

Media business and political business: The Struggle for power towards the 2014 Presidential election in Indonesia

Ludiro Madu
The Department of International Relations
Universitas Pembangunan Nasional “Veteran” Yogyakarta, Indonesia
Email: ludiro@gmail.com

Abstrak

Pemilihan Presiden 2014 telah menunjukkan fenomena menarik, yaitu munculnya minat dan partisipasi pengusaha (*business people*) untuk berkompetisi memperebutkan posisi publik tertinggi di Indonesia. Jusuf Kalla, Aburizal Bakrie, Harry Tanusudibyo, dan Surya Paloh adalah beberapa nama pengusaha yang mencalonkan diri sebagai calon presiden dan calon wakil presiden. Tulisan ini berasumsi bahwa peningkatan minat untuk terlibat ke dalam politik lebih disebabkan pada kegagalan demokratisasi paska-1998 menghasilkan aturan-aturan main baru mengenai partisipasi pengusaha dalam kontestasi politik. Demokratisasi paska-1998 memang telah berhasil dalam membatasi atau menghilangkan partisipasi militer dalam politik, namun struktur politik baru itu justru telah membuka struktur kesempatan (*structure of opportunity*) baru bagi pengusaha untuk menjadi politisi. Tulisan ini hendak menganalisis hubungan antara pengusaha dan politik dalam upaya mendominasi kepemilikan dan penguasaan di industri media, baik cetak, elektronik, maupun *online*. Dengan menggunakan analisis mengenai bisnis dan politik, tulisan ini menunjukkan bahwa formasi oligarki politik dan media yang telah berpusat di pengusaha dan politisi tertentu tampaknya merupakan upaya tidak langsung mempersiapkan diri dalam pemilihan presiden 2014. Oleh karena itu, argument tulisan ini adalah bahwa demokratisasi telah meningkatkan kesempatan politik bagi para pengusaha dengan kepemilikan dan penguasaan atas media untuk membangun koalisi dengan politisi dalam rangka mendukung upaya mendapatkan kekuasaan pada pemilihan presiden 2014.

Kata kunci: Indonesia, media kontrol, oligarki, pemilu presiden 2014

Abstract

The 2014 presidential election has interestingly attracted the interest of several business people to participate in the struggle for presidential power in Indonesia. Jusuf Kalla, Aburizal Bakrie, Harry Tanusudibyo, and Surya Paloh are the examples of those business people who will potentially run for the 2014 presidential candidacy. This paper assumes that the increasing interest of business people in politics is due to the failure of post-1998 democratization in effecting new regulations for the involvement of business people in the political arena. While recent democratization has not allowed the participation of military personnel in politics, the post-1998 democratic structure has built new political opportunity for business people to become politicians. With special reference to Indonesia's big business in media, this paper seeks to scrutinize the nexus between big business and politicians in their efforts to dominate the media be it printed, electronic, and online. Using the approach of the link between business and democracy, this development points to the formation of political and media oligarchies which have centered around certain business individuals and politicians as the

preparation for their involvement in the 2014 presidential election. Additionally, analysis on the previous 2004 and 2009 presidential elections are of importance as well in providing the continuation and break-up of coalition patterns among big businesses or conglomerates and politicians. Finally, this paper argues that democratization has increased political opportunity for big businesses in using their media control and ownership for building coalitions with politicians in their quest to capture power in the 2014 presidential elections in Indonesia.

Keywords: *Indonesia, media control, ownership, big business, oligarchy, 2014 presidential election.*

Introduction

Different from the previous elections in the post-1998, the 2014 presidential election has interestingly attracted the interest of several business people to participate in the struggle for presidential power in Indonesia. Conglomerates, especially media business people, have declared their nominations as presidential and vice presidential candidates, including Aburizal Bakrie (Bakri & Brothers Group), Harry Tanusudibyo (owner MNC Group), and Surya Paloh (Media Group) through Golkar Party, Hati Nurani Rakyat (Hanura) Party, and Nasional Demokrat (Nasdem) Party respectively. As for Dahlan Iskan, the Minister of State's Owned-Enterprises and owner of Jawa Pos Group, joined the convention of the ruling Democrat Party for selecting the best candidate for its president. Another media mogul, Chairul Tanjung who owns CT Group (Trans Corp) and the Head of the government's National Economic Commission declined his nomination for joining Democrat Party's convention. This development shows that the post-1998 democratic structure has built new political opportunity for business people to become politicians and, particularly, promoted themselves for running presidential or vice presidential candidate in 2014.

The media business has experienced this unexpected democratic political change in Indonesia. The immediate impact of the 1998 democratization was liberalization of media which, in turn, led to media industrialization (Tomsa, 2007). This tendency raised the issue on

media ownership and control, especially those which have been controlled by conglomerate groups. A conglomerate is defined as the combination of two or more companies or businesses which essentially work with each other in creating a final product. Specifically, a media conglomerate describes companies which own a number of other smaller companies in various economic sectors, including media business.

The 1998 political reform gave the new political structure of opportunity for several conglomerate groups to possess and to control various media (Lim, 2012; Nugroho *et.al.*, 2012). With special reference to Indonesia's big business in media, this paper seeks to scrutinize the nexus between big business and politicians in their efforts to dominate the media be it printed, electronic, and online. Using the approach of the link between business and democracy, this development points to the formation of political and media oligarchies which have centered around certain business individuals and politicians as the preparation for their involvement in the 2014 presidential election. Finally, this paper argues that democratization has increased political opportunity for big businesses in using their media control and ownership for building coalitions with politicians in their quest to capture power in the 2014 presidential elections in Indonesia.

Political business is defined as conglomerate or big business who actively participate in political parties for the purpose of maximizing their political and economic interest. The political behaviour of big business groups

tends to adjust political structure in which they operate. Under authoritarian Suharto's rule, political participation of business people was influenced by the ruling political party. However, the post-1998 democratization gave different political structure within which business people seems to have more independent and different political manner from the ruling party. Gomez (2002: 3) argues that

“...following democratization in a number of East Asian countries, the influence of capital over politics has increased appreciably. The changing pattern in the balance of power between capital and the state in democratized countries also appears to have affected the dynamics of policy-making and policy implementation, the form of corporate development, as well as the flow of funds from business into politics. Political funding by business has contributed to a significant rise in the phenomenon of “money politics,” that is the use of money in the political arena to secure control over the state in order to influence the distribution of state-generated economic rents. Since political contests are being extremely influenced by access to money, this brings into question the quality of democracy...”

In Indonesia, conglomerate's participation in political parties can be traced back to the 2004 general elections. There is no doubt that many Indonesian politicians have used their position for obtaining economic profit or the fact that they originally have the business background before shifting their status into a politician. However, few or, even, no conglomerates has openly expressed their political interest by joining non-ruling political parties. Jusuf Kalla and Aburizal Bakrie are two big business who turned to be politicians in Golongan Karya (Golkar) Party. It seems to be such a political reality that member of Golkar Party consists of many business people compared to those of other newly established political parties in the Reform era since the

Party has been the representation of the New Order era in Indonesia. In its effort for selecting the best candidate for president, the party held a convention which came up with the failure of both political businesses to be the nominated candidate from Golkar Party. In his political manouvre, JK cancelled his participation in the convention and accepted the invitation of SBY for running as his vice presidential candidate. The case of JK shows the success of political business in the first direct democratic presidential election in the country.

The post-1998 democratization has frequently declared as the point of departure for the rearrangement of Indonesia's political, social, and economic structures (Forrester, 1999; Manning & van Dierman, 2000; Madu, 2004; Mietzer & Aspinall, 2010; McLeod & MacIntyre, 2007). This was also the case for the media business, including printed, electronic, and online media. The electronic media had actually been the domain of the government-owned television company (TVRI or Televisi Republik Indonesia) and of a certain politically high-profile business people who were closely related to the former President Suharto. As for the printed media, this television media had also been tightly controlled by the government in order to eliminate its criticism to the government. The shift of tight, strict, and loose control of the authoritarian government to freedom of expression has significantly remarked the post-1998 political reform in Indonesia.

Business people seem to capture democratic political system for their political benefit. While the military has been restricted for its political activities, business people looked at democracy as the opening space for their political expression. The Democratic electoral system has required politicians who run for national leadership to promote their popularity throughout the country. This led to the necessity of politicians to have a strong financial back-up for supporting their campaign.

Since the first democratic general election in 1999, Indonesia people have the opportunity to

participate in three votings in each election. The first is voting for a member of local or provincial parliament. The second chance is voting for national parliament members. The third voting is to elect presidential and vice presidential candidates. The 1999 general election resulted in the emergence of Abdurrahman Wahid and Megawati Sukarnoputri for assuming positions of national leadership. Many members of the national parliament came from business people. There was a growing awareness that political participation needs much more money for political costs which consequently attracted more interests of business people to turn into a politician. Being parliament member gave a different political image for business people. Their success in the economic sector is strengthened in their political election for parliament member, either in local/provincial or national level. Direct involvement of business people in politics in Indonesia reached its momentum with the winning of JK as the vice president at the 2004 election. As the running mate of the elected President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY), JK came out as the first business people who assumed the national political leadership.

While the 2009 presidential election did not manage to result in business people as, either president or vice president, the election attracted the political participation of JK in nominating himself as a presidential candidate. It is interesting to see political rivalries between the then president and vice president for the nomination of the presidency for 2009-2014. JK's failure for presidential position reflected the political opening for business people for vying the highest political position in the country. During the campaign of the 2009 presidential election, Indonesian politics shows fragmentation within business people on which presidential-vice presidential candidate they will elect. A Certain group of business people led by Sofyan Wanandi openly supported the nomination of former Vice President JK for the presidential position. While other groups of business people also disclosed their political support for SBY and Budiono's

nomination.

The case of Indonesia shows that media conglomerations became the urgent issue which democratic society has to deal with (Haryanto, 2007; Cahyadi, 2012;). The conglomeration of media seems to build paradoxal tendency of democratization. While the democratic process has been in a transitional phase, it lacks the capacity of regulating and limiting conglomerate's ownership on media and has put democracy at risk. Media take almost full control in determining issues to be published or broadcasted publicly (Haryanto, 2007). Using their own television and other media, a conglomerate could directly advertise his/her vision, programs, and other image building within his/her own media without any strict and strong monitoring from government's institution.

Method

This research uses the descriptive qualitative method. Qualitative research method would try to understand various issues related to the background of the phenomenon, trying to give more meaning or predict the behavior of social or political phenomenon which other persons perceived to the issues (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994: 2). The case of Indonesia is used by focusing on two difference tendencies. The first is that democratization increased the power of media, particularly in the hands of media owners or political business. The second tendency is that democratization promoted the concentration of media ownership and control in the hands of few conglomerates which, in turn, give more room for maneuver for political business to take a political role in the 2014 presidential election. This tendency consequently puts democracy at risk. Although democratization boosted the number of media in Indonesia, this political change also resulted in the danger for democratization itself. Media's concentration brought about the monopoly of information for the interest of the media's owners.

(Media) Political Business in the Making since

1998

The case of Indonesia generally shows two difference tendencies about the link between democratization and media power which increasingly attracted the interest of political business in controlling the media. The first is that democratization increased the power of media in influencing public opinion. The diversity of opinion promoted public awareness on the difference meaning of a fact. The increasing number of media gave the people power to choose the right media for their need of information. The second tendency is that democratization promoted concentration of media ownership and control in the hands of few conglomerates. This tendency consequently puts democracy at risk. Although democratization boosted the number of media in Indonesia, this political change also resulted in the danger for democratization itself. Media's concentration brought about the monopoly of information for the interest of the media's owners. In this case, Indonesia's media conglomerate has the power in managing what kind of information their media would like to broadcast to the public.

After the fall of the Soeharto regime in 1998, political and media climate in Indonesia changed from authoritarian and tight state control to the current situation which has been characterized by liberalization, a highly competitive market, and significantly less state intervention (Heryanto and Adi 2001:1). The growth of Indonesian media was initially marked by the abolition of the Press Licensing System (SIUPP) through President B.J. Habibie's policy in 1999 (Tomsa 2007:3). The following president, Abdurrahman Wahid, unexpectedly eradicated the communication ministry and issued the Press Law Number 40/1999 and Number 32/2002. The Democratic commitment of the latter was supported by the establishment of the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (Komisi Penyiaran Indonesia/KPI) as the government's partner for monitoring the behavior of media on the application of democratic culture for the interest of the public. Soon after the abolition of the

Press Licensing System and the issuance of the Press Law number 40/1999, there was a dramatic increase in the number of media. There were 873 radio stations in 2002, 11 television stations, 186 daily newspapers, 245 weekly newspapers, 279 tabloids, 242 magazines and 5 bulletins in 2003 (Gobel and Eschborn 2005:2).

Interestingly, the media liberalization in Indonesia was characterized by a certain media in a certain period. In the early years of reform era 1998-1999, tabloid was the most favorite media. Starting the year of 2000, tabloid was vanished due to the lack of advertisement and the shift of reading culture from tabloid to a more qualified media, including electronic media such as television and radio. Business people started to invest their money in the electronic media. This shift also indicated the dynamics of printed media business which accounted for only 20 percent of those can take profit, including Kompas-Gramedia, Jawa Pos, and Femina.

Development of printed and electronic media (television) seems to be a paradox. Recently, national printed media has been only owned by several media groups such as Jawa Pos Group, Kompas Gramedia Group, TEMPO Group, Media Indonesia, and Republika. Along with the reducing numbers of printed media in the national level, we can also see the increasing number of electronic media, especially television stations. In the era of Suharto's New Order, Indonesian television media had only been dominated by the government-owned television, namely TVRI. The last ten years of Suharto's rule had shown private television companies which were established by people closed to the first family. In 1989, Bambang Trihatmojo, Suharto's second son, established RCTI as the first private television company in the country. In the following years, other television companies followed to be aired by other first-family members, including SCTV, Indosiar, TPI, and Lativi.

The mushrooming television companies raised optimism of media Indonesia (see table 1). Although the initial development of

media business shows the ownership has been concentrated around politically connected business people of Suharto's family, this electronic media took the interest of other business people. In 2000-2001, five national private companies operated, including Metro TV, TV 7, Trans TV, Lativi and TV Global. In regional level, several local business people also established local private television, such as JTV Surabaya, RTV Pekanbaru, Jak TV Jakarta, and Bali TV Denpasar. One of the most interesting reasons of this television business has been the increasing number of advertisement (Bisnis Indonesia, 5 May 2002).

group in media business outside the circle of the politically connected business group of Suharto's family. With their wide-range control of various media business, those business groups can also be called as media conglomerate or tycoon.

The liberalization and industrialization of media have initially resulted in two opposite opinions among Indonesian media workers or analysts. The first insight comes from those who view the media industrialization as a good sign of the decreasing role and influence of the politically-connected conglomerates, with particular reference to those which closely-related to the Suharto family. The emergence of

Table 1. Indonesia's media industrialization in television business

TV channels	First on air	Current status	Market share %	
TVRI	1962	State/Independent	1.4	1.4
RCTI	1987	Merged (MNC)	19	
Global TV	2001	Merged (MNC)	5.1	36.7
MNCTV (formerly TPI)+	1990	Merged (MNC)	12.6	
SCTV	1989	Merged (EMTEK)+	17.3	31.5
Indosiar	1995	Merged (EMTEK)+	14.2	
Trans TV	2001	Merged (TransCorp)	12.1	18.5
Trans 7	2001, <i>re-launch in 2006</i>	Merged (TransCorp)	6.4	
TVOne (formerly Lativi)	2001	Merged (Bakrie/MM Group)+	4.5	8.7
antv	1993	Merged (Bakrie/MM Group)+	4.2	
Metro TV	2000	Media Group/Independent	1.9	1.9

Source: Merlyna Lim, *The League of Thirteen: Media Concentration in Indonesia*, <http://merlyna.org/?p=2580>, diakses pada 4 September 2012.

Following the increasing number of television business in the democratic era, media business in Indonesia has gradually, but surprisingly, showed that the media ownership has concentrated in several groups of big business or conglomerates (Nugroho *et.al*, 2012; Lim, 2012). Similar to Lim's research, Centre for Innovation Policy and Governance (CIPG) found that 12 groups of big business have dominated almost all channels of media in Indonesia (see table 2). They are MNC, Media Group, Jawa Pos Group, Kompas-Gramedia Group, Mahaka Media Group, Elang Mahkota Teknologi, CT Corp, Visi Media Asia, Media Group, MRA Media, Femina Group, Tempo Inti Media dan Beritasatu Media Holding. These 12 big business groups have inevitably confirmed the emergence of the new business

Mahaka Group, Trans Corpora, and the MNC Group have raised the issue of the increasing capitalistic considerations in building the media business ---especially those who built television media empire--- instead of political motives of the elite groups.

On the other hands, the emergence of the new media tycoons also reflected the potential danger of the on-going democratization in Indonesia in the name of media industrialization, especially with the issue of the concentration of media ownership in the hands of several conglomerates. The economic motives of building media empire have inevitably put democratic values or culture into risk. In the realm of journalism, the media liberalization which resulted in the emergence of the media

Table 2. Big business' ownership and control in media in Indonesia

No	Group	TV	Radio	Media Cetak	Online Media	Bisnis lainnya ^a	Pemilik
1	Global Mediacomm (MNC)	20	22	7	1	Produksi konten, Distribusi konten, <i>Talent Management</i>	Hary Tanoesoedibjo
2	Jawa Pos Group	20	n/a	171	1	Paper Mills, Printing Plants, Power Plant	Dahlan Iskan, Azrul Ananda
3	Kelompok Kompas Gramedia	10	12	88	2	Property, Jaringan toko buku, Manufaktur, <i>Event Organiser</i> , Universitas	Jacob Oetama
4	Mahaka Media Group	2	19	5	n/a	Event Organiser, PR Konsultan	Abdul Gani, Erick Thohir
5	Elang Mahkota Teknologi	3	n/a	n/a	1	Telekomunikasi dan IT solutions	Sariatmaadja Family
6	CT Corp	2	n/a	n/a	1	Financial Services, Lifestyle and Entertainment, sumber daya alam, Properti	Chairul Tanjung
7	Visi Media Asia	2	n/a	n/a	1	Sumber daya alam, <i>network provider</i> , Properti	Bakrie & Brothers
8	Media Group	1	n/a	3	n/a	Properti (Hotel)	Surya Paloh
9	MRA Media	n/a	11	16	n/a	Retail, Properti, <i>Food & Beverage</i> , Otomotif	Adiguna Soetowo & Soetikno Soedarjo
10	Femina Group	n/a	2	14	n/a	Talent Agency, Penerbitan	Pia Alisjahbana
11	Tempo Inti Media	1	n/a	3	1	Produksi dokumenter	Yayasan Tempo
12	Beritasatu Media Holding	2	n/a	10	1	Properti, pelayanan kesehatan, TV kabel, <i>Internet service provider</i> , Pendidikan (Universitas)	Lippo Group

Source: Yanuar Nugroho (et.al.), *Memetakan Lansekap Industri Media Kontemporer di Indonesia*, Centre for Innovation Policy and Governance, Jakarta, 2012.

tycoons is a new threat to the press freedom. The media conglomerates are an opposing threat to press freedom in itself, leaving a large imbalance of power with limited checks and balances (the Jakarta Globe, 2012).

The above-mentioned development in media industrialization shows the way democratization has generally created the structure of political opportunity for conglomerates for increasing their business in media industry without any control of the government (Nugroho, 2012). In the name of liberalization, these media conglomerates made use their power of capital to appropriate the on-going Indonesia democratic reform for their own profit. Following the logic of capital, these conglomerates have accumulated their economic profit they gained from media business (Irianto, 2005; Madu, 2012). They did not stop their media ownership in a certain media sector. They, however, have strongly tried to concentrate all media sectors within their conglomerations. These practices of appropriation have, in turn,

developed their significant control and ownership of media industry. This tendency shows that Indonesia's democratization has unlikely been able to manage and arrange media industry for the sake of public interest.

Business' participation in the 2014 Presidential Election

The increasing political interest of business people, particularly media big business or conglomerates, has been reflected in their potential participation in the 2014 presidential and vice presidential election. At least, five media moguls have declared their interests for both political positions, including Aburizal Bakrie (the owner of Bakrie & Brothers and Golkar Party's leader, declared presidential position), Harry Tanusudibyo (owns MNC Group and Hanura Party nominated him for vice president), Dahlan Iskan (owns Jawa Pos Group, Minister of State's Owned Enterprise, joined Democrat Party's convention for its presidential candidates), Surya Paloh (owner of Media

Group, founder and presidential candidate from Nasional Demokrat Party) (see table 3). Other business people, but without ownership in the media industry, who are interested in the 2014 presidential election are Jusuf Kalla (Kalla Group) and Gita Wirjawan (Ancora Group). Gita Wirjawan, who was the Minister of Trade, nominated himself for the presidential candidate through the internal convention of Democrat Party. Of course, the 2014 presidential election also attracted other candidates with a military background, such as Wiranto, Prabowo, Joko Suyanto, and Endriastono through different political parties.

has strongly tried to oppose negative coverage on Sidoarjo mud-flow disaster. Bakrie has been predicted to promote his political intention for running a presidential candidate in the next 2014 election via his media group. The massive use of media for the political campaign has made Indonesia's Broadcasting Commission issued warning for several television companies, such as Metro TV, TVOne, and MNCTV.

One of the most problematic issues is about the content of media (Masduki 2014). Basically, media independence in general election, including the 2014 Presidential election is a must. The problems in its contents, however,

Tabel 3. Big business, media ownership, and political parties

No.	Owner	Business Group	Television	Political Party	Nomination
1	Aburizal Bakrie	Bakrie & Brother	TV One, ANTV	Golkar	President
2	Harry Tanusudibyo	MNC	MNCTV, RCTI	Hanura	Vice President
3	Suryo Paloh	Media	MetroTV	Nasdem	President
4	Dahlan Iskan	Jawa Pos	JTV	Democrat	President
5	Chairul Tandjung	CT Corp	TransTV, Trans7TV	Democrat	President

These conglomerates have used media within their group for marketing their political interests. Surya Paloh, for instance, has frequently used his media ---Metro TV and Media Indonesia daily--- for voicing his Nasional Demokrat (Nasdem) Party. Another media tycoon is Harry Tanoesoedibyo, the owner of MNC Group. Possessing several television stations (RCTI, Global TV, MNC TV with its several channels), Seputar Indonesia's daily, and radios would make him easier to promote his nomination as Vice Presidential candidate and his Hanura Party. Looking at political strategy of Harry Tanusudibyo was very interesting. Harry Tanusudibyo formerly joined Surya Paloh in Nasdem Party, but internal friction led the first move to Hanura Party with its chairman Wiranto run for the presidential candidate and Tanusudibyo for vice presidential candidate. This is also the case for Aburizal Bakrie with his media group

occur when media are used by the owners for practical politics. The case of Indonesia's political business in the struggle for power through the 2014 Presidential election interestingly portrayed dynamic frictions among media which was potentially steered by media owners. Their direct and indirect participation of political business in the elections also revealed the problems of provocative contents of media which were based on the political inclination of media owners. Bakrie's media of TV One, for instance, directly was directly in oppositional stance from Paloh's media of Metro TV, including other media, such as Kompas TV, MNC TV, AN TV. This tendency also occurred in other forms of media in Indonesia during and after the 2014 Presidential election as the political consequences of the media owners' political support to Presidential candidates, ie. Prabowo Subianto and Joko Widodo.

The momentum of political opportunity

was presented by the result the 2004 Presidential Election, although it failed in bringing about political regulation and agreement. The first direct and democratically-elected Presidential and Vice Presidential Election raised Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono and Jusuf Kalla respectively for the President and Vice President of Indonesia. The 2004 election presented the first business people, Jusuf Kalla (generally called 'JK'), in the political position of Vice President. Both president and vice president were initially agreed on dividing the authority of managing economic issues in the hands of JK and political-security affairs in the hands of SBY. They, however, failed in sustaining the division of the authorities and in arranging regulations for politicians to do business and for business people to have political activism. The further political development also shows that several media tycoons revealed their political inclinations for promoting their interests in the 2014 presidential election (Adrianto, 2012; Madu, 2012).

This also figures out the general pattern of business people's political activity in, both authoritarian and democratic political system. In an authoritarian regime, business people did not openly express their political interest. They quietly organized themselves in a business association which has been dictated collectively and personally by the government in order to follow and support the ruling party, Golkar. During the new order era, it is impossible to figure out the support of business group towards non-ruling political parties. Otherwise, the conglomerates would have found them difficult to develop their business. Eklof (2002: 237) revealed that

“During the Suharto era, carefully staged general elections were held every fifth year, which invariably produced large victories for the government's electoral vehicle, Golkar. Golkar's main patron was President Suharto, who provided the organization with financial resources, much of which consisted of contributions from the corporate sector and which were

channeled through the *yayasan* which the president controlled. A large part of Golkar's funding from the business community and other sources...”

However, the democratic political system has unlocked their political activities by putting themselves in different political parties. Business people found the democratic political system has made them possible to join and become the leader of a political party outside Golkar Party. Media owner with their various political interests used their television to advertise their profile and compete with other for political power. Media mogul became the chairman, influential member, and, of course, the founder-and-owner of a political party. The fact that the ruling party, Democrat Party, does not have media (particularly television company) or no media has directly declared its support for the party has made it difficult for struggling and maintaining its political image. In its rivalries to other political parties, almost all conglomerates tend to be critical of various government's policies.

Conclusion

Democratization has increased political opportunity for big businesses in using their media control and ownership for building coalitions with politicians in their quest to capture power in the 2014 presidential elections in Indonesia. On behalf of democratization, Indonesia's media has significantly increased in numbers and attracted Indonesia's conglomerates to dominate media ownership and control. This led to the increasing position of their power bargaining, particularly in attracting politicians with the purpose of building a political coalition. Business people also managed to take advantage of using political parties as their political vehicle for running presidential and vice presidential candidates. Approaching the 2014 presidential election, Indonesian politics shows media tycoons has taken the most benefit of democracy for vying with other tycoons and candidates for the highest political position in the country. There is no

more such a political ‘taboo’ for business people to struggle for presidential or vice presidential position in Indonesia.

References

- Adrianto, Fadjar. (2012). “Pemilihan Presiden: Pebisnis Calon Presiden 2014”. Jakarta: *Warta Ekonomi*. 23 Agustus-5 September.
- Aspinall, Edward & Marcus Mietzner. (2010). *Problems of Democratisation in Indonesia: Elections, Institutions and Society*. Singapore: ISEAS.
- Cahyadi, Firdaus. (2012). ”Konglomerasi Media dan Politik Oligarki.” Lihat <http://www.satudunia.net/content/konglomerasi-media-dan-politik-oligarki>, diakses 5 September 2012.
- Denzin, Norman K, and Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.). 1994. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Eklof, Stefan, (2002). “Politics, business, and democratization in Indonesia”. In Edmund Terence Gomez (ed.). *Political Business in East Asia*. Routledge: London & New York. 216-49
- Forrester, George. (1999). *Post-Soeharto Indonesia: Renewal or Chaos?* Singapore: ISEAS.
- Gobel, R & Escborn, N 2005, *Indonesia: KAF Democracy Report 2005*, http://www.kas.de/upload/Publikationen/KAF-dem-rep2005_3-7.pdf. diakses 6 September 2012
- Gomez, Edmund Terrence (ed.). 2002. *Political Business in East Asia*. Routledge: London & New York.
- Haryanto, Ignatius. (2007). ”Kepemilikan Media Terpusat dan Ancaman terhadap Demokrasi.” Lihat <http://yudhite.wordpress.com/2007/06/13/65>, diakses 4 September 2012.
- Heryanto, Ariel & Stanley Yoseph Adi (2001). ”The Industrialization of the Media in Democratizing Indonesia.” *Contemporary Southeast Asia*. 23 (2). August.
- Lim, Merlyna. (diakses 4 September 2012). *The League of Thirteen: Media Concentration in Indonesia*. <http://merlyna.org/?p=2580>.
- Madu, Ludiro. (2004). “The Politics of Conglomerates in Democratizing Indonesia: New Patronages and Old Actors.” Paper presented at the 15th Biennial Conference of the Asian Studies Association of Australia (ASAA), Australia National University. Canberra. Australia.
- (2012). “Media Conglomeration and Government Nexus in the Post-1998 Indonesia: Does Democratic Culture Matter?” Paper presented at the “Jogja International Conference on Communication (JICC) 2012”. University of Pembangunan Nasional “Veteran” Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- Manning, Chris & Peter van Diermen. (2000). *Indonesia in Transition: Social Aspects of Reformasi and Crisis*. Singapore: ISEAS.
- Masduki. 2014. “Media Conglomeration and Political Intervention In 2014-General Election of Indonesia”. *GSTF Journal on Media & Communications (JMC)*, 2 (1).
- Nugroho, Yanuar (et.al.). (2012). *Memetakan Lanskap Industri Media Kontemporer di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Centre for Innovation Policy and Governance.
- Rianto, Puji. (2005). “Jurnalisme dalam Tatanan Neoliberal dan Krisis Demokrasi”. Dalam *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik*, Yogyakarta: FISIPOLUGM. 9(1).
- The Jakarta Globe. (2012). <http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/Indonesia/media-conglomerate-a-threat-to-press-freedom-and-diversity-journalists/362042>, accessed 28th August.
- Tomsa, Dirk. (2007). “Party Politics and the Media in Indonesia: Creating a New Dual Identity for Golkar’.” Dalam *Contemporary Southeast Asia*. 29 (1).