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The return of freedom of expression to Indonesian society and the rapid infiltration of the market economy are the two main elements that have influenced media development in Indonesia since May 1998 in the reformasi era. The rejection of the former authoritarian rule of the Suharto regime by Indonesian society was profound and led to broad-based support for the concept of political and economic reform, in which the role of the state is to be minimized, and where free market forces are to preside over society, including the media. This is the socio-political climate in which the privatization of entire industries, including the media, is taking place. As a consequence, in the last decade since the end of Suharto’s centralized media regime, the media sector has simultaneously undergone a democratization process whilst expanding tremendously and giving way to increasing media corporatization. Meanwhile, digital technologies and converged platforms are not just making media more ubiquitous, but also offer tremendous opportunities to reconstruct the mediascape in the post-Suharto Indonesia, especially in the political and cultural spheres. Against this backdrop, any discussion on media access and rights in Indonesia needs to be anchored.

**Access & Accessibility**

Like most countries, in Indonesia, a country with a population of around 238 million, citizens access the information mostly through the media—including print, television, radio, and, more recently, the Internet. In general, television still dominates the media landscape in Indonesia. Over 90% of Indonesians (over 10 years old) account watching television as one of their main social and cultural activities (Table 2). Listening to radio, however, is a waning practice in Indonesia. Only 23.5% of the population still listen to the radio, a decline from over 50% in 2003 (Table 2). Meanwhile, only 18.94% of the population are newspaper readers and this, too, is in decline (Table 2). In the meantime, accessing the Internet, a relatively newer activity, has grown popular among urban middle class populations.

---
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In a 2011 survey (Table 5), for 39% of a select urban population, the Internet has become the second most consumed media after television, surpassing radio and newspapers.

### Table 2 Percentage of Population with Media Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watching TV</td>
<td>84.94%</td>
<td>85.86%</td>
<td>90.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to Radio</td>
<td>50.29%</td>
<td>40.26%</td>
<td>23.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Newspapers</td>
<td>23.70%</td>
<td>23.46%</td>
<td>18.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3 Weekly media use frequency for news

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet/Online</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4 Main sources of political information (2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5 Media usage in urban areas (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TELEVISION: CLOSING THE URBAN-RURAL DIVIDE**

There has been increase in the number of households with a television set, from 54% in 2000 to 65% in 2007. In line with Table 2, a survey by InterMedia (2010) reports that 91% of total population has access to television. While there is a slight disparity of access between urban (96%) and rural (88%) populations, the television has successfully made its way to almost every Indonesian living room. Most of the adult population in the country watches the news on television at least once a week. Television also maintains its position as the most important source of news, as shown in Table 3. A comparable survey focusing on political information by the International Republican Institute (2009) in Table 4 also yields similar results.

By and large, accessing television is no longer a problem for any regular Indonesia. But that does not imply that television serves various populations equally. Nor do all segments of society have equal and fair access to needed information. Despite the fact that 88% of rural access, people living in remote areas, mostly, can only watch state owned television Televisi Republik Indonesia (TVRI); they are prohibited from accessing other stations.

Subscription-based cable and satellite television services are growing very slowly. In 2009, close to 15% of Indonesian households had satellite television. In the same year, overall household cable access was at 3%, however it only experienced very modest growth in rural areas with less than 1%.
RADIO: URBAN DECLINE, RURAL RISE

Although broadcast radio is highly accessible from most places in Indonesia, in contrast to television, household radio ownership has been in decline since 2006. Sixty seven percent of households had at least one radio by December 2006, compared to 50% by April 2009. The most severe drop in radio ownership in the past year occurred in urban areas, from 72% in late 2007 to 58% in early 2009. As stated previously, listening to radio news is a declining activity in Indonesia. In 2009 only 35% of Indonesians are weekly radio news listeners, which has decreased from 50% by December 2006. This data is consistent with another survey by Nielsen Research, which shows that in 2009 only 31% of urban dwellers listened to the radio on a weekly basis decreased from 50% in 2005. The 2011 Net Index Survey of Yahoo! Indonesia—with respondents living in Jakarta, Bogor, Tangerang, Bekasi, Surabaya, Bandung, Medan, Medan, Semarang, Palembang, Makassar, Yogyakarta and Denpasar—shows an even lower figure, with only 24% of the population still listening to the radio.

![Figure 1 Most Important News Media Sources](image)

In spite of its obvious downturn, radio still comes second after TV as a source of news in general (Table 3) as well as of information about day-to-day politics (Table 4). Yet, only 1 percent of Indonesians mentioned a radio station when asked about their most important source of news (Figure 1). Despite this trend, Radio KBR68H reports an increase in time devoted to listening the radio. For some segments of society, radio may still be an attractive alternative vis-à-vis the poor quality of TV news reporting. The majority of the stations broadcast their programs in Indonesian, but there are some programs in local languages. Some foreign stations, such as the BBC World Service, Radio Australia, and Voice of America are accessible in Indonesian.

In contrast to those living in urban areas, Indonesians in remote and/or border areas assert that radio is their only source of information and entertainment. This contributes to the availability of a state-owned radio, Radio Republik Indonesia (RRI), in those areas. In Ende, Nusa Tenggara Timur, for example, 85% of the population listens to RRI. While in Bangka-Belitung islands, RRI listeners count for 90% of over 1.2 million residents.

Radio listeners seem to be concentrated in two social groups of differing classes. Popular urban radio stations are predominantly consumed by middle-class, young (18-25 years old), urban dwellers in big cities. Observably, this reflects the accessibility of this population to private car ownership as radio is mostly listened to while driving to/from work. While those from lower income groups residing in remote areas, as mentioned above, listen to RRI stations.

With only 85% of Indonesian areas reachable by radio broadcast, more than forty thousand villages are left without access to radio. Community radios emerged out of this situation to fill the gap in both access and content disparities. It is estimated there are 700 of them operating all over the archipelago, including in remote villages.
PRINT: LIMITED REACH, JAKARTA ORIENTED

While representing only 20% (Table 2), reading newspapers comes third after (watching) television and (listening to) radio. Only 2% of respondents, however, referred to newspapers as their most important source of news (Table 4, Figure 1). Television and radio, the print media have a far more limited reach. The number of print media grew significantly since 1998 reformasi, yet the overall circulation and readership has not increased much. In 1997, with only 289 print media, the circulation reached 14.4 million copies. Meanwhile, in 2010 where the number of print media quadrupled to 1,076, together they only produced 21.5 million copies in which over 60% are circulated in Jakarta. Print media is reasonably accessible all over the country, but numbers of available prints and their circulations are highly unequal. The numbers are exceptionally low in the eastern part of Indonesia. For instance, provinces in Papua have only 45,000 copies daily, West Sulawesi 15,500, and 10,800 for Gorontalo.

### Table 6 Print Media in Number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total no. of print media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/1999</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERNET: URBAN MIDDLE CLASS CONSUMPTION

In June 2010, the Ministry of Communications and Information Technology reported that the number of Indonesian Internet users had reached 45 million, or approximately 18.5% of total population, growing 50% from 30 million in 2009 (Table 7). This was a dramatic growth from only 0.26% in 1998. The number of broadband Internet connections has more than doubled since 2008. However, broadband service remains prohibitively expensive or otherwise unavailable to many Indonesians. Currently, personal broadband users in average spend 200,000 to 500,000 Indonesian rupiahs (US$23-59) per month. By comparison, the monthly per capita income among the poorest segments of the population is less than 355,000 rupiah (US$41), and in Jakarta the minimum wage for workers is about 1.29 million rupiah (around US$151) per month.

### Table 7 ICT profile (2008-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Internet users</td>
<td>25,000 (10.5%)</td>
<td>30,000 (12.9%)</td>
<td>45,000 (18.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of fixed broadband</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of mobile broadband</td>
<td>3,300 (3.48%)</td>
<td>2,263 (1%)</td>
<td>3,447 (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of households with</td>
<td>1.32 (2007)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of households with</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of fixed telephone</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of prepaid mobile</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of regular mobile</td>
<td>61.83</td>
<td>69.24</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of mobile phone</td>
<td>140,578</td>
<td>163,676</td>
<td>211,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Home broadband connections are still the luxury of the urban middle and upper classes, particularly in big cities on Java. Given Indonesia’s archipelagic geography, cable infrastructure has been costly to provide and is mostly confined to urban areas, particularly in Java and Bali. Another factor contributing to the low use of ICTs is the limited knowledge and use of English. Indonesians use Indonesian, the national language, at work and school as well as in daily conversations while other local dialects and languages are still very important in certain areas. As such the ability to use the Internet is limited.

Since most Indonesians have no access to fixed telephones, computers or the Internet, and because they cannot afford to own these facilities or pay to use these services (even when access is available), the Internet café, warnet model of Internet access has been most successful. Warnets provide relatively affordable access ranging from as low as US$ 0.1 to US$2 (depending on the location) per hour any time of the day. Currently, there are about 5,000 warnets in Indonesia where 64% of Internet users (65% in urban areas and 63% in rural) gain Internet access (Figure 2).

![Figure 2 Most frequently used locations for Internet access](image)

In addition to warnet, there is also RT/RW-Net initiative. RT/RW-Net is neighborhood Internet network using wireless technology, an initiative proposed and started by Onno Purbo and his groups in 2004.36 The network is built using wireless (radio packet Internet) connection. It can connect 6 houses with 8 connection ports. Purbo and his groups modified the specifications for the network to use some recycled elements, such as empty tin cans, to minimize the cost of equipment. The monthly subscription fee is approximately US$35-40 plus a start-up fee of US$50. There is no definite number of RT/RW networks. However, with the little progress the government and big corporations have made in providing affordable Internet, especially in peri-urban and rural areas, the neighborhood networks will continue to grow.

**Online media.** With the relatively small Internet population, consequently online media is still very much a minor source of information (only 4%, as shown in Table 3 and Table 4). Yet, accessing online news has been one of the most dominant online activities of Indonesian users. The most popular local news sites are Detik.com, followed by Kompas.com, Vivanews.com and Okezone.com.

![Figure 3 Daily Unique Visitors: detik.com vs tempointeraktif.com vs republika.co.id (2009-2011)](image)

Most popular websites among Indonesians, however, are not local ones. Global social networking site Facebook.com ranks first, followed by the global search engine, Google, and Blogger.com, as one of the oldest blogging platforms.38 Among the top 50 sites, 19 are local and 31 are global. Detik dominates the chart by...
claiming position #11, #17, #19, and #34. Meanwhile, kaskus.us, the Indonesian online forum, authoritatively positions itself in rank #6, to be the only Indonesian site that makes it to the top 10. While not as popular as Detik.com, nearly all major newspapers have an online presence. For example, Kompas with its kompas.com and kompasiana.com, while Tempo owns tempointeraktif.com, and Republika has republika.co.id.

**Table 8 Top 50 sites in Indonesia (June 2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>URL</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. facebook.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. google.co.id</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. google.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. blogger.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. yahoo.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. kaskus.us</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. youtube.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. wordpress.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. twitter.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 4shared.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. detik.com</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. wikipedia.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. viwanews.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. kompas.com</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. klikbcn.com</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. bp.blogspot.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. detiknews.com</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. mediafire.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. detiksport.com</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. ziddu.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. adsense-id.com</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. tokobagus.com</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. adfly.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. multiply.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. amazon.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. paypal.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. okezone.com</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. clicksor.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. histats.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. googleusercontent.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. kapanlagi.com</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. indowebster.com</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. bankmandiri.com</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. detihot.com</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. bing.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. goal.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. games.co.id</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. live.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. nicrosoft.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. lintasberita.com</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. photobucket.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. wordpress.org</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. indowebster.web.id</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. scribd.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. kompasiana.com</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. sponsoredviews.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. files.wordpress.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. yieldmanager.com</td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. stafaband.info</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. idr-clickit.com</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All major national televisions also own websites and some are making their (select) programs available online through live streaming. Among the most popular live streaming sites are liputan6.com (from SCTV), metrotvnews.com, and kickandy.com (MetroTV’s talk show). Commercial radio stations’ programs, too, are mostly available online. They are mostly accessible from the livestreaming aggregator such as IndoSound and Radioguide.FM.

**Blogging.** Blogging platforms such as blogger.com and wordpress.com are among the most accessed sites by Indonesians. The number of Indonesian bloggers is not very well documented. In 2007 the estimated number of bloggers in Indonesia was around 150,000. In contrast to some claims that the Indonesian blogosphere has started to die with the rapid growth of Facebook and Twitter users, the number of bloggers has increased. The most recent, and, reliable, source records over 5 millions blogs in 2011.

**Figure 4 Growth of Facebook users (2008-2011)**

**Facebook and Twitter.** Despite the reasonably low number of Internet subscribers, Indonesia witnesses a rapid growth in social media usage. As clearly shown in Figure 4, Facebook is tremendously popular among Indonesian Internet users. It shows 47.3% growth in twelve months or 18,000% of the Facebook population in mid 2008 (only
209,760), when Indonesians started to recognize the availability of this social networking platform. In September 2011, the total Facebook users in Indonesia reaches 40,418,860 making it the second largest nation on Facebook, exceeded only by the United States. The number represents 16.46% of Indonesia’s total population. In addition to Facebook, Indonesians also embrace Twitter as one of their social networking tools. In August 2010, ComScore.com reported that Indonesia, at 20.8% of 93 million, had the highest proportion of its home and work Internet audience visiting Twitter.com.\(^{46}\) Reflecting strongly a pattern of technological dependency, social media users are concentrated in urban areas with over 60% traffic coming from a small number of cities such as Jakarta, Bandung, Medan, Yogyakarta, Surabaya, and Semarang (Figure 5).

![Figure 5 Twitter: Indonesia’s Busiest Cities\(^{47}\)](image)

**GENDER AND AGE DISPARITIES**

Among television viewers and radio listeners there are no significant disparities. While there is no general statistics on the male-female ratio of newspaper readers, numbers from select newspapers show a serious gender divide (Table 9) and the concentration of readership on people aged 20-39 years old.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9 Profiles of select newspapers readers(^{48})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender ratio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kompas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakarta Globe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seputar Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suara Pembaruan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the growth of Internet and social media users, gender and age disparities persist. These are reflected in the demographic of Indonesian Facebook users where 60% of the users are male and 40% female (Figure 4), predominantly 18-34 years old (62%) with only 1% are over 55 years old (Figure 7), which reflects gender/age disparities of Internet access in general. The biggest group of
Internet users are Indonesians aged between 15 and 24. Similar disparities are found among mobile web users, where 53% are 18-27 and 82% are male.\textsuperscript{49}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{male_female_ratio}
\caption{Male-Female ratio of Facebook users (2011)}\textsuperscript{50}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{age_distribution}
\caption{Age distribution of Facebook users (2011)}\textsuperscript{51}
\end{figure}

**MOBILE PHONE AS A PLATFORM OF CONVERGENCE**

Mobile telephony continues to be the most popular communication tool in Indonesia. “The mobile telephone ownership is much more widespread and expands at a more rapid pace than computer ownership and Internet subscriptions do. The urban-rural divide in mobile telephone ownership is slowly closing.”\textsuperscript{52} In 2010, there are approximately 211 million mobile phone users in Indonesia (Table 7) with over 88% of mobile phone penetration (Figure 8). Mobile phone ownership at the household level in rural areas grew from 24% to 45% in roughly one year. In 2009, 69% of urban households have at least one mobile phone (compared to 53% a year before).\textsuperscript{53}

The growth of Internet access via mobile phones has been a positive development, as prices are relatively affordable and the cost of the necessary infrastructure is far less than for cable broadband. Telkomsel, the largest mobile-phone service provider, has reported that mobile phone Internet service is available in all major cities and the capitals of all regencies.\textsuperscript{54} 58% of the Internet users in urban areas access the Internet via mobile phones.\textsuperscript{55}

The boom in mobile phones as a means of social networking is significant. Data from SalingSilang.com, for example, shows that 86.98% access Twitter from mobile devices.\textsuperscript{56} The sharp increase of Facebook users in 2009 was, hypothetically, related to the increased sale of BlackBerry and similar mobile devices.\textsuperscript{57}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Teledensity of telephony system in % (2006-2010)}\textsuperscript{58}
\end{figure}
TELECOM INFRASTRUCTURE: RURAL NEGLECT, NON-TRANSPARENT SPECTRUM ALLOCATION

The telecom sector has been one of the fastest growing sectors in the country, with over 200 million wireless subscribers. However, certain aspects of spectrum allocation, vertical integration, as well as neglect of marginalized communities, especially in rural areas, by telecom service providers remain areas of concern.

Rural areas lack access to even the most basic telecom infrastructure. Of the 66,778 villages across Indonesia, almost 65 percent remain unwired and 19 million households (40% of the population) have no electricity service. In 2010 (see Figure 8), teledensity of fixed telephony in Indonesia reaches 3.55%, which means there are 7 wired telephone connection units serving 200 people. This number is categorized as low teledensity. The utilization of wireless telephony (mobile phone), however, has reached 88.85% which can be considered as high-teledensity. The central problem, thus, is not the low teledensity in the country, but unequal distribution of telecom infrastructure. The telecom penetration shows a significant gap between urban and rural areas (Figure 9). While teledensity of urban areas has reached 35% or at least 11-25%, in rural areas it only reaches 0.25%.

![Penetration map of telecom in rural and urban area of Indonesia (2010)](image)

Funding for rural ICT development in Indonesia is obtained from all licensed telecommunication operators and service providers. “To develop communications access in remote and isolated areas”, operators are “obliged to pay an USO (Universal Service Obligation) distribution of 0.75% of their annual revenues”. But “this contribution is considered too small” and “there is a concern over government transparency in managing this USO fund.”

Using the USO funding, the Ministry of Communication and Information has started two rural ICT development programs. The first program, Desa Berdering (Ringing Village), was launched to provide telephone access in all villages in Indonesia by 2010. The program does not seem to be equally sustainable across villages. In some villages, villagers stopped using the service as soon as the (subsidized) credit ran out. Four months after the deadline, in April 2011, the program has served only 32,800 villages out of 43,000 targeted villages. The Minister, though, is optimistic that the whole program will be completed in no time.

The second program, Desa Pinter (an abbreviation of Desa Punya Internet, or “the village has Internet”), which in Bahasa Indonesia also literally means “smart village”, is a program to provide internet access to all villages in Indonesia by 2015 by developing 5,748 district Internet service
centers. It is too early to predict whether this program is successful or not. Being delayed due to some problems associated with the auction document, the program finally started in 2010 and was inaugurated by the President in January 2011.

Much of the telecom infrastructure problems originate from the regulatory framework. For example, the existing regulations regarding telecom access provision allows for vertical integration (e.g. PTSN—long distance and international calls—duopoly) which makes it hard to control anti-competition practices.\(^{64}\) Meanwhile, the current licensing process for spectrum allocation lacks clarity and transparency and is suspected to be “corrupt, involving collusion and nepotism.”\(^{65}\)

**MEDIA AND PUBLIC INTEREST COMMUNICATION**

The demise of the Suharto era in 1998 produced several positive developments for media democratization in Indonesia. The Department of Information, once led by the infamous Minister Harmoko was abandoned, followed by several major deregulations that changed the media landscape dramatically. From 1998 to 2002, over 1200 new print media, more than 900 new commercial radio and five new commercial television licenses were issued. Over the years, however, Indonesian media went ‘back to business’ again. Corporate interests took over and continues to dominate the current Indonesian media landscape.

**MEDIA OWNERSHIP**

The map of media ownership in Indonesia (Table 10) shows that 12 media groups have control over 100% of national commercial television shares (10 out of 10 stations). These groups also own five out of six newspapers with the highest circulation, four out of the four most popular online news media, a majority of Jakarta-flagship entertainment radio networks, and a significant portion of the major local television networks. In addition, some of these groups also take control over digital pay-TV services and media related businesses, such as telecommunications, information technology, and content production and distribution. Media corporations, too, have expanded their businesses into non-media sectors and, thus, given their owners stronger economic and political control.

Among these groups, there are veteran players such as Kompas Gramedia Group and Jawa Pos Group that, in Sen and Hill’s words, “given their relative political autonomy, were least vulnerable to the political and economic crisis of the last days of the New Order, and best placed to move into the post-Suharto era.”\(^{66}\) Then there are groups that have obvious political ties. Media Group is owned by Surya Paloh, the Chairman of the Advisory Board of the former ruling party Golkar.\(^{67}\) Another Golkar related company is Bakrie & Brothers (antv and TVOne, among others). Its owner Aburizal Bakrie is the Chairman of Golkar.\(^{68}\) While not directly involved in politics, Lippo Group’s owner James Riyadi has made his political connections apparent by appointing Theo Sambuaga, a prominent leader of Golkar, as the president of the group. Another player, Trans Corpora (Trans TV and Trans 7), is owned by Chairul Tanjung who is a close ally of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono. While not affiliated with any political party, Hary Tanoesoedibjo of the MNC Group is known for his close relations with major political players.\(^{69}\)

Interesting to note here is the prominence Tempo Inti Media Harian (of *Tempo* magazine and newspaper), headed by writer Goenawan Muhammad. Tempo is the only non-media conglomerate that survives in the mainstream media industry while maintaining its political independence. As the media environment is dominated by just a small number of large corporations—some of which have obvious political connections—the Indonesian public does not receive an adequate quality or quantity of news and is only exposed to the viewpoints and opinions of a few. This concentration of ownership also leads to a disproportional political control by the media,\(^{70}\) the public’s decreasing access to important information, and the under-representation of certain groups in the media.\(^{71}\)
Table 10 Indonesian Media Conglomerates\textsuperscript{72}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Group</th>
<th>Group Leader</th>
<th>TV stations</th>
<th>Radio stations</th>
<th>Newspapers</th>
<th>Print</th>
<th>Online media</th>
<th>Other businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media Nusantara Citra (MNC) Group</strong></td>
<td>Hary Tanoesoedibjo</td>
<td>RTL, Global TV, MNCTV [ex TPI]</td>
<td>Trijaya FM, Radio Dangdut, ARH Global Radio</td>
<td>Seputar Indonesia (Koran Sindo)</td>
<td>High End mags, Genie, Mom &amp; Kiddie tabloids</td>
<td>Okezone</td>
<td>IT, content production and distributions, talent management, automobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahaka Media Group</td>
<td>Erick Tohir</td>
<td>TVOne</td>
<td>Radio JakFM</td>
<td>Republika, Harian Indonesia (in Mandarin)</td>
<td>Parents Indonesia, A+, Golf Digest, Area, magazines</td>
<td>Republika Online</td>
<td>Entertainment, outdoor advertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kompas Gramedia Group</strong></td>
<td>Jakob Oetama, Agung Adiprasetyo</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Sonora Radio &amp; Otomotion Radio</td>
<td>Kompas, Jakarta Post, Warta Kota, + other 11 local papers</td>
<td>Intisari + 43 magazines &amp; tabloids, 5 book publishers</td>
<td>Kompas Cyber Media</td>
<td>Hotels, public relation agencies, university &amp; telecommunication tower (in plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jawa Pos Group</td>
<td>Dahlan Iskan</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>JTV, BatamTV, RiauTV, FajarTV + others (total: 12)</td>
<td>Fajar FM (Makassar)</td>
<td>Jawa Pos, Indo Pos Rakyat Merdeka, Radar + others (total: 151)</td>
<td>Mentari, Liberty magazines + 11 tabloids</td>
<td>Jawa Pos Digital Edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media Bali Post Group (KMB)</strong></td>
<td>Satria Narada</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Global Kini Jani, Genta FM + others (total: 7)</td>
<td>Bali Post, Bisnis Bali, Salah Indonesia, Harian Denpost, &amp; Suara NTB</td>
<td>Tokoh, Lintang, &amp; Wiyata Mandala tabloids</td>
<td>Bali Post, Bisnis Bali</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elang Mahkota Teknologi (EMTEK) Group</strong></td>
<td>Eddy Kusnadi Sariaatmadja</td>
<td>SCTV, Indosiar</td>
<td>O’Channel, Elshinta TV</td>
<td>Elshinta FM</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Elshinta, Gaul, Story, Kort, Mamamia</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakrie &amp; Brothers</td>
<td>Anindyra Bakrie</td>
<td>antv, TVOne</td>
<td>Channel [V]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>VIVAnews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femina Group</td>
<td>Pla Alisyahbana, Mirta Kartohadjiprodjo</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>U-FM Jakarta &amp; Bandung</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Femina, Gadis, Dewi, Ayahbunda + others (total: 16)</td>
<td>Femina, GitaCinta, Ayahbunda, Gadis, Parenting Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Group</td>
<td>Surya Paloh</td>
<td>MetroTV</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Media Indonesia, Lampung Post, BorneoNews</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Media Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mugi Reka Aditama (MRA) Group</strong></td>
<td>Dian Muljani Soedarjo</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Cosmopolitan FM, Hard Rock FM, I-Radio, Trax FM</td>
<td>Cosmopolitan, CosmoGirl, Fitness + others (total: 16)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Holder of several international boutique brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans Corpora (Para Group)</td>
<td>Chairul Tanjung</td>
<td>Trans TV, Trans 7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Detik Online</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table provides an overview of Indonesian media conglomerates, including their group leaders, TV stations, radio stations, newspapers, print media, online media, and other businesses they engage in. It highlights the diversity and complexity of media ownership in Indonesia, with a focus on the intersection of demographics, technology, and economic structures. The table also underscores the influence of these conglomerates on various aspects of the economy and society, from entertainment and education to telecommunications and insurance. The detailed information on each group provides insights into their operations, market strategies, and the broader landscape of media in Indonesia.
Currently there are 10 private national television networks in Indonesia—RCTI, Global TV, MNCTV, SCTV, Indosiar, TVOne, antv, Metro TV, Trans TV, Trans 7—that operate in competition with the state-owned Televisi Republik Indonesia (TVRI). In addition, there are more than 100 local television stations all over the country and some locally produced programming and cable television channels.

Six groups own all ten private national television networks. Among these groups, MNC Group has the highest share (36.7%) with the ownership of RCTI, Global TV, and MNCTV, making it the most powerful player in broadcast television. The newcomer EMTEK, which just controversially acquired Indosiar in May 2011, comes second with 31.5%, followed by Trans Corp (18.5%) and the partnership of Bakrie and MM Group (8.7%). Meanwhile, TVRI, which was the only television broadcaster in the country from 1962 to 1989, currently has the smallest share with only 1.4% of the total television market share. The concentration of ownership of television in Indonesia results from the practice of mergers. While mergers and the consolidation of media business is a logical consequence of media liberalization, it is not favorable in terms of media democratization. When there is lack of competition and only a small number of media companies remain, power and dominance is inevitable. The companies remaining dominate the media industry and create a media oligopoly and will contribute to biased political views.

### Table 11 Television landscape: Main National Players

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TV channels</th>
<th>First on air</th>
<th>Current status</th>
<th>Market share %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TVRI</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>State/Independent</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCTI</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Merged (MNC)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global TV</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Merged (MNC)</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNCTV (formerly TPI+)</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Merged (MNC)</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTV</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Merged (EMTEK)+</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indosiar</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Merged (EMTEK)+</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans TV</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Merged (TransCorp)</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans 7</td>
<td>2001, re-launch in 2006</td>
<td>Merged (TransCorp)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVOne (formerly Lativi)</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Merged (Bakrie/MM Group)+</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antv</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Merged (Bakrie/MM Group)+</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro TV</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Media Group/Independent</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a regional/local level, ownership is less concentrated. With the growth of local TV stations in the last five years, local TV eventually managed to steal a share of the national TV audience. However, the audience share of local TV is very modest if compared to national TV. Local TV audience share increased from an average of 2.1% in 2005 to 3.2% of the total audience share in 2008. The trend, however, went down to 2.5% in 2010. Among more than 100 local TV stations, TVRI still has 27 stations spread in 27 different provinces while the rest are owned by at least 10 other local television networks.
However, as there is no longer any space for private national television expansion, some big business entities start looking at this market. For example, one of the richest Indonesians, Peter Sondakh, with his group, Rajawali Corp, who formerly owned RCTI, went back to the media business by establishing the network of TV Nusantara (22 stations). A similar step was taken by giant newspaper player Jawa Post Group and Bali Post Group. MNC Group has also expanded to the local level by creating SunTV Network. Soon the largest print media company, Kompas Media Group, will own its own Kompas TV network, too. The current map shows a drift that in the near future local television networks, too, might be dominated by a small number of media moguls.

RADIO: GROWING INDEPENDENT & COMMUNITY RADIOS

While not free from the sights of media conglomerates, the ownership of radio is much more diverse compared to television. Of the estimated 2,800 radio stations in the country (up from around 700 in Suharto era), around 700 are community radio stations. Radio Republik Indonesia (RRI), the state radio network of Indonesia that previously functioned as a mouthpiece of the New Order government, has 64 stations. While no longer monopolizing the radio landscape in Indonesia, RRI still adopts its role in ‘distributing, spreading information, and educating, entertaining society to maintain Indonesian identity’ and is committed to ‘protect the unity and togetherness of the United Nation of the Republic of Indonesia’. Since 2006, the expansion of RRI has taken place mainly in border areas focusing on developing the ‘safety belt information’ program in partnership with TVRI.

The most promising data on media ownership is the fact that the country’s largest radio network is KBR68H, a quality citizen journalism radio. Founded as a news agency on 29 April 1999, KBR68H was created as part of civil society response to the ‘transition to democracy’. In 2000, KBR68H started to use a satellite to distribute its radio programming, enabling the radio station partners to relay the agency’s programs using just a parabolic antenna and a digital receiver. In one decade, the radio news agency has expanded rapidly, becoming a network that reaches 625 stations with an estimated 18 million listeners, and is available in 10 countries in Asia and Australia.

Commercial radio networks are also on the rise. The major ones include Ramako Group, Smart FM, and Masima Group, all of which have flagship stations in Jakarta and branches in other cities. Some out-of-Jakarta regional networks are also emerging, such as Arbes Network in Padang, Suzana RadioNet in Surabaya, and Volare Group in Pontianak. There are also an increasing number of commercial networks owned by conglomerates. These include: Hard Rock FM, Cosmopolitan, I-Radio, and Trax owned by MRA Group; Trijaya FM, ARH, and Radio Dangdut by MNC Group; Elshinta by EMTEK, and Sonora FM by Kompas Gramedia Group. Yet, the investment of big media players tends to be concentrated in big cities such as Jakarta, Bandung, and Surabaya, leaving the rest of the country to smaller, independent, groups, including hundreds community radios that proliferate small towns and rural areas.

PRINT MEDIA: DOMINATION OF TWO PLAYERS

The post-Suharto euphoria and an easing of press restrictions had catapulted the number of print media from 289 in early 1999 to 1,881 in 2001. The euphoria, however, did not last long. Market realities pushed some to go out of business soon after they were established. As of the end of 2010, there are just 1076print media in operation. Kompas leads with 600,000 copies daily, followed by Jawa Pos (450,000), Suara Pembaruan (350,000), Republika (325,000), Media Indonesia (250,000), and Koran Tempo (240,000).

Currently, there are two dominant players in the print media sector. The first is the largest media conglomerate in Indonesia, Kompas Gramedia Group. Its chief outlet, the morning newspaper Kompas (600,000 copies/day), is Indonesia’s most prestigious daily and the largest ‘quality’ newspaper in Southeast Asia. Benedict Anderson once described Kompas as ‘the New Order par excellence’. This newspaper consistently earns more than 25% of the nation’s newspaper advertising revenue. The group also runs the Jakarta Post (90,000) which was the only English newspaper in Indonesia until Lippo Group-founded Jakarta Globe (60,000) entered the scene in
2008. Besides Kompas daily, Kompas Gramedia Group also owns Warta Kota daily, Intisari magazine, and 11 other local newspapers, 43 magazines and tabloids, and 5 book publishers. Through these businesses, Kompas Gramedia group dominates the publishing industry. The country's second largest print media company is Jawa Pos Group, well known for its Jawa Pos daily. With 450,000 copies a day, Jawa Pos is the nation's second most read daily. Taking a different route than Kompas-Gramedia, Jawa Pos Group concentrates almost exclusively on provincial markets. With 151 newspapers distributed in more than 20 provinces, 11 tabloids, and 2 magazines, this group situates itself as a close competitor of Kompas Gramedia.

The rest of the newspaper market is divided between other media conglomerates, such as MNC Group (Seputar Indonesia), Mahaka Media Group (Republika), Bali Post Group (Bali Post), Lippo Group (Suara Pembaruan), and Media Group (Media Indonesia), many other small companies, and Koran Tempo. With a daily circulation of 240,000 copies, Koran Tempo is the only non-conglomerate-owned newspaper surviving the competition against big players. Tempo Inti Media Harian, the publisher of Koran Tempo daily, is a major player in print media sector. Its magazine, Majalah Tempo (180,000 copies/week), holds 68% of the share of weekly magazine market. Like newspapers, the magazine/tabloid segment, too, is not free from media conglomerates' undertakings. In this area, there are MRA Group (Cosmopolitan, CosmoGirl, Men's Fitness), an experienced player Femina Group (Femina, Gadis, Dewi), EMTEK (Elshinta, Gaul, Story), and Bali Post (Tokoh, Lintang). However, these are mostly focused on lifestyle and entertainment. By focusing on investigative journalism, Tempo has developed its own niche and is still far superior to Forum Keadilan and newcomer Tokoh tabloid who also try to venture in the same genre.

ONLINE MEDIA: DIVERSE YET THE TOP RULES

The web has become a critical part of Indonesia's media environment. It is now the largest information source and most of the content is provided by millions of Indonesian individuals. Thus, we expect to see that online media would have less concentration of ownership. But, in reality, the vast plethora of web content has not yet translated into diversity for what users see and access. On the contrary, despite the vast amount of content, the structure of the web leads to a staggering and unexpected degree of concentration. This explains why global companies such as Facebook, Google and the like have most Indonesian users and dominate the top 10 of most visited websites. The outlier is Kaskus.us, Indonesia's very own community forum, who makes it into the top 6.

In spite of that, in acquiring content Indonesians typically go to local content providers such as Detik.com. The language preference might be one explanation behind this occurrence. In addition, Detik.com, online since 1998, is one of the oldest news providers in Indonesia and thus has created a path dependency in the online media market.

As seen in Figure 11, Detik.com is disproportionately superior against the rest of content providers. Along with its subsidiaries—Detiknews.com, Detikhari.com, Detiksport.com—Detik.com with other big new media players such as Kompas.com, Vivanews.com, and Okezones.com dominates the market—top corporate online media occupies 'the head', an immense volume of the share. Blogdetik.com and kompasiana.com can be classified as citizen journalism, yet they take place in the space owned by Detik and Kompas.

Although no one disputes the lengthening of the tail—clearly more blogs and more blog-posts are being made online every day—the tail is extremely flat and populated by content that originates from, is driven by, or communicates with those in 'the head'. Even the number one blogger site IndonesiaMatters.com shares only less than 1.5% of Detik.com's daily and monthly visitors.
better lower class and rural population to consume the stations’ goal is generally to set the benchmarks for the industry and thus frame their programs for the homogeneity of available content. Various alternative media have emerged—community radios and televisions, independent online content providers, individual blogs, however they are still a long way from far-reaching.

**TELEVISION: DOMINATION OF URBAN ENTERTAINMENT**

The majority of the content on national commercial television stations is entertainment, ranging from 60% to 80%, in the forms of soap operas, movies, infotainment and reality shows. Commercial stations’ goal is generally to set the benchmarks for the industry and thus frame their programs for the entertainment-seeking urban lower-upper and upper-middle classes, providing access to the lower class and rural population to consume city-based culture and lifestyles that have very little connection with their daily realities. Popular themes mostly revolve around urban upper class lifestyles, sex, and violence. In January 2011, three out of 10 most watched programs were soaps operas. These programs counted for only 10% (602 hours) of the total broadcast time (6,072 hours). However, viewers spent most of their watching time (29% of the 73 hours) to watch them.

Some might assume that the choice to air entertainment in a dominant fraction is audience driven. The historical record of ratings, however, does not reflect that assumption. There are several better-quality talk shows that received very positive responses. For instance, a satirical talk show Republik BBM (Benar-Benar Mabok), aired by Indosiar, received good ratings for its ability to provide political critique through jokes and satire. Despite its enormous popularity, the show featuring humorous skits with politicians look-alike and sound-alike actors was cancelled in May 2008 by the station under the ‘advice’ of the then Vice President Yusuf Kalla.
Several national TV stations devoted to news deliver well-packaged and up-to-date news programs. However, news programs are, by and large, tailored with an inclination to sensationalize the events rather than to provide accurate information. Frequently, disaster events are hijacked by prominent figures—the so-called ‘celebrities’—who reap individual benefits by their media exposure. For example, in the case of 2004 Aceh tsunami disaster, media were more preoccupied in covering ‘charitable’ trips of movie stars and singers to the area rather than the living stories of the victims. Narratives of the poor, the marginalized, and the lower class are often ignored. When they appear on the screen, they are treated merely as objects.

RADIO: PROMISE OF DIVERSITY

Due to its relatively diverse ownership, the radio sector carries more diversity in content and targets more varied audiences than television. Commercial radio stations populating urban areas are commonly focused on entertainment programs, particularly music. A survey by MARS (2009) reports that music is the most listened to program (82%), followed by news, talk shows, expert interviews, and traffic reports.85 For non-entertainment content, there are a number of news and public journalism radio stations in Indonesia, including the network of Radio KBR68H news agency, who take up the space with an average quality better than those of television. Journalists and nonjournalists of the Radio KBR68H news agency have received no fewer than 21 awards and prizes, including the King Baudouin International Development Prize for its “contribution to the sustainable development based on the strengthening of democracy, tolerance and citizen participation.”86

Radio has always been a vital medium in providing public spheres in Indonesia. Historically, Indonesian independence fighters used the radio in fighting against Dutch colonialism. The very same medium was also vital in building people’s resistance against the Suharto regime and facilitating the student pro-democracy movement in 1998. Today, the radio, too, still has the potential to play a role as a constructive agent of change. Producing and delivering content close to the realities of their communities using a participatory model, community radios are on the forefront of this change. There are many successful stories on how community radios allow communities to be more involved in resolving social, economic, and political issues. Community radios, too, can be a space where local and alternative cultures emerge, be created and re-invented amidst the homogenous urban metropolis culture endorsed by mainstream media.

PRINT: VARIED BUT NOT PLURAL

Print media is at the very heart of Indonesian content landscape, especially in news production. Sen & Hill (2000) argue that “despite reaching a much smaller readership than electronic media’s audience, it is still the press which largely determines what is news.”87 To a certain degree this assumption is still valid. Yet, in the age of social media, print journalists have increasingly relied on prominent bloggers and tweeps (Twitter users) as the source of their stories.

Not only distribute information, print media also provide a forum for the exchange of discourses on social, cultural, political and economic issues. Being the oldest medium for the ‘literate’ consumers, print has an ability to ‘set the political agenda’ more than any other types of media in Indonesia.88 As a rule of thumb, newspaper readers are far more critical and more active politically than the electronic counterparts. This combination of readership factors and the domination of the newspaper industry by veteran publishers such as Kompas, Jawa Pos, and Tempo, make the newspaper content in Indonesia of much higher quality than other media. While recognizing the downside of their domination, together these three publishers produce adequate information on national and provincial levels, as well as in investigative journalism. In so many ways, these print media are representative of the Indonesian press in general in three ways, including “balanced reporting” (Kompas), “aggressive reporting” (Jawa Pos) and “investigative reporting” (Tempo).

Post-authoritarian developments in the press has also produced a variety of viewpoints, something that did not exist prior to 1998. Islamic publishing alone represents a wide spectrum of viewpoints. While the Jakarta-based newspaper Republika is assertively modernist, Media Dakwah (Islamic
‘preaching’ media) makes it clear its campaign for an Islamic state. However, viewpoints of marginalized groups are not represented. These groups only appear when they were involved in conflicts, scandals, or other ‘sensational’ events—often with inaccurate portrayals. The minority Islamic group Ahmadiyah, for example, did not get much coverage until its members were violently attacked by Islamic radicals. Even then, they still did not get fair coverage. Media also rarely recognizes the diversity of sexual orientation—homosexuality is often portrayed negatively as sexual abnormality or deviant behavior.

ONLINE MEDIA: MANY VOICES BUT WHO ARE HEARD?

With the proliferation of blogging, Facebook and Twitter in Indonesia, some observers say that social media is furthering democracy and freedom of speech, and is a trigger for social change, “the fifth estate in Indonesian’s democracy,” and democratizing content. To a certain degree, these statements have their currency. However, they are only valid when contextualized in select, rare, stories such as the victorious online movements to support Prita and Bibit-Chandra. Some of the above arguments also rely on the fact that with the availability of new technologies and the freedom to produce, content production is no longer the monopoly of the powerful elites. Anybody can tweet, blog, and post on Facebook. The content of the online Indonesia, indeed, is rich and bountiful. The question is, when there are many voices, whom are heard?

As illustrated in Figure 11, the distribution of audiences in the Indonesian online environment is very skewed, which makes it appropriate to quote the phrase: “Never have so many people written so much to be read by so few” to describe this phenomenon. Corporate websites aside, the distribution of weblinks and traffic in the Indonesian blogosphere itself is heavily skewed with a small number of bloggers getting most of the attention. Even though there are over 5 million Indonesian bloggers, posting approximately 1.2 million new items daily, the average blogger has almost no political influence as measured by traffic or hyperlink. Moreover, as described previously in the ‘access’ section, social media usage in Indonesia is still very much the enterprise of urban elites. The majority of content, too, thus, resembles and represents the usage—opinions, expressions, and stories of urban middle class culture, lifestyle and problems. Among 539 known Indonesian Facebook groups, 193 are on brands/products/services/companies, 188 on media/entertainment/celebrities, and only 66 on campaigns/movements/ activities/public information—reflecting urban middle class preferences and choices.

A similar tendency is also found on Twitter. As the largest tweets producer after Brazil and USA, Indonesia produces around 15% of all tweets globally. With 8.29 tweets per account, Indonesian tweeps produce a humongous amount of content and, yet, little of it devoted into topics other than those reflecting urban lifestyles and/or driven by mainstream media—as reflected in these Twitter trending topics (Figure 12, see the prevalence of English terms here). Tweets reflecting true social and political concerns are present, however they are usually issue or event-driven (propelled by mainstream media) and short lived. By and large, the subject matter of Indonesian online media—
including small independent online content providers and online citizen journalism, very much mimic the ‘taste’ and the biases of mainstream media. This is due to the content dependency, where mainstream media steers the direction of discourses in other media, including in alternative online media.

Figure 13 illustrates how this bias is reflected in the blogosphere. Among 80 blogs with social and political concerns, issues on marginalized communities such as Lapindo and Ahmadiyah receive minimum coverage, while issues closer to the middle-upper class interests—that were highly propagated by mainstream media—got much higher coverage. The pornography scandal of Indonesian artists Ariel and Luna Maya picked up ongoing discussions from July 2009 to March 2011 while a deadly attack on Ahmadiyah members was hardly discussed.

Apart from these overall problems, social media does provide a space for Indonesians to communicate and express themselves in a way unimaginable before. Social media also encourages a participatory type of content production, which has the potential to contribute to enriching the diversity of content. On a small scale, the practice of producing alternative content is rampant. In the last couple of years, there is an emergence of community blogs focusing around real issues and concerns in Indonesian society such as politikana.com, obolanlangsats.com, savejkt.org, and akademiberbagi.org. Despite their inherent middle-class orientation, the formation of these communities can be seen as a step towards building diversity and pluralism of content in the online sphere in Indonesia.
ADVANCING HUMAN RIGHTS & SOCIAL JUSTICE THROUGH DIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS

In the midst of the commercialization of media, digital media and communications provide a novel sphere where alternative content and information can be created and disseminated. The availability of communication technologies have presented Indonesian society with new ways to become more conscious about human rights and related issues, particularly on the right to freedom of expression. Digital media also has provided human rights activists with new tools for monitoring, defending, and advancing human rights and social justice.

WEB 1.0 MOBILIZATION

Past events in the history of Indonesia provide ample evidence that the Internet is indeed a ‘convivial medium’ for Indonesians not only to express to communicate and exchange ideas, but also to provide a socio-political conditions for human agency to flourish. It can go even further to act as ‘cyber-civic space’ in which civil society generates collective actions online, and, moreover, translate these online actions into real-world movements. During the authoritarian era under Suharto, Internet provided a much more democratic media environment when compared to other media such as television, radio, and print. The political history of the 1990s shows how the substantially unregulated Internet contributed to the civil society movements that led to the downfall of Suharto’s New Order. As a convivial medium, the online environment is not only conducive to educated, democratizing, fair, and empowering usage and content, but also cannot weed out the ‘bad’, and can similarly be used by both civil and uncivil society organizations and individuals.

WEB 2.0 MOBILIZATION

Today, in the more open political climate, the Internet, particularly social media, continues to be the popular medium and tool for Indonesian urbanites to exercise their freedom of expression and their rights to participate in political decision-making, as well as to mobilize themselves in claiming their rights, challenging the perceived injustices, and to support the ‘weak’ members of society. This is exemplified by the use of blogs, Facebook, and Twitter to mobilize mass movements, such as:

• “Coin for Prita” (2009) Through an online campaign, using blogs and Facebook, hundreds of thousands of Indonesians were mobilized to collect 500 Rupiah (~6cent US$) coins to help Prita Mulyasari to pay the Rp. 204 million (~US$22,000) fine applied by the court for a defamation suit against her. This suit was a reaction to an e-mail complaint sent by Prita Mulyasari, a 32-year-old mother of two, to her friends and relatives about the bad service she received at a private hospital where the hospital’s lawyers accused her of violating the Information and Electronic Transactions Law.

• “One Million Support for Bibit-Chandra” (2009). Facebook was used to mobilize public protests against the perceived injustice of the government towards Bibit and Chandra, members of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK).

• “Coin Love for Bilqis” (2010). Modeled after the “Coin for Prita,” this movement was intended to help a 17-month old Bilqis Pasya who suffered from a life-threatening liver problem. Using social media, the movement successfully collected nearly 900 million Rupiah (~US$96,300) to finance Bilqis’ liver transplant.

THE LIMITS OF ONLINE MOBILIZATION

To a certain degree the emergence of citizen journalism and reporting through social media has provided a mechanism to uncover social and political injustices that otherwise would not be
revealed. However, the success of such mobilizations is biased towards certain types of narratives and issues. Besides, while these movements started online, they only became very popular after being publicized by the mainstream media (especially television). The cases of Bibit-Chandra and Prita are exemplary. There are many other cases that failed to reach a critical mobilization, such as:

• The Lapindo case (2006-present): refers to the Sidoarjo mudflow incident, which has been ongoing since May 2006 and affected more than 10,000 people. The biggest mud volcano in the world was created by the blowout of a natural gas well drained by PT Lapindo Brantas, a big company owned by a well known Indonesian conglomerate, Aburizal Bakrie. While Lapindo represents a bigger problem and impacted more victims than the case of Prita, attempts to mobilize the Lapindo issue in social media have only resulted in modest participation.

• The Ahmadiyah assault (2011): refers to the murderous attack against members of a minority Islamic group called Ahmadiyah by a militant Islamist group in January 2011. Despite the availability of online videos of the assault, there is a lack of movement mobilized around this issue.

• There are many other “Coin” movements that were subsequently initiated online (e.g. Coin for Minah, Coin for Sumiyati) but never became popular.

While it can be political, social media is mostly social. Successful mobilization, such as in the case of Prita, mostly works under the logic of popular participatory culture, rather than civic participation of informed citizens. Having said that, however, to a certain degree the emergence of citizen journalism and reporting through social media has provided a mechanism to uncover social and political problems and injustices that otherwise would not be revealed. While never really making any big wave of movements, videos of the victims of Lapindo case did surface in the limited online public sphere and raised concerns of some segments of Indonesian society. Similarly, the assault of Ahmadiyah members by a group of militant Islamists has been made public by the online availability and dissemination of various user-generated videos made by regular persons. These videos were disseminated through social media and made their way into the hands of local and international human right activists and institutions, as well as society at large.

**ONLINE VIDEO ACTIVISM**

The more organized attempts to make use of digital media to communicate human rights and social justice related issues comes from media and human rights activists. In response to the need for better, relevant, content, media activists have developed various media networks and channels. Among them are:

• Kampung Halaman (KH), a non-profit organization based in Yogyakarta, whose goal is to foster the use of popular audio-visual media in community-based programs to facilitate the marginal youth to understand their roles in improving the conditions of their communities. Through its partnership with various youth communities, KH has facilitated the production and dissemination of more than 60 videos covering an assortment of issues that are dear to young Indonesians’ heart and minds.

• EngageMedia, a media activist organization based in Jakarta and Melbourne, uses “the power of video, the internet and free software technologies to create social and environmental change” and works with independent filmmakers and video activities to generate wider audiences and challenge the capitalistic model of video distribution. One of its ongoing video projects is produced around the issue of torture and human rights in West Papua. The most recent video on this issue is a documentary video of Tunaliwori Kiwo in recounting the detailed experiences of his torture by Indonesian soldiers on 30 May 2010.

• Kalyana Shira Foundation, a non-profit organization established in 2006 by a group of independent film professionals who are concerned with the lack of films advocating women’s rights issues and is led by Nia Dinata, a renowned award-winning filmmaker known for her
feminist values. Often exploring themes that are deemed controversial and/or taboo, such as sexuality and reproductive rights, this organization produces quality documentary films to spread awareness on women rights issues and other social issues that have been marginalized in Indonesia. One of their productions is “At Stake”, an anthology documentary film of four stories on the various social problems faced by Indonesian women in a patriarchal society. It tells “four fresh and powerful stories of two Indonesian migrant workers in Hong Kong, the practice of female genital mutilation, the difficulty of finding a non-judgmental obstetrician-gynecologists in the metropolitan Jakarta, and the daily lives of women who become sex workers in a Chinese cemetery complex.” Kalyana Shira draws on public screenings in both physical and virtual space (through and using EngageMedia online video platform) to disseminate its films.

Documentary video/film is the dominant medium used for advancing human rights and social justice. However, it is important to note that many of these activist organizations make use not only video technology, but also other media such as local television and radio networks, the Internet, and social media in their content production, development, and distribution.

CHANNELING SENSITIVE/INACCESSIBLE/FILTERED INFORMATION

While the number is very small, there are a few independent organizations that utilize digital media to open the channels of information for politically sensitive issues. Some examples include:

- West Papua Media Alerts, a non-profit initiative providing independent news from West Papua. This initiative is partly in response to the constant threats experienced by journalists reporting on/from the area. Through its online portal, this initiative is focused on reporting “Papuan campaigns to end human rights abuses and bring these unreported Papuan issues to the front page”.

- Kontras, The Commission for “the Disappeared” and Victims of Violence, provides information on and support for victims of human right violence through its online portal.


- Kalyanamitra, Women’s Communication and Information Centre, utilizes digital networks to promote awareness about women’s rights, to fight for oppressed women, and to provide an information and knowledge network on women-related issues.

CONTROLLING MEDIA AND COMMUNICATIONS

‘Reformasi’ (Reformation) has ushered Indonesian society to encounter, experience, and experiment with the notion of freedom. Freedom House Institute classifies Indonesia as a ‘free’ country with good scores on both political rights and civil liberties. However, when it comes to press freedom and Internet freedom, Indonesia’s status is classified as ‘partly free’—signaling the ongoing struggle of the Indonesian media to remain independent and credible vis-à-vis the increasingly corporatized environment, a more outspoken public, and government’s desire to regain control over the media.

POST SUHARTO’S EARLY DEMOCRATIZATION AND THE SET BACK

Claiming the right to information and communications, new found freedom of expression and press freedoms take many forms. The first step taken by civil society organizations in 1998 was to advocate for legal reform of the Press Law and the Broadcasting Act. They formed a media coalition and held a successful campaign to endorse a new Press Law no. 40 in 1999 and Broadcasting Act no. 32 in 2002. The principle of press freedom is enshrined in the new Press Law. The Broadcasting Act of 2002, stressing media decentralization and emphasizing accountability and transparency in licensing procedures for public service and commercial broadcasting licenses, was meant to
democratize the landscape of broadcast media. Central to this is the establishment and the inclusion of the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission, an independent regulatory body representing the public interest, and in particular the licensing processes. These two legal products are the symbol of civil society's victory in promoting free and independent media as well as advancing the public interest.

Following 2002, however, there are many legal products that have become more of a set back. In fact, just three years after the issuance of this Broadcasting Act, in 2005 the government passed a series of administrative regulations on private and community broadcasts that ignore the spirit of the 2002 Act. Under the 2002 Act, the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission has the right to issue and revoke the licenses of broadcasters. These 2005 newer regulations on foreign, private, community, and subscription-based broadcasters, however, grant this power back to the state as the government has the right to intervene.

THE ABUSE OF CRIMINAL DEFAMATION CODES & THE INDONESIAN CYBERLAW

While official censorship has become rare (except within the film sector), criminal defamation codes continue to raise concerns about freedom of media and freedom of expression in general. Although in the past few years the Constitutional Court has overturned some clauses in the criminal code that were created under Suharto’s regime, such as two regulations that criminalize defamation of the government through public media, public officials continue to use other articles of the criminal codes for their interests. The Alliance of Independent Journalists in Indonesia reported that “most charges leveled against journalists and media are related to defamation.”

In 2008, the government passed the Electronic Information and Transactions (ITE) Law that was originally designed to protect electronic business transactions. Its vague definition of defamation, however, lends itself to be used against individuals and groups who express opinion on the Internet and social media. There were six individuals prosecuted in 2009, including Prita Mulyasari, who was arrested and charged for her email complaint to friends and relatives about the service she received at the hospital. Under Article 27 (3) on the transmission of electronic information with libelous content, she faced up to six years in prison and a penalty of 1 billion rupiah (US$85,000). The final verdict handed her a 204 million rupiah fine. But supporters ran an online campaign through Facebook and collected donations on her behalf. At the same time, Prita Mulyasari was also charged under Article 310 of the Criminal Code on defamation and Article 211 of the Criminal Code on defamation in libelous writing. Later the hospital dropped the lawsuit on Article 27 (3) and Prita won a parallel case in the court. But two years after her acquittal, in July 2011, the panel of judges at the Supreme Court sentence Prita to one year of probation for being guilty of the defamation charge. In May 2009, the Press Legal Aid Institute (LBH Pers) and the Alliance of Independent Journalists (AJI) petitioned for a judicial review of the Article 27 (3) of the ITE Law. The Constitutional Court, however, rejected the petition.

THE RETURN OF STATE CONTROL: RULING THE PRESS, PUBLIC ACCESS TO INFORMATION & PUBLIC MORALITY

Along with the ITE Law, three other new laws that brought new threats to media freedom and freedom of expression were issued. First was the 2008 Election Law that included articles stating that “print mass media must provide a fair and balanced space and time for election coverage, interviews, and campaign ads for election candidates” and holding the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (KPI) and the Press Council (Dewan Pers) accountable. Critics said that these articles undermine the press and broadcasting laws of 1999 and 2002 and placed an unnecessary burden on Broadcasting Commission and Press Council.

Second was the 2008 Transparency of Public Information Law—Indonesia’s freedom of information law. On the one hand, this law offers new legal guarantees for public access to information. On the other hand, this law also provides a one-year jail term for anyone who ‘misuses’ that information. The vague definition of ‘misuse’ opens possibilities of the misuse and abuse of this law.
Lastly, the controversial 2008 Pornography Law that criminalizes any sex-related materials deemed to violate public morality. The law also embodies public discourses on content in the “Asian” and/or even “Muslim” country context where most of the debates around content regulation are framed around public morality and the regulation of the “excesses” of the information/networked environment. Under this law, possessing or downloading pornography can bear a four-year jail term and a sexually attractive performance can result in 12-years jail. Relying on a vague definition of pornography, this Law also invites members of the public to play a role in enforcing it, which according to critics gives a legal basis to already unruly groups of Islamic vigilantes such as the Islamic Defenders Front (FPI). This law has particularly upset populations outside of Java, especially in the predominantly Hindu population of the island of Bali, where some cultural traditions could now be deemed pornographic. The law is perceived as limiting the freedom of expression of journalists, media, and the public in general, especially those dealing with creative visual work, such as filmmakers and video artists/journalists.

The desire to regulate online content is particularly pronounced in the proposed Ministerial Decree on Multimedia Content (RPM Konten Multimedia). While failed to make it into a formal legal framework, the proposed decree was, nevertheless, evidence of government’s attempts to regulate online content.

**FUTURE CRIME, CONVERGENCE, AND INTELLIGENCE BILLS**

In the coming years, there will be three media related bills to keep an eye on. First is the Informational Technology Crime bill (TIPITI). AJI considers the bill as even more repressive and vague than the controversial 2008 ITE Law. Media observers are concerned that the TIPITI bill are “overly aggressive and not emphasizing the investigation of digital evidence enough” and carries heavier penalties for online offenses.

Second is the Media Convergence bill (RUU Konvergensi). While the bill is meant to consolidate and organize Indonesia’s Broadcasting Act, ITE and Telecommunications laws, it also will merge the Broadcasting Commission, the Information Commission, and the Indonesian Telecommunications Regulatory Body into a single commission. The merging of various institutions into a single body might lead to the creation of ‘a super-body armed with penal provisions that will have the mandate of regulating and monitoring the press, broadcast and new media, and various telecommunications platforms.’

Third is the Intelligence bill (RUU Inteligen), a controversial bill defining the role and functions of Indonesian intelligence agencies. The controversy centers around three issues: “whether the State Intelligence Agency (Badan Intelijen Negara, BIN) should have arrest and detention powers; whether wire-tapping and other intercepts should require a court order; and how to ensure oversight and accountability mechanisms consistent with democratic governance.” The concern around the bill includes its vague language, its lack of human right principles, and its threat to the 2009 freedom of information act (Keterbukaan Informasi Publik, KIP) because of an article that could override the state’s responsibility to divulge particular classifications of information.

**CORRUPTION, INTIMIDATION, AND SELF-CENSORSHIP**

In addition to problems around control over media and information originated from regulatory framework, there are some other problems that are more political and/or cultural. Corruption and bribery in journalism still persists. Even though state-violence is no longer practiced, since 1998 journalists and media continue to suffer violence and intimidation when they cover corruption or other sensitive topics involving high rank government officials, top politicians, and prominent business persons. In 2010 alone, AJI recorded 63 cases of violence against journalists and media.

Meanwhile, as described by Ignatius Haryanto, journalism practices have been influenced by political and commercial interests of the media owners. Haryanto’s findings show that a new form of internal censorship from media owners has become the norm.
CONCLUDING REMARKS

SUMMARY OF CURRENT SITUATION

• In the last decade, there has been a significant improvement in media access and accessibility in Indonesia. Television is accessible to more than 90% of the population and access to other media has generally increased. The Internet and social media have witnessed tremendous growth.

• There are, however, some persistent access/accessibility issues. Uneven distribution of the infrastructure continues to be one of the major issues. Public infrastructure of media and communication technologies is very limited and, when available, is mostly concentrated in cosmopolitan areas. Urban-rural divides continue to persist and even widen the gap between urban areas of Java and the rest of Indonesia.

• While the Indonesian media landscape has undergone democratization processes, media ownership is increasingly concentrated in the hands of the few. A small number of conglomerates—some of whom have obvious political connections—dominate the media environment, leading to a disproportional political control by the media, public's decreasing access to important information, and under-representation of certain groups in the media.

• This concentration of media ownership and the networked media business model, as expected, leads to the lack of diversity in the production and content, especially in mainstream Indonesian media. Issues and interests closer to the middle-upper class interests dominate while issues on marginalized communities get no or minimum coverage.

• Alternative sources of information have been made available through the emergence of community radios and televisions, independent online content providers and social media based citizen journalism. However, they are still marginal, their amount of information is miniscule if compared to the mainstream information, and, some suffer from the content dependency where mainstream media steers the direction of information/conversations in other media. In terms of production and content, another problem is the supremacy of the online global players.

• Currently Indonesian media operates under a relatively free environment. In the last ten years, however, some newly created regulations have hindered Indonesian media from continuing its democratization processes. While official censorship has become exceptional, criminal defamation codes continue to raise concerns about freedom of the media and freedom of expression in general. Some political and/or cultural practices such as violence and intimidation against journalists and media, the practices of bribery, and self/internal censorship continue to persist.

CIVIL SOCIETY ENGAGEMENT—OPPORTUNITIES

• Despite these identified issues, the Indonesian media landscape is vibrant and dynamic. Historically, Indonesian media has always been rife with innovative technologies providing easy and affordable access solutions.

• Various small independent initiatives to address the internal digital divide are present and, observably, will continue to grow.

• Indonesia witnesses the expansion of independent media and soaring potential on the production of rich alternative content.

• Community radios, in particular, demonstrate a promising prospect in local content production.

• Digital media, particularly social media and online video, has become an effective medium for activists in mobilizing social movements and advancing human rights and social justice.
REGULATORY AND POLICY ISSUES

- Telecom policies and regulatory frameworks in general need reform. The PSTN duopoly must be terminated, a conducive and more competitive investment policy is needed, and the licensing body needs greater independence and professionalism.

- Spectrum licensing environment needs to be more transparent. The government should make information on spectrum allocation accessible and understandable by the public.

- Recent developments in digital communications related regulatory frameworks have raised the possibility of increased censorship and tend to be ‘vague’, leading to abuse and misuse. Future regulation should be made in accordance with the recommendations of the Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression and Opinion in the Human Rights Council.

- Discourses on content regulatory framework has been hijacked by the ‘public morality’ and ‘excesses’ debates over-focusing on ‘negative content.’ There is an urgent need to shift the debates from ‘morality’ and ‘excess’ to ones of ‘access’ and ‘diversity’.

SYMPATHETIC STAKEHOLDERS AND ALLIES

- Indonesia has many independent organizations, especially media activists, which are apparent partners, sympathetic stakeholders and allies, to work with in addressing a range of challenges and problems. There are very few, however, who work specifically on media rights in terms of pressuring and/or lobbying for a more open regulatory sector. As revealed previously, back in late 1990s to early 2000s there was a strong civil society movement that brought about the media law reforms. However, many of the coalitions who fought for these reforms are no longer active.

- There is an apparent lack of systematic efforts to actively monitor of the development of media related draft laws. There is only a handful organizations focusing on this issue, such as Satu Dunia (One World), AJI, and ICT Watch, and a few individuals such as Anggara. Furthermore, there is a lack of technical expertise among the CSO to offer viable policy alternatives vis-à-vis government’s push for the proposed new laws (such as in the cases of the Media Convergence and the Informational Technology Criminal Laws).

- Corporations might not be natural allies in contesting regulatory framework or changing policies. However, as some companies do take consumers’ interests seriously, yet they often operate in grey spaces where they do not seem to fully adhere to government regulations. For example, in the case of censoring ‘porn’ (Pornography Law), the association of Internet service providers, APJII, and some of the Internet providers chose not to block the content but came up with an option for subscriber-based filtering services if they wanted them. By employing strategies that emphasize consumers’ interest, the corporate sector, particularly the Internet service providers, “could be ‘invited’ to protect the public interest (which also helps their business).”

- The establishment of an Indonesian Internet Governance Forum (ID-IGF) is perhaps one of the most hopeful scenarios for the more sustainable advancement of internet access and rights in Indonesia. Currently the chairman of APJII is very active in establishing the ID-IGF which is a multi-stakeholder forum for policy dialogues on issues of Internet government, particularly to protect an open Internet. In its establishment, ID-IGF has effectively involved representatives from the private sector and civil society as well as some low ranking officials from the Ministry of Communication and Information. To ensure that the ID-IGF continues to advocate for the public interest and allows for citizen participation is a crucial end to follow through.

- The Indonesian public is enthusiastic in embracing participatory culture, especially through social media. How to take advantage of this mass popular participatory culture and transform its energy into meaningful civic engagement is a task at hand.
STRATEGIES FOR INTERVENTIONS & CHANGES

- Indonesian CSOs can really benefit from insights and initiatives on pressuring and/or lobbying for a more open regulatory sector elsewhere in the world; international organizations focusing on similar/related issues can extend a valuable assistance.

- Diverting from the "lobbying" approach and using the "back-door" approach—which has resulted in some successful regulatory interventions is worth consideration. This strategy refers to the collective effort to put (local, national and international) pressure on the government to change or amend regulations. One of the glaring examples is Onno Purbo’s (and his group) struggle to liberate the 2.4GHz broadband. As part of his strategy, Purbo spread the knowledge and the access (of 2.4 GHz band) all over Indonesia to reach the point where it was impossible to regulate. Purbo also brought the international partners, such as IDRC and CERN, into play to put pressure on the Indonesian government. This approach was a success, resulting in the signing of the Ministry Act liberating 2.4GHz in Indonesia on 5 January 2005. Purbo recommended a similar approach in responding to other regulatory frameworks. In responding to the proposed Convergence bill, he suggested to “flood the space with local content” to make it impossible for the government to administer taxes as proposed through the bill. Along this line of approach, some have proposed to put pressure on the government to employ USO (Universal Service Obligation) accordingly, by using it to develop infrastructure and extend access rather than just to negotiate its own contracts (often unrelated to extending access).

- There is a pressing need to engage the public (communities) in initiatives concerning media diversity, ethics and equitable access through activities such as trainings, capacity-building, and networking. One of the known strategic initiatives focusing on this issue is the Cipta Media Bersama (CMB) project, launched by the Ford Foundation Indonesia in collaboration with ICT Watch, the Alliance of Independent Journalists (AJI), and Wikimedia Indonesia. CMB is an open request for proposals to engage communities in pursuing (a) media pluralism and content diversity, (b) equitable and just media access, (c) media freedom and ethical media practices. One of the goals of CMB is to not just to produce new initiatives and approaches but also a new generation of people concerned about these issues, especially in the citizen sphere. By instilling a good amount of public education and capacity building components to this RFP initiative, this endeavor might yield a more coordinated networked sphere with new approaches to promoting media diversity, ethics and equity. The CMB is one of the rare initiatives that particularly responds to this challenge. Yet, there is still much work to be done.

- For Indonesians to participate and be engaged in the global dialogues and initiatives around the Internet and media governance, there is an immediate need to develop local capacity. Local and international institutions can provide meaningful support, not only by influencing the discourses, assisting resources/skills development, and supporting infrastructure expansion locally, but also by intentionally directing global discourses and initiatives towards the needs of the people and the conditions of media environments in the countries of the Global South such as Indonesia.
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