



# Habermas's Critical Hermeneutics on Hate Speech Language of Identity Politics in Facebook of Indonesia

Fabianus Fensi<sup>1</sup>, Alo Liliweri<sup>2</sup>, Mirza Ronda<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Lecturer of Communication Studies, Bunda Mulia University, Doctoral Student of Communication Program of Sahid University of Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Senior Professor of Nusa Cendana University of Kupang, Guest Lecturer of Communication Doctoral Program of Sahid University, Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>Senior Lecturer of Communication Doctoral Program of Sahid University of Jakarta, Indonesia

## Abstract

*Indonesian politics in the last decade has attracted public attention because of the massive use of social media, such as Facebook, Twitter, and WhatsApp. Political communication is getting faster, public political participation is getting higher, and people are becoming more politically aware. This positive development is being degraded as social media-mediated politics is distorted due to hoaxes and hate speech. This study uses the perspective of Habermas' communicative action theory to see the position of the intersubjective dialogue on the use of Facebook in Indonesian politics, which is often colored by hate speech over people's identities based on racial dimensions. Facebook's language regarding identity politics is analyzed critically through a hermeneutic approach in order to uncover the political motives behind the use of hate speech in identity politics. Five hermeneutic steps: text reconstruction, text distortion level, text analysis, self emancipation, and text validity claim were used to review the motivation of distorted Facebook text. Based on the principle of communicative action to build understanding for each social actor involved, it seems that political language expressed in a narrative manner is not able to lead actors to agree with each other. In the case of political distortion due to identity politics, the main obstacle is intersubjective consensus because the text's truth claims are based on two themes, which contradict each other, namely: the stigma of exclusive collective identity and the affirmation of inclusive collective identity. Arab identity is exclusively characterized: political opposition, riding on the Prophet for political gain, using religion as a mask, wearing clerical robes to fool the public, often spreading slander, hoaxes, hate speech, and anti-Chinese. Meanwhile, Chinese Identity is described as inclusive: doesn't talk much, focuses on work, doesn't ride religion for politics, and likes to help. Exclusive stigma and inclusive affirmations have the potential to undermine consensus failure Communicative action.*

**Keywords:** Affirmation, Collective Ideologi, Critical Hermeneutics, Distortion, Exclusive, Stigma

---

## Introduction

In the last decade, the use of Facebook in politics in Indonesia massively. Philip Behnke (2010), said that almost all politicians, academics, and various movement groups in Indonesia use Facebook to expand their communication network. Facebook as an alternative to the new publication model, in addition to newspapers, magazines, newspapers, and books as mainstream media. Anders C. Johansson (2016) describes that to communicate about socio-political movements, most Indonesians have a strong tendency to use three international social media: Facebook, Twitter, and WhatsApp. According to him, the election for the Governor of the Special Capital Region of Jakarta in 2012 is considered an era of revival in the use of Facebook in politics, which has continued in the 2014 legislative and presidential elections, until now. In fact, the dramatic victory of Joko Widodo-Basuki Tjahaja Purnama (Jokowi-BTP) in the second round of the 2012 DKI Jakarta goverial election, was due to the success of intelligently translating candidate-based political marketing (personal branding) via Facebook (Nyarwi: 2014).

This pattern of political communication is both interesting and creates problems. Interesting, because as a sign of acceptance of internet technology in facilitating the process of political communication of the Indonesian people in winning competition and political sympathy. However, at the political technical level, the use of Facebook, instead of bringing about civilized political enlightenment to society, on the contrary, presents political

issues that are packaged with distorted language that smells of sectarian identity in the form of hate speech and hoaxes.

The Indonesian Anti-Defamation Society (Mafindo, 2019) conducted a study to map the 2019 hoaxes throughout Indonesia. It was found, as many as 1221 hoaxes, an increase of 224 hoax cases from 2018 which was only 224 cases. If the average hoax per month increased by 101 cases, from 83 cases in 2018. If averaged per day, the increase in hoaxes reached 3-4 cases, from 2-3 cases per day in 2018. That is, there is no day without hoaxes. Hoaxes theme, politics 52% (644 cases) and religion 8.4% (103 cases). However, religious hoaxes are closely related to politics and are conveyed in a narrative manner and reinforced by the use of images/photos on Facebook (Mafindo, 2020). These data confirm the results of a survey on the Digital Civility Index conducted by Microsoft for 32 countries in Asia Pacific. Indonesia is placed as the country with the worst digital civility level in 2020 in Asia Pacific. Hoaxes and fraud fall into the category of the most significant digital uncivilized, 47% [Databoks, 2021).

This study attempts to uncover the distorted motives of Indonesian people's political language through the selection of hoax language and hate speech regarding identity politics. By using the perspective of communicative action theory and critically disassembling with Jürgen Habermas' critical hermeneutic approach, this research ultimately intends to put the Facebook language as an instrument for forming intersubjective mutual understanding of Indonesian people who have backgrounds of social, cultural, religious, and racial diversity.

### **Habermas' Theory of Communicative Action: from Socio-linguistic Action to Communication Theory**

Habermas' Theory of communicative action arises, not only in relation, but also in contrast to previous thinking, namely the crucial historical problem in the body of thought of rationalism and reification that has plagued German thinkers, from Karl Marx, Marx Weber to George Lukacs and the Frankfurt School (critical theory), and George Herbert Mead and Emile Durkheim. In *The Theory of Communicative Action Volume I*, translated into English by Thomas McCarthy, Habermas writes:

“..... However, through his basic action-theoretic assumptions Weber prejudiced this question in such a way that processes of societal rationalization could come into view only from the standpoint of purposive rationality. I would like, therefore, to discuss the conceptual bottlenecks in his theory of action and to use this critique as the starting point for analyzing further the concept of communicative action.”

Habermas sees that Weber's assumptions on his theory of action are still empirical-scientific and do not touch the problem of everyday action. Action according to Habermas should be able to determine the practice of everyday communication and move at an egalitarian level among the participants involved. Action in Weber's sense according to Habermas is rationalization, meaning that the assumption of action is only directed to the view of the purpose reason. And he admits that his communicative action theory is used to discuss theoretical and conceptual bottlenecks on Weber's theory of action (Habermas, 1984: 273).

In other words, the thinkers before Habermas tried to localize the practical elements of science to the paradigm of objective rationality, namely emphasizing the dimension of work.

Habermas is clean and firm in his position that the reduction of the "practical" meaning of science to a working paradigm can stagnate the vision of the struggle for critical theory itself, namely social change. Social change occurs of the unification process of theory for practical purposes, namely social transformation of society.

Using the perspective of linguistic analysis, Habermas believes that the ratio does not only play a role in exploiting nature through work actions, but also plays a role in forming intersubjective relationships through communicative actions, through the use of everyday language. According to Habermas, humans are not only *homo aeconomicus* who orient their actions for practical purposes, but also *homo communicatus*, who orient their actions for the purpose of intersubjective dialogue.

The dimension of language is neglected by Weber in his theory of social action. Habermas admits that he uses speech act theory to understand the complexity of objective rationality in Weber's view. In communicative actions that are mediated by the language dimension, are rational because based on a certain agreement on the content of their speech. In other words, an agreement in a communicative act has a rational basis because it is not imposed by a certain external force but by the shared beliefs of all involved. A speech act according to Habermas is only called successful if the other party takes a "yes" or "no" position to a shared truth claim (Habermas, 1984: 286).

In summary, it can be said that in his theory of communicative action, Habermas believes his stance that the practical dimension of work action must be followed by other practical actions, namely communication. The work dimension is an instrumental action that has the aim of achieving certain technical interests, but the communication dimension is directed to interaction to achieve mutual understanding of all those involved intersubjectively. According to Habermas, the human ratio does not only deal with actions to achieve certain goals,

but also moves human interactions with each other through the language they use every day. According to Habermas, communicative action theory analyzes instructive meaning, which emphasizes the structure of linguistic expressions rather than the intentions of the speakers. Therefore, communicative action theory must still pay attention to the problem of how one's actions are related to one another to achieve a common understanding mechanism in the historical social space of their society (Habermas, 1984: 275-276).

According to Habermas, in communication, language functions beyond, not just "achieving" understanding, language also plays an important role to directly coordinate various good actions from different subjects as the same medium is used for socialization purposes. Or, language as a medium for understanding as well as a medium for coordinating individual actions and socialization in a communicative society (Habermas, 1984: 287-288). In communicative action, all forms of action of the participants involved are coordinated, not through calculations of egocentric success, but are coordinated through actions to achieve mutual understanding. Participants in communicative action, especially do not have an orientation to individual success, but are oriented to mutual success. The pursuit of individual goals is possible on the condition that they must harmonize a plan of action based on their common definition of the situation. Negotiating the definition of a common situation is the most important element needed in communicative action (Habermas, 1984: 285-286).

Habermas mentions four essential claims in communicative action: (1) Agreement about the natural and objective world, means that we reach truth claims; (2) Agreement on social norms, means we reach a claim of accuracy; (3) Agreement on the suitability of the inner world and outward expression, means achieving a claim of authenticity; and when we are able to explain the various claims to reach an agreement, then we reach a claim for comprehensiveness (Hardiman, 2009: 18-19). Roger E. Bolton (2014) says that, the term of communicative action theory is a social action in which the existence of actors, participants, try to reach a common understanding and coordinate various group actions with rational argumentation, consensus, and cooperation. Communicative action leaves no room for ambition to pursue personal goals. Communicative action requires a process of sharing information between citizens, or between participants. They can argue with each other and ensure a deliberation process through public meetings, hearings, and information sharing. Habermas' theory of communicative action is a theory of individual action specifically designed to promote common understanding and cooperation in groups. Mutual respect becomes social capital so that communicative actions provide space for every citizen to participate, uphold inclusiveness, and guarantee the process of empowering participants (Bolton, 2014: 11-20).

### The Language of Identity Politics on Indonesian Facebook

The context of the Facebook netizen's conversation about the issue of identity politics started with the posting of an anonymous account. The account displays images of eight figures (political and religious) with Arab backgrounds. Although the faces are highlighted in yellow, the identities of the them can still be recognized: Muhammad Rizieq Shihab, Chaidir Hasan Bamukmin; Bahar bin Smith; Abu Bakar Ba'asyir; Ahmad Haikal Hassan; Yusuf Muhammad Martak; Anies Rasyid Baswedan; and Novel Baswedan. Under the image of figures, the account submits a rhetorical question, as: "Why are these Arabs the opposition in this Republic? By wearing religious masks and wearing clerical robes, they are fooling this nation. By spreading slander, hoaxes, and hate speech, they make destroy of this nation?"

The following is a screenshot of pictures and conversations:



These pictures posting and rhetorical questions received wide attention from netizens and brought the spread discussions and tended to be loud, as follows apart netizen conversations:

Harun Iskandar:

"The Prophet was ridden (cut off the head of the Last Caliph (with a dot with a laughing emoticon). Then he continued his sentence, "I am grateful, apart from the influence of my parents, I have lived in an environment where I can be "freed" from negative thoughts about primordialism issue."

**Figure 1: Picture & Netizen Conversation Scenshoot**  
Source: Facebook (2020).

Petite Goulette:

"Really, really fed up with these Arabs. Moreover, Arabs was always shouting anti-China PKI etc.... They are also foreign strangers, what's more, these people are just state parasites and troublemakers too. It's the same as in France, those who create chaos are still Arab immigrants, although not all of them. I also have friends who are Arab who are educated and not radical like the ones who made a commotion yesterday to behead and stab people in Nice."

Sugiono:

"The Chinese don't like to brag about their work, let alone ride religion for politics. In everyday life, it's important to work to make a living... don't to be adventurous."

### **Text Reconstruction**

Hardiman (2015) in the reconstruction that the text reveals include: the author of the text, the type of language used, does it contain public tendencies, private tendencies, or a combination of both. In addition, does the writer use linguistic symbols in expressing certain intentions, both in verbal, written form, signs, and the meaning of language repetition in the text. Related to the identity politics text above, the text reconstruction is intended to find four important phenomena contained in the entire text, such as: revealing the identity of the author; the politics of the language used in the text; symbols in writing, and repetition of text. First, there are four authors, three with their own names: Harun Iskandar, Petite Goulette, and Sugiono, while one author does not include his own name (anonymous). Actually, by writing one's own name as an identity, the construction of the text directly leads to the responsibility of the text to the author, while if the text does not include identity, the reader has difficulty holding the text accountable.

Second, language politics. From the overall political language used, it can be seen that there is a battle between two language contexts, private language vs public language. According to Habermas, all forms of language use, both private and public in a text, always describe the author's ulterior motives for the entire text building he makes (Hardiman, 2015: 228). The language used by Facebook netizens for discourse on identity politics suggests that there is a mastery of private language over public language. Public language is a language whose use, both grammatically and stylistically, is acceptable and universally understood by language users (Ministry of National Education, 2008: 117). The language is widely used (Kuntarto, 2007: 100). Private language is a language that is used with meanings that are limited to certain people or groups and fields (Kuntarto, 2007: 100). Private language is a language whose expressions of use refer exclusively to personal and group experiences so that the language cannot be understood by anyone except by the author and the speaker himself in his group (Bussman, 2006: 945). In the whole discourse of identity politics, eleven private languages are reconstructed: (1) Arabs, (2) Chinese, (3) Arabs shouting PKI (Indonesian Communist Party) and anti-China; (4) parasites and state troopers; (5) Foreigners, (6) Arab immigrants, (7) the influence of both parents, (8) boasting, (9) it is important to work to make a living, (10) not adventurous, and (11) Chinese and Betawi are friends. Only five public languages: (1) Prophet, (2) Religion, (3) Ulama; (4) the issue of primordialism, and (5) religion for politics.

Third, symbols. Symbols are always understood as signs used to tell and know something (Sobur, 2013: 155). Something that represents the presence of meaning over something else. The context of the symbol is interpreted as relating to the text where the symbol is placed in the text. Symbols can emphasize the meaning of the text, or omit it. Chris Barker (2014) describes symbols as anything that presents itself through signs. The debate on Facebook's identity politics involves the use of three prominent symbols (1) a picture of the face of a figure of Arab descent (highlighted in orange); (2) the use of capital letters, written in bold, and in black and red; and (3) the use of quotation marks.

Fourth, repetition. Repetition of the text occurs in the two words "Arabic" and "Chinese." The word "Arabic" is repeated four times, and the word "Chinese" is repeated three times. The question is, what is the meaning that can be extracted from unusual text construction through anonymous text, private language hegemony over public language, use of symbols, and repetition on certain words? Questions will be answered through text analysis.

### **Text Distortion Level**

Hardiman (2015) distortion in a text occurs in three layers, distortion through language symbols, which is seen in language phenomena that deviate from language rules and grammar in general; distortion in usage behavior and language game, as seen from the rigidity of the language through impulsive repetition around the scope of the written language; distortion in the structural communication system in written communication patterns, which has an impact on the loss of linguistic symbolism and the author creates new symbolism based on the collective interests of the group. Based on this, the text of Facebook's identity politics above, there are three layers of distortion. First, distortion at the agreed symbol level. There were violations of the language rules in three ways: (1)

The formation of sentences without a subject, in the sentence: "Why are these Arabs being the opposition in this Republic? By wearing religious masks and wearing clerical robes, they are fooling this nation. By spreading slander, hoaxes, and hate speech, they make fun of this nation." (2) The use of the number "2" to indicate a repeat word: very2 disgusted; these Arabs2; shouting2; make a mess of those Arab immigrants2 anyway; have friends2 who are Arab educated; do not like *koar*2 (talk to much) with their gait; day2 life; important work; no need to be adventurous; (3) Use of local language: shouting; *koar*2; and cool.

Second, the distortion in the behavior of using language that does not heed ethical principles, in four sentences: "religious masks and wearing clerical robes are fooling this nation," "The Prophet was also ridden," disgusted with Arabs," and "people just become country parasite and troublemaker." Based on ethical principles, religion as a universal public text should not be matched, and even merged with the mask as a private text. The act of fooling the nation should not be reduced to the cloak of a clergyman as a symbol of the glory of a religious figure. What is fooling is not the cloak of the cleric but the ideology that makes people in the robe behave "fool." The terminology of the Prophet as a public word, a description of a very noble figure, should not be used equally, even as a riding tool. The unification of the word "disgusted" with Arabs should not be, because with the union, Arabs who should act as subjects, automatically turn into objects. Making people or groups of people as objects based on ethnicity is a racially discriminatory act. Likewise, the stigmatizing sentence "people are only parasites of the state and troublemakers," is not only discriminatory, but tendentious because it analogizes the behavior of Arab immigrants in France with the behavior of citizens of Arab descent in Indonesia.

Third, distortion at the level of the communication system, not only causes linguistic symbolism to disappear, but also the author creates new language symbolism to serve collective interests. Let's examine these four sentences: (1) "Why are these Arabs the opposition in this Republic?" is an interrogative sentence. If the interrogative sentence is used as the title of the discourse, the discourse loses its subject. To bring up the subject, the sentence should be written, "These Arabs are the opposition in this Republic." (2) "Even the Prophet was ridden." Constructed as a passive sentence. The subject of the sentence is not clear. The word "Prophet" is used as the object of the sentence. Then, who is the subject objected the Prophet as a mount? It is not clear, and for what motivation the Prophet became a mount is equally unclear. (3) "I'm really, really fed up with these Arabs. Moreover, Arabs are always shouting anti-China PKI etc..." The two sentences contradict each other structurally. The first sentence does not present a subject, but the predicate and object are clearly stated, "I am very, very fed up (predicate) with these Arabs (object). The second sentence contains a complete subject, predicate, and object. Arabs (subjects) always shout (predicate) the anti-Chinese PKI (object). (4) "Chinese people don't like to brag about their work, let alone ride religion for politics," is formulated negatively but has a positive motive. The subject is clear (Chinese people), but the predicate is formulated negatively (don't like to brag), and there are two objects, the main object in the structure of the text (gait) and the affirmative object as well as explanation for the main object (riding religion for politics).

### Text Analysis

Hardiman (2015) text analysis is intended to answer the question why the text is formulated in an unusual way? Text analysis is directed to uncover the various motivations of the writer who he, she is not aware of. Unconscious motivation can be revealed through the use of various signs, language symbols, which the author himself does not understand the meaning of. In the analysis of the text, the structure that dictates the author makes him or she not free to speak because the language he or she uses is being controlled by a system of collective ideology. Language is controlled by interests structurally. Here, the truth of language is not determined by argumentative logical categories, but the truth of the language whose use is successfully monitored by a system. Based on the findings in the distortion layer above, there are five texts that are distorted structurally based on a linguistic system that is accepted generally.

First, the text disguises the subject with an interrogative sentence pattern, in the sentence: "Why are these Arabs being the opposition in this Republic?" Shifting the formulation of an affirmative sentence to an interrogative sentence is inappropriate because it has the potential to eliminate the presence of the subject of the sentence, even though the position of the subject is important as the main actor, subject, and even theme in a sentence (Ministry of National Education, 2008: 471). The writer assumes that by showing a picture as a sign, the reader will immediately find the subject of the sentence. The use of the word "this" after the word "Arabs" confirms the author's intention. The question is, if this assumption is true, why in another sentence is written the statement, "with religious masks and wearing clerical robes they are fooling this nation?" Is it true that the citizen of Arab descent shown in the picture is wearing a religious mask, wearing a robe, and a cleric? The use of the word "they" in the sentence, "with religious masks and wearing clerical robes *they* are fooling this nation," and "by spreading slander, hoaxes, and hate speech *they* make fun of this nation," is very problematic because it contradicts with the sentence "These Arabs," which is clearly shown by the picture or photo. Two sentences written with adverbs, or clauses have a direct impact on the disguise of the subject actor (Eriyanto, 2011: 178).

Furthermore, the word "they" in the two sentences already shows the generalization process. Generalization is a process or way of thinking in which a general conclusion is drawn from specific events and ideas, which gives rise to vague generalizations (KBBI, 2008: 439). Generalization causes the specialization of behavior addressed by the image to lose its meaning. The author shifts from specialist arguments to generalist arguments. The author is building a conclusive argument that being an opponent, wearing a religious mask, wearing a clerical robe, spreading slander, hoaxes, and hate speech are common behaviors of Arabs (them). Generalization with a motive to disguise the main purpose, namely to give a negative stigma to citizens of Arab descent with exclusive characters: opposition, religious masks, wearing clerical robes, spreading slander, hoaxes, and hate speech.

Second, the formulation of passive sentences. The sentence, "The Prophet was also ridden" is formulated in the passive form. The word "Prophet" is placed as an object with a disguised subject. In passive sentences, the subject becomes the goal and the object of action in a predicate sentence (Ministry of National Education, 2008: 609). The question is, what subject, and who uses the "Prophet" as an object? Why is the concept of "Prophet" made an object? According to Theo van Leeuwen (Eriyanto, 2011: 173-174), the impact of a passively formulated sentence is that a person, a group of actors, experiences an omission in the text. Or, its presence becomes disguised, hidden, and does not get attention according to its portion in the construction of the text. Based on the overall context of the discourse, the subject of the sentence which is hidden through passivation, implicitly refers to "Arabs" or "them", so the question of why the concept of "the Prophet" is used as an object is immediately answered, namely: justifying interests to become political opposition.

Third, *contradictio in terminis*. The text "I'm really, really fed up with these Arabs," has a lame linguistic structure. On the one hand, the subject of the sentence is missing, or omitted, but on the other hand, the predicate and object are clearly stated. The situation is in contrast to the linguistic structure in other texts, "Arabs always shout anti-China PKI," which has a complete linguistic structure because it has the constitutive elements of a sentence: subject, predicate, and object. In the first sentence, it is not clear which subject has the predicate "very, very fed up" of the object "Arabs?" Does the author show the subject to himself, or show the subject to the interpreter or reader in general? In the second sentence, the author relatively shows the subject to the interpreter or reader, namely: "Arabic", followed by the predicate, "shooting" at the object, "anti-China PKI." If analyzed, the sentence "I am very, very fed up with these Arabs," actually the author means his subjective disgust as the main subject, but when the text is read and reproduced by the readers, the subject of the sentence immediately changes, no longer the writer, but the reader in general, including the author himself. With this way of writing, the writer conducts opinion swaying and tries to divert the reader's awareness that the predicate that "shooting" to the object of "anti-China PKI," is the disgust of readers and the public in general as the subject. The real meaning of the hidden text is to say that the people, "are very, very fed up with Arabs." Instead of eliminating the subject, the writer leaves the role of the subject to the reader through rereading (reproduction) of the text.

The subject of "Arabs" in the second sentence, is deliberately used to replace the object in the first sentence, namely "Arabs." The first sentence is the result, because the main cause of the discourse is the second sentence, but the author formulates the subject in the second sentence with the word "Kadrun" instead of the object of the first sentence, namely "Arabs." If follow the logic of causality, the discourse that is actually being developed is "Arabs are shouting anti-China PKI, making people very, very fed up." It is this unconscious, affirmative motive that the writer should be able to hide from the two texts.

Fourth, the ambiguity of the use of the words "they", "foreign-strangers", and "people" as the subject of the sentence. In the sentence: "They are also foreigners, what's more, these people are just state parasites and troublemakers," it seems, there are three subjects: "they", "foreign-strangers", and "peoples." The question is, are the three subjects used separately, or does the author have a motivation, trying to hide the Arabic subject in the previous sentence? If we read it in the context of the entirety of the following sentence: "I'm really, really fed up with these Arabs. Moreover, Kadrun was always shouting anti-China PKI. They are also foreigners, what's more, these people are just state parasites and troublemakers," so what is meant by "them", "foreign strangers", and "people" are Arabs. The author disguises Arab texts with the pronouns "they", "foreign-strangers", and "people" to weaken the psychological effects of the texts stigmatizing, namely stereotypes as parasites and state intruders to citizens of Arab descent.

The private sentence, "Arabs shout PKI and anti-China," is not important, because emphasizing the status of foreign nationals with the stigma of "parasites" and "state intruders" stereotypes is the main purpose of the text. The author justifies the stigmatic text by using an analogy process. Analogy is a linguistic expression that expresses the similarity, or resemblance of an object to another object (Kuntarto, 2008: 160). It is in the context of this analogy that the thought process is justified to equate the behavior of "state intruders" with the same experience in France, as read in this sentence "the same as in France, the ones who create chaos are the Arab immigrants..." The author does not realize that his analogical process is paralleling the behavior of citizens of Arab descent in Indonesia with the behavior of Arab immigrants in France. Citizens of Arab descent in Indonesia have the behavior of political opponents who often wear religious masks, wear the robes of clerics, spread slander, hoaxes, and hate speech, similar to the behavior of Arab immigrants in France who become parasites and intruders the country. The analogical conclusion is distorting because the space for sharing the truth is difficult to accept universally.

Fifth, the predicate of the sentence is formulated negatively but has a positive meaning and is formulated positively with a negative meaning. This is read in the following two sentences: "Chinese people don't like to brag about their work, let alone ride religion for politics" and the sentence "I'm really, really fed up with these Arabs, always shouting anti-Chinese PKI." The first sentence contains the subject (Chinese people), the predicate is formulated negatively (don't like to brag up their work), with two objects: (1) gait, and (2) riding religion for politics. The second sentence contains the subject (Arabic), the predicate is formulated positively (really, really fed up and shouting), but has a negative meaning. Text structure: "The Chinese don't like to brag about their work, let alone ride religion for politics;" is a reaction to the previous sentence: "I'm really, really fed up with these Arabs. Moreover, Arabs are always shouting anti-Chinese PKI."

The opposite of two predicates formulated differently produces positive and negative impact on the object at the same time. The positive impact of the predicate, "doesn't like to brag up" is the focus on "work" and "don't ride religion for politics," on the other hand, the negative impact of the predicate "fed up and shouting" is the growing issue of "anti-China PKI." Unconsciously, the author actually does not consider, the "predicate" as important. The author actually emphasizes the "object" so as to produce something that is contradictory to each other. It's not, text, "don't like to brag up" and "fed up and always shouting anti-Chinese PKI" as important things, because the main focus of the text is to highlight objects that focus on "action of work," "don't ride religion for politics," and "anti-Chinese PKI." The broader implication of the entire text framing is that the author is fighting the opposite behavior of two groups of citizens of Indonesian descent (Arab *versus* Chinese) through the representation process.

Emanuela Lombardo & Petra Meier (2014), describe representation as the process of ensuring that different members of the community are present in a situation and condition where they are not physically present. Representation relates to an action that is presented to represent people, groups of people in an event. The principle by which an actor's actions are presented to represent the actions of other actors. Based on this explanatory framework, citizens of Chinese descent are presented inclusively as behavioral representations: don't talk much, focus on work, don't use religion for politics, and like to help. Meanwhile, citizens of Arab descent are represented through exclusive behavior: political opposition, rioters, riding on the Prophet, using religion for politics, clerical robes to fool the people, spreading slander, hoaxes, and hate speech.

### Writer's Self Emancipation

At the stage of self-emancipation, the writer should be able to get out of the control of the text structurally, so that he/she realizes that what he/she is writing is deceiving him/her. With self-reflection, the author wants to achieve universal truths based on rational logical categories, not truths controlled by the system. The author experiences emancipatory healing where he/she, the writer and the reader reach a consensus, what is the author's understanding, also becomes the understanding of readers and interpreters of language in general (Hardiman, 2015: 227). In the debate on identity politics on Facebook, there are actually have two texts containing the author's self-reflection: (1) "I am grateful, apart from the influence of my parents, I have lived in an environment where I can be "freed" from negative thoughts about the issue of "primordialism." (2) "... although not all. I also have friends who are Arab educated and not radical like the ones who made a fuss about beheading and stabbing people in Nice." The question is, do the two texts develop towards emancipation so that the writer is free from the control of the collective ideology that underlies the entire discourse building? To find emancipation as the author's practice of self-liberation, two texts must be read in what context are the texts produced and reproduced?

The Text: "I am grateful, apart from the influence of my parents, I have lived in an environment where I can be "freed" from negative thoughts about the issue of "primordialism," produced from the context of the reaction to the previous text: "The Prophet was also ridden." This text deliberately describes the behavior of citizens of Arab descent who have generalized their roles as political opponents, disruptors of the state, riding on the Prophet, using religion for politics, clerics' robes to fool the people, spreading slander, hoaxes, and often using hate speech. Does the author really experience critical self-emancipation when reproducing texts based on stigmatizing thinking to citizens of Arab descent? The stigmatic way of thinking as a background makes it difficult for the author to experience self-emancipation, so the text: "Grateful, apart from the influence of my parents, I have lived in an environment where I can be "freed" from negative thoughts about the issue of "primordialism," is not an expression of self liberation, but only an antithesis to the behavior he/she is fighting. The text, "the influence of both parents" is the antithesis of the behavior of "riding the Prophet" for political purposes. For the author, "riding the Prophet" for political purposes is an attitude of primordialism. The influence of parents is used as historical data that frees the author from primordialism.

We can review the same explanation in other texts: "... although not all. I also have friends who are Arab educated and not radical like the ones who made a fuss about beheading and stabbing people in Nice." The author seems to avoid generalizing to the behavior of citizens of Arab descent, but when it is related to the context of the previous sentence: "I am very, very fed up with these Arabs. Moreover, Arabs was always shouting anti-China PKI. They are also foreign strangers, what's more, these people are just state parasites and troublemakers too. It's the

same as in France, the ones who create chaos are still Arab immigrants,” the impression of making generalizations has actually been strengthened. Disgust, anti-Chinese stigma, parasites, and state intruders, hindered the author's self-liberation. The text seems emancipatory, but actually reinforces the propaganda of stigma and stereotypes against citizens of Arab descent as political opponents, troublemakers, riding on the Prophet, religion is used as a political mask, and clerical robes are used to fool the public. In these two texts, self-liberation is difficult to build, on the one hand, the text is constructed to justify the text it opposes, while on the other hand, the text that is produced only strengthens the stigma. The text is difficult to generate consensus because the author does not recognize the claim of honesty in building self-reflection.

### **Text Validity Claim**

According to Habermas, claim validity is a form of acknowledgment of the validity of knowledge that is pragmatically universally accepted and relevant for every subject who speaks and acts. The validity claim is accepted by both the speaker and the listener. The validity claim presupposes the ability to collectively understand knowledge in a relevant domain (Edgar, 2006:45). By adopting the speech act idea from J. Austin, Habermas makes the claim of validity as the main idea in language programs as universal and formal pragmatics (Fultner, 2014: 59). Based on the process of reconstruction and analysis of the text and strengthened by the writers' self-reflection, the validity of the text claimed on the issue of identity politics on Indonesian Facebook languages is centered on "against" the behavior of two groups of citizens of Indonesian descent, Arab vs Chinese. Citizens of Arab descent are described exclusively as political opponents, riding the Prophet for political purposes, using religion as a mask, wearing clerical robes to fool the public, often spreading slander, hoaxes, hate speech, and anti-Chinese. While citizens of Chinese descent are described inclusively as a group that doesn't talk much, focus on work, don't ride religion for politics, and like to help.

The overall validity of the identity politics text on Indonesian Facebook is claimed in two main themes, namely the stigma of an exclusive collective identity and the affirmation of an inclusive collective identity. The claim of the validity of the text that is stigmatizing as an exclusive collective identity can be read in texts, such as: (2) Arabs became opponents in the Republic; (2) wearing religious masks and wearing clerical robes, they fool the nation; (3) spreading slander, hoaxes, and hate speech to make fun of the nation; (4) The Prophet was ridden; (5) shouting anti-China PKI; (6) become parasites and troublemakers of the country; and (7) radical. Meanwhile, the claim of the validity of the text which is an affirmation of inclusive collective identity can be read in texts, such as: (1) Chinese people don't like shouting; (2) not using religion for politics; (3) what is important is work to make a living; (4) not adventurous; and (8) likes to help. The broad impact of such validity claims is the driving force of truth, both at the level of writers and readers in general. On the one hand, the fact of the discourse text that Arabs are political opponents, troublemakers, rides the Prophet, uses religion for politics, wears clerical clothes to fool the people, spreads slander, hoaxes, hate speech, and is anti-Chinese, is deliberately brought to the reader as a truth, and, on the other hand, the truth is deliberately conveyed to the reader that the citizens of Chinese descent are not talkative, focus on work, do not ride religion for politics, diligent, share, and like to help. One is stigmatized as an exclusive collective identity, the other is given an affirmation of an inclusive collective identity.

### **Conclusion**

The reason for communicative action demands mutual agreement of the entire community participating in communication on the basis of common interests and mutual understanding in intersubjective consensus. Based on the reconstruction, finding the level of distortion, analysis of the text, the author's self-reflection, and claims of the validity of the text in Facebook's public discourse on identity politics in Indonesia, it is very difficult to lead to consensus building. The main obstacle to mutual understanding is the stigma of exclusive collective identity, on the one hand, and the affirmation of inclusive collective identity on the other. The depiction of contradictory collective identities cannot be used as the basis for forming an agreement on the meaning of the intersubjective existence of a plural society. The two claims lack one universal agreement to communicatively coordinate joint action. The two propositions are constructed egocentrically, thus failing to bring the writer and reader to a single truth that guides communicative joint action. Communicative action is not only based on the acceptance of a shared universal truth, but also on the adherence to shared norms and each participant acknowledges their shared existence with honesty. For that we need a unifying public reason, where people live together in diversity. The life of Indonesia's plural society, it is not enough to practice tolerance, beyond it, the recognition of the public experience of shared nationality is revived. Social media democracy does not stop at consensus to be tolerant of each other, but acts to acknowledge each other in intersubjective communication.

## **Works Cited**

- Behnke, Philip, *Social Media and Politics, Online Social Networking and Political Communication in Asia*. Singapore: Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung, 2010.
- Baker, Chris, *Dictionary of Cultural Studies* (translated to Indonesia, or Bahasa Kanisius Publishers), Yogyakarta, Kanisius, 2014.
- Bussman, Hadumod, *Routledge Dictionary of Langugae and Linguistics*, London, Routledge, 2006.
- Databox, Economics and Business Data Center, *The Disrespect of Indonesian Netizens is the Worst in Asia Pacific*, Jakarta, Databox, 2021.
- Ministry of Education, *Big Indonesian Dictionary (Fourth Edition)*, Jakarta, Gramedia Pustaka Utama, 2008.
- Ministry of Education, *Indonesian Thesaurus*, Jakarta, 2008.
- Edgar, Andrew, *Habermas: The Key Concepts*, Newyork: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2006.
- Eriyanto, *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction to Media Text Analysis (Community Special Edition)*, Yogyakarta: LkiS, 2011.
- Fultner, Barbara (ed.), *Jürgen Habermas Key Concepts*, London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2014.
- Habermas, Jürgen, *The Theory of Communicative Action, Reason and the Rationalization of Society (Transleated to English by Thomas McCarthy, Volume 1)*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1984.
- Habermas, Jürgen, *The Theory of Communicative Action, Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason (translated to English by Thomas McCarthy, Volume 2)*, Boston: Beacon Press. 1985.
- Hardiman, F. Budi, *Ideological Criticism, Revealing the Linking of Knowledge and Its Interests According to Jürgen Habermas*, Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 2009.
- Hardiman, F. Budi, *The Art of Understanding: Hermeneutics from Schleiermacher to Derrida*, Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 2015.
- Johansson, Anders C, *Social Media and Politics in Indonesia in Stockhom School of Economics Asia Working Paper Vol. 42*. Sweden: Stockhom School of Economics, 2016.
- Kuntarto, Niknik M, *Careful in Language Careful in Thinking*. Jakarta: Media Discourse Partners, 2007.
- Lombardo, Emanuela & Petra Meier, *The Symbolic Representation of Gender*, Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2014.
- Indonesian Anti-Defamation Society (Mafindo), *The Mapping of hoaxes in 2019*. Jakarta: Mafindo, 2020.
- Sobur, Alex, *Media Text Analysis: An Introduction to Discourse Analysis, Semiotic Analysis, and Framing Analysis*, Bandung: Rosda Karya, 2012.