Unbridled Sharing Culture and Unhealthy Narcissim as Reflected in *Cebong* and *Kampret* Poetic Metaphors

Andreas Akun[(✉)] and Wiwik Andreani

English Department, Faculty of Humanities, Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia
akun@binus.edu

Abstract. This article is an attempt to reflect the revolutionizing sharing culture of digital social media in Indonesian context. The method used in this research is textual qualitative studies of the textual poetic expressions chosen from two young and current poetry writers as to get the sense of nowness and connectedness to the issue. Lacan's concept of metaphor is used in elaborating the poetic expressions as to reveal the psychological explanations of the culture. The study concludes that beyond the irresistible practice of social media sharing culture lie the unhealthy narcistic and self-justified loving-hating culture of constructing truth, at the same time disregarding critical thinking and common sense. Social media have sophisticatedly fostered grouping and sharing culture where members are unconsciously and politically justified to produce their own version of truth which can be totally against the other groups' version, forgetting that both belong to the same Indonesia's humanity group. Fortunately, a solution is offered by loving Indonesia, the greatest metaphor of unity in diversity where love is supposed to navigate differences without hatred.

Keywords: "cebong" · "kampret" · loving-hating · metaphor · narcissism · sharing culture

1 Introduction

Indonesia has entered the post truth era where digital technology has massively enhanced the spread of misinformation that to some extent has endangered humanity, "Digital misinformation has become so pervasive in online social media that it has been listed by the World Economic Forum (WEF) as one of the main threats to human society" [1]. Thus, beyond its many opportunities and advantages of digital technology, the threats to humanity are just as serious.

Disinformation according to Bennett & Livingston [2] is intentional falsehoods spread as news stories or simulated documentary formats to advance political goals… more systematic disruptions of authoritative information flows due to strategic deceptions that may appear very credible to those consuming them", while misinformation is "the inadvertent or unintentional spread of inaccurate information without malicious

intent" [2]. Paterson [3] has further stated that cyberspace expansion in Indonesia contributes to prolific issues of misinformation and disinformation due to Indonesians' low rates of digital literacy and fast increase in digital connectivity, indicating the unreadiness of Indonesians in facing and utilizing the digital world, even though most people regardless their age use the cyberspace [4]. In US, the baby boomers or people over 65 years old with conservative political views are more likely than any other groups to share fake news though social media, but what happens in Indonesia is just the other way around. People from all ages share fake news in this country [5]. Indonesian netizens are also vulnerable in their cyberspace activities: "Indonesia also has one of the highest number of internet users globally, with over 80 million active users accessing online services across multiple devices… Little-to-no control over the hardware used by Indonesian "netizens", as well as the information that is carried through them, Indonesia's national security architecture is susceptible to multiple kinds of digital intrusions, from espionage, cybercrime, cyber-attacks and even cyber warfare" [6]. Paterson has further differentiated disinformation from misinformation where intentionality is the key characteristic. Disinformation is false information intended to mislead, whereas misinformation is merely inaccurate information that probably unintentionally spread, and both are referred as hoaxes in Indonesia [3]. Hoaxes proliferated through social media have produced and amplified social problems in Indonesia, such as "the problem of increasing religious intolerance…increased and unrestrained expression of strong views, which has resulted in cyberspace-amplified polarization of public discourse as well as religious intolerance [3]. The polarization is obvious in the surfacing and popularizing of the mocking jargons "cebong" (baby frog) and "kampret" (baby bat) as a virtual war respectively between the supporters of incumbent president Joko Widodo and his political rival president candidate Prabowo Subianto. This war involves and is much caused by the spread of hoaxes through social media.

Utami [7] in her research about hoaxes circulating around Basuki Tjahaja Purnama (Ahok) in 2017 Jakarta governor election has concluded that, "a hoax can create a culture that is based on a shared belief among the community… The use of hoax as a means of political partisanship can be dangerous as it can overpower the truth and lead people to avoid believing facts" [7]. Moreover, as stated by Kikue Hamayotsu, an associate professor of political science at Northern Illinois University and faculty associate at the Center for Southeast Asian Studies, religion has aggressively been politicized in Indonesia by the political elites based on sentiments rooted from "deep-seated feelings of insecurity, inferiority and animosity toward the more well-off minorities" [8]. Niaz has stressed the role of heuristic tendency in creating bias acceptance and understanding of information, "The first of these is the confirmation bias which is the tendency to seek out, accept, and remember information that supports our pre-existing opinions. We pay more attention to the content that reinforces our beliefs and tend to ignore and discount the type that offers alternative explanations. This heuristic is magnified when there is an emotionally driven subject as is often the case with sensational fake news stories" [9]. Quoting Foucault, Creech and Roessner [10] have stressed how power and technology construct the truth, "the strategic production of truth is rooted in the workings of institutional power, where

those that can expertly navigate changing economic relations and technological possibilities then gain the means for controlling, if not what is true, then how it is understood as true" [10]. Those in power will construct the truth in line with their preferences.

The purpose of this study is to elaborate further this online sharing culture through the analysis of contemporary literary texts responding to the phenomenon. The method used in this research is textual qualitative studies, focusing on the metaphoric expressions found in the texts and then elaborated using Lacan's concept of metaphor. Three Poems and a song are chosen from two young writers—Ahmad Gaus A.F. and Norman Adi Satria—published in their websites: *Kepada Yth. Cebong dan Kampret* (Dear Cebong and Kampret), *Cuma Calon Presiden* (Just A President Candidate), *Pilpres-Pilpresan* (Joking Presidential Election) and *Ingin Kucinta Prabowo Tanpa Membenci Jokowi* (I Want to Love Prabowo Without Hating Jokowi). These literary expressions are chosen due to their factuality, informality, to-the-point responses and depth of criticism. Ahmad Gaus is a writer, researcher, lecturer and activist currently working at LSF (The Film Censorship Board). He has written more than 20 books, some of them are biographies, with two Poetry Collections: *Kutunggu Kamu Di Cisadane: Antologi Puisi Esai* and *Senja di Jakarta.* Meanwhile, Norman Adi Satria is a young and productive poem writer. He has been active expressing his ideas online and written more than 600 poems [11]. Both writers have their concerns about the recent polarization of Indonesian people into two opposing groups due to the politicization of religion, ethnicity and identity for the sake of the country leader elections.

2 Grouping, Narcissism, and Metaphor

2.1 Grouping and Sharing Culture

Most people actively using social media today will socially belong to more than one group, especially to the most practical and popular one: WA (WhatsApp) groups. Their gadget has now become the site where the groupings work and activate their sharing culture. Indonesian people love talking and sharing stories said Deddy Mulyana, a professor of communication studies at Padjadjaran University, but sadly many of them can't differentiate facts from fake stories [12]. The grouping somehow fulfils people's social needs but giving them social pressures as well because they have been intricately absorbed into the endless web of virtual sharing and consumed by the culture.

2.2 Narcissism and Sharing Culture

Why do people willingly share through social media? For whatever contents shared, there is an individual sense of self-love and grandiose self-admiration leading to insensitivity toward others' worth and even failure to connect to others. This individual grandiosity may lead to group levels in both healthy and unhealthy ways. Sharing may provide this sense of self-love a form of mistaken self-image as the tragic story of Narcissus reveals. The term narcissism has its origins in Ovid's Romanised Greek legend of Echo and Narcissus about the tragedy of self-love where "Narcissus, frozen in self-admiration and mistaking the image of himself on the meniscus for the stranger who could return his love,

is un able to connect with anyone outside himself. Such self-absorption makes Narcissus deeply unhappy and through extreme self-love and displays of arrogant behaviour, he harms Echo and others around him" [13].

Narcissism can be healthy and unhealthy. Quoting Horwitz (2000) and Winnicott (1965), MacDonald [13] states that healthy narcissism "involves a steady sense of one's worth, based on genuine achievement, the capacity to recover from disappointment or failure and the ability to find comfort and support in relationships…Healthy narcissism or self-love comes from being loved by another. So if all goes well, the baby looks into the mother's face and seeing something of himself reflected back, internalizes parental love and approval as healthy narcissism".

Unhealthy narcissism, on the other hand, involves "serious disturbances in self-esteem which can ensnare the individual, just like Narcissus in a shallow world of self-obsession and grandiosity with no warm or loving relationships. Grandiosity is a defence against deep feelings of inferiority and is neither constant nor consistent, leaving the individual torn between thinking himself as wonderful or worthless" [13]. It is obvious that unhealthy narcissistic individuals are characterized by shallow self-esteem, mistaken self-image, torn self-identity, all rooted from deep feelings of inferiority. Extremely, this unhealthy narcissism may turn into uncommon NPD (Narcissistic Personality Disorder: "a pathological state which involves seriously disproportionate preoccupation with personal competence, power and superiority with the potential for slippage into alienation and estrangement,"). Although NPD is still rare, the unhealthy narcissistic traits such as vanity, arrogance, feeling special, lacking empathy and having little regard for others are increasingly common [13].

Social media platforms have provided rooms for this unhealthy narcissism to grow as it has its virtual supports from seemingly secure group members through sharing culture. This in turn becomes collective narcissism "which describes an ingroup identification tied to an emotional investment in an unrealistic belief about the unparalleled greatness of an ingroup" [14]. This collective narcissism happens when idealization of self is followed by idealization of ingroups as a strategy to protect a weak and threatened ego by seeing groups as "the extensions of themselves and expect everybody to recognize not only their individual greatness but also the prominence of their ingroups…especially in collectivistic cultures, individual narcissism may stem from the reputation and honour of the groups to which one belongs. Because narcissists seek constant validation of their unrealistic greatness of self-image, therefore they seem to unceasingly encounter threats to their self-image and persistently intolerant of them, then consequently sharing culture is difficult to stop because sharing may act as defence of self-image. Due to high but unstable collective self-esteem, the constant required external validation is never sufficient, and thus "collective, rather than personal, threatened self-esteem is the best predictor of intergroup aggressiveness" [14].

2.3 Metaphor

Metaphor is an effective medium to contain intended meanings uneasily conveyed in a conventional way due to their complexity. Modell [15] has defined metaphor "as a cognitive tool that enables the transfer of meaning between dissimilar domains…the

Greek term metaphor literally means 'transfer'…Metaphor retains a paradoxical quality in that there is an "as-if" play of similarity and difference and not a rigid specified identity of meaning. As metaphor enables the transfer of meaning between dissimilar domains, transference repetition, the similarity of affective responses between the differing domains of the past and the present can be understood as a metaphoric process" [15]. Metaphor is indeed a transfer and transport of meaning from the sender to the receiver, needed due to three reasons according to Fainsilber and Ortony [16] i.e., inexpressibility, compactness, and vividness. Metaphor helps to communicate complicated—even conventionally inexpressible—ideas in a simple symbolic expression, expressing huge ideas or a lot of information succinctly, and summarizing comprehensive image or representation of event or idea into a single expression. Thus, functionally, "metaphor enables someone to more accurately communicate an unclear, ambiguous, or even contradictory idea in a single expression" [17].

Metaphor is widely used in poetry because poetry requires tranquillity, recollection and contemplation upon impulsive overflow of feelings and emotions as a response toward reality before all crystallize into metaphors and poetic lines. Bret and Jones [18] have explained this process: "These feelings do not at once lead to the creation of poetry; they are recalled by the poet after the actual situation which first aroused them is past…Poetry…takes its origin from emotion recollected in tranquillity: the emotion is contemplated till by a species of reaction the tranquillity gradually disappears, and an emotion, similar to that which was before the subject of contemplation, is gradually produced, and does itself actually exist in the mind" [18]. Poetic metaphor is then a crystal of ideas in its briefest yet most complicated form.

In psychological perspective, Lacan developed Freud's dream mechanism concepts of condensation and displacement respectively into his concepts of metaphor and metonymy, arguing through linguistic view that the unconscious is structured like a language [19]. Metonymy is a concept where one thing represents another by means of the part standing for the whole through its certain attributes, while in metaphor some things are compressed into one symbolic image.

Caspi [20] has emphasized how "psychoanalysis can indeed contribute to shed light on and enrich the understanding of metaphor's modus operandi, with the unconscious emotional aspects that lie in it". Caspi also argues that "emotional and intersubjective aspects play an important role in how we constitute meaning and produce an decipher metaphors…that psychoanalysis may shed light on the emotional and intersubjective aspects at play within the workings of metaphor" [20]. Metaphor in Lacan's psychoanalysis is essential since his concept of therapy follows a progression from the concrete to the metaphoric and the symbolic where the unconscious is structured like a chain of signifiers normally working in a language. Lacan's metaphor, just as Freud's condensation, makes it possible for a poetic and symbolic expression "to represent several senses, using one signifier, thereby allowing in turn mental extension during psychoanalysis" [20].

3 Sharing and Loving-Hating Culture

The intensive polarization of Indonesian people due to their political preference in the last two presidential elections (2014 and 2019), with unfortunately only two opposing candidates i.e. Mr Joko Widodo (JW) and Mr Prabowo Subianto (PS), has reached its climax when the two sides are labelled as "Cebong" (JW supporters) and "Kampret" (PS supporters). The political contestation coloured by intense using and sharing of hoaxes, religion politization, ethnic minority stereotyping, and anti-communist/Chinese/Christian propaganda, has produced political partisanship resulting in the unhealthy culture of negating each other. Social media have become the war site for both sides to build their narratives and to be easily and sometimes blindly shared by uncritical supporters. Truth has been masqueraded by untruth where intensively propagated and shared disinformation, misinformation and hoax overpower truth, blunting critical thinking and common sense and finally leading people to avoid believing facts.

Blind loving-hating hating culture is unavoidable, as if there is no choice. It is not a matter of which candidate is better or worse anymore, but if one is good then the other is bad, if one belongs to "lover" the other is "hater". The following discussion on the poetic expressions will depict this very unhealthy political atmosphere.

3.1 Group Narcissism and the Death of Critical Thinking

The blind polarized support of each candidate can be categorized into group narcissistic support as it negates each other by forgetting the fact that both have positive and negative sides as normative facts of any candidates. This polarization unfortunately starts with only criticizing, mocking, and insulting on the counterpart, neglecting the appreciation and reward culture. The metaphors of *cebong* and *kampret* reflect this very negative culture. The way the poem is written is also reflecting the erosion or degradation of Indonesian glorious and honoured culture of respecting the elder and leaders through for instance addressing the president (candidates) by nick names or impolite expressions such as "Pabowo", "Jokowi", "Cuma Calon Presiden", "Cebong", "Kampret", and "Pilpres-Pilpresan".

The term *cebong* (*kecebong*) was first known from JW's youngest son Kaesang Pangarep who with his joking nature revealed that his father loves to keep or collect baby frogs since he became Solo Mayor up to his move to presidential palace in Jakarta by releasing several frogs into the pond [21]. Kaesang later developed his creative business using *kecebong* character, wearing hat reading "Kolektor Kecebong" (baby frog collector). JW haters then mockingly call him "Jokodok" or "raja kodok". Meanwhile, PS followers are labelled "kampret" by JW's following as their reaction to their labelling JW followers as "cebong". Although BBC News Indonesia mentions that it not known why *kampret* is chosen to label PS followers, it is safely assumed that as mocking metaphor it is related to the nature of the bat (*kampret*) in seeing things upside down as it hangs on trees while anchoring or sleeping with its head down, giving the effect of different or upside-down perspective. This baby bat label is much associated with other PS supporter jargons as "bani micin", "kaum bumi datar" or "kaum sumbu pendek," all referring to religious fanatics who are easily politicized for certain political interests, but easily angry as well when criticized [22].

Further, the metaphors contain opposing practical meanings that divide sharply the two sides mostly packaged and spread as misinformation, disinformation and hoaxes. "Cebong" reflects PS supporters' anti-JW attacks, accusations and mockeries on e.g.: useless infrastructure development, burdening foreign loans, political party's 'puppet' leader, henchman of 'Asing' (foreign government) and 'Aseng' (Chinese capitalist and communist), etc. On the other hand, "kampret" reflects JW supporters' anti-PS attacks on nationalism and religious narrowmindedness, Arab-centered cultures and lifestyles, religious radicalism, anti-diversity and National Ideology of Pancasila (The Five Principles) and National Slogan *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* (Unity in Diversity), etc. Both have condensed into two polarized metaphors: *Cebong* and *Kampret*. Both have their own "truth" by negating each other.

What is interesting is the fact that both metaphors are given by its political counterpart 'netizens, starting with mockery, mostly popular in internet communication and sharing, and using innocent baby animals. These baby animals may be interpreted as lack of maturity in Indonesian democracy, yet with advanced use of social media for sharing mocking and insulting hoaxes or disinformation, reflecting both sides' preoccupation in post truth reality where people only wish to find and accept truth of their own version.

Group narcissism has made this mocking culture flower to defend each position. Mocking in this context happens when one lacks empathy, warm and loving relationship with others, indirectly showing a defence against deep feelings of inferiority, shallow self-esteem and mistaken self-image by for instance directly exposing grandiose loving or hating share in social media. This grandiosity can be traced in Gaus' poem "Menggantikan lidah yang sudah hangus karena tidak pernah berhenti saling menista" (Substitute the tongue that has been burnt for never stopping to insult each other; stanza 2, line 8). Continuous and exaggerated hatred is shown in the expression "never stopping to insult each other", so intensive is the insult that it burns the tongue, and this hatred is surprisingly developed out of grandiose love or idealization of ingroup figure from both sides.

The grandiose love and hatred can also be seen clearly in Satria's poetic and straight lines:

Ingin kucinta Prabowo/Tapi mengapa tiap kali kucari tahu tentangnya/dari orang-orang yang sudah duluan cinta/Yang kutemukan hanyalah benci Jokowi. Bagaimana sebenarnya cara membenci Jokowi?/Setelah kucari tahu dari yang duluan benci/Yang kutemukan hanyalah cinta Prabowo

Trans:

I want to love Prabowo/But why each time I seek information on him/From people who have previously loved him/What I found out was only to hate Jokowi./How to actually hate Jokowi?/After I sought it from those who have previously hated him/What I found out was only to love Prabowo.

These lines show how people are divided into two opposing sides without any other alternatives but love or hate. This situation is constructed by the culture of loving out of hating inherited from the assumed previous practice with no rooms for differing from the existing culture, except fortunately the persona's choice not to follow both.

Why are people divided in such a way? And why does the insulting and mocking culture surface? The answer to the first question is because people lack critical thinking and let their mind be manipulated by political narration, mostly consist of disinformation or hoaxes loaded with attacking and hating contents, intentionally spread through social media by political elites who struggle for power. Satria's poem indicates this:

"Kini statusmu mudah dibaca/namun sulit untuk diterima akal sehat/Apakah akalku harus sakit dulu untuk memahamimu?"

Trans:

Now your status is easy to read/but difficult to be accepted by common sense/Should my common sense get ill first to understand you?

People now do not seem to show common sense through their media social status, meaning that there is something wrong with their mind and way of thinking. The persona label this as ill mind and common sense because he finds it difficult to rationally understand the status which is written in a direct and blatant expression of hate or love. The difficulty lies more on understanding the reason why the person has such an out of logic status. This is due to the fact that previously (before the presidential contestation of 2014 and 2019) he or she used to have exaggerated (*lebay*) expressions, written in a weird and seemingly difficult to read but easy to comprehend when the pattern is found (e.g. "C3mun6uD 3a q4q4k", reads "semangat ya kakak"). Now, it is easy to read but difficult to comprehend since the person has transformed into somebody else with his or her narrowminded love or hate. The persona finally can't stand this transformation by stating that his/her social media status is now repugnant after he/she is co-opted by the joking or parodic presidential election narrations of hatred and love.

The answer to the second question of surfacing insulting and mocking culture is smartly illustrated by Satria by taking religious background to show people's habit of ridiculing God (though safely taking Christianity minority as a case illustration) in his poem Only President Candidate. He narrates that thousands of years ago the Almighty God and all-capable God was ridiculed for He was capable of doing anything except dying. But then about two thousand years ago God was ridiculed again by questioning His Divine Quality or God-ness when He finally experienced death. Satria thus concludes about human ridiculing nature by saying that it is not surprising if the president candidates are ridiculed or insulted because God Himself is ridiculed, let alone human president candidate only. This way, people nowadays can openly insult other human fellows without ethical considerations due to their blind acceptance of their ingroup ideology and propaganda.

The process of this transformation is metaphorically explained and interestingly criticized by Gaus in his poem *Dear Cebong and kampret*. Gaus safely uses first person point of view to cover both sides. It is narrated that the persona's country slips from his hand, falls into a pond and a crowd of birds get into his body, changing him radically. His ecosystem has changed, and he is forced to adapt to this new environment by drinking the polluted water and breathing the polluted air. He even does not know when his body starts to mutate. His tail and wings just come out. Imitating others, he starts to be able to swim like baby frogs and fly like baby bats. He then enters stealthily into others' head and steal their mind. He then plants the mind in the middle of a dead city and it grows

into a tree with leaves able to speak, substituting the tongue that has been burnt for never stopping to insult each other. People then get awake from their sleep with their head filled with birds, scattering out from their mouth and ears, flying to and fro in the whole city. Their legs clutch the burning rocks and drop them unto people's residence. People run out of their house with face looking up and mouth widely open, swallowing the rocks until their belly is full, and then blows like a suicide bomb. The sky is then dark and the earth flat. The persona finally questions: "Should all first be destroyed?" He ends by continuing "before it is reconstructed by the unborn babies—human babies—not baby frogs or baby bats.

The above paraphrase of the poem shows how people change or turn into "cebong" or "kampret" even without their full understanding of what is wisely categorized as right or wrong. The verbs "slip" and "fall" explain this lack of awareness. Next, the word "forced" adds to this unintentionality in adapting into the polluted new world with its wild polluting ideology. Then the transformation (more than mere change) happens with mutation process even without the person's knowing when. What they know is "imitating" others, of which action shows lack of personal confidence and integrity. The worse stage happens when the person has mutated into the new being, when he then starts to steal or pollute others' mind, filling it with hoaxes and disinformation (metaphorically represented by birds flying from people's mouth and ears into the whole city). These hoax birds then destroy the whole uncritical citizen by filling their mind with burning disinformation and they explode like a suicide bomb, uselessly sacrificing oneself and innocent others. Meaning.

3.2 Questioning Love

The divide that splits Indonesians into loving one image by hating the other is unhealthy since it is a sign of collective narcissism. The idealization of self is followed by the idealization of ingroups as a strategy to protect a weak and threatened ego where the group is seen as the extension of individual and everybody is expected to recognize not only individual greatness but also the prominence of the ingroups. People then seek constant validation e.g., through sharing ingroup unrealistic greatness of self-image via unverified information of glorifying the ingroup (love) or condemning the outgroup (hatred) because they continuously feel threatened and intolerant of it, so they need to defence themselves.

This intolerance is reflected in the metaphors of "cebong" and "kampret" where one cannot love without hating the other and vice versa. How can one love by hating the other? Or how can one hate by loving the other? Above all, is it "love" or "hatred" at all? What kind of love is with them when it is defined through hating? It is indeed not love, but blind and unrealistic idealization or greatness of self-image. This only happens when people lose their common sense due to the politicization of people's religious belief in the parodic presidential election through the acts of insults or mockeries of president candidates and God intensified through the power of disinformation spread and smear campaign via social media.

3.3   Navigating Difference: "Indonesia" as Metaphoric Navigator

What should be done to save the people from their polluted mind of blind love or idealization? Fortunately, one of the discussed literary works provides a solution, although extended through a tone of despair and informality: "Ya sudahlah/Aku cinta Indonesia saja/Dengan mencintainya/Aku tidak perlu/Membenci siapa-siapa" (Well/I just love Indonesia then/By loving it/I don't need/To hate anyone). These lines are taken from Satria's poem which is presented in a song format entitled "Ingin Kucinta Prabowo Tanpa Membenci Jokowi". The very title has indeed a strong message of peace and offering a way out of the complicated opposition of love and hatred. The fact that the poet witnesses in Indonesian political situation is now opposed to the dream solution ("ingin" = wish) he offers: the technical and right way of loving without hating. How? By loving Indonesia. Here he reminds everybody of the greatness of "Indonesia" as a great metaphor of navigating people's life as a nation and citizen. Indonesia is a metaphor of unity in diversity where loving is without hating. It is a metaphor of navigator in dealing with un-simple given diversity of being "Indonesia", where narrowmindedness, blind acceptance of only preferred truth and wild polluting ideologies are just irrelevant in this country. In that way, the opposing divide of people into "cebong" and "kampret" should have never happened.

4   Conclusion

Poetic expressions may reflect more deeply of today's chaotic political divide among people since poetry is not instant and direct in responding either positively or negatively to realities, letting the process of sedimentation of ideas take place even through seemingly trivial everyday events and responses. The four discussed literary expressions have proven to be helpful in discussing the metaphoric condensed meanings of *cebong* and *kampret* as opposing sides who only accept their own versions of truth due to their group or collective narcissistic idealization of false or mistaken image in their unconscious strategic effort to protect the weak or threatened ego. This is unfortunately intensified by the unbridled sharing culture through conducive social media and grouping facility.

The polarization of hatred and love culture as the result of collective narcissism and wild spread of disinformation and hoaxes has caused the death of critical thinking and common sense. Fortunately, a solution is provided by the literary work. The best way to cope with the divide is to navigate the differences by turning back to the metaphor of Indonesia where unity in diversity is the essence of being Indonesia. Only through loving Indonesia you don't need to hate anybody, where love is returned to its essence: To love means just to love, not to hate.

References

1. E Del Vicario, M., Bessi, A., Zollo, F., Petroni, F., Scala, A., Caldarelli, G., et al. (2016). The spreading of misinformation online. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113 (3), 554–559.

2. Bennett, W.L. & Livingston, S. (2018). The disinformation order: Disruptive communication and the decline of democratic institutions. European Journal of Communication, 33(2), 22–139.

3. Paterson, T. (2019). Indonesian cyberspace expansion: A double-edged sword. Journal of Cyber Policy. https://doi.org/10.1080/23738871.2019.1627476.

4. Amin, K. (2014, June 5). Indonesians spend most time on smartphones in the world. The Jakarta Post. https://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2014/06/05/indonesians-spend-most-timesmartphones-world.html.

5. Wibowo, K.A., Rahmawan, D. & Maryani, E. (2019, February 19). In Indonesia, young and old share fake news on social media. The Jakarta Post. https://www.thejakartapost.com/academia/2019/02/19/in-indonesia-young-and-old-share-fake-news-on-social-media.html.

6. Watada, J. (2018, May 04). The cyber security agency's challenge in Indonesia. The Jakarta Post. https://www.thejakartapost.com/academia/2018/05/04/the-cyber-security-agencys-challenge-in-indonesia.html.

7. Utami, P. (2018). Hoax in modern politics: The meaning of hoax in Indonesian politics and democracy. Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, 22 (2), 85–97.

8. Hamayotsu, K. (2018). The Editors. How Religion Has Been 'Aggressive Politicized' in Muslim-Majority Indonesia. https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/trend-lines/24295/how-religion-has-been-aggressively-politicized-in-muslim-majority-indonesia.

9. 9 Niaz, A. (2019, Februray 3). Psychology of fake news. The Jakarta Post. https://www.thejakartapost.com/academia/2019/02/03/psychology-of-fake-news.html.

10. Creech, B. & Roessner, A. (2018). Declaring the Value of Truth. Journalism Practice, https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2018.1472526.

11. S Puisi Normantis. (n.d.). Siapa sih Norman Adi Satria? https://normantis.com/siapa-sih-norman-adi-satria/.

12. Prasetyo, E. (2017, February 09). Indonesians Love to Share Fake News: Media Monitoring Agency. Jakarta Globe. https://jakartaglobe.id/context/indonesians-love-share-fake-news-media-monitoring-agency.

13. MacDonald, P. (2014). Narcissism in the modern world. Psychodynamic Practice: Individual, Groups and Organizations, 20 (2), 144–153.

14. de Zavala, A.G., Eidelson, R., Cichocka, A. & Jayawickreme, N. (2009). Collective narcissism and its social consequences. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97 (6), 1074–1096.

15. Modell, A.H. (2005). Emotional memory, metaphor, and meaning. Psychoanalytic Inquiry, 25 (4), 555–568.

16. Fainsilber, L. & Ortony, A. (1987). Metaphorical uses of language in the expression of emotions. Metaphor and Symbolic Activity, 2 (4), 239–250.

17. Akun, A. & W. Andreani (2016). Microaggression and diversity: Tracing Indonesian university students' attitudes toward pluralism through metaphorical creative expressions. Bharatiya Prajna: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Indian Studies, 1 (1), 1–14.

18. Brett, R.L. & Jones, A.R. (2005). Lyrical ballads: Wordsworth and Coleridge. New York: Routledge.

19. Barry, P. (2017). Beginning theory: An introduction to literary and cultural theory. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

20. Caspi, T. (2018). Towards psychoanalytic contribution to linguistic metaphor theory. The International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 99 (5), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207578.2018.1490476

21. Azzahra, A. (2016). MATA NAJWA 24 Februari 2016 CERITA ANAK JOKOWI Gibran Rakabuming Kaesang Pangareb [Mata Najwa 2016 Story ofJokowi's Children Gibran Rakabuming Kaesang Pangareb] [Video]. Youtube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sz-TxVASEkk

22. BBC News. (2019). Kamus istilah pemilu: Dari mana asalnya cebong dan kampret [Dictionary of election terms: Where did cebong and kampret come from?]. https://www.bbc.com/indonesia/trensosial-47653910