



UNIVERSITAS  
**SANATA DHARMA**  
Y O G Y A K A R T A



**Proceeding**

The 3<sup>rd</sup> Literary Studies Conference

**THE 1965 COUP  
IN INDONESIA:  
QUESTIONS OF  
REPRESENTATION  
50 YEARS LATER**

21 – 22 October 2015

*Hosted by*  
English Letters Department,  
Graduate Program in English Language Studies,  
Universitas Sanata Dharma, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

*Co-hosted with*



Ateneo de Manila University,  
the Philippines

# **PROCEEDING**

## **The 3<sup>rd</sup> LITERARY STUDIES CONFERENCE**

### **“The 1965 Coup in Indonesia: Questions of Representation 50 Years Later”**

Department of English Letters and  
Graduate Program in English Language Studies  
Universitas Sanata Dharma, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

co-hosted with

Kritika Kultura  
RAFIL (Reading Asia, Forging Identities in Literature)  
Ateneo de Manila University, the Philippines

#### **Board of Committee:**

Paulus Sarwoto, M.A., Ph.D.  
Dra. A.B. Sri Mulyani, M.A., Ph.D.  
Dr. Gabriel Fajar Sasmita Aji  
Anna Fitriati, S.Pd., M.Hum.  
Harris Hermansyah Setiajid, M.Hum.



Faculty of Letters Universitas Sanata Dharma Yogyakarta  
21-22 October 2015

# PROCEEDING

## The 3<sup>rd</sup> LITERARY STUDIES CONFERENCE

### “The 1965 Coup in Indonesia: Questions of Representation 50 Years Later”

Copyright © 2015  
Faculty of Letters  
Universitas Sanata Dharma

Published by



Faculty Letters,  
Universitas Sanata Dharma  
Jl. Affandi Mrican Tromol Pos 29  
Yogyakarta 55022.  
Telp. (0274) 513301, 515253 Ext.1324

Board of Committee:  
**Paulus Sarwoto**  
**A.B. Sri Mulyani**  
**Gabriel Fajar Sasmita Aji**  
**Anna Fitriati**  
**Harris Hermansyah Setiajid**

Ilustrator & Cover Design:  
KY grafiti

Cetakan Pertama

viii, 253 hlm.; 210 x 297 mm.  
ISBN: 978-602-7189-04-1  
EAN: 9-786027-189041

**All rights reserved.**

No part of the materials including graphics, or logos available in this Proceeding may be copied, photocopied, reproduced in whole or in part, without permission from the Publisher.

## Rector’s Address

I would like to extend my warmest regards to all speakers and participants of this conference. Let us ask for God’s blessing upon this occasion so it can be an effective means to strengthen our role as researchers and writers. I do hope that the conference facilitates a fruitful sharing and exchange of ideas to respond one of the most difficult tragedies to understand, the 1965 coup in Indonesia.

We might agree to what, how and why the coup happened but it is unbelievable to realize that part of the event was thousand innocent citizens killed in a massive massacre. It has left us a painful scar for the victims as well as created a series of serious problems to all related victims up to now. The anxiety, frustration and resentment are still around and felt deeply by the family members of the victims.

It is really unbelievable and difficult to make sense of the event especially when we perceive ourselves as people of having dignified characters such as respecting others, keeping harmonious way of life, and believing in God. Some people understand that the event was a perfect contradiction: defending *Pancasila* (The Five State-Principles), yet at the same time violating those values and principles.

It has been 50 years now, the coup and its related events have been burdening us especially to those who critically understand and feel how bad the tragedy ruins the life of thousand innocent people. It is time for us to step forward by understanding the tragedy from a new and more humanistic perspective. No matter how difficult it is, because many live-witnesses are still around, understanding the event from the victims’ perspectives might be appropriate and provide a scheme to heal the wound of the victims as well as the whole nation.

It is the responsibility of ours as academicians to provide the context, framework and narrated presentation to better understand and make sense of the event. I do hope that such endeavor will shed light on us and especially to politicians and public leaders who have position and authority to propose reconciliation and solution. Therefore, *The 3<sup>rd</sup> Literary Studies Conference on The 1965 Coup in Indonesia: Questions of Representation 50 Years Later* is really an appropriate and relevant call to all of us.

Have an enjoyable conference and may it bring a better conversations, understanding, and awareness to such important but painful tragedy. Thank you for visiting Sanata Dharma.

**Johanes Eka Priyatma, Ph.D.**  
Universitas Sanata Dharma, Rector

## Words from the Dean

Fifty years ago a terrible bloody coup took place in Indonesia. It has been a nightmare in the modern history of Indonesia for it has caused a great number of casualties and a variety of horrible and sad stories to be in circulation in the communities right after the event. Unfortunately, most of the public and official discussions on the incident have been confined merely to the party that masterminded the coup, to the one that benefited from it, or even to the one that was supposed to be blamed, which in a way sounds distorting, reductive, and impoverishing.

I guess the committee of the *Literary Studies Conference*, the international conference which is annually hosted by the English Letters Study Program of Universitas Sanata Dharma, make use of the fiftieth commemoration of the coup as a momentum to reflect upon the history of Indonesia as a nation and part of the global community by raising the issue of the representation of the event in cultural texts and practices, especially literature, which have been produced across the country as the theme of the conference of this year. The choice of the theme is undertaken on the basis of the belief that the production and reproduction of a national discourse of one country is implicated in the production and reproduction of its national cultural texts and practices. As contended by Fredric Jameson, the relationship between the two in the field of literature is particularly evident in the third world literature.

The questions to be answered at the conference are whether the representations of the 1965 coup in Indonesian cultural texts and practices only confirm “what is already known”, conforming to the political mainstream or whether they go beyond that, giving a voice to both those that possess no voice and those that have been silenced. Indonesian cultural texts and practices of the former kind situate themselves as an instrument for maintaining the prevailing structure of power. On the contrary, those of the latter kind serve the function of establishing one’s critical collective awareness.

Indeed, the establishment of one’s critical collective awareness in turn enables him to see the history of his nation with a proper perspective, locating the history as an opportunity to learn as both a human and a citizen. Only when one comes to this awareness, as Ignas Kleden puts it, would he not present himself as a romantic, treating history as a mere repertoire of human virtues, nor would he situate himself as a pathologist, treating it as a mere document of human follies.

**Dr. F.X. Siswadi, M.A.**  
Faculty of Letters, Dean

## A Welcome Note from the Chair

As stated in its Strategic Plan 2013 - 2017, one of the short-term goals of Universitas Sanata Dharma is the improvement of the productivity, quality, and scope of its academic contribution and community service. This goal is carried out through various activities such as developing the quality of the education system and improving the quality of the lecturers. Those are supported by the improvement of research quality and research publication. It is emphasized that the researches done by Universitas Sanata Dharma must be qualified and contextual.

The English Letters Department as one of the leading departments at Sanata Dharma University actively participates in reaching this goal by conducting the annual international conference ‘Literary Studies Conference’.

This year’s conference is different from the previous one because the 3<sup>rd</sup> Literary Studies Conference is hosted together not only with Ateneo de Manila University but also with Kritika Kultura, RAFIL Consortium, and the Graduate Program in English Language Studies, Universitas Sanata Dharma.

Without neglecting the main focus of Literary Studies Conference which is to focus on the Asian Literature, the selected theme of the conference is “The 1965 Coup in Indonesia: Questions of Representation 50 Years Later.”

The theme is selected to commemorate a painful event that occurred in Indonesia 50 years ago. Another reason is because similar experience also occurred in other countries in South East Asia.

It is expected that this conference can give us a chance to see and to question the coup from literary and linguistic perspectives, and to share our ideas so that we can better understand and make sense of what happened 50 years ago.

Finally, have an enjoyable conference and may it bring enlightenment for us to contribute in creating more humane society for all of us.

**Anna Fitriati, S.Pd., M.Hum.**  
Conference Chair

## CONTENTS

Rector's Address .....	iii
Words from the Dean .....	iv
A Welcome Note from the Chair .....	v
Contents .....	vi
Masalah 1965 dalam Representasi Artistik dan Ideologi Estetis <i>Martin Suryajaya</i> .....	1
Catatan Kecil Dalam Gerakan Besar Bangsa Indonesia <i>Putu Oka Sukanta</i> .....	7
A Comparative Analysis of Systematic Political Strategy of Repression & Oppression during 1965-1966 of Suharto's Regime in Indonesia & in Mid-1980s of Aquino's Administration in the Philippines Presented in Two Films- Joshua Oppenheimer's <i>The Act of Killing</i> & Lino Brocka's <i>Orapronobis</i> <i>Mark Laurence D. Garcia</i> .....	10
<i>Menanam Terjemahan Semangat Priyayi: Habitus and State Violence in Para Priyayi</i> <i>Jeffrey Willever Jacobson</i> .....	22
Environmental Damage in the Indonesian 1965 Coup Literature <i>Novita Dewi</i> .....	30
Indonesian <i>Bildungsroman</i> in Pramoedya A. Toer's <i>Buru Quartet</i> <i>FX. Dono Sunardi</i> .....	36
Laksmi Pamuntjak's <i>Amba</i> and Re-membering Fractured Identities in Indonesia <i>Siti Nuraishah Ahmad</i> .....	42
Performing Present: Temporal Shock in <i>The Act of Killing</i> <i>Fiky Daulay</i> .....	50
Depicting Political and Social Hegemony in Umar Kayam's Short Stories <i>Nudia Imarotul Husna</i> .....	58
Wound around the Wound: Narrative, Trauma, and Indonesia 1965 <i>Taufiq Hanafi</i> .....	65
The Untold History of the 'Unfinished Nation' in History Schoolbooks <i>Nenden Rikma Dewi</i> .....	70
Translating Pain: Women's Struggle in Their Everyday Life after G30 S Tragedy as Represented in Putu Oka's <i>Istana Jiwa</i> <i>Nungki Heriyati</i> .....	75

Collating the Nation: The Disruption of the New Order and New Society's National Narratives in the Novels of Seno Gumira Ajidarma and Edel Garcellano <i>Amado Anthony G. Mendoza III</i> .....	81
A Strange Form of Life: Tracing Pramoedya's Revolutionary Realism in <i>Tales from Djakarta</i> <i>Francis C. Sollano</i> .....	93
The Politics of "Placing" in Selected GUMIL Hawaii Short Fiction <i>Ma. Socorro Q. Perez</i> .....	101
Marx and Magic: The Appropriation of Millenarianism through Magical Realism in Jose Rey Munsayac's <i>Duguang Kamay sa Nilulumot na Pader</i> <i>Dominic Sy</i> .....	109
Ideology of Media: Suharto's Collapse and International Perspective <i>Rieta Anggraheni, Sekartiyasa Kusumastuti</i> .....	128
Cultural Forms of Woman's Submission and Resistance in Pramoedya Ananta Toer's <i>The Girl From The Coast</i> <i>Sri Kusumo Habsari</i> .....	136
Politik Estetika: Strategi Mochtar Lubis dalam Mempertahankan Propaganda Orde Baru Melalui Buku <i>Kuli Kontrak</i> <i>Heru Joni Putra</i> .....	141
Plane of Immanence of the Romance Films in Indonesia: Deleuzian Cinema Critics <i>Fitrilya Anjarsari</i> .....	151
Pramoedya Ananta Toer and Levy Balgos dela Cruz: A Comparative Analysis <i>Ricky Celeste Ornopia</i> .....	155
Joshua Oppenheimer's <i>The Look Of Silence</i> : A Cinematic Look at the Banality of Evil <i>Hassan Abd. Muthalib</i> .....	161
Collective Indonesian Memories of the 1965 Tragedy during New Order Regime <i>Yoseph Yapi Taum</i> .....	168
A Pilgrim's Story: Iwan Simatupang and Finding the Self in the Modern Indonesian Novel <i>Maria Amparo N. Warren</i> .....	179
The Ruling Ideology: Communism in the Life and Art of Pramoedya Ananta Toer <i>Fajar Purnomo Adi</i> .....	184
Rewriting History through Buru Quartet by Pramoedya Ananta Toer as a Form of Resistance in Soeharto's Era <i>Deri Sis Nanda, Susanto</i> .....	190
Fenomena Kekerasan Gender di Balik sebuah Karya Sastra: Tinjauan Strukturalisme Genetik dan Feminisme <i>Sylvie Meiliana</i> .....	196



Psychological Disorder Experienced by Drum in the Film <i>Novel Tanpa Huruf R</i> (A Study of Psychoanalysis and Literature) <i>Firqo Amelia</i> .....	207
On Sympathizing and Ridiculing Victims of the Violent Past: Readers' Perspective on Linda Christanty's <i>Makan Malam</i> and Yusi Avianto Pareanom's <i>Laki-Laki di</i> <i>Ujung Jalan</i> <i>M. Dirgantara, Fransisca Kristanti</i> .....	222
Cerpen Berlatar Peristiwa 1965 dalam Koran <i>Kedaulatan Rakyat</i> 2012-2015 <i>Yerry Wirawan</i> .....	229
<i>30 September</i> By A Child: Modernity in Ideology <i>Gabriel Fajar Sasmita Aji</i> .....	226
Joshua Oppenheimer's 'The Act of Killing': a Closer Look to the Lasting Communist Stigma among Indonesians <i>Ursula Quera Nandadevi Bone, Fransisca Kristanti</i> .....	231
State Censorship: Government Defense Mechanism upon Printed Mass Media from Regime to Regime <i>Laura Artha Manofa Sianturi, Fransisca Kristanti</i> .....	237
Dominant versus Resistant Reading <i>Francis Borgias Alip</i> .....	243
A Plea for Reconciliation in Asmadji As Muchtar's <i>Bapakku Juga Hilang: Social</i> <i>Actor Representation Analysis</i> <i>Fransisca Kristanti</i> .....	246

## State Censorship: Government Defense Mechanism upon Printed Mass Media from Regime to Regime

<sup>1</sup>Laura Artha Manofa Sianturi, <sup>2</sup>Fransisca Kristanti

Sanata Dharma University

<sup>1</sup>manofa.laura@gmail.com; <sup>2</sup>f.kristanti@usd.ac.id

### Abstract

Indonesia has applied censorship upon printed mass media since the Old Order. Censorship has always been meant to maintain social order without oppressing the people. Yet, censorship has been used as the government defense mechanism for years. The practices of censorship from regime to regime take the side of the government high officials by protecting their interests. The Old Order practiced state censorship by putting the responsibility under the military. Slightly different in the execution, the New Order practiced censorship by dismissing the people's freedom of speech. The dismissal was done as a cover-up of Soeharto's involvement in the 1965-1966 massacre. The censorship practices in the New Order reflect a paranoid, patrimonial government. Most decision in the state censorship area during this period was done to protect the government interests. State censorship becomes less controlling in the Reformation era. The government seems to be more open towards criticisms. However, the leniency of the state censorship policy in this era is compensated by a strong civilian control which sometimes leads to the violation of freedom of press.

**Keywords:** *state censorship, defense mechanism, printed mass media, Indonesia.*

### Censorship in Indonesia: An Overview

For years, Indonesia has applied censorship upon the information broadcasted and published by the mass media produced by both the Indonesians and other nationalities. The government might find censorship to be prominent in keeping the society in order. From the first regime ruling Indonesia, censorship has been imposed upon mass media that result in the hampering of the information dissemination. The control over the media that the state has imposed often raises questions. The legal right of the state in imposing censorship is indisputable. The state has outlined detailed points regarding censorship, yet the execution of the rules is often questionable. The most extreme practice of censorship is banning. From regime to regime, the government has banned numerous mass media especially the printed ones. Whether the state has a valid legal basis on these banning is concerning. Thus, this paper is aimed to construe the tendency of each regime through the analysis of the elaborated reason(s) behind the printed mass media banning by the state.

Censorship itself is defined as “the prior restraint, by adequate physical or psychological pressure, of any communication that would be published and distributed where that restraint not applied,” (Phelan 1969, vii). It is meant to prevent any future harm or risk caused by the formal dissemination of sensitive issues like politics, religion, and sex. In social context, censorship justifies its urgency to be applied.

Freedom of speech has gained its reputation in the society. It is prominent in terms of paving the way to explicate critical ideas in the interest of developing the nation. Nevertheless, conflict of interests between the state political figures and society often creates conundrum. Thus, society's freedom of speech mostly addressed to criticize the government whereas the government considers the society has maxed out the idea of freedom in freedom of speech. Yet, freedom of speech in various printed media is one of the key factor in Indonesia democracy system.

However, the extreme practice of censorship, the banning, from regime to regime has a common denominator. Most banned printed media have the tendency to be critical towards the government. Thus, perhaps it is justified to say that the state censorship from regime to regime is the reflection of the government's attitude when dealing with criticism directed towards the government. Among the 3 dominant regimes in Indonesia, the Old Order, the New Order, and the Reformation era, each reaps its own criticisms and each uses censorship in its own unique way when dealing with these criticisms.

### The Development of Press in Indonesia Post-Independence

The first news agency in Indonesia was founded on 13 December 1937 under the name of *Lembaga Kantor Berita Nasional* (Antara, National News Agency Institute). By the time of the Indonesian independence, Antara had been operating for 8 years approximately. It was the only state's national news agency which supplied information and news reports to many other media. For some time, Antara was the source of the information, thus it also held the control of the information disseminated to the country.

After the Independence, the development of press in Indonesia continued year by year. By the year 1954, there have been 150 different daily press recorded within the country. They were able to sell 697 thousand copies daily. Nevertheless, the heyday of Indonesian press was in 1959. Even though the number of the printing house decreased, the sale of the copies increased to 1.036.500. Most (if not all) the printing houses were under the hand of certain parties with certain degree of control in Indonesia. During the period, the four biggest daily press are *Harian Rakjat* (under the Indonesian Communist Party), *Pedoman* (under *Sjarikat Islam* Party), *Suluh Indonesia* (under *Partai Nasional Indonesia* - PNI, Indonesian National Party), and *Abadi* (under Masjumi Party). The press began to flourish in the Old Order, indicating the rise of the people's voice.

The New Order was marked by the downfall of the *Partai Komunis Indonesia* (PKI, Indonesian Communist Party). Naturally, the pro-PKI printing houses were banned by the government. Thus, the voice of the sympathizers and members, sharing similar ideology, was silenced. Other printing houses, however, continued to publish newspapers. These surviving printing houses were owned by all stakeholders, but PKI. These printing houses were owned by the military, the nationalists, religious-based parties, and other independent groups. Some newspapers published under the military were *Angkatan Bersenjata*, *Berita Yudha*, *Ampera*, *Api Pancasila*, and *Pelopor Baru*. Those which were under the nationalists were *Suluh Marhaen*, *El Bahar*, and *Warta Harian*. The Islamic press were *Duta Masyarakat*, *Angkatan Baru*, *Suara Islam*, and *Mercusuar*. The Catholic press were *Kompas* and *Sinar Harapan*. The press, even though was still developing, had undergone a massive cutout in this regime. The silencing of the people's voice did not stop in the banning of the PKI-owned printing houses. The banning continued for different reasons.

When the New Order ended and people were entering the Reformation Era, the development of the press was regarded as the most progressive period in Indonesia. Soon after B.J. Habibie, the third President of Indonesia, ended his term of service, Indonesia had the most progressive figure as the fourth President, Abdurrahman Wahid. During his term of service, Abdurrahman Wahid dismissed the Department of Information. This action resulted in a new kind of freedom in journalism. Variety of perspective in delivering news became common. This kind of freedom led to the birth of mega-press such as *Kompas*, *Jawa Pos*, *Media Indonesia*, and *Media Nusantara*. The birth of these mega-press was enabled due to the structural changes made during Abdurrahman Wahid term of service. During this period, the changing attitude of government and high officials in Indonesia has a big contribution in the protection of freedom of speech (Sayid 2015).

## State Censorship in the Old Order

The Old Order (1945-1965) started the Indonesian politics by undergoing a long process of finding the nation's stability. Under Soekarno's leadership, Indonesian press started emerging. However, tension between the government and the press emerged when Soekarno released Presidential Edict on 5 July 1959, declaring all mass media were under the authority of the government. The edict was claimed to be the impact of the Indonesian's emergency status at the time.

Indonesian's emergency status resulted in the unlimited power of the Indonesian military, under the command of A. H. Nasution as the Commander, to apply any kinds of prohibition towards the content of information distributed through the media. By then, Indonesian government had executed some kind of censorship upon the media. The standard of the prohibition ranged from criticism, presumption, to humiliation addressed to the Indonesian high officials. Any products having the possibility of causing threats or riots were banned. The measuring standard to what could cause threats and riots were not elaborated into legal points, hence gave the impression of imbalanced power relation between the government, the military, and the media. The concepts of criticism, presumption, and humiliation to high officials were limitless with no regards whether or not it could hamper the nation's stability. The subjectivity of the military in assessing the situation reflects the existence of power imbalance.

Furthermore, freedom of speech of the media was shackled under the new censorship law. This new censorship law, *Surat Ijin Terbit* (SIT, Publication Permit), was described in 1960 under the *Peraturan Panglima Tertinggi* (Peperti, Rule of the Supreme War Commander) number 10. In the era of *Demokrasi Terpimpin* (Guided Democracy), the Old Order, the disseminated information in the media was required to be in line with the goal of the government, hence the military. To choose otherwise meant to agree to sacrifice the SIT of the printed media. *Indonesia Radja* owned by Moechtar Lubis and *Pedoman* owned by Rosihan Anwar were two of many newspapers being banned by the government and had the SIT repealed due to the critical content of the news towards the government. SIT was the proof that the Old Order government was not ready to deal with clashes of intellects. This condition was justified by the government need to fix the political environment to maintain Indonesian stability and security (Bella, 2015).

In addition to that, government's regulation toward the press was strictly elaborated in Peperti number 2, issued in 1961. This regulation spelled out the supervision and control on private press. Verse number 4 stated that the job of the supervision and control board was to take any preventive and repressive action on the supervised press. Considering that the highest control of the press was still under the military, the expression of feeling towards the implementation of the political manifesto as the nation guidelines was prevented. The military, being the armed forces of the country, was trained to protect the nation by physical means. Thus the practice of the censor regulation towards the press was executed by physical approaches. The context of the military and the press contradicts. This reflects that the Old Order

put the control of the nation in the arm of the armed forces which resulted in the repression of the civilians' voices.

To conclude, by putting the control of the press censorship in the hands of the military official, the Old Regime government blurred the lines between the military and civilians. The Old Order government was military-centered when it comes to the people's freedom of speech, formally disseminated in the media by the press. The practice of censorship in the Old Order reflect the government's attempt to establish a patrimonial government in which the power came straight from the leading group, blurring the lines between military and civilians. The military oligarchy was evident. The censorship became the governmental tool to protect themselves instead of the people.

## State Censorship in the New Order

When the new order came (1966-1998), for a short while the press reclaimed new freedom under the Pancasila. Focusing on the Pancasila as the base of the nation, any issue favoring on communism was prohibited. After *Gerakan September Tiga Puluh* (Gestapu, 30 September Movement) in 1965, communism became the forbidden ideology. The one year period from 1965 to 1966 became the milestone of the New Order. The government involvement in the spreading of the anti-communism propaganda set the course of Indonesia as a nation. The press was used as the tools of propaganda. Anti-communist media mold the communist stigma among Indonesian.

The interference of international press in strengthening communist stigma interfered with later practice of censorship. Tapol Bulletin 163 (2001) states the secret involvement of the United States and the United Kingdom upon the construction of this communist stigma. Both Indonesian and foreign government promoted anti-communist policy and put PKI as the scapegoat. The American media referred the killing as “A Historical Turning Point,” (Simons 2000, p. 178). The United States involvement stretched from providing the lists of PKI leaders for the Indonesian army to providing mall arms for the non-military killers (Tapol 2001). The United Kingdom, on the other hand, provided the killers with radios to enable communication between them. These international favors were not unconditional. Soon, Soeharto, as the elected President in the New Order, returned the favor by giving Indonesian resources to International companies. Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) act in UU No. 1/1967, drafted in Geneva, Switzerland, authorization led to the massive investment which exploited Indonesian natural resources.

The massive foreign investment in Indonesia made the people restless. Indonesian press started attacking government policy on FDI and led to Malari (*Lima Belas Januari*, 15 January) tragedy in 1974. This tragedy caused the death of 11 people and injured 297 others. Many demonstrations addressed to the government because the people were disappointed with the government policy which led to the “selling” of the country to the foreign investors (Agil 2015). After the tragedy, New Order government made a stricter regulation for the mass media. Mass media had always became the tool of government to maintain peace and order in society. Twelve press and magazines were banned as the result of the incident because they were considered as the triggering factor of the tragedy. Those twelve press and magazines are *Indonesia Raya*, *Pedoman*, *Harian KAMI*, *Nusantara*, *Abadi*, *The Jakarta Times*, *Mingguan Wenang*, *Pemuda Indonesia*, *Suluh Berita*, *Mahasiswa Indonesia*, *Indonesia Pos*, and *Ekspress*.

Being the aftereffect of the conspiracy between Soeharto and the International world in claiming the Presidency, the policy should be untouchable. This paranoia led to the oppression towards the mass media. One of the concrete proofs that New Order was oppressive to the mass media was the legalization of *Surat Izin Usaha Penerbitan Pers* (SIUPP, Press Publication Business License) which put ultimate control on the government officials upon the press. The difference that SIUPP in New Order and SIT in Old Order had was that once government refused issuing SIUPP, the mass media would never be able to get a clearance to publish ever again. In addition to that, SIUPP only could only be given with the recommendation of Persatuan Wartawan Indonesia (PWI, Indonesian Journalist Association) and *Serikat Penerbit Surat kabar* (SPS, Newspaper Publisher Union) before issuing the license after a follow-up recommendation came from *Departemen Penerangan* (Department of Information), (Bella 2015).

Tempo was one of the printed media that shows the biggest retaliation upon the excessive control by government. As the weekly magazine that brave enough to criticize the government, Tempo was banned by government in 1982 and again in 1994. Criticizing many of the government policies, Tempo never got the banning revoke during the New Order. The banning of Tempo was revoked after the fall of the New Order in 1998.

The beginning of Tempo's magazine banning case started on 12 April 1982 when Ali Moertopo (Minister of Information of Indonesia at that time) issued a banning document for Tempo. The legal governmental statement was that Tempo had violated the press etiquette code due to the article questioning the legality of the general election method during the Soeharto regime.

The idea to ban Tempo came from PWI which was led by Harmoko, the journalist of Pos Kota. PWI was only legal association for journalist under the control of the government. The article which caused the banning was the report on the *Golongan Karya* (Golkar), the most dominant political party in Indonesia, campaign in *Lapangan Banteng* which ended in chaos. Soeharto, as the leader of Golkar and the conspirator of the 1965-66 massacre, considered the article '*Kemarahan di Awal Kampanye*' (The Anger in the Beginning of the Campaign) and '*Mengungkap Huru-Hara Banteng*' (Revealing Banteng's Riot) as an attack

toward his government. The banning lasted for 3 months and was revoked on 7 June 1982 after Goenawan, Tempo head editor, signed an apology documents which stated that Tempo was willing to obey the government regulation (*Laporan Tahunan* PT Tempo Inti Media Tbk. 2010).

The second banning of Tempo happened on 21 June 1994. Tempo along with two other magazines, Editor and Detik, were banned due to the articles criticizing the political state of the ruling government. The article entitled '*Jerman Punya Kapal, Indonesia Punya Beban*' (Germany Has Ships, Indonesia Has Burdens) by Wangkar and Andi Rahardian from Tempo criticized the purchase of 39 used battleships from East Germany based on B.J. Habibie's recommendation as *Menteri Riset dan Teknologi* (State Minister of Research and Technology). The news criticizing about the amount of money spent by the government to buy the used battleships which cost US\$ 1,1 billion instead of new ones which cost less. This article made the high officials in the military feel their authority was surpassed. Thus, this banning reflected the patrimony of the Indonesian military which directly reflected the Indonesian government.

The standard used for the banning of mass media was subjective and the banning had no legal justification. Muis wrote in Tempo (1994) that the right of the press not to be censored and banned was protected by the press law in item 2, article 4 and 8 in the SIUPP. Article 4 prohibited the censoring and banning of the press, whereas article 8 stated that the publication of press did not require SIT. Thus, the banning of Tempo by the government violated the law itself. If the news was considered harrasing the foundation of press, the government must propose an indictment to the court. (Tempo 1994, p. 99). Even when the court found proof of the violation of the press code of ethics, the penalty could only be given to the journalist who wrote the article, not to the institution. The government's failure to understand the law regulated by the government itself reflected the government's subjectivity when concerning its own interest.

The existence of SIUPP contradicted the press law elaborated in article 8 about the right of every people to publish the press. The regulation in which the press could be given the SIUPP or not remained unclear. Every press that was considered unfit by the Department of Information would not be given SIUPP. Most of the times, the press which were not given the SIUPP were the press whose journalists once criticized the government like the case of *Kompas*, *Sinar Harapan*, *Merdeka*, *Pelita*, *The Indonesian Times*, *Sinar Pagi*, and *Pos Sore*. The referred article was the one covered about college students' demonstration against the re-nomination of Soeharto as the Presidential candidate for the umpteenth times.

The objection towards the government's censorship practices re-emerged when Surya Paloh, the CEO of *Prioritas*, submitted the test material to the Supreme Court toward the existence of SIUPP. Surya Paloh argued that PERMENPEN (Minister of Information Regulation) No.1/PER/MENPEN/1984 burdened the publishing press and contradicted item number 5 and 4 in the Press Law which ensured the freedom of press as human rights and also stated that no censorship and banning would be imposed upon the national press. However, the Supreme Court rejected the appeal with a reason that the procedural process and the letter of appeal were not yet completed. The Supreme Court stated that the test material could only be assessed after the Minister of Information gave his reason(s) and explanation about the relevant law which became the foundation of the Press Law.

This reason by the Supreme Court could be inferred as the escape mechanism without any sense of justice. The Supreme Court was supposed to be the upholder of justice which made it possessed the highest authority to conduct any material tests. This privilege even granted the power to withdraw a law which was considered contradictory to the amendment. This strengthened the claim that the New Order government heavily sided on its own interests.

In conclusion, the New Order government was not only sustaining the patrimonial governance, but also full of self-interests. The censorship policy became its killing machine when it comes to the freedom of speech. The patrimonial government imposed power upon any press which denied its ultimate power upon the people. The government exercised their excessive and unlimited power to control all aspects of Indonesians' way of living. All criticisms addressed towards the government were not seen as the input for the government's betterment, but as the defamation and humiliation. In addition to that, the self-interest government would never be able to fight for truth. It was too busy to cover the dark past that it carried.

## State Censorship in the Reformation Era

The reformation era of Indonesia that started from 1998 up until now is being called as the most democratic time in Indonesia. The freedom of mass media is due to the structural regulation changes in Indonesian government. The regulation that strict or intrude the freedom of mass media is withdrawn. Government is no longer sensitive to criticisms and critical opinions from society. Even, government starts to be more open toward criticisms and want to be criticized. This changing of attitude by government marks the most influential time in printed media development.

A revision of SIUPP was made. Sayid (2015) states that even though article 9 item 2 number 40 in 1999 SIUPP revision defines that the obligation to propose SIUPP for the sake of the press publication still exist, article 4 item 2 number 40 abolished the banning of the press. To support the regulation, article 4 item 2 juncto article 18 item 1 number 40 also guarantees protection for the journalists and issues criminal law punishment up to two years or a fine up to 500 million rupiahs (about 35 thousand dollars) for the attempt of hampering the freedom of press.

Regardless the revision of the regulation, printed media still have a long journey to gain its freedom of press. Even though the legal right of the government to control mass media is abolished, but the non-politic obstruction from the public or officials in the government still exists. In 1999, there were 47 verbal and physical intimidation cases to journalists. Based on *Aliansi Jurnalis Independen* (AJI, Alliance of Independent Journalists), there were 37 cases of violence towards journalists from 3 May 2014 to 3 May 2015. However, printed mass media still maintain the power to criticize the government and the regulations.

Freedom of press is protected by the country, although the mass media still need to follow the regulation made by government. The 1945 constitution states that government guarantees the right to communicate and obtain information, supported by the article 14(2) of Law No. 39 in 1999 which ensures the right to seek, obtain, own, store, and giving information using all possible facilities.

From the practices of censorship in the Reformation Era, it can be concluded that the government started to open up to political criticisms. What once a very sensitive issue and considered to be enough cause for banning, the 1965 massacre, has become a widely addressed issue in the printed mass media. Tempo, in its special coverage published for the 1-7 October 2012 edition, presented more than 150 pages coverage on the Gestapu, including testimonies from the executioners in the massacre. This edition strips down the 1965-1966 massacre. A 2-page article with a huge 2-page headline saying *Saya Sering Membawa Kampak Panjang. Daripada Dibunuh, Lebih Baik Saya Membunuh* (Tempo 2012, p. 29-32) - I Often Carried a Long Ax around. Instead of being Killed, I'd Better Kill - presented a testimony from the non-military executioner. It also covered the involvement of religious institution in the killings. Another article entitled *Haram Membunuh Cicak jika Belum Membunuh Kafir* (p. 66) - It is Forbidden to Kill a House Lizard if We Have Not Kill an Infidel - reflect the inherited hate which still lasts. Some articles covered testimonies from the executioners from different areas in Indonesia and ended with coverage about Joshua Oppenheimer's documentary film, 'The Act of Killing'.

The state censorship board might not ban the printed media, yet in the reformation era, some people carrying persistent communist stigma consider the state being incapable of handling this issue. Thus some consider the responsibility to stop the communist stigma is in their hand. The banning and attack upon the movements demanding reconciliation for the survivors of 1965-1966 massacre were done by civilians. Hate crime progresses. From what happened, it can be concluded that the government in the reformation era utilizes different kind of censorship. The state censorship in this era might not be as strong as in the previous regime, but the state has been successful in preserving the anti-communist notion among some Indonesians.

## Closing Remarks

The practice of state censorship from regime to regime reflects the characteristic of respective era. Overall, censorship practices are done because the government's paranoia of losing control of the people who could result in the failure to maintain society order. Printed mass media as one of the biggest information dissemination tools has endured their oppression for a long time. Taking control over the media reflect a patrimonial government which clearly seen in the Old Order and New Order, but not clearly seen in the Reformation era. State censorship applied in the Old Order reflects a paranoid and patrimonial government whereas the New Order government was not only paranoid and patrimonial, but also opportunistic. The government in Reformation era, however, shows changes in attitude that is shown from how the law has less restriction toward printed media. The two possibilities from this situation are either the present government is very open to criticisms, or they realize their success in using the people as their defense mechanism to secure them.

## References

- Affan, Heyder. "AJI: Polisi Mengancam Kebebasan Pers Indonesia - BBC Indonesia." BBC Indonesia. 3 May 2015. Web. 23 Sept. 2015.
- Agil, Muhamad. "Malari, Perlawanan Terhebat Pertama Terhadap Orde Baru | Merdeka.com." Merdekacom Atom. 15 Jan. 2014. Web. 23 Sept. 2015.
- Andrianto, Andi. "Buku Menggugat." *Selasar.com*. 21 June 2014. Web. 29 Sept. 2015.
- Bella, FK. "Kebebasan Pers." Kebebasan Pers. Web. 23 Sept. 2015.
- Laporan Tahunan PT Tempo Inti Media Tbk. 2010.
- Liputan Khusus TEMPO. *Pengakuan Algojo 1965*. 1-7 October 2012. Print.
- "Kemarahan Di Awal Kampanye." Tempo 27 Mar. 1982: 12-17. Print.

- Muis, A. "Memasalahkan SIUPP." *Tempo* 28 Nov. 1994. Print.
- Phelan, John M. *Communications Control; Readings in the Motives and Structures of Censorship*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969. Print.
- Rizki, Muhammad. "Patgulipat Di Sekitar Menteri." *Tempo* 20 Sept. 2015: 42-43. Print.
- Saputra, Roni. "Selintas Sejarah Perjuangan Kebebasan Pers Di Indonesia." *Memahami Hukum Pers: Panduan Untuk Jurnalis*. Padang: LBH Pers Padang ;, 2013. Print.
- Sayid, M. "Kebebasan Pers Di Indonesia - KOMPASIANA.com." KOMPASIANA. 25 Sept. 2012. Web. 23 Sept. 2015.
- Simon, Geoff. *INDONESIA: The Long Oppression*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd. 2000. Print.
- Stavis, Ben. "Patrimonial System." *Patrimonial System*. Sept. 1999. Web. 28 Sept. 2015.
- TAPOL Bulletin 163. "What the US and Britain knew but never revealed". Web. October. 2001. <http://tapol.org/news-and-reports/bulletin/163-october-2001#1965>.
- Wahyuni, Hermin. "Relasi Media-Negara-Masyarakat Dan Pasar Dalam Era Reformasi." *Ilmu Sosial Dan Politik* 4.2 (2000): 197-220. Print.
- Wangkar, Max, and Andi Rohadian. "Jerman Punya Kapal, Indonesia Punya Beban." *Tempo* 4 June 1994: 88-89. Print.