references to the religious, ethnic or other affiliations of the parties involved in a conflict. One of her cases is a newspaper journalist from Ternate, who explains that if a house of worship has been burnt down somewhere in the Moluccas, he will report on the event, but not mention whether the destroyed building is a church or a mosque (Spyer 2005:155).

This type of journalism seems to depart from the Reformasi ideal of ‘transparency’, as it is aimed at peace and safety rather than critical illumination (Spyer 2005:152). According to Spyer (2002:33), by leaving out the crucial details of an event, the peace-minded journalists deny the public the chance to come to terms with what has happened. Their reporting can lead to a ‘spectralization’ of conflicts and violence (Spyer 2002:33), potentially causing more conflicts and violence and completely reversing the original intentions of the journalists.

One can imagine that when violence comes to be seen as lacking an identifiable origin, when it lurks both nowhere and potentially everywhere, when its source is largely unseen, that this can engender a terrible fear. Without a clear object to fix on or turn to for reassurance, the response to such an engulfing fear may, in the right circumstances, be a recourse to violence. (Spyer 2005:160.)

Although, for very understandable reasons, this type of reporting exists in post-New Order Indonesia, it is certainly not the only type of peace journalism developed and practiced by Indonesian journalists. In certain radio talk shows and news bulletins, reporters or hosts explicitly mention the origins of

19 Darpan A. Winangun, LSPP publishing manager, personal communication, Jakarta, 10-10-2001.
a conflict or the names of the parties involved, or deliberately take provocative, thought-provoking stands. This includes KBR 68H’s talk show ‘Hak asasi manusia’ (‘Human rights’), which, unlike the peace journalists that refrain from being transparent, addresses sensitive issues in a direct manner.

An example is the 9 October 2001 broadcast of ‘Hak asasi manusia’, which contained an interview between host Andi Budiman and liberal Muslim leader Muslim Abdurrahman on the US invasion in Afghanistan. The producers constructed the interactive programme to have a peaceful or cathartic effect by providing it with a provocative starting point for discussion. It started with Abdurrahman trying to understand and expressing certain sympathy for the motives behind the US invasion. Although many KBR 68H listeners disagreed with a fellow-Muslim country being invaded, Abdurrahman’s respected status as local Muslim leader saved the discussion from an early death.

Before listeners could phone in and participate in the programme, the host warmed up the conversation with Abdurrahman by asking him about his personal opinion about the invasion. Abdurrahman responded that he could understand that the US government was angry and wanted to find and punish the people guilty of the attack on the World Trade Center. He did not consider the US actions a form of state terrorism or an attack on Islam, assuming the bombings were restricted to military targets and not designed to cause any civilian casualties. According to Abdurrahman, the Taliban were guilty of many crimes themselves and not representing the thoughts and ideals of Afghan society or the Islamic world in general. He also did not agree with the destruction of US assets or the intimidation of US citizens in Indonesia, especially since Islam was an accepted religion in the US and many US citizens went to the streets in protest against the war plans of their government.

The majority of listeners who participated in the interactive discussion was sceptical about the US and their allies, believing their main reason to go to war was economic interests. One of the listeners, Ms Yetti from Kediri, East Java, requested Abdurrahman to confirm whether he really sympathized with the allied forces, as she personally thought their decision to bomb Afghanistan was premature.

Yetti: I just noticed that you also said that the bombings conducted by America on, where on... on Afghanistan, were reasonably fair, according to you. According to me, they are not, because of America’s own political attitude. You see how unfair they are towards Palestine. What America is doing now is apparently because the Afghan government does not want to indicate where Osama Bin Laden is, as there are still doubts about his case. While America already had the courage, so to say, to immediately bomb this place, thereby affecting the Islamic community itself. So if things flare up in Indonesia, I think it is rather... er... maybe because of a feeling of solidarity with fellow Muslims. But I would not agree if there would be destruc-
tions of American assets by the Indonesian people in Indonesia. So, I would like to ask you about your attitude, how you just justified the American bombings.

Budiman: Fine, thank you, Ms Yetti. Maybe you can explain it again, Brother Muslim.

Abdurrahman: Well, Ms Yetti, I did not say that it was fair. But as long as America is selective in [bombing] military installations and so on, according to me, it is still in proportion, as they actually have a reason to search for ‘the mass murderer’ [in English] via the Taliban regime that protects him. Therefore, in my opinion, if it goes beyond military targets and the like, it cannot be justified, of course. 20

This example shows that the hosts and invited guests of certain interactive radio shows have the courage to take provocative stands or address sensitive issues in a direct, ‘transparent’ manner. KBR 68H has promoted its own type of transparent peace journalism also in other programmes and jingles. The following jingle for the religious affairs talk show ‘Agama dan toleransi’ (‘Religion and tolerance’), for instance, did not avoid but explicitly addressed the complex and sensitive issue of religious pluralism.

Should a person who is different be treated as an enemy? Can a difference in religion become a reason to quarrel? Listen carefully to the programme ‘Agama dan toleransi’ every Thursday 3:30 p.m. Western Indonesian Time. Together with me, Udin Apsar Abdallah, and renowned social personalities in Indonesia. Live from Kantor Berita Radio 68H, Jakarta. 21


KBR 6H and Internews Indonesia have also promoted another type of transparency, namely media transparency, by developing broadcasting ideas and practices with a meta-journalistic character. Especially the Indonesia Media Law and Policy Centre (IMLPC), which started as the Media Law division of Internews Indonesia and developed into an independent institute in 2001, has given prominence to meta-journalism. IMLPC’s mission is to enhance the professionalism of the Indonesian press, particularly the non-governmental broadcasting media with their short experience in news production. The IMLPC also informs the public about media legislation and negotiates with parliament and other relevant parties about the drafting of new media laws. Its activities include the organization of workshops, the publication of books and brochures, and the production of radio and television programmes on issues related to media law and policy.

IMLPC’s programmes are distributed as broadcast material on CD to local radio stations nationwide. I will focus on the 2001 CD series ‘Mengawal kebebasan pers’ (‘Pioneering/monitoring press freedom’), which was produced in collaboration with Dewan Pers (the Indonesian Press Council) and the Jakarta-based commercial radio station MStri. The series was meta-journalistic, as it contained information about the rights and obligations of both journalists and audiences in the context of Indonesia’s renewed press freedom, and aimed at enhancing the media literacy of the Indonesian public. Themes included ‘violence against the mass media by the masses’ (kekerasan terhadap media massa oleh massa, June 2001), ‘how to correctly recognize a journalist’ (bagaimana mengenali wartawan dengan benar, August 2001) and ‘who holds responsibility in a talk show’ (siapa yang bertanggung jawab dalam sebuah talk show, June 2001).

Each feature took approximately 25 minutes and consisted of the host’s narrative, inserts with comments from media experts, background music and special sound effects. The host was Hinca I.P. Pandjaitan, media lawyer and head of IMLPC. From 2001 until 2006, Pandjaitan also hosted the weekly TVRI talk show ‘Dewan Pers menjawab’ (‘The Press Council responds’), in which issues are addressed similar to those in the IMLPC series. In each radio feature, Pandjaitan’s narrative was accompanied by Western classical music, probably to enhance the status of the programme and create a serious

23 Mengawal can either mean ‘to pioneer’ or ‘to monitor’, depending on whether it is derived from the noun awal (‘beginning’) or from the noun kawal (‘guard, watch’). Thus mengawal enables a play with two concepts – pioneering and monitoring – that are both considered relevant in the early stage of Indonesia’s renewed journalistic freedom during Reformasi.
but pleasant atmosphere. Comments from experts and special sound effects were used to illustrate certain key issues or provide dramatic emphasis. For instance, when Pandjaitan talked about violence against the media, the sounds of broken glass and people screaming could be heard.

In the programmes, Pandjaitan tirelessly reminded journalists and the general public that their right to obtain and provide information was protected by ‘the supremacy of the law’. While different parties with or without any legal knowledge have used and abused this phrase in the context of Reformasi, Pandjaitan always referred to specific legislation such as the Second Amendment to the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, the 1999 Press Law and particularly the 1999 Human Rights Law. Pandjaitan often quoted article 14 of the Human Rights Law, which states that ‘every person has the right to seek, obtain, own, store, process and convey information by any type of medium available’. The frequent references to this type of legislation were to emphasize that the state was legally prohibited to monopolize and ‘monologize’ the news as during the New Order. At the same time, Pandjaitan used different case-studies to argue that journalists and the general public had to develop the right ethics and skills to avoid or counter media abuse, and give real meaning to the information freedom of the Reformasi era.

For instance, in the programme on the theme ‘who holds responsibility in a talk show’, Pandjaitan discussed the publication of President Abdurrahman Wahid’s health reports by the commercial television station Metro TV. He posed the question whether Metro TV and its informants had acted ethically in accordance with their right to convey information or whether they were in breach of other legislation that prohibits people from offending the president of Indonesia. The programme did not solve the problem in a direct manner, but presented the details of the case as well as references to relevant legislation to encourage the listeners to search for answers themselves.

The programme on the theme ‘how to recognize a real journalist’ was also about the ethics of the journalism profession. It talked about wartawan gadungan (‘fake journalists’), sometimes also called wartawan bodrek24 (‘Bodrex journalists’) or wartawan amplop (‘envelope journalists’).25 These self-proclaimed journalists use fake press cards and force people to pay money for responses to stories that will never be published. In the programme, Pandjaitan provided the public with practical and legal information about how to recognize and deal with the bogus journalists. Indirectly, he also criti-

24 Bodrex is derived from the painkiller brand Bodrex, which in one of its commercials depicts a mass of people hunting for the medicine. Fake journalists usually also operate in groups, hunting for money: Veven Sp. Wardhana, personal communication, 18-10-2001.

25 These are fake or ‘real’ journalists demanding envelopes with money from interviewees.
cized ‘real’ journalists who, in order to earn something in addition to their official salary – which is often very meagre indeed – ask interviewees for envelopes with money in exchange for publicity.

The programme on the theme ‘violence against the mass media by the masses’ was about audience behaviour. It analysed why Indonesia during Reformasi has experienced groups in society expressing their anger with the media by threatening journalists or destroying their offices. The programme discussed and defended the rights and functions of the press and warned the public about sentences for violent behaviour against journalists. Pandjaitan also informed the listeners about alternative, non-violent ways of expressing their dissatisfaction with media reports, such as their ‘right of reply’ (hak jawab) and their right to demand rectification (hak koreksi).

IMLPC’s programmes provide counter-evidence against Habermas’ claim that mass culture and media segmentation would automatically lead to passive consumerism. The programmes live up to the expectations of the bourgeois public sphere to the extent that they are institutionalized, reach large parts of society through IMLPC’s extensive network of client stations, and voice consensus among media scholars and practitioners involved in rational debates on state-related issues. Rather than contributing to the ‘refeudalization of society’ and the ‘externalization of inner life’, IMLPC and other post-New Order media organizations such as KBr 68H and Internews Indonesia have shown awareness of these Habermasian fears – which can manifest themselves in tangible instances of media abuse indeed – in their attempts at making audiences media literate and media savvy.

The IMLPC programme series addressed themes that were considered of immediate relevance to the Indonesian public struggling with the challenges of Reformasi, such as law reform, regional autonomy and human rights. At the same time, the themes and ways of discussion transcended the Indonesian situation and the borders of the Indonesian nation-state, as they were also derived from and applicable to situations and nation-states elsewhere. Similar to KBR 68H and Internews Indonesia, IMLPC receives inspiration from the civil society and public sphere idiom used by the extensive network of international NGOs of which it is a part. This means that the institutional structures and programmes of KBR 68H, Internews Indonesia and IMLPC contradict Habermas’ implicit claim that the boundaries of the public sphere follow the boundaries of the nation-state (Calhoun 1992:37) and call for the study of civil society and the public sphere in an international perspective. Some of the programmes express a type of patriotism that confirms Indonesia’s national motto of ‘unity in diversity’ (bhinneka tunggal ika), as reflected in titles such as KBR 68H’s ‘Suara bangsaku’ (‘The voice of my nation’) and Internews Indonesia’s ‘Sehat Indonesiaku’ (‘My healthy Indonesia’). This is a new type of patriotism, or rather, ‘cosmopatriotism’
(Jurriëns and De Kloet 2007), which replaces the narrow nationalist rhetoric of the New Order and is fuelled by global or cosmopolitan experiences.

Similar to the criticism on Habermas’ notion of the bourgeois public sphere, the programme content of KBR 68H, Internews Indonesia and IMLPC has been criticized for being elitist and exclusive, as it is based on the professional input of media insiders rather than experiences shared by the common public. In this respect, radio stations broadcasting programmes such as the pre-recorded episodes of IMLPC’s ‘Mengawal kebebasan pers’ confront their audiences with finalized products and the consensus reached by others. As my analysis of ‘Hak asasi manusia’ shows, KBR 68H gives the listeners of regional stations relaying its talk shows the opportunity to phone in to the studio in Jakarta and have their opinions broadcast in the whole archipelago. These opportunities are limited, though, as conversations are predominantly between hosts and invited experts. There are also other constraints on participation such as the expense of telephone calls, which makes it more difficult for less affluent listeners from outside Jakarta to have their voices represented.

Local radio stations that broadcast KBR 68H, Internews Indonesia and IMLPC programmes have also received comments from their listeners that the programme content is Jakarta-centred and often not relevant to local circumstances. Some of these listeners perceived the Utan Kayu Community as an elite society of intellectuals, separated from the rest of Indonesian society and, similar to Habermas’ bourgeois public sphere, only accessible to people with the appropriate educational background or social network.26 In short, the three institutions and their programmes are dialogical in their attempts at enhancing the media literacy and ideological awareness of the public, but not in the narrower, more literal sense of directly involving audiences in debates on the media and other socio-political issues, due to the institutions positioning themselves as the representatives – rather than the presenters – of the public.

Friedrich Naumann Stiftung; Contests, inserts and virtual interactivity

Another influential international organization that has been active in promoting alternatives to the New Order’s monological development journalism on a national scale is the Friedrich Naumann Stiftung (FNS). While KBR 68H, Internews Indonesia and IMLPC have used programme production and jour-

---

26 This view was expressed by Yusirwan Yusuf, head of Suara Padang, Padang: personal communication 19-8-2002, and Kecuk Sahana, Production Manager of Unisi, Yogyakarta: personal communication 30-8-2001, among others.
nalism workshops as their main strategies to develop Indonesian radio journalism, FNS has focused on the organization of annual competitions for best radio news programmes. The type of journalism promoted by FNS is ‘virtual interactivity’, which has its own specific dialogic qualities and is a fourth journalistic genre or sub-genre besides independent journalism, peace journalism and meta-journalism that has come to the fore since the late 1990s.

FNS was founded in Germany in 1958 by the first president of the Federal Republic of Germany, Theodor Heuss (1884-1963). Heuss named the organization after his political mentor, Friedrich Naumann (1860-1919), a leading liberal politician and one of the founders of the Weimar Republic (1919-1933). FNS ‘sees itself as an agent of organized liberalism and is connected with the Free Democratic Party (FDP)’ (Radio awards 2000b, 2001). The organization works in the spirit of Naumann, who believed that political education builds democracy by enabling the political participation and emancipation of citizens. FNS provides political education based on the principles of ‘legal security and the rule of law, freedom of the media and of information, human rights, tolerance, pluralism, the application of the subsidiarity principle and market oriented economic reforms’.27 The organization has a worldwide network with offices in Europe, Asia, Africa and North and South America.

FNS has worked in Indonesia since the late 1960s, ‘mainly promoting political dialogue and strengthening civil society’ (Radio awards 2000b, 2001). The Indonesian office has five departments: Administration, Publications, Government and Parliament, Law, and Journalism. The journalism department organizes training courses for radio journalists in cooperation with Deutsche Welle and provides a selected number of radio stations with broadcasting equipment such as computers, mixing panels and tape recorders. The department also organizes courses for journalists from the print media, including training on creating political cartoons. Every two months, Indonesian media representatives and parliamentarians are invited to go to Germany and meet German politicians and FNS members from other countries. These meetings give the invited guests the opportunity to conduct comparative research on topics such as how to organize general elections in a democratic way, and how to utilize the media in covering those events.28

A key element in FNS Indonesia’s mission of disseminating democracy through broadcast journalism is its annual Lomba Program Radio, or ‘Radio Programme Competition’. This competition, which has been organized since

27 With this particular suggestion for economic reform, FNS clearly links its liberal program to the ideology of capitalism. This may explain why it attributes an important role to commercial media institutions in the Indonesian process of Reformasi, apart from emphasizing their potential for high-quality news production.
28 Firqie Firmansyah, personal communication, 15-8-2002.
The Friedrich Naumann Stiftung ‘Radio awards 2000’ brochure
1999, focuses each year on a different theme. In 1999 the theme was the general elections, in 2000 the performance of the members of parliament, and in 2001 regional autonomy. Radio stations compete with each other in three different categories: reportage, mini-feature and interview. Information on the competition and the conditions of participation are announced on posters and several mailing lists on the Internet, and sent to commercial radio stations and branches of PRSSNI and AJI. Stations that are interested in the competition have to send a recording and its transcript to FNS.

Each year, FNS Indonesia sends its jury’s reports and cassettes or CDs with recordings of the prizewinning programmes to commercial radio stations nationwide. The jury’s reports are informed by the political education ideals of the international NGO, but also the journalistic ideas and practices of local Indonesian radio stations such as Suara Surabaya. Suara Surabaya is not only where the head of the jury, Errol Jonathans, works, but also the radio station with the greatest prestige and longest history in news production in Indonesia. Suara Surabaya does not participate in the FNS competition because of Jonathans’ involvement in the jury. By establishing connections with such a reputable radio journalist and exploiting the popularity of the competition format, FNS has successfully distinguished itself from other international and national media training institutions such as KBR 68H, Internews Indonesia and IMLPC, and partially set a standard for Indonesian radio journalism.

The use of competitions for enhancing the quality of radio are embedded in what Karen Strassler (2004) has called an Indonesian ‘culture of contests’. Strassler observes that contests are very common in Indonesia, especially for inviting popular participation in state programmes and commercial ventures. She describes how the New Order used contests for promoting state initiatives – ranging from family planning to tourism development and neighbourhood security watches – to the public. According to Strassler (2004:9), these types of contest, ‘[...] while apparently celebrating achievement and innovation [...] actually function to reinforce existing structures of authority and to homogenize expression in accord with dominant ideologies’.

Examples from the New Order were the contests organized for radio audiences participating in Kelompencapir and state-sponsored competitions for Sundanese wayang golek (wooden puppet theatre). According to Andrew Weintraub (2001:99), the wayang contests ‘represented attempts to recruit performers as vehicles for popularizing the government’s program of national development’. Following the official evaluation criteria used for the contests, the performances had to ‘thematize mental and spiritual development’, ‘communicate the instructions of development to the masses’ and use language that was ‘good and correct’ (Weintraub 2001:93). Although the contests partially codified Sundanese wayang golek according to the New Order
guidelines, *dalang* (puppeteers) also resisted state co-optation and continued to respond to the audience’s taste for entertainment, communication and innovation. It was precisely *dalang* with the ability to respond to the expectations and concerns of the public which gained special popularity and prestige (Weintraub 2001:88).

New Order’s political marketing rooted the tradition of organizing and participating in contests in Indonesian culture. During Reformasi contests have remained popular, including competitions for radio stations and outstanding radio listeners. Like the New Order contests, the Reformasi radio competitions are not free from ideology, as they are used to represent (foreign) political viewpoints or commercial interests. However, unlike the New Order contests, the latter competitions do aim, in Strassler’s words (2004:9), at ‘achievement and innovation’ and attempt to be dialogical. In the contests for either radio stations or radio listeners, the participants are not merely asked to repeat or apply fixed ideas in a competitive situation, but encouraged to think about the very principles of radio communications and to suggest improvements and change of organizational forms, production modes, programme formats, journalistic concepts and audience behaviour. Most Indonesian media institutions are also aware of the ideological underpinnings of their cooperation with (foreign) political or commercial counterparts, and often show a very pragmatic attitude to those partnerships by calculating to what extent they serve the aims of the institutions themselves.

In the 2001 Friedrich Naumann Stiftung (FNS) competition with the theme of regional autonomy, 44 radio stations participated with 104 programmes in total. Although the organizers tried to stimulate the participation of radio stations from regions such as Sumatra, Sulawesi, Kalimantan and Eastern Indonesia, the majority of the participating stations (29) was from the traditional political and economic centre of Java (Radio awards 2001:2, 7). The head of the jury was Errol Jonathans, while the other jury members were specialists either in the field of radio journalism or regional autonomy.

While the jury’s report of 2000 noticed an improvement in the quality of the competing radio programmes compared to the preceding year, the 2001 report regretted a decline in journalistic quality. According to the jury, it was difficult to find programmes that matched good knowledge of regional autonomy with good skills in radio broadcasting. Some programmes met the production criteria but failed to deliver satisfying analyses of regional autonomy, while other programmes provided useful discussions on the topic that were poorly presented. The jury believed that radio makers had to take into account four aspects of radio production to create successful programmes on regional autonomy. Firstly, they had to find a balance between radio’s role as a public medium on the one hand, and its function as an institution with specific ideological or commercial interests on the other. Secondly, they had
to have good knowledge of the topic, to be able to provide not only information, but also education, criticism and ideas for solutions. Thirdly, they had to be able to present the programme content in an attractive manner without compromising the quality of the information provided. Fourthly, they had to have a sense of radio’s impact on the audience’s perception and knowledge of the topic (Radio awards 2001:10-3).

In order to explain what FNS considered ‘good’ radio journalism particularly in terms of presentation, I will discuss two reports from that which they considered their most successful competition, the 2000 competition on the theme of ‘our representatives in parliament’. The first report was on the first-prize programme in the reportage category produced by the former news agency Quadrant News Centre in Jakarta. The programme was about the outbreak of social unrest and demonstrations after an incident in which the army had taken several student activists into custody. What the jury appreciated about this programme was its ability to give the atmosphere of the event through the dynamic presentation of the reporter and the sound recording from the demonstration as well as a declaration of the local head of police. (Radio awards 2000b:8.)

The strength and unique quality of this reportage lies in the packaging, which presents several sound elements that are lively through the strength of the ‘ambience’ of the demonstrators’ voices. The dynamics of this atmosphere are combined with a dynamic announcing technique that follows the rhythm of the event. An auxiliary element that strengthens the reportage is the sound bite from the declaration of the Head of the Metro Jaya Regional Police. Overall, the report flows harmoniously and is able to bring the listeners into the atmosphere of the demonstration, as if they were participants at the same location as the reporter. (Radio awards 2000b:8.)

The second report was on the third-prize programme in the same category. It was produced by Ria FM in Solo and discussed the false testimony by the chief director of the plantation firm PTPN IX in Central Java. The report was positive about the presentational style of the programme, particularly the way that the reporter explained the facts of the event. However, it also stated that the quality of the programme could have been enhanced if a greater sense of the atmosphere surrounding the event was provided.

The different evaluation of the first- and third-prize programmes shows that a central element in the radio journalism FNS attempts to promote, is the ability to provide the atmosphere of the reported event. Reporters can give the audience a sense of atmosphere by including sound-bites from people directly involved in the event, such as eyewitnesses, or ambient sounds from the event itself. In the jargon of Indonesian radio journalists, these sounds and sound-bites are called *sisipan* or ‘inserts’ (the English term is sometimes used) as they are inserted in the narrative of a reporter or programme host.
(Masduki 2001:31-3; Jonathans 2000:81). Inserts are a relatively new phenomenon in Indonesian radio journalism as they were rarely used in the formal and distanced RRI bulletins, which all commercial stations were obliged to relay during the New Order.29 According to Masduki (2001:31-2), inserts have enhanced the credibility of Indonesian news programmes and made them more ‘factual’ (factual), ‘lively’ (hidup), ‘attractive’ (atraktif) and ‘sharp’ (tajam).

The following description of the first-prize programme in the category mini-feature of the 2000 competition provides a concrete example of the function of radio inserts. The mini-feature produced by KBR 68H was ‘MPR tetap pertahankan TNI/Polri hingga 2009’ (‘MPR maintains TNI/Polri until 2009’). It was on the proposal of one of the People’s Consultative Council (Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat, MPR) committees to extend the position of the Indonesian National Army (Tentara Nasional Indonesia, TNI) and the Police of the Republic of Indonesia (Polisi Republik Indonesia, POLRI) in the council until 2009. The army and police had seats in MPR and Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat (DPR) as part of their dwifungsi (‘dual function’, that is, both security and politics-related) since 1960 (Vatikiotis 1993:60-91). In the light of Reformasi and the democratization of the political system, this dual function was under reconsideration.

The mini-feature reported several reactions in politics and society about the proposed plan of the MPR committee. First, the female presenter reported on the political parties that were in the process of voting for or against the proposal. Then her discussion was that groups in society were disappointed that the position of the army and police in MPR would be maintained. Before and after this section, sounds from students’ demonstrations in front of the MPR building could be heard, including slogans such as ‘Usir, usir TNI’ (‘Chase away, chase away the army’). The presenter continued with summarizing the opinion of one of the members of the Partai Demokrasi Indonesia-Perjuangan (PDI-P, Indonesian Democracy Struggle Party) faction who supported the proposal, as he thought that the army and police would otherwise establish their own political party and become even more influential in politics. The summary was followed by sound-bites from the original statement of the PDI-P member. Finally, the presenter discussed the opinion of the Minister of Defence, Yono Sudarsono, who was against the plan and wanted the army and police discharged immediately from their political functions. This final part of the feature also included sound-bites from Sudarsono’s statement.

On the audio-cassette with recordings of all the awarded programmes, the FNS jury praised the producers of the mini-feature particularly for their selection of information sources and ability to display the atmosphere.

29 Masduki, personal communication, 4-9-2001.
The strength of this feature lies in the texture of several audio elements that feature human interest perspectives. The ambient sounds of demonstrators who refuse the decision complement the depth of the discussion about the topic. The choice of balanced and credible informants constitutes the other strength of this programme.\textsuperscript{30}

The jury’s reports made it clear that, according to the FNS standard, ‘liveliness’ and ‘attractiveness’ – as mentioned in Masduki’s description of sisipan – referred to the function of inserts to stimulate the imagination of the audience and give them the impression of being physically present at the reported event. Masduki’s other notions of ‘factuality’ and ‘sharpness’, however, are more complicated when applied to cases of sisipan in Indonesian news programmes. They probably refer to the fact that radio stations also use inserts to claim that their reports are ‘live’ and that their reporters are on the spot of the reported events. Factuality and sharpness also imply the Reformasi ideal of transparency, or the fight against the legacy of New Order leaders covering up the ‘real’ facts.

Mora in Bandung is an example of an Indonesian commercial radio station that has partly based its image on notions of factuality and sharpness or liveness in news reporting. Mora is known for its bulletins with local news, which are broadcast every half hour. In these bulletins, the studio hosts have direct contact with Mora reporters in the field. The jingle that accompanies the reports contributes to the image of the radio station as a fast and reliable news provider. The jingle suggests speed and liveness by announcing the reports as ‘interruptions’ (interupsi). It underlines the accuracy of the reports by stating that the information they contain has been ‘checked’ (teruji). The news bulletins themselves have inserts with background noises and on-the-spot interviews to signify the presence of the Mora reporters at the site of the reported events.

When radio stations use inserts to suggest liveness as in the case of Mora, they give the illusion of providing a window on the world, as if the sounds they transmit are undistorted and the listeners can hear for themselves what is happening on the site of the event. However, such usage of inserts poses questions about the authenticity of the represented sounds and sound-bites, as they are usually edited and are thus distorted and manipulated in the process of mediation. By stressing immediacy or transparency, the stations seem to obscure their own role in the process of mediation. In other words, inserts do not necessarily make a report more ‘factual’ and ‘sharp’ than monologic narration.

\textsuperscript{30} Kekuatan feature ini ada pada rajutan berbagai elemen audio yang menampilkan sisisisi minat insani. Suara-suara ambience demonstran yang menolak keputusan ini melengkapi kedalaman bahasan topik. Pemilihan nara sumber yang berimbang dan kredibel merupakan kekuatan lain program ini, see Radio awards 2000a.
Nevertheless, irrespective of whether they are used to create immediacy, inserts certainly make the audience feel more engaged with the news event. Where liveliness is concerned, engagement is triggered by the programme’s presentation and the allure of the sheer materiality of the inserted sounds. In the case of a report being seen as live, this is mainly based on the information value of the represented event and the supposed transparency of the inserted sounds and the programme as a whole. In other words, inserts stimulate a kind of ‘virtual interactivity’ in which the audience responds emotionally and intellectually to a programme and news.

In engaging or involving the audience, this virtual interactivity is dialogical and breaks with and reacts against the monologism and detachment of the journalistic styles and other public discourse officially approved by the New Order. It is not necessarily dialogical in the Bakhtinian sense of enhancing the media literacy and ideological awareness of the audience, and certainly not dialogical in the narrow sense of ‘real’ interactivity. ‘Interactive journalism’ that gives listeners the opportunity to directly contribute to broadcasts constitutes a different, fifth dominant genre or subgenre in post-Suharto radio journalism, and will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.