

PAPUA IN MEDIA: A DISCOURSE CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF ECONOMIC NEWS IN THREE NATIONAL INDONESIAN NEWSPAPERS

Mungky Diana Sari

Accounting and Finance Department, Faculty of Economic and Communication, Bina Nusantara University,
Jln. K.H. Syahdan No 9, Palmerah, Jakarta Barat, 11480
mungky@binus.ac.id

ABSTRACT

For so many years, peace in Papua has become a high critical thing in Indonesian politics. In order to find the solution, the paradigm has been shifted from security to welfare or economic approach. Article explored the impact of religion affiliation toward news making and news frame, especially in economic news published by mass media. This research was developed to explore the framing formed by three media outlets which each of them affiliated with certain religion. This research focused on the analysis of economic articles published by three media outlets; Sinar Harapan, Republika, and Kompas daily. The method of framing analysis was based on Robert N. Entman theory, while the critical discourse analysis method was based on Norman Fairclough theory. Political economics theories such as Vincent Mosco, Robert E. Babe, and D.W. Smythe to analyze the influence of religion affiliation in news production were also used. Meanwhile, some political communication theories such as Brian McNair, Dann Nimmo, Noam Chomsky and Denis McQuail were also used to know how media stands in Papua conflict. From the research, it is discovered that the religion affiliation has a big impact on news media and its content, and also the frame that is built. Not only political-economic matters, but "the-sense-of-belonging" of the owner through particular religion gives impact to media policy. The content and frame are finally influencing political communication in Indonesia in Papua conflict particularly.

Keywords: *Papuan conflict, political economic, political communication, media farming, critical discourse analysis, social construct, mass media.*

INTRODUCTION

Ever since Papua became a part of Indonesian Republic in 1969, it has never escaped from conflict matters, either vertically between Papua and Jakarta, or internally between ethnics there. However, according to Widjojo *et al.* (2008), the main spotlight from the New Order is the conflict with the central government. Economically, Papua is left behind from any other regions of Indonesia, although Papua is rich in natural resources with less civilization.

In his article, Drooglever (2010) said that Papua has finally changed its name to Irian Jaya. Under President Soeharto's leadership, Irian Jaya was assigned as a Military Operation Zone due to the small amount of inhabitants. Also during that time, the information about Papua was always secluded from the press because the central government tightly regulated the media as fact providers to give justification or basic legitimacies for the born of the New Order, and to accentuate facts regarding government's development triumph at that time. Furthermore, in the early of the New Order's regime, the press was still focusing on the September 30, 1965 Movement issue that the conditions and news about Irian Jaya were almost unrecorded by the Press (Purwanto, 2011). Government's political communication in economics was rarely recorded in media's coverage for all

this time, the covered news was mostly focused on Human Right's Violence issues and shooting issues in Papua.

In the period of more than thirty-two years, Papua with unfinished conflicts became a big question for the writers. Whereas in 2012 when the writers had opportunities to visit Papua for more than ten days, they experienced a real big picture of economic and social condition as a result of unending conflicts. The economic and social conditions in Papua were far from good compared to the other region of Indonesia that has ever been visited by the writers. Therefore, this research was hoped to be one of the references for mediators or parties who have to deal with Papua's conflict solutions. By the existence of research regarding the relationship between mass media and certain political affiliation which then forming public opinion, it can finally be a message for the central government that the communication these days were still not well conducted.

There was some consideration in choosing economic issue. Firstly, one of the issues that basing all of many conflicts in Papua according to many circles and sources was the unjustified welfare since the New Order regime. However, due to that issue, the approaches that have been done by the Indonesian government ever since were safety approaches, not economic approaches. This was shown by many Military Operations sent to the earth of Cendrawasih for decades, which finally ended in problem complexities in many sides (Tebay, 2011).

The second reason is that ever since the Reformation era under President Abdurahman Wahid, it could be seen that the government's approaches to the people of Papua were shifting. The government of that era started to emphasize dialogues in order to end conflicts in Papua. Moreover, the government also established a Law no. 21 of 2001 in the era of President Megawati Soekarnoputri regarding Special Autonomy Region.

Many ways have been through by the Central Government, starting from establishing Special Autonomy Law Merauke, which is popularly known as Merauke Integrated Food and Energy Estate (MIFEE), up to forming The Unit of Development Acceleration for Papua and West-Papua (UP4B) on September 22nd, 2001 through President Decree no. 66 of 2011.

Starting from these reasons, researcher would like to observe the press' role in established communication process between Indonesian Government and people of Papua, vice versa. In a study of Political Communication Science by McNair (2203), how far media plays its role in the process of resolving conflicts in Papua, especially as it learned from a previous experience on reporting conflicts in Aceh, whereas the government and Indonesian National Armed Force tried to do a "propaganda" by setting up two media center in Banda Aceh (Sherlita, 2004).

In this research, writer chose three media as research parameters that will be done. First media is Sinar Harapan Daily. Sinar Harapan, as one of biggest national mass media in Indonesia, was chosen because its ideology context was assessed as related to Protestant religion, whereas the majority of Papua people are Catholic and Protestant. This is surely referred from the amount of readers in Papua where the majority is Christian Protestant. Second media is Republika Daily. This newspaper is chosen as this media's affiliation is close to Islam religion, which is why the writer would like to see how far a media affiliated with majority's religion of people in Indonesia, and few in Papua, pictured the conflicts happening in Papua. Last media is Kompas in which there were two reasons why this media was chosen. First, Kompas is the highest sales rating in Indonesia and second, Kompas has affiliation with Catholic religion which is the majority religion in southern Papua. Therefore, it can be assured how far the biggest media in Indonesia could show Papua's conditions and events. The circulation of some media in Indonesia can be seen in following table.

Table Circulation Amount of Biggest Newspapers in Indonesia

No	Newspapers	Circulation Amount (in thousands)
1.	Kompas	500
2.	JawaPos	425
3.	Koran Sindo	300
4.	Media Indonesia	300
5.	Suara Merdeka	261
6.	Koran Tempo	240
7.	Republika	160
8.	Jakarta Globe	70
9.	SinarHarapan	60
10.	Jakarta Post	55
11.	SuaraPembaruan	38

Source: Media Muscle, 2012

The perspective that is being used in this research is the political economic perspective, where it was chosen because it is close to understanding the context of a relationship between communication and media. Smith (1937) defined political economic as a wealth science or small amount of natural resources being allocated with maximum satisfaction. Smith also stated that political economic focused on the process of production, distribution, exchanged, and consumption also affects individual and society's wealth.

On the other hand, Mosco (1996) defined political economic as a science about social relationship and power that affects the chain of production, distribution, and consumption, whereas the power aspect strongly influences in supervising and controlling, starting from the production process to consumption. In the perspective of political economic, the capital owner is very influencing in how the goods and services are being used as a way to reach its goal. The goal itself can be interpreted for the owner's own benefit. This research is mainly adapting from Mosco's approach because the researcher wanted to see how far the interest of the capital owner resulting to how the news is being presented. In this case, it includes whether the capital owner will influence the perspective, and to find out how far the affiliation of the media with an ideology, group or belief is. This research is focused on the relation between media with certain affiliation in shaping an occurrence, which is in this case, the conflicts in Papua.

In mass media, when the advertising starts to work out, the core ideology of media will be hard to be implemented. The reason is when the media gets higher rating, which also means that the media has gained popularity among the people, then the advertisers will also become more eager to advertise their advertisement in that media. The more advertisers use that media, then the more benefits that media could get. That is the mechanism used by the media, capital owners, and advertisers in finding their own benefits. Yet, this is also the mechanism that is being criticized by the Marxist. The study about political economy is also an "entry-point" in learning communication (Mosco, 1996). According to Mosco, it was because political economy becomes a reason how the content of media being produced.

The news that is shown by mass media often does not include the full truth of an event, but instead, a construction of various events happened. It is this construction, which is made by the mass media that create the public opinion. How far the opinion developed among the people can be viewed from the survey, letters to editor, opinion, or comments. In constructing the event, media often emphasize the bad sides of an event. In the history of media development and the relation to democratization, which later affecting the media influences toward politics, if the classic liberal theory stated that media gives effect to democracy, yet it does not happen in Southeastern Asia. According to

Woodier (2008), most of the Southeastern Asia countries precisely, the development of democracy resulting to the development of media, for example, Indonesia, where the media has grown rapidly after the tyranny of New Order.

The construction that is made surely affiliated with some elements in choosing the policy, one of it is the agenda-setting. Agenda-setting is a direction of issue determination that is brought to media (Rogers, 2004). Commonly, the content determination of the agenda setting follows the common agenda about an issue that is being talked by many people. Agenda-setting can be seen from a framing made by the media. The issue chosen as a headline in a newspaper determines the importance position of the issue. In another sense, if the issue ends up as a national issue, it will show how strong the media is in political system of a country. The bigger the power of media, then the stronger the issues are spreading to the public. This strength can push an issue to be a national issue.

The construct being made by the media will give influential effect in constructing social reality. The theory and approach regarding social construction happen through three processes; externalization, objectivities, and internalization (Berger and Luckmann, 1966). In the process of shaping that social reality, the media is still related to those three moments mentioned by Berger. After getting through the externalization and objectivities process, the media will then experience the internalization whereas the media has an affiliation with certain groups which should have been in a same path as the ideology.

The media certainly has been through a process in order to build a social construction. One of it is the political communication. Political communication is a merger of communication science and politics, whereas the politics as a way to achieve a goal is being used as a way to deliver message through communication. In early 1990, political communication is not only being learned as a way to deliver a message. Denton and Woodward (1990), specifically mentioned that the focus of political communication is the content and the target of the message. However, according to McNair (2003), the focus of political communication study is not only the verbal or written messages that are being told by the communicator but also the physical appearance, such as the fashion, hairstyle, outfits color, eyeglasses style. Therefore, the physical appearance can emphasize more the message that is being delivered to the audiences. Moreover, the physical appearance that is being shown will also be a key point of the communicator, so it builds its own image in the people's mind. According to McNair, the relation between media and political process is dialectical, where there are media's involvement and reaction toward it. In the news research, media also does reportage and analysis from each event, where the media surely has an interviewee as both politic actor and its advisor. In this case, the decision in choosing the interviewees will affect the framing toward an event.

There are some several problems which are discussed in this paper. First, how does the daily newspaper, such as Sinar Harapan, Republika, and Kompas in 2011 period, make their news framing regarding Papua's problem, especially regarding the central government's effort? Also, how does the framed news become a politic communication medium between the central Government and Papua's people?

This research is done for academic reason which is to look for a complete comprehension and a relatively complete explanation about the connection between mass media and conflict resolution in Papua. The academic reason of this research is to tell how Indonesian Government actually resolves Papua's conflict through media framing, especially since the government era of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono. Moreover, this research is done to tell whether the approach made by Indonesian government now can also be accepted by the people of Papua.

On the other hand, the practical reason of this research is to see how far economy condition influences news reporting process, especially regarding the conflicts issues, that this research is wished to give further knowledge about media's framing toward conflict issues.

The academic usage of this research is to be a recommendation and new founding about how politic affiliation in a media can affect the news reporting process. In addition, to know the groups of media based on their politic affiliation. While the common usage of this research is to be knowledge of how media and institution's politic affects the media's way of producing the news, in which the media shapes the public's opinion toward a certain issue.

METHODS

Generally, this research in methodology and analytical method is done in qualitative approach. Regarding to the used method, then there were two steps made in the research process. The first method is the framing analysis. In the framing analysis, the involvement of social, politic, and cultural concept can be used in analyzing the communication signs. Therefore, in framing analysis, the main focus is how reality is constructed by the media.

According to Eriyanto (2002), framing approach lets an event get bigger portion in the media than other events. Framing analysis which is done in the media's texts, especially in an article and special report of Sinar Harapan, Republika, and Kompas in 2011 period. There were some factors of choosing period of 2011. First, the year of 2011 marked a decade since the Law no 21 of 2001 about Papua Special Autonomy established. It should be considered by the government of how their effort in resolving conflicts through what the media covered. Second, the year of 2011 is also the same year when Law no 65 of 2011 about Development Acceleration for Papua and West-Papua, which then it was also established the Law no 66 of 2011 about The Unit of Development Acceleration for Papua and West-Papua as a special agency who is responsible to the President of Indonesia. Both laws were established by President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono at that time as a part of resolving Papua's conflict with economical approach.

As for framing analysis model that is chosen is Robert N. Entman's model in order to show the selection process and the projection of news which are articles about Papua economic news in two national daily newspapers. The reason for choosing Entman's mode is because it is not only analyzing the content of the text, but also the communication process from the audiences to institution, the production of message to message, up to how it is being accepted by the society.

The second step of this research is done by using content analysis qualitatively, which is Critical Discourse Analysis. The big framework of this critical discourse analysis uses a model developed by Norman Fairclough. By Fairclough approach, then this research puts media's micro text as a raw basic of situational analysis. According to the researcher, Fairclough approach only analyzes the structural and practical factor from media, in which it includes economic and political importance of the administrators. The population of this research overall took texts of three newspapers throughout 2011; Sinar Harapan, Republik, and Kompas. While the unit of this research is the economic articles in those three media.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

From 18 articles about the implementation of Special Autonomy Laws, there were some interesting and important articles that caught the researcher's attention, because of those articles; there were some paragraphs that showed subjective views from the reporter in seeing events happening in Papua.

Sinar Harapan was one of the media that consistently oversees the execution of Special Autonomy Laws in Papua. Since the news agency established in 2001, Sinar Harapan has always tried to report Papua's condition. After ten years, Sinar Harapan considered the failure of the government in executing the Special Autonomy as for sometimes in their articles. Sinar Harapan wrote the word "failure" when mentioning Special Autonomy matters.

From most of the articles about Special Autonomy, Sinar Harapan framed the failures. Although there was an official statement from the government, it was placed at the end of the articles instead of the head. Therefore, it was aimed to accentuate many problems of Special Autonomy that it ended at a word "failure".

Sinar Harapan viewed the failure of Special Autonomy was caused by the negligence supervision by the Central Government and the elites in Papua who were dishonest in using Special Autonomy Fund. In addition, the failure of Special Autonomy was also caused by the incomplete coverage of four main targets in Special Autonomy Law's mandate namely; economic empowerment, education empowerment, health, and infrastructure.

Sinar Harapan viewed the master plan program of Merauke Integrated Food and Energy Estate (MIFEE) as a program that harmed Malinds; a major native tribes who live in Merauke, and destroyed the healthy and productive protected forest area. Sinar Harapan viewed the mega project MIFEE plan, which was hoped to be a way to build up Papua region by the Central Government, turned out to cause some sociology, economic, social, and cultural problems. Not only that the healthy and productive forest area will be converted to an industrial area, but also it omitted the "ulayat" right from Merauke's tribe.

After the mega project MIFEE faced a lot of problems along its way resolving problems in Papua, the Central Government later established The Unit of Development Acceleration for Papua and West-Papua in September 2011. There were three special articles written by Sinar Harapan regarding this new unit.

Sinar Harapan pictured establishment of this unit as a new communication method. Recalling the establishment was almost at the end of 2011, there were not many activities of this unit recorded in Sinar Harapan news framing. Sinar Harapan assessed the formation of The Unit of Development Acceleration for Papua and West-Papua as a new way of resolving the problems, yet it stayed in a position of questioning the performance of this new unit. As Sinar Harapan supports the dialogue way of resolving Papua's problems, no matter what the Central Government does to end Papua's problem, as long as it is done peacefully, it will always be supported by Sinar Harapan.

Basically, Sinar Harapan's attitude showed that it supported the establishment of The Unit of Development Acceleration for Papua and West-Papua as a new form of communication effort between the Central Government and people of Papua to end the problems in the Earth of Cendrawasih. However, with many failures following the policies done by the central government, Sinar Harapan became skeptical if the establishment of The Unit of Development Acceleration for Papua and West-Papua will answer the problems in Papua.

Based on the amount of articles regarding Papua, compared to Sinar Harapan and Kompas, Republika had the least news reports. For instance, in economic matter, Republika only had 24 articles throughout 2011, with 16 articles used as the analysis units in this research.

The news regarding special autonomy in Republika mostly reported in November, because it remarked the ten years' anniversary of Special Autonomy implementation in Papua. Republika sought this Special Autonomy Law implementation as "not optimal" which means the policy made after ten

years by the Central Government was impressed as a good way, yet not optimal, just like the way Government mentioned Special Autonomy.

Moreover, in one of its headline, the form of support from Republika toward Special Autonomy Law was that the problematic situation in Papua was not mentioned as “conflict”, but as a “fluctuation,” which means the problems in Papua was not as big as it still could be suppressed. Whereas the usage of "conflict" word may mean that the problems were so crucial, and it has no meeting point.

Unlike Sinar Harapan, who appointed Central Government and Local Government as an institution in charge for the failure of Special Autonomy implementation, Republika emphasized that the problems in Papua were caused by the least Special Autonomy implementation. Therefore, from that sentence, it can be analyzed that the Special Autonomy policy was still relevant, and it had no problem, only optimization needed.

The mega project MIFEE plan in Republika daily can be seen as a solution to end domestic food problem, whereas the program was Central Government’s plan to make Merauke as one of Indonesia breadbasket area. Republika saw the Central Government's decision to build a land for estate food program was to answer the needs of food in Papua, and also to advance the region itself. It is why Republika wanted to say that this program was actually helpful in advancing the Papua people, especially Merauke. Therefore, it could be inferred that Republika saw this government's program as a good way of solving problems in Papua. By presenting Papua's condition as a lagged region in Indonesia, Republika wanted to show that any programs from the Government would be supported, without seeing the locals point of view, especially Merauke, as the people who got the after effect of this MIFEE program.

There were not many articles regarding the Unit of Development Acceleration for Papua and West-Papua in Republika throughout 2011. From the researcher’s archive from Republika Documentation Center, there were only two special articles that presented Unit of Development Acceleration for Papua and West-Papua, the rest were attached to an article regarding Papua Special Autonomy. Those two featured articles were published on November 4, 2011 and November 22, 2011, or two months after the Unit of Development Acceleration for Papua and West Papua was officially formed and signed by President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono in September 2011.

Republika used the Central Government’s point of view as it judged the establishment of this new unit as a form of ending Jakarta-Papua problems. Republika often showed what the unit’s programs doing instead of what happened through Papua’s side.

Throughout 2011, Kompas mentioned Papua’s problem more than Republika. Even researcher found a lot of Kompas articles regarding Papua's conflicts in many perspectives and many aspects. According to Kompas reporter, Josie Hardianto, who was interviewed by the researcher, admitted that his media has placed three of its reporters in Papua for the last two years. Therefore, the news was mostly pictured from years before.

As in 2011, there were 20 articles about Special Autonomy in Kompas dailies. In its articles, Kompas viewed the Special Autonomy as central government’s way to suppress the people of Papua’s fluctuation after the end of Soeharto’s regime where there were a lot of separatism actions. Generally, Kompas’ point of view regarding Special Autonomy Law was very supportive in a term of ending Papua’s problem. In the other articles, Kompas also saw that the matters in Special Autonomy was not only because of the fund nominals, but there was another aspect that influenced, in which Kompas, in its two articles, mentioned that Papua’s “democratic” should be “strengthen”. Just like Sinar Harapan, other than welfare matters, Papua’s democratic was also one of the mentioned problems.

Another assessed problem by Kompas was that Kompas sometimes quoted its interviewees' by mentioning that Special Autonomy has "failed" in resolving Papua's problems. It was obviously seen in one of the articles titled "Papua's Development Has Not Yet Put People in Welfare," March 23rd edition in 2011, the third page. The word "failed" was also mentioned in an article "Government Ignored Special Autonomy Law."

It was clear from Kompas' news framing that despite it generally supported Special Autonomy's as a way to resolve problems in Papua, the implementation of Special Autonomy was still failed in ending the problems in Papua. The issue about MIFEE in 2011 was surfaced in March by Kompas in which they presented MIFEE's condition and its implementations. It was explained in the articles of how the land has been changed to a farm in order to plant various plants in MIFEE program, also the condition of the company and working system of the MIFEE program. Kompas, on the other hand, saw the mistakes of MIFEE were caused by the failure of central government to make a food security program. According to Kompas, Java's farming system has harmed a lot of farmers. Therefore, the government tried to seek another land outside Java to fulfill the MIFEE program. Instead of enhancing farmers' welfare, MIFEE program was handed over to the private and foreign companies. It was a mistake that the food security program was planned through an instant way without considering the sociology, economy, social, and cultural aspect of Native Merauke people. The development of MIFEE project was in fact harmed the native people of Merauke, especially the Malind people, a native tribe who resides in Merauke.

Kompas regarded the formation of Unit of Development Acceleration for Papua and West-Papua as one of the new communication ways between the central government and people of Papua. Along 2011, there were 11 special articles regarding this unit in Kompas' news framing. In its position, Kompas considered that this new unit was a new way to resolve the problems in Papua. In some articles, Kompas often framed the issue with some words, such as "communication", "dialogue", and "welfare". In a further analysis, those three words led to a point of view or opinion of what kind of actions and procedures that can be done in order to end the problems in Papua. Kompas supported the central government in forming this unit, proven by numbers of articles after this unit officially established in September 2011. Through its articles, Kompas would like to encourage the usage of dialogue in order to solve the problems.

The moral assessment done by Kompas regarding this Development Acceleration for Papua and West-Papua Unit was hoped to resolve the complex problems in Papua. In its articles, Kompas regarded the unit to be able to gather the "apparatus" from the neighborhoods to the villages to have a dialogue. Although the government always put the dialogues front under Unitary State of Indonesia, Kompas still recommended the government to hear the aspiration and wishes of the Papuan themselves.

Based on the three national newspapers analysis; either macro, micro, or meso, it could be seen how each media tried to build a public opinion toward an event. There were specific patterns that were meant to be built by each media in affecting its news production process. At some points, there was some subjectivity of the reporters in delivering the message to the readers, yet this subjectivity was the key to strengthening the news.

From the results of the analysis, it could be seen some pattern happening in a media to influence the public opinion. There was a main pattern built, starting from the headline of news, the choice of interviewees, the questions list, quote, up to the placement of interviewees in news. Moreover, there were parts where the interviewees being appointed as a reference of a particular event. It was the effect of agenda-setting meeting and the knowledge of concerned reporters. In Papua's conflict, among Sinar Harapan, Republika, and Kompas, each media has its own characteristic of analyzing. Sinar Harapan often placed the NGO that is in contra-position of having the central

government to be the main interviewee, which then it could be inferred that their quotes were always contradicted to the government.

Based on the fairness and equality principles, Sinar Harapan wanted to form an image of the situation in Papua these days, and how the failure impacted of Special Autonomy laws, MIFEE and Development Acceleration Papua and West Papua Unit. While Republika was only reporting event happened in Papua lightly on the surface, starting from the choice of interviewees who were always the officials in Jakarta, and quoting from Antara. Whereas Kompas wanted to serve a comprehensive, detailed previews, also its recommendation toward an issue or event. In every article, Kompas always explained the causes of problems, impacts, and the solutions. Although Sinar Harapan also did the same, there were differences from both media which was located in how the solutions offered from both media. Sinar Harapan always quoted the result of the interviews, while Kompas with detail sometimes took sources from books or reports of a team as its recommendations.

Those patterns were built from the mixture of ideologies and political economy interests from the media owners. Although the incomes of newspapers circulation in Papua toward national newspapers compared to the local newspapers wasn't much, but the affiliation proximity that those two newspapers had finally influenced the production process and opinions made by the three medias.

Choosing the interviewees was also one of the factors that affected a media's news reporting process. The choice of interviewees, instance, and diction became a factor that constructed the news which in the end reached the readers. It did not mean that the news would "unbalanced" or not cover both sides, but the placement of interviewees in the news articles would affect the first paragraph in news. This first paragraph will then become the first consideration of making the title from the news. The title which was symbolized by straightforwardness or metaphor would surely give different impact or perception to the readers and societies. Sinar Harapan, generally chose interviewees who were activist, either NGO or civil society such as Papua Peace Network and academicians from universities in Papua, and the details from government sides were only added to the middle or end of paragraphs.

Republika, on the other hand, although there were statements from Papua's sides, the main interviewees were always the government or officials in Jakarta. On the other hand, Kompas was almost the same as Sinar Harapan, but with smoother dictions. The choices of interviewees and the statements placement, in the end, would build a unity to the news. Finally, the output of the news could be seen from a whole construct which was not noticed by the readers. Therefore, borrowing from the Marxist and Neo-Marxist, it would make a false consciousness in the readers' mind, and it would affect the public opinions in the society.

CONCLUSIONS

There were some points that can be concluded regarding the conflicts happening in Papua through the media by using critical discourse analysis on three Indonesian national daily newspapers; Sinar Harapan, Republika, and Kompas.

First, throughout Indonesian press history, especially Reformation Press, Indonesia's media started to actively report any issues and problems. The government was no longer able to control information spread in society as the society had a freedom to use its right as a public user to achieve any information, including conflicts issues in Papua. This research's goal was also to see how far the importance of media's ideology and political economic affecting the process of news production. Two out of three media, affiliated with the church, whereas the majority of Papuans are non-Islam, while

the other media was affiliated with Islam. From these two, after being analyzed, it could be inferred that the affiliation of the media was strongly affecting on how an issue being reported in that media. Sinar Harapan and Kompas had really distinct differences in framing Papua's conflicts, as well as Republika. Confessed in an interview with those three media's representative, both Sinar Harapan and Kompas had their reporters in Papua, but not Republika.

Second, the proximity of religion affiliation by the three daily media which became the research object was very influencing in reporting process. The choice of interviewees, direct or indirect quoting, up to the dictions, were strongly showed the attitude of each media in seeing the problems in Papua. Sinar Harapan, which was affiliated with Protestant, was really clear in explaining the conditions and impacts of Central Government's policies. Sinar Harapan was also straightforward in its reporting technique, directly to the matters, as if the problems in Papua needed attention from the Central and Local Government. While Republika, although it was also supporting the government's policy, it still wanted to end Papua's problems respectfully through dialogue. Whereas Kompas, not only it demanded seriousness and attention from Central Government, it also suggested the solution to end the problems, indeed in "Kompas Way" with satire or refines.

The attitude showed by three national dailies showed that media was not only giving information, but also as a political actor in the communication process. Media had its own political attitude based on the framing done toward an issue. As an actor, media surely had a role in the flow. The affiliation and ideology closeness was the base of the media's attitude. Therefore, in the end, the process would immensely affect the public opinions.

The third point that can be concluded is the framing strategy. From the three media, it could be seen from the news presented throughout 2011 that the media wanted to lure the public opinion by showing controversial quotes and moral strategy. Sinar Harapan, for example, in Special Autonomy research, wanted to present the event in Papua's point of view; the failure of Special Autonomy and the scandal of fund deviation. Although it presented the local government's statement, the interviewees' placing and the words used showed that not only the local government was at fault, but also the central government who was lack in supervising. On the other hand, Kompas, in a refined language, reported the sequences of its news for a year that the government failed in implementing the Special Autonomy. In contrast, Republika only reported less news about Papua, and it recommended the optimization of Special Autonomy.

REFERENCES

- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Denton, R. E., & Woodward, G. C. (1990). *Political Communication in America*. New York: Praeger.
- Drooglever, P. J. (2010). *Suatu Penentuan Pendapat Rakyat (Pepera)*. Dipresentasikan dalam Seminar on the Act of Free Choice. Page 129-147. Oxford.
- Entman, R. (1991). "Framing US Coverage of International News: Contrast Narrative of the KAL and Iran Air Incident". In Eriyanto. *Analisis Framing: Konstruksi, Ideologi dan Politik Media*. Yogyakarta: LKiS.
- Eriyanto. (2001). *Analisis Wacana: Pengantar Analisis Teks Media*. Yogyakarta: LKiS.

- Eriyanto. (2002). *Analisis Framing:Konstruksi, Ideologi dan Politik Media*. Yogyakarta: LKiS.
- McNair, B. (2003). *An Introduction to Political Communication* (3rd Ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Mosco, V. (1996). *The Political Economy of Communication: Rethinking and Renewal*. London: Sage.
- Purwanto, W. H. (2011). *Papua in 100 Forthcoming Years*. Jakarta: CMB Press.
- Sherlita, W. (2004). *Isu NKRI dalam Tajuk Rencana Perstentang Konflik Bersenjata di Aceh (Analisis Framing Tiga Harian Ibukota)*. (Unpublished Bachelor Thesis). Universitas Indonesia: Depok.
- Tebay, N. (2011). *Dialog Jakarta – Papua, Sebuah Perspektif Papua*. Jayapura: SKP.
- Widjojo, M. S., Elizabeth, A., Rahab, A., Pamungkas, C., & Rosita, D. (2008). *Papua Road Map: Negotiating the Past, Improving the Present and Securing the Future*. LIPI: Jakarta.
- Woodier, J. (2008). *The Media and Political Change in Southeast Asia*. UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.