SOCIAL MEDIA SHUTDOWN: A POLITICAL AND CYBER SECURITIZATION OF INDONESIA'S 2019 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

Muhammad Arief Virgy, Claudia Destianira, dan Mustabsyirotul Ummah Mustofa

Department of Political Science and Department of International Relations
Faculty of Social and Political Science
Universitas Padjadjaran

E-mail : arieffirgyy@gmail.com

ABSTRAK
Penelitian ini menganalisis bagaimana proses Sekuritisasi yang dilakukan oleh Pemerintah Indonesia untuk mencegah penyebaran berita hoaks yang merajela perihal hasil Pemilihan Umum 2019. Berita hoaks tersebut membuat polarisasi publik hingga terjadi demonstrasi pada 21-22 Mei 2019 yang ditujukkan kepada Komisi Pemilihan Umum (KPU) sebagai manifestasi dari ketidakpercayaan publik atas hasil Pemilu 2019. Untuk memitigasi polarisasi publik dan menjaga stabilitas sosial dan politik negara, Pemerintah melalui Kementerian Komunikasi dan Informasi, menonaktifkan fitur-fitur tertentu seperti akses dan distribusi foto dan video di beberapa saluran media sosial untuk mencegah penyebaran berita bohong. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode studi literatur dengan berbagai referensi ilmiah. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan sikap pro dan kontra terhadap kebijakan penonaktifan fitur dalam sosial media tersebut. Media sosial sebagai saluran representasi baru bagi publik untuk menyuarakan aspirasi mereka diblokir oleh Pemerintah yang menganggap bahwa distribusi foto dan video seputar penolakan hasil Pemilu 2019 dapat memperburuk suasana yang telah memanas sehingga fenomena itu dianggap sebagai ancaman eksistensial. Menanggapi hasil penelitian ini, pemerintah sebagai aktor sekuritisasi perlu mengevaluasi metode speech act mereka untuk mendapatkan legitimasi yang kuat dari publik sehingga wacana yang mengganggu agenda sekuritisasi dapat dicegah oleh pemerintah.
Kata Kunci: Pemilihan Presiden 2019, Sekuritisasi, Penutupan Media Sosial

ABSTRACT
This study analyses how Securitization efforts by Indonesian Government to prevent the spreading of hoax news that was rampant as the result of General Election 2019. That hoax news made polarization of public until the demonstration happened on 21-22 May 2019 which addressed to General Election Commision (KPU) as manifestation of public's distrust over the result of General Election 2019. To mitigate of polarization of public and to keep state's social and political stablisation, Indonesian Government through The Ministry of Communication and Information was deactivated several features on social media such as access and distribution of photos and videos to prevent the spreading of hoax news. This study used literature review method. The result of this study indicated pro and contra responses towards the policy that deactivated several features on social media. Social media as a new channel of representation for public to voice their aspiration was blocked by Government which considers that distribution of photos and videos about the rejection of General Election 2019's result would made worsen the atmosphere that has heated up so this phenomenon was considered as an existential threat. Responding to study result, Government as securitization actors should evaluate their speech act method to obtain strong legitimation from public so discource that disrupt securitization agenda could be countered by Government
Keywords: Indonesia presidential election, securitization, social media shutdown

INTRODUCTION

The concept of security especially after the Cold War in the 1990s has shifted due to the emergence of a shift in security trends that expanded from traditional to non-traditional in increasingly multidimensional discussions about security. Today's militaristic threats are deemed inadequate to explain the potential threat in its entirety. This is due to the increasing complexity of global problems and the threat of security is not enough to be addressed but also anticipated, to support global development and improve the quality of life. At present, there is a need for a holistic approach to security that is conceptualized. The security context is conceptualized not only as a militaristic threat, but a threat that affects strategies for survival, to improve quality of life.

Issues that began to be discussed after the Cold War era included issues of human security, societal security, environmental security, economics security, health security to political security. The approach to the issues mentioned is a non-traditional security approach, where the concept was born from Barry Buzan, Ole Waever, and Jaap de Wilde in Copenhagen Schools (Buzan, Waever, Wilde, & de, 1998). In the context of political stability, threats to the political sector refer to state organizations - in this case the government has legitimate authority. Threats in this sector also refer to units in the political system including process structures, or institutions among the political system in the country.

In the Indonesian context, one of the threats that attacks the political sector is the delegitimation of state institutions, namely the General Election Commission or Komisi Pemilihan Umum (KPU) and the Election Supervisory Agency or Badan Pengawas Pemilu (Bawaslu) who are the organizers of the 2019 General Election. This is due to the mistrust of the presidential candidate pair Number 2 namely Prabowo Subianto and Sandiaga Uno on the 2019 Election results which were announced on May 21 2019, specifically the 2019 Presidential Election and they carry the narrative that the KPU and the Bawaslu has been cheating in this election (Ariefana & Aranditio, 2019). This narrative has been exhaled long before the voting on April 17, 2019 began. Director of Communication and Media of the National Winning Body or Badan Pemenangan Nasional (BPN) Prabowo Subianto, Hashim Djojohadikusumo, is the first party to say that there is fraud in the 2019 Election (Yuliawati & Ramadhan, 2019). Hashim first complained that there was a potential for a double voter list on Daftar Pemilih Tetap (DPT) of around 17.5 million voters to the KPU. Later, the KPU verified and stated that no double DPT was found as previously reported. The Chairperson of the Prabowo-Sandiaga BPN Steering Board, Amien Rais, has threatened to encourage people to flock in protest if there is fraud in the 2019 Election (Yuliawati & Ramadhan, 2019). Amien Rais said that this was part of a social or social revolt from the community towards the regime.

Furthermore, the cheating narrative of the 2019 Election continued when after the voting day on April 17, 2019 Survey Agencies released a quick count and stated that candidate pair President and Vice President number 01 Joko Widodo-Ma'ruf Amin was the winner of the 2019 Presidential Election contestation (Yuliawati & Ramadhan, 2019). Candidates for President Prabowo Subianto accused the survey

institutions of being bragging who could not be trusted anymore. A similar accusation occurred in the KPU Vote Counting Information System (SPU) where candidate candidate number 02 Prabowo accused that the KPU was deemed to have made a mistake in entries that favored the presidential candidate number 01 Joko Widodo.

The peak escalation of the narrative is a movement that is mobilized by certain parties and named as the People Power movement that occurs on May 21 to 22 May 2019. The movement is manifested through demonstrations carried out in front of the Bawaslu office. The aim of the movement according to BPN is to echo the sovereignty of the people who think that the people want justice in the 2019 Election. The action that ended in the riot was mentioned by the Republic of Indonesia Minister of Politics, Law and Human Rights, Wiranto, as a serious crime that threatens state sovereignty Indonesia (BBC Indonesia, 2019). Some countries like Canada, United States, United Kingdom, Australia, Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore, and Thailand issued travel advice to citizens who visited Indonesia due to the incident (Panca Rini, 2019). In addition, the action also caused the movement of the Composite Stock Price Index (IHSG) to decline and the weakening of the exchange rate of the Rupiah against the United States Dollar (Andriani, 2019).

The 2019 Election cheating narrative carried out by the Election organizers was manifested through the distribution of hoax news on the majority of social media regarding the vote counting process of the 2019 Presidential Election conducted by the KPU. The Republic of Indonesia Ministry of Communication and Information (Kominfo) noted that there were 9 hoaxes about the 2019 Election which were widely discussed on social media (Annur, 2019). First, hoax news is related to the results of the Central KPU which has reached 75% on April 23, 2019 and shows that candidate pair President and Vice President number 02 Prabowo-Sandiaga won the 2019 Election. In fact, real count vote recapitulation was conducted in the April 18 period until May 22, 2019. Second, a video upload on social media that shows the difference in information related to KPU vote recapitulation which was transferred to Microsoft Excel. According to information from the Indonesian Ministry of Communication and Information, this is not true. Third, an upload on social media stating that the length of time the data entered into the KPU was due to the winner of the 2019 Election being Prabowo-Sandi 02 presidential candidate pair and if the winner of the 2019 Election was presidential candidate number 01 Jokowi-Ma'ruf then the process of recording data will be faster. According to the Indonesian Ministry of Communication and Information, this is not true because the time of data recording and data recapitulation has been scheduled by the KPU.

Fourth, the Indonesian Ministry of Communication and Information found a video showing the Chairperson of the Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDIP) Megawati Soekarnoputri, who is the party holding candidate number 01 Joko Widodo, in his press conference, thanking the Indonesian people for their support for candidate numbers 02 Prabowo Subianto. In fact, at the press conference, Megawati expressed his gratitude to the people of Indonesia who had given their support to candidate number 01 Joko Widodo and hoped to continue their duties as President of the Republic of Indonesia. Fifth, there is a

video on social media explaining that the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) shut up when they saw the KPU and Bawaslu known to accept bribes in the regional elections and presidential elections. In fact, according to the Indonesian Ministry of Communication and Information, the video was an old upload uploaded on July 22, 2018, related to allegations of the Governor of Lampung Province in 2018. Sixth, information related to the theft of C1 form at the time of vote recapitulation at the National Education Foundation, Medan, North Sumatra that circulated on social media. In the event, actually the Voice Announcement Committee (PPS) and the Sub-District Election Committee (PPK) brought copies of C1 to be distributed to the kelurahan to be announced to the public. However, they were even accused of stealing a copy of the C1. The incident was clarified by the Chairperson of the Medan Bawaslu who stated that this was a misunderstanding and had been handled by his party.

Seventh, a video showing the burning of ballot papers in Papua. The uploader of the video claimed that the government had cheated candidate pair number 02. In fact, according to the Papua Police Chief, the documents burned were remnants of documents that were no longer needed and the minutes of their destruction were made. Eighth, information is spread via Whatsapp stating that the Prabowo-Sandi team will announce the results of the quick count which will be announced on Tv One on April 24, 2019. The announcement is a form of rebuttal to six other survey institutions that are considered partisan towards the Jokowi-Ma'ruf. After being confirmed, Tv One stated that the message was hoax. Finally, the Indonesian Ministry of Communication and Information identified hoax news about the former Situng KPU voice recording officer who uncovered fraudulent data input. After tracing, the news turned out to come from uploading a Facebook user named Fahri Ismael who expressed his opinion related to errors in voting in Situng KPU. In fact, according to the Indonesian Ministry of Communication and Information, the news did not come from credible, valid media.

In addition, there are also news hoaxes that stimulate riots and spread throughout the period of 21-22 May 2019. The Indonesian Ministry of Communication and Informatics records 30 news hoaxes about the riots that occurred at that time (Sari, 2019). The news starts from the existence of hoax news about the attacks carried out by Brimob against worshipers at the Al Makmur Tanah Abang Mosque in Jakarta; Brimob personnel who are foreign nationals; until the demonstrators were shot by live ammunition by the police. These hoax news is exacerbated by the post-truth phenomenon today where people even degrade data and facts about the results of the 2019 Presidential Election so that people are reluctant to verify the news spread on social media and just believe it. Post-truth is interpreted as a vague meaning and irrelevance of the meaning of a phenomenon (McIntyre, 2018).

This caused the Indonesian Government to take preventive steps to prevent the spread of hoax news which stimulated more polarization between the people who did not trust the election organizing institutions and the people who trusted the election organizers. The preventive steps are by deactivating social media features such as the distribution of photos and videos. The restriction is carried out within 3

days starting from May 22, 2019 to May 25, 2019 (Editorial of CNBC Indonesia, 2019). According to Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs Wiranto, the effort was made so that the country remained safe, not only through security tightening by security forces, but also by the role of the public who did not spread hoax news. In addition, according to the Indonesian Minister of Communication and Information, Rudiantara, the restrictions on the distribution of photos and videos were carried out because the public spreads information in the form of photos and videos through social media so that they restricted the use of photos and videos on social media.

However, these restrictions reap the pros and cons of being judged by some to injure the value of their own democracy. According to the Alliance of Independent Journalists (AJI), the measure is considered to limit the right of everyone to communicate and obtain information (CNN Indonesia, 2019). It encouraged the government to take initiative towards the organizers of social media to prevent the spread of hoax news through a mechanism that is transparent, legal, and accountable.

Based on this situation, questions began to rise: what are the threats that potentially bring harm to Indonesia's national security, particularly in the presidential election momentum? How does social media influence political preferences of the public, and how can it potentially threatened a nation's security? How the government, as the sovereign entity, use their authority through domestic policy as a securitization instrument to maintain the nation's political stability and security? And how will impact its society? This research aims to identify Indonesia's effort in securitizing political and cyber spectrum of the nation during the momentum of its presidential election through restrictions of visual content on social media.

In this study, we will explain the phenomenon of deactivating some features in social media by using securitization theory from Copenhagen School researchers such as Barry Buzan, Ole Waever, and Jaap de Wilde (1998). There are two rationalizations which are the reasons why researchers use the theory to explain the policy of deactivating some features in social media in the events of 21-22 May 2019. First, there is a social construction process used by the government related to the interpretation of security and threats that come from events 21 -22 May 2019 to the public. Second, the government uses words that characterize precarious conditions and the crisis being faced so that the government assesses only securitizing or security options that are most likely to be carried out by actors. Through these methods, the threat is presented and introduced to the public by the government. Related to the securitization process carried out by the government in the context of political security, researchers have conducted library studies to find literature and references related to the topic of research.

First, the previous research is related to the deactivation of social media carried out in both authoritarian and democratic countries (Howard, Agarwal, & Hussain, 2011). Over time, social media has become a fundamental infrastructure for collective action in both authoritarian and democratic countries. The internet has become the infrastructure needed for the development of civil society and when during elections it is often the time for the community to become the most active entity. There are several

conditions in which a state, both an authoritarian state and a democratic state, intervenes in information infrastructure as a way to manage a crisis, namely when a period of political uncertainty, a mass reaction from a crisis to an election, or a military attack. The purpose of the intervention is to protect political leaders and state institutions; eliminate propaganda; reduce disputes; and protect national security. The state uses several ways to disrupt information networks on the internet, including online contexts by turning off political websites or portals or by controlling proxies and ISPs and forcing companies to close certain websites or deny access to unpleasant content; and, in the most extreme cases, turning off access to all online and cellular networks, while for offline contexts by arresting journalists, bloggers, activists and citizens. However, the deactivation of the internet, including social media itself has economic consequences, where there are economic losses and damage the reputation of a country in the presence of technology investors that make the stability of a country a consideration for investing.

Second, research relates to the role of social media as a tool for political mobilization (Mutana, 2016). In the study it was stated that social media can disseminate information for political mobilization, including for mass mobilization to repress the government or to carry out movements to protest things that are considered not in favor of justice in the general public. the socio-political and economic climate can trigger social media movements to try to make real social, political and economic changes. The findings also reveal that the movement on social media can introduce speed and interactivity that are lacking in traditional mobilization consisting of leaflets, posters and faxes. Social media is an effective communication tool that has a positive effect on political mobilization.

Third, a previous research relates to how important Audience, Political Agencies, and Substances are conveyed in the context of securitization processes (Balzacq, 2005). The author argues that the success of securitization is more than how the Speech Act method is carried out by Securitizing Actors and who support Speech Acts such as Functional Actors. That successful securitization is centered on the target audience of securitization; Success of securitization depends on the social position of the Securitizing Actors so that it is full of the power or power concerned and how the capacity capacity of the securitizing actor to use the right words and convincing terms of reference in a particular context, to win the support of the target audience in realizing political goals; and the success of securitization depends on the context conveyed to the target audience so that the context must also be felt by the target audience.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The argument underlying the existence of securitization is because there are actors who define a security issue in a particular field as a threat that threatens certain objects (referent objects). Thus, an actor can claim that there is a certain object that is said to be threatened and the actor uses his right to overcome the threat. This claim is called the speech act, where the speech act consists of several pillars namely (Floyd, 2010):

1. Internal claims against the speech act based on the grammar of security and form a scheme with the right threat, point where there is no way out or the way back;

2. Social capital owned by a person who states or an actor who performs securitization, who has authority, whether it is officially authorized or not;

3. Historical conditions that have a relationship with threats.

Security itself is widely constructed not only related to the issue of high politics such as the issue of military defense, but security is constructed more broadly, because basically security is a condition where humans can be free from threats. In practice, securitization refers to efforts or policies to tackle a problem with 'normal' handling to be an extraordinary issue and need special handling from the government. The method used is by using militaristic or out of the ordinary methods is the main method used. The essence of the securitization approach is that there is an effort to be an individual or group actor which usually does not constitute a threat to the state as a threat to the state.

To find out whether a policy is an attempt at securitization or not, there are several indicators that can identify related policies. The first is to see how the construction process of the actors involved in the policy is taken. Here we identify actors related to their understanding of security, as well as understanding related to threats that come upon an object rather than the actual conditions of the security threat. Here we also see how this construction process creates a type / political condition that allows actors to ignore applicable regulations or laws in order to try to prevent a threat that is considered an emergency by the actor. Securitization conditioning according to the initiators of the securitization approach can be identified through political engineering, especially related to linking it to crisis or emergency conditions that cannot be accepted under normal conditions. The second we can identify securitization efforts through the use of words, verbalization, and policy measures that characterize the precarious conditions and the crisis at hand. The construction of threats in this securitization approach in the language of Barry Buzan (1998) is carried out through "grammar security" namely "a plot that includes existential threat, point of no return, and possible way out". This plot will be formulated through the actions of these actors who, among other things, announce for example that there are specific issues or problems and show an urgent level of danger. On the basis of considering these emergency conditions, only the securitizing or security options are most likely to be carried out by the actor. Through these methods, threats are presented and introduced to the public by the government.

In the process of securitization, there is a classification of issues to determine a security threat, such as: First, non-public (non-politicezed) where a threat is only considered as a public issue that does not concern the public interest and has no political element. Therefore the issue is not handled by the government. Second, politicized, where in this classification, an issue that was initially considered as not a public issue had entered the realm of public interest and needed the efforts of securitization actors to intervene in terms of policies or allocation of resources. And Third, to securitized where in this classification,

an issue has been considered a real threat of security, which of course requires emergency action where the use of procedures above ordinary political procedures is considered legitimate or commonly stated by extraordinary measures (Buzan, Waever, & Wilde, 1998).

In securitization, in general, there are three types of unit analysis in involving securitization processes (Barry Buzan., 1998). The three units in question are as follows:

a) Referent Object. That refers to an object that is claimed to be threatened and needs to survive.
b) Securitizing Actors. That refers to the actor who claims that in certain objects there is a threat that the actor must overcome.
c) Functional Actors. That refers to actors who influence the dynamics of a security sector and are actors who have an interest in referent objects.

Securitizing actors can be grouped again into 3 components, namely:

a) Lead Actor is an actor who has a strong commitment to speak out about specific issues of an issue at the international level. Actors in this category can be nation-state, Epistemic Communities and NGOs' or civil society;
b) Veto Actors are actors who play a role in weakening the issue to be securitized;
c) Veto Coalition is a group of countries that form agreements on important issues that have the power to fight the regime if it is needed.

According to Scott D. Watson (2009) there are 3 requirements for the framework for studying securitization. 3 of these requirements include the following:

1. Identifying the Field of Issues

In terms of we must find out how the relationship between units in the issue area. Finding relationships between these units is very important because not all issue areas have clear inter-unit relationships;

2. Identifying Securitization Episodes

Identifying episodes of securitization uses two indicators, namely discursive fighting and the implementation of emergency measures because securitization involves communicative action and legitimacy that requires the confidence of others (others/ audience) regarding a position.

3. Identifying Conditions That Cause Securitization to Succeed or Not

In identifying conditions that cause securitization to succeed or fail, 6 conditions are needed: the grammatical component of the claim (action), the social position of the actor concerned, the purpose of the claim (action), the priority of the stated threat, the social context when the claim happened, a debate strategy emerged.

RESEARCH METHOD

The type of research method used in this study is qualitative research. The qualitative research theory used is qualitative research method John W. Creswell (2012). The reason for choosing qualitative research

methods is because the phenomenon under study is a phenomenon that has unique and complex characteristics, so it requires in-depth analysis of such phenomena.

Qualitative research that researchers design is qualitative research with a case study approach. Case studies are research strategies in which researchers will reveal in depth a particular program, event, activity, process or individual (Cresswell, 2012). The reason for choosing a case study approach is because the case study explains the past events, where there is a follow-up of a case, in this case the phenomenon of securitization in the political sector through deactivation of some features on the social media by the Indonesian government during the demonstration on 21-22 May 2019. In addition, this approach explains the causes of emergence, actors and elements involved in it, the motives or objectives of the government to securitize with the method and assess the success of the securitization process carried out by the government.

In this study, researchers will analyze issues in the news, literature journals, books, articles, and documents from the government regarding related events. Through these information, the author will collect specific data, analyze the data and then interpret it according to what is the purpose of this study. For data which we searched for, these are the detail of that data:

No	Theme	Specific Data	Sources	Method
1	*Unit analysis that involved in Securitization Processes*	Indentifying those actors into 3 types of unit analysis. There are Referent Object, Securitizing Actors, and Functional Actors	- Media - Official Website of Government of Indonesia	Literature Review
2	*Speech Act*	Statements by Securitizing Actors that warned public from an existensial threat. These statements reflected of grammar security	- Media - Official Website of Government of Indonesia - Literature journal - Books	Literature Review
3	*The Responses of Audience towards Speech Act*	Speech Act would be succeed if audience accepted grammar security by Securitizing Actors. Afterwards, the issue recognized as an existential threat by public. Otherwise, the speech act would be failed if audience rejected grammar security by Securitizing Actors. Thus, the issue did not recognized as an existential threat	- Media - Official Website of Government of Indonesia	Literature Review

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Restrictions on Social Media as a Threat Securitization Process by the Government of the Republic of Indonesia

Securitization is an attempt by an actor to define an object as a threat and the existence of certain objects that are threatened. The first medium of securitization is the speech act. Speech act, as a claim for a situation that is considered a threat through an attitude statement, according to Floyd consists of three pillars, namely internal claims, social capital, and historical conditions.

In internal claims, the speech act occurs based on the grammar of security which grammatically forms a threat construction scheme. In the context of the phenomenon of the 2019 elections, especially the presidential election in Indonesia in April, there was a delegitimation of the electoral institutions, KPU and Bawaslu in the phenomenon of framing fraud as a threat based on perceptions of the opposition camp. This is due to mistrust of the presidential candidate pair Number 2 namely Prabowo Subianto and Sandiaga Uno on the 2019 Election results which were announced on May 21, 2019, specifically the 2019 Presidential Election and they carry the narrative that the KPU and Bawaslu have cheated in this election (Ariefana & Aranditio, 2019). The claim was initiated by the statement of the Director of Communication and Media of the National Winning Body (BPN) Hashim Djojohadikusumo, who was the first party to say that there was fraud in the 2019 Election (Yuliawati & Ramadhan, 2019). Hashim first complained that there was a potential for a double voter list (DPT) of around 17.5 million voters to the KPU. The KPU then verified and stated that no double DPT was found as previously reported, so that the claim was broken.

On the pillar of social capital, the speech act is carried out by actors who have authority, either officially or unofficially, who can influence the public with the influence of the statements they produce. Chairman of the Prabowo-Sandiaga BPN Steering Board, Amien Rais, has threatened to encourage people to rally in April 1 2019 if there is fraud in the 2019 Election (Yuliawati & Ramadhan, 2019). Furthermore, Amien Rais said that this was part of a social or social revolt from society to the regime. Through its social capital, even though it is not official, the figure makes a statement that leads to opinion while declaring what is considered a threat.

On the pillars of historical conditions, events that have previously occurred can support the strength of framing threats. The statement related to cheating was linked to the previous election, the 2014 presidential election which later also became a weapon of delegitimation of the election administrators by the opposition through the creation of a discourse of distrust of the government. In 2014, the Spokesperson of Koalisi Merah Putih who carried the Candidates for President and Vice President Prabowo Subianto-Hatta Radjasa, Tantowi Yahya said, found irregularities in the presidential election in 52 thousand polling stations spread throughout Indonesia (BBC Indonesia, 2014). Hashim Djojohadikusumo added, irregularities found

include the addition of votes in a different recapitulation process with form C-1. Prabowo at that time rejected the results of the 2014 election on the same grounds as the results of the 2019 Election, namely there was fraud in the election which was detrimental to his side. Thus, Prabowo-Hatta sued the 2014 election results to Mahkamah Konstitusi.

However, Mahkamah Konstitusi rejected the claim for several reasons (Ihsanuddin, 2014). First, the Mahkamah Konstitusi considers that the applicant does not describe clearly and in detail at what level and where the error in the results of the vote count results in a reduction in the votes received by the applicant and the increase in vote acquisition of the parties concerned. Evidence and witnesses at the trial were also unable to explain it. Second, Mahkamah Konstitusi assessed that the applicant could not explain in detail the neglect of Data Penduduk Pemilih Potensial (DP4) as the source of the preparation of the Daftar Pemilih Tetap (DPT). Mahkamah Konstitusi also believes that the preparation of the DPT is a long process carried out by the KPU with the appropriate stages of regulation. Third, Prabowo-Hatta suspects that the high number of voters registered in Daftar Pemilih Khusus Tambahan (DPTKb) is a mass mobilization strategy to win Jokowi-JK. They considered the DPTKb invalid and violated the Law. However, Mahkamah Konstitusi considers that DPTKb is legitimate and can actually channel constitutional rights for citizens who are not registered in the DPT so that there is no indication of mass mobilization as is the case in the lawsuit. From these reasons, Mahkamah Konstitusi concluded that the subject matter of the petition submitted by Prabowo-Hatta had no legal grounds

The essence of securitization is the existence of a speech act from an individual or group actor which is usually not a threat to the state being a threat to the country. The first identification of securitization is to see how the construction process of the actors involved in the policy is taken. Related actors are identified with their understanding of security, as well as understanding related to threats that come upon an object rather than the actual conditions of the security threat. This construction process creates a type or political condition that allows actors to ignore applicable regulations or laws in order to try to prevent a threat that is considered an emergency by the actor. Securitization conditioning can be identified through political engineering, especially related to relating it to crisis or emergency conditions that cannot be accepted under normal conditions.

Securitization efforts can also be identified through the use of words, verbalization, and policy measures that characterize critical conditions and the crisis at hand. The construction of threats in this securitization approach in the language of Barry Buzan (1998) is carried out through "security grammar" which is implemented through the actions of the actors in expressing specific issues or problems and showing an urgent level of danger. Based on the consideration of emergency conditions, only the securitizing or security options are most likely to be carried out by the actor. Through these methods, threats are presented and introduced to the public by the government. Therefore, these are statements that reflected as security grammar by the government:

Date	High Officer of Indonesia Government	Statement
22 May 2019	President Jokowi	Government would not given a space for everyone who threatened national security. (Santoso, 2019)
22 May 2019	Coordinating Minister for Politics and Security Wiranto	- There were scenarios to made a riot and blamed police. Therefore, public became distrustful over government. (BBC, 2019) - The purpose of giving restriction some features on social media was to ensuring the state's security. (Safitri, 2019)
22 May 2019	Minister of Communication and Information Rudiantara	Government knew that spreading photos and videos about the result of General Election 2019 on social media would made public became provoked. So, Government decided to restrict the features of sharing photos and videos on social media. (Safitri, 2019)

Sources: Processed from any sources by authors

To identify securitization efforts, 3 prerequisites are needed according to Scott D. Watson: *First*, identify the issue area. In this prerequisite, it is necessary to identify how the relationship between units is on an issue. Election organizers as delegitimized referrals require securitization efforts from the government as securitizing actors to reduce their vulnerability due to multidimensional threats in the 2019 election. Media as functional actors influence the dynamics of the security sector especially around discourse on electoral fraud caused by the lack of integrity of election organizers disseminated through speech act.

Second, identifying episodes of securitization through two derivative indicators, namely discourse contestation and implementation of emergency measures. There are several discourse contestations that occur in the dynamics of the 2019 presidential election, including: news hoax related to the acquisition of the Central KPU which reached 75% on April 23, 2019 and when verified the recapitulation of the vote count was held until May 22 2019, uploading videos on social media regarding information differences related to the KPU's vote recapitulation which was transferred to Microsoft Excel which was confirmed by the Indonesian Ministry of Communication and Information as a hoax, the slower data recording discourse due to higher opposition opposition votes according to the Indonesian Ministry of Communication and Information when recording and recapitulation of data was scheduled by the KPU. when he saw the KPU and Bawaslu accept bribes in the Lampung provincial governor election in 2018, to the news hoax about the former KPU voice recording officer who dismantled fraudulent data input. The news underlies the government to take steps to limit social media.

Third, identify the conditions that determine the success or failure of a securitization effort, including the purpose of the claim/action and the priority of the threat that is constructed to then be securitized by the actor. The threat underlying the policy of limiting social media by the government is the

lack of public political literacy in an era of post truth that has the potential to cause conflict and division. The threat affects the community with emotional issues, inferring data and facts, prioritizing and popularizing news that is uncertain or even false, combining populist movements with assumptive conspiracy theories, mobilizing fictional narratives around certain figures or events, and packaging dishonesty in building opinions to strengthen the social position of certain figures, groups or interests in society that are increasingly responsive to global communication, especially social media according to the characteristics of the post-truth phenomenon according to Coughlan (2017). In relevance with securitization efforts in Indonesia, post-vis-a-vis reality also shows its existence in politics in Indonesia. The phenomenon of the politicization of religion became a form of post-truth politics in Indonesia. In matters relating to securitization, the context discussed is not the reality of the news circulating, but the preference of perception from the public who reads it and makes it a justification to keep what he believes to be true (Coughlan, 2017).

The phenomenon of post-truths is filled with justification (not substantive truth) or legitimacy which is then argued through opinion and hoax, disinformation, and partial facts (Coughlan, 2017). While Oxford's dictionary itself defines the term post-truth as a condition in which facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than personal emotions and beliefs (Alison, 2016) several factors that influence the development of post-truth are cognitive bias, declining quality of traditional media, popularity social media and fake news issues that are easily spread, and the climate of postmodernism (McIntyre, 2018). On the other hand, fact partiality is one of the special characteristics of the post-truth era. The era of post-truth is filled with partial facts which have the legitimacy of an interest. What is meant by this is the existence of a selection process in conveying facts, where the facts that support for certain purposes are the facts called "facts". If it is not in accordance with certain interests, facts are not "facts" and are rejected. This reality is the main key in understanding the post-truth phenomenon (Coughlan, 2017).

Beside, the research from Emily Thorson (2015) tells that false information would affect to people's attitude in checking of information. People who got misinformation would reluctant to fact-check and barely to be corrected, even they have been received a truly information. According to this research, the best thing to do by government is block the spreading of information rather than correcting false understanding. What the Government has done was the best option that they can do.

Actor Dynamics in the Threat Securitization Process: Post-Truth Rationalization and Visual Symbolization

In the events of 21-22 May 2019, the Indonesian government as an actor defined the event as a threat to a particular object or referent object. The referent object here is meant by the Election organizers such as the KPU and Bawaslu where there are narratives from candidate number 02 Prabowo Subianto-Sandiaga Uno who seek to delegitimize the two institutions. The government claimed the riot threatened

state security, as seen from Jokowi, Wiranto, and Rudiantara statements which stated that the incident was a serious crime that threatened the sovereignty of the country (CNN Indonesia, 2019). Jokowi, Wiranto, and Rudiantara as part of the government is a Securitizing Actors where they make security efforts against referent objects by conducting a speech act through these statements. Speech act is a form of framing that highlights a threat as an existential problem. The Speech Act is a reaction of existential threats and is a method for gaining legitimacy that what is done is something that needs to be taken, even though it is outside the normal procedure.

Jokowi, Wiranto, and Rudiantara as high official from the government of the Republic of Indonesia has social capital to claim that the incident was a threat that disrupted the unit in the Indonesian political system. With their position, they have the authority to synchronize and coordinate the planning, drafting and implementation of policies in the fields that related to access of communication and information. Therefore, they have the legitimacy to make the event believed as a threat to the public. According to several regulations, there are authorities which Jokowi, Wiranto, and Rudiantara have:

No	High Officer of Indonesia Government	Authority	Regulation
1	President Jokowi	The President have authority to approve and responsible for managing the country's defense system	Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 3 Tahun 2002 tentang Pertahanan Negara
		Minister sets policies regarding the implementation of national defense based on general policies that has been established by President	Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 3 Tahun 2002 tentang Pertahanan Negara
2	Coordinating Minister for Politics and Security Wiranto	Coordination and synchronization of formulation, stipulation, and implementation of ministry/institution policies related to issue in the political, legal, and security	Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 43 Tahun 2015 tentang Kementerian Koordinator Bidang Politik, Hukum, dan Keamanan
		Ministry of Communication and Information is the one of ministry which under Coordinating Ministry for Politics and Security's jurisdiction	Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 43 Tahun 2015 tentang Kementerian Koordinator Bidang Politik, Hukum, dan Keamanan
3	Minister of Communication and Information Rudiantara	Have authority to carry out the management of public communication and information	Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 54 Tahun 2015 tentang Kementerian Komunikasi dan Informatika

Sources: Processed from any sources by authors

In addition, the narrative built by Jokowi, Wiranto, and Rudiantara form a scheme in which special actions are needed outside of the ordinary to cope with these events. In the securitization process, there is a classification of issues to place whether a phenomenon is said to be a security threat or not. Related to the context of this issue, this issue has been included in securitized classification where an issue has been deemed as a real security threat, which of course requires emergency action where the use of procedures above ordinary political procedures is considered legitimate or commonly stated by extraordinary measures (Buzan, Waever, & Wilde, 1998).

This scheme is embodied through a feature restriction policy for sharing photos and videos on social media. However, in its implementation, this policy represents that there is a construction that allows the government to ignore regulations or the applicable legal basis in order to strive for the prevention of something that is considered by the government as a threat. First, this can be seen from the limitation of freedom from the community to obtain information and restrictions on freedom of expression. In the 1945 Constitution Article 28 F states "*Every person has the right to communicate and obtain information to develop his personal and social environment, and has the right to seek, obtain, possess, store, process and deliver information using all types of available channels.*" .

Second, this can be seen from the policy of limiting the sharing of photos and videos on social media without prior notice, where it does not pay attention to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) which has been ratified through Law No. 12 of 2005. Article 4 of the Law No. 12 of 2005 explains that the state has the right to limit human rights when the state is in an emergency. The human rights referred to in accordance with Law No. 12 of 2005 read "Everyone has the right to freedom of expression; this right includes the freedom to seek, receive and provide information and thoughts of any kind, regardless of restrictions in oral, written or in the form of print, artwork or through other media according to his choice. "Article 4 of Law No. 12 of 2005 explains that if the country is in an emergency, then the President through a Presidential Decree must officially announce it and then make a policy to overcome the threat in question. The policies taken must also pay attention to boundaries and measures that do not open up the possibility of abuse by harming wider interests. However, even though the government uses national security reasons, regulation in Indonesia itself has not regulated national security restrictions so that in the context of the events of 21-22 May 2019, the government as a securitizing actor translates that event is a threat to national security.

The important thing in the securitization process is related to the audience's acceptance. Audience acceptance is important, because the audience will legitimize the securitizing actors for what they have done. Getting this approval or acceptance may be another difficulty of securitizing actors. Especially in democratic countries, where people freely have thoughts and perspectives that are freely related to see a phenomenon, so that the audience's acceptance of the speech act becomes essential. In a democratic

country like Indonesia, the securitization method does not use violence. Therefore, there is a need for public acceptance of the events of 21-22 May 2019 that the incident was a threat so that the government gained legitimacy to restrict some features of social media.

Regarding to public acceptance, there were restrictions or criticism from several parties regarding the Indonesian government's social media restriction policy for the period 22 to 25 May 2019. *First*, the criticism arose from two journalist organizations in Indonesia namely the Indonesian Women's Journalists Forum (FJPI) and the Alliance of Independent Journalists (AJI) (Madia, 2019).. FJPI General Chairperson Uni Lubis said that the social media restrictions had hurt the constitution and that law enforcement officials should have exercised their authority to take action against those who spread the hoax news. AJI also provides opinions similar to FJPI. AJI believes that the government should work with social media providers to prevent news hoaxes instead of limiting them. *Second*, the criticism came from NGOs such as the Institute for Criminal Justice Reform (ICJR) for example (Thomas, 2019) (Azanella, 2019). According to ICJR Director Anggara Suwahju, restrictions on social media access should be based on evidence of a crime. The government cannot arbitrarily restrict access to social media because this has an impact on all citizens, including for citizens who do not participate in spreading the news hoax also incur losses due to these restrictions. Restrictions on access should be used as a last resort if various ways to deal with a crime are not successful. In addition, criticism also came from other NGOs, Lembaga Studi dan Advokasi Masyarakat (ELSAM) (Thomas, 2019). According to ELSAM, these restrictions can lead to mass surveillance that has the potential to break through private spaces of citizens. The interception of communication through restrictions on social media access is usually used by investigators through a warrant and regulated by its authority in the Corruption Crime Act, the Corruption Eradication Commission Act, the Terrorism Act, and the Trafficking in Persons Act. *Third*, the criticism comes from those who use social media as a platform to trade (Putri, 2019). Traders complain that their business activities are disrupted because they depend on the smooth access of social media as the main platform for trading. As a result, there is a reduction in turnover and reputation from traders is also a bet. According to Bhima Yudhistira, Economist from Institute for Economics and Finance (Indef), amount to 66 percent online buying and selling transactions occurred at social media such as Instagram, Facebook, and Whatsapp. Total e-commerce transactions value in 2019 was estimated at 8.7 billion US Dollars or 126 trillion Rupiah, divided by 365 days on average by 345 billion per day. Thus, if we calculated that value into 3 days of implementation of social media restriction policy, traders had lost 681 billion Rupiah (Masyrafina, 2020)

The potential of mass surveillance by the government through the policy of social media restrictions, where it is feared that it can degrade the values of democracy, particularly freedom of expression. Article 10 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights protects your right to hold your own opinions and to express them freely without government interference.This includes the right to express your views aloud (for example through public protest and demonstrations) or through published articles, books

or leaflets, television or radio broadcasting and works of art. Public authorities may restrict this right if they can show that their action is lawful, necessary and proportionate in order to protect national security, territorial integrity (the borders of the state) or public safety, prevent disorder or crime, protect health or morals, protect the rights and reputations of other people, prevent the disclosure of information received in confidence, and maintain the authority and impartiality of judges.

The mass media certainly has an important role in this securitization process. This is the best way to reach the widest audience. In this securitization process, there are actors who influence the dynamics of an actor without having to be a referent object or securitizing actor called functional actors. Present mass media become functional actors because they are present as a catalyst for the government to spread warnings that the events of 21-22 May 2019 were a threat to national security. This can be seen from reports from mainstream media that reported that the 21-22 May 2019 event was a serious threat. (Indonesian CNN, 2019) (Gunadha & Aranditio, 2019) (Mursid, 2019) (Judge, 2019) (BBC Indonesia, 2019) (Dewi, 2019) (Anugrahadi, 2019) (Merdeka, 2019). News broadcasts from mainstream media are the most important elements of mass media content regarding the securitization process (Dolinec, 2010), so that news from the mass media can frame a threat to be handled by policies that are outside the procedure.

Preference of public perception becomes more important than reality. There is also hoax news that stimulates riots and spreads over the period of 21-22 May 2019. The Republic of Indonesia Communication and Information Ministry records 30 news hoaxes about the riots that occurred at that time (Puspa Sari, 2019). The news began from the news of hoaxes about the attacks carried out by Brimob against worshipers at the Al Makmur Tanah Abang Mosque in Jakarta, Brimob personnel who were foreign nationals, and demonstrators who were shot by live ammunition by the police. These hoax news are exacerbated by the post-truth phenomenon today where people degrade data and facts about the results of the 2019 Presidential Election so that people are reluctant to verify news spread on social media, verify it as limited to what news is most appropriate only to what they believe so post-truth is interpreted as a vague meaning and irrelevance of the meaning of a phenomenon (McIntyre, 2018).

Stanley Cohen (1973) in his book Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers expresses that there is a wonder in the public eye that he calls sentimental hysterias or moral panics. As per the conditions that exist in the present society, Cohen characterizes moral panics as a reaction to something that can be misrepresented as genuine (even to anecdotal) marvels, when contrasted with two things: first, increasingly real, dependable sources and unbiasedly about the wonder itself and besides, contrasted with the earnestness of different issues that are progressively genuine and vital, so they cloud the genuine size of needs towards existing issues and shape the network with the absence of arrangement thinking and the steady debasement of virtues. With respect to wonder as sentimental hysteria does not imply that the marvel does not happen at all or prove to be fruitful from dream, delirium, daydream or doctrination from the proprietor of intensity alone, yet from how the network reaction itself misrepresents

the marvel so it creates a reaction that, on the off chance that it is viewed as nearer, inordinate and lacking or even not relevant, it devours vitality for an issue whose degree of criticalness is quite higher than different issues that require more consideration and genuine activity.

There are three keys to the success of a moral panic derived from three essential dimensions in a moral panic: *first*, exaggeration and distortion. Excessive things are responded to by securitization actors such as the media, political figures and community groups have the opportunity to produce a variety of interpretations in society, both intentionally exaggerated over various factors such as identity and interests or unintentional, conscious or unconscious, which can produce reality distortions leading to a distortion of concepts, leading to a public response with various different misconceptions. Identity factors are one of the main components in an attempt to overestimate and distort reality in the 2019 election contestation, through hoaxes of police members who are assumed to be descendants of one race.

Second, prediction. A party with an arrogance of identity and certain interests can direct the agenda of what needs to be in the community to strengthen identity and realize its interests in the future, which ultimately can become rooted in an element in social construction or even become a social construction itself. Delegitimizing election management institutions has the potential to give rise to distrust of the democratic system and the government itself, with the aim of directing public opinion even though it is based on unrealistic and far-reaching news.

Third, symbolization. The attachment of symbolic elements in the visual means accelerates the process of interpretation of discourse, which also triggers a response faster than the reader, although in reality all social media users can easily disseminate symbols in visual contents and distort the narrative to adjust the visual content with their own perceptions. The strong visual influence is also caused by the tendency of justification of visual content which is considered to be empirical evidence, especially in this case the limitation of photos and videos on social media conducted by the government within 3 days starting from May 22, 2019 to May 25, 2019.

CONCLUSION

The emergence of practices of securitization carried out by the Government of Indonesia on the events of the 21-22 May 2019 cannot be separated from the development of the security concept which shifted initially to militaristic and then shifted to a broader sector such as the political sector. In this context, the Indonesian government protects referent objects in the political sector, namely the Election organizing institutions such as the KPU and Bawaslu from delegitimation efforts from dissatisfied parties to the results of the 2019 Election. The delegitimation efforts are carried out through hoax reporting on 2019 elections through social media so as to create a sense of public distrust of the organizers of the 2019 Presidential Election. In addition, there is a post-truth phenomenon in which people degrade data and facts without verifying the information they obtain as a stimulant for the public not to trust the election organizers.

Therefore, the government as a securitizing actor conducted securitization through a policy of limiting the sharing of photos and videos in social media.

President Jokowi, Coordinating Minister for Political Legal and Security Affairs Wiranto, and Minister of Communication and Information Rudiantara as part of the Indonesian government conducted a speech act that made the 21-22 May 2019 action an event that threatened national security. Mainstream media as functional actors also enliven the dynamics of the securitization process carried out by the government through reports on the event so that the community agrees that the events of the 21-22 May 2019 are a threat to national security and the government should make policy restrictions on sharing photos and videos in social media to protect security.

However, in enforcing policy, the government got some difficulties from the securitization process it did. This can be seen when there was criticism from the policy such as alleged human rights violations in the context of sharing and obtaining information, the potential for mass surveillance, and material losses from digital economic actors. The public in the context of securitization is considered as one of the important elements in the securitization process, so the government needs to get a public acceptance in the hope that the securitization process carried out by the government can be done more easily. The government needs to evaluate its speech act method, especially regarding the dissemination of information regarding the background of implementing the policy to the grassroots level. The government needs to coordinate with the regional government to the district / city level even to the sub-district level. In addition, the government also needs to make regulations which can be used as references to identify a phenomenon that can threaten national security or not.

Based on Indonesia's experience in securitizing the threat of conflict through social media restrictions, the government needs to include political literacy and media literacy, provide public education and transitive statements that explain the consideration of each policy for all parties and address securitization of a threat as a joint effort between the government and all actors who can be involved, such as civil society organizations, non-profit organizations, individuals, and so on.

REFERENCES
Alison, F. (2016, November 15). 'Post-Truth' Named Word of The Year by Oxford Dictionaries. Retrieved July 7, 2019, from Theguardian.com: https://www.theguardian.com/books/2016/nov/15/post-truth-named-word-of-the-year-by-oxford-dictionaries

Andriani, R. S. (2019, May 22). Ringkasan Perdagangan: IHSG & Rupiah Terseret Aksi 22 Mei, Asing Justru Borong Saham. Retrieved July 3, 2019, from Bisnis.com: https://market.bisnis.com/read/20190522/7/926118/ringkasan-perdagangan-ihsg-rupiah-terseret-aksi-22-mei-asing-justru-borong-saham

Annur, C. M. (2019, April 25). Kementerian Kominfo Identifikasi 9 dari 17 Hoaks Soal Pemilu 2019. Retrieved June 30, 2019, from Katadata.co.id: https://katadata.co.id/berita/2019/04/25/kementerian-kominfo-identifikasi-9-dari-17-hoaks-soal-pemilu-2019

Anugrahadi, A. (2019, May 21). Wiranto Jawab Tudingan Pemerintahan Kembali ke Zaman Orba dan Diktaktor. Retrieved July 7, 2019, from liputan6.com:

https://www.liputan6.com/news/read/3972085/wiranto-jawab-tudingan-pemerintahan-kembali-ke-zaman-orba-dan-diktaktor

Ariefana, P., & Aranditio, S. (2019, May 21). Pendemo Mulai Berdatangan ke KPU, Tapi Tolak People Power 22 Mei. Retrieved June 30, 2019, from Suara.com: https://www.suara.com/news/2019/05/21/111005/pendemo-mulai-berdatangan-ke-kpu-tapi-tolak-people-power-22-mei

Azanella, L. A. (2019, May 24). ICJR Nilai Pembatasan Akses Sosmed Tak Tepat, Ini Alasannya. Retrieved July 23, 2019, from Kompas.com: https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2019/05/24/15231221/icjr-nilai-pembatasan-akses-medsos-tak-tepat-ini-alasannya

Balzacq, T. (2005). The Three of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience, and Context. European Journal of International Relations, 171-201.

Barry Buzan., O. W. (1998). Security: A New Framework of Analysis. London: Lynne Rienner Publisher.

BBC. (2019, May 22). Demo 22 Mei, Korban Meninggal, Dalang Kerusuhan dan 'Ada Settingan Menciptakan Martir". Retrieved from BBC.com: https://www.bbc.com/indonesia/indonesia-48345791

BBC Indonesia. (2019, May 22). Demo 22 Mei: Korban meninggal, Dalang Kerusuhan dan 'Ada Settingan Menciptakan Martir'. Retrieved July 7, 2019, from BBC.com: https://www.bbc.com/indonesia/indonesia-48345791

Buzan, B., Waever, O., & Wilde, J. d. (1998). Security A New Framework of Analysis. Colorado: Lynne Rienner, Inc.

Buzan, B., Waever, O., Wilde, & de, J. (1998). Security: A New Framework of Analysis. London: Lynne Rienner Publisher.

CNN Indonesia. (2019, May 23). AJI Desak Pemerintah Cabut Pembatasan Akses Media Sosial. Retrieved July 6, 2019, from CNNIndonesia.com: https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20190523122208-20-397762/aji-desak-pemerintah-cabut-pembatasan-akses-media-sosial

CNN Indonesia. (2019, May 22). Wiranto soal Aksi 22 Mei: Itu Kejahatan Serius. Retrieved June 30, 2019, from CNN Indonesia: https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20190521142949-12-396888/wiranto-soal-aksi-22-mei-itu-kejahatan-serius

Cohen, S. (1973). Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of The Mods and Rockers. London: Paladin.

Coughlan, S. (2017, January 2017). What Does Post-Truth Mean for Philosopher? Retrieved from BBC.com: https://www.bbc.com/news/education-38557838

Cresswell, J. W. (2012). Research Design Pendekatan Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, dan Mixed. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Dewi, S. (2019, 21 May). Wiranto Sebut Ada Rencana untuk Kepung dan Duduki KPU Hingga Istana. Retrieved July 7, 2019, from idntimes.com: https://www.idntimes.com/news/indonesia/santi-dewi/wiranto-sebut-ada-rencana-menduduki-kpu-istana-merdeka/full

Dolinec, V. (2010). The Role of Mass Media in the Securitization Process of International Terrorism. Politicke Vedy, 8-32.

Floyd, R. (2010). Security And The Environment: Securitization Theory and The U.S Environment Security Policy. London: Cambridge University Press.

Frantzich, S. E. (2008). Citizen Democracy: Political Activism in a Cynical Age. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Gunadha, R., & Aranditio, S. (2019, May 21). Wiranto: Aksi Tolak Hasil Pemilu adalah Kejahatan Serius, Dihukum Berat. Retrieved July 7, 2019, from Suara.com: https://www.suara.com/news/2019/05/21/164140/wiranto-aksi-tolak-hasil-pemilu-adalah-kejahatan-serius-dihukum-berat

Hakim, R. N. (2019, May 21). Wiranto: Ada Rencana Menduduki KPU, Bawaslu, DPR, Istana. Retrieved July 7, 2019, from Kompas.com: https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2019/05/21/16090161/wiranto-ada-rencana-menduduki-kpu-bawaslu-dpr-istana

Howard, P. N., Agarwal, S. D., & Hussain, M. M. (2011). When Do States Disconnect Their Digital Networks? . The Communication Review, 216-232.

Madia, F. (2019, May 24). FJPI dan AJI Desak Pemerintah Cabut Pembatasan Media Sosial. Retrieved July 23, 2019, from IDNTimes.com: https://jatim.idntimes.com/news/indonesia/fitria-madia/fjpi-dan-aji-desak-pemerintah-cabut-pembatasan-media-sosial/full

Masyrafina, I. (2020, May 24). Pemblokiran Medsos Rugikan Jual-Beli Online Rp 681 Miliar. Retrieved from Republika.co.id: https://republika.co.id/berita/ekonomi/korporasi/prongo370/pemblokiran-medsos-rugikan-jualbeli-online-rp-681-miliar

McIntyre, L. (2018). Post-Truth. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Merdeka. (2019, May 21). Wiranto Sebut Rencana Demo Besar-besaran Kepung & Duduki KPU Tindakan Keliru. Retrieved July 7, 2019, from Merdeka.com: https://www.merdeka.com/peristiwa/wiranto-sebut-rencana-demo-besar-besaran-kepung-duduki-kpu-tindakan-keliru.html

Mursid, F. (2019, May 21). Wiranto Minta Masyarakat Batalkan Aksi 22 Mei. Retrieved July 7, 2019, from Republika.co.id: https://nasional.republika.co.id/berita/nasional/politik/pruooy335/wiranto-minta-masyarakat-batalkan-aksi-22-mei

Mutana, N. (2016). Social Media and Political Mobilisation: An Analysis of the July 2016 Zimbabwe Shut Down. American Journal of Trade and Policy, 73-78.

Panca Rini, R. A. (2019, May 24). 8 Negara Keluarkan Travel Advice ke Indonesia akibat Aksi 22 Mei yang Berujung Rusuh. Retrieved July 3, 2019, from Tribunnews.com: https://wow.tribunnews.com/2019/05/24/8-negara-keluarkan-travel-advice-ke-indonesia-akibat-aksi-22-mei-yang-berujung-rusuh

Puspa Sari, H. (2019, May 25). Kominfo Sebut Ada 30 Berita Hoaks Selama Kerusuhan 22 Mei. Retrieved June 30, 2019, from Kompas.com: https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2019/05/25/18132981/kominfo-sebut-ada-30-berita-hoaks-selama-kerusuhan-22-mei

Putri, A. W. (2019, May 27). Online Shop: Pembatasan Internet Bikin Kami Rugi. Retrieved July 23, 2019, from Tirto.id: https://tirto.id/online-shop-pembatasan-internet-bikin-kami-rugi-d1JP

Redaksi CNBC Indonesia, C. I. (2019, May 22). Whatsapp-Medsos Dibatasi Pemerintah Sampai 25 Mei 2019. Retrieved July 6, 2019, from CNBCIndonesia.com: https://www.cnbcindonesia.com/fintech/20190522144725-37-74298/whatsapp-medsos-dibatasi-pemerintah-sampai-25-mei-2019

Safitri, E. (2019, May 22). Pemerintah Nonaktifkan Sementara Medsos, Download-Upload Video Lambat. Retrieved from Detik.com: https://news.detik.com/berita/d-4560433/pemerintah-nonaktifkan-sementara-medsos-download-upload-video-lambat

Santoso, B. (2019, May 23). Rusuh Aksi 22 Mei: Ketegasan Jokowi Hingga Pembatasan Akses Media Sosial. Retrieved from Suara.com: https://www.suara.com/news/2019/05/23/075417/rusuh-aksi-22-mei-ketegasan-jokowi-hingga-pembatasan-akses-media-sosial

Thomas, V. F. (2019, June 15). ICJR: Pembatasan Internet dan Medsos Perlu Bukti Kejahatan Spesifik. Retrieved July 23, 2019, from Tirto.id: https://tirto.id/icjr-pembatasan-internet-dan-medsos-perlu-bukti-kejahatan-spesifik-ecsh

Thorson, E. (2015). Belief Echoes: The Persistent Effects of Corrected Misinformation. Political Communication, 460-480.

Watson, S. D. (2009). The Securitization of Humanitarian Migration: Digging Moats and Sinking Boats. Routledge Advances in International Relations and Global Politics 74.

Yuliawati, & Ramadhan, F. (2019, May 13). Gerakan People Power, Siasat Terakhir Prabowo Jelang 22 Mei. Retrieved July 3, 2019, from Katadata.co.id: https://katadata.co.id/berita/2019/05/13/gerakan-people-power-siasat-terakhir-prabowo-jelang-22-mei