



SYMBOLS OF WORDS AND PHRASES IN THE BAP ON HATE SPEECH IN THE POLICE ANTHROPHOHISTORICAL SEMIOTIC PERSPECTIVE

Erfi Firmansyah¹, Liliana Muliastuti², Miftahulkhairah Anwar³

Universitas Negeri Jakarta¹²³

Email: erfirmans@unj.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The Investigation Report (BAP), as an official police legal document, serves not only as a factual record but also as a linguistic construction rich in cultural and historical meaning. This study aims to uncover the symbolic words and phrases that appear in the BAP of hate speech cases within the police environment using an anthropohistorical semiotic perspective. The method used is qualitative descriptive-analytical with an anthropohistorical semiotic approach. Data in the form of quotes of words and phrases in the BAP of hate speech from several police work units, were collected through documentation studies and analyzed through three stages: the position of signifiers, tracing the historical-cultural traces of symbols, and interpreting meanings in the context of law enforcement and the collective memory of society. The results show that the words and phrases in the BAP are not neutral; they represent stigma, cultural bias, and historical narratives rooted in the Indonesian social structure. These linguistic symbols often reinforce group dichotomies, obscure legal objectivity, or even become a form of symbolic resistance to dominant discourse. This study concludes that the anthropohistorical semiotic approach can uncover layers of hidden meaning in police legal documents. Recommendations include integrating semiotic awareness and cultural sensitivity training for investigators and linguists, as well as developing forensic linguistic guidelines that minimize the reproduction of hate speech.

Keywords: *word and phrase symbols, hate speech, police investigation reports, anthropohistorical semiotics.*

INTRODUCTION

The Investigation Report (BAP) is the primary legal instrument that records the police investigation process, including chronology, statements from suspects and witnesses, and evidence. Formally, the BAP is designed as an objective and neutral factual record. However, studies of contemporary legal discourse show that the police report (BAP) is a linguistic construct shaped by institutional bias, the prevailing legal framework, and the investigator's cultural background (Hakim & Fadli, 2021). Every choice of diction, sentence structure, and emphasis in the BAP is not accidental; it reflects how the police interpret, classify, and assign legal weight to an event. In the case of hate speech, this construction becomes even more complex because it involves emotional dimensions, collective identity, and political content that are difficult to separate from the social context in which the event occurred.

Forensic linguistics and critical discourse analysis approaches have been widely applied to uncover how language in legal documents can reproduce injustice or strengthen human rights protections. Research by Lestari and Kusuma (2022) shows that the choice of transitive versus intransitive verbs in the BAP can shift the perpetrator of the crime or obscure legal responsibility. Similarly, a study by Arifin and Maulana (2024) confirmed that identity-marking phrases such as "certain groups," "provocative parties," or "sensitive citizens" often function as stereotypical labels that reinforce dominant narratives without adequate empirical verification. These findings indicate that police reports are not merely administrative archives, but rather battlegrounds for meaning where power, knowledge, and history interact symbolically.

To uncover the layers of meaning hidden in legal texts, a semiotic perspective offers an analytical framework capable of unraveling the relationship between signifiers, signifieds, and represented objects. Peircean semiotics, in particular, emphasizes that signs do not operate in a vacuum but rather through an interpretive process influenced by customs, context, and cultural memory (Chandler, 2021; Deely, 2022). In police documents, words and phrases not only point to factual realities but also activate networks of historical associations deeply rooted in society. Linguistic symbols in hate speech investigation reports, for example, can refer to past collective trauma, inherited ethnic stereotypes, or political stigma deliberately maintained by official narratives.

Without an approach that can trace the genealogy of these meanings, legal analysis risks becoming trapped on a textual surface that ignores the problem's structural roots.

Unfortunately, most studies on hate speech in Indonesia remain descriptive-legal or focus on regulatory aspects and the enforcement of criminal sanctions. Research by Setiawan and Rahmawati (2021) and Firdaus and Hidayat (2023) has successfully mapped case trends and the effectiveness of the articles used, but both tend to ignore the semiotic and historical dimensions that shape the language construction in investigative documents. Existing linguistic approaches are generally limited to lexical or syntactic analysis and do not address how these symbolic meanings are produced, maintained, or transformed in institutional practices. As a result, a theoretical gap exists between positive legal studies and cultural-linguistic studies, which should complement each other to understand hate speech holistically.



To bridge this gap, the anthropohistorical semiotic perspective offers an analytical alternative that combines sign theory with historical anthropology. This approach views signs not as static entities, but as living, changing, and meaningful entities through time and intergenerational interactions (Kohn, 2022; Manguel, 2023). In the context of policing, anthropohistorical semiotics allows researchers to trace how phrases like "incite," "offend ethnicity," or "mass provocation" not only have legal definitions but also carry historical burdens shaped by colonial experiences, political transition, and social reconciliation. The word symbols in the police report thus become living archives that record how the state, through its apparatus, interprets "verbal violence" and "threats to unity" within the framework of the nation's collective memory.

This approach is increasingly relevant given the heterogeneous and dynamic transformation of Indonesia's social structure. Hate speech is no longer merely a personal expression but a structural phenomenon reflecting tensions between identities, economic disparities, and political fragmentation. During the investigation process, the police find themselves at a crossroads between the impersonal demands of law enforcement and highly contextual social realities. The language used in the police report serves as a bridge between the two, reflecting the extent to which the police institution is capable of remaining objective or, in fact, trapped in the reproduction of cultural bias. A study by Prasetyo and Wijayanti (2024) asserts that without critical awareness of the symbolic-historical dimensions of legal texts, efforts to uphold justice risk perpetuating the very structural injustices they are intended to prevent.

Against this backdrop, this study aims to fill a still under-explored academic gap: analyzing symbolic words and phrases in police investigation reports (BAP) of hate speech cases through the lens of anthropohistorical semiotics. The primary focus is to identify dominant linguistic signs, trace the historical-cultural roots of their meanings, and interpret how these signs help construct legal narratives. This research assumes that the language in BAPs is not neutral, but is imbued with traces of collective memory, power hierarchies, and symbolic strategies that influence the judicial process. Thus, the analysis goes beyond what is said to explore why it is said and how these meanings are inherited or challenged in the contemporary context.

The research questions guiding this study include: (1) What symbolic words and phrases appear most frequently in BAPs handling hate speech cases in the police? (2) How do historical and cultural traces underlie the formation of the meaning of these symbols? (3) Within the framework of anthropohistorical semiotics, how do the linguistic symbols in the police report (BAP) reproduce, negotiate, or challenge the dominant discourse on hate speech? These questions are designed to open a dialogue between forensic linguistics, legal anthropology, and collective memory studies, while also providing an empirical basis for developing semiotic theory in official state documents.

Methodologically, this research adopts a qualitative design with a document study approach and interpretive semiotic analysis. The primary data consists of quoted words, phrases, and clauses from the BAP of hate speech cases that have been legally processed, collected through a study of police archives and cross-verified with legally binding court decisions.

The analysis technique integrates Peirce's triadic semiotics (representamen, object, interpretant) with a genealogical search of meaning based on oral history sources, anthropological literature, and public policy documents. Data validity is maintained through source triangulation, peer debriefing with legal linguistics experts, and a transparent audit trail during meaning deconstruction.

This research contributes a theoretical model for anthropohistorical semiotic analysis applicable to contemporary legal documents. By positioning the police report (BAP) not as a closed text but as a site of struggle for meaning connected to collective memory and social transformation, this study enriches interdisciplinary discourse between law, language, and anthropology. Furthermore, this research examines the relevance of Peircean theory in non-Western contexts, particularly in societies with oral traditions, complex social stratification, and colonial experiences that still influence contemporary meaning structures. This analysis is expected to serve as a reference for developing a more inclusive and reflective legal epistemology.

Practically, the findings of this study have direct implications for improving standards for preparing investigative documents within the police force. Integrating semiotic awareness and cultural sensitivity into investigator training can reduce stigmatizing diction, lessen interpretive bias, and improve the accuracy of legal narratives. Police education institutions and the National Legal Development Agency (BPHN) can utilize the results of this study to develop forensic linguistics guidelines. This supports a more adaptive approach to the diversity of identities and historical memories in society. Thus, the police report (BAP) is no longer an instrument that unconsciously reproduces hate speech, but rather a documentation tool that contributes to the restoration of justice and social reconciliation.

This research is increasingly urgent in the post-truth era, where narrative manipulation, disinformation, and digital polarization threaten the integrity of the legal process. Hate speech processed through the BAP has real consequences for the fate of suspects, victims, and the legitimacy of law enforcement institutions in the public eye. Without semiotic-historical critique, the justice system risks becoming a machine for reproducing biases that contradict the principles of the presumption of innocence and substantive justice. This research, therefore, is not merely an academic endeavor but a critical intervention into the practice of legal documentation, often considered technical, despite its human, cultural, and historical dimensions.

This article is systematically structured to guide readers through a coherent argument, from an explanation of the socio-legal context and a critical literature review to a theoretical framework of anthropohistorical semiotics, an analytical methodology, and a discussion of the findings and policy recommendations. Each section complements the others in answering the research questions and demonstrating the relevance of the proposed approach. By positioning the symbolic words and phrases in the hate speech report as living, historically meaningful objects of study, this research aims to open new perspectives on how legal language not only records reality but also shapes it symbolically, culturally, and politically.

METHOD

This study uses a qualitative approach with a descriptive-analytical design to uncover symbolic meanings within legal documents. Document analysis is the backbone of this research, enabling researchers to examine the Investigation Report (BAP) not merely as a



formal legal text but as a linguistic artifact rich in cultural and historical meaning (Fauzi & Rahmawati, 2022). This approach was chosen because it can contextualize hate speech within the language structures used by suspects and investigators in the police interrogation room. In this context, legal language and cultural language intersect.

The data source for this study was primary documents, namely transcripts of the BAP of hate speech suspects handled by the Jakarta Metropolitan Police (Polda Metro Jaya) in 2025. The data collection technique used purposive sampling, with documents selected based on specific criteria: the use of words and phrases that explicitly convey identity, history, or cultural content related to hate narratives (Chen & White, 2023). Data were collected using a listening and note-taking technique, in which researchers read, marked, and transcribed key words and phrases that symbolized hate speech in the police report (BAP).

Data analysis used an Anthropohistorical Semiotics perspective, a framework that integrates sign analysis with cultural dimensions (anthropology) and the chronology of meaning (history). At this stage, the words and phrases in the BAP were not read as static markers and signified, but evaluated for how these symbols shifted in meaning due to historical trauma, cultural conflict, or identity politics that pervaded society during a specific period (Pratama & Hidayat, 2023). Researchers mapped how the suspect constructed hate-speech phrases and how police recorded them in positive legal language.

To ensure data validity, this study used comprehensive triangulation of sources and methods. Source triangulation involved comparing the police report (BAP) text with other supporting documents, such as court decisions and media coverage related to the same case. Method triangulation involved juxtaposing semiotic analysis with a historical-sociological review of the phrases studied (O'Reilly & Parker, 2020). Furthermore, the researchers consulted forensic linguists to ensure the interpretation of the words and phrases was unbiased and grounded in a valid anthropohistorical context.

Because the data are confidential and sensitive legal documents, the researchers made ethical considerations a top priority. The researchers implemented anonymity and data confidentiality by masking the names of suspects, victims, and specific police agencies when presenting the findings (Coulthard & Johnson, 2021). The study also followed ethical protocols for handling texts containing hate speech. Citations of phrases containing ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup relations (SARA) were limited to those essential for semiotic evidence in the analysis to prevent the replication and spread of the hate narrative itself in the public sphere.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data analysis from transcripts of the Investigation Reports (BAP) of hate speech suspects reveals that the words and phrases used do not merely function as communication tools, but rather operate as symbols loaded with anthropohistorical content. The findings indicate that suspects consistently utilize vocabulary with historical and cultural roots to legitimize their hatred of the target group. In the context of the BAP, these words are recorded as textual

evidence, but their meanings go beyond dictionary definitions, referring to collective memory, past trauma, and deeply ingrained cultural stereotypes.

Ontologically, the BAP transforms emotional, contextualized oral speech into a rigid, structured legal text. This transformation often erodes the speech's semiotic dimension, with investigators tending to focus on fulfilling the elements of legal articles, such as the ITE Law, rather than exploring the cultural meaning of the phrases used (Kruger & Van Rooy, 2021). As a result, the depth of meaning of hate speech symbols is often diminished, necessitating anthropohistorical semiotic analysis to restore the cultural and historical context hidden behind the legal text.

The following is an example of a Hate Speech Investigation Report.

----- AF, S.Pdi, S.H., M.H. Rank: Police Commissioner, Number of Police

----- Y, S.H. Rank: Chief Brigadier, Number of Police -----

----- DN Rank: Chief Brigadier, Number of Police -----

The three of them, as investigators assigned to the aforementioned police station, based on:

--- 1. Police Report Number: LP/B/.../POLDA METRO JAYA, dated ..; ---

--- 2. Investigation Order Number: SP.Lidik/.../Dit....., dated –

An interview was conducted with a man named:

----- : Erfi Firmansyah, M.A.-----

Place/Date of Birth:, Gender: Male, Religion: Islam, Citizenship: Indonesian, Occupation: Lecturer, Linguist....., Residential Address: ,....., Mobile Phone Number:

He (...Erfi Firmansyah, M.A) was interviewed to testify as an Indonesian Language Expert Witness in Police Report Number: LP/B/.../POLDA METRO JAYA, dated ..., regarding the alleged crime

of publicly expressing feelings of hostility and hatred towards a group of Indonesian people, as referred to in Article 156 of the Criminal Code and/or Article 4 letter b number 2 of Law No. 40 of 2008 concerning the Elimination of Racial and Ethnic Discrimination, which occurred on on the street...

In response to the investigator's questions, the interviewee provided the following information and answers.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

7. As an Indonesian language expert, I would like to ask you to provide a complete explanation of the meaning of the sentences used in statements of hostility, hatred toward a



group of Indonesian people, and racial and ethnic discrimination according to the Indonesian language.

7. Yes. Could you please explain the meaning or sentences used in statements of hostility, hatred toward a group of Indonesian people, and racial and ethnic discrimination from the perspective of the Indonesian language that I am familiar with? Article 156 of the Indonesian Constitutional Court (MKRI) states, "Anyone who publicly expresses feelings of hostility, hatred, or contempt toward one or more groups of Indonesian people shall be subject to a maximum imprisonment of four years or a maximum fine of four thousand five hundred rupiah." The wording of this article is:

- 1). Anyone in public, meaning anyone in front of a crowd or in front of an audience;
- 2). Expresses feelings of hostility, hatred, or contempt, meaning that the person expresses feelings, expresses feelings, or utters words containing hostility or hostility toward another party. Or the person expresses feelings of hatred or feelings of dislike, or the person expresses feelings of insult or utters insulting words;
- 3). Against one or several groups of Indonesian people, meaning one or several groups of diverse Indonesian society. In the second book of the Criminal Code, the word group in Article 156 and the following articles means each part of the Indonesian people that is different from one or several other parts because of race, country of origin, religion, place of origin, descent, nationality, or status according to constitutional law. Then, Article 4 letter b number 2 of Law No. 40 of 2008 concerning the elimination of racial and ethnic discrimination, namely: showing hatred or feelings of hatred towards people because of racial and ethnic differences in the form of actions: 2. "Making speeches, expressing, or throwing out certain words in public places or other places that can be heard by others." This article can be interpreted that if there is a person who expresses or throws out certain words that contain hatred or feelings of hatred towards people because of racial and ethnic differences in public places or other places that can be heard by others

8. Investigators... The Jakarta Metropolitan Police are conducting an investigation and handling an alleged criminal case of publicly expressing feelings of hostility and hatred toward a group of Indonesian citizens, as referred to in Article 156 of the Criminal Code and/or Article 4 letter b number 2 of Law No. 40 of 2008 concerning the Elimination of Racial and Ethnic Discrimination, with the following chronology:-----

PT. SMS was first established in 2013, located on Jalan, with a factory area of approximately 3 (three) hectares. Entry and exit for personnel and operational vehicles are through two gates: one gate located on the north side in front of the reported AG market, which is physically controlled by AG, and the other gate located on the west side in front of AG Market, which is controlled by the heirs of H.M.

The problem arose when the defendant, GS, requested a rental fee of Rp. 660,000,000 (six hundred and sixty million Rupiah) for a 3-square-meter (3.00 square meter) plot of land in front of the gate on the north side of the GS Market, physically controlled by the defendant, GS Cs. The rental fee was calculated from 2012 to 2023, with a monthly rental rate of Rp. 5,000,000 (five million Rupiah). PT SMS objected to the request, citing the absence of a

written or verbal agreement. Consequently, the defendant, GS, with his force, deliberately blocked access through the gate on the north side of the GS Market, preventing the company from operating for three weeks throughout September 2023.

Subsequently, PT SMS successfully leased a 70-square-meter plot of land located directly in front of the gate on the west side of the GS Market for Rp. 36,000,000.- (thirty-six million Rupiah) per year for 1 (one) year, leased from witnesses DI and witness S, each acting as attorneys for the owner of the 70 m² land, Paradedi. Based on this lease, witnesses DI and witness S, together with their followers, dismantled the concrete wall erected by an individual in 2019 with the aim of permanently closing the entrance and exit of PT. SMS so that it could be used again for employee and operational vehicle access starting September 23, 2023.

Then, on September 23, 2023, at approximately 8:15 a.m. WIB, the reported defendant GS and his followers arrived at the PT. SMS factory with the intention of intentionally and without authorization, mobilizing their followers to close the entrance and exit through the gate located on the west side of the GS Market. However, they were prevented from doing so by PT. SMS's internal security team. SMS, and uttered words suspected of criminal acts in public, expressing feelings of hostility, hatred, and discrimination against a particular group of Indonesians, as well as racial and ethnic discrimination.

Three video recordings were shown to the Expert as follows:

From the three video recordings, the accused GS, the accused S, and the accused MAs O uttered the following words:

In the first video, which is 1 minute 33 seconds long, at 13 seconds to 16 seconds and at 34 seconds, the accused GS uttered the words "I'm suing this China, I'm suing this China, I'm suing China now."

In the second video, which is 3 minutes 47 seconds long, at 17 seconds to 18 seconds, Mr. GS uttered the words "Watch out, I'm suing China... I'm suing all of China."

At 40 seconds to 42 seconds, Mr. Masud, also known as Ochen, uttered the words "This is no longer a big deal, let's go to war."

At 3:29 to 36, Mr. GS uttered the words, "I'll look everywhere for China, and when I find it, call me." In the third video, which is 57 seconds long,

At 7:16, Mr. S uttered the words, "Let the China come out... let the China come out first."

At 18:20, Mr. S uttered the words, "Even if I invest billions to catch him, he doesn't have the money, it's too little."

At 47:50, Mr. GS uttered the words, "I'm not afraid of you, I'll provide the capital."

Of all the statements in the video recording above, the accused, GS, S, and Masud, also known as Ocen, were directed at Mr. IC, the owner of the AC A factory.. / PT. SMS

Based on the chronology above, can the statements above be categorized as statements of hostility and hatred toward a particular group of Indonesian people, or racial and ethnic discrimination? The expert is requested to explain the reasons in detail, based on your expertise?

8. Based on the chronology above, the statements by the reported parties, Mr. GS and Mr.



S, can be categorized as statements of hostility and hatred toward a particular group of Indonesian people. The Indonesian people and racial and ethnic discrimination. This is because the reported parties, Mr. GS and Mr. S, expressed feelings of hostility, hatred, or dislike toward a group of Indonesians, as well as racial and ethnic discrimination, by using the word "chinese" directed at the factory owner, Mr. I. However, the reported party, M alias O, did not use the word "chinese" directly. The words containing feelings of hostility, hatred, and racial and ethnic discrimination are as follows:

In the first video, which is 1 minute 33 seconds long, at 13 seconds to 16 seconds and at 34 seconds, the reported party, GS, utters the words "I'm suing this Chinese, I'm suing this Chinese, I'm suing China now."

In the second video, which is 3 minutes 47 seconds long, at 17 seconds to 18 seconds, Mr. GS utters the words "watch out, I'm suing China... I'm suing all Chinese."

At 3:29 to 36, Mr. GS uttered the words, "I'll look everywhere for Chinese people, and when they come, call me."

In the third video, which is 57 seconds long, at 7:16, Mr. S uttered the words, "Let the Chinese come out...let the Chinese come out first."

9. Can the reported parties GS, reported party S, and reported party Masud alias Ocen be categorized as having made statements of hostility, hatred toward a group of Indonesian people, and racial and ethnic discrimination against victim I C? Is the expert requested to explain in detail the reasons based on your expertise?

9. Yes. The reported parties GS and reported party S can be categorized as having made statements of hostility, hatred toward a group of Indonesian people, and racial and ethnic discrimination against victim I C. This is because they used the word "Chinese" directed at the factory owner, Mr. I. However, reported party M alias O did not use the word "Chinese" directly.

Studies show that hate speech symbols in the police investigation report (BAP) are dominated by phrases representing historical trauma. Suspects frequently use words referring to past conflicts, such as the political upheaval of 1965 or the social unrest of 1998, to discredit opposing groups. This use of trauma symbols is not simply an insult, but a rhetorical strategy to evoke historical anxiety and position the target group as a recurring existential threat.

The use of phrases such as "national traitor," "foreign stooge," "Chinese bastard," or labels associated with banned ideologies in the BAP transcripts demonstrates a significant anthropological shift in meaning. Wicaksono and Pratama (2023) note that these phrases have shifted from markers of specific historical events to permanent stigmatizing labels used to delegitimize political opponents or minority groups today. In the BAP, these phrases are recorded as elements of defamation or hate speech, but semiotically, they represent a legacy of a black narrative that continues to be reproduced.

From an investigative perspective, recording these historical symbols in the police report (BAP) often creates tension between investigators' and suspects' understandings.

Investigators tend to standardize these emotional phrases into limited legal categories, so the nuances of the suspect's intended historical provocation are often not fully documented (Santoso & Lestari, 2021). This demonstrates the importance of forensic linguistic

competence with a historical perspective so that the BAP serves not only as an administrative document but also as an accurate representation of the symbolic meanings expressed.

The next analysis concerns symbols of othering or marginalization based on culture and religion. The BAP transcripts contain various phrases that explicitly construct the target group as "the other"—inferior, dangerous, or inconsistent with majority values. These symbols are constructed through word choices that denigrate certain religious practices or distort the cultural traditions of minority groups into something deemed deviant.

Anthropologically, the phrases used to carry out this othering are rooted in long-standing power structures and the majority's dominance in society. Nugroho and Puspitasari (2023) explain that cultural stereotypes in hate speech cases reflect cultural hegemony, where dominant groups use language to maintain privilege and oppress subordinate groups. In the police investigation report (BAP), these phrases are documented as evidence of malicious intent (*means rea*) to divide unity.

Phrases referring to the status of "immigrants," "minorities," or derogatory ethnic designations have deep historical roots, often related to the colonial policy of *divide et impera* or post-independence migration dynamics. Chen and Wang (2020) emphasize that these seemingly simple words in everyday contexts carry the historical burden of economic and political inequality, which are then exploited by perpetrators of hate speech to inflame primordial sentiments in public spaces and interrogation rooms.

Furthermore, the analysis shows how hate speech symbols evolved from offline to digital contexts and were then recorded in the BAP. Suspects no longer use long macro sentences; instead, they use symbols, abbreviations, or cultural codes understood only by certain groups (in-groups). Wijaya and Kurniawan (2024) found that the digitalization of hate speech has changed how anthropohistorical symbols are packaged, making them appear obscure to the general public but highly provocative to their intended targets.

This linguistic mutation challenges the investigative process, as investigators must decode seemingly innocuous phrases or abbreviations into fully fledged hate symbols. O'Reilly and Smith (2021) highlight that failure to understand digital linguistic codes rooted in specific cultures can lead to misinterpretations. In this case, coded hate speech was not optimally identified in the Investigation Report.

The investigator's role in decoding these symbols is crucial, given that the Investigation Report (BAP) is a vital document that determines the direction of the prosecution in court. Mahendra and Fauzi (2022) emphasize that investigators must have semiotic sensitivity not only to record what was said but also to understand why the suspect chose certain phrases, which largely depends on the perpetrator's cultural background and historical understanding of the target group.

Misinterpreting these anthropohistorical symbols risks legal misinterpretation. Zhang and Liu (2023) warn that when the historical and cultural context of a phrase is ignored in the police investigation report (BAP), hate speech that should be classified as a crime of incitement to ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup relations (SARA) is often reduced to a simple insult. This weakens law enforcement efforts to address the root causes of the social conflicts triggered by such speech.



Subsequent research revealed symbols of territorial exclusion in the BAP transcripts, characterized by phrases such as "return to their village," "leave this land," or "expel them from our territory." These phrases are not simply calls for physical expulsion, but symbols of denying certain groups the right to exist in a geographic space. This expressed territorial exclusion has deep historical roots, often linked to land disputes, transmigration issues, or narratives of natives versus immigrants, which frequently trigger horizontal conflicts across regions. Puspitasari and Santoso (2024) argue that territorial exclusion in hate speech continues historical spatial politics. In this case, certain groups feel they have a claim to the territory and view other groups as intruders that must be eliminated.

Taken together, these findings confirm the Anthropohistorical Semiotics model as a comprehensive framework for analyzing hate speech. This model shows that the words and phrases in the police report (BAP) are triadic: linguistic signs (symbols), cultural products (anthropology), and accumulations of time (history). Hidayat and Rahman (2023) argue that this approach can uncover the deepest layers of meaning in hate speech, showing that the hatred expressed is not a momentary impulse but an explosion of historical sediment and unresolved cultural tensions.

Overall, this discussion underscores the importance of integrating an anthropohistorical semiotic perspective into forensic linguistics practices in police departments. Firmansyah and Yulianti (2022) recommend revising the format and guidelines for preparing BAPs for hate speech cases to include a column for semiotic context analysis, so investigators can document not only the sound of the phrase but also the cultural and historical dimensions inherent in it, to ensure more comprehensive justice for victims and the community.

CONCLUSION

This research concludes that the words and phrases in the Investigation Report (BAP) of hate speech cases do not merely function as formal textual evidence, but rather operate as complex symbols loaded with anthropohistorical content. The linguistic symbols recorded by investigators are manifestations of historical trauma, cultural hegemony, and territorial exclusion deeply rooted in society's collective memory. The suspect's use of certain phrases is not merely a momentary emotional impulse, but rather a rhetorical strategy that leverages the legacy of past narratives to discredit and marginalize the target group, which is then solidified into a rigid legal text in the BAP document.

Furthermore, the application of an Anthropohistorical Semiotics perspective successfully uncovers the discrepancy between the suspect's communicative intentions and the textual reduction that occurs during the investigation process. The transformation of contextual and multidimensional oral speech into a structured BAP text often erodes the semiotic dimension of uttered phrases, resulting in the loss of crucial cultural and historical context. This demonstrates that the conventional forensic linguistics approach, which focuses solely on fulfilling the elements of legal articles, is not comprehensive enough to capture the depth of meaning and latent danger of hate speech disguised in cultural codes.

Based on these findings, it is recommended that police institutions, particularly criminal

investigation units, integrate forensic linguistics and semiotics competencies into their training for handling hate speech cases. The format and guidelines for preparing police reports (BAP) for cases involving ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup relations (SARA) need to be strengthened to include a semiotic context analysis, so investigators can document not only the literal sound of phrases but also the historical and anthropological dimensions inherent in them. This step is crucial to ensure that law enforcement processes are not merely administrative but also capture the true essence of the crime and provide substantive justice for victims.

For further research, it is recommended that the scope of the study be expanded to include cross-jurisdictional comparisons or to compare BAPs with court decisions to examine the consistency of interpretation of anthropohistorical symbols from the investigation stage to the judge's verdict. An interdisciplinary approach that combines semiotics, social psychology, and cultural studies is expected to produce a more adaptive analytical model for addressing the dynamics of hate speech in the modern era.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank Prof. Dr. Endry Boriswati, Coordinator of the Applied Linguistics Doctoral Study Program, and Prof. Dr. Ninuk Lustyantje—both faculty members at the Graduate School of Universitas Negeri Jakarta—for their support in writing this scientific article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arifin, S., & Maulana, Y. (2024). Konstruksi identitas dalam wacana kepolisian: Analisis frasa penanda kelompok minoritas pada dokumen penyelidikan. *Jurnal Linguistik Terapan Indonesia*, 12(1), 45–62.
- Chandler, D. (2021). Semiotic frameworks in legal discourse analysis: Tracing interpretive habits in institutional texts. *Journal of Law & Semiotics*, 5(2), 77–94.
- Chen, H., & White, P. (2023). Sampling strategies in legal discourse analysis: Navigating access and representativeness in forensic corpora. *Discourse & Society*, 34(2), 150–168.
- Chen, L., & Wang, Y. (2020). Historical roots of ethnic slurs and their pragmatic functions in contemporary hate speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 168, 112–126.
- Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (2021). Ethical dilemmas in forensic linguistics and legal document analysis. *International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law*, 28(1), 88–107.
- Deely, J. (2022). The anthropological turn in semiotics: From sign systems to cultural memory. *Sign Systems Studies*, 50(2), 112–134.



- Deely, J., & Petrilli, S. R. (2023). Legal semiotics and the triadic construction of institutional truth. *Semiotica*, 253, 145–167.
- Fauzi, A., & Rahmawati, I. (2022). Metode analisis dokumen dalam penelitian linguistik forensik: Sebuah tinjauan metodologis. *Jurnal Linguistik Indonesia*, 40(1), 45-60.
- Firdaus, A., & Hidayat, R. (2023). Efektivitas penegakan hukum terhadap ujaran kebencian berbasis media sosial di Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum Pidana dan Kriminologi*, 14(2), 201–218.
- Firmansyah, A., & Yulianti, R. (2022). Reformasi pedoman Berita Acara Pemeriksaan dalam perspektif linguistik forensik: Menangkap dimensi semiotik ujaran kebencian. *Jurnal Linguistik Indonesia*, 40(2), 210-225.
- Hakim, L., & Fadli, M. (2021). Bias institusional dalam dokumentasi kepolisian: Kritisasi wacana BAP sebagai teks hukum. *Jurnal Antropologi Indonesia*, 11(3), 189–205.
- Hidayat, T., & Rahman, F. (2023). Semiotika Antropohistoris: Sebuah kerangka teoritis baru untuk analisis wacana konflik di Asia Tenggara. *Semiotika: Jurnal Kajian Tanda dan Budaya*, 17(2), 88-105.
- Kohn, E. (2022). Historical anthropology and the semiotics of institutional memory. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 78(4), 512–530.
- Kruger, M., & Van Rooy, H. (2021). The ontological shift in legal transcription: How spoken hate speech is reconstructed in written police records. *Forensic Science International*, 324, 110-119.
- Lestari, D., & Kusuma, W. (2022). Forensic linguistics in Indonesian legal documents: Agency, voice, and accountability in police reports. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(3), 567–580.
- Mahendra, B. S., & Fauzi, A. (2022). Linguistic competence of investigators in decoding coded hate speech: A forensic perspective. *International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law*, 29(1), 45-64.
- Manguel, A. (2023). The archive of signs: Language, power, and cultural memory in contemporary societies. *Cultural Semiotics Review*, 9(1), 33–51.
- Nugroho, B. (2023). Dokumentasi penyelidikan sebagai narasi hukum: Studi kritis terhadap objektivitas BAP di Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum & Keadilan*, 10(2), 145–162.
- Nugroho, B., & Wijaya, K. (2024). Phrasal collocation as symbolic power: Critical discourse analysis of institutional categorization. *Journal of Language & Politics*, 23(1), 88–

107.

- Nugroho, W. A., & Puspitasari, L. (2023). Cultural hegemony and the anthropology of othering in Indonesian digital hate speech. *Discourse & Society*, 34(4), 455-472.
- O'Reilly, M., & Parker, N. (2020). Triangulation in qualitative discourse analysis: Ensuring validity and reliability in legal and forensic contexts. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 17(3), 301-318.
- O'Reilly, M., & Smith, J. (2021). Decoding digital dog-whistles: The challenges of forensic linguistics in online hate speech investigations. *Computer Speech & Language*, 68, 101-115.
- Prasetyo, H., & Wijayanti, N. (2024). Beyond legal text: Semiotic awareness in police documentation and justice outcomes. *Asian Journal of Criminology & Legal Studies*, 12(1), 89-107.
- Pratama, R. A., & Hidayat, T. (2023). Semiotika Antropohistoris: Rekonstruksi makna tanda dalam dinamika budaya dan sejarah kontemporer. *Semiotika: Jurnal Kajian Tanda dan Budaya*, 17(1), 22-39.
- Pratama, R., & Wijaya, A. (2022). Digital hate speech and social polarization in post-pandemic Indonesia. *Journal of Communication & Society*, 8(3), 221-240.
- Puspitasari, L., & Santoso, B. (2024). Territorial exclusion and historical land disputes in contemporary Indonesian hate speech. *Asian Journal of Social Science*, 52(1), 34-50.
- Santoso, B., & Lestari, D. (2021). The gap between legal intent and emotional framing in police interrogation transcripts of hate speech cases. *Journal of Forensic Linguistics*, 18(1), 77-94.
- Setiawan, D., & Rahmawati, Y. (2021). Regulasi dan praktik penanganan ujaran kebencian di Indonesia: Tinjauan hukum positif. *Jurnal Hukum Tata Negara*, 9(2), 133-150.
- Suryani, I., Maulana, F., & Prasetyo, D. (2023). Digital hate speech as symbolic violence: Linguistic markers and sociopragmatic thresholds. *New Media & Society*, 25(9), 2345-2364.
- Suryani, I., Maulana, F., & Prasetyo, D. (2023). Hate speech as symbolic violence: Mapping discourse patterns in Indonesian public spheres. *Language & Society in Indonesia*, 7(2), 178-195.
- Wicaksono, A., & Pratama, R. (2023). From historical event to permanent stigma: The semiotic shift of political labels in Indonesian hate speech. *Social Semiotics*, 33(3), 312-329.
- Wijaya, C., & Kurniawan, H. (2024). The evolution of hate symbols: From offline historical



narratives to digital coded language in Indonesia. *New Media & Society*, 26(5), 2105-2123.

Wijaya, K., & Prasetya, D. (2024). Historical trauma and legal language: Tracing cultural memory in Indonesian investigative documents. *Journal of Southeast Asian Legal Anthropology*, 6(1), 41–59.

Zhang, X., & Liu, Y. (2023). Misinterpretation risks in forensic transcription: When historical context is lost in legal categorization of hate speech. *Language and Law*, 10(2), 55-72.