



The Evaluation of Alleged Defamation: A Forensic Linguistics Analysis

Dhion Meitreya Vidhiasi (*Corresponding Author*)

dhionmeitreya@upi.edu

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia

Aceng Ruhendi Saifullah

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia

acengruhendisaifullah@upi.edu

Andika Dutha Bachari

andika@upi.edu

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia

Abstract: Defamation remains a prevalent occurrence on a global scale. In Indonesia, the fervor surrounding the outcomes of the 2014 presidential election contestation has led to a noticeable escalation in the level of fanaticism among supporters of the respective presidential and vice-presidential candidates. Frequently, the act of posting tweets on the social media platform Twitter can result in the author becoming entangled in a legal dispute pertaining to defamation. The objective of this research is to investigate the potential occurrence of defamation committed by Natalius Pigai, the former National Human Rights Commission (Komnas HAM) member. The analytical framework employed in this study to assess the linguistic techniques employed in the data, with the aim of identifying potential instances of defamation, was Appraisal Theory as proposed by Martin and White (2005). The data was extracted from a Twitter post authored by Natalius Pigai (@NataliusPigai2) on October 1, 2021. The findings indicated that Jokowi and Ganjar were subjected to poor evaluation in relation to their treatment of the Papuan population. The presence of this adverse evaluation also gives rise to the possibility of defamation in accordance with the provisions outlined in the Criminal Code and the ITE Law. The presence of credible factual evidence supports the assertion that Natalius Pigai's tweet can be classified as hate speech, which has the potential to result in defamation. The findings derived from this study could potentially facilitate the application of law enforcement strategies in the Indonesian police investigation, as well as in other nations that are undertaking comparable reforms to those observed in Indonesia.

Keywords: *Appraisal system; criminal code; forensic linguistics; defamation; twitter.*

Article Info:

Received: 6 March 2023

Accepted: 25 August 2023

Published: 31 August 2023

How to cite:

Vidhiasi. D. M., Saifullah. A.R., & Bachari. A. D. (2023). The Evaluation of Alleged Defamation: A Forensic Linguistics Analysis. *Al-Lisan: Jurnal Bahasa (e-Journal)*, 8(2), 139–153.

<https://doi.org/10.30603/al.v8i2.3482>



A. INTRODUCTION

The use of technology is favored by a significant number of individuals; nonetheless, the absence of specific limitations gives rise to numerous concerns. The increasing prevalence of cybercrime is giving birth to a multitude of challenges. The government plays a crucial role in facilitating technological progress by establishing a legal framework and enacting regulations that ensure the responsible implementation of technology, taking into account prevailing social norms. According to Wiraprastya & Nurmawati (2016), an act that violates the law and diminishes an individual's self-esteem and dignity, hence causing offense to them or a group, can be classified as defamatory. The criminal offense of defamation may also be denoted as the intention to humiliate as stipulated by the Criminal Code. Simultaneously, in alternative contexts, the act of insult necessitates the attribution of an action to an individual with the deliberate aim that these allegations become widely known.

According to Agustini & Parwata (2021), it can be argued that statements that allege wrongdoing can be classified as assaults on an individual's dignity and standing, both in an objective and subjective manner. Provision 27, paragraph (3) of Law-No. 19 of 2016 on Electronic Information and Transactions ([Undang-undang No. 19 Tahun 2016](#)) centers its attention on the subject of "defamation material" within the context of criminal offenses related to cybercrime utilizing electronic media. The Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law) holds significant importance in the context of utilizing electronic media, particularly social media platforms. The examination of ethics in the use of social media is an ongoing endeavor aimed at preventing deviation and harm to others, notwithstanding the virtual nature of the platform ([Adhi & Nurmawati, 2016](#)). Legal comprehension is crucial in Indonesia, a country that boasts the highest levels of internet and social media utilization worldwide, in order to prevent criminal activities.

The subject of defamation has been studied from a language standpoint in the past ([Algburi & Igaab, 2021](#); [Askurny & Syihabuddin, 2022](#); [Douglas, 2021](#); [Kniffka, 2007](#)). Using a German legal viewpoint, Kniffka (2007) examined a defamation case and demonstrated that discourse analysis might be utilized to analyze defamatory interpretations in a linguistic setting. Defamation may be analyzed using twelve linguistics examples, including grammatical referring, speech actions, transmitted meaning and intentionality, malicious language, and discourse structure and framing.

The study undertaken by Algburi & Igaab (2021) centers on instances of defamation that were communicated in both English and Arabic through various news items. The researchers adopt a pragmatic theoretical framework, particularly emphasizing the analysis of speech acts.



It has been suggested that English and Arabic exhibit pragmatic parallels with regard to the phenomenon of defamation. Nonetheless, it is argued that cultural disparities significantly contribute to the occurrence of defamation offenses. Consistent with the findings of Algburi and Igaab, the study conducted by Askurny & Syihabuddin (2022) also adopts a pragmatic perspective, complemented by a semantic framework, in their investigation. The distinction lies in their endeavor to provide education to junior high school children regarding reading materials that possess the capacity to defame individuals.

Defamatory acts have the potential to significantly impact the reputation of individuals belonging to both the common populace and esteemed figures such as politicians. The subject of investigation in Douglas (2021) research is centered around this particular aspect. According to his statement, reputation is a complex and multifaceted notion that is at the core of defamation legislation. The significance of an individual's reputation is intricately linked to their sense of honor, dignity, and social standing. The defamation laws in Australia serve to safeguard the intrinsic worth of an individual's stake in their reputation by establishing that the act of disseminating content that impairs one's reputation is subject to legal action.

Haryanto & Arimi (2022) stated that negative remarks against another person might be considered defamation. Defamation is a legal term that refers to any false, misleading, or untrue remarks made with the goal of harming another person's reputation. Defamation is a term commonly used to describe the act of disseminating false information that have a detrimental impact on the reputation of a person or entity. Within the realm of cyberspace, defamation manifests itself in several ways, encompassing the dissemination of fabricated allegations, the propagation of hostile rumors, and the dissemination of false assertions concerning an individual through social media platforms or other digital avenues. Cyber defamation encompasses both deliberate and inadvertent acts, affecting both individuals and entities (Khan et al., 2023).

Affect, judgment, and appreciation are three types of attitudes. Affect refers to the feelings felt by an assessment subject (internally) expressed through verbal phrases (Martin & White, 2005). As a general rule, a judgment is based on comparing the assessment subject to the object of evaluation, which is typically a human being, using a benchmark of values prevalent in society (social sanctions). Non-human objects can be valued for their aesthetic qualities via appreciating them. It is possible to link this evaluation to a person's emotional response to a certain item, both actual and abstract. An evaluation object's quality might also be a factor in the assessment.



The concept of engagement pertains to the dynamic interplay between the evaluator, who may be a speaker or writer, and the recipient of the evaluation, who may be a speech partner or reader. This interaction is closely tied to the issue under evaluation, as discussed by Hermawan et al. (2021). Within the realm of interaction, speech is commonly categorized into two distinct forms: monoglossic and heteroglossic. The distinction between the two is predicated upon the inclusion or exclusion of perspectives from external entities, specifically interlocutors or readers, who play a role in the assessment procedure. Monoglossic speech refers to a form of communication where just one perspective or viewpoint is expressed, without including the opinions or perspectives of other parties. In this type of speech, the participants are assumed to share the same viewpoint, therefore aligning their perspectives on the subject matter being discussed. In the context of discourse analysis, a speech can be categorized as heteroglossic if it incorporates diverse perspectives or opinions. This form of discourse pertains to, contemplates, and/or navigates prevailing perspectives while simultaneously anticipating alternative perspectives that may arise through evaluative counterparts.

Graduation is the third part of the assessment evaluation methodology. Graduation is based on the strength (amplification) or attenuation of the evaluations that have been conducted during the process (Hood, 2010; Tokunaga, 2010). There is a volume knob on top of graduation, which students turn right and left to adjust their performance rating.

The present study aims to consolidate the findings of several studies that have been referenced in the realm of social media, with a particular emphasis on Twitter. The Appraisal System developed by Martin and White was utilized in this study. The utilization of the Appraisal System theory technique for assessing speeches with defamatory potential has not been extensively employed. Speech act theory is frequently employed by numerous scholars to analyze the specific category of speech that is generated. The primary aim of this research is to assess the purported defamation in Natalius Pigai's tweet, with the intention of providing insights applicable to law enforcement practices in other nations.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

Qualitative descriptive is employed within this study. Qualitative study considers human thought and behaviour in social context and covers a wide range of phenomena in order to understand and appreciate them thoroughly (Daniel, 2016). Inductive reasoning in qualitative research, based on constructivism, is more relevant to develop theories or models.



Theoretically, this approach, when conducted with phenomena rebuilding is able to acquire a fresh value and explicit understanding of the phenomena (Park et al., 2020).

The data utilized in this study was extracted from a Twitter account belonging to Natalius Pigai (@NataliusPigai2) on October 1, 2021. Natalius Pigai, a well-known activist, has previously served as a member of the National Human Rights Commission (Komnas HAM). The selection of Natalius Pigai's account was based on the individual's frequent expression of critical remarks, which possess the capacity to detrimentally impact the reputation of notable figures, particularly President Joko Widodo of the Republic of Indonesia.

The researchers have conducted observations on the Twitter account with the handle @NataliusPigai2. The selection of the tweet dated October 1, 2021 was based on its explicit reference to two prominent individuals who have held the esteemed positions of President of the Republic of Indonesia and Governor of Central Java. Furthermore, the selection of the tweet on October 1, 2021 was influenced by several factors, including the presence of a narrative grounded in subjective conjectures that resulted in allegations, as well as the amplification of this tweet's significance through its coverage in the national media.

The researcher subsequently performed an analysis utilizing the Appraisal System theory. The Appraisal System is employed as a means to analyze speeches that possess the capacity to slander. This idea is utilized through the categorization of every clause into three distinct sub-systems, namely Attitude, Engagement, and Graduation. Once the data in the tweet is categorized, it is next analyzed by examining the connections among evolving political, social, and cultural dynamics.

C. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings



Figure. 1 Natalius Pigai Tweets



Jgn (Jangan-negation) percaya (affect) org (orang) Jawa Tengah Jokowi & Ganjar. Mrk (mereka) merampok (judgment-negative) kekayaan kita (rakyat Papua), injak2 (injak-injak – judgment-negative) harga diri bangsa Papua dengan kata2 (kata-kata) rendahan (judgment-negative) Rasis (judgment-negative), monyet (judgment-negative) & sampah (judgment-negative). Kami bukan (negation) rendahan (judgment-negative). Kita lawan ketidakadilan (judgment-negative) sampai titik darah penghabisan. Sy (Saya-Pigai) Penentang Ketidakadilan (judgment-negative)

Table 1. Appraisal Systems found in the data

No	Type	Sub-Type	Σ	%
1	Atitude	Affect	1	8.3
		Judgment	9	75
		Appreciation	0	0
2	Engagement	Monogloss	0	0
		Heterogloss	2	16.7
3	Graduation	Force	0	0
		Focus	0	0
Total			12	100

This study found that in Natalius Pigai's tweet, there were many judgments or an assessment of a person's behavior. The judgments found in the data mostly have a negative tone. The many elements of judgment (negative) that Pigai highlights indicate that Pigai judges the behavior or attitudes shown by someone, especially Jokowi and Ganjar. The negative assessment given by Pigai cannot be separated from Pigai's disappointment with Jokowi. On one occasion, Pigai said that Pigai often criticizes Jokowi because Jokowi does not humanize the Papuan people with the indicator that there are at least Papuan sons and daughters who are members of the Jokowi government. Pigai considers this to be very inversely related to the administration of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono.

Discussion

There is one word that falls into the category of affect type, namely "*percaya (believe)*". The word "*percaya*" according to the KBBI means "to admit or believe that something is true or real". Although the word believe is a verb according to the KBBI, for someone to have a sense of belief in something or someone, there needs to be the participation of the heart or feelings of the subject. The word "*jangan-do not*" is a textual marker that falls into negation, which means rejection.

In this sentence, Bung Pigai, the familiar greeting of Natalius Pigai, asks the Indonesian people in general and Papua in particular to raise an assessment of distrust towards Jokowi as



the President of the Republic of Indonesia Ganjar Pranowo as the Governor of Central Java. Jokowi as the President of the Republic of Indonesia and Ganjar Pranowo as the Governor of Central Java were not explicitly mentioned. However, the term Jokowi in Indonesia only refers to one person, namely the President of the Republic of Indonesia.

The implementation of the XX Papua PON has captured many people's attention, not only because of its implementation during a pandemic and concerns over KKB terrorists but also various stories of success and the beauty of Papua. Likewise, Ganjar Pranowo as the Governor of Central Java. Ganjar, as he is familiarly called, visited PON XX Papua athletes from Central Java at Wisma PON Papua on October 1, 2021. Ganjar's visit was the reason for Pigai in his tweet asking the public not to trust Ganjar.

The use of the clause "**org (orang-people)**" in Central Java also turned out to be a polemic of its own. Some refer to this clause as an insult to a certain tribe, namely the Central Javanese tribe. This assumption could later cause the feud between the Central Javanese and Papuan tribes represented by Natalius Pigai. The clause "**jangan percaya orang Jawa Tengah**" seems to build the perception of others that Central Java is a place for people who like to lie.

The tweets made by Pigai seem to be in contrast to the facts that can be found in Central Java. A Papuan named Gabriel Ndawi, better known as Gandi, said that he lived in Yogyakarta and Central Java for decades, even since he was 20 years old. Gandi, who comes from Merauke, feels the warmth given by the people of Central Java. Yehud, a student from Papua who is studying in Solo, shared a similar feeling. Yehud said that for 5 (five) years living in Solo, the people of Solo welcomed and treated him in a friendly, safe, comfortable, and non-discriminatory manner.

The names Jokowi and Ganjar mentioned in Pigai's tweet did refer to President Joko Widodo and the Governor of Central Java, Ganjar Pranowo. This is reinforced by adding a Central Java clause that indicates the origin of the two people's birth. The presence of an actor mentioned further shows that Pigai's tweet was explicitly aimed at Jokowi and Ganjar. The "**jangan percaya (do not believe)**" clause can be represented as a possible lie about the entity being reported, Jokowi and Ganjar. It can be analogous that Pigai once felt lied to by Jokowi and Ganjar, which was later used by Pigai as an invitation not to put trust in Jokowi and Ganjar.

Natalius Pigai's invitation not to trust Jokowi can be categorized as an incitement to distrust a President. This incitement can then have an impact on the social conditions of the community. In addition, the potential for clashes between communities is also getting bigger. This invitation to distrust Jokowi and Ganjar can be categorized as an inflammatory activity.



According to the Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (KBBI), the term "inciting" refers to the act of arousing anger inside individuals, particularly directed towards rebels or similar entities. The regulations pertaining to the repercussions of incitement are governed by Article 160 of the Criminal Code, which prescribes a maximum custodial sentence of six years. According to Article 160 of the Criminal Code, individuals who publicly incite others to engage in criminal activities, perpetrate violence against a public authority, or fail to adhere to both legal provisions and the directives of a designated office, as determined by the law, may face a maximum prison sentence of six years or a fine of up to four thousand five hundred rupiahs.

If viewed in more detail KUHP Article 160, some several words or clauses can be a concern. The clause "*Barangsiapa*" can be interpreted as a person or person who has full awareness of himself and his actions. The clause "*di muka umum*" means that the act can be known to many people and is not carried out in secret. People can only be punished if the incitement is carried out in a public place, where the public is visited or where the public can hear. There is no need for the instigator to stand on the edge of the highway, for example, but what is required is that there are many people in that place. Does not reduce the requirement that incitement must be in a public place and there are many people, incitement can occur even if it is only directed at one person. Pigai's tweet that got 666 Retweets, 625 Quote Tweets, and 2937 Likes indicates that the tweet was done in a public space where many people can see and comment.

"*Lisan atau tulisan (Oral or written)*" means that incitement can be carried out in spoken language, which requires the perpetrator to pronounce his incitement, and also writings that require the perpetrators to write down their incitements and display them in public spaces. According to R. Soesilo, "*menghasut (to incite)*" means to encourage, invite, arouse or burn people's enthusiasm to do something. In the word "incite" is concluded the nature of "deliberately". Incitement is tougher than "luring" or "persuading", but not "coercing".

People force other people to do something, not to incite. How to incite the person directly, for example: "Attack the unjust policeman, kill him, and take the gun!" directed against a police officer who is carrying out his lawful job. Meanwhile, how to incite people indirectly, such as in the form of questions: "Brothers, do you just let the unjust police officer go, don't you attack, kill, and take the weapon?"

"*Melakukan kekerasan (To commit violence)*" according to R. Soesilo means to use no small amount of physical force or strength illegally, for example hitting with the hands or with all kinds of weapons, kicking, and so on. According to the law, the "general authority" referred to in Article 160 is a legitimate ruler. Article 160 of the Criminal Code also explains the



purpose of incitement, namely: (1) A criminal event (violation or crime) is committed or all acts are threatened with punishment; (2) Fight against public power by force; (3) Do not obey the laws and regulations; (4) Do not obey the lawful orders given by law.

Inciting is the only act that causes a result (riot, chaos, damage, injury or even death. Or the act of incitement turns out to be influenced by certain circumstances (circumstances) so that it causes a prohibited result. Therefore, these two possibilities must be explained and proven in court.

Mrk (mereka) merampok kekayaan kita (rakyat Papua), injak2 (injak-injak) harga diri bangsa Papua dengan kata2 (kata-kata) rendahan Rasis, monyet & sampah

Pigai again gave a very negative judgment about Jokowi and Ganjar (*Mereka (them)*) by using words of *merampok* (robbing), *injak-injak* (trampling), *rendahan* (lowly), *monyet* (monkey), and *sampah* (trash). The word *merampok* (robbing) means to take by force and force the property of someone. The use of these words creates an understanding that Jokowi and Ganjar are two people who take things from the Papuan people by force and use violence. Pigai mentioned that Jokowi and Ganjar robbed something but did not mention what was robbed and how to rob it. This can then lead to a lot of perception and refraction of meaning.

The accusation of robbing that Pigai wrote to Jokowi and Ganjar can be seen as contradictory actions. On the one hand, Pigai asked the Papuan people not to trust Jokowi and Ganjar because of the possibility of lying. But on the other hand, Pigai lies in his way by making accusations of robbing Jokowi and Ganjar without adding any information about the object being robbed or how to rob it.

If then the context of *merampok* (robbing) is associated with the existence of PT. Freeport in Papua, then Natalius Pigai's accusations are baseless. As we all know, PT Freeport Indonesia (PTFI) has started exploration and mining in Papua since 1967 during the leadership of President Soeharto. The permit is stated in the Contract of Work which has been agreed by both parties.

In 2018, under the leadership of President Joko Widodo, Indonesia succeeded in acquiring 51% shares of PT Freeport Indonesia. Even though the government is considered successful in acquiring shares, many parties also regret the extension of PTFI's contract from 2021 to 2041. However, we should all understand that in the previously agreed Contract of Work, there is a clause that PTFI has the right to apply for a two-time extension of 10 years, namely until 2041. There is a threat of an international arbitration court pending if the Government of Indonesia does not agree to the extension of the contract.



Returning to the context of *merampok* (robbing), the use of this term is very inappropriate because the origin of PT Freeport Indonesia in Papua occurred during the leadership of President Soeharto.

The aura of sedition, hate speech, especially defamation is increasingly visible when Pigai “accuses” Jokowi and Ganjar of trampling, even hurling lowly, racist, monkey, and trash words. If you look further into the possibility of Jokowi and Ganjar doing as Pigai alleged, the facts show that no evidence reveals that Jokowi and Ganjar trampled on the dignity of the Papuan people, especially by using lowly words, racism, monkeys, and trash.

According to the KBBI, in a lexical sense, the word *monyet* (monkey) is a noun which is defined as a monkey whose fur is grayish and has a long tail, its facial skin is hairless, as well as the palms of its hands and soles of its feet. However, if the word *monyet* (monkey) is not addressed to a specific animal, it is often used as a curse. This swearing also often leads to reports of racist actions because they equate humans with monkeys. If Jokowi and Ganjar rightly equate the Papuan people with monkeys, they will not be well received in Papua. It can be concluded that Pigai’s accusations against Jokowi and Ganjar are unfounded because reliable facts do not support them.

In 2019, to be exact on August 19, 2019, there was a demonstration in Manokwari, West Papua. The action was carried out by residents of Manokwari who felt insulted by a video in which the contents of the video allegedly insulted Papuans as “*monyet* (monkeys)”. However, if it is related to the context of the tweet made by Natalius Pigai, the video of the alleged insult was clearly not made or distributed by Jokowi as the President of the Republic of Indonesia. Based on these facts, Natalius Pigai's speech can be categorized as spreading false news.

Crimes that refer to spreading fake news can be charged with Article 378 of the Criminal Code with a maximum imprisonment of four years. If the incident is carried out using social media, the perpetrator can be charged with using the ITE Law article 28, paragraph 1 with a maximum imprisonment of six years and/or a maximum fine of Rp. 1,000,000,000.00.

The tweet made by Natalius Pigai in addition to violating Article 28 paragraph 1 of the ITE Law, the tweet can also be categorized as violating the ITE Law Article 28 paragraph 2. Pigai by openly trying to clash or cause hostility between the Javanese and the Papuans. This can be seen by the mention of “*Orang Jawa (Javanese)*” before the mention of Jokowi and Ganjar. This act of creating SARA hostility can be punished by a maximum imprisonment of six years and/or a maximum fine of Rp 1.000.000.000,00.



In addition to the act of spreading false news, Pigai can also be charged with the article regarding defamation. This is because Pigai clearly mentions Jokowi and Ganjar as the perpetrators of the actions alleged by Natalius Pigai.

The regulations pertaining to defamation, particularly in written form exhibited in public domains, are stipulated in Article 310 paragraph (2) of the Criminal Code and Law Number 11 of 2008 in conjunction with Law Number 19 of 2016 on Information and Electronic Transactions Article 45 paragraph (3). According to Article 310, paragraph (2) of the Criminal Code, the act of defamation, when committed through written or pictorial means that are publicly broadcasted, displayed, or posted, is subject to legal consequences. Specifically, the offense of written libel carries a maximum penalty of imprisonment for one year and four months, or a maximum fine of four thousand five hundred rupiahs.

This principle is reiterated in the ITE Law, which stipulates that individuals who intentionally and unlawfully disseminate, transmit, or provide access to Electronic Information and/or Electronic Documents containing insults and/or defamation, as defined in Article 27 paragraph (3), may face a maximum prison sentence of four years and/or a maximum fine of Rp 750.000.000,00 (seven hundred and fifty million rupiah).

Kami bukan (negation) rendahan (judgment-negative). Kita lawan ketidakadilan (judgment-negative) sampai titik darah penghabisan. Sy (Saya-Pigai) Penentang Ketidakadilan (judgment-negative)

Pigai's statement that "***Kita lawan ketidakadilan sampai titik darah penghabisan (we fight injustice to the last drop of blood)***" shows that Pigai wants the public to perceive the injustices that Jokowi and Ganjar have given. Since antiquity, the term "***sampai titik darah penghabisan (until the last drop of blood)***" has been used, especially during the colonial era. The proverb means the struggle that must be carried out until there is no blood left or death. Pigai's use of these sayings reveals that critical conditions must be fought, even if they have to fight to the death.

The history of Indonesia shows that in the colonial era, the Indonesian people were in a condition of colonialism and there were many inequalities and injustices committed by the colonizers. The struggle of the Indonesian people to get a decent life, justice, and prosperity is indeed carried out to the last drop of blood. That is, they are not afraid of death as long as the Indonesian people can achieve independence which will lead to the desired prosperity and prosperity.



The use of the term “*sampai titik darah penghabisan* (to the last drop of blood)” in Natalius Pigai's tweet can be assumed that Jokowi and Ganjar are colonizers who are colonizing Indonesia, especially Papua. This can be categorized as an insult to the President. Insulting the president can be charged with article 134 of the Criminal Code with a maximum penalty of six years in prison, or a maximum fine of four thousand five hundred rupiah.

The implicit accusation of colonialism directed at Jokowi as the President of the Republic of Indonesia can also be considered as an act of expressing hatred and hostility to the Government of Indonesia. As we know that the position of a President of a country can be considered as a representation of the Government of that country. Acts that clearly express feelings of hatred and hostility towards the Indonesian government can be charged with Article 154 of the Criminal Code with a maximum imprisonment of seven years or a maximum fine of four thousand five hundred rupiahs.

The proverb can be said to be too exaggerated or even inversely proportional to the attention given by Jokowi. Since serving as President of the Republic of Indonesia in 2014, President Joko Widodo has at least 16 (sixteen) infrastructure developments to provide justice in the Land of Papua. Developments that have recently attracted national and even international attention are the construction of the Trans Papua road and the implementation of the XX PON in Papua. With Jokowi's commitment to equitable development, including in Papua, it seems that the word “*ketidakadilan* (injustice)” accused by Pigai is not appropriate.

This inaccuracy was also seen when addressed to the Governor of Central Java, Ganjar Pranowo. It doesn't make sense if the Governor of Central Java gives injustice to the Land of Papua. From a geographical point of view, the two regions are very far apart. Papua already has a governor whose regional autonomy is different from that of Central Java in terms of bureaucracy. The attack aimed at Ganjar can be assumed because it was widely heard that Ganjar would run for President of the Republic of Indonesia in the 2024 Presidential and Vice-Presidential Elections.

D. CONCLUSION

Data analysis in the form of tweets written by Natalius Pigai was carried out using Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis approach. At the description level, the results show several abbreviated words in the tweet. As in the words "*Jgn (jangan-do not), org (orang-people), & (dan-and), Mrk (mereka-they), injak2 (injak-injak-trampled), dgn (dengan-with), kata2 (kata-kata-words), and sy (saya-me)*". The abbreviation of some words is due to the limited number of maximum characters that can be written in 1 (one) tweet, which is 280



characters. The words “*monyet (monkey)*” and “*sampah (garbage)*” in the data also show a bad association of meaning. Pigai also gave rise to 3 (three) actors who looked very clear, namely Jokowi, Ganjar, and the Papuan Nation. From the description analysis, it can be seen that Pigai wants every reader to focus that there are interesting things or even problems between Jokowi, Ganjar, and the Papuan Nation.

In the data interpretation stage, the writer uses the Appraisal System theory from Martin and White. The analysis results show that all clauses contain negative judgment values of the many clauses presented in the data. This negative assessment given by Pigai then gave rise to the perception in the community that there were indeed problems between Jokowi, Ganjar, and the Papuan Nation. Natalius Pigai, previously known as the Human Rights Commissioner, made the tweets deemed meaningful and true.

The tweets written by Natalius Pigai indeed reap the pros and cons. Looking at some of the previous facts, Natalius Pigai has often issued quite scathing criticisms during President Joko Widodo. For example, Pigai criticized Jokowi with the statement “Statistically, Jokowi failed the most in paying attention to the weak and poor” and criticized the Minister of Religion Yaqut Cholil Qoumas regarding Merry Christmas greetings.

The results of the analysis show that Natalius Pigai’s tweet is not based on accurate facts but rather a hate speech. Although hate speech is not necessarily defamation, hate speech can lead to defamation. In addition, Natalius Pigai's tweet raises the fact that there is a potential attack on the reputation of the President of the Republic of Indonesia and the Governor of Central Java.. If you look at the linguistic facts in the data, Natalius Pigai’s tweet can violate the law regarding defamation. Calls for public incitement and accusations against Jokowi and Ganjar by using the words “*merampok (robbing)*” and “*injak-injak (stomping on)*” fulfill a violation of Article 310 of the Criminal Code (Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana) regarding defamation. In addition, Pigai's tweet also fulfills the criteria for violating the criminal law regarding the spread of false news, insults to the President, and attempts to create enmity between groups.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors wish to extend their sincere appreciation to the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology of Indonesia (Kemdikbudristek Indonesia), the Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education (LPDP), Pusat Layanan Pembiayaan Pendidikan (Puslapdik), and the Indonesian Education Scholarships (BPI) for their financial support, enabling the publication of this research.



REFERENCES

- Adhi, I. P. K. & Nurmawati, M. (2016). *Legalitas Personal Chat Pada Social Media Sebagai Alat Bukti Di Pengadilan*.
- Agustini, A., & Parwata, I. (2021). Upaya Penegak Hukum Dalam Menanggulangi Tindak Pidana Pencemaran Nama Baik Melalui Media Elektronik. *Kertha Wicara: Journal Ilmu Hukum*, 10(5), 352-362. doi:10.24843/KW.2021.v10.i05.p06.
- Algburi, B. Y. J., & Igaab, Z. K. (2021). Defamation in English and Arabic: A Pragmatic Contrastive Study. *International Linguistics Research*, 4(2), p31. <https://doi.org/10.30560/ilr.v4n2p31>
- Askurny, N. R., & Syihabuddin, S. (2022). Students' Linguistic Knowledge in Comprehending Defamation Text. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, 9(1), 97-106.
- Daniel, E. (2016). The Usefulness of Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches and Methods in Researching Problem-Solving Ability in Science Education Curriculum. *Journal of Education and Practice*.
- Douglas, M. (2021). Defamation actions and Australian politics. In *University of New South Wales Law Journal Forum* (pp. 1-12). Sydney, NSW: University of New South Wales, Faculty of Law
- Haryanto, H., & Arimi, S. (2022). *The Implication of The Meaning of Utterances in Defamation Cases: A Forensic Linguistics Study*.
- Hermawan, R., Rahyono, F. X., & Dallyono, R. (2021). Counter-claiming for a Crime Narrative: An Evaluation of the Defendant's Plea at the Corruption Criminal Court. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v11i1.34669>
- Hood, S. (2010). *Appraising Research: Evaluation in Academic Writing*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230274662>
- Khan, N., Shaikh, D. A., Vidyapeeth, B., & Singh, M. V. P. (2023). *Understanding of Cyber Defamation and Its Impact: A Critical Analysis*. 13(6).
- Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana.
- Kniffka, H. (2007). *Working in Language and Law*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230590045>
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Park, D., Bahrudin, F., & Han, J. (2020). Circular reasoning for the evolution of research through a strategic construction of research methodologies. *International Journal of Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods*.
- Tokunaga, R. S. (2010). Following you home from school: A critical review and synthesis of research on cyberbullying victimization. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(3), 277–287. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2009.11.014>
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 19 Tahun 2016 tentang Perubahan atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik.



Wiraprastya, S. R., & Nurmawati. M. (2016). Tinjauan Yuridis Mengenai Sanksi Pidana Terhadap Tindak Pidana Pencemaran Nama Baik Melalui Media Sosial. Fakultas Hukum Universitas Udayana, 4(1), 1-5.