CHARACTERIZATION OF JAVANESE HATE SPEECH WITH LEGAL IMPACT: A FORENSIC LINGUISTIC STUDY

First Author [1]Trismanto
e-mail: [1]trismanto@untagsmg.ac.id
*Affiliation [1]***University of 17 Agustus 1945 Semarang**

ABSTRACT

This study aims to identify and analyze the characteristics of hate speech in Javanese speech using a forensic linguistic approach. The research method is descriptive qualitative with 4 case data of alleged Javanese hate speech. Based on the analysis of the structure, meaning, and context of language use, it is found that there is a use of words with negative and insulting meanings. These utterances not only serve as a communication tool but also as a means to attack and defame someone, which can have a detrimental impact socially and reputationally. The results of this study are expected to provide a deeper understanding of the dynamics of hate speech in Javanese and its contribution to discriminatory treatment and social injustice in society.

Keywords: Forensic linguistics, Hate Speech, Javanese Language

INTRODUCTION

Hate speech has become a global issue and occurs in all countries in the world, without exception in Indonesia. Indonesia is no exception. The cases of hate speech that occur in Indonesia are very diverse, including defamation, harassment, slander, provocation and threats against individuals or groups. One case that has been in the public spotlight is the hate speech case involving the former Governor of DKI Jakarta, Basuki Tjahaja Purnama. He was accused of insulting the Qur'an while campaigning for the DKI Jakarta Governor election (Wijaya, 2017). His campaign speech eventually brought him to court and he was sentenced to two years in prison on blasphemy charges.

The legal problems that are often encountered in relation to hate speech are related to

to the delivery of information and communication, which of course is conveyed by language. Language as a communication tool has an important role in shaping and reflecting the culture and values in society.

Hate speech cases generally use speech as the main evidence and become an important component in the trial and one of the determining factors for the judge in giving a verdict of guilt or innocence of a defendant (Lagorgette, 2011). And to understand the utterance belongs to the category of hate speech, forensic linguistics is needed. According to Turrell (Mintowati, 2016) forensic linguistics is a linguistic subdiscipline that studies linguistics and law or linguistics and legal issues. Likewise, the opinion expressed by Olsson (2004) that forensic linguistics is the application of linguistics in the field of law. The application of forensic linguistics has a lot to do with language as legal evidence (Saputro, 2019, p. 12). The application of forensic linguistics is very useful in helping analyze language cases as legal evidence.

Forensic linguistics covers a wide area. The study of forensic linguistics also involves various linguistic disciplines, one of which is pragmatics and semantics. To describe the true meaning of an utterance, it is necessary to study the meaning and situation of the utterance, which linguistically is studied in pragmatics. Pragmatics is a linguistic science that examines the meaning of language in a word situation. One word that has the same semantic meaning does not necessarily have the same meaning if it is spoken in different word situations. In relation to the word situation, Leech (2019) explains that the word situation includes the following elements: speakers and speakers, the context of an utterance, the purpose of an utterance, the utterance as a form of action or activity (speech act), and the utterance as a product of verbal action. Pragmatic analysis is used in the analysis of speech or language in use.

In relation to this research, pragmatic analysis is used to analyze utterances/texts that contain hate speech, defamation, slander, and false news. Another discipline that is quite widely used in forensic linguistic analysis is semantics. Semantics as the study of meaning which includes lexical, grammatical, syntactical, and intent semantics is very helpful in forensic linguistic analysis. Chaer (2009) explains that lexical semantics is a branch of semantics that examines the meaning of words independently, without linking the position of words in sentences. Semantic analysis helps linguists find the meaning of words that are sometimes ambiguous. Lexical word meanings can become grammatical meanings and even deeper into meanings that have certain connotations

or metaphors. Generic meanings that become ambiguous can be analyzed into specific meanings that have clear descriptions and references.

Many studies on hate speech cases have been conducted including Siregar et al (2021) exploring the role of pragmatics in forensic linguistics and finding that the characteristics of hate speech include negative word choice, dehumanization, and "us vs them" language. Hadiansah et al (2021) examined hate speech through a semantic lens, using the Surabaya riots as a case study, and highlighted factors such as content, context, intention, target, and effect. Meanwhile, Leny (2021) investigated ethnic-based hate speech using critical discourse analysis, sociopragmatics, and semiotics, concluding that hate speech can trigger communal conflict and emphasizing the urgency of swift legal action.

In particular, the disclosure of cases using language as legal evidence faces problems and challenges related to the diversity of ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup (Musfiroh, 2014, pp. 82-83). One of them is the problem is dialect. Dialect is important evidence that a perpetrator comes from certain circles or just class camouflage. Furthermore, differences in social class interpretations of the text. It is possible for the same text to have different meanings when interpreted by other people.

The three studies above show that linguistic analysis can be used to explain the meaning of an utterance in cases that make language the center of the problem in court. The objectives of the three studies are relevant to the objectives that the author is trying to raise, namely how forensic linguistics can help the judicial process in explaining the reasons why and what characteristics of an utterance including Javanese utterances are called hate speech.

METHODOLOGY

This research uses descriptive qualitative research methods using 4 data sources, namely conversation documents as evidence of alleged hate speech cases at Jepara Police Station (2018), Semarang Police Station (2018), Pati Police Station (2023) and Blora Police Station (2024). The data collection technique used the documentation method, listening, and continued with the note-taking technique (Jamshed, 2014). The documentation method was carried out by making copies of language use document data as evidence handled by linguists from the University of 17 August 1945

Semarang. The listening technique was carried out by reading carefully and carefully the data of language use documents as evidence to be identified and grouped which were then analyzed with a forensic linguistic analysis approach. Furthermore, the research data was recorded on the data card that had been prepared. Data analysis of language use documents in the SL (Reported) case was carried out by content analysis. The author analyzes the data by referring to the characteristics of hate speech and classified based on diction that is considered negative or triggers conflict. The results of the analysis conducted by the author are in the form of characteristics of speech that contain hate speech and explain the characteristics of words that signify hatred.

DISCUSSION

Characteristics of Speech Containing Hate Speech

1. Word Selection with Negative Meanings

Forensic linguistics is a branch of linguistics used for the analysis of language in a legal context. This analysis involves examining the structure, meaning, and use of language to determine the intention, interpretation, and impact of a particular utterance.

In the first data sentence "Mbah Naryo iku usahae **bodong** kabeh", (Polres Jepara, 2018), syntactically consists of the subject is Mbah Naryo and the predicate is iku usahae bodong kabeh. Semantically, this sentence contains an accusation that all businesses owned by "Mbah Naryo" are fake or illegitimate ("bodong"). The word "bodong" in this context has a strong negative connotation, implying deception or dishonesty. Furthermore, from a pragmatic point of view, this sentence is most likely uttered with the aim of denigrating Mbah Naryo's reputation and credibility. The context of use, such as the social situation and the relationship between the speaker and the listener, can reinforce the negative intention of this utterance.

The sentence "Mbah Naryo iku usahae bodong kabeh" can be categorized as hate speech. This is due to the direct accusation that is demeaning and has the potential to cause harm to Mbah Naryo. The main characteristics of this utterance are the use of language with negative connotations, and the potential for harmful effects.

2. Humaliation

Then in the second data

Bayar kelon, iyo, payah Yon, Santri tobat lah Yon, mumpung ijeh ono waktu, percuma sampeyan dadi pimpinan Wakiah, opo gunane Wakiah wong kelakuane koyok ngono, ya? ra ono gunane sampeyan ki"(Polrestabes Semarang, 2018)

Semantically, the phrase "Bayar Kelon" means "to pay for kelon," which can literally be interpreted as paying to cuddle. However, in many contexts, especially in Javanese culture, the term often has a more vulgar connotation or refers to inappropriate sexual behavior. The term carries the implication that the individual concerned is engaged in immoral or unethical acts, which are against social and religious norms.

Pragmatically, the use of the term "pay kelon" in this conversation shows an attempt to demean the character of someone who has a religious or moral status, in this case a santri. Santri are individuals who are generally respected for their religious knowledge and practices. This speech seems intended to tarnish Yon's reputation by accusing him of engaging in actions that are incompatible with his roles and responsibilities as a santri. A santri is expected to adhere to high ethical and moral norms, and to be a role model in their community. Accusations such as "pay kelon" can damage the community's reputation and trust in the individual. The accusation is not only personally insulting but also calls into question Yon's integrity and morality as a religious leader, which can result in social isolation, loss of honor, and other negative impacts within the santri community.

In conclusion, the use of the term "pay kelon" in the context of calling a santri is a form of negative speech that has the potential to become hate speech. This is because the accusation directly damages the reputation, defames, and questions the morality of the accused individual. The main characteristics of this speech include the use of insulting language, negative connotations, and a detrimental impact on the social and religious position of the individual.

In the third data

The sentences "Tedake Maling, Yo Maling" and "Wong Nek Kulino Maling, Marai Kulino Maling" have the following discussion:

In the sentence "Tedake Maling, Yo Maling" syntactically, it consists of a hidden Subject: "Tedak e" (his son) and Predicate: "yo maling" (the thief). Overall, this sentence contains the statement that the son of a thief is also a thief. The sentence structure is quite simple but full of meaning.

Semantically, this sentence means that a person inherits or repeats negative behavior from their parents, in this case, stealing behavior. The term "maling" has a very negative connotation, referring to a clear and widely recognized criminal act in society. From a pragmatic point of view, this utterance is most likely said with the intention to criticize or insult someone based on their family behavior or reputation. It implies that a negative trait or action is something inherited and unchangeable, which can negatively affect the individual mentioned.

This sentence clearly contains the insult of accusing someone of being a thief simply because of their family relationship. The intention is to demean the individual mentioned, assuming that they have a criminal nature. It may affect society's perception of the individual, which may lead to discrimination or unfair treatment.

The characteristic of Hate Speech in this sentence is that "maling" is used to insult an individual by accusing him/her of committing a criminal act and clearly has a derogatory and defamatory meaning. This speech seems to be intended to damage the individual's reputation based on his family background so that it can cause the individual mentioned to be treated with prejudice by the community.

Based on the analysis above, it can be concluded that the sentence "Tedake Maling, Yo Maling" can be categorized as hate speech. This is due to the direct accusation that is demeaning and has the potential to cause social harm to the individual mentioned. The main characteristics of this speech are the use of derogatory language, negative connotations, and the potential for social and reputational harm.

Then in the data "Wong Nek Kulino Maling, Marai Kulino Maling"

Syntactically, the sentence "Wong Nek Kulino Maling, Marai Kulino Maling" consists of: Subject: "Wong" (person), Conditional: "Nek Kulino Maling" (if used to stealing), Predicate: "Marai Kulino Maling" (will become accustomed to stealing). This sentence has a structure that states a cause-and-effect relationship: if someone gets used to stealing, then they will continue to steal. Semantically, this sentence states that the habit of stealing will cause someone to continue stealing. The word "maling" has a very negative connotation, referring to criminal acts. From a pragmatic point of view, this utterance is most likely used to give a moral judgment or criticism of a person or group of people who are considered to have a habit of stealing. It can be considered a generalization that singles out a particular individual or group. This sentence contains contempt by stating that a person's habit of stealing will continue. In addition, there is

also an intention to demean individuals who are considered to be stealing. This speech can affect people's perception of the individual or group mentioned, potentially leading to discrimination or unfair treatment.

The characteristic of hate speech in this sentence is that it is implicitly insulting by stating that bad habits will continue, the connotation of "maling" or thief is very negative and criminal. This speech appears to be intended to tarnish the reputation of the accused person and may cause the individual or group mentioned to be viewed negatively by society.

Based on forensic linguistic analysis, the sentence "Wong Nek Kulino Maling, Marai Kulino Maling" can be categorized as hate speech. This is due to the negative generalization that is demeaning and has the potential to cause adverse social impact to the individual or group mentioned. The main characteristics of this speech are the use of derogatory language, negative connotations, and potential adverse social and reputational impacts.

In the fourth data point

Han, Jare Koe Tuku Walang Ambeg Putri "Orak Mbug Bayar", Ojo Ngisin Ngisin Wong Koe!"

Semantically "Orak Mbug Bayar" is an accusation, it implies that someone did not pay for something they bought, in this case "walang ambeg putri" (grasshopper to princess). Not paying is an act that is considered unethical or cheating, which carries a negative connotation. Pragmatically, this sentence is most likely uttered in a conversational context where the speaker is criticizing or accusing the other person, in this case Han, for not paying for something he bought. The utterance aims to humiliate or discredit Han by accusing him of not paying, which is an action that is considered negative in society.

Based on forensic linguistic analysis, the phrase "Orak Mbug Bayar" in the sentence can be categorized as hate speech. This is because the direct accusation is demeaning and has the potential to cause adverse social impact to Han. The main characteristics of this speech are the use of derogatory language, negative connotations, and potential adverse social and reputational impacts.

CONCLUSION

Based on the forensic linguistic analysis of various utterances in Javanese, some key characteristics of hate speech can be identified. First, hate speech often contains direct derogatory accusations, such as accusations of non-payment or stealing. These accusations carry strong negative connotations, which damage the reputation and integrity of the accused individual. Second, hate speech is usually delivered with the intention to humiliate or discredit a particular individual or group, often by implying that such negative behavior is part of their character or habit. Third, the impact of hate speech can be socially detrimental for the accused individual, as it can influence the perceptions of others and lead to social isolation or discriminatory treatment. Overall, hate speech in this context is characterized by the use of insulting and demeaning language, and has the potential to cause significant and adverse social impact to the targeted individuals..

REFERENCES

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire] ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Coulthard, R.M. 1998. *Forensic Linguistics. The International Journal of Speech, Language, and Law.*, 5. p.35-37 cited. 18th of April 2013. Available in: *www.questia.com/Journals*

Chaer, Abdul. 2009. *Pengantar Semantik Bahasa Indonesia*. Bandung: Rineka Cipta

Jamshed, S. (2014). *Qualitative research method-interviewing and observation*. Journal of Basic and Clinical Pharmacy, 5(4), 87

Leech, G. 2019. *Prinsip-Prinsip Pragmatik*. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia.

Lagorgette, D. (2011). *Pragmatics in the courtroom: Violent speech acts, law, and the linguist in France. Pragmatics and Society*, 2(2), 187–204. https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.2.2.04lag.

Mintowati, M. (2016). *Pencemaran Nama Baik: Kajian Linguistik Forensik*. Paramasastra, Volume 3.

Musfiroh, T. (2014). *Linguistik Forensik dalam Masyarakat Multikultur. In Bahasa dan Sastra dalam Perpespektif Ekologi dan Multikulturalisme* (Cetakan I, pp. 75--86). Yogyakarta: Jurusan bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni UNY.

Olsson, J. (2008). *Forensic Linguistics: Second Edition*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Peteda, Mansoer. (1986). *Semantik Leksikal*. Ende-Flores: Nusa Indah.

Saputro, G. (2019). *Studi Kasus Linguistik Forensik: Hoaks Rekaman Suara yang Diduga Gatot Nurmantyo*. Diksi: Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya, Volume 27.