

The Cosmopatriotism of Indonesia's Radio-Active Public Sphere

Edwin Jurriëns

This chapter is based on the premise that Indonesian private radio constitutes a public sphere - or better: amalgam of public spheres - in which mutual relationships between patriotism and cosmopolitanism are envisaged and explored. The issue of 'publicness' has been deemed much importance in contemporary Indonesia, as it is seen by various groups in society - including media practitioners - as one of the key instruments with which the country can free itself from the constraints of President Soeharto's totalitarian New Order government (1967-1998) and give shape to Reformasi, or the post-Soeharto mass-based project of social and political reform.

In order to support the premise, in the first paragraph I will give an explanation of my working concept of the public sphere, which is mainly based on Craig Calhoun's reading of Habermas's bourgeois public sphere and Adam Seligman's idea of civil society, and explore the interrelations between civil society, the public sphere and the mass media.

In the second paragraph I will argue that the phenomenon of segmentation is both a symptom of (over)specialization in (post)bourgeois society and mass culture and the decisive factor in the development of late- and post-Soeharto Indonesian radio.

The next four paragraphs contain case-studies about Indonesian radio news agencies, community radio and commercial talk-back radio that illustrate how Indonesian radio lives up to, contradicts, alters or abuses the ideals of the Habermasian concept of the public sphere.

In the final paragraph I summarize the findings and show how the 'publicness' as expressed in Indonesian radio gives shape to specific manifestations and interrelations between



cosmopolitanism and patriotism, which transcend the boundaries between society and the state, the commercial and the public, and the local and the national or international.

Civil society, the bourgeois public sphere and the mass media

As a starting point for this chapter I take a concept of ‘public sphere’ that presupposes intersections between the public and the private as well as the civil and the state-related. This public sphere can be considered ‘a sphere of civil society (or civil life) beyond the state and yet transcending purely individual existence’ (Seligman 1992:9). Civil society here encompasses social identity and activity that is not directly controlled by the state and goes beyond the intimate sphere of family life (cf. Seligman 1992:122; Calhoun 1992:21). It has both private and public aspects, as it depends on the participation of individuals in collective life. The very ‘privacy’ of these individuals guarantees that the collective identity and activity developed goes beyond the state, and is ‘civil’, indeed. Thus ‘public sphere’ refers to the public aspect of a civil society of individuals, who belong to the private realm themselves:

‘The public space of interaction in civil society is a public space only insofar as it is distinguished from these social actors who enter it as private individuals. Where there is no private sphere, there is, concomitantly, no public one: both must exist in dialectic unity for sense to be made of either one’ (Seligman 1992:5; cf. Calhoun 1992:7).

At the same time, the public sphere can only be conceptualised in its full sense when the state is constituted as an impersonal locus of authority (Calhoun 1992:8). In democracies, the state guarantees the possibility of public life with a more personal face, beyond the state itself, by institutionalising, respecting and stimulating citizenship, or ‘the values of membership and participation in collective life’ (Seligman 1992:101). This type of citizenship goes further than simply the exercise of individual or civil rights, but includes an element of shared solidarity (cf. Seligman 1992:118).

Jürgen Habermas, tracing the roots of contemporary notions of the public sphere to 17th and 18th century Europe, which saw the rise of the modern state, capitalist economic activity and bourgeois society, identifies public discourse or communicative action as a crucial factor in coordinating the public sphere (Calhoun 1992:6) and achieving a mutually agreed consensus among citizens (Calhoun 1992:16). This type of discourse-based, bourgeois public sphere relies on institutional bases, revolves around rational argument, covers topics related to state



and other authorities, and involves a public that is inclusive in principle (Calhoun 1992:12-13):

'The [eighteenth century] bourgeois public may be conceived above all as the sphere of private people come together as a public; they soon claimed the public sphere regulated from above against the public authorities themselves, to engage them in a debate over the general rules governing relations in the basically privatised but publicly relevant sphere of commodity exchange and social labor. The medium of this political confrontation was peculiar and without historical precedent: people's public use of their reason' (Habermas 1989: 27; cited in Calhoun 1992:9).

One of the foundations of this European bourgeois public sphere was capitalism, which completed the privatisation of civil society by allowing people free control of property and production (Calhoun 1992:15). Two other foundations were the free provision of information and education, which enabled the public to arrive at a considered, rather than merely a common, opinion (Calhoun 1992:14). Property ownership, access to information and education developed into criteria for admission to the institutional bases of the public sphere, including meeting places such as coffee houses (England), salons (France) and table societies (Germany), and print media and literary products such as journals of opinion, novels and theatre plays (Calhoun 1992:12-13).

According to Habermas, these criteria for admission did not necessarily diminish the public sphere's representativeness of civil society as a whole:

'However exclusive the public might be in any given instance, it could never close itself off entirely and become consolidated as a clique; for it always understood and found itself immersed within a more inclusive public of all private people, persons who - insofar as they were propertied and educated - as readers, listeners, and spectators could avail themselves via the market of the objects that were subject to discussion' (Habermas 1989:37; cited in Calhoun 1992:13).

According to Habermas, in the contemporary Western world the foundations of the public sphere have become undermined through a 'refeudalization' of society (Calhoun 1992:21). Refeudalization is due to the fact that state and society, once distinct, have become interlocked, with private organizations assuming public power on the one hand, and the state penetrating the private realm on the other (Calhoun 1992:21). As a consequence, the public sphere is no longer a space in which private citizens engage in rational debate in the interest of all, but rather an arena in which special interest groups attempt to increase the prestige of their own positions and legislators stage displays for their constituents (Calhoun 1992:26).



The parties with power in this transformed public sphere see their interests best served through negotiated compromise rather than critical debate and the notion of a general interest:

‘The process of the politically relevant exercise and equilibration of power now takes place directly between the private bureaucracies, special-interest associations, parties, and public administration. The public as such is included only sporadically in this circuit of power, and even then is brought in only to contribute its acclamation’ (Habermas 1989:176; cited in Calhoun 1992:22).

Another aspect of the refeudalization of society is the ‘externalization of the inner life’, which implies that citizens have reduced the private sphere to the family, and have withdrawn from ‘their socially controlled roles as property owners into the purely “personal” ones of their noncommittal use of leisure time’ (Habermas 1989:152; cited in Calhoun 1992:22). As a consequence, rational public discourse has been replaced by a more passive culture consumption on the one hand and an apolitical sociability on the other (Calhoun 1992:22-23). As Calhoun rightly observes, Habermas’s account here follows the tradition of the critique of mass culture in which members of the Frankfurt School played a prominent role (Calhoun 1992:23).

According to Habermas, the culture of passive consumption and apolitical sociability has been partly created and reinforced by the modern, audio-visual mass media such as radio, film and television. These new institutions of public discourse have a far greater immediacy than the print media and generate a bond with the audience that can be described as a ‘secondary realm of intimacy’ (Calhoun 1992:24). States and corporate actors use this immediacy to persuade the audience, by turning politicians into media stars, stage displays - rather than institutionalise real forums - of rational-critical debate, and instil motivations in the audience that respond to the needs of those states and corporate actors (Calhoun 1992:24-26). At the same time, the media immediacy is used to implement the false consciousness in the audience that it constitutes a group of critically reflecting private citizens that contributes responsibly to public opinion rather than a group of media consumers that is merely being persuaded and manipulated through those media (Calhoun 1992:25).

Habermas’s account of the bourgeois public sphere has disclosed and analysed issues that are the heart of problems in contemporary democracies. It has proven to be extremely productive and influential, although it has also yielded criticism and controversy. A central point of criticism is that the modern media are not necessarily as uniform and anti-democratic as



Habermas suggests, and that alternative, democratic media strategies do exist (cf. Calhoun 1992:33).

In the following paragraphs I will focus on concrete examples of such ‘alternative’ media strategies, which originate from the Indonesian radio landscape of the late 20th and early 21st centuries. In the way they give shape to complex interactions between patriotism and cosmopolitanism, these examples also put Habermas’s implicit assumption that there must be one public sphere for each state (cf. Calhoun 1992:37) in a critical perspective.

Consumer culture, segmentation, Indonesia

In Indonesia, society’s ambition of reclaiming the public sphere was arguably the most important factor that led to the end of more than thirty years of totalitarian Soeharto regime and the initiation of the project of social, political and economic reform known as Reformasi. In the late 1990s, the most visible and persistent social actors calling for Reformasi were the students, while the audio-visual media such as radio, the Internet, VCDs and television provided the necessary channels for expressing and distributing their call. The urge for reform was strengthened by the economic crisis that had hit Indonesia and the rest of South East Asia severely since mid-1997. After the step-down of Soeharto in 1998, the audio-visual media have remained a central institutional pillar on which Indonesia’s public sphere-under-reform is based.

This media-based public sphere is a complex one, especially when it is taken into account that many of the media institutions also pursue commercial aims and/or have ties with international media and NGOs. This raises questions about how these institutions maintain or cross the borders between the public and the private, the local and the global and civil society and the state, and to what extent they contribute to the ‘refeudalization of society’ and the ‘externalization of inner life’, or prevent these processes from happening. I will address these questions here and in the following paragraphs through an exploration of the organization of post-Soeharto private radio.

The central force behind the structure of the contemporary Indonesian private radio landscape is the phenomenon of segmentation. Segmentation means that stations attempt to distinguish themselves from their competitors by specializing in particular broadcast content and broadcast style. In this way they try to attract specific parts of the audience, whose needs and



interests are partly shaped by the individual radio stations themselves. The segmentation of Indonesian radio already existed during the 1930s, the period of the so-called 'Eastern' radio stations or *radio ketimuran*, private stations monitored by Dutch colonial rule that catered for an autochthonous market (Lindsay 1997:109; Sen and Hill 2000:81). Segmentation highly increased since the 1980s, when stations began to broadcast on FM and had to fight for a profitable share of the overcrowded market (Samuel 2002:305; Lindsay 1997:118-119; Jurriëns 2004:58-59). Nowadays Indonesia counts more than 1000 officially registered private stations, focussing on such diverse, segment-classifying themes as pop music, regional culture, news, religion, humour, youth culture, jazz, women's affairs and business.

According to Habermas, this kind of segmentation - as a typical manifestation of the consumption orientation of mass culture - is partly responsible for the disintegration of the public sphere. Being designed to please various tastes, individual products of segmentation would reflect fragmentation rather than diversification, and undermine the formation of a mass-based solidarity that is the result of critical discussion and capable of reaching the whole of the public (Livingstone and Lunt 1994:27; Calhoun 1992:25). Moreover, media segmentation would represent and contribute to the segmentation of society in a broader sense, manifested in the transformation of the once intimate relationship between cultural producers and consumers:

'The sounding board of an educated stratum tutored in the public use of reason has been shattered; the public is split apart into minorities of specialists who put their reason to use nonpublicly and the great mass of consumers whose receptiveness is public but uncritical' (Habermas 1989:175; cited in Calhoun 1992:26).

Seligman, following Max Weber, stresses that this transformation is actually a negative and paradoxical consequence of the very success of the public sphere, in particular the widespread implementation and dissemination of the idea of the use of reason: 'By bringing ever increasing realms of life into the realm of Reason, it also denuded them of any value (especially ethical value) beyond that instrumental calculus of means-end relationship' (Seligman 1992:128). It is this 'disenchantment of the world' that has left us with 'specialists without spirit, sensualists without heart' (Seligman 1992:128).

Both from theoretical and empirical points of view, it can be argued that the segmentation of the media and society at large is not only negative and disruptive, though, but does also provide alternative, positive contributions to public life. My case-studies of Indonesian



private radio will show that certain manifestations of mass culture contain rational-critical debate and address society as a whole, for instance.

This exposure of the more favourable aspects of segmentation cannot be isolated from a critical examination of the bourgeois public sphere as identified by Habermas. In line with Seligman's comments on the role of reason, amongst others, it will lead to a re-interpretation of the public sphere and to counter-arguments that say, paradoxically, that rational-critical debate or the capability to address the whole of society are not necessary requirements for media such as Indonesian private radio to be able to facilitate and improve public life (cf. Calhoun 1992:36-39). In short, I will show that certain media can and do live up to the standards of the (idealised) bourgeois public sphere, in spite of them being manifestations of mass culture, while at the same time I will argue that the concept of the (bourgeois) public sphere needs revision in the light of new developments in the media and society at large.

In the following case-studies, I will focus on activities developed by Indonesian radio institutions since the fall of Soeharto in 1998 that can be roughly divided into the following three categories: 1. Activities that represent the ideals of an Habermasian public sphere, 2. Activities that include alternative 'public' strategies, 3. Activities that are controversial with regard to the public interests they are supposed to defend. The first category includes the institutional organization and programs of the radio news agencies KBR 68H and Internews, the second category community radio and talk shows and off-the-air activities of commercial stations, and the third category the programs and concepts of Radio Mora, a commercial station with a mixed format of news, legal issues and entertainment. This is a rough division, made for the sake of the argument, as there is also much overlap between the constituents of the different categories.

Radio news agencies and the bourgeois public sphere

KBR 68H (Kantor Berita Radio 68H or Radio News Office 68h) and Internews Indonesia are both radio news agencies: they produce programs for radio stations and do not broadcast themselves. They make use of CDs, the Internet and satellite technology in order to transmit the programs to their clients, mainly commercial radio stations. Their programs include new bulletins, features, documentaries and talk shows about topical events. Apart from producing



programs, they also organize courses about broadcast journalism and provide equipment or funding to private radio stations.

KBR 68H and Internews Indonesia, which are both located in Jakarta (KBR 68H at Utan Kayu street no. 68H), came into being in 1999 and 1998, respectively. They made use of the enhanced freedom of speech and more liberal legislation with regard to the media in the early period of Reformasi in order to create and secure their position in the field of Indonesian news provision. A crucial development in this respect was the Ministerial Decree issued by Yunus Yosfiah, then Minister of Information, which made an official end to the monopoly of state broadcaster RRI (Radio Republik Indonesia) on news production and allowed private radio institutions to create their own information programs. This new legislation stimulated a number of commercial radio stations not just to produce news programs, but also to profile themselves as news stations (Samuel 2002:318; Sen 2003:585). They wanted to provide an alternative sound and point of view to the government propaganda of RRI and thought news could be commercially beneficial in creating or attracting a specific segment of the population.

While the reach of those commercial stations is generally restricted to a city, town or village and its surroundings, the news agencies KBR 68H and Internews Indonesia are able to cover almost the whole of Indonesia by distributing their products to regional radio stations. With this cover area they have become serious competitors of RRI, the only Indonesian radio broadcasting organization with a nation-wide scope. Both KBR 68H and Internews Indonesia, as non-profit organizations, have formulated their activities in contrast with the activities of state RRI and commercial stations. The type of journalism they want to promote is independent journalism and the type of interest they want to serve is the public interest, as becomes clear from the following statement from the KBR 68H website:

'Internet and satellite are only tools. What matters are the people behind these technologies. Radio 68H relies on professional journalists, who really understand the function of journalism. We are here to serve the public interest and to satisfy their right to 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, refusing to submit to [state] power or financial interests'¹ (<http://news.radio68h.com/profile.php>).

¹ Internet, satelit, hanyalah alat. Mereka yang di belakang teknologi itulah yang menentukan. Radio 68H didukung oleh para jurnalis profesional, yang mengerti betul fungsi jurnalisisme. Kami ada untuk melayani kepentingan publik, memenuhi hak mereka akan informasi. Di tengah euforia kebebasan, kami menyadari



This discourse is the discourse of reformation, expressed by people who look for a definitive break with Indonesia's totalitarian past and attempt to guide the process of reform itself. At the same time it represents or repeats the discourse of international NGOs, in particular their discourse on civil society and the public sphere. This is not surprising when it is taken into account that KBR 68H was founded with funding from The Asia Foundation, the Media Development Loan Fund and the Dutch Embassy. Since January 2000, the agency still covered 40 percent of its costs with funding from these international organizations, while it covered the remaining 60 percent with income from commercial activities.

Internews Indonesia was founded as part of the United States non-profit organization Internews Network. The Network has 20 offices worldwide and is funded by organizations such as USAID (the United States Agency for International development), the Dutch Government, the United States Information Agency, the Ford Foundation and Rockefeller Financial Services. According to its website, Internews Network supports 'independent media in emerging democracies'. It assists these emerging democracies in developing 'innovative television and radio programming and internet content' and in using the media 'to reduce conflict within and between countries' (<http://www.internews.org/about/about.htm>).

The Internews Network, also active in the states of the former Soviet Union and other conflict areas or former conflict areas such as Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Israel, Palestina, Timor Loro Sae and Iran, thus promotes a mixture of what in literature on journalism is called 'independent journalism' and 'peace journalism'. Since the fall of Soeharto, both concepts have also been taught to Indonesian journalists via journalism courses and handbooks that have been made available all over Indonesia by both international and national journalism organizations, which felt there was no opportunity or time to waste.²

pentingnya informasi yang jelas, jujur, menjernihkan perkara. Jurnalis kami telah terlatih untuk mengembangkan sikap independen. Menolak tunduk pada kekuasaan ataupun kepentingan modal.

² An example is the Indonesian NGO Lembaga Studi Pers dan Pembangunan (LSSP, or Institute for Press and Development Studies), which has organized training courses and published a series of journalism handbooks in co-operation with The Asia Foundation and USAID Jakarta (Darpan A. Winangun, LSSP Publishing Manager; personal communication 10 October 2001). The book series includes titles such as *Peace Journalism: How to Conduct It?* (*Jurnalisme Damai: Bagaimana Melakukannya?*; 2001), *Multicultural Conflicts. A Guide for Journalists* (*Konflik Multikultur. Panduan bagi Jurnalis*; 2000) and *The Convention for the Abolition of Every Form of Discrimination against Women. A Reporting Guide for Journalists* (*Konvensi tentang Penghapusan Segala Bentuk Diskriminasi terhadap Perempuan. Panduan Meliput bagi Jurnalis*; 1999).



While KBR 68H and Internews Indonesia responded to the turmoil of local political and social events, their role can only be fully understood in the spectrum of regional, national and global forces. KBR 68H, for instance, has not only received donations from foreign institutions, but is also an institutional part of a community formed by internationally trained, 'cosmopolitan' or 'cosmo-patriotic', 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 center ISAI (Institut Studi Arus Informasi or Institute for the Studies on Free Flow of Information), the art gallery Galeri Lontar, the theatre group Teater Utan Kayu (TUK) and the bookshop Toko Buku Utan Kayu, all located at Utan Kayu Street 68H.

Central figure of this community is the journalist, essayist and poet Goenawan Mohamad, who decided to buy four shops at Utan Kayu Street in order to create a place where journalists and artists could meet. This was in 1994, after Tempo, Indonesia's best-known news weekly of which Goenawan was the editor-in-chief, was banned by the Soeharto regime because of its critical content. Journalists previously involved in the weekly used the formal structure of Utan Kayu Community as an undercover for continuing journalistic work according to the old Tempo standards. Tempo even re-appeared in electronic version on the Internet, a medium that escaped the censorship of the New Order regime.

The Utan Kayu complex and community revive memories of the infrastructure and ambience of the 18th century coffee houses, salons and table societies as identified by Habermas. At the centre of the complex there is even a warung or small restaurant where Indonesian and foreign journalists, artists, intellectuals and scholars come together in order to participate in rational-critical debate about socio-cultural topics such as journalism, art, literature, politics, religion and class, while having a coffee or a meal. The conclusions or consensus reached during these and other discussions are disseminated to society through radio broadcasts, current affairs magazines, literature, theatre plays, paintings, sculptures, journalism courses, handbooks, interviews, public speeches and other media.

In 2001, KBR 68H produced and transmitted 15 programs daily, consisting of twelve News Updates (Kabar Baru, or New Message), two news bulletins (Buletin Pagi and Buletin Sore, or Morning Bulletin and Afternoon Bulletin, respectively) and one special feature program, including features about politics (Perspektif Baru, or A New Perspective), law (Reformasi



Hukum, or Law Reform), art and culture (Apresiasi, or Appreciation), human rights (Hak Asasi Manusia, or Human Rights), economy (Obrolan Ekonomi, or Talk about Economy), the environment (Bumi Kita, or Our Earth) and regional autonomy (Daerah Bicara, or The Region Talks). Internews Indonesia produces similar programs: from 1999 until 2001 they had weekly features about topical socio-political issues (Kilas Balik, or Flashback), gender issues and the position of women in society (Jurnal Perempuan, or Women's Journal) and marginalized groups in society (Mata Hati, or The Mind's Eye). In 2001, they started the production of three new programs, about the environment (Sahabat Alam, or Friends of Nature), public affairs (Suara Bangsa, or The Voice of My Nation) and health (Sehat Indonesiaku, or My Healthy Indonesia).

As indicated by their titles, the programs all address themes that are considered to be of high and immediate importance 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 transcend the Indonesian situation and the borders of the Indonesian nation-state, as they are also derived from and applicable to situations and nation-states elsewhere. They are partly the idiom of an international civil society and public sphere as envisioned by international NGOs. In that sense, KBR 68H and Internews Indonesia contradict Habermas' implicit claim that each public sphere is exclusively linked to only one nation. This does not prevent the program makers from projecting their own kind of patriotism - as represented in programs such as The Voice of My Nation (Suara Bangsa) and My Healthy Indonesia (Sehat Indonesiaku), which confirm the boundaries of the nation-state and stress the unity-in-diversity of Indonesia. However, this is a new type of patriotism, which is inspired and fuelled by global or cosmopolitan experiences, and replaces the nationalist rhetoric of the New Order.

The programs also provide counter-evidence to the claim that mass culture and segmentation would always lead to the 'internalization of inner-life', or passive consumerism, and the 'refeudalization of society'. The programs do live up to the expectations of the bourgeois public sphere to the extent that they represent consensus that is the result of both off-the-air and on-the-air rational debate among intellectuals, and potentially represents and reaches the whole of society. In 2001, KBR 68H had a network of more than 200 radio stations that made use of its programs, while Internews Indonesia distributed its products to more than 50 radio



partners nationwide. KBR 68H also enables the exchange of information from different regions in Indonesia, by broadcasting programs produced by commercial regional radio stations that are part of their network, thus enabling listeners in Manado, North Sulawesi to receive news that was produced by a radio station in Aceh, and listeners in Aceh to receive news from a radio station in Bandung, West Java (Santoso, personal communication, 18 October 2001). This type of information-sharing constitutes a serious challenge to the regional branches of RRI, which was the only national network of regional stations that was permitted during the New Order.

While KBR 68H and Internews Indonesia reach large parts of the Indonesian population, the direct influence from the listeners in the activities of the two news agencies is restricted. The two news agencies could be criticized on the same grounds as the bourgeois public sphere has been criticized, namely that accessibility is restricted to people with the appropriate educational background or social network. In most cases, KBR 68H and Internews Indonesia distribute news and features that have been produced by professional journalists or experts in a particular field and contain the discourse of specialists. In that sense, the radio stations that relay the programs confront their audiences with finalized products and consensus reached by others.

KBR 68H does provide interactive services, in which the listeners of a regional station that relays the KBR 68H talk show can phone in to the studio in Jakarta and have their opinions broadcast all over the archipelago. These opportunities are restricted, though, as most of the time the conversation is between the host and the expert(s). A number of managers and hosts of regional stations declared that their listeners at times felt that the KBR 68H and Internews Indonesia information is Jakarta-controlled or Jakarta-centred, the traditional center of power in Indonesia, and does not always fit comfortably with the format and content of their favourite, regional, radio station. The same listeners perceive the Utan Kayu Community as an elite society of intellectuals, inaccessible and separated or isolated from the rest of Indonesian society³.

³ This view was expressed by Yusirwan Yusuf, Head of Suara Padang, Padang (personal communication 19 August 2002) and Kecuk Sahana, Production Manager of Unisi, Yogyakarta (personal communication 30 August 2001), amongst others.



Community radio, accessibility and the reversal of roles⁴

While the activities of KBR 68H and Internews Indonesia have been labelled by some listeners as creating or strengthening the separation of specialist knowledge from the lifeworld, two other developments that have come to the fore in the late New Order period and early Reformasi were intended to bring producers and consumers closer together, or even reverse their roles. The first is community radio, the second talk-back shows by regional commercial radio stations. Both types of radio address the issue of the accessibility and representativeness of the mass media - as a main constituent of the public sphere - as well as the accessibility and representativeness of the public sphere itself.

Community radio constitutes an alternative to both government radio and commercial radio, mirroring and contributing to the role of the public sphere as a 'Third Way' in-between and transcending the interests of state and business (cf. Howell and Pearce 2001:65-68). It is known as radio 'about, for and by the people', which indicates that the listeners themselves bear responsibility for ownership, management and production (Fraser and Estrada 2001:6). In that sense, community radio goes one step further than the efforts by KBR 68H and Internews Indonesia in resisting the possible refeudalization of society by the government or the unbridled promotion of consumerism by commercial media and other companies. The scope of community stations is small, though, usually restricted to a village or one or several neighborhoods in a city or town. This means that community radio cannot claim to represent society 'as a whole' and may serve and be dominated by the specific interests of - part of - a local community. On the other hand, community radio has the potential of providing a voice to people and special interest groups that have been excluded from the mainstream media.

In Indonesia, two types of community radio can be found, 'regular' community radio and campus radio. Regular community radio is about, for and by people whose mutual social relationships are determined by the fact that they live in the same geographic or administrative area or share the same professional background. The managers, producers and target audiences of campus radio are university students or students from other tertiary educational institutions. In spite of their limited cover areas and small communities, both types of community radio - as concepts as well as practices - are not strictly local affairs, as

⁴ This paragraph is partly based on my article 'Radio Komunitas di Indonesia: "New Brechtian Theatre" di Era Reformasi?' (Jurnal Antropologi Indonesia no. 72, September-December 2003).



they have precedents in other countries and entertain links with national and international organizations. For instance, many Indonesian community stations receive educational or financial support from international organizations such as UNESCO and The Ford Foundation.⁵

An example of how community radio presents itself in Indonesia while continuing to reflect the international NGO idiom on 'small' and 'democratic' media is the brochure of the campus radio station Swaragama. Swaragama (an abbreviation for Swara Gadjah Mada, or The Voice of Gadjah Mada) is the students' radio of the prestigious Gadjah Mada University in Yogyakarta, which began its production and broadcasting activities in September 1999. Although Swaragama received an official commercial status in February 2000, it continued to present itself as a 'public' alternative to both government and profit-oriented media, by fostering an image of rebellion, idealism and creativity:

'Two past radio categories in Indonesia, that is government radio and commercial broadcast radio, have been proven still to be insufficient for answering all the hopes and idealism of the public. The movements and "guerrilla" of the academic community in the struggle for the presence of a third radio have proven this. The fact that radio clubs have often been confronted with ups and downs because of limited resources, or because of the thickness of the bureaucratic wall, actually enhanced their militancy in organizing their movements. Some people define this alternative category as: social radio, campus radio, community radio, etc. Radio Swara Gadjah Mada is back again with its identity as "campus-based radio", making use of the current corridor for developing a vision about radio that is paired with the idealism of education and democratization'⁶ (Swaragama brochure 2001).

⁵ UNESCO organized an influential seminar on community radio in Jakarta and Yogyakarta in September 2001 and, in the same period, also distributed its own handbook on community radio (Fraser and Estrada 2001) to stations all over Indonesia. Since 2000, The Ford Foundation has financially supported community radio projects of the Indonesian NGO Combine (<http://www.combine.or.id/projects.html>).

⁶

Dua kategori radio yang pernah ada di Indonesia yaitu radio pemerintah dan radio siaran swasta terbukti belum memadai untuk memenuhi seluruh harapan dan idealisme publik. Pergerakan dan gerilya civitas akademika dalam memperjuangkan keberadaan radio ketiga membuktikannya. Meskipun sering dilanda gelombang pasang surut baik karena terbatasnya sumber daya ataupun disebabkan oleh tebalnya tembok birokrasi, hal itu justru menjadi pelecut militansi klub-klub radio ini dalam melakukan pergerakannya. Ada yang mendefinisikan kategori alternatif itu adalah: radio social, radio kampus, radio community, dan lain-lain. Memanfaatkan koridor yang ada, untuk membangun visi tentang radio dengan idealisme pendidikan dan demokratisasi, Radio Swara Gadjah Mada hadir kembali dengan identitas sebagai "radio berbasis kampus".



Swaragama's anti-establishment messages - as reflected in the use of words such as 'movement' (pergerakan), 'guerrilla' and 'militancy' - more than voicing real struggle or ideals, seem to represent a nostalgia for student activism, and to support a carefully constructed commercial image. Nevertheless, the quote also shows Swaragama's awareness of the character and possibilities of public radio and its potential in mediating processes in contemporary Indonesian society, such as Reformasi, regional autonomy and the improvement of the education system. The 'guerrilla' of community radio, as envisioned by Swaragama, embodies a new type of patriotism as well, which is realized on a local 'grass-roots' level, inspired by international examples and serving a national cause.

The efficiency of the medium of radio in mobilizing a community outside the realm of government and commerce is illustrated by the case of the community station Angkringan (Javanese for 'The Food-Vendor's Place', a place where people come together in order to eat and talk), which was founded by the inhabitants of the Timbulharjo village, Central Java, in 2000. Before they founded the radio station, the Timbulharjo people already had a community magazine, also called Angkringan. However, the disadvantage of the magazine was that people had to spend money in order to purchase it and be literate in order to understand it. The Angkringan radio programs, on the other hand, were for free, had an oral character and could report about events and respond to people's reactions more frequently and efficiently than the print medium (Nasir 2001:2-3).

In line with the predicament of community radio, Angkringan makes use of cheap and simple production and broadcasting equipment, and covers its operational costs by selling coupons for requesting songs and sending on-the-air greetings to its community members. This working strategy, in combination with the oral character of the medium, in principle enables every member of the community to take part in the ownership, management and production of a radio station, and thus to participate and be represented in public life as institutionalized by the mass media.

At the same time this enhanced access and in some cases immediate representation raises questions about the themes and nature of the discussions in the media and the public sphere. In other words, is the accessibility of a radio station only a matter of the quantity of listeners that can participate in the production of programs and other aspects of the station, or does it



also have impact on the quality and style of on-the-air discourse? In the next paragraph I will examine the case of Indonesian commercial talk-back radio in order to give an indication of the extent to which talk-back radio leads to rational-critical debate and consensus, or to possible other strategies of representing civil society in the public sphere.

Talk-back radio and the oppositional public sphere

The phenomenon that the roles of producer and consumer become reversed not only occurs in the case of community or semi-community stations such as Angkringan and Swaragama, respectively, but also in the case of commercial stations that broadcast interactive talk shows. The advantage of these commercial stations over community radio is that they have a larger reach and potentially represent more people and groups in society. The majority of the talk-back programs are concrete examples of ‘the externalisation of inner life’, in which listeners exhibit aspects of their private life, while participating in seemingly trivial activities such as requesting songs and sending greetings to members of an audience of overhearers. However, there is a steady growth in talk-back radio about issues of a shared public interest, such as current affairs, art and culture, health and sexuality, the environment, religion, law and regional autonomy.

Before the fall of Soeharto, commercial radio used the latter, ‘serious’ kind of talk show in order to circumvent prohibitions on the production of news and still be able to provide the audience with useful, non-governmental, information on topical matters (Samuel 2002:308; Sen 2003:580-582). The more liberal legislation of the early Reformasi period has meant an extra stimulus for commercial stations to produce talk shows on current affairs and other news programs, or to decide to profile themselves as news stations. Nowadays, with slogans such as ‘Information From You and For You’ (Informasi Dari Anda, Untuk Anda)⁷, commercial news stations involve the audience in the legal activity of producing news, in order to reduce production costs and compensate for the lack of professional radio journalists as well as to make the news and information relevant to local or regional circumstances.

Talk shows on commercial radio usually involve the three parties of the host, the expert and the listener - often backed-up by a team of journalists, editors and gatekeepers - who during their conversations sometimes undergo a reversal of roles, in which the listener becomes host

⁷ This slogan has been used by Radio El Shinta and Jakarta News FM, both located in Jakarta.



or expert, the expert listener or host, and the host expert or listener. In order not to let this process run out of control and to check and maintain the reliability of the information provided, stations have set up systems of journalism self-training and self-disciplining. These systems for on-the-air behavior have been a crucial element in the early stage of the development of Indonesian radio journalism and have also set the rules for part of the post-Soeharto public sphere.

Radio Global FM in Den Pasar, Bali, is an example of a commercial news station that organizes talk shows in which the audience can comment on current affairs as well as the format of the shows themselves.⁸ The evolution of the radio station's slogans illustrates how the managers, hosts and listeners believe that mutual cooperation may further develop the format of talk-back radio, increase the standard of Indonesian radio journalism and eventually improve the quality of Balinese society. In this way they give expression to a type of patriotism that is regionally rather than nationally oriented, although hosts and listeners also discuss matters of national and international interest in their on-the-air conversations.

Since its birth in 1999, Global FM has featured the Balinese motto 'Don't Be Unwilling to Talk' (De Koh Ngomong). The motto encouraged listeners to talk on the air and give their opinions about topics discussed in Global FM broadcasts and society at large. At the beginning, the listeners, apparently caught up in the spirit of Reformasi, reacted *en masse*. The slogan almost died of its own success, though, as both the radio hosts and the audience were not satisfied with the way in which discussions took place. Often, a listener would not listen to the arguments of other participants or the host and would get angry, yelling at other participants or not letting them talk at all. Both the hosts and the listener-participants felt the urge for the development and nurturing of an 'ethics' for talking on the air.

After a testing period of several months, Global FM began to combine the initial motto with slogans such as 'There are Moments to Listen, Moments to Speak, and Moments to Act' (Saatnya Mendengar, Saatnya Bicara, Saatnya Berdaya [Indonesian]) and 'Improve your Talk' (Melahang Ngomong [Balinese]). These slogans, advertised on the air and in newspapers and magazines, clearly reflect the ambition of the Global FM producers and

⁸ The information on Radio Global FM is based on my paper 'Radio Awards and the Contestation of History' presented at two consecutive workshops on the theme 'Media and the Making of History in Post-Suharto Indonesia', Leiden University, in 2003 and 2004. The paper will be published in a joint-volume, to be edited by Patricia Spyer (Leiden University) and Danilyn Rutherford (University of Chicago).



listeners to improve the performance of the participants in on-the-air discussions and the quality of the genre as such. They teach the participants to give space to the opinions of others ('There are Moments to listen'), to decide on the appropriate moment for expressing their own opinion ('There are Moments to Speak') and to speak in a clear and decent manner ('Improve your Talk').

The interactivity paradigm establishes strong disciplinary links between 'Acting' ('There are Moments to Act') and talking and listening, and defines social activity as being embedded in discursive interaction or constituting a result of it. It summons listeners to be careful in assessing when and how to synthesize talking and listening - combining their own arguments and the arguments of others - and when and how to draw conclusions, make decisions, or actually leave the discussion to prepare for action in a particular social field.

Another means through which Global FM underlines the strong link between radio talk and civil society are the annual elections of the ten most prominent listener-participants. These listeners are not awarded the title of 'Best Listeners' or something similarly plain, but 'Social Empowerment Personalities' (in Indonesian: Tokoh Pemberdayaan Masyarakat), indicating that the way they perform during, and possibly outside, Global FM broadcasts can make a positive difference to Balinese society. By being awarded the title of 'Tokoh' ('prominent person', usually in art, culture, politics), these listeners also gain social status, at least among the listeners of Global FM. This is a title many of the awarded listeners could not have easily received in 'normal' society or, simply because of their low educational background or lack of financial means. In general, Global FM attracts listeners from many different social backgrounds, although it formally targets at a middle-class audience.

Every year on May 30, the station's anniversary, Global FM publishes a magazine in which ten awarded listeners are listed, described and interviewed. These interviews contain rich information about the popularity and accessibility of Global FM, the rules of radio discourse, the process of becoming a radio personality, gender issues, intimidation by other listeners or officials, off-the-air organization among listeners, intermediality and other issues. The lists of the winning listeners for 2001 and 2002 consisted of persons with educational backgrounds ranging from junior high school to university and included housewives, teachers, taxi drivers, traders and government officials. These lists are representative of the audience's strong diversity in profession and social or economic status.



Most of the awarded listeners first listened some time to the talk shows and other programs before actively participating in interactive discussions. They had to learn how to speak in public and how to adapt themselves to radio speech in general and the discursive behavior of the hosts and other listeners in particular. For them, being on the air was an exercise in controlling their emotions, distinguishing between minor and major problems, identifying and respecting other people as well as introducing and developing their own identities (Global FM brochures 2001 and 2002). The following quote from an interview with the trader Kadek Mako, one of the 2001 'Social Empowerment Personalities', illustrates several of these aspects of interactive radio communications:

'From the beginning, I was against injustice. I often read the magazines Forum and Tempo, which covered injustice in Indonesia. Eventually I became incited [to know] where I could ignite my ideas and pour out my feelings. In fact, before this medium of Global, there were no other media in which I could speak out loud. That means that I only talked with friends around. Eventually there was the medium of Global. I listened to it several times, and there were several billboards of radio Global put up along the roadside. The first time I tried to enter was in Warung Global. If I am not mistaken it was Mr Hendra who responded that time, while I was speaking my sentences with a trembling voice, because I was not used to talk on the radio. [...]

About talking on the radio, I believe that some Global companions who join talking for the first time can be coarse. Nevertheless, that is a process in which people teach themselves by entering Global several times. When I just entered, I was expressing things too vulgarly myself. After several months, I thought to myself why I did it that way, why I did not say things in a refined but effective way? For instance, conflicts among Global companions should best be finished in private, that is, among the two of them. Otherwise we would be talking about reform and democracy without being able to implement those things. We also have to leave aside [self-]interests when we enter Global. For instance, party concerns or function interests. It is our priority to voice the aspirations of the people' (Global FM brochure 2001:17).⁹

⁹ Saya dari dulu anti dengan ketidakadilan. Saya sering membaca majalah Forum dan Tempo yang memuat ketidakadilan di Indonesia. Akhirnya saya tergelitik, di mana bisa mencetuskan ide dan menuangkan perasaan saya. Kebetulan sebelum ada media Global ini, di media-media yang lain tidak bisa bicara lantang. Artinya saya



Kadek Mako's own experience of participating in talk-back radio clearly mirrors the development of Radio Global's interactivity concept as reflected in the use of different slogans over different periods of time. Kadek Mako was 'willing to talk' from the very beginning, but had to 'improve his talk' and learn that there were 'moments to listen' and 'moments to speak' and, for that matter, 'moments to act'.

His concepts of ideal discursive and social behavior resonate aspects of the Habermasian bourgeois public sphere: people are not supposed to express their own interests, but 'the aspirations of the people' (aspirasi masyarakat), and conflicts should be restricted to the private sphere. However, the activities and ideals of Radio Global and other Indonesian interactive radio share characteristics with an alternative, so-called 'oppositional' public sphere as well (cf. Livingstone and Lunt 1994:32). According to Livingstone and Lunt, the oppositional public sphere - unlike the bourgeois public sphere - emphasizes and makes public the, potentially conflict-ridden, *process* rather than *product* of discursive opinion formation:

'In Habermas's theory, one gets the impression of politics as a complex, emergent process where discussion, debates and negotiations take place in private (in families, committee rooms and the meetings of special interest groups) only coming to the light of critical exposure when they have been formulated clearly and in controlled forms of debate. Participatory programming brings public exposure earlier in this process. Ideas and opinions don't have to be "well formed" before they can be expressed' (Livingstone and Lunt 1994:24).

Radio Global's interactive talk show Global Terkini ('Global Latest News') is a concrete example of how Global FM puts into practice mottos like 'Don't be Unwilling to Talk' and

hanya bicara dengan teman sekitar. Akhirnya ada media Global. Beberapa kali saya mendengarkan dan ada beberapa billboard radio Global yang terpampang di jalan. Saya coba masuk pertama kali di Warung Global. Waktu itu kalau tidak salah diterima pak Hendra, dengan kalimat yang gemeteran karena tidak biasa ngomong di radio. [...]

Soal bicara di radio, menurut saya kalau kawan Global pertama kali ikut bicara mungkin ada yang kasar. Namun demikian itu proses pembelajaran diri dengan beberapa kali masuk ke Global. Saya sendiri ketika baru masuk terlalu vulgar menyatakan sesuatu. Setelah beberapa bulan saya introspeksi diri kenapa demikian, mengapa tidak mengatakan secara halus tapi mengena? Umpama kalau ada pertentangan di antara kawan Global sebaiknya diselesaikan secara person artinya berdua. Agar tidak kita bicara reformasi dan demokrasi ternyata kita tidak bisa mempraktekkannya. Selain itu kita masuk Global harus menanggalkan kepentingan. Misalnya masalah partai atau kepentingan jabatan. Kita utamakan untuk menyuarakan aspirasi masyarakat.



‘Improve your Talk’ as well as an alternative or ‘oppositional’ vision on people’s participation in public life. This program is accessible to anyone with a radio and a phone, thereby facilitating the participation and representation of a major part of the community. Topics for discussion, the course of debate and possible conclusions are not drafted beforehand or merely represented, as the program offers listeners the opportunity to provide their own topics for discussion and perform the roles of expert and host themselves. The host, on the other hand, often simply acts as a moderator or overhearer, but - almost unavoidably - remains to have a steering role in narrowing down the discussion on a central topic, or trying to reach a consensus or conclusion.

In the program, the listeners and the host both give meta-discursive comments on themes of discussion, styles of speech and the effectiveness of talking, thereby stressing the process rather than the outcome of debate. They underscore that this process includes mutual links between ‘listening’, ‘speaking’ and ‘acting’ - as represented in Global’s third motto ‘There are Moments to Listen, Moments to Speak, and Moments to Act’ - and transcends the distinction between ‘radio’ and ‘real life’, or on- and off-the-air manifestations of people and events.

The fact that this type of Indonesian interactive radio stresses the process rather than product of discursive opinion formation can be seen as an expression of the euphoria of freedom of speech and information in the era of Reformasi as well as a sign of the early stage of the development of Indonesian radio journalism. Although it may not always be the result of deliberate concepts and actions like in Global FM’s case, this alternative type of public opinion formation certainly caters for some of the disadvantages of the conventional public sphere, such as its restricted accessibility and its distancing of specialist knowledge from the life world.

Talk-back radio and the refeudalization of the public sphere?

The cases of RRI during the New Order, and community radio and Global FM during the early Reformasi, show that ‘publicness’ does not necessarily refer to media with government support and protection, or excludes commercial and community media. In fact, they point out that publicness is a value rather than a media category, and that only detailed case studies can



make it clear whether a station can live up to public values or not, irrespective of the media category to which it belongs.

While in the case of Radio Global, and also other interactive commercial radio such as Suara Surabaya in Surabaya, Radio Unisi in Yogyakarta and Radio Mara in Bandung, commercialism does not seem to contradict public values, other commercial stations may be more controversial with regard to the claims of publicness they make. In order to give a more balanced picture of the Indonesian late New Order/early Reformasi radio landscape, and also to put the idea of public sphere in a different context, in this paragraph I will pay attention to one such controversial station, Radio Mora in Bandung. Mora's controversy revolves around the question whether the station serves the public cause indeed, or merely stages displays of publicness to the benefit of its own commercial interests.

Radio Mora received an official broadcasting license in 1999, after the abolishment of the Ministry of Information. The radio station had already trial broadcasts from 1985 until 1987, but failed to receive official recognition by the New Order broadcasting authorities, because of its information-oriented format (Taye Tayudin Dj., personal communication, 27 September 2001). Radio Mora has created a unique segment of the Indonesian radio market by combining current affairs with information and advice on legal issues. This has been a successful formula, as both items are in high demand in the context of the social and political reform in contemporary Indonesia.

By choosing the name of Mora and focusing on the format of news and information, Radio Mora aroused the anger of another commercial news station in Bandung, Radio Mara, who had their name and format since the late 1960s, long before Mora did. According to the people from Mara, Mora in a cheap manner has attempted to benefit from Mara's long history and good reputation in the field of information production (Layla S. Mirza, Head of Mara; personal communication 28 September 2001). The people from Mora claim, however, that Mora is just an abbreviation from the name of its owner, Monang Saragih, and that they have a different approach in presenting news than Mara, which does not have the in-house expertise in legal issues.

Most of Radio Mora's program hosts, on the other hand, are lawyers. Monang Saragih is also a lawyer, who besides the radio station owns his own lawyer's office. It is the close



cooperation between Saragih's two businesses - which are even located at the same physical spot - that raises questions about the sincerity of the information and advice provided by Mora. Do the Mora hosts serve the private and public interest of the listeners indeed, or rather attempt to instil motivations in them for making use of the commercial services of Saragih's lawyer's office? A description of Mora's programs and the interaction between hosts and listeners will show there is no univocal answer to this question.

From Monday until Saturday, each day at the same times, Mora broadcasts the same seven programs. Three of these programs are about legal issues and one about current affairs. Mora's remaining three programs contain light infotainment about regional culture and religion, while the Sunday broadcasting schedule predominantly consists of popular music. The radio station also organizes off-the-air activities, such as seminars about law and broadcasting courses for law students.

The current affairs program is Somasi ('Injunction', also an abbreviation for Sorotan Masalah dan Situasi [Clarifications of Problems and Situations]), broadcast twice an hour, with local news about politics, economy, social affairs and culture from Mora's own reporters in Bandung and surroundings. The radio station only broadcasts national or international news when it is of direct importance to the local situation, such as news about the fall of an Indonesian president or international terrorist attacks. The crew of Mora considers radio as a local medium and believes it unrealistic to try and compete with national and international news media. In interactive programs, hosts and listeners often also show a 'patriotic', regional pride and concern about Bandung and West Java.

The three programs about legal issues are Saksi, Kasasi and Mora Interaktif, each of them with a talk show format. Saksi ('Witness', also an abbreviation for Saran Komentar dan Informasi [Suggestions for Comments and Information]) is a talk show in which listeners can request legal advice. In Kasasi ('Cassation', also an abbreviation for Kasus dari Sana-Sini [Cases from Everywhere]), cases from Saragih's lawyer's office are discussed. In Mora Interaktif, listeners have interactive discussions with experts in the studio about legal issues as well as topics of a more general - social, political or religious - nature.



A major challenge for Mora's hosts during these programs is to translate legal problems into a language that suits the medium of radio. This means that messages have to be short and attractive, but still cover the essence of a topic. The hosts also need to know Sundanese, the mother tongue of many listeners in Bandung. Those hosts of Mora who are not lawyers themselves obtain regular training from either law practitioners or lecturers from the Law Department of Padjadjaran University in Bandung (Taye Tayudin Dj., Program manager Mora, personal communication, 27 September 2001).

During broadcasts, Mora's hosts do seem to put their expertise in the service of the general interest, by providing the listeners with legal advice, explanations about new government legislation and information about legal aspects of other public issues, such as the violation of human rights. Often listeners request information about legal matters they are confronted with in their daily lives, such as how to request an identity card or birth certificate. Listeners do not have to pay for the on-the-air advice by Mora's host, but they do have to pay for legal assistance by Monang Saragih's lawyer's office (Radio Mora brochure 2001).

As the Mora hosts receive money for every case they are able to hand over to the lawyer's office, they never enter the debates about law and legal issues completely unbiased or without self-interest, though. During talk shows, host also discuss cases that have already been handled by the lawyer's office. Although the radio station literally presents itself as a 'public' station, it is clear that, under the veneer of its 'publicness', it predominantly serves as a popular communications channel for attracting new clients and advertisers, and promoting and expanding Saragih's law business.

The Mora audience, or the Bandung population, is not unaware of the ambiguous nature of the radio station. For instance, in August 2003, hundreds of employees of the ailing Indonesian aircraft maker Dirgantara were on the streets of Bandung heading towards Radio Mora. During the demonstration in front of Radio Mora the angry crowd even broke some of the radio station's windows. The employees of Dirgantara, who were in a legal conflict with the company's management, accused Mora of biased news reporting. They claimed Mora favored the management's case, especially since Monang Saragih was appointed the management's legal defender (Suara Pembaruan, 14 August 2003). They felt betrayed, as Saragih and his radio station were initially thought to favor their case. During the demonstration, the



employees were shouting that 'Radio Mora was no longer defending the small people' (Kompas, 14 August 2003).

The cosmopolitanism of Indonesia's radio-active public sphere

The case-studies of KBR 68H, Internews Indonesia, Swaragama, Angkringan and Radio Global prove that Indonesian radio institutions, each in their own manner, address and promote public values. The non-profit news agencies, being part of or supported by international NGOs, stress values that are closely related to the bourgeois public sphere, such as rational debate and consensus. The community radio stations, on the other hand, attempt to cater for some of the disadvantages of the bourgeois type of publicness, such as restricted accessibility and the separation of specialist knowledge from the life world. Although the scope of community radio is restricted - thereby raising questions about the extent to which they represent society at large - they do represent groups that have been underrepresented in the mainstream media.

Commercial stations focussing on the segment of news provision usually have a larger scope. Some of them use interactive talk-shows on current affairs as a means to close the gap between producers and consumers, although the reversal of roles does not go as far as in the case of community radio, where the listeners cannot only become participants or producers of programs, but also the managers and owners of a radio station.

The interactive talk shows on commercial radio and also community radio often share characteristics with the oppositional public sphere rather than the bourgeois public sphere, as they stress the process instead of the outcome of debate. This means that Indonesian radio of the late New Order and early Reformasi not only contradicts the Habermasian assumption that the mass media are unsuitable for creating or representing the public cause, but also provides alternative models for the way in which publicness is expressed and experienced.

Each of the radio categories discussed - non-profit, community-based or commercial - also give expression to different types of patriotism. KBR 68H and Internews Indonesia confirm the conceptual boundaries of the Indonesian nation-state through their nation-wide coverage and exchange system of regional programs, which are both established by satellite and Internet technology. Community stations such as Angkringan create and confirm self-



awareness and pride among small-scale communities in the Indonesian villages and neighborhoods of cities and towns. A commercial station such as Radio Global is a player on the level of a provincial capital and its surroundings and stresses regional identity and concern.

What distinguishes these types of patriotism from each other are less differences in scope than differences in nature, though. The fact that certain types of radio have indeed functioned as public spheres in late- or post-Soeharto Indonesia implies that their concomitant types of patriotism, unlike 'official' patriotic discourses, are not directly government constructed or controlled, but created and expressed by media communities residing in-between society and the state.

At the same time, these media communities also reside in-between the 'local' and the 'extra-local', as a result of the goals and attitudes of the radio stations they are attached to. The way in which a local audience is structured as a 'media segment', for instance, may link it to an audience elsewhere, categorized as a similar segment, but located in another socio-political context. Thus the patriotic identity of different audiences can be based on similar principles, even if these audiences have never been in direct contact with each other.

Mass communications and segmentation also lead to direct, but often 'virtual', contacts between producers and listeners in different socio-political contexts, thereby turning these producers and listeners into '(virtual) travellers' (cf. Jurriëns 2004) and '(virtual) cosmopolitans' or '(virtual) cosmopatriots' (that is, cosmopolitanism-inspired patriots). These contacts become manifest in or are channelled through the news and information relays from other countries or regions on local radio, the collaboration between the Indonesian news agencies and community stations with international NGOs, or the comments of listeners on international affairs in commercial talk-back radio. These examples are all illustrations of the fact the public sphere can be simultaneously informed by the regional, the national and the international, as well as transcend the divisions between the three categories.

Bruce Robbins (1998) has argued that if mass communications are not restricted to administrative borders, it would be inconsistent to assume that the process of imagining a sense of community - which is dependent on mass communications - would be limited to any borders itself:



'If people can get as emotional as [Benedict] Anderson says they do about relations with fellow nationals they never see face-to-face, then now that print-capitalism has become electronic- and digital-capitalism, and now that this system is so clearly transnational, it would be strange if people did not get emotional in much the same way, if not necessarily to the same degree, about others who are not fellow nationals, people bound to them by some transnational sort of fellowship' (Robbins 1998:7).

Just as popular media, including radio, enhance accessibility to and participation in the public sphere, they also enable greater parts of the population to undergo cosmopolitan experiences. In that sense, 'something has happened to cosmopolitanism' (Robbins 1998:1). Basing himself on Paul Rabinow, Robbins explains that cosmopolitanism used to be applied, 'often venomously', to certain groups - including Christians, aristocrats, merchants, Jews, homosexuals and intellectuals - that had the financial or educational capital either to travel or to receive guests, goods or information from elsewhere. 'Now it [cosmopolitanism] is attributed, more charitably, to North Atlantic merchant sailors, Caribbean au pairs in the United States, Egyptian guest workers in Iraq, Japanese women who take *gaijin* lovers' (Robbins 1998:1). To this list could be added the KBR 68H news bulletin producers in Jakarta, the manager-listeners of Radio Angkringan in Timbulharjo, Central Java, and the participants in topical affairs talk shows of Radio Global, Bali.

What remains is the question whether the-media-segment-as-public-sphere can function as a real space for the expression of solidarity and the general interest, or becomes co-opted or 'refeudalized' by the media institution that brought it into being. As the case of Radio Mora showed, public interests and commercial interests sometimes become inextricably intertwined in the mass media. Many talk-shows for requesting songs and sending greetings to family and relatives could also be considered as the mere 'externalizations of inner life', not serving the interest of a larger community. Similarly, non-profit organizations can become hijacked by the agenda of international governments or NGOs, and community radio may be used merely to represent the chauvinistic ideals of a minority group.

However, what differentiates institutions such as KBR 68H, Internews Indonesia, Radio Angkringan and Radio Global from less favourable cases is, if not their interactivity as such, their accountability and self-reflection on the role of the media. KBR 68H and Internews Indonesia do not only produce news and information, but also produce programs and organize workshops *about* journalism and the media, in order to enhance the 'media literacy' (*melek media*, in Indonesian) of audiences. Both in the case of community stations such as



Angkringan and talk-shows on commercial radio such as Global FM's Global Terkini, audiences can not only participate in discussions on topical issues, but also criticize or alter the format of the programs themselves. Through its slogans and competition for social empowerment personalities, Global FM asks listeners not only to hold politicians and corporate businessmen responsible for their deeds - in itself a great achievement of late New Order and post-Soeharto radio - but also to demand the radio station's crew and the own group of listeners to be accountable for their on-the-air behavior. It is precisely these attempts at accountability, transparency, self-awareness that reveals the true spirit of Indonesian Reformasi, according to many.

References

- Calhoun, Craig
1992 Introduction: 'Habermas and the Public Sphere'. In: Craig Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, pp. 1-48. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: The MIT Press.
- Fraser, Colin, and Sonia Restrepo Estrada
2001 *Panduan Radio Komunitas* (translation). Jakarta: UNESCO Jakarta Office.
- Habermas, Jürgen
1989 *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. An Inquiry into a category of Bourgeois Society* (translation). Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Howell, Jude, and Jenny Pearce.
2001 *Civil Society and Development. A Critical Exploration*. Boulder-London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Jurriëns, Edwin
2003 Radio Komunitas di Indonesia: "New Brechtian Theatre" di Era Reformasi?'. *Antropologi Indonesia* 72: 116-130.
2004 *Cultural Travel and Migrancy. The Artistic Representation of Globalization in the Electronic Media of West Java*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Kompas.
2003 'Aksi Unjuk Rasa Karyawan PT DI Diwarnai Insiden'. *Kompas*, 14 August 2003.
- Lindsay, Jennifer
1997 'Making Waves: Private Radios and Local Identities in Indonesia'. *Indonesia* 64:105-123.
- Livingstone, Sonia, and Peter Lunt
1994 *Talk on Television. Audience Participation and Public Debate*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Nasir, A.



- 2001 'Radio sebagai Alat Penguatan Komunitas'. Paper presented at the UNESCO seminar *Radio Komunitas: Untuk Demokrasi dan Kesatuan Bangsa*, Yogyakarta, 4 September 2001.
- Robbins, Bruce
 1998 'Introduction Part 1: Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism'. In: Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins (eds.), *Cosmopolitics. Thinking and Feeling beyond the Nation*, pp. 1-20. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Samuel, Jérôme
 2002 'Radios Indonésiennes: Comment Survivre à l'Ordre Nouveau?'. *Archipel* 64: 289-321.
- Seligman, Adam B.
 1992 *The Idea of Civil Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sen, Krishna
 2003 'Radio Days: Media-Politics in Indonesia'. *The Pacific Review* 16 (4): 573-589.
- Sen, Krishna, and David Hill
 2000 *Media, Culture and Politics in Indonesia*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Suara Pembaruan
 2003 'Karyawan PT DI Masih Berdemo'. *Suara Pembaruan*, 14 August 2003.
- Brochures*
- Global FM:
 'Radio Global 99,15 FM Bali, Edisi Khusus HUT ke-3, 30 Mei 2002'.
 'Global FM 99,15 Kinijani Bali, News Letter, Edisi Khusus HUT ke-2, 30 Mei 2001'.
- Radio Mora:
 'Bio Data Mora FM 88.65. PT Radio Mora Parna Kasa', 2001.
- Swaragama:
 'PT. Radio Swara Gadjah Mada 98,45 MHz Yogyakarta', 2001.
- Websites*
- Combine: < <http://www.combine.or.id/projects.html>>.
 KBR 68H: < <http://news.radio68h.com/profile.php>>.
 Internews: <<http://www.internews.org/about/about.htm>>.
- Personal communications*
- Darpan A. Winangun, 10 October 2001, Jakarta (LSPP).
 Kecuk Sahana, 30 August 2001, Yogyakarta (Radio Unisi).
 Layla S. Mirza, 28 September 2001, Bandung (Radio Mara).
 Santoso, 18 October 2001, Jakarta (KBR 68H).
 Taye Tayudin Dj., 27 September 2001, Bandung (Radio Mora).
 Yusirwan Yusuf, 19 August 2002, Padang (Suara Padang).



