PUBLIC BROADCASTING AND PUBLIC SPHERE

AG Eka Wenats Wuryanta

Abstract

Public broadcasting can relatively accommodate a public sphere that has autonomy and independence. It also facilitates ongoing cultural activities in various aspects of functional life. Public broadcasting as a public sphere is expected to become a new format of public life that can accommodate a variety of public interests into a shared vision in the administration of public life in an honorable and democratic manner. In the context of contemporary reforms, there should be opportunities to develop new formats for the existence of government broadcasting media (RRI / TVRI) to become autonomous and independent institutions that carry out cultural functions in the public sphere (read: public broadcast media). Within the framework of achieving public space based on fulfilling public rights in accessing, receiving, and providing information openly and responsibly.

Keywords: Broadcasting, Public Sphere, Politics, Communications, Media

Introduction

Why do we communicate? What is the function of communication for humans? This question is so broad, it can be seen from various points of view. So it is not easy for us to answer. Especially if we are more focused on questions like, why do we communicate? ways such as what makes communication effective, etc.

If we examine further, the question is the basis when we will explore the process of communication between people. Whether it's direct, interpersonal communication or communication that uses media, both interpersonal communication media and mass media.

Public Broadcasting

Before entering the term public broadcasting, it is better to first define the word public as far as possible. The public said, speaking on the level of public service broadcasters, generally embedded in the context of the citizens with their rights. Becoming a citizen and obtaining his rights is a logical legal consequence (as well as political, administrative, etc.) consequences of a joint social contract, which gives birth to the following country with; state territory, citizens, and government, as well as other attributes of the country. For example, public uses attached to public transportation, public services, etc.

Specifically, the public in terms of public broadcasting as referred to by Efendi Ghazali in 'Public Broadcasting and Alternative but Absolute Community Broadcasting', that the

word public is positioned simultaneously in two (2) meanings, namely as an audience (viewer or listener) and as an active participant. This understanding is related to freedom of expression, the right to obtain information, as well as community empowerment efforts in the process of civil society. Philip Savage, Manager of Coverage and Regulatory Affairs, CBC (Radio Canada) said that what is known as public broadcasting is; 'A public broadcaster attempts to inform, anticipate, and enroll the citizens of the country as citizens first and foremost, that is as active participants in the social, cultural, economic, and political life of Canada'.

Eric Barendt (in Mendel, 2000) makes a definition of public service broadcasting media as 1) available in general-geographical manner, 2) has concern about national identity and culture, 3) is independent, good from state and commercial interests, 4) has program impartiality, 5) has a variety of program varieties, and 6) funding is borne by media users. The definition presupposes that public broadcasting is built based on the interests, aspirations, public ideas that are made based on self-help and self-sufficiency from the public or public users and beneficiaries of the benefits of public broadcasting.

Therefore, when public broadcasting is built together on public participation, the function and value of the use of public broadcasting are of course aimed at various public interests and aspirations. Sendjaja (2001, p.1) inspired by Harol D. Lasswell (1946), has outlined some of the social functions of public broadcasting institutions. First, as the supervisor of social (social surveillance). That refers to efforts to disseminate information and objective interpretation of various events that occur within and outside the social environment with the aim of social control so that undesirable things do not occur.

Second, social correlation. This refers to efforts to provide interpretation and information that connects one social group with other social groups or between one view and another intending to reach consensus. This social consensus is usually to strengthen the sense of identity of various groups to become one big power together. And third, socialization. This refers to efforts to inherit values from one generation to another, or from one group to another. The values of the wisdom of the local community must be kept and fortified from the 'invasion' of modern values displayed through the institutions of production.

Furthermore, according to Ashadi, several things need to be considered for the presence of public broadcast media in Indonesia. First, telecommunications as a material base. The existence of public broadcast media relies on the domain (telecommunications) domain, namely signal transmission facilities. Each transmission uses telecommunications lines in the form of electromagnetic waves that are 'controlled' by the state. The regulation of public broadcasting must ensure the management of the wave spectrum within the framework of public strengthening.

Second, the orientation of public functions on a cultural basis. The cultural basis of the existence of public broadcast media as a public institution is determined by the shared values on which it is based. This basic value starts from the legal provisions, state policies, and the growing consensus in the community about the socio-cultural orientation and functions that must be carried out by the public broadcast media. This shared value is expected to be formulated by public diversion professionals as a starting point in the appreciation of the institutional functional orientation.

Third, the public network system. The public broadcasting system is basically in the form of networks broadcast and broadcasting stations. Each of these domains can have specific functional orientation patterns, as well as institutional relationship patterns with each other. The formulation of these two types of patterns is needed as a systemic basis for public broadcasting institutions. The existence of public surveillance media is also determined by social and financial support. Concretely, this support is realized through the existence of stakeholders that function to encourage and oversee the functioning of the cultural function of public broadcasting and provide financial support for the operation of public broadcasting systems.

Fourth, there is a code of conduct for professions and institutions. The code of conduct is intended to maintain professional standards. It usually includes a vision and mission which form the basis of all standards of action and the value of the work of professionals, based on attitudes towards society, and the meaning of work in a social context. The meaning of work results in this social context needs to be placed in the context of the social meaning of public broadcast media. As a reference standard for professional actors and the results of an institution's work has two sides, external to maintain the social meaning of the mass media, and internal as a basis for professional evaluation as part of the personnel management system.

And fifth, the public function control system. To maintain an institution that can run in a clean operation, it is necessary to uphold the principle of accountability to stakeholders in particular and the general public. Accountability has two sides, concerning the accountability parameters of accounting and concerning the principle of social accountability to maintain its functional orientation to the public. If accounting accountability passes through auditing institutions (public or state), then social accountability needs to be accounted for by relevant stakeholders and institutions. Through this social accountability control over public functions that must be carried out by public broadcasting, media can run.

Public Sphere Debate.

The concept of the public sphere was first triggered by Jurgen Habermas's article The Public Sphere in 1962. In that essay, Habermas wanted to say about the existence of open social territory, free from censorship and domination. The region he called "public sphere". Namely, all areas that allow human social life to form public opinion that is relatively free. The emphasis is on the formation of social sensitivity (sense of public), as a social practice that is culturally inherent. The people involved in conversations public sphere are private people, not people with business or professional interests, not officials or politicians, who have the freedom to express their opinions.

In Habermas's view, he raised the concept of the public sphere based on terms that existed and developed in European traditions. For example about coffee houses (England), salon (France), and tichgesllschaften (Germany) in the 19th and 20th centuries. The terms used in constructing the concept of the public sphere. Henceforth, the public sphere is Habermas's known as the bourgeois public sphere. Because these places are often used as a means of gathering the royal aristocrats. Where they face-to-face discussions and dialogues within the broader framework of social interests to change the relationship between the aristocratic class and the business class. Thus, the public sphere is independent of church and state and is open to all humans.

What Habermas presented about the bourgeois public sphere, both Salon, Coffe House, and Tichgesllschaften, philosophically and institutionally have similarities in several respects. First, both Salon, Coffee House, and Tichgesllschaften both see equality as a human being in the context of communicating and sharing information through a tradition of dialogue. In the discussion, they broke away from sharing social and cultural attributes and certain economic interests. In a certain sense, each of them functions as an educator. Second, the discussion in the context of the public sphere presupposes the process of disputing areas or fields that existed in the next period is not questioned. The problem is that cultural products (such as art and literature) become profane commodities. In the context of art criticism a new role has emerged, namely art critics (who represent the public as well as educators) then this role is replaced by periodicals essay which is a critical journal of the coffee cafe group discussion. This role emerged in the 18th century when at that time the view emerged that philosophy, art, and critical literature could enlighten the process of life.

And thirdly, as with the process of transforming culture into commodities, the public sphere is inclusive. The discussion participants always associate with the interests of the wider community and the objects discussed can be accessed by anyone. The public sphere bourgeois did develop from a feudal system that rejected the principles of open public discussion on universal problems. Although the public sphere existed in ancient

Greece, it was not until the 7th and 8th centuries that Europe, together with the development of capitalism, assumed a public sphere as a different form.

In this context, the state is separated from the public domain. Where countries with their instruments of authority tend to be 'hard' towards the public domain. At this level encourages the birth of a public sphere gap between the people themselves. Where the main purpose of the public sphere is to make people able to reflect on themselves critically and in state practices, both socially, politically, economically, or culturally. Although indeed, if explored further the concept of the public sphere Habermas originated from the male bourgeois, aristocratic and intellectual circles. In this context, they consciously and rationally meet to discuss literary works. While these conversations continue to be based on exclusionary practices, for Habermas at least that practice holds back certain existence.

Furthermore, according to Habermas, the potential critical conversation in the public sphere is supported by three main reasons. These three reasons are based on historical realities that prevailed at the time of European conditions at the time in which Habermas adopted the concept of the bourgeois public sphere. First, the social relations that ultimately change from literary criticism to political criticism open social distance where the strongest arguments are expressed against the status quo. Second, the area of closed social debate under feudalism has lost the aura given by churches and palaces and has become an issue through conversations that do not look at participant status. And third, Habermas argues that the meetings that took place in Europe in salons and coffee houses, especially in 1680-1730, were inclusive and exclusive.

Because of the nature of openness that was built from Habermas's bourgeois public sphere model, of course, some conditions allow people to participate in participating in these dialogues. In the beginning, the birth was still very limited, because the claim made was that this activity formed a "mouthpiece" to the public. Habermas argues that while "the public" is still small, the principles of universality are beginning to be accepted; those who meet the rational criteria, are male and are of benefit to him, through active participation, in the public sphere. Through the principle of publicity, he argues, it cannot be denied that the use of public thought is superior to its private benefits. The search for truth through an intersubjective dimension that reflects both civil society and the state. According to Habermas, differences can reform asymmetric power relations. The dominant male capitalist class maintains hegemony through exclusionary practices, while simultaneously providing a cultural setting for criticism.

Public service. The model of public service (public-service) is considered to have failed in an attempt to carry out two functions in the realm of media public sphere. The two

functions are gathering and disseminating information (the role of journalists) and providing a public forum for debating (the role of politicians). Journalists in the matter of public services perform these two functions on behalf of the public under the rules of balance and high objectivity. This condition creates a contradiction.

To overcome this, there is a need for a structure of freedom of information, trained and professional journalists, a structure for the provision of public services, professional values, open access to social skills, and also by a public accountability structure. To ensure the continuity and diversity of information in the public sphere, political debates must be highly political by providing access to political parties and social movements in the public to appear through the media.

At present, public service broadcasts tend to distance themselves from the political nature of consumerism by contrasting broadcasts with politicians. Politicians are criticized and seen as intervening and controlling broadcasts. The decline of political parties in the media becomes a problem because in a society separated by conflicts of interests, rationalist and Universalist interests. However political involvement cannot be avoided because to raise various issues such as the women's movement is impossible without linking to the objectives of the social economy in the general structure and program of political priorities.

Universalism and International public sphere. The strength of the concept of the public sphere regarding public services is universalism. In the sense that the scope of the structure of political decisions has the same limit in the sphere of power it controls. Thus, public services at the national level should reach all citizens to be able to participate in public debates and also to include as many relevant views as possible. The problem of the relationship between communication channels and political power becomes a problem when viewed in the transnational aspects of media development. Difficulties in building a public sphere at the national level will be easily defeated by developments in the public sphere at the international level.

Besides, the emergence of trends in the internationalization of the media as a further threat from the ideal model of public service. The internationalization of media in the form of media ownership, control and content are not coherently able to realize the internationalization of the public, or the national public as practiced by the BBC in the UK. Because the general public agenda has not been dominated by international events that could unite the project identification of international audiences as part or members of the international public. Besides, it is also unable to unite real feelings, emotions and even public thoughts.

In this context, Garnham identifies trends that lead to the internationalization of the media as further threats to the ideal model of public service. And this observation model emphasizes the contradiction that media ownership, control, and content are becoming increasingly international but cannot be interpreted to have created an international or national public like the BBC in the UK. The general public agenda has not been dominated by international events which can unite the identification of international audiences as members of the public. Also, they cannot form appropriate and coherent international feelings.

Habermas Public Broadcasting Debate and Public Sphere

Thus, of course, mass media which includes public broadcasting is oriented to broadcasting that carries local values and the interests of local communities. Habermas believes that initially the media was formed and became an integral part of the public sphere but later commercialized it into a commodity (commodified) through mass distribution and selling mass audiences to advertising companies, so the media are far from their original role as public spheres. In this context, Habermas rejects the principles or mechanisms built in the mass media which are contained as public broadcasting institutions.

In Habermas' view, the commercial broadcast media mass has caused information as a commodity and is far from the public interest at large. Commercial broadcasting media in a certain sense cannot be a means of public fairness, openness and democratic air circulation as contained in the concept of the public sphere. This is true because Habermas presupposes the mass media as the media as an ideal public sphere. And this theory was finally criticized by (see Thompson, 1983). For Thomson, the Habermas concept too idealizes and romanticizes the world of the very elite and the world of men, as well as overemphasizing the radical working-class press (Curran and Seaton, 1983). Thus, Habermas is also too pessimistic in assessing the progress of the mass media. Newspapers, radio, television at that time held a forum for discussion of issues of public concern. The discussion involved people who were knowledgeable, interested and able to speak on behalf of broader social interests and who had potential political influence. Habermas also paid too much attention to political news in the public sphere and exaggerated the frauds caused by the commercialization of mass media in the 19th and 20th centuries. Where these values have been abandoned in such a way by commercial (private) broadcasting institutions.

Then what about public broadcasting? Does Habermas agree with the concepts offered in public broadcasting? And is public broadcasting in some sense a container of the public sphere? Or in another sense is public broadcasting a media tool that is considered to be able to become and build a public sphere today? In answering these questions,

Habermas does not explicitly mention the existence or the existence of the term public broadcasting in the context of the public sphere. However, the values and concepts developed in the context of public broadcasting emphasize more on the interests and aspirations of the public in line with what Habermas calls the public sphere. Why is that, because according to Habermas the public sphere is a gap the space between the state (state) and civil society, where every citizen can involve themselves in the discourse on joint problems and control the state and market. This gap can be filled and played by the mass media that functions as publicity (bc; public broadcasting institution) as an institution that supplies and disseminates the information needed to determine attitudes in society. In this context, public broadcasting also facilitates the formation of public opinion by placing itself as an independent forum for public debate, concerning economic, political, social, and cultural issues. The problem is, is there a media which purely plays such public power and is freed from the influence of the state system and market system. Especially in an anti-democratic political system and in a free market economy supported by the capitalist system, can the media be independent? The answer is that at least public broadcasting is an alternative in building the ideal public sphere as it is intended to be built and conceptualized in the public sphere.

Because, if you expect the commercial mass media, of course, it is very difficult to create a public sphere. That is because commercial broadcasters have abandoned their function as educational broadcasters in favor of the public and public sphere. Because it has left the values inherent in public broadcasting and the urgency of the public sphere, namely as mentioned by Denis McQuail, in Senjaja (2001, p.3) is a factor of independence, solidarity, diversity (opinion and access), objectivity and quality information.

Why is that, because philosophically, the urgency of the presence of public broadcast media departs from public life which is seen from the position as citizens only in two domains, namely in the sphere of power and market sphere. The community has its own space to appreciate, work, think, and act towards the reality around them. Therefore, the emergence of dichotomous views that ignores the role and position of citizens in the context of social and state relations has ignored the reality of the public sphere which is expected to become a free and neutral zone in which a dynamic life that is free from power and markets takes place. Habermas calls this domain the public sphere.

Therefore, to explain this, according to Habermas (in Barret, 1995, pp. 239-240), which mentions the beginning of the formation of the media. According to him, initially, the media was formed and became an integral part of the public sphere but later commercialized into a commodity (commodified) through mass distribution and selling mass audiences to advertising companies, so that the media moved away from the role public sphere's. This is the reason why Habermas believes that commercial media are far from public sphere

values. Well, in this context public broadcasting becomes an alternative that implicitly contains public sphere teachings.

At the same time, Ashadi (2001, p. 3) said that civil society can be realized among others starting from the paradigm that drives the dynamics of public life based on cultural values. This cultural value is the meaning of every activity in the public sphere. This can be seen through the dominance and monopoly carried out by the authorities and the market must be kept away from public life, and positively build autonomy and independence of social institutions. So, building civil society is reversing the mainstream that had been 'from state and market power to citizens', to 'from citizens to the state and market power'. And this can be done through public broadcasting.

Public broadcasting can relatively accommodate a public sphere that has autonomy and independence. It also facilitates ongoing cultural activities in various aspects of functional life. Public broadcasting as a public sphere is expected to become a new format of public life that can accommodate a variety of public interests into a shared vision in the administration of public life in an honorable and democratic manner. In the context of contemporary reforms, there should be opportunities to develop new formats for the existence of government broadcasting media (RRI / TVRI) to become autonomous and independent institutions that carry out cultural functions in the public sphere (read: public broadcast media). Within the framework of achieving public space based on fulfilling public rights in accessing, receiving, and providing information openly and responsibly.

According to Keane's observations, public media provide opportunities for opportunities to speak and be heard unevenly among readers. They rely on professional casting or 'subscribed' people who are self-appointed by the media to speak for the public. Murdock refers to the failure of public broadcasts following the rapidly increasing steps of socio-political discourse. A democratic system at the national level that is responsible requires a media system that has the same boundaries that can produce discussions of public issues that are not related to partisan interests.

Therefore, in the media industry, the most effective protection is by public monopoly protected by the state, which is based on the principle of protection of public goods, which, although erroneously, can realize the importance of the implications of free-market expansion. Keane believes that the diversity of media communication in nongovernmental communication and the creation of supranational and politically responsible regulatory bodies and assigning responsibility to large media corporations can improve the public service model. Currant (1991) proposes this mixed model of public television with the private, professional, social and civil sectors.

In this stage, Habermas referred to as a condition that caused a decline from the public sphere. According to Habermas, the decline was due to changes in media, in the sense of media from the public to commercial ownership, as is happening now. Meanwhile, according to Phillip Elliot, it was said that the cause was the commercialization of society in general, and an increase in the market because of the Reagan and Thatcher policies that better determine the relationship between providers and consumers of goods and services.

The main thing, in seeing the above problems mainly related to the concept of public broadcasting in relation to the formation of an ideal public sphere as mentioned by Habermas, certainly has some shortcomings. However, Habermas's concept of the public sphere certainly has advantages. These advantages include; first, authenticity sociological that impresses and illustrates the scarcity of equal works for other media, in different contexts and histories. Secondly, it has a strong influence on the mass glasnost followed by the collapse of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Third, Reagan and Thatcher policy inspiration and diffusion and application in the general bureaucracy to revitalize and strengthen capitalist ideology and capitalist practice give rise to a 'challenging' condition of radical opposition analysis, and at the same time, it weakens the legitimacy and opportunity to use the analysis.

Fourth, the practical importance of research to help redefine and regulate the role of media in the east, together with western interests regarding the consequences of the privatization of public media and the more intensive commercialization of private media. And fifth, political advantages for media intellectuals to establish a dialogue with the world in academic life.

Murdock proposes fundamental principles namely the need for access to information, advice, and analysis that enables them to find out what their rights are and work on them effectively; access to various information, debates in fields involving public political choices; facility to recognize themselves and their aspirations in their representation and formation in the media. Public media licenses to speak and listen unfairly because speakers are appointed and do not necessarily represent the public interest.

So, to strengthen public broadcasting as a model of public service (the public service models) that can strengthen public sphere buildings, of course, must do things that can support the sustainability of the intended public service model. Thus, the ideals of the public sphere as mentioned by Habermas can be realized. This concept was born from the view of Nicholas Garnham, first, to make suppositions and his efforts to develop practices in a series of social relations that are more political than economic. And second, at the same time trying to separate themselves from state control (political control).

Therefore, the most important thing is to restore society as a political person because the existing social relations have been formed by the ideology of consumerism by proposing economic and political issues, public services, and knowledge brokers (knowledge broking), public and party services, public services, universalism, and the international public sphere. In this context, the public sphere will be realized, indeed not as Habermas calls the bourgeois public sphere. However, the aspirations of Habermas's public sphere can be realized through the formation of public broadcasting in several places which can provide a means of public discussion in social, political matters, and so on.

Bibliography

Baran, Stanley J., 2000, Mass Communication Theory: Foundation, Ferment, and Future, New York: Wadsworth

Berry, David, (2000), Ethics and Media Culture, Oxford: Focal Press

Boyd Barrett's, 1995, Conceptualising the Public Sphere. In Boyd Barrett, Oliver and Newbold, Chris. Eds (1995), Approach to Media Reader, New York; Arnold.

Chesney, Robert Mc., (1998), Corporate Media and The Threat to Democracy, (trans. AJI), Jakarta: AJI

Curran and Gurevitch (eds), 1991, Mass Media and Society, London: Edward Arnold.

Habermas, J, 1989, Institution of the Public Sphere. In Boyd Barrett, Oliver and

Newbold, Chris. Eds (1995), Approach to Media Reader, New York; Arnold.

Hardiman, F. Budi, Menuju Masyarakat Komunikatif, Ilmu Masyarakat dan Posmodern menurut Jurgen Habermas, (1993), Yogyakarta, Penerbit Kanisius.

Garnham, Nicholas, The Media, and The Public Sphere. In Boyd Barrett, Oliver and Newbold, Chris. Eds (1995), Approach to Media Reader, New York; Arnold.

Elliot, Phillip, Intellectuals in the Information Society and the disappearance of the Public Sphere. In Boyd Barrett, Oliver and Newbold, Chris. Eds (1995), Approach to Media Reader, New York; Arnold.

Senjaja, S. Djuarsa dan Ashadi Siregar, (2001), Kumpulan Makalah Seminar Televisi Publik, Yogyakarta: UGM

Stevenson, Nick, Understanding Media Cultures, Social Theory and Mass Communication, 1995 Sage Publication, London.