Uncovering Alleged Hate Speech in Ahmad Dhani's Statements: A Forensic Linguistic Study

Harto Malik[1], Jefriyanto Saud[2]

[1,2] Universitas Negeri Gorontalo
Email: malik@ung.ac.id, jefri.saud@ung.ac.id

Abstract-This study delves into hate speech instances within social media statements by Ahmad Dhani Prasetyo (ADP) using forensic linguistic analysis. Leveraging advanced data mining techniques, relevant data was extracted from ADP's Twitter account. Through meticulous lexical, grammatical, and pragmatic analysis, expressions of hate speech and defamation within these online statements were identified and categorized. The significant findings offer a comprehensive understanding of hate speech's linguistic features in social media contexts, contributing to forensic linguistics and digital communication discourse. Moreover, practical insights are provided for drafting investigation reports and informing legal decisions and policies regarding online defamation. By emphasizing the importance of linguistic analysis in identifying and addressing hate speech, this research presents a methodological framework applicable to similar cases in the future. Ultimately, this study underscores the broader implications and relevance of linguistic analysis in combating hate speech in digital platforms, paving the way for future research directions and applications.

Keywords: Hate Speech, Forensic Linguistic Analysis, Social Media, Investigation Reports

I. INTRODUCTION

In the era of information dynamics and technological advancements, public figures like Ahmad Dhani Prasetyo (ADP) play a central role in shaping public perspectives and opinions. His involvement in the entertainment and political spheres of Indonesia often garners attention, particularly due to the controversial statements expressed through social media. In this context, the research focus on the potential hate speech in ADP's statements becomes crucial, as the rhetoric conveyed has the potential to trigger social tension. Therefore, to explore whether the language used by ADP can be categorized as hate speech or not, a thorough examination is required

using forensic linguistic methods. This is emphasized because the role of linguistics is increasingly significant in assisting with legal problem-solving in Indonesia. Forensic Linguistics is a multidisciplinary field that combines linguistic studies, law, and language analysis to investigate language usage in legal contexts. This field involves applying linguistic knowledge and techniques to assist in legal cases, such as analyzing language in written evidence or providing expert testimony on language-related issues (Ode & Huda, 2022) and (Warami, 2017).

Forensic Linguistics first emerged in the United Kingdom in the 1980s, while in Indonesia, its academic study is relatively new

and has not seen much development. As the most contemporary subdiscipline of applied linguistics, Forensic Linguistics integrates various other subdisciplines, including phonology, semantics, pragmatics, discourse, and psycholinguistics. Studies in the field of forensic linguistics offer significant opportunities for law enforcement. For instance, investigators rely on forensic linguistics to extract accurate data through interviews with suspects or alleged criminals. In the courtroom, this subdiscipline has proven to be an effective tool for assessing the credibility of witness testimony. In the era of information openness and communication, easy access through social media enables every individual to express their thoughts regarding surrounding phenomena. Although netizens' expressions are sometimes constructive and positive, many turn into hate speech against specific individuals. Therefore, the study of hate speech becomes an interesting focus within the scope of forensic linguistics.

In this context, this paper discusses linguistic data related to hate speech. This study is relevant given the increasing cases of hate speech, emphasizing the need for a profound understanding of the language structures involved in hate speech. Thus, this research aims to provide detailed insights into forensic linguistic studies in addressing this phenomenon by detailing relevant linguistic data. In 2017, Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia (POLRI) received 3,325 reports related to hate speech, marking a 44.99% increase compared to the previous year. Of this total, POLRI successfully resolved 2,801 cases. The most common type of hate speech was insults, reaching 1,657 cases, indicating a significant increase of 73.14% compared to 2016 (detik.com).

One of the most notable incidents that thrust Ahmad Dhani Prasetyo (ADP) into the spotlight involved his entanglement in a high-profile hate speech case, marking a pivotal moment in the Indonesian socio-political landscape. ADP, renowned as a prominent celebrity and musician, ventured into the political arena, albeit unsuccessfully in his bid for mayorship. However, it was his subsequent engagement in political discourse, particularly regarding the case of Basuki Cahaya Purnama (Ahok), that drew widespread attention. Ahok, the former governor of Jakarta, faced allegations of blasphemy, sparking fervent debates and polarizing opinions across the nation. ADP's involvement in this discourse took an unexpected

turn when he posted a series of controversial tweets through his personal Twitter account on February 7, 2017, March 6, 2017, and March 7, 2017 (Ramdhani, 2017). These tweets, suspected to contain hate speech related to the Ahok blasphemy case, not only intensified the media spotlight on ADP but also underscored the intricate challenges in addressing hate speech at the national level. By delving into ADP's specific involvement in such a significant and contentious issue within Indonesian politics, this study sheds light on the complexities surrounding hate speech and its implications, making it a vital contribution to understanding and combating this phenomenon in the Indonesian context.

Until now, there has been no specific research delving into the disclosure of alleged hate speech in ADP's statements using a forensic linguistic approach. Nevertheless, several previous studies have significant theoretical relevance to the focus of this research. (Nirwana, 2023) found indications of the use of taboo language such as "anjing" (dog), "anak lonte" (prostitute's child), and similar terms. Meanwhile, Irawan & Saptarini, (2021) applied lexical analysis, lexical semantics, and grammatical semantics to investigate hate speech. Another relevant study is by (Susanto & Nanda, 2020), identifying distinctive language analysis dimensions in forensic linguistics, involving comparative, differentiating, and measuring dimensions. (Zaman, 2022) also made a significant contribution in this context. Furthermore, (Khaer, n.d.) found that the use of the word "cillang" in the sentence "Oee Cillang, berhentiko! (Oi Cillang, shentikan!)" uttered by Risma could not be categorized as an insult. On the other hand, (Mualafina, 2016) and (Muhammad, 2020) found that the language used by Zaskia Gotik did not qualify to be classified as controversial speech. Although there is no direct research focus on ADP's statements, these findings provide relevant theoretical groundwork for understanding and analyzing forensic linguistic aspects related to hate speech.

A similar study focusing on hate speech has been conducted by Susanthi, (2021), who identified lexical denotation meanings through lexical semantic analysis, as well as phrase and sentence meanings through grammatical semantic analysis. These findings provide in-depth insights into the linguistic interpretation of hate speech. Additionally, (Kusno, 2021) discovered that language warfare can occur both directly and indirectly, attacking ideas, thoughts,

behaviors, honor, or physical conditions of an individual. Another study by (Permatasari, 2019) identified various forms of hate speech, including provocation, incitement, insult, defamation, slander, and the spreading of false news. (Halid, 2022) found indications of intentional criminal acts demonstrating hatred or insults towards others in public or through media. Wulandari (2022) investigated hate speech directed by Rocky Gerung towards Jokowi, involving forms of insult, defamation, incitement, provocation, and others. It is noteworthy that (Permatasari, 2019) found a variety of forms of hate speech, including provocation, incitement, insult, defamation, slander, and the spreading of false news. (S, 2021) concluded from the analysis of 22 netizen data that 15 statements could be considered valid as expressions of hate. Thus, these research results provide a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon of hate speech from various linguistic and online behavior perspectives.

Furthermore, extensive research has been conducted to explore the functions and roles of language in everyday life by several renowned researchers, including (Haryono at al., 2023); (Muta'allim et al., 2020); (Muta'allim et al., 2021); (Muta'allim et al., 2021); (Muta'allim at al., 2022); (Irsyadi et al., 2022); and (Yudistira et al., 2022). These studies delve into the aspects of the roles, functions, and contributions of language, particularly in understanding language within its context. The contexts considered encompass the environment of pesantren (Islamic boarding school), speech communities, language politeness, and language harmonization. Additionally, in-depth examinations of the functions and meanings of language related to culture have been undertaken by (Hairus Salikin et al., 2021); (Akhmad Sofyan et al., 2022); and (Yudistira, R., 2023).These studies intricately elucidate the roles and functions of language in providing profound meanings to interlocutors, tightly linked to the cultural context that surrounds it.

Moreover, studies investigating the role of language within the context of Islamic boarding schools (Pesantren), religious aspects, and the unique characteristics of pesantren life have been conducted by researchers such as (Sofyan, Badrudin, et al., 2022); (Irsyadi, 2023); (Sofyan, Firmansyah, et al., 2022); (Dumiyati et al., 2023); and (Julhadi et al., 2023). Subsequently, research on the roles and contributions of language in learning, language acquisition, and skill

development has been carried out by scholars such as (Merizawati & Munawir, n.d.); (Karuru et al., 2023); and (Suryanti et al., 2023). Drawing distinctions from prior research, this study not only varies in theoretical and methodological approaches but also distinguishes itself in terms of its examination of hate speech. Thus, it enables the identification and detection of expressions classified as hate speech. Positioned within the realm of forensic linguistics, this research represents a relatively new investigation in identifying or uncovering suspected hate speech in ADP's statements on social media through lexical semantic analysis, grammatical semantic analysis, and pragmatic analysis. Consequently, the researcher is keenly interested in exploring the expressions conveyed by ADP on social media. Stemming from this interest, the researcher formulates the problem: how do lexical semantic, grammatical semantic, and pragmatic perspectives view the expressions conveyed by ADP on his Twitter account? To address this problem, it is necessary to employ forensic linguistic analysis.

How do lexical semantic, grammatical semantic, and pragmatic perspectives view the expressions conveyed by ADP on his Twitter account? By posing this question, the study aims to delve into the intricacies of ADP's language use on social media, particularly focusing on how his statements are perceived and interpreted linguistically. This research not only seeks to identify and detect expressions classified as hate speech but also aims to provide insights into the underlying linguistic mechanisms and strategies employed by ADP in conveying his messages. Positioned within the realm of forensic linguistics, this study represents a novel inquiry into uncovering suspected hate speech in ADP's statements, offering a unique contribution to the existing body of literature on language and social media discourse. Through rigorous forensic linguistic analysis, the study endeavors to shed light on the linguistic nuances of ADP's communication on Twitter, thereby enriching our understanding of hate speech and its manifestations in the digital age.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW
1. Linguistics Forensics at Glance

Linguistics Forensics, as a branch of linguistic science, examines human life in the context of legal issues. McMenamin, as cited in Mahsun (2018), explains that this is a discipline that focuses on the analysis of linguistic crime

evidence to support law enforcement. The linguistic levels involved include acoustic phonetics, discourse analysis, and semantics, while also touching on pragmatic and psycholinguistic aspects. As a study of linguistic crime, forensic linguistics has common characteristics, namely: 1) having forensic parameters related to law and criminality in a linguistic context; 2) functioning as a surgical tool to solve problems involving language, law, and crime; 3) identified as a study of legal texts; 4) revealing linguistic crimes in a legal context; 5) uncovering legal pragmatism; and 6) serving as a pillar of reconciliation to resolve legal conflicts (Warami, 2017). Not only does forensic linguistics have common characteristics, but it also adheres to basic principles in analyzing legal-related texts.

In the study conducted by Gibson, as presented in (Warami, 2017), principles of forensic linguistics are outlined to ensure precision in analyzing legal texts. Some of these principles include: a) forensic linguistics as a fusion of the language and legal worlds, b) identification of legal texts through linguistic features, c) proving the alignment of linguistic features and legal aspects, d) utilizing language to facilitate the understanding of crime types, e) the crucial role of text and context in forensic linguistic actions, f) the influence of the sequence of criminal events on forensic linguistic identification, g) the importance of interaction types among parties in language crimes, and h) the role of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary speech acts in problem-solving.

The gap in the research lies in exploring more deeply the applications of forensic linguistics in different aspects of law and law enforcement, and how these methods can be adapted to other linguistic practices and discourse analysis to support the resolution of legal cases. While research has identified the general characteristics of forensic linguistics and its various applications, there is still room for further exploration of how specific forensic linguistic techniques can be applied in different legal cases, and how they can assist in the process of law enforcement and legal dispute resolution. In addition, there is a need to expand the understanding of how forensic linguistics can be a tool in providing evidence in court and how it can support speaker identification and language analysis in legal contexts. According to the research of (Susanto & Nanda, 2020), forensic linguistics is divided into three areas of study:

language in legal processes, language in legal products, and language as legal evidence. The first area of study focuses on the role of language in legal processes.

The study of law and legal issues has evolved into an intriguing field within the scope of forensic linguistics. Forensic linguistics is an applied branch of linguistics that explores the interaction between language, law, and crime. Referred to here as the study of legal text language, this field involves in-depth analysis of various types of legal documents. The study of legal text language includes the analysis of diverse types and forms of texts, such as linguistic documents produced by Parliament or legislative bodies, personal wills, assessments and court summonses, as well as the laws of other bodies, including unions and government departments. In her brief overview, Maite Correa outlines the contributions of Forensic Linguistics (FL) to the criminal justice system. Correa focuses her discussion on three interrelated aspects: (1) the role of language as a means of communication between law enforcement and suspects/witnesses, (2) legal language aspects such as issues of clarity, interpretation, and the construction of legal language, and (3) handling language crimes and linguistic evidence in the context of their use, validity, and reliability in the courtroom (Correa, 2013).

Forensic linguistic studies encompass various aspects, including (1) language and official document analysis, (2) understanding the language of law enforcement and police, (3) interactions in the courtroom, (4) interviewing children with witnesses in the legal system, (5) applying linguistic evidence and expert witness testimony in the courtroom, (6) tracing authorship attribution and plagiarism cases, and (7) exploring forensic phonetics and speaker identification. Within the framework of Forensic Linguistics, forensic linguists have the responsibility to uncover morphological meanings and phonetic similarities, syntactic complexity in official letters, lexical-grammatical ambiguities, lexical meanings, and pragmatic meanings (Coulthard, 2010). Semantics, as a linguistic discipline, explores the meanings of linguistic units, encompassing both lexical and grammatical meanings.

On the other hand, pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that investigates how linguistic units are used in the context of communication. While both address meaning, semantics focuses on contextually-based linguistic meanings,

whereas pragmatics emphasizes the speaker's intentions related to the context. Semantics studies meaning internally, related to literal meanings and detached from the situation, speaker, and listener. Meanwhile, pragmatics focuses on external meanings related to the speaker or language user. Thus, it can be concluded that semantics and pragmatics are complementary, mutually enhancing each other. Semantics views meaning as a dyadic relationship involving form and meaning, while pragmatics considers meaning as a triadic relationship encompassing form, meaning, and context.

2. Speech Acts and Hate Speech at Glance

Speech acts, or often referred to as speech actions, play a central role in pragmatics as speech acts become the primary unit of analysis. The classification of various types of speech acts is explained in this context, and according to Austin, there are three main types of speech acts, namely locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act (Chaer A. d., 1995). The locutionary act is a speech act used to state something. For example, *"kakinya dua, pohon punya daun"* (its legs are two, the tree has leaves). This speech act involves actions related to stating something, such as deciding, blessing, giving consent, and demanding. The illocutionary act is a speech act that not only functions to say or inform something but can also be used to perform something. For example, *"Saya bisa mengerjakan soal tersebut"* (I can solve that problem). This statement not only expresses an ability but also involves actions related to the values contained in the proposition. The perlocutionary act, as presented by Austin and Searle, involves actions performed by saying something to make others believe in something, urge others to do something, etc. This is the aspect of the perlocutionary speech act that includes influencing or impacting others.

The term 'hate speech' denotes prohibited actions that can be subject to criminal sanctions, as regulated in Article 310 *Kitab Undang-undang Hukum Pidana (KUHP)* and *Pasal 27 Ayat (3) Undang-undang No. 11* of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions. Circular Letter *(Surat Edaran)* KAPOLRI Number 6 of 2015 details various forms of 'hate speech' that can be considered criminal offenses, including (1) defamation, (2) defamation of character, (3) blasphemy, (4) unpleasant actions, (5) provocation, (6) incitement, and (7) spreading false news. Hate speech is a communicative act carried out by an individual or group, in the form of provocation, incitement, or insults directed at another individual or group, involving various aspects such as race, skin color, ethnicity, gender, disability, sexual orientation, citizenship, religion, and so forth (Wikipedia, 2018). This reflects an awareness of the importance of protecting individuals and groups from threats or hate-based discrimination in the realm of communication, both in the real world and in the virtual world.

In the legal context, 'hate speech' is interpreted as speech, behavior, writing, or performances that are prohibited because they can incite acts of violence and prejudice, both from the perpetrator of such statements and the victims of those actions. Websites that use or promote 'hate speech' are often referred to as Hate Sites, with many of these sites utilizing internet forums and news to reinforce specific perspectives. To date, there is no legal definition or understanding regarding what is referred to as 'hate speech' and defamation in the Indonesian language. In English, defamation is defined as defamation, libel, and slander, which, when translated into Indonesian, are fitnah (defamation), fitnah *lisan* (slander), and fitnah *tertulis* (libel). In the Indonesian language, there is no official term that distinguishes between these three words. It is essential to note that the distinction between 'hate speech' and defamation reflects complexity and requires an in-depth legal understanding within the context of Indonesian legislation. There might be a need for further efforts to formulate clear and specific legal definitions related to both concepts for consistent application within the Indonesian legal system.

R. Susilo explained that the term "insult" refers to "attacking someone's honor and reputation", typically causing the victim of hate speech to feel ashamed. According to him, there are six types of insults against individuals, as presented by (Ratiyu, 2011), including oral defamation *(smaad),* written defamation *(smaadschrift),* slander *(laster),* simple insult *(eenvoudige belediging)*, defamation accusation *(lasterlijke aanklacht),* and defamatory accusation *(lasterlijke verdachtmaking).* All forms of insult can only be legally pursued if there is a complaint from the affected individual, except when the insult is directed at a civil servant performing their duties legally. Articles that regulate hate speech against individuals can be found in Book I of KUHP Chapter XVI,

especially in Pasal 310, 311, 315, 317, and 318 of KUHP. Meanwhile, insult or defamation against the government, organizations, or specific groups is regulated in specific articles not explicitly mentioned in the context of this writing.

Here is a summary of the legal provisions related to insult and defamation in Indonesia, as regulated in *Kitab Undang-undang Hukum Pidana (KUHP):*

1. Insulting a Foreign Head of State
    *   *Pasal 142 KUHP.* Insulting a foreign head of state with the threat of punishment.
    *   *Pasal 143 KUHP.* Committing insult against a foreign head of state.
2. Insulting a Group of Inhabitants/Group/Organization
    *   *Pasal 156 KUHP.* Causing feelings of hostility or hatred towards a group of people.
    *   *Pasal 157 KUHP.* Engaging in actions that can lead to hostility or hatred among groups of people.
3. Insulting Religious Officials
    Pasal 177 KUHP. Defaming or tarnishing the good name of religious officials.
4. Insulting the Authorities in Indonesia
    *   *Pasal 207 KUHP.* Committing insult against the authorities in Indonesia.
    *   *Pasal 208 KUHP.* Causing feelings of hostility or hatred towards the authorities in Indonesia (Wikipedia, 2018).

It is important to note that the penalties and sanctions may vary depending on various factors, including context, available evidence, and legal procedures. The enforcement of laws related to hate speech and insults is a crucial aspect in maintaining a balance between freedom of expression and the protection of the rights of individuals and groups.

III. METHODS

This study employs a qualitative research design with a descriptive-analytical method, chosen to explore the linguistic aspects of hate speech in Ahmad Dhani's social media discourse. This method is well-suited for investigating complex phenomena like hate speech, especially in the dynamic realm of online communication. Qualitative methods offer the advantage of delving deeply into the meanings and contexts of language use, providing nuanced insights that quantitative approaches might overlook. By using descriptive-analytical methods, researchers can systematically analyze ADP's statements,

identifying linguistic patterns and underlying themes of hate speech. This allows for a thorough examination of ADP's rhetorical strategies and communicative intentions on social media.

The data utilized in this study consist of linguistic data containing suspected hate speech sourced from ADP's Twitter account. The selection process for identifying tweets suspected of containing hate speech involved several steps to ensure data relevance and validity. Researchers initially conducted a review of ADP's Twitter account to identify tweets with potentially inflammatory or discriminatory language. This screening process may have included searching for keywords or phrases commonly associated with hate speech. Subsequently, tweets meeting the initial criteria underwent further analysis to determine their eligibility for inclusion in the study. Selection criteria considered factors such as the clarity and intensity of language used, the context of the statements, and their potential impact on targeted individuals or groups. The importance of each tweet in reflecting ADP's communication patterns and the prevalence of hate speech within her social media discourse was also taken into account. Ultimately, three tweets suspected of being forms of hate speech, posted on February 7, 2017, March 6, 2017, and March 7, 2017, were selected for analysis.

The applied method is the free discourse observation method, wherein the researcher examines ADP's statements suspected of hate speech on social media. The research process commences with the selection of ADP statements potentially qualifying as hate speech. The data is then classified based on its type, covering the lexical meaning of words, phrase meanings, sentences, and discourse in alignment with the speaker's intention. Subsequently, the researcher verifies the data related to ADP statements potentially constituting hate speech. Following successful verification, linguistic data analysis is conducted using forensic linguistic theory, specifically focusing on lexical semantics, grammatical semantics, and pragmatic analysis. ADP's speech data is tabulated into tables and then interpreted to comprehend the meaning and context of suspected hate speech. Through this approach, the study aims to provide a profound understanding of the linguistic aspects of potential hate speech within ADP's statements on social media, enabling a comprehensive analysis of the potential hate speech.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Hate speech, as a phenomenon in public discourse, has increasingly garnered attention. Controversies surrounding hate speech often draw scrutiny due to their detrimental impacts and potential to incite social conflicts. In this context, public figures, including community leaders or celebrities, frequently become the primary focus concerning the potential spread of hate speech. This research aims to uncover suspected hate speech in ADP's statements through a forensic linguistic approach. ADP, as an influential figure in society, serves as the research subject for an in-depth analysis of linguistic elements that may reflect the presence of hate speech in their social media statements.

Through forensic linguistic analysis, this research explores the language structure, lexical meaning, grammatical semantics, and pragmatic analysis of ADP's statements. This approach is expected to provide deeper insights into the linguistic aspects of potential hate speech and contribute to understanding the context and impact that may arise from their statements. The results and discussion of this research are anticipated to offer a more comprehensive understanding of the hate speech phenomenon within the realm of forensic linguistics. Additionally, it aims to serve as an evaluation of public communication behavior that can impact the social dynamics of the community.

1. Result

The findings from the linguistic data analysis concerning defamation highlight significant discoveries, including an understanding of the lexical meaning of words, phrases, sentences, and discourse in alignment with the speaker's intentions. Through lexical semantic analysis, the denotative meanings of words are revealed, while grammatical semantic analysis identifies phrase, sentence, and discourse meanings consistent with the speaker's intent. Pragmatic analysis indicates illocutionary and perlocutionary expressive speech acts, both from the speaker and the interlocutor. Based on these analysis results, the statements can be categorized as expressions of criticism, defense, and hate speech. These findings serve as the basis for the preparation of an investigation report and decision-making regarding legal sanctions for the act of defamation. The three data categories in ADP's tweets suspected as hate speech are those uploaded on his Twitter account on February 7, 2017, March 6, 2017, and March 7, 2017, as outlined in the following table.

Table 1. ADP's Hate Speech

No	Social Media Platform	Utterances	Dates	Categories
1	Twitter/@Dhani Ahmad Prasetya (ADP)	*Yang menistakan Agama si Ahok...yg diadili KH.Makhruf Amin... ADP*	7 Februari 2017	Criticism Expression
2	Twitter/@Dhani Ahmad Prasetya (ADP)	*Siapa saja yang mendukung Penista Agama adalah Bajingan yang mukanya patut di ludahi... ADP*	6 Maret 2017	Hate Speech
3	Twitter/@Dhani Ahmad Prasetya (ADP)	*Sila Pertama KETUHANAN YME...PENISTA agama jadi Gubernur...Kalian WARAS?...ADP*	7 Maret 2017	Hate Speech

Source: detiknew.com

2. Discussion

Forensic linguistics, as a subdiscipline of linguistics, explores the relationship between language and law or legal aspects. This article delves into linguistic and legal aspects in the context of hate speech analysis. Through lexical semantics, grammatical semantics, and speech act analysis approaches, we present the results of the analysis of suspected hate speech conducted by ADP. Linguistic data from ADP takes center stage in this forensic linguistic study, particularly in the context of tweets uploaded to his Twitter account on February 7, 2017.

Figure 1. ADP's Criticism Expression

On February 7, 2017, ADP made a statement reflecting his disagreement with Ahok through the phrase *"Yang menistakan Agama si Ahok...yg diadili KH. Makhruf Amin"* (Those who blaspheme Ahok's religion...are judged by KH. Makhruf Amin). The expression *"Yang menistakan Agama si Ahok"* explicitly indicates ADP's criticism of Ahok, who, in his campaign as a candidate for the Governor of DKI Jakarta, is deemed to have insulted the contents of QS. Al-Maidah, a sacred text in Islam. In this context, ADP concludes that Ahok has committed blasphemy against the Islamic religion. Furthermore, ADP expresses criticism regarding the inconsistency or lack of clarity in the legal process, particularly in the case where Ahok, accused of blasphemy, did not undergo legal proceedings, while KH. Makhruf Amin, who was not involved in religious defamation, was judged and processed. ADP's analysis highlights the potential injustice or inequality in the handling of the cases. Thus, the statement *"Yang menistakan Agama si Ahok...yg diadili KH. Makhruf Amin"* does not qualify as hate speech but rather as a clear expression of criticism and a defense of religion. ADP's statement underscores the perceived unfair legal treatment and defends religious values against the alleged blasphemy committed by Ahok.

Figure 2. ADP's Hate Speech

The statement that *"siapa pun yang mendukung Penista Agama adalah bajingan yang patut di ludahi"* constitutes a form of hate speech. This expression creates a stigma against individuals who provide support to Ahok, who is considered to have blasphemed the content of QS. Al-Maidah. Although the term *"penista"* in the Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (KBBI 2018) dictionary has a lexical meaning and originates from the word *"nista"* meaning to consider as

contemptible or to criticize, in that context, the term *"penista"* has been transformed into a tool of political language or provocative language by ADP, with the aim of encouraging others to hate Ahok. Lexical analysis indicates that the term *"penista"* itself has not been explicitly categorized as hate speech, but in that context, it is considered as such because it is utilized as a political language strategy to incite hatred against Ahok, especially when he ran for Governor of Jakarta.

Besides, the statement *"siapa saja yang mendukung Penista Agama adalah bajingan"* is also a form of very sharp hate speech. From a grammatical-semantic perspective, the phrase *"adalah bajingan"* consists of the word "adalah" as an article referring to the individual being discussed, and the word *"bajingan"* as a disrespectful or derogatory term. According to the *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* (KBBI, 2012), the term *"bajingan"* itself is a coarse word and is suitable for insulting someone. Negative generalizations about a group of people based on their political views or support create an effort to generate disapproval and hatred against that group. Therefore, the phrase implies that anyone supporting Ahok, whether they are Muslim, non-Muslim, Muslim figures, or similar, is considered worthy of humiliation. The use of the word *"bajingan"* in this context expresses a highly negative moral judgment and can be seen as an attempt to denigrate all members or groups supporting Ahok.

Furthermore, the use of the phrase *"mukanya patut diludahi"* reflects a negative attitude towards every individual, whether Muslim or non-Muslim, public figure or not, who supports Ahok and is explicitly considered to blaspheme the content of QS. Al-Maidah. This statement condemns Ahok and his supporters with a sharp expression of insult, depicting them as individuals worthy of scorn. Beyond mere verbal criticism, it involves an element of physical hatred towards specific individuals or groups, creating a negative generalization against the entire group supporting the alleged blasphemer. The statement *"Siapapun yang mendukung penista agama adalah bajingan yang patut diludahi mukanya"* is an equivalent compound sentence consisting of two parts: (1) *"siapapun yang mendukung penista agama"* and (2) *"adalah bajingan yang patut diludahi mukanya"*. The term *"siapapun"* refers to all individuals who openly or silently support Basuki Cahaya Purnama in leading Jakarta. From

a Muslim perspective, supporting Ahok is considered an insult to Islamic teachings, and this is the reason behind this statement. Despite the use of the phrase *"diludahi mukanya"* involving insult, this statement has the potential to shape negative opinions and discriminatory behavior against groups with specific views or support, making constructive dialogue between different groups challenging. Therefore, it can be concluded that ADP exhibits traits unsupportive of democratic principles, prioritizing personal ego, lacking appreciation for differing opinions, and showing intolerance towards Ahok and his supporters.

Figure 3. ADP's Hate Speech

The sentence expressing the question, *"Sila Pertama KETUHANAN YME...PENISTA agama jadi Gubernur...Kalian WARAS?"* reflects a derogatory and mocking tone. Linguistic analysis of these words, using a lexical semantic approach that focuses on the independent meaning of words (Chaer A. , 2009). The sentence reveals the selection of key terms such as *"KETUHANAN YME"*, *"PENISTA"*, and *"WARAS"*. On March 7, 2017, in a Twitter post, ADP emphasized these three words with bold print and capital letters. This action places particular emphasis on the context of the case involving Basuki Cahaya Purnama (Ahok). Through this writing, ADP refers to the first principle of Pancasila, *"KETUHANAN YME"*, to affirm the viewpoint that Indonesia as a nation values the presence of God as an essential element, and therefore, leaders, including the Governor, are expected to follow the Islamic faith. Although ADP's statement is not yet fully categorized as hate speech, the highlighting of specific words indicates an emphasis on controversial issues related to the religious beliefs of leaders.

Furthermore, the statement *"PENISTA agama jadi Gubernur"*, is ADP's criticism to Ahok, whom he deems as a blasphemer of religion. ADP emphasizes that a leader (Governor) should not be considered a blasphemer of religion, as leadership requires

neutrality and protection of all religions and citizens without discrimination. However, in this context, ADP's statement goes beyond mere criticism and has the potential to be classified as hate speech. This is due to the fact that in the mentioned incident, Ahok, who did not align with ADP's views, emerged victorious, defeating the candidate supported by ADP. Thus, the phrase *"KETUHANAN YME...PENISTA agama jadi Gubernur"* can be categorized as hate speech. In this context, the question *"Kalian WARAS?"* (Are you sane?) posed by ADP indicates disdain and mockery towards Ahok's supporters, who have been labeled as *"PENISTA agama"*. ADP implies that Ahok's supporters lack wisdom or sound judgment.

This seems to be an attempt to diminish their dignity based on their political views or specific support. Although initiated by referencing the First Principle of Pancasila, *"Ketuhanan Yang Maha Esa"* ultimately, the delivery may create an impression of generalization or stereotyping, even though it does not explicitly convey sharp threats or hatred. Careful consideration of word choices and sentence structures is essential to foster an atmosphere that supports constructive dialogue and respects differences in opinions. From a pragmatic perspective, the hate speech expressed by ADP can be explained as an expressive illocutionary act. In this context, ADP expresses disappointment and anger towards blasphemy and its supporters. The expression of anger and disappointment is directed towards Ahok and his supporters, with the aim of urging and provoking the public to reject Ahok's candidacy for the governorship of DKI Jakarta due to allegations of religious blasphemy, especially against Islam, which could hurt the feelings of Muslim communities.

The expressive illocutionary act resulted in a perlocutionary action in the form of reporting allegations of hate speech committed by ADP. Jack Boyd Lapian reported this hate speech to the Criminal Investigation Agency of *Bareskrim Polri* (VIVA, 2018). ADP's expression on his Twitter account reflects disappointment regarding the religious blasphemy committed by Basuki Cahaya Purnama (Ahok), a national political figure. However, the religious issue is highly sensitive and has the potential to trigger horizontal conflicts in society. Friction arising from such blasphemy could lead to greater national divisions in the future. The second utterance discussed in this paper is *"Sila Pertama KETUHANAN YME...PENISTA agama jadi*

Gubernur...Kalian WARAS?". This statement is directed at followers and, broadly, the general public. In terms of grammatical semantics and context, this statement is provocative. Through this expression, ADP seeks to influence followers and the general public to question the behavior of Basuki Cahaya Purnama, which is perceived as insulting the Quran and committing religious blasphemy. Based on lexical-semantic, grammatical, and speech act theory analysis, ADP's statement can be categorized as hate speech.

This research makes a significant contribution with important implications for the general public and social media users. Its primary contribution lies in providing a deep understanding of hate speech, particularly in the context of ADP's statements. The study not only delineates the characteristics, language, and context of hate speech in the public domain but also contributes to the development and implementation of forensic linguistic methods in identifying and analyzing hate speech. Furthermore, this research serves as a foundation for further studies in the field of forensic linguistics in Indonesia.

The implications of this research extend to the legal domain, particularly concerning hate speech regulation in Indonesia, notably under the Information and Electronic Transactions Law (ITE Law). By identifying instances of hate speech in Ahmad Dhani's social media statements, this research provides valuable insights into potential legal violations and their consequences. In Indonesia, the ITE Law regulates electronic information and transactions, including provisions related to hate speech dissemination via digital platforms.

Individuals or public figures found guilty of engaging in hate speech, as identified through forensic linguistic analysis, may face various legal consequences under the ITE Law. These consequences can range from administrative sanctions to criminal charges, depending on the severity and impact of the hate speech. Administrative penalties may include warnings, fines, or temporary suspension of online accounts, while criminal charges could result in imprisonment or hefty fines.

Moreover, this research contributes to raising legal awareness in society regarding hate speech in electronic media and its implications under the ITE Law. By associating linguistic analysis findings with legal provisions, the study underscores the importance of adhering to legal boundaries in online communication, particularly concerning discriminatory or inflammatory language. Increased legal awareness can empower individuals to recognize and report instances of hate speech, fostering a culture of accountability and responsibility in digital discourse.

Effective enforcement of hate speech regulations, as stipulated in the ITE Law, is crucial for combating online bigotry and fostering a safe and inclusive online environment. Law enforcement agencies play a pivotal role in investigating reported cases of hate speech and taking appropriate legal action against offenders. Additionally, public awareness campaigns and educational initiatives can further enhance understanding of hate speech laws and promote responsible digital citizenship.

Moreover, this study has implications for the protection of the public and the promotion of tolerance. Through the exposure of hate speech, the research has the capacity to enhance public awareness of the dangers of intolerance and support efforts to protect groups or individuals vulnerable to hate speech. Lastly, this research stimulates discussions on the need for increased supervision of content on social media and online platforms. These discussions can lead to improvements in policies and regulations aimed at reducing the spread of hate speech in the digital environment. Thus, the research not only provides better insights into the identification and handling of hate speech but also has the potential to create a safer and more tolerant online environment through the implementation of its findings.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on forensic linguistic analysis of ADP's statements, it can be concluded that there are indications of hate speech in his communication. Phrases like *"Sila Pertama KETUHANAN YME...PENISTA agama jadi Gubernur...Kalian WARAS?"* and *"siapapun yang mendukung penista agama adalah bajingan yang patut diludahi mukanya"* demonstrate a sharp expression of insult and hatred towards individuals or specific groups. Forensic linguistic analysis highlights that ADP uses these phrases not only as verbal criticism but also as a tool to create a negative stigma against supporters of Basuki Cahaya Purnama (Ahok). The use of offensive words like *"bajingan"* and an invitation to spit on someone's face reflects a high intensity in expressing disagreement with certain

political views or support. These statements can be perceived as an attempt to degrade the dignity and incite hatred against the group supporting Ahok, especially by embracing the religious aspect. By associating support for Ahok with religious blasphemy, ADP creates the impression that anyone supporting Ahok deserves harsh treatment and mockery.

In this context, forensic linguistic analysis indicates the presence of elements that can be interpreted as hate speech in ADP's statements, raising concerns about the potential social impact of harsh rhetoric and limiting space for constructive dialogue among groups with different perspectives. Further research should not only focus on aspects of hate speech but also involve an analysis of the perceptions of the ADP supporter community regarding the controversial statements made by ADP on social media. This research could provide a deeper understanding of how ADP's supporters respond to and interpret these controversial statements, as well as how their views on the figure may remain steadfast or possibly change. Additionally, future studies could explore limitations or regulations on freedom of speech, particularly in the democratic context of a country like Indonesia. This research could examine the extent to which these limitations can be applied to protect society from hate speech without sacrificing fundamental rights to freedom of speech. Comparative analysis with other countries having similar regulations can also provide a broader contextual understanding. Emphasizing community perceptions and exploring regulations can contribute to a holistic understanding of the social, political, and legal impacts of controversial statements in the context of freedom of speech in the era of social media.

Further research is recommended to address hate speech in practice to reduce its adverse effects and encourage constructive dialog within society. One effective strategy is to implement educational initiatives that aim to promote tolerance, empathy, and respectful communication among individuals with diverse perspectives. This can be done by integrating modules on digital literacy and responsible use of social media into school curricula to equip individuals with the necessary skills to critically evaluate and respond to online content, including hate speech.

In addition, collaboration between social media platforms, government agencies, civil society organizations, and community leaders is crucial in developing and enforcing policies to effectively combat hate speech. Social media platforms can improve their content moderation algorithms to quickly identify and remove hateful content, while governments can enact laws that hold individuals who spread hate speech online accountable. In addition, investing in community-based programs that encourage intergroup dialogue and reconciliation can help build trust and understanding among different communities, thereby reducing the prevalence of hate speech.

Furthermore, media literacy campaigns and public awareness initiatives can empower individuals to recognize and challenge hate speech in their online and offline interactions. Encouraging bystander intervention and promoting positive online behavior can create a culture of solidarity and support, where individuals actively speak out against hate speech and support those who are targeted by it.

Additionally, encouraging an inclusive and pluralistic media environment that amplifies diverse voices and perspectives can counteract the spread of hate speech by providing alternative narratives and promoting mutual understanding. By promoting media ethics and journalistic integrity, the media can contribute to creating an environment conducive to respectful dialogue and cooperation.

REFERENCES

Akhmad Sofyan, Riantino Yudistira, Muta'allim, Fahmi Reza Alfani, & Abdul Azizul Ghaffar. (2022). The Analysis of Conversational Implicature between Students and Teachers at Al-Azhar Islamic Boarding School. RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa, 8(1), 65–72. https://doi.org/10.55637/jr.8.1.4042.65-72

Chaer, A. (2009). Pengantar Semantik Bahasa Indonesia. Bandung: Rineka Cipta.

Chaer, A. d. (1995). Sosiolinguistik Pengenalan Awal. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Correa, M. (2013). An Overview of Intersection and Interaction of Language and Law. Kalbotyra/Linguistics, 5.

Coulthard, M. d. (2010). An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics: Language in Evidence. New York: Rouledge.

David, M., & Pawley, M. (2006). The Use of Systematic Samples. March, 1–38.

Dumiyati, D., Musnandar, A., Julhadi, J., Na'im, Z., & Muta'allim, M. (2023). The Development of Islamic Education Curriculum on Building Religious Moderation at Manbaul Ulum Islamic Boarding School. Al-Wijdān Journal of Islamic Education Studies, 8(3), 359–381.

https://doi.org/10.58788/alwijdn.v8i3.2607

Hairus Salikin, Muta'allim, Fahmi Reza Alfani, Hosaini, & Hasan Sayfullah. (2021). Traditional Madurese Engagement Amids the Social Change of the Kangean Society. RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa, 7(1), 32–42. https://doi.org/10.22225/jr.7.1.2633.32-42

Halid, R. (2022). Tindak Tutur Pelaku Pecemaran Nama Baik di Media Sosial Kajian Linguistik Forensik. Kredo: Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa Dan Sastra, 5(2), 441–458. https://doi.org/10.24176/kredo.v5i2.6342

Haryono, A., Wibisono, B., Sofyan, A., & Muta'allim. (2023). The Use of Speech Levels by Madurese Students as Implementation of Politeness Principles in Islamic Boarding School in Bondowoso, East Java. Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University, 58(2), 93-104. DOI: https://doi.org/10.35741/issn.0258-2724.58.2.9

Henny Merizawati, Ahmad Munawir, Muta'allim, Syaadiah Arifin, & Zarkasi. (2023). Enhancing Students' Speaking Proficiency Through Storytelling Method at Education College of Togo Ambarsari Bondowoso. RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa, 9(3), 321-330. https://doi.org/10.55637/jr.9.3.8585.321-330

Irawan, Y & Saptarini, T. (2021). Dari Makna Leksikal hingga Makna Suprasegmental Dugaan Ujaran Pencemaran Nama Baik terhadap LSM dan Media. Konferensi Linguistik Tahunan Atma Jaya 19, 466.470.

Irsyadi, A. N., Fitriyah, N. M., Hanifiyah, F & Muta'allim (2022). Menakar Potensi Nilai Kearifan Lokal dalam Sastra Daerah. Haluan Sastra Budaya. Vol. 6 (2), 145–162. DOI: https://doi.org/10.20961/hsb.v6i2.61902

Irsyadi, A. N & Muta'allim. (2023). Teaching English for Tertiary Students in Pesantren: A Narrative Using Hybrid Learning. 08(02), 137–149.

Julhadi, J., Muta'allim, M., Fitri, R., Efendi, Z., & Yahya, M. (2023). Malay Culture-Based Local Content Curriculum in Islamic Education. Al-Hayat: Journal of Islamic Education, 7(2), 506. https://doi.org/10.35723/ajie.v7i2.433

Karuru, P., Muta'allim., Suparjo, Setiawan, A.F., Junaida, S. (2023). Improving Students' Higher Order Thinking Skills Through a Question and Answer Method. RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa, 9(3), 340–349. DOI: https://doi.org/10.55637/jr.9.3.8874.340-349

Khaer, F. (n.d.). Konteks Ujaran dalam Berita Acara Perkara Kasus Body Shaming di Pengadilan Negeri Makassar: Tinjauan Linguistik Forensik Abstract: The Context of Speech in the Minutes of Cases of Body Shaming at the Makassar District Court: A Forensic Linguistic Study. 90–97.

KBBI. (2012). Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia. May 10, 2018, retrieved from KBBI Daring: https://kbbi.web.id/bajing

Kusno, A. (2021). Redefinisi Kosakata terkait Perang Bahasa (Kajian Linguistik Forensik). Diglosia: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya, 4(3), 287–300. https://doi.org/10.30872/diglosia.v4i3.183

Mahardhani, A. J., Nawiruddin, N., Jalaluddin, J., Julhadi, J., & Muta'allim, M. (2023). The Kyai's Position in Rural Local Democracy Based on Patronage Politics at Tapal Kuda. Muslim Heritage, 8(1), 115–132. https://doi.org/10.21154/muslimheritage.v8i1.6004

Mahsun, M.S. (2018.) Linguistik Forensik: Memahami Forensik Berbasis Teks dengan Analogi DNA. Depok: Rajawali Pers.

Mualafina, R. Y. S. B. dan R. F. (2016). Kajian Linguistik Forensik: Kontroversi Tuturan Artis Zaskia Gotik dalam Kasus Penghinaan Lambang Negara. Seminar Linguistik Forensik, 1–15.

Muhammad, N. P. (2020). Penggunaan Bahasa Indonesia di Media Sosial yang Berdampak Hukum Berdasarkan Linguistik Forensik. Universitas Negeri Makasar, 1(1), 89–99.

Muta'allim., Alfani, F. R., Mahidin, L., Agustin, Y. D & Wicaksi, D (2021). Fungsi Adjektiva Komparatif dalam Bahasa Madura Dialek Kangean dan Dampaknya bagi Masyarakat Kangean: Kajian Pragmatik. Totobuang, 9(2), 257-271. DOI: https://doi.org/10.26499/ttbng.v9i2.299.

Muta'allim, Nawawi, Fahmi Reza Alfani, Abdul Azizul Ghaffar, & Ali Wafi. (2021). Codes Switching and Codes Mixing of Sellers and Buyers in Traditional Markets: Case Study of Market Kampong Asembagus Situbondo. RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa, 7(2), 121–129. https://doi.org/10.22225/jr.7.2.2627.121-129

Muta'allim., Sofyan, A., & Haryono, A. (2020). Superlative Adjectives of Kangean Dialect of Madurese Language: A Pragmatic Study (Adjektiva Superlatif Bahasa Madura Dialek Kangean: Sebuah Kajian Pragmatik). Leksema: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra, 5(1), 15–26. https://doi.org/10.22515/ljbs.v5i1.2057

Nirwana, S. (2023). Kajian Linguistik Forensik pada Bahasa Pemain Mobile Legends. Skripsi: Universitas Jember.

Ode, M. I., & Huda, N. (2022). Peran Linguistik Forensik terhadap Penegakan Hukum Indonesia: Studi Analisis Ujaran Kebencian Suku Lampung. Tadabbur: Jurnal Integrasi Keilmuan, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.15408/tadabbur.v1i1.27874

Permatasari, D. I. (2019). Tindak Tutur Ilokusi Ujaran Kebencian Facebook Tahun 2017-2019.

Ramdhani, J. (2017, Desember 1). Berita. May 7, 2018, retrieved from Detiknews: https://news.detik.com/berita/d-3751250/ini-3-cuitan-ahmad-dhani-yang-dipolisikan

Ratiyu, A. (2011). Ratiyu. May 10, 2018, retrieved from Ratiyu: http://ratiyu.blogspot.com/2011/04/defamation-dan-hate-speech-menurut.htm

Risqo, K. A. (2018, Maret 12). Berita. May 9, 2018, retrieved from Deriknews: https://news.detik.com/berita/3911521/soal-kasus-hate-speech-ahmad-dhani-saya-menikmati-saja

S, F. R. (2021). Ujaran Kebencian Netizen Indonesia dalam Kolom Komentar Instagram Selebgram Indonesia: Sebuah Kajian Linguistik Forensik. AKSARA: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra, 22(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.23960/aksara/v22i1.pp1-19

Sofyan, A., Badrudin, A., Fitriani, D. N., & Muta'allim, M. (2022). Types and Functions of Illocutionary Speech Acts on Inter-Character Dialogue in Tilik Short Films. Lingua: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra, 18(2), 148–156. https://doi.org/10.15294/lingua.v18i2.36163

Sofyan, A., Firmansyah, M. B., Muta'allim, Solissa, E. M., & Rosikh, F. (2022). Islamic Boarding School Linguistic Landscape in the Development of Arabic Language Skills and Islamic Knowledge. International Journal of Educational Research & Social Sciences, 3(6), 2178–2185.

Suryanti, Jefriyanto Saud, Azhariah Rachman, Susanto, & Amiruddin. (2023). Semantic Language Skills in 2-Year-Old Children: A Case Study of Universal Substantive Acquisition at Kampung Baru. RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa, 9(2), 203–210. https://doi.org/10.55637/jr.9.2.7723.203-210

Susanthi, I. (2021). Analisis Pencemaran Nama Baik dengan Kajian Linguistik Forensik. IJFL (International Journal of Forensic Linguistic, 2(1), 1–3.

Susanto, S., & Nanda, D. S. (2020). Dimensi Analisis Bahasa dalam Linguistik Forensik. IJFL (International Journal of Forensic Linguistic), 1(1), 17–22.

VIVA, T. (2018, Januari 5). Gosip. May 10, 2018, retrieved from VIVA: https://www.viva.co.id/showbiz/gosip/993949-pelapor-kasus-ujaran-kebencian-ahmad-nbsp-dhani-nbsp-tolak-berdamai

Warami, H. (2017). Linguistik Forensik dalam UU Otsus Papua. Kibas Cenderawasih, 14(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26499/kc.v14i1.114

Wikipedia. (2018, Februari 15). Baca. May 10, 2018, retrieved from Wikipedia: https://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ucapan_kebencian

Yudistira, R., & Muta'allim. (2023). Code Mixing as An Anti-Political Indiscretion among Farm Laborers at Ajung, Kalisat, Jember. Lingua, 18(1), 25–35.

Yudistira, R., Muta'allim, M., Nurcaya, N., Julhadi, J., & Pattiasina, P. P. J. (2022). The Role of Linguistics and Local Wisdom on Knowing Harmony Between Religions at Tana Toraja. Muslim Heritage, 7(2), 409–431. https://doi.org/10.21154/muslimheritage.v7i2.5023

Zaman, S. (2022). Prosiding Seminar Nasional Linguistik dan Sastra (Semantiks) Karakterisasi Ujaran Negatif Berdampak Hukum di Indonesia: Kajian Linguistik Forensik (Characterization of Negative Speech with Legal Impact in Indonesia: Forensic Linguistic Study). 4, 423–435.