

## Ear to Asia podcast



**Title:** The price of rising inequality in Indonesia

**Description:** While poverty in Indonesia has declined significantly in the 20 years since the fall of Suharto, the gap between the rich and poor has only got worse. Political economists Prof Andrew Rosser and Dr Rachael Diprose discuss the troubling social, health and educational consequences of this rising inequality for ordinary Indonesians.

**Listen:** <https://player.whooshkaa.com/episode/?id=275514>

Peter Clarke: Hello, I'm Peter Clarke. This is Ear to Asia.

CNA Insider  
Sri Mulyani  
Indrawati: The question for Indonesia is actually how you are going to create more resiliency in terms of growth to create jobs and reduce poverty.

CGTN America  
Rian Maelzer: Poverty rates in Indonesia have been steadily declining for many years, but the gap between rich and poor has been widening. That's a worry for President Joko Widodo, whose core support comes from the lower income groups.

Aljazeera English  
Step Vaessen: One country, two different worlds. One world full of luxury and plenty of opportunity. The other, where people are struggling every day to survive. They're two worlds apart, and so far, the government has failed to close the gap. When you are dealing with the policymaking environment today, which is really affected by the speed of the information and technology, you have a very huge potential mismatch between people's expectations and the ability to deliver.

CNA Insider  
Sri Mulyani  
Indrawati: When you are dealing with the policymaking environment today, which is really affected by the speed of the information and technology, you have a very huge potential mismatch between people's expectations and the ability to deliver.

Peter Clarke: In this episode, the price of inequality in Indonesia. Ear to Asia is the podcast from Asia Institute, the Asia research specialists at the University of Melbourne. In Ear to Asia, we talk with Asia researchers about the issues behind the news headlines in a region that's rapidly changing the world. On paper and on the ground, Indonesia has come a long way in the last two decades since the fall of the authoritarian Suharto regime in 1998. Helped by robust economic growth rates, poverty in the world's fourth most populous country has been cut in half, with less than 12% of Indonesians now living below the poverty line. Yet efforts to lift the poor into relative

prosperity are now grinding to a halt. Income inequality is rising fast, and the future prospects for key segments of Indonesian society are now at risk, possibly for generations to come.

What's been happening to stop the trend towards greater equality in Indonesia? What does inequality actually look like there, and where in that sprawling archipelago are we more likely to see it? As we'll hear in this episode of Ear to Asia, the impact of inequality is about more than economics and social justice. It has important consequences for Indonesia's social cohesion, its political culture, and even regional security. To give us a sense of what's at stake and who's allowed a stake in Indonesia today, two political economists specializing in the region are with us, Professor Andrew Rosser of Asia Institute, who investigates development issues in Indonesia and Timor-Leste, and Dr. Rachael Diprose of the School of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Melbourne, who researches state-building, conflict, and development.

Andrew, Rachael, welcome to Ear to Asia.

Andrew Rosser: Nice to be here.

Rachael Diprose: Lovely to be here.

Peter Clarke: Well, we hear much talk and debate around this word inequality in most countries, especially around election time. Obviously, it has many meanings and aspects. I'm thinking perhaps we should be using plural inequalities rather than just inequality. Let's try and define what we actually mean by inequality, Andrew.

Andrew Rosser: I think you're quite right. Inequality is something that has multiple

dimensions, and in that respect, it is worth talking about inequalities rather than inequality per se. A lot of the conversation about inequality focuses on income, consumption, or wealth-related inequality, and that's a very, very important dimension of it, because it's intersected with a whole variety of other different types of inequality, but there are also, and this is particularly true of the Indonesian case, other forms of inequality that are particularly important, access to health care, access to education, access to infrastructure, access to social protection, and so on.

Peter Clarke: I'm just thinking as I hear you say that that all those various aspects, the multi-dimensional aspects, must have a lot of tug and pull. They all interact with each other.

Andrew Rosser: That's right. Inequality on the wealth, income, and consumption side has been linked to problems in terms of access to health care. Access to health care in turn, it's been argued, is one of the principal causes of income and wealth inequality. These things work in back and forward ways.

Peter Clarke: Rachael.

Rachael Diprose: Yes. One of the important points to remember is that some of these inequalities can be compounding, particularly for people who are in precarious groups, particularly the poorest of the poor. If we think about some of the measures of poverty, for example, most of us read about income inequalities measured by the Gini, as you know, which lines up individuals side by side in a society and looks at the proportion of wealth that they capture.

Peter Clarke: You're talking about the Gini coefficient now.

Rachael Diprose: Yes.

Peter Clarke: One of the database tools that researchers like you and Andrew use to get some sense of what the inequality actually is about.

Rachael Diprose: Absolutely. However, there's other measures that try and capture different dimensions of vulnerability. Andrew's mentioned a few, health and education, and there's new measures of poverty that are also looking at safety and security, so how people feel on the street, also the rates of crime in a particular society. Gender empowerment, for example, is another dimension of poverty that are being used to create this quite complex measures so that we can understand, for example, when a woman who is poor, who has five children, is also facing very precarious employment, is working in the informal sector, is running a small kiosk, trying to survive in that sort of everyday level, she's possibly living in a slum. There's possibly higher crime rates. All of these different dimensions are compounding. And her kids might not be able to go to school or access health and education services. We like to think about the complexity of those poverty measures to try and understand the sorts of problems that the big population in Indonesia is facing.

Peter Clarke: Let's go to Indonesia more specifically now. I'm just imagining Jakarta. It's a bit like Johannesburg, in the same way, and other big cities like that, where you have shiny affluence side by side, stark often, with shantytowns, and real slums, and real poverty staring you in the face. When we talk about inequality, we've got in some of those big cities in developing countries, really stark visual inequality as well. Take us into Indonesia more specifically now to describe what we might see. Remembering it is an archipelago, so we've got the big islands and the tiny, little islands spread out. What's inequality like in everyday Indonesia?

Andrew Rosser: The typical image of inequality in Indonesia is more or less along the lines that you've just described, shiny glass skyscrapers next to a shanty or slum sort of area. In urban areas, and particularly in the large cities like Jakarta, or Surabaya, or Medan, or Jogjakarta, you have precisely that sort of visage.

At the same time, though, you do have important regional disparities. Out in the outlying areas of Indonesia, you don't have the shiny glass towers, but you have people still living in a situation of relative poverty, and in fact, in many cases, poverty that is more severe compared to the poor people in the urban areas. In Jakarta, by some measures, there's almost no poverty, because the definitions that are used are sufficiently low that they don't capture, or at least, not many people meet the definition of poverty that is used. In more outlying areas, people do fall under the poverty line as it's defined for those purposes.

Peter Clarke: Andrew, could I just clarify about poverty? You talked about the low bar, but there are various strata of poverty definitions out there, moderate poverty, acute poverty. Is that relevant to our discussion?

Andrew Rosser: Yes, it is. Indonesia has had enormous success in reducing the number of people defined as existing in extreme poverty. The rate's come down, as you said before, to something close to 10%. If one defines poverty in slightly higher terms, in terms of income or consumption levels, a very large chunk of the population would be defined as poverty. OXFAM, in a recent report on inequality in Indonesia, pointed out that if you use a benchmark of moderate poverty, equivalent to \$3.10 U.S. per day, something like 93 million people in Indonesia would be classified as poor, or about 36% of the total population.

Peter Clarke: Rachael, we've had this image, haven't we, of Indonesia on an upward trend, if you like, the economy improving, etc.? But what we're now seeing,

we're going back to the Gini coefficient, is that in fact inequality has been increasing, not decreasing, in the face of that economic improvement. Could you just take us a little deeper into that?

Rachael Diprose: Yes. Picking up from what Andrew is talking about in terms of poverty severity, I think that's a really big problem in Indonesia. That's one aspect of poverty that's been growing. Usually, in Indonesia, they measure the poverty line, it sits between \$37 to \$40 Australian per month.

Peter Clarke: That's the raw figure, but against spending power, I guess we've got to figure that in as well, haven't we?

Rachael Diprose: Yes. That would be the poverty line that Indonesia uses, and that's to purchase very, very basic, staying alive sorts of food and so on. The other way of thinking about this problem is, how deep is that poverty? How greatly at risk is the communities that are defined as in poverty? If there's an economic shock like the global financial crisis in the late 2000s, or the Asian financial crisis, which was severe in the late '90s, people can very quickly fall below the poverty line. I've met and interviewed many, many people who can barely feed themselves and their family once or twice a day, let alone keep children in school and so on.

So we think about poverty in terms of that depth and severity, and what you find is that in those outer islands of Indonesia, places like Aceh, eastern Indonesia in particular, sometimes that severity is three to four times that of people in urban areas or living in Java. The archipelagic nature of Indonesia does shape the opportunities that people have, the way that services are provided, the infrastructure that's there. If we, for example, think about some of the challenges in health, it's very different trying to provide safe birth facilities for women out in eastern Indonesia that may be on tiny, tiny islands which are at some distance from the provincial capital

where there's a hospital. If they have a risky birth, their risk for mothers in particular of dying can be much more acute than, say, people living in urban areas in Java.

Peter Clarke: You talked about opportunity. The image that's stuck in my mind all those years, going way back, into China, in fact, in Beijing. There was a guy in leather pants with a BMW, with a whole lot of guys washing his car. Then a guy arrived on a bike with a piece of guttering with coals in it for their lunch. He was selling the guys washing the car their lunch. In developing countries, you get these incredibly complex ecosystems, don't you, of businesses, and then micro-businesses, and then people hanging off those micro-businesses? The same in Indonesia?

Rachael Diprose: An entire support network that actually props up, in some ways, the structures of inequality. There's an interesting example I'm thinking of in Jakarta, where a new mini-suburb was built, almost a gated community. Middle-class to slightly wealthy houses were built, and good roads, sanitation facilities, and so on, sort of as you would imagine a middle-class suburb in Australia. But because it was a gated community, there were a number of rules and regulations. They didn't want the hawkers, and the street services, and the little shop at the end of the street where you put in your dry cleaning or your washing, and so on. They didn't want that sort of community to be living in this suburb.

Eventually, a number of people started moving out, because they were so used to the fried rice seller wandering past late at night to provide a bit of food, or the cheap cleaning services, and so on, that it kind of lost that community life, if you like. It didn't end up being such a popular place to live, but it does give you an image of what happens when you take away some of those small, informal-sector support services and industries that sit behind the bigger wealth disparities that you see in Indonesia.

Peter Clarke: We've just alluded to this backwards shift, if you like, towards more inequality in Indonesia. Andrew, could you define that a little more closely? How does Indonesia fit in with its near neighbors like the Philippines and, perhaps, places like Vietnam, Cambodia, those sort of places? Are they suffering the same sort of trend?

Andrew Rosser: As we discussed before, the conventional measure of inequality is the Gini coefficient. The figures there for Indonesia demonstrate a really marked worsening in inequality. In 2000, the Gini coefficient for Indonesia was 0.3. It peaked in 2014 at 0.41, and it's come back a little bit since then to 0.39. OXFAM has some very good figures that illustrate the severity of the situation in Indonesia with regards to income and wealth inequality. According to their report, 1% of the population, that is the wealthiest 1% of the population, owned nearly half of the country's total wealth. The wealth of the four richest billionaires in Indonesia is equal to or greater than the wealth of the bottom 40% of the population. These are really, really quite marked disparities. Assessments comparing Indonesia to other countries generally show that Indonesia is now amongst the most unequal countries in the world in terms of income and wealth inequality.

Peter Clarke: They're extraordinary figures, Rachael, aren't they? This places Indonesia, as they're heading into this really important election coming up in April 2019, in a very tricky situation. So there are political dimensions to all this.

Rachael Diprose: Yes. I think that's what's happening at present, and perhaps this wasn't happening 10 to 15 years ago, with the rise of mobility, and telecommunications, and TVs are much more prevalent than they once were. Everybody's got a mobile phone. To digress for a moment, some people think, "How can you be in poverty and have a mobile phone?" but it's such an important instrument for livelihoods and staying connected.

Peter Clarke: Those people wouldn't have had landlines, but they leapfrogged into the mobiles.

Rachael Diprose: Absolutely. So we've leapfrogged the need to provide extraordinary and very expensive infrastructure that we would have once had. With that increased mobility, and different forms of telecommunication, and being able to see the differences and the disparity, that, I think, intensifies grievances. When you can see how you are faring vis-a-vis others, that creates a fair bit of dissent. I think that that then provides a very strong base for politicians and others to mobilize.

But I think some of the differences that we can see with other countries in Asia, and with the past in Indonesia, is where once under authoritarian regimes you wouldn't have that space and scope to mobilize, you also didn't have those advancements in technology where you could see differences so markedly. It's very, very important in Indonesia because the democratic bargain has held. We've seen, for example, in the Philippines and possibly in China, a regression towards a degree of authoritarianism that possibly wasn't there 10 to 15 years ago. In Indonesia, it's held that democratic bargain. It's very popular, but that means that you can't control the vote through large power structures that were once there. You actually have to have a degree of popular appeal.

If you can appease or appeal to people's everyday living circumstances and offer popular solutions to that in the political discourse, particularly around elections, I think that's how you're mobilizing the popular vote. That narrative of, "We'll solve all the problems. We will protect our industries. Jobs for us. Keep our resources here," this sort of narrative that you hear, it's very, very popular, but it also disguises those inequalities. Because economic nationalism, resource nationalism, that sort of keeping the

resources and controlling how they're distributed along large conglomerates, actually perpetuates the sort of inequality that we're seeing, because it allows a small few to capture the wealth gains.

Andrew Rosser: At the same time, though, it allows possibility for political opponents of the current government to leverage concern about rising inequality for their own political purposes. We've certainly seen that, I think, in recent times in Indonesia, where opposition political parties, and in particular Prabowo Subianto, who was President Joko Widodo's principal competitor in the 2014 presidential elections, and it looks like he's going to be the principal particular in the forthcoming elections, he's made a lot of writing inequality in Indonesia and used it essentially as a way of giving the government a bit of a kick.

Peter Clarke: One thing I'm not clear about, as we discuss this, within that archipelago, is localism really important against a more centralized control of the economy? Is it very fragmented, or is there quite a strong center?

Andrew Rosser: I guess my principal experience of central-regional relations has centered on the education sector, where under the country's decentralization laws, authority is devolved down to the district level. The fact that that has happened has caused some dilemmas in Jakarta, at the central government level, inasmuch as local governments have done things that Jakarta doesn't particularly like, but for which Jakarta has to foot the bill.

The principal problem in this respect has been with regards to teacher recruitment and the salary costs that are entailed in that respect. Also, teacher distribution. Local governments have tended to hire large numbers of teachers, and they've congregated in the urban areas. Schools out in regional areas, and remote areas in particular, have been relatively understaffed. This is another form of inequality that characterizes Indonesia

today.

The central government has sought to deal with this by issuing various sorts of instructions to district governments to redistribute teachers, to limit the recruitment of teachers, and so on. And they haven't always been able. In fact, they've rarely been able to get district governments to comply. In that respect, localism is absolutely crucial. Formally, district governments have a high degree of autonomy under the country's decentralization laws. Generally, they would prefer to exercise that autonomy than be told what to do by Jakarta.

Peter Clarke: Rachael, anything to add there?

Rachael Diprose: I don't think there's a silver bullet solution to governance in really large, diverse, multi-ethnic, multi-religious countries. This is not something that Indonesia is alone in facing. Some of the arguments have been made, we need this decentered government to be able to provide the locally appropriate social services, to tackle the sorts of problems that are very relevant to a particular region, which some would argue wasn't necessarily done so well under the prior large, centralized, authoritarian government. Others would argue, when it comes to trying to create national policies to reduce inequality, to improve education to meet the Sustainable Development Goals, one of which is reducing inequality, you need those central policies. It's about getting the mix between central initiatives and local solutions to local challenges. I think that's a very difficult balance to get right. Variations on this have been trialed all around the world, and there's no perfect solution that anybody has found yet.

Peter Clarke: You're listening to Ear to Asia, from the Asia Institute at the University of Melbourne. I'm Peter Clarke with political economists Andrew Rosser and Rachael Diprose. We're looking at the broad impact of inequality in

Indonesia. Let's go a little bit deeper, Andrew. As we move to analyze why this trend away from equality is happening in Indonesia, cronyism and corruption, how important?

Andrew Rosser: It's a terrific question. My sense is that broadly, both the right and the left of the political spectrum agree on the underlying causes of inequality in Indonesia to a certain extent. They know it's got something to do with demographic factors. They know it's got something to do with the way in which the labor market has operated. They know it's got something to do with unequal access to social protection, and so on. They know also that it has something to do with the different levels of assets that the poor and the wealthy command. So I think at that level, there's broad agreement.

Where there's debate and where there's some sort of contestation over the issue of inequality is around the extent to which it's driven by elite capture of the state, whether that's at the national level or the local level, and in particular, capture of the state by the dominant politico-business families, or what in the Indonesian context are often referred to as a politico-business oligarchy. The other key dimension of debate is around the role of neoliberal economic and social policies in creating a more unequal opportunity structure within the country, and in particular, differential access to things like quality health care, quality education, and access to infrastructure.

Peter Clarke: Rachael, do you want to take that further?

Rachael Diprose: If we take overt corruption, that's a challenge obviously for government budgets and providing social services. If that's happening at multiple levels, given the very large government structure and the decentered nature, if you've got happening in the center and out in the districts and the provinces, that has a compounding effect. And that's less funds available to

provide health, education, and other sorts of services, not forgetting that also Indonesia is in the process of trying to create a stronger taxation base with which to provide those services.

On the other side of the coin is, there's more indirect ways in which opportunities get captured. Again, I don't think this is something that only happens in Indonesia. It may happen to a more acute degree. As institutions and the rule of law strengthen, that may dissipate to a degree, but if you have a large conglomerate that has concessions for palm oil, that creates a lot of power for that business to operate in far-flung parts of the country. That is creating opportunities for people in those local areas, but if you're not within the networks of the owners or the people within the hierarchy of that business structure, you're not going to get access to be able to either get jobs in that sector or to provide your smallholder palm oil that you grow on your little patch of 2.5 acres to that company.

The way some of these industries and economic sectors are structured, they're set up to have what we would call a patronage system, where you are sort of loyal to those that can provide you with opportunities, which is how you see what Andrew is mentioning in terms of elite capture. It works its way right down through the system. Hence, if leaders both within the business sector and also the people that they're close to in the political sector are saying, "Vote for this guy. This is who we support," it's difficult for people within that supply chain or within that patronage system not to follow suit. This is how you can restrict and enhance economic and other sorts of opportunities by being in certain networks of patronage.

Andrew Rosser: I think what Rachael and I are both getting at is the idea that inequality isn't something that's natural or inevitable, or driven solely by economic or demographic factors. It's actually a choice. It's a policy choice, and it reflects an underlying political economy and underlying structure of power. In the

Indonesian case, that is a structure of power that's characterized by elite capture, in particular by the dominance of powerful politico-business families that have a strong interest in capturing the resources of the state and using them for their own purposes rather than seeing a fair share of those resources redistributed to the poor and marginalized.

Peter Clarke: Andrew, could we come back to education and health? First of all, education. Are some kids not getting any education?

Andrew Rosser: By and large, kids get to go to school. They get to start school. What you see in Indonesia, though, is still fairly high dropout rates. They're particularly high for the lower social and economic classes. By the time you get to senior secondary school, for instance, the levels of participation amongst wealthier children or children from wealthier backgrounds is much higher than the children from poorer backgrounds. However, there are really marked regional differences in terms of access to education and the quality of education.

Peter Clarke: Health, very quickly. I have no sense of what sort of health coverage, etc. Is it really just down to individual wealth to manage your health and health coverage in Indonesia, or are there other more, dare I say, socialist aspects to it?

Andrew Rosser: Indonesia has, since the Asian financial crisis in the late '90s, made significant strides in terms of developing a public health insurance system. It's done on a contributory model, however, so basically people have to contribute out of their salaries in order to be part of the national health system. If they're poor, the government will pay that premium on their behalf, but there's a group of people who are not formally employed. So they're in the informal sector. They're not classified as poor, either, who are more or less left out of the system.

One of the big challenges for Indonesia to move forward with regard to the national health insurance system is how it integrates those people into the system. The argument from groups like OXFAM and others on the left is that, in fact, the contributory model is fundamentally flawed, and what we need is a public health system a la the National Health Insurance model in the United Kingdom, whereby basically it's fully funded out of the public purse, and everybody, as a matter of a right of citizenship, has access to that public health system.

Peter Clarke: Rachael, one broad cross-cutting aspect of all this inequality we really haven't mentioned, and you alluded to perhaps, is gender. How does gender play into this very complex equation?

Rachael Diprose: In terms of gender, there is great disparities in the labor market. You'll find a lot more women are employed in the informal sector. That may be based on age, and cohort, and access to education as well. Opportunities are a bit more equal between men and women or girls and boys depending on the level of education that they have. One of the most precarious groups which you'll find in a lot of places in Indonesia are female-headed households. They tend to face those multiple dimensions of poverty and risk that we talked about earlier. They have the double burden of having a lot of the childcare responsibilities, and in some cases they're caring for the elderly as well, which is why they're defined in that instance as a female-headed household, as well as the income-generating burden, which is a different scenario compared with men.

That said, there's some really amazing innovations that are happening in lots of these spaces. I think it's important to remember the enormous achievements that Indonesia has made. It's no mean feat to halve poverty over that one to two decades in a population that's so large. That was a lot

of hard work of targeted poverty reduction programs and thinking about innovative ways to tackle that. There's some great innovations, for example, in capturing technologies and small-scale social enterprises. You can see the way that technology is being captured, selling solar in remote areas, and there's some really great initiatives like the One Woman Program, which I have seen, which sponsors women to help them build those entrepreneurial skills, particularly women at risk in female-headed households and similar sorts of situations where they become the entrepreneur selling this clean technology for the poor at very affordable prices, and create that long-term economic opportunity for themselves.

I think another thing to think about is the way that the labor market is structured and the informal sector being so large. Indonesians are looking for other opportunities. There's an enormous number of women who go as female migrant workers to work in Malaysia, Singapore, Saudi Arabia, and other places. What they do with those remittances, that being the wages that they send home to their family, can you give insight into how they think about their long or their short-term well-being. Those that invest in a nicer house aren't thinking about their economic opportunities over the long term, but there are many who invest in small enterprises so that they can have a livelihood well after their return.

Of course, there's challenges in that sector in making sure those female migrant workers are safe, but there's also quite a lot of innovation that's going on. I've seen some amazing examples of where the Australian aid program supports women's empowerment programs. One of the things that seems to be working is creating or supporting small collective action groups, so that those vulnerable women, in particular, can act collectively and have a voice, say, in how village funds are spent to help potentially meet their needs, or they can share information with each other.

Peter Clarke: What role does civil society play in all of this, Andrew? What, in your mind, are some of the more positive and feasible solutions offering?

Andrew Rosser: It seems to me, actually, that there is a broad consensus at one level about what needs to be done in relation to inequality in Indonesia. I think everyone recognizes that the country needs a fairer tax system, for instance. Indonesia needs a tax system that ensures that the wealthy pay their fair share of tax rather than avoiding or evading it. There needs to be some further work done on the development of social protection mechanisms in the country so that people in the informal sector, for instance, are incorporated in a more systematic way than they currently are, so that greater support is provided for the elderly, the unemployed, and so on. There needs to be improved access to a whole range of public services and efforts made to improve the quality of those services. I think at that level, there is broad agreement about what needs to be done.

The tricky bit is the politics around all of this. It's how do you make that happen? This is where civil society potentially has a role to play. Civil society groups, particularly the more progressive NGOs based in Jakarta and some of the other major urban centers, have been a crucial voice for a fairer and more equal Indonesia. They're relatively weak politically, though, in the face of the politico-business families that dominate the political system. The key challenge is really, how do you empower those sorts of groups vis-a-vis their political opponents? I'm not sure I have any great answers to that, to be honest. It's a very, very difficult issue, but that's really the nub of the issue, I think.

Peter Clarke: Would you agree that there's momentum away from equality clearly on the go? Altering that sense of inertia is really the nub of the problem, isn't it?

Andrew Rosser: I think that's probably right. Indonesia is not alone in this respect. Rising

inequality is a problem that's afflicting a whole lot of countries, including Australia, including many other Western countries. And very few of them really seem to have much of a solution, in large part because it really is a matter of politics. We're just in an era where not only wealth but also power is increasingly being concentrated in the hands of the few. I'm not quite sure how you reverse that in any simple, programmatic sort of way.

A key problem for Indonesia is almost certainly the weakness of the political left. The NGOs, at least the more progressive elements within the NGOs, fall on that side of the political spectrum. They don't have any obvious allies in the political parties, for instance, which tend to be much more personality-driven, patronage-driven, and to not have clear ideological or programmatic policy agendas.

Peter Clarke: As we all watch and track the upcoming Indonesian election, I hope our conversation today gives us a sharper context to that so we can see what's going on, perhaps, with a little more authenticity. Andrew, Rachael, thanks so much for being with us today on Ear to Asia.

Rachael Diprose: Thank you.

Andrew Rosser: My pleasure.

Peter Clarke: Our guests today on this episode of Ear to Asia, Professor Andrew Rosser from Asia Institute and Dr. Rachael Diprose from the School of Social and Political Sciences, both here at the University of Melbourne. Both our guests will be speaking at a conference titled Indonesia's Inequalities, which is to be held on the 1st and 2nd of November 2018 here at the University of Melbourne. Just google that title for more information.

Ear to Asia is brought to you by Asia Institute at the University of Melbourne, Australia. You can find more information about this and all our other episodes at the Asia Institute website. Be sure to keep up with every episode of Ear to Asia by following us on the Apple Podcast app, Stitcher, or on SoundCloud. And it would mean a lot to us if you'd give us a generous rating on iTunes or like us on SoundCloud. And of course, let your friends know about us on social media. This episode was recorded on the 30th of August, 2018. Producers were Kelvin Param and Eric van Bommel of Profactual.com. Ear to Asia is licensed under Creative Commons, copyright 2018, the University of Melbourne. I am Peter Clarke. Thanks for your company.