Bourdieu and Media Theory: Explaining Media's Changes and Continuities in The Post Authoritarian Countries

Wijayanto Universitas Diponegoro, Indonesia

Abstract

What happens to the media after the regime changes from authoritarian to the democratic system? Would the media also change accordingly and automatically become free after the regime's change? Furthermore, what are the forces within and outside the media that influence these changes? This paper aims to review the exiting literatures in the post authoritarian Latin America and Southeast Asia to answer the questions. As a method, this study conducts a critical literature review. This study found that there is agreement among scholars that regime's change didn't automatically lead to more free reporting. However, debate is going on about what factors influence the degree of change or continuity with regard to media freedom in post-authoritarian settings. In this regard, scholars have been divided to a theoretical dichotomy. In one hand, there are groups of scholars who believe that political economy factors are the main factors that influence degrees of media freedom. In another hand, there are scholars who believe that cultural factors are more influential. Borrowing the theory of Pierre Bourdie, French sociologists who also concern about this issue, the paper argues that his theory on media' change can be used as a theoretical framework to examine the media's changes and overcome the existing theoretical dichotomies.

INTRODUCTION

What happens to the media after the regime changes from authoritarian to the democratic system? Would the media automatically change accordingly and become free after the regime's change?

What are the factors that influence the changes? This question is highly relevant to understand the Indonesian media which previously lived after decades of authoritarian regime from the period of guided democracy under President Sukarno (1959-1965) to the New Order period. Indonesia didn't have a democratic political system until the mid of 1998 when the authoritarian President Suharto was pushed to resign from power by the massive people's protests.

Theory on the media living under authoritarian regime has actually been

---

Wijayanto is a lecturer in Media and Democracy at the Department of Politics and Government, Diponegoro University. He obtained doctoral degree at Leiden Institute for Area Studies (LIAS), Leiden University, the Netherlands in 2019.
He is the author of the article "Fearing the Majority: Catholic Media in Muslim Indonesia" published by the journal Media Asia in 2017. He wrote a PhD thesis entitled "Between Fear and Power: Kompas, Indonesia's Most Influential Daily Newspaper, 1965-2015" which investigated Kompas' biography, journalistic values and practices, with special emphasis on the newspaper's relationship with the power holders across different political regimes. Email: wijayanto@live.undip.ac.id.

long proposed under the concept of the authoritarian theory of the press. Among the four theories of the media, this authoritarian theory is seen as the most pervasive one both historically and geographically. Soon after the spreads of printing media in the western world, this theory began to influence the relationship between mass media and society in England for almost two centuries i.e. 16th-17th century (Sibert, Peterson & Schram, 1956).

This authoritarian theory has some sets of basic assumption about the nature of man, the nature of state and society, the relation of man to the state and society, and the nature of knowledge and of truth. In regard to the nature of man, this theory believes that a man has an extremely limited space to develop his potential and he can only achieve it by becoming a member of society. Only then his capacity to meet his aim would be much increased. Therefore, this theory believes that a group should sub ordinate individual as only through the group individual could reach his goal. Consequently, this theory believes that the state, which is seen as the highest expression of group organization, sub ordinate the individual. Individuals would be very much depending on the state in

developing their attribute of civilized man. Meanwhile, in relation to knowledge and truth, this theory suggests that the effort to gain knowledge and truth would be best channeled through the state.

In relation to the mass media, this theory argues that mass media should support and advance the policies of the government in power so that the government can attain its purpose. State is seen as the only authority who knows what best for the society as a whole, and for the sake of the society state may control or interfere the mass media. The owner of the media can be the state or private enterprise as long as it has gained permission from the state. In order to control the media, state will grant publishing or printing license, government patents, censorship, prosecution before the courts and, if necessary, banning. In addition, state can also prosecute individual who is seen as violating the law, in which state will guide the interpretation of that law.

In contrast of the authoritarian theory, there is the so called as the libertarian theory of the press. Developed in England and the U.S on the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, this theory of the press is rooted in the libertarian philosophy, which believes that man is a

rational animal and is an end in himself (Sibert, Peterson & Schram, 1956). As a thinking organism, man has the capacity to make decision and to organize the world around him to advance his interest. In relation to the state and society, this theory believes that the ultimate goal of state or society is the happiness and wellbeing of man as an individual. Therefore, protection should be made from the society and state's tendency to take over major role and become an end in themselves. Meanwhile, in regard to the nature of knowledge and of truth, this theory follows the theological doctrines of early Christianity, which believes that the power to reason is God-given just to knowledge of good and evil. Thus, man could achieve knowledge and truth about the world around him through his reason based on the evidence of the senses and not merely based on the previous authority or tradition.

In regard to the relation between media and society, this theory makes three main important contributions through its insistence on the importance of the individual, the reliance on his power of reasoning, and the concepts of natural rights, in which freedom of religion, speech and press become a part. First, according to this theory, the main purpose of the mass media is to do check on the state in which no other institution can do. On the other hand, mass media also play additional functions to inform and to entertain the society, and to do advertisement so that they can assure their own financial independency. Second, this theory against state's monopoly on mass media and suggests that mass media institution should be owned by anyone, citizen or alien, who has inclination to do so and would compete each other in an open market of democratic capitalist society.

Third, this theory believes that control of the media should be given to *the self-righting process of truth* in free market place of ideas. This concept was introduced by John Milton in 1644 and it said that, "If we just let every individual expresses his idea to the mass media, it is the most reasonable idea, which eventually survives" (Sibert, Peterson & Schram, 1956). Furthermore, even though this theory aware that state through its all instrumentalities cannot avoid taking some parts in the communication process, it insists that the less governments involves in the process the better it gets.

However, the theories above don't provide sufficient answer as to what

happens to media after the democratic transition and the factors influencing it. Based on critical review of the literatures on media theories in Indonesia, Southeast Asia and post authoritarian countries, this study found that there is agreement among scholars that regime's change didn't automatically lead to more free reporting. However, debate is going on about what factors influence the degree of change or continuity with regard to media freedom in post-authoritarian settings. In this regard, scholars have been divided to a theoretical dichotomy. In one hand, there are groups of scholars who believe that political economy factors are the main factors that influence degrees of media freedom. In another hand, there are scholars who believe that cultural factors are more influential. Borrowing the theory of Pierre Bourdie, French sociologists who also concern about this issue, the paper argues that his theory on media' change can be used as a theoretical framework to examine the media's changes and overcome the existing theoretical dichotomies.

Political Economy Approaches

The first significant approach explaining journalism in post-authoritarian countries are the political economy theories. To put it briefly and without wishing to generalize, this perspective assumes that media owners, media producers, or media journalists are groups of actors whose actions are guided by the desire to maximize their private political economy interests. This private political economy interest then becomes the main driving force of news production, which ultimately manifests in the media content. The simplest version of this theory is often caricatured as a "conspiracy theory" in which there is "a ruling directorate of the capitalist class that dictates to the editors and the reporters what to run in newspapers" (Schudson, 1989). The more critical version of this theory argues that power holders are usually also economic conglomerates, or at least allied with them, and therefore might not implement such "vulgar" control of the media, but rather, exert influence through an ideological hegemony resulting in a situation where the media produce consent among "the public" to legitimize the existing political establishment (Laughey, 2007).

Regarding journalism in the post-authoritarian setting, the political economy theories argue that democratization don't automatically lead the media to become more free in its

reporting and playing role as critical watchdog of the power holders. They further propose that the factors preventing the media from fully functioning as a critical watchdog of the power holders are: media ownership by politicians or by media conglomerates who have close political ties with power holders; media dependency on financial support from the state or state advertising; media dependency on the state as a news source or for access of information; and market pressure or business competition between media groups. These political economy analyses also include threats of physical violence from intolerant, radical members of society. This was closely related to either the state's failure to establish law enforcement measures to secure journalists' safety, or the failure to implement such laws where they exist.

A study in line with this political economy approach can be found in the work of Waisbord in the case of four Latin American countries: Argentina, Brazil, Colombia and Peru (2000). In research that has been much cited by scholars studying journalism in the region, Waisbord proposed the convincing argument that after the fall of authoritarian regimes, there was a rise in watchdog journalism. However, the investigative model of watchdogging, which is believed by many scholars to be the true manifestation of watchdog journalism, did not occur in those aforementioned countries. Waisbord argues that financial dependency on state advertising as a key of source of revenue made the media hesitant to expose the wrongdoings of power holders.

This situation was made worse by journalists' reliance on sources from within the state to access information about the existence of corruption. This encouraged journalists not to be critical of elites in order to ensure continued access to information. Therefore, it was of no surprise that any exposure of wrongdoing was mainly initiated by the political elites themselves, in order to beat down their political rivals who were usually mid-level politicians. Waisbord also suggests that the continued repressive political environment made journalists vulnerable to the threat of physical violence, and further prevented them from taking up adversarial positions to those in power.

In contrast to Waisbord, who still believed that to some extent there was a rise of watchdog journalism, Ferreira (2006) provides a more critical view, claiming that the media was used as an instrument by power holders in Latin

American countries such as Mexico, Brazil, Colombia, Argentina, Venezuela and Cuba, to deepen the political oppression of citizens. However, in line with Waisbord, he explains this as being due to political economy factors such as media ownership by conglomerates that had close political ties with regimes. He also cites the use of judicial threats such as libel lawsuits, treason charges, as well as impending threats of physical violence from members of civil society, as being influential factors that forced journalists in these countries to self-censor their work. Echoing Waisbord, he argues that dependency on government and corporate sources is an indirect form of control.

To a large extent, the arguments of these two scholars about the prominent influence of political economy factors on the conduct of the media has resonated with other scholars working in the region. Surveying various countries in South and Central America such as Cuba, Guatemala, Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Chile and Venezuela, Hughes and Lawson (2005), for instance, emphasize the oligarchic ownership of media outlets as the main factor that prevents the media from becoming an effective force in supporting democratization. Focusing on the case of Mexico, Fromson (1996) and

Benavidez (2000) identify the widespread practice of *gacetilla* among the print news media, whereby the state paid newspapers for writing news stories that promoted the government. This dependency on state finances, they argue, was one of the main reasons the newspapers in that country could easily be tamed by the government. Another recurring theme reported on by many scholars is the threat faced by journalists in regard to the implementation of libel laws, as well as threats of physical violence from certain hostile groups in society. It can be found, for instance, in the works of Whitten-Woodring (2009) and (Bustamente & Relly, 2014) in their studies on Mexico, Lavieri (1996) in his study on Argentina, as well as Alves (2005) and Hughes and Lawson (2005) in their extensive comparative investigation of several Latin American countries.

In Southeast Asia, the same line of argument was proposed by McCargo (2003), who compared three post-authoritarian countries: Thailand, The Philippines and Indonesia. He suggests that even though the media enjoyed more freedom in these countries after the regime change, they were less protected. The threat of physical violence, posed by

private agencies or political forces from outside the state, was significant. In addition, the political business alliance between the media and parts of the political establishment is a source of partisanship and reporting bias, preventing the media from functioning as a rigorous watchdog. This situation is made worse by the increasing concentration of media ownership amongst a handful of media moguls. Echoing McCargo, Heryanto and Hadiz (2005) found a similar situation in their observations on political journalism in these three post-authoritarian Southeast Asian countries. They argue that despite the increasing freedom enjoyed by the press, the media faced some serious challenges from oligarchic power holders consisting of the political and business elites, who have persistently pressured the newsroom to serve their political business interest. Furthermore, the threat of physical violence from radical groups is another factor that has prevented journalists from fulfilling their watchdog function.

The same line of argument can be found in the works of some political economy theories in Indonesia (Lim, 2011 & 2012; Haryanto, 2011; Ida, 2011; Nugroho, Putri & Laksmi, 2012;

Tapsell, 2012 & 2017; Sudibyo 2004 & 2009; Sudibyo & Patria, 2013; Andres, 2016). One of the main factors preventing the media from being critical of power holders is the concentration of media ownership amongst a handful of media conglomerates which have political business interests. This argument was proposed by Lim (2012), in what she names "the league of thirteen" media moguls, who she believes threaten the democratization of the Indonesian media. Similar concerns were shared by Nugroho, Putri and Laksmi (2012), who further argue that this situation led journalists to favor and support government and corporate policies. Furthermore, this situation has also led to a lack of quality media content, as media companies prioritize ratings and circulation.

Tapsell (2012) and Haryanto (2011) confirmed the findings above by providing a detailed analysis of how political economy factors influence the daily practice of journalistic works at the micro-level. Conducting interviews with newspaper journalists of different media and at different periods of time, both scholars came to the same interesting conclusion that media owners, motivated by political economy interests, have

intervened substantially in the newsroom, resulting in a climate that favors self-censorship. Researching five newspapers owned by political business figures (President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's *Jurnal National*, Surya Paloh's *Media Indonesia*, Bakrie's *Surabaya Post*, Dahlan Iskan's *Jawa Post* and Riyadi's *Jakarta Globe*), Tapsell identifies the way control was executed directly from the media owner to the Chief Editor. The Chief Editor would then give instructions to the managing editors, who in turn gave instructions to the editors, and finally these were relayed to the journalists. This has led to the practice of self-censorship. Meanwhile, examining two print media outlets (*Lippo's* Magazine and *Suara Pembaharuan*) and two television stations, Haryanto reached the same conclusion: that media owners influence the practice of self-censorship in line with their own political business interests.

Whereas the research above provides evidence of how political economy factors have strongly influenced the national media, the research by Hill (2007) and Ida (2011) provide evidence at the local level. Examining the mass media at the local level, which has rarely been done in Indonesia, they showed how the it is used by their owners as an instrument to favor certain candidates running for mayor or regent in local elections. Hill, for instance, presents empirical evidence by mapping media involvement in the 2004 local election for city mayor in Manado. He illustrated how *Global News,* a local newspaper in Manado, was used by its owner, Wempie Frederik, as an instrument for promoting his candidacy when he successfully ran for election. Meanwhile, using Robison and Hadiz's (2004) argument on the emergence of local oligarchies in Indonesia as a point of departure, Ida also argued that there was a concentration of oligarchic power at the local level, consisting of local politicians and local media owners. She supported her argument using the evidence of the owner of *Jawa Pos* newspaper, Dahlan Iskan, and his involvement in supporting a candidate who ran for the 2005 local election in Surabaya. She also identified a similar situation in the case of Satria Naradha, the CEO of the *Bali Post* group, and his close relationship with the local Balinese state administration.

In summary, it can be seen that political economy theories advocate the essential role of political economy forces in shaping journalistic practice in post-authoritarian countries, which has prevented the media from playing a role

as a critical watchdog over the power holders. These forces ranged from: (a). media dependency on state advertising, (b). media dependency on political elites as news sources or for access to information, (c). media ownership by politicians or by media conglomerates who have close political ties with power holders, (d). the increasing concentration of media ownership by a handful of media conglomerates, to (e). the threats of libel and physical violence from conservative members of society. However, factors such as market pressure or business competition between media outlets has not been examined much in the literature. Furthermore, these theories neglect the role of cultural factors in shaping journalistic values and practices in these countries and fail to examine how journalists in the newsroom legitimize or justify political economy pragmatism in the daily production of news. The influence of cultural factors in shaping the process of news production in the media newsroom is significant and cannot be ignored, and I will examine these cultural theories in the next section.

Cultural Approach

In line with the political economy theories above, there are groups of scholars who also believe that democratization don't automatically lead the media to become more free in its reporting and playing role as critical watchdog of the power holders. However, while political economy theories believe on the role of political economy factors, cultural theories believe in the role of culture. While political economy factors are arguably obvious as they materialize in the form of political interests of media owners, advertisers, market pressures, as well as pressure from the state, there has been debate amongst scholars as to how to define culture, and what role this plays in shaping media norms. In this regard, this research will follow the theorization of Hanitzsch (2006) who defined culture in six different ways. First of all, there is the territorial-based definition which maps culture to certain geographically or spatially defined systems, such as ethnicities, language, or even the state within a particular nation. Second, there is the essentialist definition in which culture is believed to be the 'true' essence, which mostly relates to individual characteristics such as race, ethnicity, religion and gender. Third, there is the milieu-specific definition which refers culture to specific, socially distinctive lifestyles signaling the identity of its

followers, and which distinguish them from other members of society. Fourthly, there is the value-centered definition which defines culture as sets of values, attitudes and beliefs embraced by certain individuals or communities, such as those found in the ideology of "Asian Values". Fifth, the organizational definition refers to collective values and practices that distinguish the members of one organization from another. Finally, there is professional culture, which is the conscious ideological views shared by either all members of a particular profession, or a subpopulation of the profession.

In this regard, it is important to note that some categories or definitions of culture may overlap. For example, the value-centered definition in terms of 'Asian Values' can also be understood as an essentialist definition, as it is attached to a certain race (Asian) or nation (Asia), as well as a territorial-based definition referring to a certain geographically defined system (Asia as a continent). Furthermore, value-centered definitions in terms of religious values could as well refer to the essentialism definition, such as when we talk about Islamic values. However, despite the potential overlap, it will become clear in the following

explanation that the differentiations above will be useful to understand how culture is understood and theorized differently by scholars in South America and Southeast Asia.

In regard to the theorization of Hanitzsch above, in post-authoritarian South America, scholars talk about culture in light of organizational culture which refers to sets of collective values and practices of individual journalists in the newsroom organization. In South America, this organizational culture of the newsroom was very much shaped by its authoritarian past, which they refer to as "authoritarian journalism culture". A study conducted by Marquez-Ramirez (2012) in Mexico advocates this theory. In her study, she argues that an "authoritarian journalism culture" was developed during the authoritarian period, and continuously maintained after the regime change. In her argument, she proposes that a defining feature of this authoritarian journalism culture was the culture of distanced, cautious, passive and detached reporting, employed to soften the tone of political coverage. In doing so, the media hoped to avoid being banned by the state, and to maintain economic benefits derived from government advertising, or more controversially, from bribes in the

form of direct payments to news executives, publishers or radio anchors (2012). This situation was made possible by the hierarchical organizational structure within the newsroom in which the editorial policy was very much directed by media elites, who were under the strong influence or control of the media owner. These sets of values and practices developed in the authoritarian era transformed into an entrenched organizational culture in the media newsroom, creating a template to be re-adopted when the political regime transitioned to a democratic government. As a result, she concluded that instead of a progressive cultural transformation, what happened within the media was development of a "hybrid journalism culture", where the liberal discourse of professionalism has blended with authoritarian practices, thereby preventing the media from fully fulfilling a watchdog function.

Hughes (2006) takes a more optimistic view compared to that of Marques-Ramirez, in the apparent rise of civic journalism, which included the implementation of watchdog journalism in post-authoritarian Mexico. She emphasizes the role of cultural factors such as organizational culture as well the social psychological world of individual journalists in supporting change. However, in line with Marquez-Ramirez, Hughes also acknowledges the existence of a hybrid journalism culture in Mexico, in which the old authoritarian journalism culture still influences current journalistic practices. Similarly, Pinto (2009) also argues that it is the impact of authoritarian journalism culture in the past that explains the "diffusion" of the recent practice of watchdog journalism in Argentina. Mostly owned and founded by wealthy political elites during early independence, Argentina's media was financially dependent on these elites and adopted a partisan voice in support of its politicians. This early period, which he calls "agrarian oligarchy", lasted for 70 years (1860-1930), and was followed by an authoritarian period under military regime which suppressed press freedom for 53 years (1930-1983). These two periods shaped the journalistic culture of the media newsroom and compelled journalists to embrace partisan loyalties which aligned with significant economic interests. As a result, when the period of political and economic liberalization finally arrived between 1984-2000, the media did not automatically transform into a fully effective force in supporting democracy. In

the short liberal period in which the media embraced the idea of watchdog journalism, the implementation of this ideal was diffused and translated according to the journalists' pre-existing values and beliefs. When the country was hit by economic recession and the threat of being banned was re-implemented again by the state, watchdog journalism was abandoned by the major print media in the country.

The same phenomenon has been observed in post-authoritarian countries in Southeast Asia, in which the media could not fully play a watchdog role due to cultural factors. However, while the scholars in Latin America talked about the "authoritarian journalistic culture" or "hybrid journalistic culture" which refers to organizational culture, scholars in Southeast Asia discussed culture in light of value-centered or essentialist-centered definitions, embodied by the theory of "Asian Values" and religious values (such as Islamic values). One example of this argument can be found in the work of Massey and Chang (2002) in their content analysis of 10 online newspapers containing what they defined as "Asian Values" from ten Asian countries with varying degrees of press freedom. Specifically, there were six newspapers

from Southeast Asia (Indonesia, Thailand, The Philippines, Singapore, Malaysia and Brunei); two newspapers from East Asian (Japan and Hong Kong); and two newspapers from South Asian countries (India and Pakistan). They found that in terms of the degree of press freedom, three regions were considered free (Japan, Thailand and The Philippines), four were partly free (Indonesia, Hong Kong, Pakistan and India), and three were not classified as free (Brunei, Malaysia and Singapore). From their analysis, it was found that newspaper content, which was seen as emphasizing the importance of respect, supporting social harmony and avoiding conflict (and thus illustrating 'Asian Values'), were found predominantly in the newspapers of Southeast Asia. Confirming the findings above, Romano (2005) argued that Asian Values such as "respect for elders and leaders, concern for upholding harmony, respect for the importance of saving face, and a preference for communicating criticism in a mild, courteous rather than brusque fashion" shaped the ideas and practices of journalists in Asia, including Southeast Asia (Romano, 2005: 6-7). It was these values that provided the justification for the journalists to embrace the idea of journalists as nation builders or

government partners in development. The later point was also often conceptualized in the idea of 'development journalism'. Romano points out that this journalistic culture is in sharp contrast to the idea of detached and adversarial watchdogs seen in Western democracies, as in Southeast Asia any questioning of the power holders was expected to be done without "offending the feeling or disturbing the authority of the honored leadership figure" (2005).

Regarding essentialist or value-centered definitions of culture, Tekwani (2008) suggests that when reporting conflict, religion and ethnicity has an important impact on the work of journalists in various countries in Asia, including post-authoritarian Philippines, Thailand and Indonesia. Biases were often adopted by journalists, for example in reporting conflict between minority and majority groups within a country, with the coverage tending to align with the journalist's religious views or ethnic affiliation. Indeed, the fact that in most Asian countries, the society is culturally diverse in term of language, ethnicity and religion, has provided much context for the conflicts studied in the book. Cultural forces in essentialist or value-centered terms have also been suggested as factors

influencing journalism in post-authoritarian Indonesia (Hanitzsch, 2005 & 2006; Pintak & Setiyono, 2011; Lang, 2016).

The same line of argument about the power of culture can also be found in the works of media scholars studying Indoensia. One prominent theme proposed in the essentialist argument regards the influences of Javanese values to Indonesian journalism, as well as religious values such as Catholic values and Islamic values. Comparable to the notion of "Asian Values", Javanese values emphasize the importance of respect for the elderly and authority, as well as the hierarchical order in society. Furthermore, there is also an emphasis on conflict avoidance, called *rukun,* in order to maintain social harmony (Geertz, 1960; Koentjaraningrat, 1989; Suseno, 1997).

In the study of journalism, this argument was proposed by, amongst others, Thomas Hanitzsch (2005), who suggested that instead of playing an assertive watchdog role, Indonesian journalists acted instead as a "timid watchdog". He argues that this situation was shaped by the Javanese values embraced by Indonesian journalists, especially those who had roots in central parts of Java such as Jogjakarta. In these

values, the principle of harmony and respect for authority are an integral feature of the Javanese way of life (Hanitzsch, 2005). He goes on to suggest that the Java-based media and Javanese journalists tend to be politer in conveying messages, and thus tend to be politically uncritical (Hanitzsch, 2006). He argued that within these Javanese values, the practice of bribery, evoked by the concept of *"sungkan"*, also evolved among media practitioners and owners. In the case of bribery from the government (as a news sources) to the journalists, *sungkan* referred to the mutual expectation in which the journalists felt hesitant to refuse the bribe to avoid offending the giver or losing their trust. On the other side, the sources felt compelled to offer bribes as they believed that the journalists expected this, and a failure to do so would result in negative coverage.

In line with Hanitzsch, Romano (2003) observed earlier the importance of cultural factors to the everyday lives of Indonesian journalists. Combining in-depth interviews and a quantitative survey, she shows that the pattern of journalistic routines (or what she called a journalistic culture/micro culture) had been shaped by the broader Indonesian political culture, which was characterized mainly by paternalism (macro culture). This patriarchal culture provided a space for the state possession of power to define what would be the appropriate ideas and practices in Indonesian journalism. In term of ideas, the state controlled Indonesian journalism through the enigmatic notion of *Pancasila*, resulting in a journalistic practice which did not allow for the implementation of the media as a watchdog. In terms of practice, the state enforced regulation that gave them the right to censor the media or even ban them if considered appropriate. Based on her study, Romano believed that the roots of such journalistic culture were the strong influence of the organic political philosophy claimed by the Javanese authoritarian ruler as being the essential, authentic Indonesian character. This philosophy, which emphasizes the harmonious relation between the ruled and the ruler to maintain social order, was seen as best suited to Javanese values.

Other scholars have also promoted the influence of culture in the essentialist or values manner, but with more emphasis on the role of religion. This can be found in the work of Pintak & Setiyono (2011) and Lang (2016). Surveying 600 journalists across the Indonesian archipelago, Pintak & Setiyono (2011)

observed the increasing influence of Islamic values in the newsroom. Many journalists saw themselves, first and foremost, as Islamic believers rather than as journalists. This shaped their attitudes towards politics, where they chose to avoid being a critical watchdog and instead preferred to be in partnership with the government. This supports earlier arguments by Romano (in Pintak & Setiyono 2011) who quotes a journalist: *"I do not wish to be a fierce watchdog; I wish to be like [the Prophet] Muhammad and to spread a good agenda. Muhammad was not fierce."* In this light, these scholars have concluded that Indonesian journalists were no longer as timid as during the authoritarian era; however, they were also never in an oppositional position with the elites, as they were still keen to maintain their partnership with the political establishment. Therefore, even though international journalistic practices might influence Indonesian journalists, it would be misleading to see them as adopting them wholesale.

A similar argument about the influence of religion was revealed in the work of Lang (2016). Analyzing the position of four Indonesian print media (*Kompas, Republika, Jakarta Post* and *Suara Hidayatullah)* towards the foreign policy of the United States, he suggested that religion did play a role in shaping the editorial policy of those newspapers. Referring to the United States' war on terror, two Islamic newspapers (*Republika and Suara Hidayatullah)* reacted negatively as they believed the policy had unfairly attacked the Islamic international community. In contrast, the secular media *(Jakarta Post)* and Catholic media (*Kompas*) supported the policy. Furthermore, with regard to conflicts in Muslim nations such as Afghanistan, Iraq and Palestine, *Republika* and *Suara Hidayatullah* suggested that Indonesia could play a bigger role in helping them. Meanwhile, *Kompas* and *Jakarta Post* took a softer stance; the former suggested that Indonesia was not strong enough to play an active role in supporting those countries, whilst the later suggested that Indonesia should play a role at the regional level of Southeast Asia instead. Therefore, it is obvious for Lang that religion was the underlying explanation behind the different positions of these four newspapers in these cases.

In summary, from the discussion above, it is clear that cultural factors have an important influence on journalism in post-authoritarian countries. However,

culture has been understood differently between scholars in South American countries and Southeast Asian countries. While in South America, culture was defined in terms of organizational culture which is theorized as an "authoritarian" or "hybrid" culture, scholars in Southeast Asia defined culture in light of values or essentialist focused definitions, by suggesting that culture refers to certain values, religion, race or ethnicity. In this regard, cultural theorists in South America are aligned with the political economy theorists by suggesting that in the beginning, it was political economy forces that shaped the authoritarian journalism culture. However, they overlooked the role of culture in the essentialist or value-centered understanding, such as that of Asian values, Islamic values, or Javanese values in the case of Southeast Asia and Indonesia. In contrast, cultural theorists in Southeast Asia are proficient in explaining the role of values, race, ethnicity, and religion in shaping journalistic practices, but they undermined the important role of political economy factors.

Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field: Bridging the Theoretical Dichotomy

The existing literature on journalism in various post-authoritarian countries, has produced a theoretical dichotomy as discussed above. This study believes that the theory of habitus in the journalistic field could offer a solution to bridge these two contrasting approaches. In fact, over the last decade there has been a growing interest among media scholars to take advantage of the work of the French sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu (2005), in approaching the study of the field of journalism (Benson, 1998 & 2006; Benson & Neveu, 2005; Hanitzsch, 2011; Hensmondhalgh, 2006; Marlière, 1998 & 2000; Schultz, 2007). One of the cornerstones of Bourdieu's influence can be seen in the manuscript edited by Rodney Benson and Erik Neveu entitled "Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field" (2005). As well as presenting a translation of Bourdieu's article entitled "The Political Field, the Social Science Field, and the Journalistic Field", this book also provides some articles by Bourdieu's colleagues, and more importantly, articles written by media scholars from English speaking countries explaining their responses to and theoretical reflections on Bourdieu's theory (Champagne, 2005; Darras, 2005; Duval, 2005; Hallin, 2005, Klinenberg, 2005; Marchetti, 2005; Schudson, 2005).

The starting point for understanding this theory of journalism is Bourdieu's general theory of 'field'. Departing from Weber's sociology of religion, Bourdieu suggested that society consists of various fields, each with its own rules, and each of which is a space of unequal social relationships between agents who are struggling either to transform or preserve that social space. Within each field, there are two opposing poles: the heteronomy pole representing the political and economic forces (which is a reflection of the penetration of external forces into the field), and the autonomy pole that represents capital unique to that field. Thus, the field can be distinguished by both the specific type of capital it utilizes, and the degree of autonomy it has in relation to the dominant economic and political field.

The first step to understanding the journalistic field is to position it amongst other fields. In this case, the journalistic field lies within the field of cultural production, which itself lies within the field of power. The field of cultural production consists of two aspects: the field of restricted cultural production and the field of large-scale cultural production. According to Bourdieu, journalism belongs mostly to the field of large-scale cultural production which contains the conflict between cultural forces and political economy forces. This cultural power is a type of capital that is unique to the field, whilst the political and economic forces are factors that come from outside, namely from the field of power. The greater the cultural capital of the field, the more autonomous a field will be. On the contrary, the bigger the political and economic forces in the field, the more heteronomous a field will be. So, in this journalistic field, there is a constant struggle between poles of autonomy and heteronomy.

In addition, the journalistic field is exposed to two binary oppositions between the old and the new, which compete dynamically for the preservation or transformation of the existing field. Each agent operating in the journalistic field arrives with a series of life trajectories, experienced through other fields in an earlier period of life. This long process of socialization shapes the agent's predisposition in terms of feeling, perception, thought and action. Therefore, the study of the journalism field is the study of the process of convergence between disposition (*habitus*) and position (*location in a field that has its own rules*). Indeed, habitus is one of the

central concepts in Bourdieu's field theory, which he defines as: systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them and, being all this, collectively orchestrated without being the product of the orchestrating of a conductor. (Bourdieu, 1977).

This is where the theory of field focuses on change. The presence of new agents entering the field will be a force for both preservation and transformation. To be able to make changes, new agents have to show their differences to those already in the field. It is important to see who these new arrivals are, what their social and economic backgrounds are, where they schooled and got their training, and where they developed their work practices. Furthermore, the already established field has its own rules that must be accepted by the newcomers. In other words, for the presence of new agents to be able to bring about change, the balance of power between

heteronomy-autonomy within the field, and ultimately larger societal structure of class relations, can only occur under certain conditions.

It is this explanation of change that is one of the main reasons why Bourdieu is highly influential. His field theory offers an explanation which unites both cultural and political economy factors, which operate together to influence the media, and he was able to observe this precisely because he used an historical approach to examine changes in journalism in France. We can find this argument in his work entitled "On Television" (1998), in which he theorized about the change in journalistic practice of TV in France before and after the 1970s. He argued that before 1970, journalism was serious and more autonomous, while after 1970 it became "cheap and sensationalistic", and more heteronomous. He argued that there are at least two factors explaining this change. Firstly, since 1968 journalism was subject to increasing privatization, resulting in the increased influence of the economic field in the journalistic field. Secondly, there was a generation of new journalists carrying a particular news habitus that was based more on practical considerations rather than on philosophy or critical studies. Therefore, the entry of

these new journalists also influences the composition of the field. In the words of Benson:

> "According to field theory, the changes are born by two sources namely internal dynamic within the field and the transformation that occurs in the surrounding environment either in the form of political break, economical break, technology and demography. To do so methodologically, field theory suggests that the best way to analyze this change is to take a case study to see media field relationships with other fields for years or even decades. Thus, it would appear that "the current state of the field of the result of a complex historical change". Media field studies combine extensive theoretical reflections, detailed ethnographic descriptions, tell anecdotes and integrate them with macro data such as media ownership, percentage of advertising revenue, journalists' numbers and trends in journalist training. Although Bourdieu is well known as a grand theorist, his concept of field, habitus and capital (these methods and approaches) is indeed intended to be a flexible tool for empirical research that is open to exploration. (Benson, 1998).

In summary, as suggested by Benson (1998), field theory can contribute to media research in different ways, and those that are germane to my research are: firstly, that, it offers a theoretical and empirical bridge between macro-societal media theories such as cultural, political economy and technological theories; and micro-organizational approaches. This theory also provides a bridge between cultural and political economy approaches in media theory, by suggesting that political economy and culture are not two competing explanations of the social world, but rather are two intertwined aspects of social reality. Secondly, it explains processes of change, both how the media field itself is transformed and how a reconfigured media field affects other major societal sectors. In this regard, this study believes that Bourdieu's field theory is useful as a theoretical tool of analysis to overcome the theoretical dichotomy in explaining the media changes in the post authoritarian settings. This theoretical avenue of investigation becomes more significant when considering that although Bourdieu made an important contribution to media studies, surprisingly Indonesian media scholars have yet to profit fully from his work.

CONCLUSION

The question of how transitions from authoritarianism to democracy affect news media is one of debate among scholars of politics and communications. In the post authoritarian Southeast Asia and Latin

America, most scholars have come to a surprising agreement that the mass media didn't automatically become free after the fall of authoritarian regimes. However, there is an ongoing debate as to the main factors explain the media's continuity which could be categorized into two group which are the political economic theories and cultural theories. The political economy theories emphasized the influence of political economy factors as the main explanation for the failure of the media from playing a watchdog function in the process of democratic consolidation. In another hand, the cultural theories believe in the dominant role of cultural factors in explaining the media change.

Interestingly, the similar situation can also be found in in Indonesia. Not only journalism didn't automatically become free after the regime's change but also the existing theoretical dichotomies are also going on in explaining this situation. Furthermore, the same theoretical dichotomy can also be found in the study on journalism in Indonesia i.e. political economy theories and cultural theories. In this regard, this study believes that the factors influencing media changes and continuities don't have to be exclusively separated each other. Both the political economy and cultural factors could be combined as an integrative approach in understanding media' change. In this regard, this study believes that the theory of media's change from French Sociologists, Pierre Bourdieu, could be useful to go beyond this dichotomy.

REFERENCES

Alves, R. C. (2005). From lapdog to watchdog: The role of the press in Latin America's democratization (pp. 181-201). In H. De Burgh (Ed.) *Making journalists: Diverse models, global issues.* London: Routledge.

Andres, N. (2016). *Media-elite interactions in post-authoritarian Indonesia* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Murdoch University, Murdoch.

Atmakusumah. (2009). *Tuntutan Zaman: Kebebasan Pers dan Eskpresi* [Demand of the Era: Freedom of Press and Expression]. Jakarta: Spasi & VHR Book, Yayasan Tifa.

Benavidez, J. L. (2000). Gacetilla: A keyword for a revisionist approach to the political economy of Mexico's print news media. *Media, Culture and Society*, 22(1), 85–104.

Benson, R. (1998). Field theory in comparative context: A new paradigm

for media studies. *Theory and society*, 28(3), 463-498.

Benson, R. (2005). Mapping field variation: Journalism in France and the United States. In R. Benson & E. Neveu (Eds.), *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field* (pp. 85-112). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Benson, R. (2006). News media as a "journalistic field": What Bourdieu adds to new institutionalism, and vice versa. *Political Communication*, 23(2), 187-202.

Benson, R., & Neveu, E. (2005). Introduction: field theory as a work in progress. In R. Benson & E. Neveu (Eds.), *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field* (pp. 1-25). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *On television.* New York: New Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2005). The political field, the social science field, and the journalistic field. In R. Benson & E. Neveu (Eds.) *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field* (pp. 29-47). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bustamante, C. G & Relly, J. E. (2014). Journalism in times of violence: Social media use by US and Mexican journalists working in Northern Mexico. *Digital Journalism*, 2(4),

507-523.   doi: 10.1080/21670811.2014.882067

Champagne, P. (2005). "The double dependency": The journalistic field between politics and markets. In R. Benson & E. Neveu (Eds.), *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field* (pp. 48-63). Cambridge: Polity Press.

De Burgh, H. (2000). *Investigative journalism: Context and practice.* London: Routledge.

Deloire, C. & Hugo S. (1996). *Handbook for journalists during elections.* Paris: Reporters Without Borders for Freedom of Information and Organization Internationale de Francophonie.

Dhakidae, D. (1991). *The State, the rise of capital and the fall of political journalism* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation], Cornell University, NY.

Djaeng, J. (2013). *Kompas business philosophy: Thoughts and philosophy of two Kompas founders.* Bogor: Buku Litera.

Duval, J. (2005). Economic journalism in France. In R. Benson & E. Neveu (Eds.) *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field* (pp. 135-155). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Ferreira, L. (2006). *Centuries of silence: The story of Latin American journalism.* Westport, Conn: Praeger.

Fromson, M. (1996). Mexico's struggle for a free press. In R. Cole (Ed.) *Communication in Latin America: Journalism, mass media and society.* Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources.

Geertz, C. (1960). *The Religion of Java.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

George, C. (2012). *Freedom from the press: Journalism and state power in Singapore.* Singapore: NUS Press.

George, C. (2016). *Hate spin: The manufacture of religious offense and its threat to democracy.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Hallin, D. C. (2005). Field theory, differentiation theory, and comparative media research. In R. Benson & E. Neveu (Eds.) *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field* (pp. 48-63). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hanitzsch, T. (2005). Journalist in Indonesia: Educated but tamed watchdogs. *Journalism Studies,* 6(4), 493-508.

Hanitzsch, T. (2006). Mapping journalism culture: A theoretical taxonomy and case studies from Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Communication,* 16(2), 169-186.

Hanitzsch, T. (2011). Populist disseminators, detached watchdogs, critical change agents and opportunist facilitators: Professional milieus, the journalistic field and autonomy in 18 countries. *International Communication Gazette*, 73(6) 477–494.

Haryanto, I. (2011). Media ownership and its implications for journalists and journalism in Indonesia. In K. Sen & D. T. Hill (Eds.), *Politics and the media in twenty-first century Indonesia: Decade of Democracy* (pp. 104-118). New York: Routledge.

Heryanto, A. & Hadiz, V. R. (2005). Post-authoritarian Indonesia. *Critical Asian Studies*, 37(2), 251-275.

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2006). Bourdieu, the media and cultural production. *Media, Culture & Society*, 28(2), 211–231.

Hill, D. T. (1994). *The Press in New Order Indonesia.* Perth: University of Western Australia in Association with Asia Research Institute on Social, Political and Economic Change.

Hill, D. T. (2007). Maneuvers in Manado: Media and politics in regional

Indonesia. *South East Asia Research,* 15(1), 5-28.

Hopmann, N.D Aelts, P.V & Legnante, G. (2011). Political balance in the news: A review of concepts, operationalizations and key findings. *Journalism,* 13(2), 240-257.

Hsieh, H., & Shannon, S.E. (2005).Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research,* 15(9), 1277-1288. doi: 10.1177/1049732305276687.

Hughes, S. & Lawson, C. (2005). The barriers to media opening in Latin America. *Political Communication,* 22(1), 9-25.

Hughes, S. (2006). *Newsrooms in conflict: journalism and the democratization of Mexico.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburg.

Ida, R. (2011). Reorganization of media power in post-authoritarian Indonesia: Ownership, power and influence of local entrepreneurs. In K. Sen and D. T. Hill (Eds.), *Politics and the media in twenty-first century Indonesia: Decade of democracy* (pp. 13-25). New York: Routledge.

Ismail, A., Ahmad, M. K. & Mustaffa C. S. 2014. Conceptualization of investigative journalism: The perspectives of Malaysian media

practitioners, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences,*155, 165-170.

Jay, R. R. (1969). *Javanese Villagers: Social Relations in Rural Modjokuto.* Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Jensen, R. (1992). Fighting objectivity: The illusion of journalistic neutrality in coverage of the Persian gulf war. *Journal of Communication Inquiry,* 16(1), 20-32.

Keller, A. (2009). *Tantangan Dari Dalam, Otonomi Redaksi di 4 Media Cetak Nasional Kompas, Koran Tempo, Media Indonesia, Republika* [Challenges from within, Editorial autonomy in 4 printing national media: Kompas, Koran Tempo, Media Indonesia, Republika]. Jakarta: FES Indonesia Office.

Klinenberg, E. (2005). Channeling into the journalistic field: Youth activism and the media justice movement. In R. Benson & E. Neveu (Eds.) *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field* (pp. 174-194). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lang, J. S. (2016). *Foreign policy and the media: The US in the eyes of the Indonesian press.* London: MacMillan.

Lavieri, O. (1996). The media in Argentina: Struggling with the

absence of a democratic tradition. *Latin America: Journalism, mass media and society,* 183-198.

Leavy, P. (2011). *Oral history: Understanding qualitative research.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Lee, O. H. (1971). *Indonesian government and press during guided democracy.* Zug Switzerland: Inter Documentation.

Lim, M. (2011). *@Crossroad: Democratization and corporatization of media in Indonesia.* Arizona: Arizona State University and Ford Foundation.

Lim, M. (2012). *The league of thirteen: Media concentration in Indonesia.* Arizona: Arizona State University and Ford Foundation.

Lim, M. (2017). Freedom to hate: social media, algorithmic enclaves, and the rise of tribal nationalism in Indonesia. *Critical Asian Studies*, 49(3), 411-427.

Marchetti, D. (2005). Subfield of specialized journalism. In R. Benson & E. Neveu (Eds.) *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field* (pp. 64-84). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Marliére, P. (1998). The rules of the journalistic field: Pierre Bourdieu's contribution to the sociology of the media. *European Journal of Communication*. 13(2), 219-234.

Marliére, P. (2000). The impact of market journalism: Pierre Bourdieu on the media. *The Sociological Review*, 49 (S1), 199-211.

Marquez-Ramirez, M. (2012). *Change or continuity: The culture and practices of Journalism in Mexico(2000–2007)* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Goldsmiths University, London.

Massey, B. L. & Chang, L. A. (2002). Locating Asian values in Asian journalism: A content analysis of web newspapers. *Journal of Communication*, 52(4), 987-1003.

Maton, K. (2008). Habitus. In M. Grenfell (Ed.), *Pierre Bourdieu Key Concepts* (49-66). Stocksfield: Acumen Publishing.

McCargo, D. (2003). *Media and politics in Pacific Asia.* London: Routledge Curzon.

McLeod, Ross H. (2000). Suharto's Indonesia: A Better Class of Corruption. *Agenda,* 7(2), 99-112.

Mulder, N. (1978). *Mysticism and everyday life in contemporary Java.* Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Nugroho, Y., Putri, D. A. & Lakshmi, S. (2012). *Memetakan Lansekap*

Industri Media Kontemporer di Indonesia [Mapping the landscape of the media industry in contemporary Indonesia]. Jakarta: Centre for Innovation Policy and Governance (CIPG) and HIVOS.

Pintak, L. & Setiyono, B. (2011). The mission of Indonesian journalism: Balancing democracy, development, and Islamic values. *International Journal of Press/Politics* 16(2), 185–209.

Pinto, J. G. (2009). Diffusing and translating watchdog journalism: Organizational response of Argentine media. *Media History*, 15(1), 1-16.

Pontoh, C. H. (2013). Amanat Hati Nurani Karyawan [The mandate of worker's conscience]. In B. Triharyanto & F. Salam (Eds.) *Dapur Media Antologi Liputan Media di Indonesia* [The media's kitchen: The anthology of media reportage in Indonesia] (pp. 19-42) Jakarta: Pantau.

Potter, D. (2016). *Handbook of independent journalism.* Bureau of International Information Program: US Department of State.

Reeve, D. (1987). *Golkar of Indonesia: An alternative to the party system.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Robison, R. & Hadiz, V. R. (2004). *Reorganizing power in Indonesia: the politics of oligarchy in an age of markets.* New York: RoutledgeCurzon.

Romano, A. (2003). *Politics and the Press In Indonesia : Understanding an evolving political culture.* London: Routledge.

Romano, A. (2005). Asian journalism: news, development and the tides of liberalization and technology. In A. Romano and M. Bromley. *Journalism and Democracy in Asia* (pp. 15-28). London: Routledge.

Roosa, J. (2006). *Pretext for mass murder: The September 30th movement and Suharto's coup d'état in Indonesia.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Sambrook R. J. (2012). *Delivering trust: Impartiality and objectivity in the digital age* (Working Paper). Oxford: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, University of Oxford.

Schudson, M. (1989). The sociology of news production. *Media, Culture, Society,* 11(3), 263-282.

Schudson, M. (2005). Autonomy from what? In R. Benson & E. Neveu (Eds.) *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field* (pp. 124-223). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Schultz, I. (2007). The journalistic gut feeling: journalistic doxa, news habitus and orthodox news values. *Journalism Practice*, 1(2), 190-207.

Semetko, H. A. (2010). Election campaigns, partisan balance, and the news media. In P. Norris (Ed.) *Public sentinel: Media and governance reform.* Washington DC: The World Bank.

Siebert, F, T. Peterson, and W Schramm. (1956). Four Theories of the Press. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Steele, J. (2005). *Wars within : The story of Tempo, an independent magazine in Soeharto's Indonesia.* Jakarta: Equinox Publishing.

Sudibyo, A. & Patria, N. (2013). The television industry in post-authoritarian Indonesia. *Journal of Contemporary Asia,* 43(2), 257-275. DOI:10.1080/00472336.2012.757434.

Sudibyo, A. (2004). *Ekonomi Politik Media Penyiaran* [The political economy of broadcasting media]. Jakarta : ISAI.

Sularto, St & Harianto S. (2016). *Kompas way: Jakob's legacy.* Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas.

Sularto, St. (2007). *Kompas: Menulis Dari Dalam* [Writing from within]. Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas.

Sularto, St. (2011). *Syukur Tiada Akhir, Jejak Langkah Jakob Oetama* [Endless gratitude, footsteps of Jakob Oetama]. Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas.

Sularto, St. (2013). *Mengembangkan Indonesia Kecil* [Developing the miniature of Indonesia]. Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas.

Suseno, F. M. (1997). *Javanese ethics and world-view: The Javanese idea of the good life.* Jakarta : PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Tapsell, R. (2012). Old tricks in a new era: Self-censorship in Indonesian journalism, *Asian Studies Review,* 36(2), 227–245.

Tapsell, R. (2017). *Media power in Indonesia.* London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Tekwani, S. (2008). Media and conflict in Asia. In S. Tekwani (Ed.) *Media and Conflict Reporting in Asia.* Singapore: Asian Media Information and Communication Centre (AMIC) and Nanyang Technological University.

Tong, J. (2011). *Investigative journalism in China: Journalism, power and society.* London: Continuum.

Waisbord, S. R. (2000). *Watchdog journalism in South America: News, accountability and democracy.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Whitten-Woodring, J. (2009). Watchdog or lapdog? Media freedom, regime type, and government respect for human rights. *International Studies Quarterly,* 53(3), 595–625.