



Cigarette Industry Intervention in the Implementation of Government Regulation on Tobacco Advertisement in the Indonesian Broadcast Media

Lailiya Nur Rokhman¹

Nina Mutmainnah²

¹Communication Department, Universitas Indonesia; lailiyanurrokhman@gmail.com

²Communication Department, Universitas Indonesia; ninaarmando@yahoo.com

Abstract

This research tries to reveal how the cigarette industry interfere the implementation of the Government Regulation (PP No 109/2012) on tobacco advertisement in the media broadcast. The approach used in this research is the political economy approach. This research conducts the document studies (in the form of minutes of meetings and media articles related to the arrangement process of PP 109/2012), it also conducts in-depth interviews with the broadcasting regulatory party. This study found that not only in the implementation process, but also in the arrangement process, the government regulation considered not strong enough to manage the cigarette advertisement in the media broadcast. The recent regulation only limits the cigarette advertisements instead of prohibiting it. In the implementation phase, the broadcasting regulators have not implemented the regulation of PP 109/2012 maximumly. This research also found that the arrangement of the cigarette advertisements in the broadcast media takes sides more on the tobacco industry interests.

Keywords: PP 109/2012, cigarette industry intervention, political economy, tobacco advertisement, broadcast media

Introduction

In Indonesia, the tobacco industry considered as a controversial industry. It is not only because of the statement about the industry and the products that believed to have many negative impacts, but also the advertisement. The advertisements displayed by the tobacco industry hide the bad effects of the cigarette itself and it only intend to introduce the products (Duana, 2013). Although the tobacco industry stated that advertising has no effect on the tobacco industry, this research shows otherwise. Dr. M. Subuh (quoted from depkes.go.id, 2017) stated that the survey conducted by Global Youth Tobacco 2009-2014 and Health Research and Development Agency (Litbangkes) showed that cigarette advertisement had an effect upto 46.3% on smoking behavior. This



influential cigarette advertisements show that it is necessary to regulate the cigarette advertisement. Referring to Law Number 36 Year 2009 (UU 36/2009) on Health Article 113 Paragraph 2, cigarettes categorized as addictive products. As an addictive product, cigarettes should not advertise in the media. This is in accordance with Law Number 32 Year 2002 regarding to the Broadcasting Article 46 Paragraph 3B. However, the next point in the Article, which is Article 46 paragraph 3C, it states that cigarette advertisements is allowed but under some conditions. It also applies in the Broadcasting Behavior Guide and the Standard of Broadcasting Program (P3 and SPS) of the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (KPI), cigarette advertisements only allowed under some conditions.

The form of inequality in the regulation of cigarette advertisement and addictive substance in Indonesia shows the difference between the treatment towards the cigarette advertisement and other addictive product, even though these products contain addictive substances that can endanger the users. As Damono (in Tempo Magazine, 2017, p63) suggests, if 'marijuana' factory is prohibited, it is not the case with cigarette factories that considered legal. In the case of the regulation i.e. circulation, as well as the punishment for the user and the dealers, the penalties for the users and the dealers of drugs have been established with clear rules, but not with the regulations on cigarettes, it actually very loose.

The regulations that regulate the cigarette advertisement in Indonesia can be said backward compared with the other countries. Referring to WHO data (2013) which noted that 144 countries have banned cigarette advertisements in broadcast media, but Indonesia is one of the countries that have not yet banned it. One of the regulations in Indonesia, which regulates tobacco advertising, is namely Government Regulation No. 109 Year 2012. This regulation is the implementer of the Health Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 36 Year 2009, Article 113, Article 114, and Article 115. The Government Regulation No. 109/2012 also becomes one of the references to some other rules, among of them become the reference of the Advertising Council in the Indonesia Ethics of Pariwara arrangement. Unfortunately, the core of the Government Regulation No. 109 of 2012, especially the Articles that regulate the cigarette advertisement in the media is only limiting it under some conditions instead of prohibiting it.

Because of the regulation is only limiting, by all means there is always a way to deal with that regulations with various forms of cigarette advertising that will continue to be done. As quoted from remotivi.or.id (2018), although cigarette advertisements do not show the form of cigarette or smoking activity in it as said in the Government Regulation Number 109 Year 2012 Article 27C, and does not mention that the product advertised in the advertisement is cigarette as Article 27D, however, the cigarette advertisement along with its tagline actually shows resistance and abandonment of the facts about the dangers of cigarette itself for instance the tagline of "GO A HEAD" or "LET'S DO IT" featured in various advertisements from Djarum as one of the cigarette brand. This



advertisement displayed along with the caution of the risk of the cigarette from the Ministry of Health, which is "Cigarette Kills You". The caution required by the Ministry of Health to be included in various advertisements of cigarette and the packaging of the cigarettes itself as an implementation of the Government Regulation No. 109 of 2012. In fact, not only through the tagline, one of Djarum 76 cigarette advertisements that aired in broadcast media entitled "PengenEksis" (the willing to be exist) seems to mock the regulation of tobacco control related the Picture Health Warning (PHW) (remotivi.or.id, 2018).

Various violations that occurred are due to the laxity of the rules applied, which later led to allegations of intervention of industrial interest in the implementation of regulation of tobacco control in media broadcast. Therefore, this research aims to examine and explain in detail about the intervention of the tobacco industry in the implementation of Government Regulation No. 109 of 2012, especially the Articles that arrange the cigarette advertisement in media broadcast.

Literature Review

The previous researches that related to this research are firstly, a research by Irwan Julianto, (2014) which explains in detail how the myth and discourse of the pros and cons occur in the regulation of cigarettes in the public space of mass media and social media. A study entitled Cigarettes that splits Indonesia: The Contestation Discourse of Pro and Cons of Cigarette Regulations in the Public Spaces of Mass Media and Social Media, Julianto (2014) found that myths about pro activists of tobacco and cigarettes developed in the tobacco industry, such as clove cigarettes that were constructed as the nation's cultural heritage, clove cigarettes considered to be able to make the life of the smokers shorter and cigarette control activities are funded by foreign white cigarette industry and pharmaceutical industry.

Secondly, a research conducted by R.A Dyah Dharmikasari Soegondo (2010) entitled, the structure of the cigarette industry in Indonesia. Communication as the Authority Resource highlights the relationship between state or government, tobacco industry and the communications industry as social agents that try to win their own interests and needs to maintain the self-sustainability in its structure in Indonesia. Soegondo (2010) also discusses the regulation of tobacco control. However, the main focus discussed in this research is the contestation of interest in FTCT in which Indonesia has not yet ratified it. The other rules concerning tobacco control only described in general. The Regulation about Cigarette Limited Regions became the second focus of this research.

The relation between a state, industry, media and regulations.

A state, industries, and media have a close relationship to each other and are influencing each other in its cycle. Mosco (2009) explains that many evidences found that the state contributes to changes in the corporate structure, technology and services. The



state represents as the supreme organization of the sovereign social sphere (Sastrapratedja & Parera, 1991). One of the tools that the state uses to carry out its function is by making regulations. Regulations made to represent the voices of the diverse communities and to adapt to the conditions of the country. However, practically the regulations formed are based on certain interests, and how it affects the wider community (Long & Wall, 2012). Regulations that made under this particular interest therefore affect the implementation of the regulation itself.

Commoditization on the Application of Regulation

Commoditization is one of three processes in the study of political economy. According to Mosco (2009), commoditization refers to the process of changing the value of an item into an economic commodity or product that has an exchange value in a market with two main dimensions in it. First, the process of communication and technology contributes significantly in the process of commoditization in general in the field of economics as a whole; second, commoditization processes work in the society as a whole by penetrating the communication and institutional processes so that the progress and the contradiction in the process of community commoditization affect the communication as a form of social practice. In commoditization, communication works as a tool to change the way people think through advertising, television programs, movies, and other media contents, therefore whether consciously or unconsciously the people will agree on what the media presents.

Commoditization in communication has several forms (Mosco, 2009, pp. 145-161).among them are the commoditization of content, relating to the process of converting messages and data sets into a meaning system to produce marketable products; the commoditization of audiences, relating to the media process in obtaining a loyal audience to watch their program and therefore will attract advertisers to entrust their channels to advertise their products; commoditization of workers, in the production process of a text, the media use technology to expand its processes to produce commodities of goods and services; and immanent commoditization, related to tradable data (Mosco, 2009).

One of the processes in political economy is the creation of product fetishism. It is the effort of blurring or making a false consciousness for a particular purpose that will lead to commodity fetishism. Product fetishism is an understanding to worship some amount of price to obtain a particular commodity, in this case is cigarettes. The worshipbased on the exchange of prices with the goods that use money as a tool of the exchange. The higher the price of a commodity, the greater the exchange and worship is, therefore the commodity fetishism can regarded as an attempt done by the industry to create a false worship of its products. Such worship tends to be identical to the symbols and brands of the product so that consumers will feel the false enjoyment through brands and symbols associated with the product (Poespowardojo&Seran, 2016).



Advertisement as an Effort to Normalize the Cigarette Images

As mentioned earlier, the creation of product fetishism done to create dependence from other industries so it will be able to manipulate the application of a regulation. In this research, the product intended is cigarette advertisement in the media broadcasts. According to Kotler & Armstrong (2001, pp. 600-603) advertising is a form of non-personal communication that held through media such as radio, television, magazines, outdoor media, newspapers and digital media that paid by sponsors. Advertisements tend to be the most widely used because advertisements perceived to reach large audience target and through advertising, a person could be aware of the existence of the product. As the legal industry, the cigarette industry is an addictive product that tries to place itself as a "normal" product as any other legal products. This industry launched a variety of marketing strategies, one of them is in the media broadcast.

The advertisement conducted by the tobacco industry then generates a false consciousness in the minds of the consumers. The dominant group that has a very strong economic influence, in this case the tobacco industry uses all its power to dominate and persuade the public manipulatively for their own benefits. Meanwhile the people are ultimately unaware of the dominance of the cigarette industry in their lives. As Burton (2002) explains, the mainstay of power is that they are able to control the production and distribution of power in any types of forms, especially in the production of ideas through the media. Therefore, the people tend to interpret a text in accordance with the media producers intended to. In this case, advertising, promotion, and sponsorship made by the tobacco industry then manipulate the community so that what presented taken for granted by the public.

Research Methodology

This study uses a political economy approach to analyze the research problem. Thus, this study uses a critical paradigm in its reviews. As Patton (2010, pp. 131) points out that the critical paradigm is used not only to learn and to understand the environment, but it is also to criticize and to change the environment. With this critical paradigm, the researchers see the reality as something mediated by the relationship of power and the data cannot be separated from the ideologies, the myths, and beliefs that govern and hegemonize individuals, groups and societies (Kinchloe & McLaren, 2000). Thus, the society is seen as a system of dominance in which the media becomes the tool for the rulers to dominate the people.

The tobacco industries have a great financial power and tremendous power to influence and to communicate their existence. The tobacco industry, then always strives their efforts in maintaining its existence in Indonesia, including through various cigarette advertisements, which creates what is called as false reality, as well as the myth about smoking is a nation's culture and cigarette industry is a good industry.



This Research uses data collection techniques gathered by in-depth interviews and documentation studies. In order to get a better understanding of the intervention of interest in the implementation of Government Regulation No. 109 of 2012 in the media broadcast, the researchers interviewed the Commissioner of Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (KPI) i.e. the Broadcasting content division, Mayong Suryo Laksono. Besides in-depth interviews, some of the data in this study also obtained from the documents in the forms of articles about cigarette advertising violations in the media broadcast.

Result

Advertising became one of the tobacco industry strategies in increasing the awareness and cigarette image that finally could attract its target market, namely teenagers, to start smoking. Although the tobacco industry says that advertising has no effect on the tobacco industry, research has shown otherwise. Advertisement becomes one of the key factors that trigger the smoking behavior.

Unfortunately, the regulations that regulate the cigarette advertisements in the media considered weak. The cigarette advertisements only not allowed to show the smoking activities and to show the form of the cigarettes as mentioned in the Law Number 32 of 2002 on Broadcasting Article 46. However, the provisions of the Broadcasting Code and the Broadcasting Program Standards (P3 and SPS) reinforce the provisions of Law No. 32 of 2002 on Broadcasting. However, the core of the provisions in P3 and SPS issued by KPI is the same to the Law Number 32 Year 2002 on Broadcasting, which justifies or permit the cigarette advertisement but only under some conditions required. The Articles of P3 and SPS mentioned previously are as follows:

Article 18

Broadcasting institution is subject to the regulation of the prohibition and/or program restrictions towards cigarette, drug (narcotics, psychotropic, and addictive substances), and / or alcoholic beverages.

Article 26

- (1) The broadcasting programs are prohibited to justify the misuse of cigarettes, drugs (narcotics, psychotropic substances, and addictive substances), and/or the consumption of alcoholic beverages as commonplace in daily life are
- (3) The broadcasting programs prohibited to show children and/or teenagers smoking a cigarette and drinking alcohol.

Article 27

- (1) The broadcasting program loaded with the depiction of cigarettes and/or alcoholic beverages consumption:
 - a) can only be displayed in the programs intended for adult audiences; and
 - b) must be displayed as negative and/or an outrage behavior and lifestyle, and not displayed as something great and interesting



Article 58

- (1) The advertisement-broadcasting program is subject to the laws and regulations applied and guided by the Etkapariwisata Indonesia.
- (4) The advertisement broadcasting programs prohibited from serving:
 - c. Promotion of cigarettes that demonstrate the form of cigarettes;

Article 59

- (1) Cigarette advertisement program only allowed advertising at 21.30 - 05.00 local times.
- (2) Any broadcasting programs containing all forms and promotional strategies made by tobacco manufacturers shall be categorized as tobacco advertisement.

Article 61

The advertisement for cigarette and drug product not read as a narration are required to display a consumer warning within a duration of at least 3 seconds for all spot of durations.

Article 82

The cigarette advertisement broadcasted outboard 21.30 - 05.00 local time as referred to Article 59 Paragraph (1), after receiving written warning twice (2), will be subjected to administrative sanction in the form of administrative fine, for radio broadcasting service maximum of Rp.100.000 (One hundred million rupiah) and for television broadcasting services maximum of up to Rp. 1.000.000.000, - (one billion rupiah).

The regulations in the P3 and SPS are in line with the Government Regulation Number 109 Year 2012 Article 27 and Article 29. These Articles read as follows:

Article 27

The Tobacco Products Advertisement control as referred to in Article 26, among others, shall be carried out as follows:

- a) to include health warnings in the form of pictures and writings of at least 10% (ten percent) of the total advertisement duration and / or 15% (fifteen percent) of the total advertising space;
- b) to include the "18+" tag in the Tobacco Products advertisement;
- c) does not demonstrate, use, and / or display the form of Cigarettes or other designations that may be associated with the Tobacco Products brand;
- d) does not include the product's name which is Cigarettes;
- e) does not describe or suggest that smoking provides health benefits;
- f) does not use the misleading words or phrases;
- g) do not stimulate or advise people to smoke;
- h) not displaying child, adolescent, and / or pregnant woman in the form of picture and / or writing;
- i) not directed against children, adolescents, and / or pregnant women;



- j) not using a cartoon character as an advertisement model; and
- k) not contrary to the norms prevailing in the society.

Article 29

Besides the controlling of the Tobacco Products advertisement as referred to the Article 27, advertisements in the media broadcasting may only be displayed after 21.30 until 05:00 local time.

Article 40

Anybody who advertises and / or promotes Tobacco Products and does not comply with the provisions referred to the Article 27, Article 28, Article 29, Article 30, Article 31, Article 35, Article 36, Article 37, and Article 39 shall receive the administrative sanctions.

These three regulations, either the Law Number 32 Year 2002, the Government Regulation Number 109 Year 2012, or P3 and SPS basically only limiting without giving any serious action. Cigarettes still cannot be categorized as addictive substances as described in Law Number 36 Year 2009 on Health Article 113.

In the other hand the Government Regulation Number 109 Year 2012 as a follow-up or the implementer of the Law of Health of the Republic of Indonesia Number 36 Year 2009 is also unable to minimize even completely eliminate cigarette advertisement in media broadcast. This is because the content substance of the cigarette advertisement in the Government Regulation Number 109 Year 2012 is as weak as the other regulation in the media broadcasting which regulate the cigarette advertisement. Thus, the implementation of this regulation cannot be applied optimally. Even from the beginning of the formulation process of the Government Regulation No. 109 of 2012, it has already intervened by the interests of the tobacco industry. For instance, the formulation process that takes up to three years, the various efforts to change the content of the content inhibited by various opposition and protests, the diffusion of issues and the formation of public opinion about the welfare of tobacco farmers. The most crucial thing appeared is the change of the content substance on the rules of advertisement, promotion and sponsorship of the cigarettes, wherein the beginning of the formulation of the regulation proposed as a total ban on cigarette advertisement, promotion and sponsorship in various media. However, as the process of the formulation proceeds, the results obtained are only restrictions under some conditions (Rokhman, 2018).

Therefore, it affects the implementation of the regulation of cigarette advertisement in the media. The stipulation of cigarettes contain addictive substances in the Law Number 36 Year 2009 is also unnecessarily make the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission to completely ban cigarette advertisement. As quoted in the KPI realization press (in kpi.go.id, 2013), the previous Chairman of KPI, Judhariksawan, revealed that KPI should wait for the government's action in response to the Constitutional Court's decision on cigarettes classified as addictive so that all forms of cigarette advertisement



should be prohibited. However, according to Judhariksawan (2013), the cigarette advertisement in 2013 had been severely restricted.

However, this limitation makes the cigarette industry more eager to find the chance to put advertisements. Various breaches later found in the application of the regulations of the tobacco control. The issues that often found are the advertisement and the promotion of events that sponsored by the cigarette industry which broadcasted outside the specified broadcasting hours. Quoting kpi.go.id (2017), PembaharuMuda and LenteraAnak Indonesia were complaint to the KPI related to the 22 spot that allegedly break the law of the cigarette advertisement. Those advertisement appeared as the advertisements of the promotion of events or activities that sponsored by the tobacco industry, such as the promotions of the movie GalihdanRatnaGGeneration, BeswanDjarum, Pro Jam Festival, Surya Nation, and GG Music. Even the promotional advertisement of the movie "GalihdanRatna" displayed the cigarette logo very obviously, Gudang Garam. This type of promotion is clearly violates the P3 and SPS Article 59 Paragraph 2 as mentioned earlier, "*Broadcasting programs containing all forms and promotional strategies made by tobacco manufacturers shall be categorized as tobacco advertisement*".

Unfortunately, the complaint does not responded seriously. This is because the Article 59 Paragraph 2 P3 and SPS suspended its application by the KPI. In 2015, KPI revised the rules on the tobacco advertising in P3 and SPS by freezing the application of Article 59 paragraph 2 (Mutmainnah&Hendriyani, 2017). This effort clearly loosen and reinforces the the presence of the cigarette advertisements. YovantraArief from Remotivi Media and Communication Studies Center (quoted from *beritasatu.com*, 2015), explains that the freezing act of the application of this article actually sets free the cigarette advertisements as long as the advertisement does not show the form of the cigarettes and does not promote tobacco products although it is as a cigarette advertisement.

In fact, until today the freezing act towards the regulation is still applied. The central of KPI Commissioner for broadcasting content area, Mayong Suryo Laksono (in interview, 2018), said that the mutual agreement between KPI and broadcasting institutions makes the implementation of the Article 59 Paragraph 2 in P3 and SPS is postponed. The postponement also applies until the management of KPI period 2016-2019. MayongSuryoLaksono (in the interview, 2018) also explained that the postponement of the implementation of Article 59 Paragraph 2, therefore consider the cigarettes advertisement and the CSR activities unclassified as cigarette advertisement. Cigarette advertisement control then only limited to the broadcasting hours and the cigarette embodiment.

This statement strengthens the weakness of the regulation of cigarettes advertisement in media broadcast and more advantageous for the cigarette industry as well as the media industry. This is because, when the lawsuit is posted and it wins, a



postponement is made, eventually the cigarette advertisement will continue to exist even outside its broadcasting hours. Even though, the derivative cigarette advertisement or an advertisements of events sponsored by cigarettes industry are already very easy to find.

The POM agency in performing one of its functions to supervise the circulation of drugs and foods including the addictive products cooperated with the KPI through the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) of the supervision of cigarette advertisement in media. Every year, the POM Agency found a number of cigarette advertisements violations and it expected to be investigated. However, this cooperation is ultimately just surveillance or even just an observation. There is no serious sanction from the KPI or the banning act on the advertisement. According to MayongSuryoLaksono (in an interview, 2018), KPI has no legal rights to prohibit as requested by POM agency. KPI is only able to supervise in the limitation because KPI follows the prevailing regime.

It is no longer surprising then that the violations of cigarette advertisements are increasing. Referring to the annual report of POM agency on 2016 on its official website, *pom.go.id* (2017), the results of the monitoring of the tobacco products (cigarettes) advertisement in 2014 to 2016 has changed. On 2014, cigarette advertisement violation was 60.96%, and decreased by 2015, which was only 18.69%. However, in 2016, the violations done by cigarette industries in advertising increased by 18.72%. According to the POM agency, there is a significant increase in compliance during the early implementation of Government Regulation No. 109 of 2012, on 2014 to 2015. However, after two years of the implementation, non-compliance or violations increase. The POM agency suspects that this may be due to obscurity in the regulations related to tobacco product advertisement.

The violations that occurred then replaced by the cigarette industries by making advertising strategies with substantial funds so that the media industry seemed to feel benefited and dependent on the cigarette industries. As explained by MayongSuryoLaksono (interview, 2018), the broadcasting industries rely heavily on the tobacco industries, not only from the commercial advertisements of cigarettes, but also from the promotion and sponsorship of the products from the tobacco industries. These cigarette derivative advertisements, such as sponsorship on the music events or educational and sports scholarships, it may eventually will be advertised in the media broadcast without the need to adjust the broadcasting hour set for the cigarette advertisement.

The regulations on the cigarette advertisement broadcasting hours in the Broadcasting Act and P3 and SPS also not in line with the definition of adult hours. The defined broadcasting hour is 9:30 pm, it is the time to start for the cigarette advertisement to be displayed. This is obviously 30 minutes earlier than the adult hour category that begins at 22:00 as is the provision of other regulations regarding the adult program broadcasting. Based on the observations on media broadcast especially



television, the cigarette advertisements in fact appeared on the teenager programs which start running from the prime time hours. Moreover, in a single advertisement break, the cigarette advertisement displayed more than two times. This violation clearly shows how incessant the promotion done by cigarette industries that is not only intended for adults, but teenagers. Unfortunately, there are no reprimands or sanctions given associated with this violation.

Besides that, the sanctions given for the violations do not necessarily apply P3 and SPS Article 82. According to MayongSuryoLaksono (in interview, 2018), the sanctions given by KPI have several stages. As Article 75, firstly, the sanctions given are administrative sanctions, and then suspension. However, since the period of 2016-2019, KPI apply what is called as coaching and appeal. MayongSuryoLaksono (in interview, 2018), said that the appeal made by KPI is the dialogue with the media based on the violation or the potential violation.

Some media that have the potential to violate the regulation and even have done a violation are only given guidance and appeal without any explicit follow-up. This is because the coaching and appeals process made by KPI is not in the form of sanction, so when the evaluation of the broadcasting license given back, the coaching will not be taken into account. In this case, this is beneficial to the media and the stakeholders. The enforcement of coaching system is opening the possibility of the violation to happen again. Even with the regulation of the cigarette advertisements, promotions, and sponsorship in media broadcast, the limitation of regulation only refers to the broadcasting hour and the banning on the appearance of cigarettes that can still be tricked by cigarette industries and media industries in various ways so it will not be categorized as a violation towards the regulation. This is obviously disadvantageous to the people because in accordance with the Law, the frequency used in broadcasting is the state property. Thus, the content presented in the media should not harm or be disadvantageous to the people, in this case the content refers to the advertisement.

Discussion

Cigarette Industry Intervention in the Implementation of Government Regulation on Tobacco Advertisement Number 109 Tahun 2012 in the Media Broadcast

However, the interest interventions cannot be unpin from the application of a regulation. The tobacco industries have also undertaken some various efforts to modify the application of the tobacco control regulations. Likewise, with the implementation of the regulation of tobacco control in the media broadcast. The Government Regulation No. 109/2012 seems to be ignored in the monitoring of tobacco advertisement in the media broadcast. The intended advertisement in this case is a form of non-personal communication carried out through media such as radio, television, magazines, external media, newspapers and digital media and paid by certain sponsors (Kotler & Armstrong, 2001).



Various violations occurring in the broadcasting media indicate that the control regulations for tobacco products not well executed. With all the restrictions that deemed to be quite strict by the regulators, the tobacco industries and its advertising agencies are more eager to find a way to escape from the regulation, they even mocking on the regulation.

Various attempts also done by the tobacco industries to make the media industries feel dependent on the tobacco industry. Starting from high budget advertisement, giving sponsorships to various media events or making award events for media employee with a fairly fantastic prize. This effort then raises a sense of "debt" because the tobacco industry perceived to have a great service for the survival of the media industry and therefore the media industry ignores the interests of the public. This blurring or false awareness then becomes the commodities fetishism, it is an understanding of the worship of a price paid to obtain a certain commodity, in this case is cigarettes. This worship based on the exchange of prices with goods that allow money as a tool of the exchange. The higher the price of a commodity, the greater the exchange and worship, the commodity fetishism can be regarded as an attempt done by the industry to create a false worship towards its products. Such worship tends to be identical to the symbols and brands of the product so that the consumers feel the false enjoyment through brands and symbols associated with the product (Poespowardojo&Seran, 2016).

Conclusion

Various violations occurred in the broadcasting media indicates that the tobacco control regulations, which both listed in the Broadcasting Act, P3 and SPS, and a detailed tobacco control regulations on tobacco advertising from the Government Regulation No. 109 of 2012 tends to be weak and has no power to suppress the tobacco industries in Indonesia.

References

- Biro Komunikasi dan Pelayanan Masyarakat. (2017, 31 Mei). *Pemerintah upayakan pengurangan jumlah perokok pemula*. Diambil kembali dari Kementerian Kesehatan Indonesia RI: <http://www.depkes.go.id/article/view/17060200002/pemerintah-upayakan-pengurangan-jumlah-perokok-pemula-.html>
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods 4th Ed*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2009). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Duana, M. sK. (2013). Pelarangan total iklan, promosi dan sponsorship rokok, mungkinkah? Sebuah harapan dalam kegagalan kebijakan penanggulangan rokok di Indonesia. *Arc. Com. Health VOL. 2 nO. 1*, ix-xi.



- Julianto, I. (2014). *Rokok yang membelah Indonesia: Kontestasi wacana pro-kontra regulasi rokok di ruang publik media massa dan media sosial*. Disertasi. Universitas Indonesia.
- Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2001). *Dasar-Dasar Pemasaran Jilid 2. (Alexander Sibandoro & Benyamin Molan, Terjemahan)*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Long, P., & Wall, T. (2012). *Media Studies: Text, Production, Context (2nd Ed)*. London: Routledge.
- Mosco, V. (2009). *The political economy of communication (2nd ed.)*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Mutmainnah, N., & Hendriyani. (2017). Regulasi tentang Iklan Rokok di Media Penyiaran Tidak Melindungi. *Developing Knowledge Community: Quintuple Helix and Beyond COMICOS 2017* (hal. 1031-1054). Yogyakarta: Universitas Atma Jaya Yogyakarta.
- Poespowardojo, S. M., & Seran, A. (2016). *Diskursus teori-teori kritis: Kritik atas kapitalisme klasik, modern dan kontemporer*. Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas.
- Sastrapratedja, M., & Parera, F. M. (1991). *Seri filsafat sosial No. 1 Niccolo Machiavelli Sang penguasa: Surat seorang negarawan kepada pemimpin republik*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Soegondo, R. (2010). *Strukturasi industri rokok di Indonesia (Komunikasi sebagai sumberdaya otoritatif)*. Tesis. Universitas Indonesia.