20 countries in the world7 and the Bali Bomb II, many Salafist leaders stated that the terrorists were only "fictional" Westerners to damage the image of Islam to always be associated with terrorists and violence.

However, the terror incidents in Indonesia continued in a row, followed by the arrest of terrorists, we witnessed other facts in the form of networks and testimonies formed by them. In Indonesia and Southeast Asia, it is possible that the biggest threat is not from Salafist radicalism or Islamic terrorism (the number of followers of Islamic radicalism in Indonesia and Southeast Asia is relative small compared to the majority of peace-loving Indonesian Muslims), but the biggest threat comes from global information technology, internet and media that exploited and used by the radical Salafist, which are increasingly out of control by the government, while the IT community and social media themselves do not develop a strong self-control system.

It should be noted that there are indeed radical Salafists who dedicate their lives to being terrorists, teach terrorism, galvanize potential terrorists, and convince people to follow a terrorist-style understanding of Islam. From this phenomenon, we can say that radicalism and terrorism are not purely Western creations, but are real facts among the Salafist Muslim because there are those who believe, embrace, and develop them from among the Muslims themselves.
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"PART OF THE SPECTACLE"
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On discussing political manipulation on the internet, there has been not enough examination on how propaganda is performed by the persons tasked to do the work. This paper looks at the performance of political buzzers: individuals employed to manage several social media accounts to disseminate information concerning electoral candidates.
The paper argues that the lives of digital propaganda cannot be isolated from Indonesian post-authoritarian experience, where political participation has been limited only to electoral ballot. Being a political buzzer allows a certain kind of civic engagement, where the performers gain a sense of agency in directing political narratives.
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INTRODUCTION

Fiona is one among many fluent political conversationalists on Twitter. A glimpse of her timeline shows frequent commentaries on Jakarta's electoral candidacy on 2017, interspersed between her musings of her daily lives. Tweets like "Ahok [the then-governor who compete in the election] haters have to watch this video!!!" appear in-between personal thoughts like "there is no place like home."

The account named Fiona, however, is not a legible voter for Jakarta election. She is not even an actual jet-black-haired young woman as shown in her profile picture. She is one among countless fake accounts that lurk within Indonesian cyberspace, appearing to public only in certain moments like election. The account operator, a man in his late 20s, live in Jakarta's neighboring town. He is employed by a team whose work is to help winning their employer's electoral candidate in Jakarta election.

Studies on digital manipulation for the purpose of politics have seen a significant rise in recent years. Many have discussed its spread, impact, circulation, including the way it is perceived, as it is understood as contributing to the rise of so-called post-truth era, ridden with 'fake news' and 'alternative facts'. (Parahita 2018; Utami 2018; Kristiyono & Jayanti 2017; Mair 2017). Others have discussed its patterns of recruitment and tactics (Rongbin 2015; Paul & Matthews 2016). A significant part on the discussion on digital manipulation of politics put attention on "computational propaganda" (Woolley 2016), that is, the use of machine (bots) to disseminate problematic information. The point of such manipulation is to twist public opinion in favor of the interest of their employer.

Rongbin (2015) has elaborated how digital manipulation workers are motivated by monetary reasons and opportunities to work on state organizations that can strengthen their resume when looking for jobs. But what does disseminating political propaganda mean for the workers themselves? How do they perceive the dissonance of working for candidates they do not favor?

I take an Indonesian case of political manipulation workers in Jakarta 2017 election. They are commonly known as "political buzzers", as their task is to buzz (propagate) opinions about certain issue their employers need to voice to the public. The word buzzer actually has contested meaning, both ethically and emically. Camil, et al (2017), for example, define buzzers as "individual or account who has the capacity to amplifying messages by drawing attention and/or building conversation motivated by certain reasons." They account for possibility of personal, unpaid acts in this definition of buzzer, as long as they intend to promote intensively certain opinions on an issue.

I find it more productive to limit the definition of buzzer under a certain commercial or political interest. The destination of online astroturfer as the closest to my purpose, which is "groups of people that [are] hired to present certain beliefs or opinions... the goal of the message sender is to convince the receiver that the message content is a heartfelt, rational, and defensible opinion
held by a social peer.” (Zhang, et al. 2013: 2 & 4) I categorize buzzers into two kinds: those who operate with their own, usually personal, accounts; and those who operate multiple fake accounts. The former is usually also known as (political) influencers, and the latter I term as fake account operators. In this paper, I use the term political buzzers to refer to those operators.

This paper is informed by interviews with three fake account operators and two digital strategists who coordinate such political campaigns. I also had the opportunity to hang out with one of them in a casual environment. Part of this experience is an observation on Twitter from October to December 2016, closely following activities of fake accounts, influencers, and the way they were interacted with other Twitter denizens—a "deep hanging out" (Clifford 1996) on Twitter cyberplace.

DESCRIPTION AND FINDINGS

Fake account operators commonly work in group. The group can consist of 10 to 30 individuals. A group is led by a coordinator who handles day-to-day matter such as content details and communicate with their supervisors. The groups typically are not tied directly to the candidate who compete in election. The candidate campaign team usually hire a marketing firm, where they outsource the work to another group which will handle technical day-to-day matters. Part of this digital campaign structure is "social media volunteers" or "social media activists", who are not officially tied to the campaign team, but are involved in supervising the operation (see also TEMPO 2016; Lamb 2018; Potkins 2019).

Those groups, akin to cells in terrorist network, may or may not know each other. They perform different tasks and work for different purpose in the year-long campaign nearing the election. Some groups work with a regular shift on a certain office (see also Lamb 2018), some others work on the go, completing their task on their spare time. Regardless of where they physically work, they mostly coordinate virtually through WhatsApp groups.

The operation adopted war-like metaphors. From my observation and interviews, Twitter has been described as a "battleground" (medan perang). Some social media volunteers declared themselves as "war commander" (panglima perang). Some WhatsApp groups are named as "special forces" (pasukan khusus) (Lamb 2018) or "task force" (satuan tugas). Twitter itself has been described by its denizens as a "bustling city", a network of interconnected strangers where everyone talks without really knowing each other (Rudyansjah & Rasidi 2018). A feeling of familiar strangeness on Twitter verse and costly electoral competition may drive this metaphor.

The on-the-ground operators themselves, however, see their activities differently. Like Rongbin (2015) has suggested, monetary reasons are one of their motivations. But monetary incentive alone is not enough to live in such concerted political efforts. While the task has been described as "easy money", some buzzers may struggle with daily operations. They may participate in spreading problematic information, which factual accuracy is questioned and generally shunned in Indonesian conversations about politics. They may also work for candidates who they do not personally favor.

"We just have to be professional," one buzzer, Rahmat, told me. "We can't make this personal (kita gak bisa bawa pribadi kita), if we do that, it would be difficult [to work]." Buzzing work is described as "just business" (pekerjaan biasa), indicating an alienation between the worker and their labor. But crafting a fake account who looks like seemingly authentic person participating in
political conversations require a certain dedication. Alternating between political tweets with personal thoughts is one matter. Another matter is the way buzzers have to interact, through their fake accounts, with other Twitter denizens who may agree or disagree with their opinions.

One of their task is to post not only their own tweets, but engage with influencers, be it political influencers on their side, not on theirs, or even non-political influencers who tweeted political materials. Debates, known as twitwar, are common on Twitter political conversations. Buzzers are briefed by their coordinators on what kind of opinions on certain issues they have to bring forth, but the details are left to themselves. Thus, they have to improvise when other accounts debate them. Ricky, another buzzer, described it as such:

"We know our target, we take important people, political pundits (pengamat politik). If it's random accounts (akun-akun gak jelas), the followers are under 50, I'm not concerned with them." Ricky laughed. "Debating them only serves to boost their followers, there is no purpose to it. ... We have to know what we want to argue about, that's why we're given materials [by the coordinator]. [When debating] sometimes it gets too exciting (seru). Even when I know I'm wrong, I have to continue arguing my point, wouldn't make sense to defend their point, right?" Ricky let out a big laugh. "But I know they are actually right, so I ask my friends [buzzer colleagues], how should I counter. Sometimes I get too excited."

Buzzers have to make a noise (buat ramai) on the opinions they are propagating, in the hope that the narratives would be picked up by mass media. Taking up narratives to gauge popularity on certain topics is a common practice in Indonesia, with Kompas TV (2016) once gauge candidate popularity from conversations on Twitter. That is why debates is crucial element in political buzzing. When there is nothing to debate, it would be necessary to invent it. Ricky continued,

We don't know if it is [social media debates] for show (settingan) or not. We don't know what happens behind the curtain, it can be for show. Probability theory, you know, probability. ... I know [debates may be for show] because I occasionally do it. I pretend to be a supporter of someone, use anonymous account. Then I debate other accounts. It became big (jadinya ramai). ... On such occasion I would ask my friends [buzzer colleagues] to debate me, and I will debate them back, as if we were supporters of different candidates. Our candidates and teams know of our show [tahu settingan kita] so there would be no conflict. We would only be conflicting with outsiders. ... It's legitimate, right (sah-sah saja, kan), and they [the candidate] always support us. Making things exciting (buat seru-seruan). To make a noise, right? (Supaya lebih ramai, kan?)"

Buzzers like Ricky enjoy the work as it allows him to participate in political debates, sporting different perspectives which he may or may not agree. Being anonymous lets him to speak without having to fear repercussion, as he considered Indonesians as "not mature enough to debate about politics". Similarly, Rifad sees the work of political buzzing as an opportunity to participate in political discussions. He elaborated,

"It's exciting, if you like these kind of stuff, it's really exciting. It's like, like becoming one of the politician." Rifad smile turned into a big laugh. "It's like playing a chess. It's really exciting. Attacking opponents, other politicians, doing black campaign. It's exciting because we have the data. We have complete studies (kajian lengkap), data, to fight (berantem) with others, other people may not have this much data. ... [If someone attacks our candidate] we can counter them, we can crush them. We can do so, because we have the complete data. We can change other people's thinking, 'that's wrong, this one is right.' The media then will take us as their story. It's exciting, like we are becoming politicians, part of spectacle on media (tontonan di media). It's full of intricacies."
Politics is composed of "muddle" (Bateson 1948), where the consequences go beyond electoral politics. Buzzers are engaged inside this muddle, but its muddle--"intricacies"--are obscured by the "excitement" (keseruan) the buzzers experience while dealing with conflicting arguments. The need to make political conversations go big (ramai) also immerses buzzer in a certain kind of performance where they almost convince themselves to agreeing into opinions they personally disagree with. It may be said that to "tidy up" (Bateson 1948) this muddle, buzzers take a spectacle turn in understanding politics.

CONCLUSION/DISCUSSION

How did the notion of excitement and spectacle got into the lexicon of buzzers in understanding electoral competition they participate in? One way to explain it may lies on how Indonesian politics is treated--mainly in Jakarta--as a spectacle itself. There is a huge gap between daily lives of ordinary people and the spectacle of electoral politics. Politicians, especially legislative members, lack proper constituency in big cities like Jakarta. They are not engaged with citizens they are supposed to represent. The costly electoral competition is accompanied with politicians' acrobatics displayed on news, with constant arguments and fantastical statements on the state of the affair. Indonesian authoritarian history has resulted in a perception that "politics" is something far away, not directly related to the lives of its citizens, limited only in spectacular entertainment provided by news media (Utomo 2014; Siegel 1984).

What remains is a "floating mass" that favors individual politics (Savirani 2014): political heroes whose publicity stunts in mass media gained traction out of their publicity. Those figures have painted Indonesian electoral politics in recent years, with names like Jokowi and Prabowo as presidential candidates. Citizens rely on great figures, obscuring politics to the hands of the elites. Political buzzing, then, is a kind of engagement in society where political mobilization is shunned and it its place a theatrical performance provided by mass media took over. Thus, for political buzzers, their work is not merely a job, but a "like playing a chess". To make sense of this world, buzzers see their work as "part of the spectacle" in Indonesian political life.

Of course, not all is interested in being entangled too long with such spectacular stunts. Most campaigners I talked to defend their job as a "professional" matter: put away your personal politics, and you will be doing fine. This may not be the case for Rahmat. After three months, he quit the job, despite having opportunity to continue it for the next period. He disagreed with the policies of one electoral candidate he worked for, and during his employment, he had to convince himself that the candidate was doing the right thing. "It felt wrong," he told me. As the work went on, the less he finds the need to argue convincingly. He just followed the brief and stopped there. He claimed that his buzzing experience made him doubt any politicians who appear "too good to be true." Such politicians, "must be one who has buzzers under their strings."
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INTRODUCTION

This paper would like to see how the exposure of information flow in social media affects youth generation's political preferences, because as we have seen, technology and information in