

Indonesian Media Framing of Reportage on the Crimean Peninsula Crisis

Mochamad Aviandy¹, Shuri Mariasih Gietty Tambunan², Silva Tenrisara Pertiwi Isma³

¹Department of Literature, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Indonesia

³Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Indonesia

✉Kampus Baru UI Depok, West Java-16424, Indonesia

✉aviandy@ui.ac.id

Article Info

Article History

Received:

May 2021

Accepted:

Oct. 2021

Published:

Nov. 2021

Keywords:

Media, Framing, Critical

Discourse Analysis,

Crimean Peninsula,

Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This research investigates how one of the mainstream media in Indonesia frames Russia in its reportage. One of the selected cases is the 2014 Crimean Peninsula crisis. The Crimean Peninsula Crisis was a major international event that reported comprehensively by Kompas. This research will reveal Kompas' bias in its reportage on Crimea and the factors that underlie the bias. In investigating the issue, this research uses Norman Fairclough's critical discourse analysis. It follows Fairclough method of critical discourse analysis by using text as a discourse. It is found that as one of the mainstream media in Indonesia, Kompas reportage is not neutral as it depicts Russia through a negative frame. Analysis on semiotic factors, intertextuality, and how the media bias could be handled are the focuses of this research.

© 2021 Politeknik Negeri Bali

INTRODUCTION

Discussions on international relations between Russia, Indonesia, and Crimea cannot be detached from a pivotal moment taking place in 2014, which was the annexation of Crimea from Ukraine. In a referendum held on March 16, 2014, 96.77% of citizens of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea decided to integrate the republic into Russia while the remaining 2.53% of the population upheld the 1992 constitution and insisted that Crimea remained under the government of Ukraine (Morello et al., 2014).

Reportages on the annexation of Crimea from Ukraine to Russia have interesting narratives to be analyzed. Emma Heywood's research titled "*Comparing Russian, French, and UK Television News: Portrayals of the Casualties of War*", for instance, shows that narratives from Eastern European and Russian news have different framings. This happens because in every reportage,

news companies will offer perspectives related to a particular range of interests, and this is particularly true for nation-owned journalistic institutions (Heywood, 2014). Heywood found that in reporting the Syrian conflict, for instance, Eastern European news focuses on the sufferings of war victims while Russian news focuses on the issue of territorial security. On top of this, American and Western European news use the phrase “annexation of Crimea by Russia”. Meanwhile, news from countries that are in close bilateral ties with Russia uses a more neutral lexical choice of words, such as “referendum”. This is evidence that the media constructs different meanings to be interpreted, and such an idea becomes the basis of this writing’s research problems.

This research explores how printed media in Indonesia constructs narratives on the separation of Crimea from Ukraine. Using critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1995), the selected corpus is taken from an article by *Kompas* which was published on March 11, 2014. Two bases can be taken as a justification for selecting this article. First, this article represents *Kompas*’ bias in dealing with the crisis in Crimea. Secondly, at the time the article was published, the crisis in Crimea was reaching its peak as the 2014 Crimean referendum almost took place. This research is aimed to investigate how *Kompas* frames Russia in its reportage for the newspaper’s audience, who are the people of Indonesia. The researcher primarily refers to the model of analysis offered by Haryatmoko (2016) in order to deconstruct the dominant meaning offered by the article, particularly on the narratives of the identity of Russia and its relation to Indonesia.

CONTEXTUALIZING PRINTED MEDIA IN INDONESIA

After its independence, printed media in Indonesia underwent a massive development. During the Old Order, every political party in Indonesia had its own publication (Herlambang, 2011). According to Herlambang, one of the ways to improve Indonesian people’s literacy at the time was by publishing newspapers that were affiliated with political parties. For instance, the Communist Party of Indonesia published *Harian Rakyat*, the Catholic Party of Indonesia published *Kompas*, and other news publications such as *Star Weekly* were emerging around that era. Various media with different ideologies had the liberty to make publications during the Old Order era.

As the country entered the New Order era, the development of media in Indonesia faced the beginning of its decline. The first trigger of this decadence was the 30 September Movement, which involved the assassination of several Indonesian army generals. It was the culmination of tensions between two groups: those who support Soekarno (left) and those who oppose him (right-counterrevolutionary) (Herlambang, 2007; Sulistyono, 2000; Roosa 2006). At the time, only media with affiliations with the government were allowed to make publications. On the other hand, media with ties with communism and socialism were banned. As the supreme leader of the New Order, Soeharto controlled Indonesian media publication by necessitating legal permits on media publication, dubbed SIUP (*Surat Izin Usaha Penerbitan*). The New Order government would end the permit for any media company that criticized Soeharto. *Kompas* and its divisions have never had their SIUP revoked (Roosa, 2006).

The fall of the New Order government in 1998 brought significant changes in the dynamics of Indonesian media. As the New Order permits for media publication have been erased, every news company has its own framing in publishing its stories. Janet Steele's research titled *Mediating Islam: Cosmopolitan Journalisms in Muslim Southeast Asia* supports the argument that Indonesian media framing is far from neutral. Steele's research focuses on three media which has been massively developing since the end of the New Order, which are *Harian Republika*, *Majalah Sabili*, and *Tempo*. Steele argues that although these media publications stand on the same journalistic principles, each is driven by its own ideology (Steele, 2018).

Steele further elaborates that *Republika*, *Tempo*, and *Sabili* have their own framings. According to Steele, *Tempo* uses universal humanism as its framing, creating an image of a media that promotes the ideas of human rights, liberalism, and strong affiliating with individual freedom of thought (Steele, 2018). Meanwhile, *Republika* is found in Steele's research to put forward framings that can comfortably be accepted by Muslim societies, especially devout urban Muslims whose communities have been growing since the early 1990s. A different strategy is used by *Sabili*, which uses hardline Islam – conservative, with the tendency to root for literal interpretations of the Quran. Steele's research argument is used for this research's standing point, which views that the media companies in Indonesia are not neutral.

METHODOLOGY: CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND MEDIA FRAMING

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is generally used to investigate texts, which can include documents, speech texts, magazine articles, advertising, and newspaper columns. In understanding a text, CDA focuses on the text's language, which is impossible to be independent of purposes or values (Haryatmoko, 2016). Therefore, a text is never a neutral one as it contains different interests. The goal of CDA is to deconstruct implied meanings and show the imbalance in texts. Therefore, by positioning the text as a site for social struggle, the *Kompas* article will be analyzed by using Norman Fairclough's CDA.

For Fairclough, there are three steps of approach in critically analyzing the discourses of an article (Fairclough, 1995). According to Fairclough, the first thing that should be analyzed from a text is the lexical choice, which is related to a particular meaning. It is a necessary step considering that terminologies and metaphors are not independent of values. People should be suspicious of terminologies and metaphors as they refer to a particular meaning or action. In its essence, CDA does not take sides (Haryatmoko, 2016). Haryatmoko also argues that investigations on lexical choices should also include analyzing a word's [established] meaning, possible meanings, and the contexts that construct the meaning of a word. The use of CDA is a factual confirmation of this research's underlying suspicion. Biases make a text side with a particular social phenomenon, and such biases must be deconstructed.

The second aspect of Fairclough's critical discourse analysis is that the practice of discourse analysis should have the capability of identifying how strong statements in a text can be, how effective a text could encourage actions, and how powerful it is to its readers. At this point, intertextuality is given special attention (Fairclough, 1995). At this step of the analysis, the coherence of interpreted texts is examined by looking at three elements: the producers, the medium, and the readers.

The third element is that a text is always related to its different levels. Descriptions of language in a text, interpretations of the link between discourses (including the production and interpretation of a text), and the explanation of discourse and social processes are the factors that are inseparable from Fairclough's critical discourse analysis.

One of the researches that use CDA is Haryatmoko's study on *Kompas* articles. In reporting the workers' demands on the rise of regional minimum wage, *Kompas* is found by Haryatmoko to side with the businesspeople (Haryatmoko, 2016). *Kompas'* articles structurally position workers as the weak group. Haryatmoko's research on *Kompas'* story of workers' demand to raise the minimum wage uses Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis. In particular, Fairclough's approach is used through the following steps: 1) Analyzing the overall semiotic meaning through looking at the vocabularies' intrinsic properties. Fairclough argues that by applying critical discourse analysis, researchers have decided to take a side and uncover the irregularities and ideologies which underlie a discourse's text (Fairclough, 1995), 2) Identifying obstacles to overcome the social deviation, 3) Analyzing whether the discourse's problems are actually "needed" by a particular social structure, and lastly 4) Identifying ways to overcome the obstacles of a discourse.

SOCIAL DEVIATION AND RUSSIA AS AN AGGRESSOR: *KOMPAS'* DOMINANT INTERPRETATION

The results of the analysis show that the "social deviation" that is revealed in the selected article for this research is related to the report on issues occurring in the Crimean Peninsula, particularly the sections where annexation of Crimea by Russia is discussed. Lexical choices in the article have already implied a bias. For instance, the use of phrases such as "Russia's step of annexation" and "legitimizing annexation" can be interpreted as depicting the danger of the steps that Russia takes. Further analysis also shows that the words used by *kompas.com* seem to depict the people of Crimea as a group oppressed by Russia's one-sided decision. The article describes the people of Crimea as if they have no power against every decision made by the Russian government, particularly the ones that are related to the referendum and the conflicts in the Crimean Peninsula.

Some terminologies indicate that Russia is the party that causes all the social "problems". The phrase "steps of annexation" depicts that Russia should be accounted responsible for the tides of events occurring in Crimea. Carrying a negative connotation, the word "annexation" creates the assumption that Russia takes away Crimea, which had been a part of Ukraine. The word "annexation" also ignores the fact that the people of Crimea also demand independence from Ukraine. These people do not look at Russia as an aggressor, and the word "annexation" is improperly used. In addition, the phrase "legitimizing the annexation" strengthens the argument that Russia is an aggressor for Crimea. This phrase speaks as if there is an imbalance between pro-Ukraine and pro-Russia parties, and the use of the phrase means a sidedness with Russia. In fact, there was a referendum in which the two parties were placed equally in discussing the fate of the Crimean Peninsula, whether the territory would join Russia or uphold the 1992 Constitution. The phrase "legitimizing the annexation" constructs a structural position where pro-Russian parties seem to have a stronger position and therefore, can control the situation.

Aside from the term "annexation", the article also contains a hyperbole which is manifested in the phrase "leaders of the world struggle [with]". This phrase implies that the crisis in Crimea

grabs the attention of the whole world with its “leaders” while in fact, the issue only occurs between Ukraine and Russia. In the context of the Crimean crisis, the article makes an exaggeration by conveying a message: the leaders of the world are in opposition to Russia. Pro-Russian leaders of countries such as Venezuela, Cuba, or North Korea are deliberately excluded from the issue. This message is also stated by Volodymyr Fesenko, a political analyst from the National Academy of Science of Ukraine’s Institute of Radio Astronomy (Research Gate, 2018). While he became one source of reference cited by the article in *Kompas*, Fesenko’s institutional affiliation was not mentioned. *Kompas* only took his political opinion, and Fesenko’s unmentioned background can be interpreted as a piece of evidence that the news publication is in an opposition to Russia.

Aside from lexical choices, the article’s structure can also be interpreted as proof of *Kompas*’ contra-Russia position. The article is divided into several sections, and it begins with the concern of “leaders of the world” about the people of the Crimean Peninsula. The second section talks about experts’ opinion on the crisis in Crimea, and all of the cited arguments come from Ukraine’s point of view. Next, the referred experts lay out five phases of events that had happened in Crimea. Finally, *Kompas* quotes Volodymyr Fesenko, who states that if post-referendum Crimea becomes a part of Russia, there will be new problems that internationally affect the world. From the four premises, it can be concluded that the article encourages people to side with Russia’s opponents.

On top of this, more pieces of evidence can be found from the article’s lexicon. In general, the article uses words and interpretations which tailor a story that puts Russia at a disadvantage. Judging from the words used by this article, there is almost no hint of sidedness with Russia. Descriptions of situations and hardships in Crimea under the government of Ukraine are non-existent. Biases in the article’s story can be more accurately proven by using Fowler’s analysis of lexical choice, as described below:

<p style="text-align: center;">Classification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Pro-Moscow (4x), Pro-Russia (2x) versus the government of Ukraine- Russian army, Russian troops versus Ukraine's military installation- Foreign Journalists and Ukraine versus pro-Russia- Leaders of the world versus Crimean bureaucrats <p style="text-align: center;">Perspective</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Separating Crimea from other territories of Ukraine- The Crimean Referendum (3x)- Russia's steps of annexation <p style="text-align: center;">Discourse Struggle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- New problems arising in the Eastern European and International regions- The power of Russian military in the territory of Crimean Peninsula.- Pro-Russia/Pro-Moscow Puppet state <p style="text-align: center;">Domination/Marginalization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- A statement from a political analyst "new territorial and international problems, becoming a frozen conflict"- Pro-Russian politician Sergey Aksonov becomes a "Prime Minister" of Crimea, and all members of the parliament decide to join the Russian parliament.

Table 1: Analysis of *Kompas*' Article's Lexical Choices according to Fowler's Classification of Lexicons (1991)

The results of the analysis as written above have shown how *Kompas* constructs what happened in Crimea (particularly Russia's "annexation" of Crimea) as "social deviations". On one hand, critical analyses on the article eventually show that the citizens of Crimea wish to separate themselves from Ukraine and become merged to Republics of Russia through a referendum, which is a very democratic process. On the other hand, international reactions are portrayed by the article as believing that the referendum was indeed Russia's intervention to the people of Crimea.

The article also lists the five steps involved in the annexation of Crimea from Ukraine: establishment of a puppet state, occupation of the land territory, restrictions on borders, control over communications, and setting up the referendum. These five steps are written in the article without citing a source. Just before this five-step plan, Fesenko's opinion on a fabricated rational plan to liberate Crimea from Ukraine is stated. However, whether the five-step plan is Fesenko's political analysis or a fabrication of the editors of *Kompas* remains unclear, and therefore its validity can be put into question.

In explaining the first step (establishment of a puppet state), it is mentioned that after President Viktor Yanukovich (who maintained close ties with Russia) was overthrown, Russian flags were

raised capitol buildings in Simferopol (the capital of Crimea) by pro-Moscow militants. A puppet state/government can be defined as a government that is controlled by another (higher) power for a particular purpose, so the phrase has a negative connotation, and the same phrase is used by the writer of the article. Nonetheless, the literature review shows that the Crimean referendum is a conscious decision made by the people of Crimea themselves. Formally, the government of Russia through President Vladimir Putin refuses to be involved in the political constellation in Crimea. However, the involvement of unattributed militia and its leaders is always connected to pro-Moscow militias by pro-Moscow media (Biersack & O’Lear, 2014).

In the article, “pro-Moscow” is mentioned four times, and “pro-Russia” is mentioned twice. However, the term “pro-Ukraine” is unmentioned, and it seems to be replaced by the word “government”. In the stage of classification, the article can be interpreted to construct a meaning in which the crisis in Crimea is totally controlled by pro-Moscow/pro-Russia militias. The article does not mention how pro-Ukraine militias faced their pro-Moscow counterparts. In addition, the *Kompas* does not give specific references to what the article means by “leaders of the world who struggle to resolve the conflict in Crimea”. There are no mentioned statements made by Ukraine or Russia. Therefore, the lexicons “pro-Russia” and “pro-Moscow” clearly impose the idea that Russia is aggressively interfering with the conflicts in Crimea.

In the sub-section of “occupying land territory”, there can be found tendentious contradictory sentences. The article mentions that thousands of Russian fleets who are believed to have been deployed from the Black Sea were sent by the Russian government to occupy Crimea. However, in another part of the article, it is mentioned that the [Russian] military troops who occupied the Crimean Peninsula did not wear any symbols. It is interesting that the word “believed” is inserted before explaining the Black Sea Fleet. It has been mentioned before that the government of Russia officially does not take part in the conflict of Crimea, but *Kompas* tends to blame the Russian government by stating that troops in the Crimean Peninsula come from the Black Sea Fleet. Despite the phrase “not wearing any military attributes” was mentioned, the article has already constructed an image that Russia plays a big role in the Crimean conflict.

Crimea itself is not without defense from Ukraine. After the fall of the Soviet Union on December 25, 1991, Crimea became a part of Ukraine. However, issues in the Crimean Peninsula at the time did not only cover the territory transfer from the Soviet Union to Ukraine. According to Ambrosio (2016), since Crimea was handed over to Ukraine, issues in Crimea arise from the people’s national identity, whether they wish to be closer to the West or to Russia (Ambrosio, 2016). Most of the citizens of Central and Western Ukraine are Ukrainians, and they mainly affiliate themselves with the West. Meanwhile, the people of Eastern Ukraine (particularly those who reside in the Crimean Peninsula, Donbas, Donetsk, and Sevastopol) are Russian, and the Russian language is used for their daily conversation.

Kompas’ statement of “liberating Crimea from other Ukraine’s territories” ignores the fact that Eastern Ukrainians (particularly in the Crimean Peninsula) are Russians. During the era of the Soviet Union, the Russian language was spoken throughout all the territories of the Soviet Union as a part of Russification, and this historical moment also influenced Ukraine and the Crimean Peninsula. The article in *Kompas* does not deliver comprehensive facts about the people of the Crimean Peninsula. Eastern Ukraine citizens consist of different ethnicities, and their existence

as a group can be said as a minority among the constellation of Ukrainians. The phrase “liberating Crimea” seems to say that with the diversity of languages and ethnicities, Crimea can be easily influenced by foreign intervention (in this case, Russia) to be independent of Ukraine.

Readers of the article, then, are seemingly informed that the article itself tends to affiliate with the West and oppose Russia. The text’s producer wishes to create a feeling of insecurity in the face of Russia’s threats. Russia is always depicted as an aggressor, and such depiction is evident in the following parts of the article. First, the condition of Crimean people as a minority among Ukrainians is not mentioned. Secondly, the historical fact that both states once belonged to the same Soviet Union government is not mentioned. Thirdly, the five-step plan to make the Crimean referendum is dominated by negative tones, particularly whenever the article talks about Russia.

Similarly, there is a problem with the statement “there are more than thirty thousand Russian troops that are operating in the Peninsula”. Through the bilateral agreement with Russia, Ukraine has decided to lend Eastern Ukraine regions, including Sevastopol and Crimea, to be occupied by the Russian Black Sea Fleet from 1992 to 2017 (Krushelnycky, 2008). The agreement started with the reign of Boris Yelysin in 1997 as one of the requirements for Ukraine to pay its debts to Russia. During the 2014 Crimean crisis, the Russian army has *already* been there according to the bilateral agreement. This explains why aside from the troops, there are also 50 battleships, 80 fighting jets, and about 100 military installations that are stationed in the Crimean Peninsula and Sevastopol (Cooley & Dubovyk, 2008).

Up to this point, it has been proven that 1) the bilateral agreement between Ukraine and Russia, 2) the legal basis for the Russian military to be stationed in Ukraine, and 3) the majority of Crimean citizens who are Russians are not mentioned by the article. In lines 21-30, Russia is framed even more negatively. How the people of Crimea as a minority who suffered from repression by Ukraine is not stated at all. After Viktor Yanukovich was overthrown, there has been massive persecutions of Ukrainian citizens of Russian ethnicity (Ambrosio, 2016).

Once Yanukovich was replaced by *acting president* Oleksandr Turchynov, the central Ukrainian government in Kyev canceled the regulation that allowed ethnic languages in Ukrainian territories. Therefore, the use of the Russian language was formally restricted. With the goal of nurturing Ukrainian nationalism, the only Ukrainian language was allowed to be spoken. Certainly, this decision prompted protests from Ukrainian citizens of Russian descent in Crimea (Ambrosio, 2016). Russia published “the white book” of human rights violations in Ukraine, particularly in Crimea. The listed violations include persecutions of minorities, the emergence of ultranationalistic *neo-Nazi* who discriminate against Ukrainians, and physical violence on Crimean citizens who are close with Russian culture. Factually, these reasons also encourage the referendum to take place, but none of these are mentioned in *Kompas*’ article. Negative opinions on Russia are constantly put forward, specifically through phrases such as “thirty thousand troops” and “occupying military installation”.

From the issues discussed above, it can be found that the article frames Russia’s position to negotiate to be very weak. Without mentioning the stories from the Crimean side, Russia is framed as an aggressor, a power that commands annexation, and the bringer of political instability. In terms of reportage, media should ideally remain neutral and unbiased, and this can actually be

achieved by reporting both sides of a story. However, according to T. Viera, Jr., most of the reports on Crimea are biased, and they tend to frame Russia as the faulty party (T. Viera, Jr., 2014).

T. Viera, Jr. (2014) further argues that the media reportage on Crimea still has two steps. The first step is the internalization of information transmitting from the producer (news company). Second, the *framing* that is to be shown to the audience is made. Western European and American news companies such as Reuters and CNN constantly create a framing that portrays Russia as hostile. *Kompas*' report on Crimea seems to follow such western framing. *Kompas*' joins the bandwagon of global media and their point of view in opposing Russia, and such is manifested within the reportages on the Crimean Peninsula. In general, *Kompas* also takes part in maintaining a social problem grounded in the legacy of the New Order.

THE LEGACY OF NEW ORDER IN NOWADAYS INDONESIA: RUSSIA AS THE ENEMY

The social problem for this article is that the events occurring in the Crimean Peninsula are not reported through a neutral lens. This research has repeatedly argued that the annexation of Crimea from Ukraine is depicted as a decision made by Russia alone. It is also necessary to take a look at how the article portrays Ukraine as the party that is at a loss, and the portrayal is done by several framings. First, Russia is depicted to have the power to annex territory in Ukraine through enforcing military troops. Second, the article depicts as if Russia has the power to influence people in a certain region to do a referendum. Third, the notion of new global problems arising from Crimea's decision to join Russia is emphasized. From these three factors, at least two critical questions can be asked: Does the crisis in Crimea emerge because of Russia alone? Why is *Kompas*' framing not accompanied by factors inclusive to Russia?

It should be noted that the problems in the Crimean Peninsula are complex matters. Researches have shown that the influences from Ukraine and western media cannot be ignored in discussing the problems in the Crimean Peninsula (Ambrosio, 2016; Biersack and O' Lear, 2014; Viera, Jr, 2014; Suslov, 2014). In addition, as mentioned before Ukraine's internal political turmoil, particularly the end of Viktor Yanukovich's presidency also plays a role in constructing this conflict. Restrictions on speaking Russian in Ukraine, ethnic violence, the rise of ultranationalists in Kyiv, and Crimea's historical ties with Russia are important factors that cannot be neglected in dealing with the annexation.

In order to understand the biased framing made by *Kompas*, there are several things that need to be understood. To begin with, *Kompas* is a news company that has existed in Indonesia since even before the 30 September Movement occurred in 1965. Made by a particular group of people during the Old Order, the movement made a coup to the legitimate government, and some military generals were killed in the process (Herlambang, 2011). After the coup ended, Soeharto rose to power and replaced Soekarno.

The New Order's version of the event accuses the leftists (socialists and communists) as the responsible groups for this incident. On top of this, Soeharto created a collective memory for the people by imposing negative stigmas on the left movements, so the people see these groups as ruthless killers (Roosa, 2006). Soekarno-related discourses and information on socialistic-

communistic countries such as Russia, China, North Korea, Cuba, and Vietnam became a phobia during Soeharto's regime. If reportages on Russia and China had been put in a positive frame during the Old Order, the New Order news reportages treat these issues as taboo. Reportages on Russia and China in Indonesia started to reappear after the fall of the New Order. As a publication that did not experience a ban during the New Order, *Kompas* also began to once again report on Russia and China, although the framing did not side with the Indonesian government at the time (Romano, 2003). Reformation era's collective memory carries on the 32-year New Order's construction of communism. Therefore, constructing a positive image of Russia for the Indonesian audience is not an easy matter. This historical factor can serve as an explanation why *Kompas* decides to put Russia in a negative frame, and such is obvious in its report on the Crimean conflict.

In brief, there are many social factors that fortify Russia's identity as an antagonist in *Kompas*' article. Global media framing and historically constructed collective memory in Indonesia also contribute to the construction of Russia's image. With the prolonging phobia of communism and socialism, Russia cannot simply have a strong, positive image in post-Reformation Indonesia.

KOMPAS'S FRAMING TO MINIMIZE READERS' SYMPATHY TOWARD RUSSIA

Upon further investigation, *Kompas*' negative framing of Russia is obvious in the reportage on the Crimean Peninsula stems from several reasons. The most obvious one would be if framing on Russia suddenly becomes positive, then western and American interests in Indonesia can be disrupted. It can be concluded that this article carries a dominant interpretation that suppresses Indonesian people's sympathy for Russia.

In table 1, in the "discourse struggle" column, there can be found the statement "new problems arising in Eastern European and International regions". According to the statement, countries all over the world (referring to the West) are paying attention to these new problems. The phrase "new problems" itself indicates that there has been "an existing problem" in Eastern Europe, which is Russia. Therefore, the use of this term is actually a sort of euphemism made by the editors. Also, as Crimea is depicted as *a new problem* for the West, Crimea's weak position in the portrayal seems to point that Russia is *the main problem*. This argument will be elaborated on as shown in the table below.

Major Premise Leaders of the world "struggle" to reach a resolution of conflict in the Crimean Peninsula while Pro-Moscow bureaucrats have taken necessary steps to make sure the annexation of Ukraine's territory by Russia.
Minor Premise Political analyst Volodymyr Fesenko mentions that after Crimea becomes a part of Russia, new international problems will arise. Crimea can be another Abkhazia, a frozen conflict. This means that according to experts, Russia is the core of the problems occurring in the international territory, such as mentioned in the "discourse struggle" column.
Conclusion

According to experts and with the leaders of the world's effort to find a resolution for the Crimean Peninsula, Russia does not bother to be concerned and proceeds to annex Crimea. Russia is the source of problems in the Crimean Peninsula.

Table 2: An Overview of the Text's Structure of Argument (Fairclough, 1995; Haryatmoko, 2016)

The structure of argument within the *Kompas* article obviously shows affiliation with the West and opposition to Russia. Pejorative terminologies can be found in the mentioning of “pro-Moscow”/“pro-Russia” militias (4x and 2x) without also mentioning other militias who oppose Russia. While the words “pro-Moscow” and “pro-Russia” are distinguished from one another, they actually refer to the same group of people. It can be interpreted that this is done in order to increase the appearance of such pejorative words, leading to more blame to Russia as the one who is responsible for the crisis in the Crimean Peninsula.

Furthermore, as mentioned above, *Kompas* cites an expert who turns out to be a Ukrainian citizen working for the Ukrainian government and making pro-Ukrainian statements. Additionally, *Kompas* mentions the word “experts” in the article, but only Volodymyr Fesenko is made source of reference. The label “political analyst” is also partial information as it does not mention the analyst's institution and its affiliation. Readers are led by Fesenko's opinions, which put Russia in a corner. Besides, the closing remark of the article contains a comparison between Crimea's conflict and that of Abkhazia. There is no explanation of Abkhazia's conflict and which parties were involved. These elements construct an image that the producer of the text has already achieved a mastery of data, and it is shown by the references made to a political analyst without a clear origin.

In brief, the existing social structure and the negative tendencies manifested in the media framing have altogether depicted Russia as the wrong side in the crisis of the Crimean Peninsula. *Kompas'* article conveys the voice of the government of Ukraine and the voices of the West, which are in opposition to Russia. The article fails to take Russia's point of view into consideration as it mentions no such thing. *Kompas'* media bias can be identified from the article's structure of argumentation, semiotic analysis, and the absence of Russia's perspective.

CONCLUSION

According to Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis, it can be concluded that *Kompas'* framing in reporting the crisis of the Crimean Peninsula is not neutral. The article sides with those who oppose Russia regarding the Crimean crisis. Russia is framed by the article's story of the Crimean Peninsula crisis as the “wrong” side, an aggressor, and a responsible party. Furthermore, the article does not explain how the crisis in the Crimean Peninsula is influenced by many factors. The 2014 Crimean Referendum can be interpreted as the final point of various problems in the Crimean Peninsula. However, the article constructs a story that Russia is the one to blame and therefore should be held responsible for Crimea's independence from Ukraine.

Using critical discourse analysis, the intertextuality of mainstream media in Indonesia, such as *Kompas*, shows that there are still negative effects of the historicity of Indonesia-Russia relations during the New Order era. Although Indonesia has entered the Reformation era, the stigma against Russia still exists and it takes the form of media framing. This negative framing cannot be separated from various factors, one of which is the negative collective memory about

Indonesia-Russia relations. Another factor is the impact of *Kompas*' framing which still shows that it tends to defend positively biased narratives against articles containing Russian issues. In terms of the Crimean crisis, *Kompas* tends to defend Ukraine and other Western countries that are in opposition to Russian policies. Negative tendencies towards Russia still exist today, as evidenced by the Crimea case, which was occurred more than sixteen years after the Reformation.

REFERENCES

- Ambrosio, T. (2016). The rhetoric of irredentism: The Russian federation's perception management campaign and the annexation of Crimea. *Small Wars and Insurgencies*, 27:3, 467-490.
- Biersack, J. & O'Lear, S. (2014). The Geopolitics of Russia's Annexation of Crimea: Narrative, Identity, Silences, and Energy. *Eurasian Geography and Economics*. 55:3, p. 247-269.
- Cooley, A. & Dobovyk, V. (2008). Will Sevastopol Survive? The Triangular Politics of Russia's Naval Base in Crimea. *PONARS Eurasia Policy*, 47.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Harlow: Pearson
- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the News, Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge
- Haryatmoko, SJ. (2016). *Critical Discourse Analysis: Landasan Teori, Metodologi, dan Penerapan*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers
- Herlambang, W. (2011). *Kekerasa Budaya Pasca 1965: Bagaimana Orde Baru Melegetimasi Anti-Komunisme Melalui Sastra dan Film*. Jakarta: Marjin Kiri
- Heywood, E. (2014). Comparing Russian, French, and UK Television News: Portrayals of the Casualties of War. *Russian Journal of Communication*, Vol. 7, 40-52
- Krushelnicky, A. (2008). Crimean Peninsula Could be the Next South Ossetia, www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/crimean-peninsula-could-be-the-next-south-ossetia-910769.html, accessed on 21 May 2018.
- Morello, C; Constable, Fayola. (2014). Crimeans Vote in Referendum on Whether to Break Away From Ukraine, Join Russia. The Washington Post, www.washingtonpost.com/world/2014/03/16/cccec2132-acd4-11e3-a06a-e3230a43d6cb_story.html , accessed on 21 May 2018.
- Romano, A.R. (2003). *Politics and the Press in Indonesia: Understanding an Evolving Political Culture*. London: Routledge Curzon.
- Roosa, J. (2006). *Pretext for Mass Murder: The September 30th Movement and Suharto's Coup d'Etat in Indonesia*. Madison: The University of Madison Press.
- Steele, J. (2018). *Mediating Islam, Cosmopolitan Journalisms in Muslim Southeast Asia*. Singapore: NUS Press
- Sulistyo, H. (2000). *Palu Arit di Ladang Tebu: Sejarah Pembantaian Massal yang Terlupakan*. Trans.: The Forgotten Years: The Missing History of Indonesia's Mass Slaughter. Ohio: Ohio State University Press.
- Viera Jr, Edward, T. (2014). News Coverage of the Crimea: Who Is Setting the Public Agenda?. *Russian Journal of Communication*, 6:2, 204-206.