Representation of Indonesia's Judiciary of Ahok's Blasphemy Verdict in *The New York Times* Article "'Rot at the Core': Blasphemy Verdict in Indonesia Dismays Legal Experts"

Hasna Nurhaliza[1], Trisnowati Tanto[2]
Maranatha Christian University, INDONESIA
e-mail**:** nurhalizahasna@gmail.com[1], trisnowatitanto@gmail.com[2]

ABSTRACT

This paper comprises the analysis of the representation of Indonesia's judiciary through Ahok's blasphemy verdict in *The New York Times* article entitled "'Rot at the Core': Blasphemy Verdict in Indonesia Dismays Legal Experts". The research belongs to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), which van Dijk (2015) describes as a study of how social-power abuse and inequality are conveyed, reproduced, legitimated, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context (p. 466). The analysis will focus on the micro-level analysis which covers three aspects of analysis, namely macrostructures, microstructures, and superstructures. This paper uses a qualitative descriptive method, which requires the analyst to observe and describe the data in order to show the representation. Throughout the analysis, it is shown that Indonesia's judiciary is represented negatively in the news article.

Keywords: Representation, Indonesia's judiciary, critical discourse analysis, micro-level analysis.

INTRODUCTION

In 2017 there was a case of a politician in Indonesia which attracted lots of attention not only from the country but also the world; it was the blasphemy case of Basuki Tjahaja Purnama, also well-known as Ahok, the former governor of Jakarta. He was convicted guilty of blasphemy regarding the speech he made back in October 2016, during his political campaign for Jakarta's 2017 governor election. He made a comment related to a chapter in Koran, Al-Ma'idah: verse 51, regarding the right of Muslims to vote for a non-Muslim to be a leader.

During his period as the governor, Mr. Basuki made a lot of improvements in Jakarta. Despite his famous personality of being fearless and assertive in ruling the capital city, his being Chinese and Christian aroused protests mainly from hard-line Islamic groups, who opposed the former Chinese Christian governor to lead Jakarta, a city dominantly populated by Muslim citizens.

When he ran for Jakarta's governor in the 2017 election, many Muslim hard-liners went against him. The edited video of Mr. Basuki's campaign speech was posted on Facebook by one of the hard-line Islamic members, which further provoked protests from mass rallies. Shortly after the edited video was published, Mr. Basuki was reported for insulting Islam. Until his case was brought to court with the final decision of sentencing him to two-year imprisonment, the blasphemy verdict from the judges has renewed criticism over the country and even the world concerning how justified the verdict itself was. This makes the controversial case an interesting subject of discussion.

In this paper the data source is taken from a news report about Ahok's blasphemy case from a foreign media, *The New York Times.* The news article was published on May 11, 2017 and entitled "'Rot at the Core': Blasphemy Verdict in Indonesia Dismays Legal Expert". Even though the news articles from local newspapers discussing Ahok's case are in abundance, the foreign one can be considered to be more neutral in giving the information. It is feared that the newspapers from local media have taken side to a particular group so that the rightness of information is likely to be doubted.

The New York Times itself is an American newspaper. It is "a global media organization dedicated to helping people understand the world through unrivaled, on-the-ground, expert and deeply reported independent journalism … to inform people who want to understand the world by directing attention to what matters — without fear or favor" (*Nytco.com*, 2018).

By doing this kind of research, it is believed that people can be more critical in taking information from the media. They would be able to distinguish whether a media tends to have a particular ideology. Thus, they are expected to be wiser and more critical in responding to the information from the media so that they will not be easily stirred.

The main problem to discuss in this paper concerns the representation of Indonesia's judiciary of Ahok's blasphemy verdict in the text. According to Hall (1997), "Representation means using language to say something meaningful about, or to represent, the world meaningfully, to other people" (p. 15). In giving representation, a person can use language to convey his/her ideology towards something, whether it is a positive or negative representation.

In analysing the use of language to give representation academically and thoroughly, I would like to use Teun A. van Dijk (2004)'s theory of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). He explains CDA as a "discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social-power abuse and inequality are enacted, reproduced, legitimated, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context" (van Dijk, 2015, p. 466).

There are three approaches that can be used in CDA: macro-level analysis, micro-level analysis, and meso-level analysis. It is stated that "Power, dominance, and inequality between social groups are typically terms that belong to a macro-level of analysis" (van Dijk, 2015, p. 468). Another approach is micro-level analysis that deals with the "language use, discourse, verbal interaction, and communication" (van Dijk, 2015, p. 468). The last is meso-level analysis which functions to fill the gap between macro- and micro-levels to form one unified whole (van Dijk, 2015, p. 468).

However, this paper will only focus on using the micro-level analysis, which aims to investigate how the writers give a representation to a particular person or thing to show their support or opposition to the issue under discussion. There are three aspects in the micro-level analysis which can be used to analyse a discourse: macrostructure, microstructure, and superstructure.

In macrostructures, the main topic of a discourse is drawn. According to van Dijk (1988), "topics belong to the global, macrolevel of discourse description" (p. 31). Here, it explains what the text is talking about or introduces the main idea of the discourse. Since the genre of the text is a news article, generally the topic will be drawn in the headline and the lead (van Dijk, 1993, p. 113).

In microstructures, an analyst will "distinguish between meaning and its expression in surface structures, such as words, phrases, clause, and sentence forms" (van Dijk, 1988, p. 59). There are three linguistic elements which can be used to analyse a text: syntax, semantics, and stylistics. Yet, the paper would only focus on stylistics.

Stylistics deals with the choice of words that a speaker/a writer uses in a discourse to express his/her idea on the issue. "The choice of specific words may signal the degree of formality, the relationship between the speech partners, the group-based or institutional embedding of discourse, and especially the attitudes and hence ideologies of the speaker" (van Dijk, 1988, p. 81). One of the tools that can be used in stylistics is lexical style. For example, the use of the words "freedom fighters" versus "terrorists" signal two different meaning (van Dijk, 1993, p. 106). "Freedom fighters" gives positive connotation whereas "terrorists" indicates the opposite.

Superstructure analysis deals with the schema or global form of a discourse. According to van Dijk (1986), a news report is constructed by some categories, such as summary, main events, background, consequences, and comments.

van Dijk (1986) says that news reports are generally characterized by a summary that is expressed in two steps, in the headline and the lead (p. 162). A headline is characterized by large bold letter type and printed on top of the news report. In addition, van Dijk (1993) states, "The headline expresses the intended highest macroproposition, and therefore signals what is the most relevant or important information of the news report" (p. 161). Aside from that, the lead also represents the global topic of a news report. It is marked by the first sentence or paragraph of a news report which also functions as an introduction of the text (van Dijk, 1986, p. 162). The lead presents fuller information about the main topic and commonly repeats the same idea as in the headline.

The next category is main events that become the body of a news report. "It organizes all information about the recent events that construct the news report itself" (van Dijk, 1986, p. 162).

The background category consists of information that makes the news events easily become understandable for the readers. It also allows the readers to –update their understanding or perception of the world. In addition, "background may be supplied by news agencies, by reporters or correspondents who simply know such background from experience, by other media, or by documentation of various kinds" (van Dijk, 1986, p. 164).

There are two kinds of backgrounds that should be differentiated, present and past background. The present background, also called Context, "contains all the information about the actual situation in which the main news event takes place" (van Dijk, 1986, p.165). The past background or History illustrates the information that happened in the previous months or even years; it leads to the actual situation and its events (van Dijk, 1986, p.165).

Furthermore, van Dijk (1986) states, "The relevance and the importance of events are often measured by their consequences" (p. 165). There is one subcategory of Consequences, namely Verbal Reactions. "This category contains information about the routinely gathered and quoted declarations of immediate participants and in particular of leading national and international politicians who have opinions or comments on the news events" (p. 166).

Van Dijk (1988) says that the comment category "features the comments, opinions, and evaluations of the journalist or newspaper itself" (p. 56). It consists of two subcategories: Evaluation and Expectation. Evaluation consists of evaluative opinions of the actual news events whereas Expectations may predict future events and speculate about what might happen next (p. 56).

In 2013, a similar study done by Sajjad reveals how the news writers reflect their ideologies about Imran Khan's Peace March towards Wazaristan in the newspaper headlines. He uses van Dijk's CDA as the approach to his study but he focuses on analysing the news headlines from twenty local papers and foreign media. Thus, he only uses the macrostructure analysis to find the representation of Imam Khan, while this paper focuses only on one news article but covers a wider scope of analysis, which consists of macrostructure, microstructure, and superstructure analyses to find out the representation of Indonesia's judiciary.

Another similar study by Amer (2015) discusses the representation of social actors in reports on the Gaza war of 2008 – 09 in four international newspapers: *The Guardian*, *The Times London*, *The New York Times*, and *The Washington Post*. The study draws on three analytical frameworks from the area of CDA model: Halliday's transitivity model (1985/1994), van Leeuwen's sociosemantic inventory (1996), and Richardson's classification of quotation patterns (2007). The data are in the form of 146 headlines of the relevant news stories and a non-random sample of 40 news stories and 7 editorials. To give statistical estimations for the qualitative analysis, the study examines the frequency distributions of linguistic and representational processes.

Overall, the findings of this study suggest that news reports on the Gaza war of 2008 – 09 are influenced by political orientations of the newspapers, editorial policies, and journalistic practices. The most represented actors are Israeli governmental officials, whereas Palestinians actors are Hamas members. This representation draws an overall image that the war is being directed against Hamas.

METHOD

In order to find the representation of Indonesia's judiciary in the newspaper, a qualitative descriptive method is used. The data are gathered by searching the Internet and reading references, and hence, the research is classified into a library research.

In the paper, there are three aspects to be analysed in finding the representation of Indonesia's judiciary through macrostructures, microstructures, and superstructures.

In macrostructures, as the genre of the discourse is already identified to be a news report, the analysis starts with finding the global topic in the news headline and lead. Some of the words in those two categories will be analysed to show the representation.

Moving on to the microstructures, the analysis will focus more on the lexicon. There will be some selected words to be analysed which can lead to the representation. The analysis begins with defining the meaning of the word based on the dictionary. Next is connecting the dictionary meaning with the contextual meaning to show the representation.

The last is the superstructure analysis, where the news article will be divided into some categories, which includes main events, background, consequences, and comments. Following this, the most frequent category that occurs in the news article can be found. The selected category will be analysed further to show the representation of Indonesia's judiciary system.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The first major finding concerns the negative representation of Indonesia's judiciary in the macrostructure, which can be seen in the headline and lead of the article. In the headline "'Rot at the Core': Blasphemy Verdict in Indonesia Dismays Legal Experts", the writer tries to convey the main idea of the article which is about the ruling or judgement of blasphemy case in Indonesia. It is interesting to notice that the writer's choice of words or lexicon is outstanding. The writer starts the headline by citing a phrase 'Rot at the Core' which originates from the idiom "*be*

rotten to the core." According to Cambridge dictionary online (n.d.), the idiom means "if a person or organization is rotten to the core, they behave in a way that is not honest or moral." It is also defined as "morally wrong and evil" (Cambridge dictionary online, n.d.).

After reading the first phrase, the reader may wonder who or what is the thing that is rot at the core. Therefore, after citing the phrase "Rot at the Core", the writer uses a colon (:) which functions to explain or illustrate the first phrase by adding more information in the second phrase, which is "... Blasphemy Verdict in Indonesia Dismays Legal Experts." Hence, the writer tries to convey that the thing which is rotten at the core is the ruling in Indonesia, specifically about the blasphemy law. If it is connected with the meaning of the idiom *be rotten to the core*, it means that Indonesia's judiciary or the Supreme Court, as the one that gives judgement of a case in the court of law, does not act in an honest and moral way. Thus, if the judges do not act honestly, then the rightness of the verdict that they have made is questioned.

Furthermore, the use of the word *dismays* confirms the negative representation of Indonesia's judiciary. The writer uses this word in the headline "... Blasphemy Verdict in Indonesia Dismays Legal Experts." Cambridge dictionary online (n.d.) illustrates *dismay* as "to make someone feel unhappy and disappointed." When related to the headline, it can be said that the blasphemy verdict from the judges makes the legal experts unhappy and disappointed because the judges themselves do not act in an honest and moral way in giving the judgement.

The next phrase *legal experts* emphasizes how Indonesia's judiciary is represented negatively. A legal expert is synonymous with a *jurist*, which means "One who has thorough knowledge and experience of law, especially an eminent judge, lawyer, or legal scholar" (The free dictionary online, n.d.). The writer puts the phrase *legal experts* in the headline because it plays an important role as the acknowledged and skillful participants in the law field. Legal experts can give their opinions regarding the blasphemy case based on their thorough knowledge and experience of law; thus, their opinions can be considered important. If the verdict itself can dismay the jurists who are experts in the law field, then the rightness of the verdict is likely to be doubted even more.

The next thing to be analysed in the macrostructure is the lead, which is the first paragraph of the article, "JAKARTA, Indonesia — As the jailed Christian governor of Jakarta prepared on Thursday to appeal

his two-year prison sentence for blasphemy, his conviction has renewed criticism of Indonesia's notoriously capricious judiciary and set off a nationwide debate on the rights of minorities in the world's most populous Muslim-majority nation."

The lead also shows a negative representation of Indonesia's judiciary. Here, it is clear that the writer specifically refers to the governor with the phrase "Christian governor of Jakarta." This emphasizes the fact that the religion of the governor plays an important role in the case. In addition, the writer also states that the governor's conviction "set off a nationwide debate on the rights of minorities in the world's most populous Muslim-majority nation." From this further explanation, it can be said that the reason for the writer using "Christian governor of Jakarta," rather than mentioning the real name, is to highlight the governor's status as a Christian, a minority in Indonesia, the world's most populous Muslim-majority nation. Thus, the writer wants to emphasize how the status of a citizen in Indonesia, whether he/she is in a minority or majority group, can affect the application of the law in the country. The writer also implies that the governor does not get an equal treatment in the judicial court only because he is a minority, which causes a nationwide debate on the rights of minorities in Indonesia.

Moreover, it is said that the governor is sentenced to two-year imprisonment as the verdict of the blasphemy. When it is connected with the headline, the verdict that dismays the legal experts is the two-year imprisonment of the Christian governor, which the jurists think is a disappointing decision.

The governor's conviction is further described to have resulted in a negative way, which again leads to the negative representation of Indonesia's judiciary. The writer says "… his conviction has renewed criticism of Indonesia's notoriously capricious judiciary and set off a nationwide debate on the rights of minorities in the world's most populous Muslim-majority nation."

The writer's use of words in the sentence above is worth noticing more as it makes Indonesia's judiciary appear negative. The words *notoriously* and *capricious* are used to describe Indonesia's judiciary. According to Cambridge dictionary online (n.d.), *notoriously* means "in a way that is famous for something bad," and based on Vocabulary.com dictionary online (n.d.) *capricious* is "determined by chance or impulse or whim rather than necessity or reason". Thus, the writer implies that Indonesia's judiciary is famous for something bad, which is the uncertainty of the judges in making decision and

being likely to change their mind based on the chance that they have, their impulse, or their whim, rather than using the necessity or their reasoning, especially regarding a case in the court which needs logical thinking, reasons, and facts, rather than feelings or desires.

The negative representation of Indonesia's judiciary can also be seen in the superstructure. In this part, the article is divided into some categories of a news schemata, such as main events, background, consequences, and comments. There are some paragraphs which can be categorized into more than one category of the news schema. There are thirty-one paragraphs in total; nineteen paragraphs belong to consequences (verbal reactions), ten paragraphs background (context/history), five paragraphs main events, and one paragraph of comments. The highest occurence is consequences (verbal reactions) with 61% of occurence, followed by background category with 32%, main events 16%, and the lowest is comments with 3% of occurence.

The highest occurrence of the category is verbal reactions, where the writer puts some opinions or direct statements from other people, as van Dijk (1986) states, "This category contains information about the routinely gathered and quoted declarations of immediate participants and in particular of leading national and international politicians who have opinions or comments on the news events" (p. 166). Moreover, a writer usually uses this category to make the news seem objective. The writer does not have to put his own opinion, but he can use others' to show his perception of the news (p. 166).

From the total of nineteen paragraphs of verbal reactions, there are five paragraphs containing statements from three sources which will not be analysed. Two of them are part of Indonesia's judiciary, namely the judges and Ridwan Mansyur, a Supreme Court spokesman. The other source is Fifi Lety Indra, Mr. Basuki's sister who is also his lawyer. These three sources are considered to be not neutral; therefore, their statements cannot be considered objective and will not be analysed further. In addition, there is one statement from some officials which would not be analysed either because the statement is not related to Indonesia's judiciary. Thus, only fourteen paragraphs of verbal reactions containing statements from six experts who are considered neutral and reliable sources will be analysed further. However, the writer's choices of the quoted statements can also be seen as a strategy to reflect his own opinion regarding the blasphemy case.

The six sources are Bivitri Susanti, the head of Jakarta chapter of Indonesia's Association of Constitutional Law Lecturers; Sidney Jones, the director of the Institute for Policy Analysis of Conflict; Melissa Crouch, a senior law lecturer at the University of New South Wales in Sydney, Australia; Tim Lindsey, the director of the Center for Indonesian Law, Islam and Society at the University of Melbourne; legal experts; and analysts. The statements from the experts mainly discuss the negative points of Indonesia's judiciary which are seen from three aspects: unfair judgement, the effect of unfair judgement on minorities, and the motive of blasphemy verdict. Content wise, all the three aspects clearly reveal the negative side of Indonesia's judiciary.

Moreover, from the analysis of the verbal reactions, it is revealed that all of the fourteen statements from the six experts show a negative representation of Indonesia's judiciary. Based on the 100% of verbal reactions showing a negative representation, it can be concluded that Indonesia's judiciary of Ahok's blasphemy verdict is represented negatively in the superstructure analysis.

The first negative aspect discussed is the unfair judgement from the judges which relies more heavily on public reaction, such as street protests, public anger from hard-line Islamic groups, and the testimonies of "expert witnesses" on Islam and blasphemy. There are six paragraphs containing statements from the reliable sources that illustrate this idea. For instance, in paragraph (2) legal experts say "the verdict seemed to be based more on public reaction to the governor's comments than what he had actually said". In paragraph (3), Bivitri Susanti, the head of the Jakarta chapter of Indonesia's Association of Constitutional Law Lecturers, also conveys the same idea. Moreover, analysts also signal that the verdict is likely to change due to public reaction, which is stated in paragraph (20). Analysts explain that the judges' unfair judgement may be influenced by the possible division of the country as the effect of Mr. Basuki's campaign for governor and his simultaneous court hearings. All these lead to strained friendships, screaming around dinner tables and personal insults on social media as "another potentially disturbing result of the case."

In line with the previous statements, in paragraph (10), Ms. Susanti states that the street protests have influenced the judges' ruling, which can be seen from their choice of article about condemning religion in the verdict, which is the same as the accusation from the mass protests towards Mr. Basuki. In addition, the statement from some legal experts in paragraph (9)

explains that the street protests dominantly come from the anger of hard-line Islamic groups, who oppose the Christian governor leading the capital city. Furthermore, the judges' ruling also relies on the testimonies from expert witnesses of Islam and blasphemy, none of whom were present and witnessed the governor's speech in September.

By contrast, the explanation about the judges who are less concerned on the evidence is clearly seen in paragraph (13), where Melissa Crouch, a senior law lecturer at the University of New South Wales in Sydney, Australia, states "the judges didn't think Ahok apologized enough," which becomes their consideration in giving the verdict. In fact, Mr. Basuki has apologized publicly regarding his behaviour that may offend others. Thus, the judges do not consider Mr. Basuki's action of apologizing to be something meaningful that may affect the verdict.

The second negative aspect describes the bad effect of the judges' unfair decision on minorities in the country. It would polarize the country, signaling that non-Muslims or minorities are lesser citizens, which is intimidating for the minorities. There are three paragraphs concerning this idea. In paragraph (7), Sidney Jones, director of the Institute for Policy Analysis of Conflict, says that the judges' decision "underscrored the rot at the core of the Indonesian legal system" and would further polarize the diversely-populated country. .

She further explains in paragraph (8) that even though this is not the first time Indonesian judges have shown less concern to the evidence in a high-profile case, this case may be the most damaging one, since it has attracted a lot of attention throughout the nation and even the world. Afterwards, she gives another supporting statement by saying the judges' decision on the blasphemy case has instantly implied that non-Muslims or minorities are lesser citizens in the country.

Last, in paragraph (22) the director of the Center for Indonesian Law, Islam and Society at the University of Melbourne conveys the same idea as Ms. Jones by saying that the verdict is really intimidating for minority groups. It can be seen from the blasphemy case where the judges' decision relies heavily on public reaction, which dominantly comes from Muslims. Meanwhile, the evidence from the Christian governor has not been considered with as much severity. Hence, the verdict frightens the minority groups regarding unequal treatment from the judges.

The last aspect, which discusses how the primary motive for the blasphemy verdict from the judges is politics, confirms that Indonesia's judiciary is represented negatively. There are some parties who want to take down the governor by arranging street protests in which the judges' ruling relies heavily on it. There are six paragraphs unveiling this aspect. It begins with the statement in paragraph (5) from many analysts who think that politics is the motive of the street protests; they say that the protests have been arranged by Mr. Basuki's political rivals in order to defeat him in the governor election.

Another one coming from experts is stated in paragraph (11), saying that experts "expressed concern about the motive for the seemingly vindictive two-year prison sentence". In paragraph (24), analysts deliberately say that the blasphemy case is mainly about politics. Furthermore, in paragraph (23), Tim Lindsey adds that religion is always connected with politics. He gives further explanation in paragraph (22) by saying that the blasphemy case automatically tells Muslim politicians to try using religion as a way to win or defeat opponents in elections.

Finally, in paragraph (25), a supporting statement comes from some analysts who say that "the blasphemy case and the protests were orchestrated by Mr. Joko's political opponents with the goal of snatching the powerful Jakarta governor's post and weakening the president", which also signals politics as the primary motive of this case.

In this paper, the microstructure will focus on the use of lexicon in the article. In lexicon, the choice of words that a writer uses in the article can reflect his/her ideology towards an event (van Dijk, 1988, p. 81). There are three paragraphs in the article which contain three specific words that the writer uses relating to Indonesia's judiciary. They are *damaging*, *vindictive*, and *intimidating*. All the three words reflect the negative representation of Indonesia's judiciary.

In paragraph (8), Sidney Jones says that the judges' showing no concern for evidence in a high-profile case can be one of the most damaging things. According to Hornby (2015), *damaging*, which originates from the word *damage (verb)*, means "to have a bad effect on sb/sth's life, health, happiness or chances of success" (p. 384). If it is connected with the context of the sentence, it means the judges's lack of concern for the evidence has a bad effect on Mr. Basuki's life, health, happiness or chances of success. It can be seen from the blasphemy case, the unconcerned behavior of the judges finally lead to Mr. Basuki's two-year prison sentence. In other words, the two-year imprisonment may negatively affect Mr. Basuki's life, health, happiness or chance of success.

Thus, what the judges have done shows a negative representation of Indonesia's judiciary.

In paragraph (11), it is explained that the experts express concern about the motive for the seemingly vindictive two-year prison sentence because the prosecutors have asked for two years' probation on a lesser charge, which would have spared Mr. Basuki's prison time. According to Hornby (2015), *vindictive (adj.)* means "trying to harm or upset sb, or showing that you want to, because you think that they have harmed you" (p. 1740). If it is connected with the context of the sentence, it can be said that the judges are trying to harm or upset Mr. Basuki because they think he has harmed them. In other words, it indicates the same meaning as revenge. This means that the judges do not give objective judgement because they involve their feelings, showing that they want to punish Mr. Basuki by giving a tougher conviction of two-year prison time than what the prosecutor has asked. Therefore, the vindictive judgement from the judges reflects the negativity of Indonesia's judiciary.

In paragraph (22), the writer quotes a statement from Tim Lindsey, director of the Center for Indonesian Law, Islam and Society at the University of Melbourne, saying "this verdict is really intimidating for minority groups." According to Hornby (2015), *intimidating (adj.)* means "frightening in a way which makes a person feel less confident" (p. 826). If it is connected with the context of sentence, it means the verdict from the judges frightens the minority groups, which makes them as minorities feel less confident in Indonesia, the world's most populous Muslim-majority country. Hence, the intimidating verdict from the judges indicates the negativity of Indonesia's judiciary.

The analysis shows that Indonesia's judiciary is consistently represented negatively in the macrostructure, microstructure, and superstructure analyses. In other words, the writer of *The New York Times* article is obviously not in favour of Indonesia's judiciary concerning Mr. Basuki's blasphemy verdict.

CONCLUSION

The analysis above shows the various good strategies used by the writer in order to give a negative representation of Indonesia's judiciary of Mr. Basuki's blasphemy verdict. However, the use of many verbal reactions is worth noticing more. Since the verbal reactions in the news report can unveil the writer's negative perception about Indonesia's judiciary in an indirect way, this can be regarded as an outstanding strategy in portraying Indonesia's judiciary.

The research is limited in the sense that it only discusses one news report. The research result can be more comprehensive and accurate if it analyses several news reports concerning Indonesia's judiciary. Further researchers may even continue with the macro and meso levels of analysis in order to widen the research's scope and analyse it more thoroughly.

REFERENCES

Amer, M. (2015). War reporting in the international press: A critical discourse analysis of the Gaza war of 2008-2009. Retrieved from http://ediss. sub.uni-hamburg.de/volltexte/2016/7899/pdf/ Dissertation.pdf

Cambridge dictionary online. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://dictionary.cambridge.org/

Cochrane, J. (2017, May 11). 'Rot at the core': Blasphemy verdict in Indonesia dismays legal experts. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com

Hall, S. (1997). *Representation.* Retrieved from https://culturetechnologypolitic.files.wordpress. com/2015/09/stuart-hall-on-representation-1.pdf

Hornby, A. S. (2015). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary* (9th ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Sajjad, F. (2013). Critical discourse analysis of news headline about Imran Khna's peace march towards Wazaristan. Retrieved from https://www. researchgate.net/publication/271293631

The free dictionary online. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.thefreedictionary.com

The New York Times Company. (2018). *Who we are.* Retrieved from https://www.nytco.com

van Dijk, T. A. (1986). News schemata. In S. Greenbaum, & Cooper (Eds.), *Studying writing. Linguistic approaches* (pp. 155-186). Retrieved from http://www.discourses.org

van Dijk, T. A. (1988). *News as discourse.* Retrieved from http://www.discourses.org

van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Analysing racism through discourse analysis: Some methodological reflections. In J. Stanfield (Ed.). *Race and ethnicity in research methods* (pp. 92-134). Retrieved from http://www.discourses.org

van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 466-485). Retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/book/10.1002/978111858 4194

Vocabulary.com dictionary online. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/