Forensic Linguistics Study on Natalius Pigai'S Speech for Central Javanese Ethnic (Jokowi and Ganjar Pranowo as an Object)

Machdori[1], Tadjuddin Maknun[1], Ery Iswary[1]

[1,]Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia
*Correspondence:dodolantang@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

There are many cases of spreading information containing hate speech in Indonesia. Hate speech can mean acts of communication carried out by an individual or group in the form of provocation, incitement or insult to another individual or group. Hate speech usually concerns aspects of race, skin color, gender, disability, sexual orientation, nationality, religion and others. This research specifically examines the ethnicity of Central Java, Indonesia. This article review aims to 1) describe elements of contempt for ethnic Central Java, namely Joko Widodo and Ganjar Pranowo, and 2) describe whether the statement forward by Natalis Pigai is identified as hate speech that violates the ITE Law of Indonesia Article 45A. The method of data collection is done by reviewing the news that has existed so far. This research review uses a qualitative descriptive analysis. The results of this study found five indications of forms of racism utterances made by Natalius Pigai namely racism, provocative, hateful, insulting and lying. This action violates the applicable ITE Law in Indonesia.

1. Introduction

Since the birth of social media facilitated by the internet, it has made it easy for anyone to connect with one another without area and time limits. The convenience that can be obtained by using social media in the form of Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, WhatApps, Telegram and so on has made this media a means of communication that is easy and inexpensive, effective and connetible wherever we are.

The presence of social media has changed human civilization and behavior. Media has two legs, one is to facilitate people to connect with each other, on the other hand this media is often misused by certain people for certain interests as well (Matamoros-Fernández & Farkas, 2021; Alkiviadou, 2019). Call it for good purposes, but behind that, the media can also be used to bully, slander , discrediting a person or group of people with the aim of avoiding and character assassination (Mozafari et al., 2020; Ștefăniță & Buf, 2021).

Hate speech is rampant in various media from time to time. This almost happens in all corners of the world, from various circles (Brown, 2018; Rahman et al., 2019). This can be proven by the appearance of an infographic issued by Facebook regarding the amount of hate speech they have removed from 2018 to March 2020. From the infographic it can be seen that for 2020 as many as 9.6 million hate speech have been removed by Facebook.

This situation is, of course, very concerning because as we all know, the number of social media users will always increase every day so that the number of hate speech on Facebook in the future may exceed the 9.6 figure. this hate speech will not only be felt by each individual but for groups of people, and may be in various countries in this hemisphere (Carlson, 2021; Hamuddin et al., 2022).

The latest facts reveal that hate speech through social media in the UK and the US has also increased by 10% during the pandemic. Currently, hate speech has reached 50.1 million posts during the pandemic. The charity Ditch the Label conducted research and analyzed 163 million conversations in the UK and US, between 2019 and mid-2011. The report revealed that there were 50.1 million discussions of, racist hate speech (Istaiteh et al., 2020; Hangartner et al., 2021; Sukmawaty et al., 2022). The report found that these conversations spiked around major news events, such as the time the WHO declared the Covid-19 outbreak a pandemic in March 2010, the Black Lives Matter protests in June 2010, and the murder of Sarah Everard in March 2011. Ditch the Label CEO Liam Hackett said told Radio 1 Newsbeat that, they have been inundated with reports of increasing incidents of hate speech and online harassment that have become increasingly extreme during the pandemic

There are several things that have been found in previous research, first, an increase was found in the Google Trends online tool (trends.google.com). Overall, the largest search volume for the keyword racism occurred in mid-2010. In the same year, the search volume increased by 10%. But then it was lower and minimal on the keyword racism in the range of below 10% until mid-2019. The trend that occurs is an upward trend with a coefficient of determination of 0.131, indicating that as much as 13.1% of the variation in the time series is linear. This result can be seen as a demonstration of the increasing awareness among users of the problem of racism over time.

Second, research conducted by Mulyadi, (2019) showed that the actual implementation of ITE LAW regulations on the internet/social media is still not optimal, as evidenced by the negative things that appear on the internet (media media). In addition, there are still many regulations that require strengthening implementation or increasing law enforcement to prevent misuse of the internet for things that are negative.

Third, research conducted by Santos, et al (2020) This study released several: Types of social media that are often used by the public, how are people's perceptions of hate speech and its types and the spread of hoax information that can cause anxiety. One example is online harassment of women and body shaming/harassment of any part of a person's body.

Another research is what was done by Silva, et.al. (2016) the results show that there are 3 trends in elements of hate speech that are often found on social media. The 3 trends are ethnicity, behavior, and physical form of a person. This is the issue that fills social media the most.

The case of racism is one of the cases that can reap a long conflict if an error occurs in delivering the news. Apparently, cases of racism are not easy to report. Through reporting, the media can frame certain events which ultimately determine how audiences see and understand events from a certain perspective (Eriyanto, 2001).

Based on a number of studies above, a review of this article with a forensic linguistic approach becomes hate speech as a topic of discussion. This paper is intended to provide a form of illustration that there are rules that must be obeyed in relation to the use of certain utterances (statements through language on social media). In addition, this paper is seen as important to emphasize the extent to which the importance of forensic linguistic studies can contribute in expressing hate speech from the perspective of linguistic studies (pragmatic, semantic and semiotic). This article review aims to, 1) describe whether there is an element of insulting an ethnicity in social media, 2) describe hate speech that is against the law.

2. Methodology

The method applied in this writing is descriptive qualitative. The only object of discussion focuses on the screen shot of the Twitter account owner @NataliusPigai2, which was broadcast in October 2021 at 4.43 PM via iPhone with a total of 423.3 thousand views, 729 Retweets, 649 Quote Tweets, and 3,192 Likes. The screen shot of Twit is seen as follows

3. Instruments

To make the present writing data easier, screenshots of tweet screens are reconstructed in 'words' version, from PDF format then rewritten according to language conventions, then given a translation. Data construction is carried out as follows

Table 1 Speech Uploading on Twitter

Twitter Data

Jgn percaya org Jawa Tengah Jokowi & Ganjar. Mereka merampok kekayaan kita, mereka bunuh rakyat papua, injak2 harga diri bangsa Papua dengan kata2 ewndahan Rasis, monyet & sampat. Kami bukan rendahan. Kita lawan ketidakadilan sampai titik darah penghabisan. Sy penantang ketidak adilan

Data Construction

Jangan percaya orang Jawa Tengah, Jokowi & Ganjar. Mereka [telah] merampok kekayaan kita, mereka membunuh rakyat Papua, menginjak-injak harga diri bangsa Papua dengan kata-kata rendahan rasis, monyet & sampah. Kami bukan rendahan. Kita lawan ketidakadilan sampai titik darah penghabisan. Saya penantang ketidakadilan

Translation

Do not trust the people of Central Java, Jokowi & Ganjar. They [have] robbed our wealth, they killed the Papuan people, trampled on the pride of the Papuan people with racist, monkey & trash words. We are not lowly. We fight injustice to the last drop of blood. I challenge injustice

Based on @NataliusPigai2's tweet, there were several things that caused Natalius Pigai to make him questioned by the police. Aspects that ensnare the perpetrators can be seen in the table below

Table 2. Aspects that ensnare the Actor

No	Speech	Speech Content/Remarks
1	Do not trust the people of Central Java, Jokowi & Ganjar	Character assassination
2	They [have] robbed our wealth,	accusing that have no facts
3	.. they killed the Papuan people, trampled on the pride of the Papuan people with racist, monkey & trash words. We are not lowly	Slanderous expressions that have no facts
4	We fight injustice to the last drop of blood. I challenge injustice	Accusations of injustice

The first aspect, the perpetrator is considered to have committed character assassination of two things, namely the Central Javanese people as a whole, and specifically to Jokowi and Ganjar. Many people feel concerned with this expression because Jokowi is a President and Ganjar is a Governor of Central Java. Second, the expression that they [have] robbed our wealth is a very heinous slander because it has accused a president and a governor. Third, another expression is that they killed the Papuan people, trampled on the pride of the Papuan people with racist, monkey & trash words. We are not lowly. This is a slanderous statement that has no facts. The accusations cannot be proven, let alone killing or orders to kill Papuans. Another slander is that these two people look down on Papuan people with racist remarks; monkeys and trash. Lastly, fourthly, accusations of injustice

The data analyzed is presented based on several views of the controversy over hate speech by Natalius Pigai against ethnic Central Java, Joko Widodo, and Ganjar Pranowo. This description is presented informally or by using the author's usual words (Sudaryanto, 1993:145). There is also a view that what Pigai has done is not fully punishable by law

Based on these facts, this paper assesses that Natalius Pigai made statements that insulted ethnic Central Java, Joko Widodo, and Ganjar Pranowo causing Natalius Pigai's speech to be considered as violating or insulting ethnicity in accordance with Law of Indonesia Article 45 A paragraph (2) juncto Article 28 paragraph (2) of Law Number 19 of 2016 concerning Amendments to Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Information and Electronic Transactions and/or Article 156 of the Criminal Code and/or Article 16 jo. Article 4 letter b paragraph (1) of Law Number 40 of 2008 concerning the Elimination of Racial and Ethnic Discrimination and/or Article 14 paragraph (1) and paragraph (2) of the Criminal Code.

4. Content Analysis

Based on various legal views regarding the racism statement that was sincere by Pigai on his Twitter, it is confirmed that it was a deliberate act with the aim of provoking the Papuan people to be more careful with Jokowi and Ganjar Pranowo as ethnic Central Javanese who visited Papua to seek public sympathy politically regarding the 2024 presidential election.

These words were deliberately made by Natalius Pigai, who has been passionate about his criticism of the government, and has taken refuge behind the Papuan people, whom he has been fighting for. During the police investigation, of course, Pigai still tried to sneer that his remarks were not racist because this was only a form of criticism of the government, not the people of Central Java as a whole. So, Article 45A of 2008 of the ITE Law does not meet the requirements to ensnare Natalius Pigai. Thus a different view.

Natalius Pigai's words do not necessarily imprison him as the ITE (Electronis Information and Transaction) Law of Indonesia article 45A of 2008. However, acts of racism cannot be justified for any reason. This causes misunderstandings and different interpretations from various groups. Therefore, criticizing in a multi-interpretation way will be considered sensitive by society, including ethnicity, religion, race, and inter-group (SARA) used as material for criticism on social media. But after all, this has entered into the realm of cyber crime. Cyber referred to here refers to the term defined by Rahman (2017), namely a digital media

As stated by Leech (1983) every speech situation needs to have a context, and it is the context that determines it. Leech's statement (1983) in his theory, context is aspects related to the physical and social environment of a speech which shows a background knowledge shared by speakers and speakers. This context helps the speaker interpret or interpret the speaker's intent.

Natalius Pigai's story on social media on the Twitter account @NataliusPigai2 which was uploaded in October 2021 at 4.43 PM via iPhone with a total of 423.3 thousand views, 729 Retweets, 649 Twett Quotes, and 3,192 Likes. This tweet caused anxiety not only to the people of Central Java but also to the people of Papua. Several people from Papua emphasized that what Natalius Pigai wrote did not represent the Papuan people but represented himself. The following is Natalius Pigai's statement:

https://twitter.com/NataliusPigai2/status/1443874222938345476?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw

Figure 1. Natalius Pigai Posts

5. Causal Action

Natalius Pigai's racism remarks aimed at the Central Javanese ethnicity, Joko Widodo and Ganjar Pranowo were made when these two important figures visited Papua in order to support the Central Java contingent at the XX PON event. During the visit, Ganjar Pranowo spent time with the Papuan people to enjoy a variety of typical Papuan menus. Then Natalius Pigai took the picture to be uploaded on Twitter's social media by providing a description of the picture with a provocative editorial leading to allegations of racism.

Natalius Pigai's words are an attempt to sway the opinion of the Papuan people so they don't trust the people of Central Java, Jokowi and Ganjar. This diction is controversial in society because it has a tendency of racism that denigrates the Central Javanese ethnicity, Jokowi, and Ganjar both as ethnic symbols as well as individual symbols and leaders who come from the island of Java in the Republic of Indonesia.

"They (Jokowi and Pranowo) robbed our wealth, they killed the people of Papua, trampled the pride of the Papuan people with low words of racism, monkeys & trash". It is a speech act that discriminates against individual Jokowi and Ganjar with the word "they" as killers of the Papuan people, and tramples on the pride of the Papuan people by calling racists in derogatory words such as monkeys and trash.

Natalius Pigai's words can be categorized as racism because he intentionally and without rights disseminates information aimed at creating feelings of hatred or hostility towards certain individuals and/or groups of people based on ethnicity, religion, race and inter-group (SARA). However, when examined further, the law requires an element of hate speech which leads to intentional racism to discriminate against certain individuals and ethnic groups. Therefore, this research will further examine whether or not there is an element of racism in Natalius Pigai's speech.

What happened from the situation of the utterances written on Twitter, these remarks occurred when the governor of Central Java, Ganjar Pranowo, visited Papua to support the Central Java contingent at the XX PON event. On the sidelines of Ganjar Pranowo's visit with the community, they were enjoying a variety of typical Papuan menus, and Natalius Pigai framed Ganjar Pranowo and the Papuan people who were enjoying typical Papuan food.

Based on Stefanus Rahoyo (2021), there are at least 5 points conveyed by Pigai in his tweet above: Don't trust the people of Central Java, Jokowi and Ganjar. They (Jokowi and Ganjar) robbed our wealth. Who are we'? I think the 'we' referred to by Pigai are Papuans. After robbing the wealth of the Papuan people, they (Jokowi and Ganjar) killed the Papuan people. (It's not clear what is meant by 'killing'. To kill in the sense of forcibly taking someone's life or what? Not so clear!)

After killing the Papuan people, Jokowi and Ganjar even trampled on the pride of the Papuan people. In what way? With racist, monkey and trash smut words.

In other words, Pigai accuses Jokowi and Ganjar of committing at least 3 'crimes' against Papuans: first, robbing the wealth of Papuans, secondly killing Papuans, and thirdly trampling the pride of Papuans (Pigai calls it the Papuan Nation).

4. Conclusion

This forensic linguistic study aims to prove whether there is an element of racism in Natalius Pigai's tweets associated with the ITE Law. As previously studied, a person charged with Article 45A of the ITE Law of Indonesia is someone who intends to and intentionally and without rights disseminates information aimed at causing hatred or hostility towards certain individuals and/or community groups based on ethnicity, religion, race, and between groups (SARA).

In the end, this review paper illustrates that there are rules that must be obeyed in relation to the use of a language in society so that there are languages that may and may not be used. Freedom of speech does not mean freedom that can violate the law, disturb people's privacy, discredit or even harass other people with lowly words. Everything has a limit including the limitations of a person so as not to apply arbitrarily which may violate the law.

Thus, the study of forensic linguistics is a study that can contribute to disclosing motives for hate speech by relying on three things, namely the fields of pragmatics, semantics, and semiotics. The combination of these three fields will in turn strengthen studies related to hate speech through forensic linguistic analysis.

References

Alkiviadou, N. (2019). Hate speech on social media networks: towards a regulatory framework?. *Information & Communications Technology Law, 28*(1), 19-35.

Brown, A. (2018). What is so special about online (as compared to offline) hate speech?. *Ethnicities, 18*(3), 297-326.

Carlson, C. R. (2021*). Hate speech.* MIT Press.

Eriyanto. (2001). *Linguistics Analysis: Analysis Preface of Media Text Analisis Teks Media*. Yogyakarta: LKiS.

Hangartner, D., Gennaro, G., Alasiri, S., Bahrich, N., Bornhoft, A., Boucher, J., ... & Donnay, K. (2021). Empathy-based counterspeech can reduce racist hate speech in a social media field experiment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 118*(50), e2116310118.

Hamuddin, B., Syahdan, S., Rahman, F., Rianita, D., & Derin, T. (2022). Do They Truly Intend to Harm Their Friends?: The Motives Beyond Cyberbullying among University Students. *In Research Anthology on Combating Cyber-Aggression and Online Negativity* (pp. 775-788). IGI Global.

Leech, G. N., (1983). Principles of Pragmatics. Longman, London.

Matamoros-Fernández, A., & Farkas, J. (2021). Racism, hate speech, and social media: A systematic review and critique. *Television & New Media, 22*(2), 205-224.

Mozafari, M., Farahbakhsh, R., & Crespi, N. (2020). Hate speech detection and racial bias mitigation in social media based on BERT model. *PloS one, 15*(8), e0237861.

Mulyadi, E. (2019). *Model Sosialisasi dan Implementasi Regulasi UU ITE yang Digunakan oleh Kemkominfo untuk Menangkal Konten Negatif di Media Sosial* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Mercu Buana Jakarta).

Rahman, F. (2017). Cyber literature: A reader–writer interactivity. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies, 3*(4), 156.

Rahman, F., & Amir, P., & Tammasse. (2019). Trends in Reading Literary Fiction in Print and Cyber Media by Undergraduate Students of Hasanuddin University. *International Journal of Education and Practice, 7*(2), 66-77.

Santos, S., Amaral, I., & Simões, R. B. (2020). Hate speech in social media: perceptions and attitudes of higher education students in Portugal. *In INTED2020 Proceedings* (pp. 5681-5686). IATED.

Silva, L., Mondal, M., Correa, D., Benevenuto, F., & Weber, I. (2016). Analyzing the targets of hate in online social media. *In Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media* (Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 687-690).

Sudaryanto. (1993). Method dan teknik analysis bahasa. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.

Sukmawaty, Rahman, F. F., & Andini, C. (2022). Covid-19 Pandemic and Axiology of Communication: A Study of Linguistic Phenomena. *IJISRT, 7*(4), 1079-1087.

Ștefăniță, O., & Buf, D. M. (2021). Hate speech in social media and its effects on the LGBT community: A review of the current research. *Romanian Journal of Communication and Public Relations, 23*(1), 47-55.