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Abstract

The emergence of citizen journalism get a skeptical response from professional journalists based on several reasons such as un-institutional, subjective and non-professional (O’nebring, 2013; Allan, 2009; Moyo, 2009). This study explores how mainstream media play dominant role in producing fact by excluding citizen journalist apart from their system. The object of the study is ‘Discourse’ about the banned of a controversial article written by an anonymous citizen journalist named Jilbab Hitam (here in after referred to as the ‘JH’) in kompasiana.com. The issues widespread quickly in cyberspace produce pros cons among internet user including professional journalists, NGO, etc. This research employs Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) on articles and twitter conversations relevant to the issue. The results of the study show how anonymity becomes dominant Discourse submerging other important issue such as media manipulation and media corruption. Negative representation of anonymity – hoax, liar, provocative – might tend to hamper struggling of internet user freedom of expression.

Keywords: Anonymity, Citizen Journalism, Journalistic Authority, CDA, Foucault

Background

The development of Citizen Journalism (here in after referred to as the ‘CJ’) in Indonesia is not as significant as happened in countries like South Korea and USA. The countries have better CJ in term of its popularity among citizen and its quality of content. Some CJ sites were emerging in Indonesia in 2006 – panyingkul.com, kabarindonesia.com, wikiku.com (Hasfi ; 2009) – but they have no significant role in shaping influential public interest. Since 2006, CJ has been using new channels such as YouTube, facebook and twitter. Natural disasters occurred in Indonesia including tsunami in Aceh, earthquake in Yogyakarta, earthquake in Padang, etc become

---

1. The article is mainly about manipulation and media corruption done by mainstream media in Indonesia.
2. Some called it pseudonym
3. Means ‘black veil’
4. Citizen journalism sites, under professional media, Kompas Gramedia Group
witnesses of how CJ played a crucial role in disseminating information and helping victims – in some case it defeats mainstream media. The success of CJ in covering disaster was responded by mainstream media by developing CJ sites in their online version.

However, public digital activism in Indonesia including CJ has not significantly influencing public agenda. For instance, Lim (2012) found although Indonesia is one of country with biggest number of twitter user, there were only two successful social media activism, Coins for Prita and Gecko vs Crocodiles. Lim (2013) found Lapindo social movement was not successful because TV One intervenes with a more powerful competing narrative, reducing social media-generated participation. Because social media is embedded in systems of control, power and domination in the larger media system, issues and interests that dominate mainstream media also influence social media activism.

Among the apathy of citizen journalism activities, there is an interesting issue relating to CJ sites under Kompas Group, Kompasiana.com. An article, entitled ‘Tempo’ and KataData, uploaded by anonymous account named Jilbab Hitam (here in after referred to as the ‘JH’), was deleted by its administrator. JH claims itself as a former journalist of Tempo, one of the biggest weekly magazines in Indonesia. In the article, he/she mentioned some senior journalists from some big media in Indonesia, including founders of Tempo, as actors behind the unethical actions. This issue widespread in cyberspace quickly and got various responses from citizens including kompasiana’s member, professional journalists, NGO, etc. Pepih Nugraha, founder of Kompasiana.com admitted that Kompasiana was deleting the article since it violated Kompasiana rule. Although it was banned, the article has been captured by some citizen journalist and blogger who then disseminated it though internet. The ban of the article reflects what Anderson (2008: 250) define as journalistic authority. Journalistic authority is the power possessed by journalists and journalistic organizations that allow them to present their interpretations of reality as accurate, truthful and of political importance. The aim of the study is not trying to prove whether JH’s article is a truth or fake. It focuses on how the Discourses are produced by mainstream media in which refereeing to Foucault – will produce knowledge that finally use for gaining and maintaining power.

**Why JH case matter?**

Kompasiana.com is the most active CJ site in Indonesia, under Kompas Gramedia Group. It is the only one CJ site under mainstream media that briefly define it activities as citizen journalism. Meanwhile, others use term like forum, blog, etc. More than 200.000 citizens from various background are subscribed at Kompasiana.com.

---

5 A case refers to hot unstoppable mud gush in Porong, Sidoarjo, East Java flowing from drilling activity of PT Lapindo Brantas, owned by Aburizal Bakri (see reference no 6)
6 TV commercial owned by Aburizal Bakrie, President’s candidate from Golkar Party Chairman for presidential election in Indonesia, 2014
7 Reputable Weekly Magazine in Indonesia
8 Media consultant
9 The corruption scandal at the Upstream Oil and Gas Regulatory Special Task Force (SKK Migas) in Energy and Mineral Resources Ministry
5000 of them are verified. Nowadays, Kompasiana successfully provide space for
citizen to discuss any kind of issue including politic, economy and social.

JH’s article uploaded at Kompasiana, 11st November 2013, might disturb
peacefulness of mainstream media in Indonesia that has been enjoying domination of
information distribution in this capital media industry. JH’s article – by ignoring
whether or not it is true or fake – could be defined as citizen media resistant that
produce counter hegemony over domination of mainstream media in Indonesai. As we
know, in the past fifteen years, the growth of the media industry in Indonesia has been
driven by capital interest, leading to a media oligopoly and the concentration of
ownership. Today, Indonesia is controlled only by 12 giant media industry (Nugroho,
2012; Lim, 2011).

The fact brings up questions such as; do mainstream media play its role to serve
public or to media owner? Do mainstream media independent? Or more critical
question such as: how does media manipulation was practiced? Why media
organization is used for public relation purposes. Many researches done by media
observer, NGO, media organization, media educator, etc have answered some of the
questions. JH’s article is interesting to be discussed as well as important. JH’s article
was written vividly; provide detail data, reflect that the writer is journalists who know
‘the backstage’ of Indonesia media system. Moreover, no one proven that whole
contents are fake. In the context of contemporary media industry – with its capitalism
system grow wildly – public ‘always ‘has right to questioning JH’s narration. This
research takes part in those discussions. However, again this study doesn’t focus on
JH’s article. It would rather provide alternative perspective from linguistic point of
view by interpreting texts (news, twitter conversation) written by mainstream media
and public responding to JH’s article. It will reveal what dominant Discourses were
produced and how power relation among them was shaped.

RQ
This research trying to answer following questions:
a. What are dominant Discourses and how mainstream media produced it?
b. How macro level (socio cultural) explain the issue?

Method

This study uses critical paradigm that view media as a tool for controlling public and
producing power. Media is not a neutral entity but an institution owned by dominant
group who control process of communication. Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough;
2003) is adhered to interpret 8 mainstream media’s articles encounter JH’s discourse,
and twitter conversation (#NgobrolTempo, #anonim) connecting to relevant issue.
Seven (7) news articles were taken from tempo.co – online platform of TEMPO group –
and an article was taken from Koran Tempo Daily Newspaper. The articles at
tempo.co explicitly responded to JH, meanwhile an article at Koran Tempo entitled
‘The Clicking Monkey’ was an implicit respond.

All of the data was collecting from 11 November 2013 until 30 December 2013. This also become limitation of the study since it does not employing total
sampling and only focuses on above texts. In-depth interview also conducted among
two senior journalists. Researcher employs Faircloug’s model of CDA analysis.
provides three stages including; text interpretation, Discourse practice and socio cultural practice.

**Literature Review**

Citizen journalism is one of important issue in new media research. The research of citizen journalism focuses in some themes including the role of CJ in democratization and collaboration between CJ – mainstream media and the resent issue is conflict between both of them. This study is included in the issue of conflict between mainstream media and citizen journalist, in which CJ produce counter hegemony over mainstream media domination. Meanwhile another research issues about conflict also give more attention to how mainstream media authority hegemony and limit CJ’s role.

This literature review will.

Niekamp (2010) and Canter (2013) found how mainstream media provide space for CJ to contribute in news production process, however this research also detect economy politic and commodification motive over CJ. Kperogi (2011) study ‘iReport.com,’ a YouTube-type, user-generated citizen news site launched by the Cable News Network (CNN). He argue that the trend toward corporate-sponsored citizen media may, in the final analysis, blur the distinction between citizen and mainstream journalism. In his study he explores how CNN represent a ‘hegemonic cooptation’ of potentially threatening citizen journalism. Palmer (2012) Using Tiziana Terranova’s notion of “network culture,” to show how CNN simultaneously denigrates and depends on the unpaid labor of its iReporters, especially when covering a political uprising. In this study he revealing that while sites like iReport do indeed exploit citizen labor to “extend the corporate hegemony of market-driven journalism”.

O’nebring (2013) did in depth and semi structured interviews with professional journalists across career stages and across media in six European countries (UK, Estonia, Germany, Italy, Poland and Sweden), and is concerned with how journalists answer the question: How is what you do different from what citizen journalists do? Based on existing literature on journalistic authority and the professional project, three areas where claims to professional legitimacy and distinction from amateurs are identified: expertise, duty and autonomy. The interview data show that while claims based on expertise and duty are common when professional journalists want to demarcate the boundary between them and citizen journalism, claims based on direct reference to autonomy are non-existent. However, claims based indirectly on reference to autonomy, but institutional or collective rather than individual autonomy, are common. Indeed the key result of this study is that legitimacy claims based on the collective nature of the journalistic endeavour are very common, in contrast to earlier constrictions of journalistic professionalism, which emphasized individualism and individual autonomy.

Mainstream media authority over CJ is also implemented in gatekeeping process. An important finding in recent research is that journalists are reluctant to open up all stages of the journalistic production process to the audience (Karlsson, 2011; Neuberger and Nuernbergk, 2010; Thurman and Hermida, 2010 in Steen ; 2013). Ali and Fahmy (2013); Tong (2014); Nielsen (2012); found traditional ‘gatekeepers’ continue to maintain the status quo over citizen journalist. Nasrullah (2012) is the only one researcher who deconstructs idea about mainstream media hegemony over CJ. In his research, in the contrary, he found how citizen journalists of Kompasiana.com using
space provided by mainstream media as commoditization for pursuing their private interest. His research rejects Curt Chandler dan Hicks’s thesis (2009 in Nasrullah, 2012) about the absence of economy politic motive of citizen journalist in using mainstream media’s space.

This research focus on how CJ do counter hegemony over mainstream media. Although citizen journalism research mention above has reflect the issue of citizen resistant over mainstream, but this study have some unique. Firstly, this study sees CJ as a subject who actively does strategic counter hegemony over mainstream media hegemony. Secondly, this study involving the concept of anonymity that becomes problematic issue in democratic country, on the other hand it was ‘used’ by mainstream as a reason for denial. Thirdly, this study is done in a context of press freedom country where it provides space for its citizen to express their opinion. This is an ironic to find mainstream media banned citizen’s freedom of expression.

A research theoretically similar to this study was done by Moyo (2011). He examines the use of blogs to mediate the experiences of citizens during a violent election in Zimbabwe. It focuses specifically on how people disseminated and shared information about their tribulations under a regime that used coercive measures in the face of its crumbling hegemonic edifice. The article frames these practices within theories of alternative media and citizen journalism and argues that digitization has occasioned new counter-hegemonic spaces and new forms of journalism that are deinstitutionalized and deprofessionalized, and whose radicalism is reflected in both form and content. He argue that this radicalism in part articulates a postmodern philosophy and style as seen in its rejection of the elaborate codes and conventions of mainstream journalism. The internet is seen as certainly enhancing the people’s right to communicate, but only to a limited extent because of access disparities on the one hand, and its appropriation by liberal social movements whose configuration is elitist, on the other.

Another research relevant to the study was done by Reader (2012) who explores the issue of “civility” in anonymous comments posted to news media websites. He did content analysis on six high-profile journalistic essays about anonymous online comments and the 927 responses to those texts. This study found that overall the journalists’ arguments focused on the negative aspects of anonymity and gave short shrift to, or glossed over, legitimate reasons for anonymity in comment forums. Meanwhile readers have three perspectives concerning to anonymity issue including: a power to the people, paranoid about privacy and anonymity as a freedom.

**Theoretical Frameworks**

**Citizen Journalism; Critical Paradigm**

Gillmor (2004) state that citizen journalist involves the ability of anyone to make the news that will give new voice to people who’ve felt voiceless—and whose words we need to hear. They are showing all of us—citizen, journalist, newsmaker—new ways of talking, of learning. Some scholars have variously defined citizen journalism as ‘participatory journalism’, ‘citizen-generated media’, ‘we media’, ‘grassroots media’ or ‘self-service media’ to emphasize the notions of inclusion and participatory communication that are often embedded in alternative media (Atton, 2002; Gillmor, 2006; Kalodzy, 2006 in Moyo 2011). Controversial as it might be, citizen journalism denotes ‘a philosophy of journalism and set of practices that are
embedded within the everyday lives of citizens, and media content that is both driven and produced by those people’ (Atton, 2002: 267 in Moyo 2011).

Those definitions also apply in practice of citizen journalism in Indonesia. However there is controversy among professional journalist and media observer in defining citizen journalism, particularly the using of ‘journalism’. It is because journalism classify as professional projecting including issue such us expertise and duty. Pepih Nugraha (2012) explains citizen cannot be easily called as journalist just because he/she write stories in internet. To become a journalist, citizen should do more than just writing article, but he/she should, for example, pursue training/ education program in a school of journalism. If we use this definition, JH case cannot be easily define as citizen journalism as it is accused does not apply journalism value such us verification and confirmation. Moreover, JH also using anonymity that – based on mainstream media – is problematic concept for individual implementation.

Meanwhile, in this study, researcher uses critical theory to define citizen Journalism. Critical theory empowers citizen journalism by releasing them from definition of journalistic principle. It also sees citizen journalism activity apart from journalism profession thus it never obligate citizen journalism to meet all journalism principles. In contrary, mainstream media limitation over citizen journalism is defined as type of domination. Citizen journalism on the other hand, views as a counter hegemony activism over mainstream media authority. By using this point of view, researcher can define JH as form of citizen journalism activity.

**Journalistic Authority**

Journalistic authority is defined by Anderson as ‘the power possessed by journalists and journalistic organizations that allow them to present their interpretations of reality as accurate, truthful and of political importance’ (Anderson, 2008: 250). The construction of journalistic authority has historically been part of a grander narrative about the role of professionals in modern society. The scholarly discussion of the professionalization of journalism is rooted in the sociology of work as developed pre-1990s – most of the touchstone references were written in a context where the institutional structures of most occupations were much more stable than they are today. Today, it is more difficult for any profession to maintain a ‘professional project’ of closure, exclusion and knowledge monopoly. But while the context of journalistic work has changed significantly in the past decades (technologically, economically, culturally and socially), the ways in which journalists frame professionalism, professional values and professional authority have been remarkably resilient and consistent over time (Nguyen, 2008; O’Sullivan and Heinonen, 2008; Robinson, 2006; Singer, 2005 in Örnebring, 2013). While a professional project of any kind may be less and less sustainable, this has certainly not stopped some journalists from trying to maintain one. Some professional journalists, when faced with citizen journalists and other amateurs perceived as encroaching upon their jurisdiction, still feel compelled to articulate what it is that sets them apart as professionals.

Örnebring (2013) mention that justification and the professional project are including three main issues; expertise, duty and autonomy. Expertise (or skill, or knowledge) refers to the domain of specialist, often technical, knowledge that is associated with a profession. Duty refers to the notion that a profession is ‘more than just a job’, i.e. that the professional has a wider societal duty rather than just a duty to
his or her employer or to him- or herself. Autonomy refers to the degree of self-governance within the profession, and the extent to which the profession is independent of other societal institutions, primarily the state and the market.

**Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA): Discourse, Power and Knowledge**

CDA has its roots in critical linguistic, inspired by Marxism focusing on culture aspect of social realm particularly when domination is strengthened through culture and ideology (Wetherell, 2001). CDA is branch of discourse analysis the goes beyond the description of discourse to an explanation of how and why particular discourse are produced. The pioneer are including N. Faurelough, T.A van Dijk, T.van.Leeuwen, R. Wodak, inspired from the idea of Foucout about the relation of knowledge, power and discourse. CDA see language not merely as a tool to communicate, but also used as power instruments. As symbolic interaction, communication has implication on the production of relation between power and knowledge. Fairlclough (2003) define that Discourse is not only a product or reflection of social processes, but itself seen to contribute toward the production (or reproduction) of these process. A critical approach to discourse analysis typically concentrates on data like news reporting, political interviewing, political speech, counseling, job interviews that describe unequal encounter of embody manipulative strategies that seem neutral or natural to most people.

Although CDA a relatively young discipline, its roots can be traced as far back as Marx, whose ideas on social theory and organization have had a tremendous impact on latter day social thinker. They are including Gramsci and Althusser who both stressed in the idea of ideology of modern societies to sustain their social structure and relation. Gramsci’s theory, Hegemony Theory, give great contrition to CDA in term of how developed Discourse unconsciously influence people without coercion as they accept it as a common sense. Meanwhile Althusser provide great idea of ideology which viewed as a practice where a certain person is placed in certain position of social relation. The aims of CDA are including; firstly, analyze the practice of a Discourse reflecting s social problem; secondly, researching how ideology is being frozen as language and figuring out how to liquefy the ideology ties language; thirdly, increasing consciousness in order to create sensitiveness to the existence of domination, discrimination, prejudice and other form of power abuse.

Foucault (Ritzer George: 2010) provides the most influential understanding of Discourse. This is about answering below questions; how a Discourse is produced, who produce it? and what is the effect of the Discourse. Foucault defines Discourse as something producing other thing – idea, concept or effect. His important thesis is about the relation between power and knowledge. He defines power differently compared to other thinker. Power is define as power strategy that implemented everywhere in social life. Power is articulated through knowledge, and knowledge has power effect. Power institution produces knowledge as basis of their power. Power is not work negatively under repression, but it work positively through regulation and normalization. As every power is shaped and settled over certain knowledge and Discourse, thus if we want to know about power we need to conduct research about the process production of knowledge. This research for example has aim to explore how mainstream journalism’s Discourses are produced in order to create its power over citizen journalism.
Anonymity

Within modern journalism in the United States, disagreement over anonymous commentary seemed to begin in the mid-twentieth century, first regarding unsigned letters to the editor, and later over anonymous call-in opinion features. Those debates often focused on three key issues: avoiding libel, improving the quality of feedback forums, and pursuing an idealistic notion of democracy—issues that appear to be raised in the contemporary industry discourse about anonymity in online comment forums (Reader, 2012). Recent issue of anonymity in USA press is about ‘the ban anonymous comments in its website’ as done by Huffington Post that had been ending it since 2013 in hopes of engendering more civil discussion.

Akdeniz (2000) said that anonymity is essential to democracy and has been a vital tool for the preservation of political speech and discourse throughout history. As a concept it is closely related to free speech and to privacy. The Internet boom in the 1990s created new opportunities for communications and for discussions. Internet technology allows genuinely anonymous communication, and this can be used for many purposes; socially useful, but also criminal. Online anonymity is therefore important both to free speech and privacy just as anonymity and anonymous publishing have been for thousands of years in the offline world.

In the United States, anonymity has been directly tied to the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. Meanwhile in Europe, the importance of anonymity as a facilitator of free speech has been affirmed by the European Court of Human Rights (Goodwin v UK, 1996). The Court recognized that the press has a vital watch dog role in a healthy democratic society and that this function could be undermined if journalists are not allowed to keep the sources of their information confidential. In this case, the Court concluded that the application of the law of contempt to a recalcitrant journalist was not necessary where the subject of the damaging story had already obtained an injunction against publication. It is not clear that the same level of protection would be afforded by the European Court to the idle gossip of non-press speakers, but anonymous 'political speech' would certainly deserve protection (Akdeniz; 2000)

As anonymity has association with citizen activity in freedom of speech, in some issue, anonymity has close relation with citizen journalism activities. The term of ‘anonymous citizen journalists’ is found in a study done by Papadopoulos & Pannti (2013) who interviewed with journalists representing major news organizations in Finland and Sweden, explores how the professional ideology of journalists is shaped by the international trend of citizen witnessing. The emergence of anonymity is defined as technological consequences challenges journalism in its news production process.

Marginalization

The Blacwell Encyclopedia of Sociology (2009) define Marginalization as metaphor that refers to processes by which individuals or groups are kept at or pushed beyond the edges of society. The term outsiders may be used to refer to those individuals or groups who are marginalized. The expression marginalization appears to have originated with Robert Park’s concept of ‘‘marginal man,’’ a term he coined to characterize the lot of impoverished minority ethnic immigrants to a predominantly white Anglo Saxon Protestant United States. More recently, the term marginalization has been largely
superseded by the term exclusion. Nonetheless, marginalization often appears as a synonym for extreme poverty or for social exclusion and it may sometimes be difficult to distinguish between the concepts other than in terms of who is choosing to use them. People may be marginalized from economic production; from consumption (including the consumption of public services); from political participation; and/or from social or cultural interaction. This can apply as much in the developed as in the developing world.

**Result**

**Text Interpretation**

Table 1 is the result of text interpretation on 7 articles of mainstream media (tempo.co). There are three levels of text interpretation; (1) representation, for describing how news object was presented, (2) relation, for describing relationship between journalist and news object, (3) identity, how journalist identity and audience was presented in news.

The main results are including; *firstly*, Tempo put them self as defamation victim. After JH’s article was spreading quickly in internet and become hot topic on twitter, mainstream media have no longer confronted only with JH but also with public. Mainstream have to struggle for its credibility among public, government, and other media institutions. Therefore, mainstream media need to prove that the article was fake. In this process, journalist using binary position professional vs amateur, ethical vs unethical in representing JH. This is what Derrida called as ‘distinction’ to emphasize journalist authority. *Secondly*, journalist only provides sources from them who identify as JH’s victim (Mandiri Bank and Kompasiana). In Intertextuality level, CDA have what defined as discourse representation. It used to figure out why media/journalist choose certain point of view. Why tempo, for instance, did not interview online media observer? This is because their statement would contrary to Tempo’s interest. They would rather talk about freedom of expression and citizen right to use anonymity than agree to inhibit anonymous. Tempos also try not to involve Goenawan Mohammad (GM)\(^9\) in the case by not confirming him in the story. Whereas, GM actively discussed about JH’s case on twitter responding public questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JH</td>
<td>Anonymous author</td>
<td>Amateur vs Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Irresponsible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have bad intention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>JH’s Article</td>
<td>Hoax: contain both true and fake data</td>
<td>Ethical vs Unethical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provocative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black Broadside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{9}\) Founder of Tempo Magazine, was accused by JH involved in media manipulation
Thirdly, journalist value (confirmation and verification) – Foucault defines it as a knowledge for gain power – is used to justify that anonymity done by JH was not acceptable for journalism practice. In this process, *doxa* might be shaped. *Doxa* is a particular definition legitimated by dominant group as if it is a truth. Whereas, anonymity should be defined from various perspective such us freedom of expression, right for public, a way to protect from tyranny, even anonymity can be define as a basic philosophy of freedom of press. Those discourse was not using by mainstream media. 

**Fourthly**, Tempo used online platform (tempo.co) to formally encounter public opinion over JH’s article spreading over cyber space. Tempo journalist also use twitter account to discuss JH’s article implicitly although they prefer to define their tweet as private opinion – not official. The Discourse dominantly focused on problem of anonymity.

**The silence of mainstream media**

The content of JH’s article is classic media concerns in Indonesia, media corruption and media manipulation. JH mentions 6 big media in Indonesia including Kompas daily news, detik.com, Antara (Indonesian news agency), Bisnis Indonesia Daily newspaper, Investor Daily, Jawa Pos daily newspaper are involved. However, the only media respond to the issue was Tempo as it might the main subject of JH’s article. However they choose not to provide adequate space to confirm the issue in term of space and the variety of angle.

What is the meaning of the silence? Silence in the context of power referring to Lusternberger and Williams (2009 in Gendron; 2011). He said that silence can be

---

11 Bambang Hari Murti (BHM), CEO of Mandiri Bank, was accused by JH involved in media manipulation.
detrimental as a means of disempowering and otherwise reducing the quality of the interaction and of the overall relationship. Silence can be used as a tool of aggression, during a specific interaction and also as a tool in a larger strategy of aggression aimed at an individual or a group. In this context, the theory provides two explanations. Firstly, mainstream media try to weakening JH’s issue and prevent blunder. Secondly, mainstream media realize JH is a sensitive issue, in term of its content and topic relating to it, such us freedom of expression, human right and press freedom. For instance, this would be a problem for Kompas was proven ban an article in its citizen journalism site. This also surely harmed what had been struggled by Indonesian Press since 1998, press freedom.

Kompas has been successfully avoided problem by implementing two strategies: silence and localize the issue. Tempo Magazine let its journalist to make private statement on twitter – not official – meanwhile Kompas choose to avoid it. The silence strategy was done by not providing any official written text responding to JH. Respond was limited in official statement by Pepih Nugraha for tempo.co and offline discussion. One of offline discussion concerning to the issue was conducted by SAFENET at Jakarta that also invited Pepih. Kompasiana twitter account once used to respond GM’s question relating to the article. At least during the sampling period (11 November – 31 December 2013) researcher did not find any Pepih’s statement relating to JH in his twitter as well as at @kompasiana. Kompas Gramedia Group put Kompasiana’s crisis separately from Kompas Daily Newspaper. Based on these data, the issue of media corruption and manipulation in JH’s article were being ignored and kept at or pushed beyond or outside the boarder of mainstream media authority.

The missing narration

In JH case, anonymity has revealed ‘fact’ but on the same time it was used by dominant to close the case. The discussions react to JH’s article than was trapped on two issues; (1) problem of anonymity (pseudonym); (2) the investigation of JH’s identity. Meanwhile, almost 60% of ‘data’ revealed by JH was missing from discussion. I called it as the missing narration.

“The Clicking Monkey” was the only one article published at print media responding to JH issue. This article is more like satire, a technique employed by writers to expose and criticize foolishness by using humor, irony, exaggeration or ridicule. Firstly, the writer use example of destructive hoax happened at Wall Street. Associate Press (AP) tweet that turned out to be fake about explosions at the White House injuring President Obama cause loss transaction. Another two example of hoaxes were included; rumor of unhealthy fried chickens and wrong instruction of how to treat stroke patients. The Discourse construct a knowledge that hoax might endanger people. Secondly, Daru describe of how hoax contain both truth and fake data. The meaning behind this article is about persuasion to reader not to believe on hoax or share information contain hoax. Them who share hoax called as ‘clicking monkey’ similar with monkeys in the jungle throwing rancid fruits (hoax) each other. Briefly interpretation: ‘if you don’t want to be called as monkey, don’t believe on hoax (read: JH’s article), if you spread hoax it is mean that you are monkey. This might an anger
expression of Tempo to JH, although readers understand it as common sense. Implicitly, Tempo had been in the process of constructing knowledge (about hoax) in order to maintain power over JH.

Offline discussion was conducted by Savenet\(^\text{13}\), 18\(^{th}\) November, 2013 at Café Tjikini, Jakarta. The public discussion entitled ‘Anonymity in Freedom of Expression’ invited Pepih Nugraha (kompasiana founder), Donny BU (Internet Sehat), Megi Margiyono (Indonesia Online Advocacy) and Almascatie (Safenet). The discussion produced more various Discourses about anonymity. Researcher recorded live tweet during the discussion on #anonym and @safenetvoice. Almascatie explain that anonymity is needed to protect citizen from regulation; not all anonymous write slander. Another speaker, Megi Margiyono mentions some points: anonymity protects public from government and social tyranny, anonymity grows rapidly in democratic country like Indonesia as public was still threatened by ITE law, anonymity is a dilemma for Indonesia since the country has no regulation concerning to this issue. Donny BU define discourse as follow; anonymity is a process in forming more mature and smart audiences, the more information confidential for public the more likely people implement anonymity. Below are dominant discourses on #anonym produced by twitter particularly during the discussion; ITE regulation was threatening freedom of expression, created tighter regulation become alternative for controlling anonymity, regulation for anonymity is a dilemma as it is both harm freedom of speak as well as promote it. However, the fruitful discussion by Savenet was not strong enough to bring the Discourse of JH’s article openly – particularly media corruption and manipulation. The discussion was focused only on anonymity.

Problem of anonymity also become central issue on professional journalist twitter account. A Tempo journalist discuss about anonymity in his twitter account in #NgobrolTempo. He described anonymity as practice of journalism under strict rules based on journalism standard such us verification and confirmation. His discourse implicitly define JH’s article is a hoax because it cannot be verified and confirmed.

Another issue dominantly discuss in twitter conversation (#JilbabHitam), blog and Kompasiana was about the investigation of JH’s identity. Professional journalist define JH as an ex-journalist of Detik\(^\text{14}\)- not Tempo – who considered revenges after he was reported done an extort to Krakatau Steel by Tempo. However until today, the journalist never admits that he is JH.

To sum up, issue of mainstream media corruption and mainstream media manipulation mentioning in JH’s narration was missing. In cyber space, public (citizen journalist) is become passive audience as they don’t have any direct access to mainstream media system. Mainstream media agenda was more powerful than citizen. It similar with Lim (2013) who found Lapindo social movement was not successful as TV One intervenes with a more powerful competing narrative, reducing social media-generated participation. Finally, internet – as the most interactive channel – never guarantee internet user to become powerful and active user.

\(^{13}\) SAVENET (Southeast Asia Freedom of Expression Network) is a network of Southeast Asia bloggers and online activists who dedicated to protecting freedom of expression online. Prita Mulya Sari case is one of its concerns.

\(^{14}\) Professional online media in Indonesia
Anonymity also represented as a concept under mainstream media authority that cannot be easily applied by citizen individually. In this case, professional journalist did what Bourdieu called as distinction. Distinction is an action uses for distinguishing someone with other people in order to represent higher level of social live, profession etc. This attitude has a certain meaning relating to comparison of binary position between right and wrong, scientific vs not-scientific, professional and amateur. The existence of binary position indicates the existence domination over marginal entity.

Discussion

JH’s case should be seen more than problem of anonymity. As Akdeniz (2000) said anonymity is essential to democracy and has been a vital tool for the preservation of political speech and discourse throughout history. Thus, Concept of anonymity might too precious to be blamed in JH case. In the United States, anonymity has been directly tied to the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. Meanwhile in Europe, the importance of anonymity as a facilitator of free speech has been affirmed by the European Court of Human Rights (Goodwin v UK, 1996).

In macro level of CDA, JH case should be seen from broader point of view involving elements of democracy. Gazali (2014) provide formula for challenging the emerging of social media in digital information. He involves social media as channel for citizen collaborate with mainstream media in bridging political communication among Government, Market, Civil Society, and Media. Each of the elements would only be functioned well if it has synergy. The discussion conducted by Savenet, mentioned that UU ITE\(^\text{\footnote{Law on Information and Electronic Transaction (ITE law), regulating cyber activism in Indonesia.}}\)\(^\text{\footnote{A blogger has been named a defamation suspect after being reported by former Prosperous Justice Party (PKS) lawmaker Muhammad Misbakhun to the police for one of his tweets.}}\) threatened Indonesian citizen has increased number of anonymity in cyberspace. It happened in the context of ‘chaotic’ media capitalism industry, blurring main role of press media in Indonesia. Media owner – who some of them are politician - use public air time for political economy interest without sufficient regulation from government. Thus, anonymity might emerge in Indonesian cyber space based on some reasons: (1) the decreasing of public sphere provided by mainstream media; (2) threatening regulation of internet user; It might what Habermas mean as degradation of public sphere in 20\(^\text{\textsuperscript{th}}\) century caused by emergence of capitalism industry.

Negative representation over anonymity put the issue of anonymity as what Foucault called as marginal discourse. When it was marginalized, the struggle of freedom of speech for internet user in Indonesia would be hampered. For example, @Benhan\(^\text{\footnote{A blogger has been named a defamation suspect after being reported by former Prosperous Justice Party (PKS) lawmaker Muhammad Misbakhun to the police for one of his tweets.}}\) case has narrow support both from public and mainstream. There are another 11 citizens listed by SAFENET become victims of article no 27 of UU ITE about defamation. Those cases are as vital as Prita Mulya Sari case in freedom of speak struggle. But why they don’t have much attention so far?

To sum up, Foucault concept of power and knowledge is very useful as analyzing tool. As Foucault say, power was accumulated through knowledge (certain Discourse), furthermore knowledge will produce a power. Public movement online such us citizen journalism and social media movement enter mainstream media
authority. In digital era, citizen deconstructed distribution of information paradigm by shifting their role from merely a consumer to be a producer of information. Consequently, citizen movement – as new comer concept – competes with dominant mainstream media system that might not sincerely give all power to public (citizen). There is competition between mainstream and citizen. For example, in some case, citizen journalism is not acceptable concept for mainstream journalism. It is based on binary assumption of amateur vs professional, ethical vs unethical, good vs bad, right vs wrong, etc. Power relation between citizen journalism and mainstream media put citizen journalism in marginal position. Citizen journalism concept is located in such blurring territory. Foucault notion of Subjugated Knowledge (Foucault; 1980:81) might fit to explain how citizen journalism was located low down on the hierarchy of knowledge beneath the required level of cognition or scientficity. It has been disqualified as inadequate to their task or insufficiently elaborated: naive knowledge. Digital era provide unlimited access for freedom of expression. However, if system does not guarantee protection and freedom of expression for public, empowering citizen would be an absurd struggle.
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