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Abstrak

Persaingan antara Aburizal Bakrie dan Surya Paloh dalam menduduki kursi ketua umum Golkar tidak hanya terjadi di internal partai Golkar saja. Lebih dari itu, persaingan ini dibawa ke hadapan publik dengan terlibatnya Media Indonesia Grup yang dimiliki oleh Paloh dan Vivanews yang dimiliki oleh Bakrie. Kedua perusahaan media tersebut berlomba-lomba untuk mencuri perhatian publik untuk mengkampanyekan pemiliknya. Hal ini menyebabkan media yang seharusnya netral, non-partisan dan independen hanya menjadi alat dari kekuasaan, tak ubahnya seperti peran militer di masa lalu. Oleh karena itulah, kehadiran media yang dianggap sebagai pilar keempat demokrasi patut untuk dipertanyakan. Semakin besarnya kekuatan yang dimiliki oleh media menjadi sebuah paradoks dari nilai-nilai demokrasi itu sendiri, dimana semakin kuat suatu media maka ia dapat dengan mudah dijadikan alat oleh pemiliknya untuk mengebirni nilai-nilai demokrasi yang melahirkannya.

Dalam Munas Golkar yang telah selesai digelar tersebut, publik benar-benar dicekoki dengan segala macam pemberitaan tentang persaingan dalam munas walaupun hal itu bukanlah sesuatu yang urgent atau berpengaruh secara signifikan terhadap kehidupan mereka.
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A. PENDAHULUAN

Sometimes people need tools to deal with their world. They need to know what happened beyond their sight. They have curiosity to recognize anything happened in the other countries, other places and other continents. With the great innovation of technology since the 19th century, people are now connected to each other with the help of media, including newspaper, magazine, television and significantly, internet. Dennis McQuail as quoted by Littlejohn on Theories of Human Communication (2008: 287) stated that one of media’s metaphors is media as a window: media enable us to see our environment quickly. The media is a tool for the people to see the world, the same function as a telescope used by scientists. All
things which are showed in the media seem like realities and truth for a lot of people. They believe it, relay on it, and unluckily—sometimes—fooled by it.

Nowadays politics is in the age of mediation (Hill, 1995). While, in the other hand, political events, behaviors and politicians’ statements are news-worthy so that the media loves them so much. For some people who believed that democracy is a noble heritage for the human being, the presence of the media is a must. It becomes the existence of the freedom of speech. And so it is now in Indonesia.

The years the media in Indonesia living in oppression and fears had been left behind a long time ago along with the fall of the Soekarno’s regime and the New Order of Soeharto’s regime. Along with this rise of the 1998’s Reform the media now has been transforming from a David into a Goliath. From an underestimate and powerless thing into the most feared feature in the modern world. It becomes an equal rival for the government when we talk about how powerful it is. For some cases, the media even more influencing for the people than the government itself.

Do the media really support the democracy as it should be? Does the growth of the democracy depend on how free the media are? Or is it just a paradox that has been blown by the media itself to strengthen their product in a particular way? This paper will analyze the roles of the media as one of the main features in the world of democracy in Indonesia. This paper will also provide some political cases for the examples to draw the problems of the media’s paradox in Indonesia. To limit the discussion about the topic, the writer choose to limit the case only on the campaign for the National Congress (Musyawarah Nasional –later we call it Munas) Golkar, stands for Golongan Karya, which is one of Indonesian biggest party —though it never be proclaimed as a party— along with Demokrat and PDI Perjuangan. The
campaign involves two popular media’s owners; they are Aburizal Bakrie and Surya Paloh. Bakrie owns several media firms such as AnTV and TVOne, while Paloh has been famous for his MetroTV and Media Indonesia newspaper.

Later, in the progress of the analysis, I will use the fight between those two major entrepreneurs to compete in *Munas* as an example of how the media goes wrong and disoriented. I will argue that it is still debatable whether the rise of media would get along and strengthen the rise of democracy. It can be on the contrary that the rise of media capitalism would endanger and decline the values of democracy itself.

**B. PEMBAHASAN**

The media is a part of mass communication. Media has several functions in people daily activities in the modern world. The four major functions according to Laswell and Wright (1948) on *The Functions of Mass Communication* are:

1) Surveillance of the environment
2) Correlation of the parts of the society in responding to its environment
3) Transmission of the cultural heritage
4) Entertainment

We agree that Golkar is a big political party in Indonesia, and thus it is important to socialize its congress as the third function Laswell has stated; to correlate between what happened in Golkar as a part of society and people who own the public sphere.

The term “public sphere” was firstly announced and elaborated by Jurgen Habermas in the end of 1989. The public sphere is an area in social life where people can get together and freely discuss and identify societal problems, and
through that discussion influence political action. It is "a discursive space in which individuals and groups congregate to discuss matters of mutual interest and, where possible, to reach a common judgment." The public sphere can be seen as "a theatre in modern societies in which political participation is enacted through the medium of talk" and "a realm of social life in which public opinion can be formed" (Habermas, 1992: 437).

The media should consider the public sphere in every step it takes. It should recognize of what Habermas noted as “giving people what they want”. And it is very ironic to say that the media we are talking about here are not even care about this public sphere. In the run of campaigns between Aburizal Bakrie and Surya Paloh, two sides of media firms are in a very tight competition to promote their owners. Those two media firms are Vivianews which includes AnTV and TVOne and Media Group which has been famous of its Metro TV.

Before we analyze the case, it is better for me to give short resume of Aburizal Bakrie and Surya Paloh as the owners of their firms.

B.1. The Two Competing Candidates in Munas Golkar

They are four official candidates in Munas Golkar, but I will only resume two candidates so that it would be relevant to the topic. The other two candidates who are not resumed here are Yuddy Chrisnandi and Hutomo Mandala Putra.

B.1.a. Aburizal Bakrie

Ir. H. Aburizal Bakrie was born in Jakarta at November 15th, 1946. He is the first son of Achmad Bakrie, a founder of Bakrie’s Group. Ical, his nick name, is a
great entrepreneur who is also the Coordinating Minister of People Welfare under President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono’s cabinet. Previously, he was appointed by the president to hold the Monetary Ministry in the same cabinet, but his position was changed on a reshuffle held by the president at 5 December, 2005.

Before hold his position as a minister, Bakrie was the leader of Kadin (Kamar Dagang Indonesia, Indonesian Industrial Chamber) for ten years since 1994 until 2004. Nearly at the same time, in 1998, he was also the president of Asean Chamber of Commerce and Industry. Not only in business, Bakrie had several careers in organization, political party and legislative. He was a member of ICMI (Ikatan Cendikiawan Muslim Indonesia, Indonesian Moslem Thinkers) and MPR (Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat, House of Representatives). According to Globe Asia, Bakrie was the richest person in South-East Asia in 2008. He beat Robert Kwok (Malaysia), Ng Teng Fong (Singapore) and Chaleo Yoovidya (Thailand).

**B.1.b. Surya Paloh**

Surya Dharma Paloh, popular as Surya Paloh, was born in Kutaraja, Banda Aceh at 16th July, 1951. Paloh was the founder of former Prioritas, a newspaper which forced by the New Order’s regime to end their publishing. With the help of 1998’s reform, Paloh declared his same-old-brand-new business, Media Indonesia. Media Indonesia grew up rapidly just like the former Prioritas, but with no oppressing regime ruling so that it can survive the days.

Later, Paloh established his phenomenal “product” under the Media Group, Metro TV. It was very phenomenal when it was launched because Metro didn’t sell anything but news. Unlike other channels which sold too much entertainment and fancies, Metro gave its audiences news and news, with its unique packaging.
B.2. Some Articles from Both Media Group and Vivanews

It is very nonsense to argue that the media in Indonesia today doesn’t support the growth of democracy without evidences. Supposedly, I have to use some records from Metro TV, TVOne and AnTV, but due to the effectivity of the paper I wrote I have to be realistic that it is easier and more effective to use only the articles from Media Indonesia as a representative of Paloh’s Media Group and articles from Vivanews.com which represents Bakrie’s Vivanews. Here I attach some articles to empower my thesis later:

B.2.a. Articles of Media Indonesia

1. Breathing in a Mud

BERNAFAS DALAM LUMPUR
25 September 2009


Ibu Tuini misalnya. Wanita paruh baya ini saat ini tinggal di sebuah gubuk yang sangat tidak layak di dusun Kedung Kampil, Porong. Gubuk yang hanya berukuran sekitar 3 X 4 meter itu ia dan anak dan cucunya harus tinggal. Sambil bercucuran airmata ia mengeluh dan tidak tahu sampai kapan penderitaannya harus berakhir. ia mengaku, memang sudah mendapatkan ganti rugi sebesar 20 persen, Uang itu ternyata sudah habis buat mengontrak rumah. ia berharap akan segera mendapat sisa ganti rugi sebesar 80 persen. Dan, disinilah pokok persoalannya. Ternyata sisa ganti rugi sebesar 80 persen, oleh PT Minarak Lapindo Brantas dicicil Rp 15 juta per bulan. Dan itu pun tersendat-sendat pembayarannya. Akibatnya banyak korban lumpur lapindo yang kesulitan membeli rumah atau tanah, karena uangnya tidak mencukupi.


Sudah sepanjangnya para korban lumpur lapindo itu segera mendapat uluran tangan. Mereka tidak hanya menderita kerugian material saja. Menurut sosioleg Thamrin Amal Tomagola, para korban lumpur lapindo ini juga menderita bathin akibat tercerabut dari akar keluarga karena tercerai berai dari kampung halamannya. Rumah tinggal bagi warga desa, bukan hanya seonggok benda yang bisa diperdagangkan. Bagi mereka rumah tinggal adalah warisan pusaka dari leluhur yang harus dijaga dan dilindungi. (end)

2. Eight Hundred Surya Paloh’s Supporters Take Off from Bali

Munas Golkar
800 Pendukung Surya Paloh Berangkat dari Bali
Senin, 05 Oktober 2009 10:10


Beberapa di antaranya adalah pengamat politik kawakan, Eep Saefullah Fatah, budayawan Garin Nurgofo, musisi Franki Sahilata, serta rohaniawan Romo Beni Setiawan. Pembekalan tersebut diharapkan dapat memberikan pemahaman agar para pengurus Golkar yang memilih Surya Paloh tidak terombang-ambing memilih kandidat lain dengan iming-iming politik uang.

Rombongan yang berangkat dari Bandara Ngurah Rai menggunakan enam pesawat carteran yang dibagi dalam dua kelompok terbang menuju Riau. (OL/OL-04)
3. Surya Paloh Will Not Forbid Fellows to be Minister

Munas Partai Golkar
*Surya Paloh tidak Larang Kader Jadi Menteri*
Selasa, 06 Oktober 2009 22:20 WIB

PEKANBARU–MI: Jika terpilih sebagai Ketua Umum DPP Partai Golkar, Surya Paloh tidak akan melerang apabila kader partai diangkat menjadi menteri atau jabatan lain di pemerintahan, walaupun secara resmi Partai Golkar bersikap independen.


Namun dia mengatakan, karena kader itu sudah dihibahkan, maka secara organisatoris tidak lagi mewakili partai. Hal itu menguntungkan bagi pemerintah maupun kader itu agar bisa menjalankan tugasnya secara baik dan tidak ada konflik kepentingan antara jabatannya di pemerintahan dengan posisinya di partai.

Untuk lebih menjamin tidak adanya konflik kepentingan, maka apabila kader yang diangkat di posisi tertentu di pemerintahan masih menjabat posisi di kepengurusan, harus melepas posisinya di partai.

Mengenai sikap politik partai apabila terpilih sebagai ketua umum, Golkar akan independen dan berada di luar pemerintahan, Sugeng mengemukakan, sikap politik itu untuk menjamin demokratisasi terus berjalan secara baik di Indonesia karena adanya kontrol dari partai.

"Kalau semua partai berada dalam koalisi pemerintah, siapa yang melakukan kontrol kepada pemerintah. Siapa yang menjamin adanya demokrasi tetap bisa berjalan secara baik," katanya.

Karena itu, dia mengatakan, sikap politik Golkar yang akan independen itu merupakan jaminan bahwa demokrasi di masa depan akan bisa berjalan secara baik. Tanpa adanya partai yang mengontrol pemerintahan, tidak ada jaminan bahwa demokrasi akan bisa berlanjut.


B.2.b. Articles of Vivanews.com

1. Only West Sumatra Supports Paloh

Aburizal Bakrie Tak Terbendung
*Hanya DPD Sumatera Barat yang mendukung Surya Paloh.*
Selasa, 6 Oktober 2009, 21:37 WIB

**VIVAnews** - Aburizal Bakrie terus mendapat dukungan dari Dewan Pengurus Daerah (DPD) I dan
organisasi massa Golkar untuk menjadi Ketua Umum. Pemberian dukungan untuk Aburizal Bakrie itu tidak sekencang yang mengalir ke Surya Paloh.


"AMPG mendukung Aburizal Bakrie untuk menjadi ketua umum dan didampingi bapak Akbar Tandjung untuk menjadi ketua dewan penasehat," ujar Yorris.

Papua yang sempat disebut-sebut mendukung Surya Paloh, ternyata secara blak-blakan menyatakan dukungannya kepada Aburizal Bakrie. Papua merupakan provinsi terakhir yang menyatakan pandangan umum dan dukungan.

"Kami secara tegas mendukung Aburizal Bakrie sebagai ketua umum Golkar," kata Ketua Golkar Papua.

**2. Aburizal is Very Optimistic to Win in a Single Turn**

---

**Aburizal Yakin Menang Satu Putaran**

Dia menyebut ada 356 pemilihnya. Dari 42 DPD I dan 10 ormas, 27 suara menunjuk Aburizal.


Dalam munas yang berlangsung sejak 5 Oktober 2009 ini, Aburizal bersaing dengan Surya Paloh, Hutomo Mandala Putra, dan Yuddy Chrisnandi.

Memasuki tahap pemandangan umum DPD I pada Selasa 6 Oktober 2009, Aburizal sudah menganungi dukungan dari 27 DPD I dan delapan ormas, sedangkan Surya Paloh mendapat 7 dukung dan DPD I, sisanya tujuh DPD I dan dua ormas masih belum menentukan pilihannya. Dari sini memang suara Aburizal terlihat sangat melampaui pesaingnya.


Aburizal mengatakan, jika dalam tahap pencalonan itu ada salah satu calon yang dipilih oleh lebih dari 50 persen pemilih (total pemilih adalah 539 suara) maka dia akan ditunjuk sebagai ketua umum. "Jika tidak maka yang berhak maju ke tahap berikutnya adalah calon yang memperoleh minimal 30 persen suara," katanya.

3. Supports for Aburizal Bakrie Are Undeniable

Peta Kekuatan Calon Ketua Umum Golkar
Dukungan pada Aburizal Bakrie semakin tak terbendung.
Rabu, 7 Oktober 2009, 00:12 WIB

VIVAnews - Sesi pandangan umum Partai Golkar membuka peta dukungan calon ketua umum. Sementara, Aburizal Bakrie unggul dibanding Surya Paloh.

Berikut Dewan Pimpinan Daerah yang mendukung Aburizal Bakrie:
1. DPD Riau
2. DPD Irian Jaya Barat
3. DPD Kepulauan Riau
4. DPD Kalimantan Timur
5. DPD Kalimantan Tengah
6. DPD Maluku Utara
7. DPD Sulawesi Utara
8. DPD Sulawesi Barat
9. DPD Bali (plus 10 DPD II di Bali)
10. DPD Maluku
11. DPD Bengkulu
12. DPD Sulawesi Tengah
13. DPD Lampung
14. DPD Bangka Belitung
15. DPD Nusa Tenggara Timur
16. DPD Gorontalo
17. DPD Sulawesi Tenggara
18. DPD Jambi (plus 10 DPD II)
19. DPD Papua (plus 29 DPD II)
20. DPD DKI Jakarta (4 DPD II)

Organisasi massa yang mendukung Aburizal adalah:
1. AMPI
2. KPPG
3. MDI
4. Kosgoro
5. MKGR
6. HWK
7. Satkar Ulama
8. AMPG

Sementara pendukung Surya Paloh adalah:
1. DPD Aceh (plus 19 DPD II)
2. DPD Sumatera Utara
3. DPD Jawa Barat
4. DPD Kalimantan Barat
5. DPD DKI (DPD I + 1 DPD II)
6. DPD Kalimantan Selatan (13 DPD II)
7. DPD Sumatera Barat

Beberapa pemilik suara belum bersikap, yakni:
1. DPD Jawa Timur
2. DPD Banten
3. SOKSI (organisasi massa)
4. DPD Sulawesi Selatan
5. DPD Nusa Tenggara Barat

B.3. The Analysis of the Articles

I will start the analysis on the Media Indonesia’s (MI) articles first and then I will continue to analyze Vivanews’ articles. As I have listed above, I have attached five samples on both sides (from point A until E). In the MI’s first article (A), MI tries to raise a same-old-brand-new issue of the East Java’s Mud. As we knew, Bakrie is accused to be involved in this accident though it was not proved to be true in front of the court. This article is basically taken from the same title from Metro TV’s channel. In the show, Andy (A senior journalist in Media Indonesia) brought some victims who felt dissatisfied with Lapindo into the stage and interviewed them infront of the audiences. This might be not a black campaign, but very closely to a negative campaign from Metro TV to blame Aburizal Bakrie as the owner of Bakrie Group and one of the candidates in the upcoming Munas Golkar.

The next articles are B, C and D. Those articles try to dictate the reader’s mind to believe that Surya Paloh is a right person to lead Golkar in the future. In article C, MI focuses on showing off the numbers of Paloh supporters which are reached about 800 people. This article is later challenged by Vivanews on it’s A and C articles which show that Bakrie has more supporters than Paloh might possessed. This case is a new shape of propaganda as Chomsky notes: “It would hardly come as a surprise if the picture of the world they present were to reflect the perspectives
and interests of the sellers, the buyers, and the product”. Yes, it is no goods or things that MI and Vivanews sell, but they sell their owner in the arena of public sphere – leaving people in confusion of which one is true—

As a comparison, I will attach articles from The Jakarta Post, a relatively more independent media in this case to give the readers description rather than imagination of how the media which is not in battle stand its views about the issues on Munas Golkar. Here are the articles:

**Wednesday, October 7, 2009 12:29 AM**
Golkar needs to move with the times: Kalla

**Rizal Harahap and Hyginus Hardoyo**, The Jakarta Post, Pekanbaru, Riau | Tue, 10/06/2009 1:31 PM | Headlines

The Golkar Party, the once-dominant party of the New Order era, hopes to regain its clout with a new spirit to win the 2014 general elections.

The plan was disclosed by Golkar leaders at the opening of the party's eighth congress in Pekanbaru, Riau, on Monday evening.

"We have to be great in the current ways, not the old ways," Golkar general chairman Jusuf Kalla said in his opening address.

From the early 1970s, Golkar had dominated the general elections by gaining more than 60 percent of votes. However, its popularity dropped to under 25 percent in 2004 and declined to 14.45 percent in 2009.

"Golkar used to hold power, but it was all achieved with dignity and not by begging" said Kalla, who is also the outgoing Vice President.

The four-day congress, attended by more than 1,360 participants and at least 600 observers, has been held to select a new leader for the party. Among the participants, only 538 have voting rights, including 494 heads of the party's regental branches.

Kalla reminded those in attendance that it would require "consolidation" of the party's 494 regental branches to win the next elections.

Despite the Golkar's losses this year, Kalla expressed confidence that it would remain a major party as long as there was consolidation "to get rid of all internal problems".

As well as coming second to the Democratic Party in the recent polls, Golkar suffered several losses in provincial elections.

Andi Mattalata, the justice minister and chairman of the Golkar congress organizing committee, said the party still had potential to regain influence provided it could resolve its internal conflicts, including the fierce competition for leadership.
Ahead of the congress, competition among the Golkar leadership candidates was getting fiercer.

Apart from the continuing claims of support made by all four candidates, the competition has been heavily marked by alleged vote buying and also negative campaigns such as the vandalized banner of one of the contenders, Surya Paloh.

Two front-runners for the post - Coordinating Minister for People's Welfare Aburizal Bakrie and media magnate Surya - claimed they were assured of 376 votes and 422 votes, respectively, from regional branches, as of Sunday evening.

The 376 votes claimed by Aburizal were from both the provincial and regency branches as well as 10 mass organizations affiliated with Golkar, while of the 422 votes claimed by Surya, 17 were from provincial branches and 405 from the regency levels.

Aburizal, the head of one of the country's wealthiest families, pledged Rp 1 trillion to develop the party if he was elected as chairman. Former president Soeharto's son, Hutomo "Tommy" Mandala Putra will provide Rp 50 billion to each of the regency branches that agree to support him, the head of his campaign team, Saurip Kadi, told a press conference on Monday.

Surya's campaign team claims to have sent at least 800 supporters by chartered planes from Denpasar.

Another candidate, Yuddy Chrisnadi, claims he has no such funding and only has his "good intentions" to win over the party's rank and file.

**Wednesday, October 7, 2009 12:31 AM**
*Aburizal claims to secure 386 votes, Surya Paloh 378*
*The Jakarta Post*, Jakarta | Tue, 10/06/2009 4:19 PM | National

Golkar Party chairman candidate Aburizal Bakrie claimed Tuesday that he had secured 386 of the total 538 votes, while another contender, Surya Paloh, claimed to win 378 votes.

Aburizal said he grabbed 376 votes from regional branches of Golkar Party and 10 votes from Golkar Party founding organizations.

He said he would never know the final result as the vote would be held in a closed door meeting.

"Only God and the voters know who they will choose," he said in a press conference as quoted by Kompas.com

Surya Paloh's campaign team member, Jeffry Geovanie said Surya Paloh was sure he could win the party chairmanship.

"We already got support from 378 voters," he added.

In the articles above, The Jakarta Post doesn’t show biased view into a certain candidate. It covers both sides and clarifies the topic. This newspaper can be a good alternative to help people to understand the reality. But, I don’t thing that the media like The Jakarta Post will be always on the right trax like this forever. What if
someday the owner of this newspaper is willing to compete in a political election? Still it sees clearly? Or it will be biased, just like Vivanews and Media Group.

B.4. Are Those Kind of Media Would Really Support the Democracy?

As I have attached and analized above that the partizanship of the media is a real fact, and thus we need to reconsider the role of the media as a supporter of democracy. We should also questioning if it is still relevant to name media as the fourth pillar of democracy, along with *trias politica*. The fact that the ownership-factor in the media firms leads to partizanship and dependency is undoubtable. People were trapped in what so called as “pseudo-reality” created by the media itself and it breaks the values of democracy. According to Paul Lazarsfeld and Robert K. Merton (1974) there are four sources of people’s worriness toward the mass media:

1). The media presence almost everywhere. They are *omnipresent* yet very potential to use their power to manipulate things for certain aims.

2). The domination of the economic interests from the owner to rule the mass media in a certain way so that it can be used to guarantee people’s obedience toward the status quo and weaken the abilities to criticize things.

3). A wide-scale mass media could possibly bring its readers into the esthetical feel and low pop-culture.

4). The mass media could erase the social succeed.

The second point mentioned by Lazarfeld describes the condition of the media firms in Indonesia today, or if it is not today : *soon…!*

And this is not only about economic interest of the owners; moreover, it’s a political interest that we are witnessing in the case of Vivanews and Media Group. I predict that if this atmosphere of political competition keeps in the same way, we will be facing a frightening future of democracy, where every candidate to compete the
election is thinking to have a media firm to accommodate their political views, and do their propaganda in the area of public sphere.

This phenomena maybe just a consequence from the logic of “laissez faire” which is adapted in the media firm. I disagree with the use of Adam Smith’s theory “the invisible hand” in the relation between media and public. We cannot rely everything on the hand of those capitalists. The government that should arrange regulation for this problem is in unconsciousness about what might trouble them someday. Mc. Chesney (2000: 257) named this as “class privilege over democracy”. A condition where, a class of powerfull finances media might direct and manipulate people’s opinion far from the reality and truth. This issue was also what Meiklejohn feared, that we are losing our capacity to distinguish public life from the commercial realm, with public life suffering as a consequence. In a short, this will be a paradox. The media will kill the democracy, though people think that democracy is getting stronger.

B.5. Paradox and Alternatives

The upcoming 2014 election faces a serious challenge. It is no other but the possibility of a great war in the public sphere by the media. The case in munas Golkar is just a minor example, the major one is about to be true if there are no rules to regulate how the media firms work. Can we imagine what if every single contender in our election has television? Who would guarantee there will be no conflict-interest in the media to support its owner?

Borrowing a term which was fistly introduced by Robert W. McChesney in 1999 that our era rests upon what he called as “a massive paradox” about the
The correlation between democracy and media, our country today reflects what had been elaborated by McChesney 10 years ago. It has been a dilemma for us to balance between the public interest, the value of democracy and the media firms’ interests.

We cannot rely on the assumption that the freedom of media is the same thing with the freedom of speech. This has been a serious problem in United States, which is clearly a liberal country which highly guarantee not only individual right but also the work of market, and so it should be a more serious problem to Indonesia because our constitution is not totally guarantee those rights. It is not relevant to use “the invisible hand” approach *a la* Adam Smith to our media firms. We are in a belief of Pancasila and UUD 1945, where our rights as an individual must be balanced with our duties as a citizen, yet we have to propose our county’s interest first before we are talking about individual’s right.

I argue that we need to support the role of the journalists over the role of the media. I have two options of how to avoid the media paradox. First, we need to keep the journalists’ independency from the media’s ownership. And this should be proposed in laws or formal-regulation. There should be rules of how the ownership is separated from the media’s editorial. There must be a regulation to punish the owner who interfere journalists’ independency to ensure the journalists working in a comfort-feel, to keep them more-neutral on analyzing the issues. Second point is to support the growth of the alternatives media which a lot of people can be involved without the interference from the owner. Some social networks such as Facebook, Twitter, or MySpace can do these things, yet local medias which shared its ownership to the citizens can support the change I have offered for the better role of media towards democracy.
C. PENUTUP

We are living in an unideal world, where our hopes don’t suit the realities. The medias which are supposed to strengthen the value of democracy, are disoriented and loosing their identities. People are expecting the media to have a significant role toward the development of public’s freedom. The partisanship and the dependency of the media toward their owners are totally dangerous. This condition will lead to a chaotic-public sphere and verbal anarchism. In the future, I recommend two things to fix the problem. Creating a good regulation about the media firms and empowering alternative medias. As Paul Alinsky noted, the only way to beat organized money is with organized people. We should manage our will and shares the people the ideas that we have to watch over the media. We have to support the role of the media by criticizing what should be criticized. In the end, media is just like other components in the democracy. It needs control, and we are the control.

DAFTAR RUJUKAN


Www.globeasia.com
Www.kompas.com
Www.medigroup.com
Www.metronews.com
Www.vivanews.com
Www.wikipedia.com