Jurnal Komunikasi ISKI, Vol. 10 (2), 2025

J U R N A L
KOMUNIKASI
IKATAN SARJANA KOMUNIKASI INDONESIA

E-ISSN: 2503-0795
P-ISSN: 2548-8740

Analysis of the Background of the Problems of Article 50B Paragraph 2 (C) of the Revision of the Broadcasting Law 2024 in the Perspective of Democratic Resilience

http://dx.doi.org/10.25008/jkiski.v10i2.1186

Hendra[1]*, Palupi Lindiasari Samputra[1], Margaretha Hanita[1]
[1]Department of Strategic Resilience and Security Studies,
Postgraduate School of Sustainable Development, Universitas Indonesia
Jln. Salemba Raya No. 4 Jakarta 10430 - Indonesia
*Corresponding author: hendra31@ui.ac.id

Submitted: February 17, 2025, **Revised**: August 22, 2025, **Accepted**: December 3, 2025
Accredited by Kemristekdikti No. 152/E/KPT/2023 until Vol 12(1) in 2027

Abstract - The revision of the Broadcasting Law 2024, particularly Article 50B paragraph 2 (c) which prohibits the "exclusive investigative journalism," has sparked controversy among media and democracy stakeholders in Indonesia. This study aims to (1) analyze stakeholders' perspectives on this provision, (2) examine the differences and similarities in perspectives in the context of democratic resilience, and (3) synthesize the underlying issues to provide recommendations for strengthening democracy. Grounded in democracy theories, this research adopts a qualitative approach using document studies from national media sources and official documents between May and November 2024. The data is analyzed using assumption analysis to identify stakeholder perspectives. The findings reveal a polarization between policymakers, who emphasize restrictions as a protective tool, and the press, which perceives them as a threat to freedom. However, a consensus emerges on the need for clearer media regulation and the protection of public interests. From a democratic resilience perspective, the macro-institutional level is identified as the weakest due to regulatory ambiguity and overlapping institutional authority, which may undermine democratic oversight and impede media control functions. The study concludes that Article 50B paragraph 2 (c) of the Broadcasting Act has the potential to threaten democratic sustainability. It therefore recommends a reassessment of the law and the article, as well as strengthening institutional coordination to harmonize regulations.

Keywords: Broadcasting Bill, Investigative Journalism, Democratic Resilience, Media Regulation, Institutional Coordination.

Introduction

In March 2024, the Indonesian Parliament proposed a revision of the Broadcasting Law to adapt the regulations to the dynamics of the rapidly growing digital landscape (Haidar, 2024). The basic idea for this reform arose because the development of streaming services and social media has created a variety of new challenges, while the 2002 Broadcasting Law has not fully addressed these issues. The existence of digital technology has triggered a surge in the use of online platforms, so policymakers believe that more adaptive regulations need to be formulated immediately. The Broadcasting Bill aims to ensure that all content, both conventional and digital, meets information standards that prioritize the public interest.

The government wants to formulate policies that provide legal protection for the public and open space for healthy competition in the broadcasting industry. The push to strengthen accountability and information integrity is increasingly relevant as public access to digital media reaches 79% of the total population (RG, 2024). In this Bill, one of the articles that caused controversy was Article 50B paragraph 2 (c), which contains a prohibition on "exclusive investigative journalism". The DPR believes that this regulation will promote a diversity of perspectives and avoid a monopoly of information by one or a handful of media (MetroTV, 2024). However, the Press Council and various press organizations see these restrictions as having the potential to limit the scope of investigative journalism, which serves as one of the pillars of public control in a democracy (Dewi, 2024). These disagreements have led to debates about freedom of expression, the public's right to information, and the state's responsibility to uphold broadcasting ethics.

The Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (KPI) welcomes the revision of the Broadcasting Law because the digital format is increasingly determining the pattern of information consumption (RG, 2024). KPI believes that Law No. 32 of 2002 is no longer sufficient to regulate the transition from conventional broadcasting to massive digital platforms. KPI also considers the need for a fair mechanism to maintain the quality of content so as not to mislead the public. However, the discourse on restrictions on "exclusive screenings of investigative journalism" raises questions about the risk of silencing the press.

According to the Press Council, Article 50B paragraph 2 (c) is in conflict with Article 4 Paragraph (2) of the Press Law No. 40 of 1999, and reflects interventions that interfere with the independence of the press (Dewi, 2024).The role of the KPI highlighted in the bill also raised objections, as the Press Council has been given the authority to resolve press disputes in accordance with Article 15 paragraph 2 of the Press Law. The Indonesian Student Press Association (APMI) also highlighted the threat of curtailing academic freedom if investigative journalism on campus is hampered by overly strict regulations (Mahendra, 2024).

The Indonesian Journalists Association (PWI) has expressed concerns that this policy may impede the role of the media as a fundamental pillar of democracy. The Alliance of Independent Journalists (AJI) has expressed concerns that the prohibition on " exclusive investigative journalism" hinders journalists' capacity to expose strategic issues and diminishes their influence over government entities (Mahendra, 2024). This critical stance underscores the notion that investigative journalism plays a pivotal role in ensuring accountability and transparency (Carson, 2019). The controversy surrounding this issue has escalated, prompting the House of Representatives to postpone its deliberations on the Broadcasting Bill in May 2024, thereby creating an opportunity for dialogue with all relevant stakeholders (Saputra et al., 2024).

A multitude of studies have demonstrated that Article 50B paragraph 2 (c) of the Broadcasting Bill possesses the capacity to exert a substantial influence on the domains of freedom of expression and creativity in broadcasting. Research by Wahyuanto et al. (2024) and Mustafa & Saumantri (2024) shows that this regulatory framework can limit investigative journalism, which is an important tool for social control. Research by Pattiasina & Triadi (2024) shows that it is important to balance freedom of expression and broadcasting responsibility. This is because excessive censorship could threaten pluralism.At the same time, research by Zuliantino et al. (2024) shows that local media may resist regulatory measures that are considered too strict. Lasonda et al. (2024) also say that overly restrictive policies can stifle the creativity of content creators.

Contrary to the preceding research, which centers on the immediate consequences of broadcasting regulations, this research will systematically analyze the background of stakeholders' points of view towards the Broadcasting Bill, especially Article 50B paragraph 2 (c). This is necessary because the controversial article is complex and involves various stakeholders with different perspectives, requiring an approach that can systematically identify differences in viewpoints (Dunn, 2017; Gualtieri & Lurati, 2024). This study will analyze the differences and similarities of these points of view in the perspective of democratic resilience.

Croissant and Lott, (2024) define democratic resilience as the ability of a democratic system to withstand challenges and pressures in a peaceful way through democratic participation. They say there are three parts of democratic resilience. First, continuity, which means that the political system can handle pressure without significantly changing the quality or character of the regime. Second, there is resistance, which shows the ability of the democratic system to limit the negative impact of a

shock so that even though the quality of democracy is eroded, the system can still maintain its core identity as a minimal democratic regime. Third, there is the ability to bounce back, which allows the political system to recover after a crisis and return to the same or a higher level of democratic quality than before.

In this context, Article 50B paragraph 2 (c), which prohibits "exclusive investigative journalism," has given rise to concerns from various parties because it has the potential to limit the function of the press. This restriction, within the framework of Croissant and Lott, can be expected to influence the continuation of democracy. This study aims to synthesize the background of the problem of the Broadcasting Bill, especially regarding Article 50B paragraph 2 (c), and propose policy recommendations from the perspective of democratic resilience.

Theoretical Framework

Croissant and Lott (2024) developed a four-level framework to measure the capacity of democratic systems to withstand shocks, with a number of indicators at each level. At the macro-institutional level, they emphasize the importance of core procedural rules and institutions that form the foundation of democratic systems. This level is assessed using three primary indicators: the stock of democracy, which reflects a nation's democratic experience and heritage; executive constraints, which evaluate the effectiveness of legislative and judicial oversight of the executive; and the rule of law, which quantifies the quality of protection of individual and collective rights within the legal system.

At the second level, the focus shifts to the analysis of political actors. In this section, Croissant and Lott direct their attention to the dynamics of political parties as pivotal actors within a democratic system. To this end, they developed two significant indicators: the anti-pluralist party index, which serves to evaluate the degree to which political parties adhere to the principles of pluralism and the democratic process; and the level of political polarization, a metric designed to assess the intensity of division and antagonism among the various political factions within the party system.

At the third level, the focus shifts to civic culture and civil society as indispensable components of democratic resilience. This level is assessed through two indicators: the resilience of civil society, which evaluates the vitality and dynamism of society in promoting democratic values, and the distribution of power resources, which quantifies the equitable access and involvement of diverse social groups in the political process.

The fourth and final level is the political community of citizens, which emphasizes the importance of social cohesion and democratic legitimacy. The two main indicators at this level are political trust, which measures the level of trust citizens have in political institutions, and trust in democracy, which assesses how deeply citizens and elites believe in the democratic system itself.

Utilizing the four analytical levels proposed by Croissant and Lott, the present study will examine the background of the article, titled "Exclusive Screening of Investigative Journalism," to ascertain its potential influence on the resilience of democracy in Indonesia.

Material and Methodology

This study uses a qualitative approach with data collection techniques through document studies. The analyzed data is secondary data from online sources for the period from May 2024 to November 2024.The data sources include news articles from national media (Kompas, CNN Indonesia, Tempo, Suara.com, and Viva.co.id), official documents from state institutions (DPR RI), and press releases from professional organizations and stakeholders (Press Council, AJI, and PWI). Table 1 shows all the information about where the data came from.

Table 1. Research Data Sources

Date	Title of	Source of
13-05-2024	Threat to Freedom of the Press...	https://www.suara.com/tekno/2024/05/13/230619/tak-hanya-batasi-netflix-cs-ruu-penyiaran-juga-akan-bungkam-kebebasan-pers
14-05-2024	Press Freedom Under Threat...	Press Releases Press Council

14-05-2024	Background to the Debate...	No. 4/SP/DP/5/2024
14-05-2024	Sukamta Explains the Ban...	https://emedia.dpr.go.id/2024/05/15/tb-hasanuddin-sampaikan-latar-belakang-munculnya-polemik-jurnalistik-investigasi-di-ruu-penyiaran
15-05-2024	Broadcasting Bill Violates...	https://emedia.dpr.go.id/2024/05/14/sukamta-jelaskan-larangan-konten-jurnalistik-investigasi-di-ruu-penyiaran
16-05-2024	The State Restricts Freedom...	PWI Electronic Document
21-05-2024	The Spirit of Journalism is Threatened...	https://aji.or.id/informasi/revisi-undang-undang-penyiaran-melanggengkan-kegemaran-negara-dalam-membatasi-kebebasan
26-05-2024	Highlighting Controversial Articles...	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9m9MdRM6E2w
14-06-2024	Member of Commission I of the Indonesian Parliament says...	https://www.kompas.tv/nasional/515384/anggota-komisi-i-dpr-sebut-ruu-penyiaran-tak-larang-jurnalisme-investigasi
14-06-2024	House of Representatives Commission I: Broadcasting Bill Not Intended...	https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20240614205959-32-1110146/komisi-i-dpr-ruu-penyiaran-tak-bermaksud-larang-tayangan-investigasi
15-06-2024	Restrictions on Investigative Journalism...	https://www.kompas.id/baca/polhuk/2024/06/15/mengatur-penyiaran-jangan-sampai-kebablasan-membungkam-pers
15-06-2024	House of Representatives Commission I Claims...	https://www.viva.co.id/berita/nasional/1723477-komisi-i-dpr-klaim-tak-laramg-jurnalisme-investigasi-tapi-diatur-ekslusifnya
18-11-2024	KPI Encourages Revision of...	https://kpi.go.id/id/umum/38-dalam-negeri/37575-kpi-dorong-revisi-uu-penyiaran?detail5=23871

Source: Different news sites, online documents, and official government and community websites.

The data will undergo processing with First Cycle Coding (Miles et al., 2014), a labeling technique that organizes stakeholders' statements contained within the document into categories based on the primary subject of discussion, the salient terms, and the values being contested. Subsequent to this, the second cycle coding (Miles et al., 2014) employs pattern coding to identify patterns and organize the initial codes into categories that are more meaningful to certain aspects.

This coding will flow systematically in Assumptional Analysis procedure (Dunn, 2017), namely: First, stakeholders related to Article 50B, paragraph 2, letter C of the Broadcasting Bill are identified and prioritized (Stakeholder identification). Second, assumptions from available statements are revealed (Assumption surfacing). Third, supporting or rejecting views are contrasted (Assumption challenging). Fourth, conflicting views are gathered (Assumption pooling). Fifth, the most balanced compromise is found and recommendations are made according to the research objectives (Assumption synthesis).

Result and Discussion

Stakeholder Identification

Stakeholder identification is important to understand the dynamics of interests and influences of different parties in this policy process. Based on data obtained from various national media sources and official documentation, there are several key actors involved in this policy discourse.

Table 2. Stakeholder Identification

Stakeholder	Job Identification	Identification Categories

Bobby Adhityo Rizaldi	Member of Commission I of the Indonesian Parliament	Policy Drafters
TB Hasanuddin	Member of Parliament Commission I	Policy Drafters
Sukamta	Member of Parliament Commission I	Policy Drafters
Ubaidillah	Chairman of the Central KPI	Media Supervisors
I Gusti Agung Gede Agung Widiana Kepakisan	Coordinator of the Supervision Division of KPI Bali	Media Supervisors
Dewan Pers	Independent Institution	Press Authorities
PWI	Journalist Professional Organization	Professional Associations
AJI	Journalist Professional Organization	Professional Associations
Ambros Boni	Secretary of IJTI Bali Province	Professional Associations
Yovantra Arief	Executive Director of Remotiv	Media Observers
Deolipa Yumara	Legal Practitioner	Practitioners
Hufron	Constitutional Law Expert, Untag	Academics

Source: Author's edits.

The policy drafting group comes from Commission I of the Indonesian Parliament, which is in charge of defense, foreign affairs, communication, and information technology. Bobby Adhityo Rizaldi, TB Hasanuddin and Sukamta as members of Commission I of the Indonesian Parliament have the authority in law making, supervision and budgeting related to the fields of communication and informatics. Commission I of the Indonesian Parliament is responsible for the legislative process of the Broadcasting Law as part of its legislative function.

The media regulatory body is represented by the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (KPI), which is an independent state institution. The KPI has the duty and authority to regulate and supervise broadcasting in Indonesia, ensuring that broadcast content complies with applicable standards and ethics. Ubaidillah serves as the chairman of the central KPI, which oversees broadcasting at the national level, while I Gusti Agung Gede Agung Widiana Kepakisan serves as the coordinator of the KPI's supervisory division at the Bali provincial level.

Professional associations and press authorities represent the interests of media professionals and journalists. The Press Council, as an independent institution, is tasked with developing press freedom and improving the life of the national press. PWI is the oldest journalist organization in Indonesia that focuses on improving the professionalism of journalists. AJI is a professional organization of journalists that fights for press freedom and professionalism. IJTI is a special forum for television journalists that focuses on the development of broadcast journalism.

From the group of media observers, practitioners and academics, Remotivi acts as a center for media and communication studies that conducts monitoring and critical analysis of media developments in Indonesia. Deolipa Yumara provides the perspective of a legal practitioner who understands the law aspects of media regulation. Hufron, as an academic from the University August 17, 1945 Surabaya, provides a study from the perspective of constitutional law on the constitutional implications of broadcasting regulation.

In the context of prioritization, political groups have the greatest influence due to their structural position in the legislative process. Media regulators are a close second priority due to their implementation and oversight role. Press authorities and professional associations are the third priority due to their role in representing and advocating the interests of media practitioners. Media observers, practitioners and academics play a fourth priority role in providing critical review and substantive input to policy.

Assumption surfacing

The dynamics of the discussion of this bill involve various parties with different interests and perspectives, ranging from policy drafters, media observers to press practitioners and associations.

Analysis of these assumptions is important to understand the basis for consideration and the implications of the proposed policy.

Table 3. Stakeholder Statement

Stakeholder	Key Statement	Category (Keyword)	Position
Bobby Adhityo Rizaldi	"...this exclusive investigative journalism is not prohibited, but rather restricted","...broadcasting rights or he is protected"	Law ("Prohibited"), Management ("Broadcast Rights")	Pro
TB Hasanuddin	"...journalistic investigations that overlap with investigations need a counterbalance"	Law ("Investigation")	Pro
Sukamta	"...the use of public frequencies for broadcasting gossip with exclusive rights"	Management ("public frequency", "exclusive rights")	Pro
Ubaidillah	"...KPI needs to strengthen its institutional and authority in overseeing new media platforms"	Management ("institutional")	Pro
I Gusti Agung Gede Agung Widiana Kepakisan	"...KPI never proposed these controversial articles."	Politics ("controversial articles")	Cons
Dewan Pers	"...press freedom and freedom of expression must not be rolled back"	Law ("press freedom")	Cons
PWI	"...the bill violates the press law and needs improvement"	Law ("violates the press law")	Cons
AJI	"...the ban is a form of the government's reluctance to make improvements"	Politics ("government reluctance")	Cons
Ambros Boni	."..journalists are ostracized and public access is hindered"	Social ("public access")	Cons
Yovantra Arief	"...the ban has the potential to restrict the public's right to diverse content"	Law ("public rights"), Social ("diverse content")	Cons
Deolipa Yumara	"...the word exclusive is open to multiple interpretations"	Law ("multi-interpretation")	Cons
Hufron	"...investigation is the spirit of journalism that cannot be banned... strange in a democratic country"	Law ("prohibited"), Politics ("democracy")	Cons

Source: Author's edits.

The analysis of stakeholder statements reveals several important patterns in the debate on Article 50B paragraph 2 (c) of the Broadcasting Act. Bobby A. R., as a policy maker identified in the group of legislators, stated: "This is what we want this exclusive investigative journalism to be, ... not prohibited, but restricted". This statement reflects two aspects: the law aspect is seen from the discussion of the concept of prohibition, which is a legal instrument to limit actions, while the management aspect arises when he discusses the exclusive rights of the first media, which is the concept of intellectual property rights management in the media industry.

TB Hasanuddin in his statement "... journalistic investigations, ... intersect ... investigations ... law enforcement officials" shows a pure focus on the law category. This can be seen in his discussion of the investigation process, which is part of the criminal justice system. Meanwhile, Sukamta stated "...the public's frequency... of broadcasting gossip with exclusive rights," which clearly points to the management category because it discusses the management of public resources in the form of frequency and regulation of broadcasting rights.

The media monitoring group took a different approach. Ubaidillah from the Central KPI stated, "...revision, KPI...strong institutional and authority,...proportional rules on new media platforms". This statement falls under the management category because it discusses strengthening the

organization and oversight system, which is an aspect of institutional management. Contrary to I Gusti Agung Widiana of KPI Bali, who stated, "KPI has never proposed, ... these articles. This statement falls under the political category because it concerns the policy-making process and the institution's position in the process.

The Press Council stated, "... the press and the public want independence... in accordance with journalistic principles..." This statement is in the purely law category because it discusses the freedom of the press, which is a fundamental legal concept guaranteed by the Constitution and the Press Law, and alludes to the rules and responsibilities that are aspects of media regulation. The Indonesian Journalists Association (Persatuan Wartawan Indonesia, or PWI) issued a statement: "...Article 50B paragraph 2 (c)...violation of Article 4 paragraph (2) of Law No. 40 of 1999 on the Press".

This statement clearly falls under the law category because it specifically discusses the conflict between legal products and uses formal legal argumentation. AJI issued a statement calling "... exclusive journalistic broadcasts... a manifestation of the government's reluctance to make improvements". This statement falls into the political category because it analyzes the motives and attitudes of the government in policy making and highlights the power relations between the government and the press.

Ambros Boni of IJTI made a statement that "... if investigative programs no longer exist, then the first thing to fall is the journalist's crown, ... the public's right to access information is hampered". This statement falls into the social category because it discusses the social impact of policies on the profession of journalism and public access to information, which are aspects of social dynamics.

Yovantra A. made a complex statement: "These bans have the potential to limit the public's right to diverse content". The law aspect is seen from the discussion of public rights, which is a fundamental law concept, while the social dimension arises when he discusses the diversity of content, which is an aspect of the social dynamics of society in access to information.

Deolipa Y. stated "...exclusive words,...not discussed...these are words that are open to multiple interpretations". This statement falls under the law category because it discusses the clarity of definitions in legal products, which is an important aspect in the formulation of regulations to avoid different interpretations in their application. Hufron made the statement "journalistic investigation ... strategically important ... the crown ... this journalism was then banned ... strange in a democratic country". This statement combines two categories, namely the law aspect, which can be seen from the discussion of the ban, which is a regulatory instrument, while the political aspect arises when it is related to the concept of a democratic state, which is a political system.

The analysis of this keyword shows that not all actors who initially appeared to have a dual perspective actually used arguments from two different categories. Only Bobby A.R., Yovantra A. and Hufron explicitly showed the use of keywords from two different categories in their statements. This finding makes it clear how stakeholders construct their arguments based on certain aspects and their position on the Broadcasting Bill.

Assumption challenging

Article 50B paragraph 2 (c) of the Broadcasting Bill has led to a polarization of views reflecting different interests and perspectives on the regulation of investigative journalism. Stakeholders construct their arguments based on law, media management, political and social impact perspectives.

Table 4. Comparison of Views

Assumption	Law	Management	Politics	Social
Pro	Restriction Not Prohibition (BAR, TBH)	Broadcasting Rights Protection (BAR, SKM, UB)	Strengthening Supervision (UB)	-
Cons	Press Law Violations (DP, PWI, DY, HUF)	-	Regulatory Disagreement (GAW, AJI)	Threats to Public Access (AB, YA)

Remarks: BAR (Bobby Adhityo Rizaldi), TBH (TB Hasanuddin), SKM (Sukamta), UB (Ubaidillah), DY (Deolipa Yumara), DP (Press Council), PWI (Indonesian Journalists Association), HUF (Hufron), YA

(Yovantra Arief), AB (Ambros Boni), AJI (Alliance of Independent Journalists), GAW (I Gusti Agung Widiana). Source: Author's edits

BAR and TBH constructed an argument that gave rise to the theme of "restriction not prohibition" in law terms. BAR explicitly stated that "this exclusive investigative journalism is not prohibited, but rather restricted" to protect the publisher's rights. TBH reinforced this argument by emphasizing the need for a balance when investigations overlap with inquiries, showing that both see restrictions as regulatory tools different from outright bans.

The issue of "violation of the press law" was strongly reflected in the arguments of four personalities who rejected regulation from a law perspective. DP stressed that the regulation was a setback for democratic life, while PWI explicitly stated that the article violated the press law. DY and HUF reinforced this criticism by questioning the multiple interpretations of the regulation and emphasizing that the ban on investigations contradicts the principles of a democratic country, showing that they see this article as a serious threat to the foundations of the press law.

In the field of media management, the issue of "protection of broadcasting rights" emerged from the views of three supporters of the regulation. BAR talked about the urgency of protecting the publishing rights of the media that first conducted the investigation. SKM stressed the importance of regulating the use of public frequencies, while UB urged proportionate rules for new media platforms. Interestingly, there was no argumentation from the counterpart in the management category, indicating that the debate on media management aspects was dominated by the pro-regulation side.

The political theme is seen in the contrast between "strengthening supervision" and "regulatory disapproval". UB emphasizes the need to strengthen the KPI institution as a media watchdog in the digital era. On the other hand, GAW firmly stated that KPI had never proposed the controversial article, while AJI saw it as a manifestation of the government's reluctance to reform, showing political opposition in the regulatory formation process.

The social dimension was strongly voiced by the opposition through the issue of "threat to public access". AB warned that the regulation would hamper public access to information uncovered by journalistic investigations. YA reinforced this argument by highlighting the potential restriction of the public's right to receive diverse content. Both figures showed that the social impact of the regulation would have a significant effect on the quality of information received by the public.

The overall mapping shows that the pro-regulation side builds arguments that focus more on aspects of media regulation and governance, such as the protection of broadcasting rights and the strengthening of supervision. Meanwhile, the counter-arguments are more diverse, covering law, political and broader social impacts. This difference in focus reflects a fundamental difference in perspective on the role of the media in democracy, with one side emphasizing the importance of regulating broadcasting rights and authorities, while the other side emphasizes the broader implications for democratic life and access to public information.

Assumption pooling

Based on the statements listed in Table 3 and Table 4 on the comparison of views, there are differences and similarities in law and social aspects. The following is a combination of assumptions that show the similarities and differences between those who support and those who oppose the article:

Tabel 5. Overlapping Assumptions

Assumption	Law	Social
Differences	Restriction is not prohibition	No significant impact
	Violation of Press Law	Threat to public access
Similarities	Need for clarity in media regulation	Importance of public access to information
	Compliance with the law	Protecting the public interest

Conclusion	There is no common ground between the concepts of limitation and infringement.	No agreement on social impact

Source: Author's edits

Table 5 shows the differences and similarities in law and social aspects. The difference in the law aspects between "restriction not prohibition" and "violation of the press law" is due to different interpretations. BAR believes that restrictions are necessary to protect the rights of publishers, while TBH emphasizes the need for a counterbalance when investigations overlap with inquiries. On the other hand, DP and PWI see it as a violation of the press law because it has the potential to hinder the freedom of the press guaranteed by the Constitution.

The difference in the social aspect between "no significant impact" and "threat to public access" reflects the gap in perspectives on the impact of regulation. This difference arises because UB from KPI believes that regulation will strengthen the control of new media platforms without disrupting access to information. In contrast, AB from IJTI warns that regulation will hamper public access to investigative information, while YA highlights the potential for limiting the public's right to diverse content.

The similarity in the law aspects of "need for clarity in media regulation" and "respect for the law system" arises because all parties recognize the importance of a clear law framework. This can be seen in DY's argument that questions the multiple interpretations in the regulation, while BAR also emphasizes the importance of clarity of boundaries in the regulation. Despite their different positions, both want regulations that do not create confusion in their implementation.

Similarities in the social aspects of "The importance of public access to information" and "Protecting the public interest" arise because both parties prioritize the public interest. This is reflected in the DP's statement emphasizing the public's right to information in accordance with journalistic principles, while the KPI also emphasizes the importance of maintaining the quality of content so as not to mislead the public.

The conclusion of the table shows that no meeting point has been reached due to fundamental differences in the interpretation of restrictions and their social impact. Pro-regulation parties such as BAR and TBH see restrictions as a protective tool, while opponents such as DP, PWI and AJI see them as a threat to press freedom and public rights. However, a common view on the importance of law clarity and the protection of public interests can be a basis for further discussion.

Discussion

From a macro-institutional perspective, political groups represented by members of the House of Representatives such as Bobby Adhityo Rizaldi, TB Hasanuddin and Sukamta show weak indicators in the context of executive restrictions and the rule of law. This can be seen in their arguments, which tend to limit press freedom through regulations that have the potential to hamper the media's function as a check on power. For example, although Bobby Adhityo Rizaldi states that investigative journalism is "not banned, but rather restricted," these restrictions may actually weaken the media's function of monitoring the executive (Solis & Zvobgo, 2023). TB Hasanuddin's statement that "journalistic investigations that overlap with investigations need a counterbalance" also indicates a tendency to limit the press's room for maneuver in monitoring power.

At the level of political actors, the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (KPI), represented by Ubaidillah and I Gusti Agung Widiana Kepakisan, shows ambiguous indicators in the context of political polarization. Ubaidillah supports strengthening the KPI institution to oversee new media platforms, which can be interpreted as an effort to strengthen democratic oversight. However, I Gusti Agung took a different position, stating that the KPI had never proposed these controversial articles. These differences of opinion reflect the internal polarization within the media regulatory body, which may affect the effectiveness of its democratic oversight function.

At the level of civic culture and civil society, professional associations and press authorities such as the Press Council, PWI, AJI and IJTI show strong indicators of resilience. These organizations actively fight for democratic values by rejecting articles that are considered to limit

press freedom. This action is a way of protecting democratic space and preventing the consolidation of authoritarian power (Lee & Chan, 2023). For example, the Press Council emphasized that "press freedom and freedom of expression should not be rolled back," while the Indonesian Journalists Association criticized the bill for violating the press law. The Indonesian Journalists Association even saw the ban as "a manifestation of the government's reluctance to reform," demonstrating the critical role of civil society in monitoring government policies.

At the level of the political community, media watch groups, practitioners and academics such as Yovantra Arief, Deolipa Yumara and Hufron provide critical but constructive indicators of political trust. Yovantra Arief is concerned about the potential restriction of the public's right to diverse content, while Deolipa Yumara criticizes the unclear definition of "exclusive" that can lead to multiple interpretations. Hufron, as an academic, even emphasized that the ban on journalistic investigations is strange in a democratic country. These critical views reflect a healthy level of political trust, where citizens dare to criticize policies that are considered a threat to democratic values (Hooghe et al., 2017).

Synthetic Assumption

Based on a comparative analysis of Croissant and Lott's views and framework of democratic resilience, the macro-institutional level is identified as the weakest level and needs to be strengthened. This is evidenced by several problematic indicators in the aspects of rule of law and executive limitations, which reflect gaps in the foundation of the democratic system.

In the rule of law aspect, the weakness is seen in the lack of clarity and potential overlap between the Broadcasting Law and the Press Law No. 40 of 1999. This conflict is reflected in the findings of conflicting views, where all parties recognize the need for clarity in media regulation and compliance with the legal system, but are still trapped in the dichotomy between the concepts of restrictions and prohibitions. Proponents of regulation, such as Bobby Adhityo Rizaldi, emphasize restrictions as a protective tool, while opponents, such as the Press Council, see them as a threat to press freedom. This regulatory disharmony illustrates the weak coordination between institutions in a democratic legal system. Weak coordination can lead to chaos and inefficiency in enforcement (Larcom & Swanson, 2015). Regulatory inconsistencies can lead to conflicts and settlements between regulators and courts (Silva & Guimaraes, 2024).

In the context of executive restrictions, the weakness is seen in the absence of a clear check and balance mechanism between KPI and the Press Council in media supervision. Ubaidillah of the KPI emphasized the importance of institutional strengthening to oversee new media platforms, but press organizations such as PWI and AJI were concerned about the potential for press suppression. The lack of clarity in the division of powers reflects weaknesses in the democratic oversight system that should ensure a balance between regulation and freedom. Overlap between agencies can lead to inefficiency and bureaucratic dysfunction (Kwon, 2024). When clear lines of authority are blurred, it becomes difficult for the public to engage meaningfully, leading to reduced trust in regulatory institutions (Lemos, 2017).

In strengthening the resilience of democracy at the macro-institutional level, the most balanced and evolving view is one that focuses on the clarity of media regulation and the protection of the public interest - two areas where all stakeholders have common ground. In terms of media regulation, it is necessary to develop a legal framework that accommodates the interests of all parties, taking into account the Press Law and the principles of press freedom, while providing legal certainty on clear boundaries for investigative reporting. Clear legal protections for press freedom are necessary to safeguard journalists from undue interference and to support their role in a democratic society (Pender, 2023).

There is also a need to strengthen institutional coordination by establishing a coordination mechanism between the National Broadcasting Commission and the Press Council in the oversight of investigative content. This mechanism must have a clear division of authority between broadcasting and journalistic aspects to avoid overlapping authorities that can hamper journalistic work and media oversight. The development of common technical guidelines that take into account the need to protect the broadcasting rights of the media while ensuring public access to investigative information is also important to provide operational certainty for all stakeholders. The implementation of a structured framework within the collaborative process enables stakeholders to quickly understand the

ramifications of the proposed requirements. This approach fosters critical reflection, negotiation, and transparent dialogue, thereby facilitating the articulation of diverse perspectives (Okeyo et al., 2020).

By strengthening the macro-institutional level through the development of this balanced view, it is hoped that a stronger foundation can be laid for the resilience of democracy in the context of media regulation in Indonesia. This will support the creation of a healthy media ecosystem where public interest, press freedom and the need for regulation can work in harmony within the framework of a sustainable democracy.

Recommendations

The DPR and the Press Council must establish a regular consultation mechanism to harmonize the Broadcasting Bill with the Press Law. This consultation should involve stakeholders from different backgrounds to ensure the creation of balanced regulations. The consultation forum can use the meeting points of "media regulatory clarity" and "protection of public interests" as a basis for constructive dialogue.

KPI and the Press Council should form a joint working team to formulate standards for monitoring investigative content in the digital age. This team can develop clear criteria on the limits of exclusive broadcasting rights without hampering the function of investigative journalism. The division of powers between the two institutions needs to be clarified to avoid overlaps that could interfere with the journalistic process and media oversight.

The government must encourage the formation of a multi-stakeholder forum involving academics, media practitioners and civil society to study the impact of regulations on the resilience of democracy. This forum can conduct periodic studies on the effectiveness of regulations in maintaining the balance between public interest and press freedom. The results of the study can be used as input for improving regulations in the future.

Conclusions

The results of the research into the background of the problems of the 2024 Broadcasting Law Revision, in particular Article 50B paragraph 2 (c), show potential threats to the sustainability of democracy, because the construction of the assumptions from the article has a weak point at the level of macro-institutional analysis. Croissant and Lott's analytical framework shows that regulatory ambiguity and overlapping authority between institutions can weaken the democratic oversight system and hamper the media's watchdog function, which has become an important pillar in the resilience of Indonesian democracy after the reform.

The government and the House of Representatives need to review the Broadcasting Law by considering strengthening institutional coordination and protecting the function of the press in a democratic system. Regulatory harmonization involving various stakeholders is key to ensuring that the resulting rules can strengthen the resilience of democracy in the digital age. Balancing the need for media oversight and ensuring press freedom must be a priority for building a sustainable democratic ecosystem in the face of the dynamics of technological change and global challenges.

References

Amrihani, H. A., & Ritonga, R. (2021). Freedom of the Press Regulations in Indonesia and Sweden: Limited but Free. *Jurnal Komunikasi Ikatan Sarjana Komunikasi Indonesia*, *6*(2), 353–361. https://doi.org/10.25008/jkiski.v6i2.609

Carson, A. (2019). Investigative journalism, democracy and the digital age. In *Investigative Journalism, Democracy and the Digital Age*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315514291

Croissant, A., & Lott, L. (2024). *Democratic Resilience in the TwentyFirst Century Search for an analytical framework and explorative analysis*. V-Dem Institute.

Dunn, W. N. (2017). *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction* (3rd ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.

Eka Yudha Saputra, Defara Dhanya Papamitha, & Hendrik Khoirul Muhid. (2024, May 28). *Menerka Nasib Revisi UU Penyiaran Usai Ditunda Baleg DPR Hari Ini*. Tempo.Co. https://www.tempo.co/hukum/menerka-nasib-revisi-uu-penyiaran-usai-ditunda-baleg-dpr-hari-ini-54743

Fahri Haidar. (2024, March 19). *Belum Akomodasi Perkembangan Teknologi, DPR Dorong Revisi UU Penyiaran*. Telusur.Co.Id. https://telusur.co.id/detail/belum-akomodasi-perkembangan-teknologi-dpr-dorong-revisi-uu-penyiaran

Gualtieri, G., & Lurati, F. (2024). Seeing through a polarized world: a narrative approach to understanding stakeholders. *Journal of Communication Management*. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-12-2023-0130

Hooghe, M., Marien, S., & Oser, J. (2017). Great expectations: the effect of democratic ideals on political trust in European democracies. *Contemporary Politics*, *23*(2), 214–230. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569775.2016.1210875

Kwon, J. (2024). Jurisdictional overlap: The juxtaposition of institutional independence and collaboration in police wrongdoing investigations. *Regulation and Governance*, *18*(2), 551–572. https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12532

Larcom, S., & Swanson, T. (2015). Documenting legal dissonance: Legal pluralism in Papua New Guinea. *Review of Law and Economics*, *11*(1), 25–50. https://doi.org/10.1515/rle-2013-0013

Lasonda, D., Ariningdyah, C., Rahmah, S. M., Miarsa, F. R. D., & Asyraf, A. F. (2024). Analisis Yuridis Terkait Asas Kebebasan Berekspresi dalam Rancangan UndangUndang Penyiaran Terhadap Pembuat Konten. *Halu Oleo Law Review*, *8*(2), 242–257.

Lee, F. L. F., & Chan, C.-K. (2023). Legalization of press control under democratic backsliding: The case of post-national security law Hong Kong. *Media, Culture and Society*, *45*(5), 916–931. https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437221140525

Lemos, M. H. (2017). Democratic enforcement? Accountability and independence for the litigation state. *Cornell Law Review*, *102*(4), 929–1002. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85016950091&partnerID=40&md5=6bd97e1a9bae4ada87455b9144366f65

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Mustafa, R. A., & Saumantri, T. (2024). Kerusakan Modal Sosial Pers Indonesia Akibat RUU Penyiaran: Analis Teori Bordieu. *JSPH: Jurnal Sosial Politik Humaniora*, *1*(1), 1–11.

Ni Kadek Trisna Cintya Dewi. (2024, May 15). *Dewan Pers Tegas Tolak RUU Penyiaran, Ini 7 Poin Catatannya*. Tempo.Co. https://www.tempo.co/hukum/dewan-pers-tegas-tolak-ruu-penyiaran-ini-7-poin-catatannya-58799

Okeyo, I., Lehmann, U., & Schneider, H. (2020). The impact of differing frames on early stages of intersectoral collaboration: The case of the First 1000 Days Initiative in the Western Cape Province. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, *18*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-019-0508-0

Pattiasina, R. J., & Triadi, I. (2024). Membedah RUU Penyiaran: Ancaman terhadap Kebebasan Pers di Indonesia. *Quantum Juris: Jurnal Hukum Modern*, *6*(3).

Pender, K. (2023). Protecting Press Freedom through Human Rights Charters in Australia. *Melbourne University Law Review*, *47*(1), 192–228.

RG. (2024, March 19). *RUU Penyiaran Harus Segera Disahkan*. KPI. https://www.kpi.go.id/id/umum/38-dalam-negeri/37382-ruu-penyiaran-harus-segera-disahkan

Rizky Adha Mahendra. (2024, May 27). *Ini Tuntutan Massa Demo Tolak Revisi UU Penyiaran*. Detik.Com. https://news.detik.com/berita/d-7360541/ini-tuntutan-massa-demo-tolak-revisi-uu-penyiaran

Silva, J., & Guimaraes, T. A. (2024). Clashes and agreements between regulatory agencies and courts: The influence on regulatory governance. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *90*(3), 529–545. https://doi.org/10.1177/00208523231210478

Solis, J. A., & Zvobgo, K. (2023). Defending the watchdogs: How citizens and courts protect the press. *Journal of Human Rights*, *22*(3), 367–385. https://doi.org/10.1080/14754835.2022.2151834

Wahyuanto, E., Mintarti, A., Heriyanto, H., Hastuti, S., & Widodo, J. D. T. (2024). Jurnalisme Investigasi dalam Perspektif Draf UU Penyiaran dan Implikasinya. *Jurnal Review Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran (JRPP)*, *7*(3), 7358–7367.

Zuliantino, T., Murdiati, E., & Hamandia, M. R. (2024). Analisis Wacana Kritis Teun Van Dijk Tentang Pemberitaan RUU Penyiaran Di Detik Sumsel. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi Dan Sosial Politik*, *2*(2), 266–284.