



## Systematic Repressive System: An Analysis of Legal Instruments as a Tool to Silence Criticism by the Indonesian Government

(Sistem Represif Sistematis: Analisis Instrumen Hukum Sebagai Alat Pembungkaman Kritik Oleh Pemerintah Indonesia)

**Muhammad Ifan\***

Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta,  
Indonesia  
[ifanm179@gmail.com](mailto:ifanm179@gmail.com)

**Titik Sudartinah**

Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta,  
Indonesia  
[titiksudartinah@uny.ac.id](mailto:titiksudartinah@uny.ac.id)

**Pangesti Wiedarti**

Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta,  
Indonesia  
[pwiedarti@uny.ac.id](mailto:pwiedarti@uny.ac.id)

**Pratomo Widodo**

Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta,  
Indonesia  
[pwidodo@uny.ac.id](mailto:pwidodo@uny.ac.id)

**Evi Sulistiana**

Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta,  
Indonesia  
[evisulist09@gmail.com](mailto:evisulist09@gmail.com)

**Azhari**

Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta,  
Indonesia  
[azhari.ue.org@gmail.com](mailto:azhari.ue.org@gmail.com)

\*Corresponding author: Muhammad Ifan | email: [ifanm179@gmail.com](mailto:ifanm179@gmail.com)

### Article History

Accepted: January 12, 2025

Revised: April 9, 2025

Available Online: April 30, 2025

**Abstract:** Citizens who voice criticism of government policies often face criminalization, eroding expressive spaces, and democratic freedoms. This study examines a systematic repressive apparatus enforced through legal instruments. Beyond mere coercive action, it explores how biased language within legislation constructs narratives that legitimize repressive measures. Utilizing the AntConc corpus tool and a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach, this research analyzes the discourse embedded in the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law), the Indonesian Criminal Code (KUHP), the Law on Mass Organizations (UU Ormas), and Government Regulation No. 26 of 2020. The findings reveal that the state constructs a system of negative labeling, framing expressions of dissent as threats to national stability through terms such as “public order disruptor,” “threat to state officials,” “freedom usurper,” and “communism propagator.” These terms function not only as juridical categories, but also as ideological labels that criminalize dissent. Legal language in these documents is applied selectively to reinforce negative perceptions of critics and plays a role in perpetuating structural violence. Therefore, this study emphasizes the urgent need for a critical audit of legal language to eliminate ambiguous and biased terminology.

### Keywords

AntCont, democracy, Indonesia, Critical discourse analysis, Repressive system

**Abstrak:** Masyarakat yang menyuarakan kritik terhadap kebijakan pemerintah, menghadapi kriminalisasi yang berdampak pada hilangnya ruang ekspresi dan kebebasan berdemokrasi. Penelitian ini mengkaji sistem represif yang dijalankan secara sistematis melalui instrumen hukum. Lebih dari sekadar tindakan koersif, studi ini menelaah bagaimana bahasa yang bias dalam undang-undang membentuk narasi yang melegitimasi tindakan represif tersebut. Dengan menggunakan perangkat korpus AntConc dan pendekatan Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), penelitian ini menganalisis wacana dalam UU ITE, KUHP, UU Ormas, dan PP No. 26 Tahun 2020. Hasil analisis menunjukkan bahwa negara membangun sistem pelabelan negatif yang membingkai ekspresi kritik sebagai ancaman terhadap stabilitas nasional, melalui istilah seperti “pengganggu ketertiban umum”, “mengancam aparat negara”, “merampas kebebasan”, dan “menyebarkan ajaran komunisme”. Istilah-istilah ini tidak hanya berfungsi sebagai kategori yuridis, tetapi juga sebagai label ideologis yang mengonstruksi citra kriminal terhadap para pengkritik. Bahasa hukum dalam dokumen-dokumen tersebut digunakan secara selektif untuk memperkuat persepsi negatif terhadap warga negara yang menyuarakan kritik, dan berperan dalam reproduksi kekerasan struktural. Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini menekankan pentingnya audit kritis terhadap bahasa dalam regulasi hukum guna menghapus istilah multitafsir yang mendiskreditkan kritik, demi menjaga fondasi demokrasi dan kebebasan sipil di Indonesia.

### Kata Kunci

AntCont, demokrasi, Indonesia, Kajian Wacana Kritis, Sistem represif

### How to Cite

Ifan, M., Sudartinah, T., Wiedarti, P., Widodo, P., Sulistiana, E., & Azhari, A. (2025). Systematic Repressive System: An Analysis of Legal Instruments as a Tool to Silence Criticism by the Indonesian Government. *KEMBARA: Jurnal Keilmuan Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 11(1), 374–389. <https://doi.org/10.22219/kembara.v11i1.38555>



Copyright©2025, Muhammad Ifan, Titik Sudartinah, Pangesti Wiedarti, Pratomo Widodo, Evi Sulistiana, & Azhari

This is an open-access article under the CC-BY-3.0 license.



## INTRODUCTION

Freedom of expression, including voicing criticism, is a fundamental right in a democratic system. This right is not only constitutionally guaranteed but also universally recognized through international legal instruments, such as *the Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (Domente, 2021; Marashini, 2022). However, reality shows that there are symptoms of systematic repression against society, primarily through the applicable legal apparatus (Bethke & Wolff, 2023). Governments in various countries, such as Honduras, responded to criticism using legal mechanisms to curb and limit the space for opinion (Middeldorp & Le Billon, 2019). This reflects a form of covert repression applied to strengthen control over individuals and groups deemed to be a threat to power.

The law is used as a means to legitimize repressive actions under the pretext of maintaining state stability and public order (Arslanalp & Deniz Erkmén, 2020). Although the action is claimed to be legitimate, in reality, it is more of a move that leads to silence and oppression of society (Silver & Shi, 2023). In addition, it is more of a move that leads to silence and oppression of society (Davis et al., 2022). As a result, the space for civil liberties is narrowing, especially for activists, journalists, and civil society groups who are vocal in voicing injustice (Trouillard, 2022). In this context, the law that is supposed to protect the rights of individuals has turned into a tool to silence and maintain the dominance of power.

Furthermore, several articles in the law contain ambiguous elements, allowing authorities to take action against anyone disrupting stability. These articles use multi-interpreted language, thus opening up space for subjective interpretation by the interests of the ruler (Dragu & Fan, 2020). The unclear limits of meaning in the wording of the article provide a gap for law enforcement officials to interpret criticism as a threat to state order or stability. This uncertainty makes individuals and groups that fight for human rights and social justice the target of unjust actions (Moroska, 2021). These conditions have created a climate of fear that inhibits the active participation of the public in pushing for better change (Slough & Fariss, 2021).

Previous studies have revealed that discourse is a strategic instrument in shaping and maintaining the legitimacy of power. Through the selection of diction, narrative construction, and specific argumentative structures, discourse is used by political actors to consolidate dominance, direct public perception, and frame social reality in a hegemonic manner. For example, research from Anowu et al (2024) shows that discourse legitimizes and rationalizes power in an institutional context. The study identified that actors in discourse utilize non-traditional strategies, such as confrontational movements, similes, and forgetfulness, as well as more conventional legitimacy strategies, such as authorization, morality, and rationalization. Furthermore, research by Skuczynski (2020) shows that legal narratives are not wholly neutral because they are influenced by the narrative structure that frames how facts and arguments are presented. Legal narratives, in this case, function as a medium to convey events or decisions and reflect ideological positions and power. Then, according to Samuel (2025) various rhetorical techniques such as analogy, metaphors, emotional language, repetition, and parallelism, are used to build authority, persuade audiences, and legitimize decisions. The results of the study highlight the importance of rhetorical skills in judicial practice and the need for rhetorical training for judges and lawyers. The findings confirm that language is more than just a means of communication; It plays a key role in framing power, influencing public perception, and shaping social legitimacy towards authority or decisions taken.

Although highlighting the role of discourse in shaping the legitimacy of power through legal narratives, these previous studies have not specifically examined how the structure of discourse and the choice of terminology in legal texts are used to legitimize repressive actions. Therefore, a study is needed that explores how language in legal instruments, such as laws, constructs narratives that justify repressive actions. The *Critical Discourse Analysis* (CDA) design provides an analytical framework that can reveal how legal texts are interpreted based on the interests of the dominant group. Then, using *AntConc corpus tools* as an analysis tool provides ease in automatically detecting terminology used to justify repressive actions.

Thus, this study aims to analyze the systematic repressive system implemented through legislation. More than just the imposition of repressive measures, this paper analyzes how ambiguous and multi-interpreted language creates a narrative legitimizing these actions. The primary focus is on three questions: How does the government apply the repressive system in silencing criticism? Second, how is the language in the law interpreted to legitimize repressive actions? Third, how does using this language impact freedom of expression? To dismantle this, this study uses *the Critical Discourse Analysis* (CDA) approach, structural violence theory, and deliberative democracy theory as the main theoretical foundations.

CDA is an approach that analyzes the relationship between language, power, and ideology, mainly how language is used to construct, maintain, or challenge power structures in various social contexts (van Dijk, 2008). This approach is rooted in critical social theories such as Marxism, which highlights class relations and inequality, as well as post-structuralism, which emphasizes the importance of language in shaping social reality (Newman, 2020). In CDA, discourse is understood as a social practice that shapes power dynamics, so it has a central role in creating and strengthening inequality (Willey-Sthapit et al., 2022).

Through the analysis of linguistic elements such as word choice, communication patterns, and representation of social groups, CDA can uncover how certain ideologies are disseminated through media, policies, or political discourse (Tian, 2021). This approach also emphasizes the importance of understanding the relationship between texts and social contexts, given that texts are often used as a tool to legitimize power or normalize dominance (Han, 2020). Study by Hart & Winter (2022) and Küçükakin & Engin-Demir (2022) shows how CDA can be used to uncover the dynamics of inequality hidden in oral and written discourse. In the context of this research, CDA provides a framework to explore how language is used strategically in silencing criticism and legitimizing policies that repress environmental activists.

Furthermore, the theory of structural violence as put forward by Galtung & Høivik (1971) refers to forms of violence integrated into broader social, political, and economic structures, thereby creating systemic injustice. This violence is indirect, that is, it does not involve individual actors explicitly, but is manifested in policies, norms, and rules that benefit the dominant group and harm the marginalized group (Macassa et al., 2021; Anchuri et al., 2021). In the context of repression against environmental activists, Barak (2003) argues that structural violence can be observed by applying laws that support repressive actions, such as criminalizing movements with accusations of disrupting development or social stability. The use of official narratives such as "national interest" or "sustainable development" is used to cover up injustices, making it challenging to identify the impacts of such violence directly (Webb, 2019).

Middeldorp & Le Billon (2019) developed the concept of a repressive response used by dominant powers to maintain the status quo, especially when social movements were perceived as threatening their interests. This response was divided into two dimensions: direct repressiveness and symbolic repressiveness. Direct repression refers to concrete actions in the form of physical violence or intimidation against activists, such as detention or dispersal of demonstrations, to enforced disappearances (Mentan, 2021). Then, Mentan (2021) also explained that symbolic of repression focuses more on using language and discourse to discredit or silence the movement. Strategies such as labeling activists as "anti-development" or "radical" are an important part of this dimension, where legal documents and official statements are used to manipulate public opinion to justify repressive actions.

These two dimensions complement each other in suppressing social movements, both through physical actions that create fear on the ground and by shaping public opinion that undermines the moral legitimacy of the movement (Jackson & Sadler, 2022; Burton et al., 2021). Structural violence served as the systemic basis that underpins this repressive response, making acts of oppression appear legitimate and organized (Kohler & Alcock, 1976). In this context, language plays a key role as a key instrument in concealing the dominance of power, while also creating conditions in which repressive actions are considered a legitimate response to socially constructed threats. Therefore, a deep

understanding of structural violence and repressive responses, both direct and symbolic, is essential to unearth the systemic mechanisms underlying repression.

Meanwhile, the theory of deliberative democracy as initiated by Habermas (1984), placing the public space as a key element in the proper democratic process. Public space is an arena where individuals and groups interact rationally, without the domination of power that inhibits freedom of opinion. In this theory, the public space is not only a place where various opinions meet, but also a means to produce critically considered arguments (Motta, 1991). An ideal democracy, according to Habermas, is achieved if every individual has an equal opportunity to participate in public discussions free from pressure or control by certain parties. Through an open exchange of ideas, political decisions can reflect a fair and rational common interest (Miller, 1992).

This theory also emphasizes that democracy is not only concerned with the right to choose leaders, but also with the active participation of citizens in the process of communication, free from pressure (Ercan, 2019). In an ideal public space, every individual can express their views based on accountable reasons, not due to the pressure of power or unfair political influence (Ercan & Gagnon, 2014). Habermas also emphasized that public deliberation must be free from political, economic, and social domination to produce a fair and rational agreement. This communication process, according to him, was more than just an exchange of opinions, but a joint effort to reach a consensus that reflects various interests in society (Ercan & Dryzek, 2015).

However, the implementation of deliberative democracy is not separated from challenges. Inequality of power and access to information often limit public space from its ideal role as an arena for free discussion (Davydenko & Andrianova, 2023). When certain institutions or groups control public spaces, the freedom to express opinions could be disrupted (Kakasur, 2022). In this situation, public spaces are more likely to be used to perpetuate power than as a place of healthy and inclusive deliberation. Therefore, this theory demanded the protection of public space to remain open and free from influences that undermine the rational discussion process (Scudder, 2023). In addition, it is important to ensure that marginalized groups have equal opportunities to be involved in the deliberation process, so that democracy can run in an inclusive and fair manner (Al'anam & Salman, 2024).

## METHOD

This study used a qualitative approach and *Critical Discourse Analysis* (CDA) design because it analyzed the systematic repressive system implemented by the Indonesian government through legislation. More than just the imposition of repressive measures, this study uncovered how biased language in laws creates a narrative that legitimizes such actions. The documents analyzed include the Electronic Information and Transaction Law (UU ITE) <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/details/274494/uu-no-1-tahun-2024>; the Book of Law; Indonesian Criminal Law (KUHP) <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/234935/uu-no-1-tahun-2023>; the Law on Community Organizations (UU CSOs) <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/38876/uu-no-17-tahun-2013>; Government Regulation on Security and Public Order No. 26 of 2020 <https://satpolpp.sulbarprov.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Permendagri-Nomor-26-Tahun-2020-tentang-Penyelenggaraan-Trantibum-Linmas.pdf>. A number of documents were chosen because they were predominantly used to ensnare individuals or groups who voiced criticism of power.

Data was collected through a literature study from the official website <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/>. The document was then prepared for analysis using AntConc's corpus analysis software. The process of preparing the corpus included the extraction of articles or clauses related to protests and criticism of the government, as well as the selection of keywords relevant to the themes of freedom of speech, public order, and security. Once the corpus was ready, the data was analyzed with *AntConc* to trace word frequency, collocation, and term concordance used in the document. The keywords analyzed in this study were: "security, public order, threats, censorship, dispersal, decisive action, and repression; as well as other terms such as insult, defamation, spreading fake news, disturbing order, provocation, inciting crime, security threats, hindering development,

national stability, mine rejection, acts of destruction, spreading communism, deprivation of freedom, SARA-based hate speech, threatening state apparatus, threats to the state, fake news, disturbing content, and electronic slander". These words were identified from cases of arrests and imprisonment of environmental activists using the ITE Law, the Criminal Code, the CSOs Law, and the Government Regulation on Security and Public Order, which were documented in media such as Kompas and Tempo.

*AntConc* was also used to analyze the relationships between words in legal contexts, specifically through collocation and concordance features that allow mapping the linguistic context of a given term (Putri & Mardiah, 2024). The *Critical Discourse Analysis* (CDA) approach was applied to interpret how the language structure in legal documents served as a legitimacy tool against state repressive actions. The selection of *AntConc* as a tool in this study was based on its ability to process large amounts of text efficiently and accurately. In addition, *AntConc* allowed analysis of the co-text patterns of keywords and uncovers how specific terms were used strategically to shape the construction of discourse that justifies restrictions on freedom of expression. Thus, using *AntConc* improved the accuracy of linguistic analysis in tracing the practice of symbolic power in legal texts.

To increase credibility, researchers used trail audits, a transparent documentation process for each data analysis stage. Every step in the data collection, processing, and analysis process was recorded in detail, so that other parties could follow and verify the processes that have been carried out. In addition, validation was carried out through triangulation of source data, namely by comparing various legal documents (ITE LAW, KHP, CMO Law, and PP) and criminalization cases recorded in the media and advocacy reports. This strategy was used to test the consistency of cross-source findings and strengthen the accuracy of interpretation without involving legal experts directly. Finally, in the use of *AntConc* tools, the analysis was carried out consistently by establishing clear parameters for data collection and processing. The results of the analysis, such as word frequency and occurrence of key terms, were presented transparently to show how language was used in legal texts systematically.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study analyzes the Electronic Information and Transaction Law (UU ITE), the Criminal Code (KHUP), the Law on Community Organizations (UU ORMAS), and Government Regulations on Security and Public Order to dismantle the systematic repressive system carried out by the Indonesian government. The data was taken from keywords associated with acts of criminalization of public expression and restrictions on freedom of speech.

**Table 1**  
**Data on the Frequency of Word Occurrence in Documents**

No	Keywords	UU ITE	CRIMINAL Code	UU Ormas	PP	Total Appearances
1	Security	2	32	32	9	75
2	Public order	4	2	5	33	44
3	Threat	7	66	66	2	141
4	Action	0	65	65	25	155
5	Humiliation	0	14	14	0	28
6	Defamation	3	14	0	0	17
7	Spread	4	2	2	0	8
8	Fake news	0	14	0	0	14
9	Disturbing order	3	10	10	2	25
10	Incite	2	6	6	0	14
11	Barriers to development	0	3	2	1	6
12	Criminal	20	839	839	2	1.700
13	The spread of communism	0	2	2	0	4
14	Deprivation of liberty	0	31	31	0	62
15	Hatred	2	1	3	0	6
16	Threatening the authorities	0	0	6	1	7
17	Slander	1	4	4	0	9

The table reveals the frequency of keyword occurrences in the four documents analyzed. Based on data, the term "criminal act" has the highest frequency of occurrence, totaling 1,700 times. In addition, the word "threat" appears 141 times, and "action" was recorded 155 times. The term "security" appeared 75 times, while "public order" appeared 44 times, with a relatively consistent distribution across the documents analyzed. Several other words related to public expression, such as "insult" (28 times), "defamation" (17 times), "fake news" (14 times), and "seditious" (14 times), were also found in a fairly striking frequency. In addition, the term "deprivation of liberty" was recorded to appear 62 times, marking its existence as part of the discourse in the regulations under review. If directly associated with various cases of repression against public expression, these terms were used to label individuals and groups who voice criticism in various aspects.

For example, the terms "insult" and "defamation" were often associated with the application of articles in the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law) to ensnare activists, journalists, and ordinary citizens who criticize public officials through social media. For example, the case of human rights activists Haris Azhar and Fatia Maulidiyanti illustrated how these terms were used to label individuals who voice criticism. In 2021, the two uploaded a video on their YouTube channel discussing the alleged involvement of the coordinating minister for Maritime Affairs and Investment, Luhut Binsar Pandjaitan, in the mining business in Papua. In the video, the two mentioned that Luhut had a relationship with a mining company in the area. As a result, Luhut reported the two to the police on charges of defamation under Article 27 paragraph (3) and Article 45 paragraph (3) of the ITE Law, which regulated "insult" and "defamation through electronic media."

Other terms, such as "fake news" and "seditious," were used to prosecute those who disseminated information considered detrimental to the authorities, even if the information was a legitimate criticism or report. In 2020, activist Rавio Patra was arrested by police after posting information on social media that was deemed to contain an invitation to riots. This arrest was related to Rавio's activities, which were previously active in criticizing various government policies, including transparency in the Pre-Employment Card Program, potential conflicts of interest of state officials, and the lack of clarity in handling the COVID-19 pandemic. Rавio denied the allegations and stated that the post was aimed at reminding the public to remain calm after his *WhatsApp* account was hacked and used to spread provocative messages without his knowledge. Nevertheless, the police still considered that the upload could trigger public unrest, so Rавio was charged with violating Article 160 of the Criminal Code regarding incitement. The case has drawn widespread criticism from various parties, including Amnesty International and SAFEnet, who considered that the authorities' actions are silencing freedom of opinion and public expression. Amnesty even called Rавio's arrest as part of the "state's terror against critical voices."

Then in 2019, journalist Dhandy Laksono also faced legal threats due to his activities reporting the unrest situation in Papua through social media. Dhandy was accused of violating Article 28, Paragraph (2) of the ITE Law concerning disseminating information containing elements of hatred or hostility between groups based on SARA (Ethnic, Religious, Racial, and Inter-Group). The allegations began after he posted a series of tweets on his personal Twitter account criticizing the way security forces handled the protests and violence in Papua, including allegations of human rights abuses against civilians. In his tweet, Dhandy highlighted the structural injustices experienced by the Papuan people, including racism and state violence. The upload aimed to provide alternative information and urge public attention to the situation that had not been widely reported. This case showed how "incitement" and "fake news" were often used to silence individuals seeking to mobilize the public to be more critical of government policies, especially when Papuan issues did not gain attention by the media. A number of these cases are further detailed in the following table.

**Table 2**  
**List of Criminalization of Activists and Journalists**

No	Activist Name	Year	Context of Criticism	Labeling Language	Law and Articles of Entanglement	Criminalizing Parties
----	---------------	------	----------------------	-------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------

1	Haris Azhar and Fatia Maulidiyanti	2021	Uncovering the alleged involvement of officials (Luhut Binsar Pandjaitan) in the mining business in Papua	Insults, Defamation	Article 27 paragraph (3) and Article 45 paragraph (3) of the ITE Law	Coordinating Minister for Maritime Affairs and Investment, Luhut Binsar Pandjaitan (through a report to the police)
2	Ravio Patra	2020	Criticizing government policies related to the Pre-Employment Card Program, the COVID-19 pandemic, and official conflicts of interest	Spreading False, Seditious News	Article 160 of the Criminal Code	Police
3	Dhandy Laksono	2019	Reporting violence and human rights violations in Papua, criticism of security forces	Spreading hatred, inciting	Article 28 paragraph (2) of the ITE Law	Police

Source: *News media (WALHI, Kompas, Tempo, BBC News Indonesia, Detik Jateng, CNN Indonesia)*

In addition to being used in previous cases, the terms "insult (28 times) and "defamation (17 times) were also used to label several environmental activists. 2014 I Wayan Tirtayasa, I Wayan Saniyasa, I Wayan Adi Jayanatha, and I Made Murdana were imprisoned for voicing their opposition to the Benoa Bay reclamation project, Sidakarya, Bali. This reclamation project was initiated by PT Tirta Wahana Bali Internasional (TWBI), a subsidiary of Artha Graha Network, a business group owned by national businessman Tomy Winata. This rejection was motivated by community concerns about the adverse impact of reclamation on coastal environments and customary areas, as happened with the reclamation of Serangan Island in Bali, Manado Bay, and Jakarta Bay. The project was considered to have the potential to damage the ecosystem, threaten the livelihood of fishermen, and ignore the sacred values of customary lands. In the action, the Sidakarya people held traditional rituals and symbolic actions that contained criticism of the policies of the Bali Provincial Government under the leadership of Governor I Made Mangku Pastika. However, these four residents were later reported to the police on charges of "insulting" and "defamation" against the governor. The four were charged with Articles 310 and 311 of the Criminal Code, which regulate "insult" and "defamation."

Similarly, terms such as "threatening" (141 times) and "threatening the apparatus" (7 times) in the ITE Law, the Law on CSOs, and the Government Regulation on Security and Public Order were often used to label citizens who rejected illegal mining as a threat to the state. In 2017, Commander Tubagus Budhi Firbany was criminalized for rejecting illegal mining and supporting fishermen's struggle in Bangka. He was accused of "threatening" the authorities. He was called a "Commander", was ready to attack a police station, even though the designation was a surname in local tradition. This accusation became the basis for Budhi to be charged with Article 335 paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code regarding "unpleasant acts," a rubber article often used to silence environmental activism.

Muhammad Hisbun Payu experienced a tendency toward negative labeling in 2013. Students of the Faculty of Law, University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta, and environmental activists, together with Sukoharjo residents, were involved in a protest against air pollution caused by PT Rayon Utama Makmur (PT RUM) factory waste in Plesan Village, Nguter District, Central Java. The action on February 22-23, 2018, was triggered by a pungent smell from factory waste, which caused public health problems. In the action, there was the burning of tires and the destruction of PT RUM's security post, which was then used as a basis to label the activists as "rioters" and "provocateurs." Police accused them of "threatening public order" and "inciting citizens to violence," terms often used to justify repressive measures. Muhammad Hisbun Payu and two other activists, Kelvin Ferdiansyah Subekti and Sutarno, were charged with Article 170 of the Criminal Code regarding joint destruction. Hisbun's arrest occurred on March 4, 2018, in Lenteng Agung, South Jakarta, when he was about to report the defamation case to Komnas HAM. In addition, several other activists were also charged with violating

the ITE Law for allegedly provoking through social media. This negative labeling was part of a criminalization strategy to silence citizens' protests against environmental damage and maintain the dominance of corporate interests.

Muhammad Hisbun Payu experienced a tendency toward negative labeling in 2013. Students of the Faculty of Law, University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta, and environmental activists, together with Sukoharjo residents, were involved in a protest against air pollution caused by PT Rayon Utama Makmur (PT RUM) factory waste in Plesan Village, Nguter District, Central Java. The action on February 22-23, 2018, was triggered by a pungent smell from factory waste, which caused public health problems. In the action, there was the burning of tires and the destruction of PT RUM's security post, which was then used as a basis to label the activists as "rioters" and "provocateurs." Police accused them of "threatening public order" and "inciting citizens to violence," terms often used to justify repressive measures. Muhammad Hisbun Payu and two other activists, Kelvin Ferdiansyah Subekti and Sutarno, were charged with Article 170 of the Criminal Code regarding joint destruction. Hisbun's arrest occurred on March 4, 2018, in Lenteng Agung, South Jakarta, when he was about to report the defamation case to Komnas HAM. In addition, several other activists were also charged with violating the ITE Law for allegedly provoking through social media. This negative labeling was part of a criminalization strategy to silence citizens' protests against environmental damage and maintain the dominance of corporate interests.

The practice of labeling and criminalizing environmental defenders also occurred in 2019. Muhammad Sandi, Chairman of the DPC Alliance of Environmental Observant Communities (Ampuh), was criminalized after advocating for environmental pollution in six villages in Sandai and Delta Pawan Districts, Ketapang Regency, West Kalimantan. He highlighted the pollution of rivers due to palm oil waste and mining, which caused skin diseases in around 300 residents. Instead of getting protection, Sandi was reported by the palm oil company on May 15, 2019, and only four days later was designated as a suspect. He was charged with Article 27 paragraph (3) jo. Article 45 paragraph (3) of Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Information and Electronic Transactions (ITE Law), on the allegation of "defamation (17 times) through uploads on social media, and accused of fraud. Labels such as "fraudster" and "spreader of fake news (14 times)" were used to stifle his criticism of environmental damage. In the same year, Jasmin and 21 residents of Wawonii Island, Konawe Islands Regency, Southeast Sulawesi, experienced criminalization due to the rejection of nickel mining activities carried out by PT Gema Kreasi Perdana (a subsidiary of Harita Group). Residents carried out a blockade of heavy equipment that would be used for mining activities that threatened their living space, including agricultural land and clean water sources. To silence the resistance, Jasmin and other residents were charged with Article 333 of the Criminal Code regarding the deprivation of the freedom of others. Labels such as "usurpers of freedom/freedom (62 times) and "investment disruptors" were used to frame peaceful citizens' protests as criminal acts.

The latest criminalization case occurred in 2024 against Daniel Frits Maurits Tangkilisan, an environmental activist from Karimunjawa, Central Java. Daniel was criminalized after criticizing illegal shrimp pond activities that polluted the protected area of Karimunjawa National Park. This incident began with Daniel's upload on his Facebook account on November 12, 2022, where he shared a video of the condition of the beach polluted by shrimp pond waste and included a sarcastic comment that called "the shrimp brain community". The upload was later reported by a resident named Ridwan, who accused Daniel of spreading hate speech based on "SARA". Daniel was charged with Article 28 paragraph (2) in conjunction with Article 45A paragraph (2) of Law Number 19 of 2016 concerning Information and Electronic Transactions (ITE Law). He was first detained on December 7, 2023, but was released the next day after a request for a stay of detention was granted. However, on January 24, 2024, Daniel was again detained by the Jepara District Attorney's Office after completing his case file. On April 4, 2024, the Jepara District Court sentenced Daniel to 7 months in prison and a fine of IDR 5 million, arguing that his uploads caused a sense of "hatred (6 times)" against certain community groups based on SARA. This verdict drew criticism from various parties, including NGOs KontraS

and Greenpeace Indonesia, who considered this case a form of criminalization of environmental defenders and a violation of the right to freedom of expression.

The following table provides further details of cases of repression and criminalization against environmental activists.

**Table 3**  
**Cases of Repression Against Environmental Activists**

No	Activist Name	Year	Context of Criticism	Labeling Language	Law and Articles of Entanglement	Criminalizing Parties
1	I Wayan Tirtayasa, I Wayan Saniyasa, I Wayan Adi Jayanatha, I Made Murdana	2014	Rejection of the reclamation of Benoa Bay, Bali	Insults, Defamation	Articles 310 and 311 of the Criminal Code	Reported to the police, by the Bali Provincial Government
2	Commander Tubagus Budhi Furbany	2017	Rejection of illegal mining and support for fishermen in Bangka	Spreading False, Seditious News	Article 335 paragraph (1) of the Criminal Code (unpleasant acts)	Police
3	Heri Budiawan alias Budi Pego	2017	Rejection of PT Bumi Suksesindo's gold mine in Gunung Tumpang Pitu, Banyuwangi	Spread of communism	Article 107a of the Criminal Code	Police and Courts (PN Banyuwangi, MA)
4	Muhammad Hisbun Payu, Kelvin Ferdiansyah Subekti, Sutarno	2018	Protest against air pollution by PT RUM waste in Sukoharjo	Rioters, Provocateurs, Threatening public order	Article 170 of the Criminal Code; ITE Law (Article 170 of the Criminal Code on joint destruction)	Police
5	Muhammad Sandi	2019	Advocacy on palm oil waste and mining pollution in Ketapang, West Kalimantan	Defamation, Fraudsters, Spreaders of false news	Article 27 paragraph (3) jo. Article 45, paragraph (3) of Law No. 11/2008 (ITE Law)	Palm Oil Company
6	Jasmin and 21 residents of Wawonii Island	2019	Rejection of nickel mining activities by PT Gema Kreasi Perdana	Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Speech	Article 333 of the Criminal Code concerning the deprivation of the liberty of others	Marion, an employee of PT GKP
7	Daniel Frits Maurits Tangkilisan	2024	Criticism of illegal shrimp ponds that pollute Karimunjawa National Park	Hate speech, SARA, Shrimp brain community (sarcasm)	Article 28 paragraph (2) jo. Article 45A, paragraph (2) of Law No. 19/2016 concerning ITE	Reported by residents (Ridwan); processed by the Prosecutor's Office and the Jepara District Court

Source: News media (WALHI, Kompas, Tempo, BBC News Indonesia, Detik Jateng, CNN Indonesia)

Furthermore, van Dijk's (2008) *Critical Discourse Analysis* (CDA) was also applied to unpack how legal texts build ideologies and manipulative strategies used to rationalize repressive actions. The analysis focuses on ideology, manipulative strategies, discourse structures at both the macro and micro levels, and framing strategies that legitimize systematic repressive actions.

### Dominant Ideology in Legal Texts

The dominant ideology that underpins the Electronic Information and Transaction Law (UU ITE), the Criminal Code (KUHP), the Law on Community Organizations (UU CSOs), and

Government Regulations related to public order was the ideology of security and order, that served as the basis for legitimacy for the state's repressive actions against its citizens. Within this ideological framework, public expression was not positioned as a guaranteed democratic right, but rather as a potential disruption to national stability. As a result, legal policies were designed by placing the interests of state security above the principle of freedom of expression. The narrative built through these regulations portrays criticism as a threat to the socio-political order, rather than as an essential element of democratic life. This ideology was then manifested concretely through the choice of diction in legal texts that criminalize forms of public expression.

Terms such as "security" (75 times), "public order" (44 times), "threat" (141 times), "action" (155 times), "spread" (8 times), "disturbing order" (25 times), "inciting" (14 times), "spread of communism" (4 times), "usurpation of liberty" (62 times), and "threatening the apparatus" (7 times) that appeared in the documents analyzed, indicated the articulation of the dominant ideology of state security in the four legal instruments. The repetition and emphasis in such dictionaries not only reflect a legalistic orientation towards social stability and control, but also demonstrated their ideological function as a means of legitimacy against the practice of criminalization in several cases. This can be seen, for example, in the labeling of M. Hisbun Puyu as a "rioter and provocateur" and his activities as a form of "disturbing public order"; on the accusation against Jasmin and 21 Wawoni Island residents as parties who "deprived others" of their freedom because their activities were considered to "interfere with investment"; on the criminalization of Budi Pego who was accused of "spreading the teachings of communism"; and in the case of Budhi and Patra who were labeled as "spreaders of fake news" because their actions in rejecting illegal mining were constructed as a form of "incitement".

In addition to this ideology, legal instruments in Indonesia also contained the ideology of legalistic authoritarianism, which was a perspective that places the law as a tool of power to limit and control public expression that threatens the status quo. Within this framework, legal instruments were executed selectively and repressively to protect the interests of political and corporate elites, framing criticism as a form of lawlessness that is legitimate to be punished. The terms "insult" (28 times) and "defamation" (17 times), for example, served not only as juridical categories, but also as ideological labels used to frame the expression of criticism as criminal acts. In practice, these terms were mobilized in criminalization cases such as those experienced by M. Sandi in Ketapang, I Wayan Tirtayasa and his colleagues in Bena Bay, and Haris Azhar and Fatia Maulidiyanti in mining cases in Papua. These three cases showed how seemingly neutral legal terms were operated ideologically to dampen opposition, perpetuate power dominance, and silence voices demanding ecological justice and public accountability.

### **Manipulative Strategies in Legal Texts**

Based on the dominant ideology underlying the formulation and implementation of several legal instruments, six manipulative strategies were identified to legitimize state repressive actions. First, criminalization through lexical framing used terms such as "insult", "defamation", "sedition", and "spread of communism" that constructed the expression of criticism as a crime, not a civil right. Second, the repetition of ideological dictions such as "threat", "security", and "public order" reinforced the narrative that the state was always in danger due to citizen expression, thus requiring strict control. Third, the generalization and blurring of the boundaries of legal categories with terms such as "community unrest" provided a broad scope of interpretation used to repress citizens. Fourth, the disappearance of agents and the use of passive structures, such as "sanctionable," disguised the authority of the perpetrators of repression and shield the state from direct responsibility. Fifth, the selectivity of law application could be seen in the uneven use of the law that targets groups critical of power. Sixth, legal euphemisms polished repressive actions with terms such as "law enforcement" and "maintenance of order" that hide the authoritarian nature of these policies. These strategies not only normalized state repressive actions, but also served as an ideological instrument to silence criticism and maintain the dominance of political elites and corporations.

### **Discourse Structure**

Macro-wise, the central theme that dominated the legal discourse was the ideology of security and order, which was used as a legitimacy for state repressive actions, by constructing a narrative that public expression potential threat to national stability. This theme was identified through a discourse scheme consistently portraying criticism as a socio-political disorder, not part of democratic practice. At the micro level, the analysis of the lexical, syntactic, stylistic, and rhetorical dimensions revealed the manipulative strategies used by legal texts to articulate and disseminate these dominant ideologies. The choice of diction, such as "threat", "insult", and "public order" that appear repeatedly, was evidence of an ideological framing that perceives citizens' expressions as criminality. The use of passive structures, the disappearance of agents, and euphemisms such as "law enforcement" disguised repressive actions as normative policies. Thus, the macro structure presented the dominant ideological construct in the form of a large narrative of law as a guardian of order. At the same time, the microstructure showed how the narrative was manipulated and operationalized linguistically to legitimize repression, silence criticism, and perpetuate the dominance of power.

### **Framing Strategy**

The framing strategy applied in the text aimed to frame an issue or event in a certain way to influence the reader's interpretation. It consisted of three main strategies. First, in the criminalization of criticism, the legal text used terms such as "insult", "defamation", "sedition", and "spread of communism" to describe the expression of criticism as a violation of the law that must be punished. Second, the strengthening of social control was manifested through the repetition of the terms of "security", "threat", and "disturbing public order", which served to frame criticism as a potential threat to state stability and justified repressive measures to protect order. Third, legal instruments were used as tools that restrict freedom of expression, with terms such as "defamation", "sedition", and "deprivation of freedom" to criminalized political and social opposition. Overall, this framing strategy showed how legal texts not only formulated policies but also shaped public perceptions of what was perceived as a threat, as well as how the state leveraged the rule of law to maintain stability and control public expression.

The results of this study revealed the repressive system that the Indonesian government systematically carried out in various sectors, such as the environment, human rights, freedom of the press, cultural customs, economic-social, and political-government. This system worked by negatively labeling citizens who voiced criticism and framing such activities as threatening national stability. Whether in direct action or through social media, the criticism conveyed was not responded to as part of civil rights in a democratic country, but was constructed as a criminal act. This mechanism was strengthened through legal tools such as the Information and Electronic Transactions Law (ITE Law) and the Criminal Code (KUHP), whose articles were used selectively to associate criticism with law violations. The findings are described in detail in the following sections.

### **A Systematic Repressive System That Silences Criticism**

The systematic repression carried out by the Indonesian government was manifested in the practice of negative labeling of citizens who voiced criticism. Terms such as 'security' (75 times), 'public order' (44 times), 'threat' (141 times), 'action' (155 times), 'spread' (8 times), 'disturbing order' (25 times), 'inciting' (14 times), 'spreading communism' (4 times), 'depriving of freedom' (62 times), and 'threatening the authorities' (7 times), were systematically used to target activists deemed to be disturbing national order and stability. These terms were further associated with articles in the Electronic Information and Transaction Law (UU ITE), the Criminal Code (KUHP), the Law on Community Organizations (UU CSOs), and Government Regulations that regulated public order, to silence, arrest, and imprison activists who voiced criticism in various aspects. This finding was aligned with the [ICJR report \(2023\)](#), which showed that articles in the ITE Law were often misused to suppress freedom of opinion, where individuals who expressed criticism of the government were targeted for criminalization.

The practice of negative labeling of citizens who voiced criticism was in line with Michel Foucault's (1980) idea of power that was diffuse throughout social structures. Within this framework, language served as a tool to form a social consensus that establishes the boundaries between what was considered legitimate and illegal in a society. The Indonesian government, through the use of negative terms, framed criticism as an illegal activity because it was considered to disrupt social stability. This narrative not only served to maintain state power, but also established a social structure that places freedom of speech as a subversive act perceived as a threat to the state order.

Furthermore, the practice of labeling and criminalizing criticism could be understood as a form of structural violence, as stated by Galtung (2018), where power did not work through physical violence directly, but through social and legal structures that systemically created inequality and oppression. When the state used the legal apparatus to construct criticism as a threat, individuals and groups who voiced disapproval of government policies were silenced without physical violence. However, they were still politically, socially, and psychologically harmed. This violence was hidden in legality, but it impacted the paralysis of citizen participation in democracy. Thus, a seemingly neutral legal system reproduced oppressive power through symbolic and structural mechanisms that undermined civil liberties in a systemic and sustained manner (Ariyawansa et al., 2022).

The structural violence manifested through the legal system not only created fear and silence but also weakened society's ability to demand justice. When legal instruments such as the ITE Law, the Criminal Code, and other regulations were used to ensnare criticism, criminalized citizens did not have an equal space to defend themselves because the judicial system inherently favored power. This inequality of access to justice showed that the law did not protect civil rights but was a tool of symbolic domination that reinforced state hegemony over public discourse. In conditions like this, criticism was not only silenced but also delegitimized through legal processes that appear to be legitimate. This showed that the democratic deficit in Indonesia lied not only in political practices but also in legal structures that created exclusion and systemically limit the political participation of citizens. This finding was strengthened by the results of a Kompas (2021) study, which showed that the power of law was often used to limit freedom of speech, causing public discussion spaces to become closed and not inclusive.

### **The Role of Language in Legal Documents as an Instrument of Repression**

Negative terms in legal instruments served as a tool for labeling, regulating, and sanctioning, and also form a public narrative that harmed individuals or groups who voice criticism of government policies. The language in legal documents systematically created a negative stigma against activists and individuals who fought for freedom of expression, thus narrowing the space for legitimacy for opposition voices. The use of terms such as "provocateur," "rebel," and "threat to the state" in various government legal and regulatory decisions not only reflected the state's defensive stance but also constructed a social reality in which criticism was perceived as a form of threat. This terminology reinforced the logic of state security and public order that ultimately facilitated repressive actions against those who were constructed as "problematic" or "dangerous" people within legal and social frameworks. In perspective Corsaro & Bourdieu (1992); Sabrina et al (2021), this kind of practice showed how language functioned as a tool of symbolic domination, where actors with institutional authority, such as police and ministers, used the symbolic power of language to set the boundaries of the legitimacy of discourse. Thus, the law not only became a coercive tool, but also a symbolic battleground that determined who was allowed to speak, within what limits, and on what behalf.

### **Impact on Freedom of Speech and Democracy**

Using negative terms and stigmatizing criticism in legal documents effectively created a frightening landscape of discourse, where individuals felt threatened when expressing opinions. The narrative built through regulations such as the ITE Law and the Criminal Code placed criticism of the state as a criminal act, not as part of civil rights. This created a climate of self-censorship that eroded deliberative public spaces, narrowed the possibilities for healthy policy debate, and removed the role

of society as a supervisor of power. This situation showed the contradiction between the democratic principles contained in the constitution and the practice of power exercised by the state. The criminalization of political expression and criticism showed a severe democratic deficit (Arianto et al., 2021). Policies that restrict freedom of speech through legal threats violated civil rights and weakened society's capacity to demand accountability and transparency. Research by Tempo (2024) showed that using the ITE Law to ensnare criticism expanded the deterrent effect in society, creating collective fear that led to the delegitimization of civic activism.

The lack of a safe space to speak also deepened socio-political polarization. Those who criticized government policies were often labeled as "destabilizers" or even "enemies of the state," labels that were not ideologically neutral and full of symbolic power. As a result, democratic discourse was reduced to a mere justification of the status quo. Within the framework of deliberative democracy, freedom of speech was not just a right but a fundamental mechanism to limit power and prevent authoritarianism (Schudson, 2020). Therefore, silencing critical discourse through the language of law was a form of symbolic violence that eroded the foundations of democracy itself.

## CONCLUSION

The Indonesian government implements a systematic repressive system using legal instruments to silence public criticism. Through the narrative built into the text, the government has criminalized criticism and attributed it to a threat to national stability. The term is used not only as an instrument to impose sanctions, but also as a tool to form negative perceptions of criticizing individuals and groups. Therefore, a critical audit of the legal language is important to remove multi-interpretation terms that discredit criticism, so that it no longer legitimizes structural violence and weakens the foundations of democracy in Indonesia. Although it analyzes the use of language in legal instruments, this study has limitations in the scope of data, which is focused only on formal documents. This study has not included the dimension of cross-country comparisons or the influence of local political dynamics on the implementation of repressive articles. Moreover, the analysis is still limited to textual representations without empirically exploring how legal actors (judges, prosecutors, police) interpret and apply these terms in court practice. Further research can expand the scope with a legal ethnography approach or field studies to capture the praxis dimension of symbolic power in the justice system.

## DECLARATIONS

<b>Author contribution</b>	: Muhammad Ifan conceptualized the research idea, developed the methodological framework, and conducted the primary data analysis. As academic supervisors, Titik Sudartinah, Pangesti Wiedarti, and Pratomo Widodo provided conceptual guidance, academic supervision, and substantive feedback on the content and direction of the research. They also contributed to the review of the theoretical framework and ensured the academic quality of the article. Evi Sulistiana and Azhari assisted in data collection, literature review, and the initial editing of the manuscript.
<b>Funding statement</b>	: This article did not receive specific funding from any institution or funding agency.
<b>Conflict of interest</b>	: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest in the writing and publication of this article.
<b>Ethics Approval</b>	: The authors agree to have this article published in KEMBARA in 2025.
<b>Additional information</b>	: No additional information is available for this paper.

## REFERENCE

- Anchuri, K., Jacox, N., Andreychuk, T., & Brown, A. (2021). Structural violence education: A critical moment for psychiatric training. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 66(9), 785–787. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07067437211016243>
- Anowu, A. E., Ope-Davies, T., & Shodipe, M. (2024). Strategies for legitimising and delegitimising power in nigerian courtroom discourse. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale de Sémiotique Juridique*, 37(2), 379–398. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-023-10052-9>
- Arianto, O. D., Sujoko, A., & Wahyudi, A. (2021). Repressive political communication through legal products to preserve the ideology of Jokowi's government. *The Journal of Society and Media*, 5(1), 173-185. <https://doi.org/10.26740/jsm.v5n1.p173-198>
- Ariyawansa, S., de Silva, A., & Jones, B. (2022). Introduction: Conceptualisations of violence. *Australian Feminist Law Journal*, 48(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13200968.2022.2138181>
- Arslanalp, M., & Deniz Erkmén, T. (2020). Mobile emergency rule in Turkey: Legal repression of protests during authoritarian transformation. *Democratization*, 27(6), 947–969. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2020.1753701>
- Barak, G. (2003). *Violence and nonviolence: Pathways to understanding*. SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452231716>
- Bethke, F. S., & Wolff, J. (2023). Lockdown of expression: civic space restrictions during the COVID-19 pandemic as a response to mass protests. *Democratization*, 30(6), 1073–1091. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2023.2209021>
- Burton, C. W., Gilpin, C. E., & Draughon Moret, J. (2021). Structural violence: A concept analysis to inform nursing science and practice. *Nursing Forum*, 56(2), 382–388. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nuf.12535>
- Corsaro, W. A., & Bourdieu, P. (1992). Language and symbolic power. *Social Forces*, 71(1), 242. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2579985>
- Davis, C. S., Lieberman, A. J., & O'Kelley-Bangsberg, M. (2022). Legality of drug checking equipment in the United States: A systematic legal analysis. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 234, 109425. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2022.109425>
- Davydenko, V. A., & Andrianova, E. V. (2023). "Simulacra of translation": Reflections on the publication of Jürgen Habermas' theory of communicative activity. *Tyumen State University Herald. Social, Economic, and Law Research*, 9(2), 58–82. <https://doi.org/10.21684/2411-7897-2023-9-2-58-82>
- Domente, M. (2021). Freedom of speech is a fundamental right within the Republic of Moldova and Transnistria. *Supremacy of Law*, 1, 29–36. <https://doi.org/10.52388/2345-1971.2021.1.02>
- Dragu, T., & Fan, X. (2020). Self-enforcing legal limits: Bureaucratic constraints on repression under emergency powers. *The Journal of Politics*, 82(2), 687–699. <https://doi.org/10.1086/706981>
- Ercan, S. A. (2019). Deliberative democracy. *Democratic Theory*, 6(1), 97–110. <https://doi.org/10.3167/dt.2019.060106>
- Ercan, S. A., & Dryzek, J. S. (2015). The reach of deliberative democracy. *Policy Studies*, 36(3), 241–248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2015.1065969>
- Ercan, S. A., & Gagnon, J.-P. (2014). The crisis of democracy: Which crisis? Which democracy? *Democratic Theory*, 1(2), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.3167/dt.2014.010201>
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977* (C. Gordon, Ed. & Trans.). Pantheon Books.
- Galtung, J. (2018). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Organicom*, 15(28), 33–56. <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.2238-2593.organicom.2018.150546>
- Galtung, J., & Höivik, T. (1971). Structural and direct violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 8(1), 73–76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002234337100800108>
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action, volume 1: Reason and the rationalization of society*. Beacon Press.

- Han, D. (2020). Critical discourse analysis of public speech: A case study of Obama's speech. *J-Institute*, 5(1), 13–20. <https://doi.org/10.22471/crisis.2020.5.1.13>
- Hart, C., & Winter, B. (2022). Gesture and legitimation in the anti-immigration discourse of Nigel Farage. *Discourse & Society*, 33(1), 34–55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265211048560>
- ICJR. (2023). *Laporan tahunan: Potret pelanggaran kebebasan berekspresi dan penyalahgunaan pasal-pasal UU ITE*. Institute for Criminal Justice Reform. <https://icjr.or.id>
- Jackson, B., & Sadler, L. S. (2022). Structural violence: An evolutionary concept analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 78(11), 3495–3516. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.15341>
- Kakasur, N. O. (2022). The communicative action of Habermas. *Journal of University of Raparin*, 9(5), 389–413. [https://doi.org/10.26750/Vol\(9\).No\(5\).Paper18](https://doi.org/10.26750/Vol(9).No(5).Paper18)
- Kohler, G., & Alcock, N. (1976). An empirical table of structural violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 13(4), 343–356. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002234337601300405>
- Kompas. (2021, Februari 21). *UU ITE, antara Menjaga Ruang Digital dan Alat Pembungkaman*. [kompas.id](https://kompas.id)
- Küçükakın, P. M., & Engin-Demir, C. (2022). The compliant wife, the good mother, and other normalizing constructions of womanhood: A critical discourse analysis of idealized female identities within Turkish educational policy. *Critical Studies in Education*, 63(4), 451–467. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2021.1899950>
- Macassa, G., McGrath, C., Rashid, M., & Soares, J. (2021). Structural violence and health-related outcomes in Europe: A descriptive systematic review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(13), 69–98. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18136998>
- Marashini, S. N. (2022). Freedom of expression in international law. *Communication Journal*, 9–22. <https://doi.org/10.3126/cj.v2i1.57009>
- Mentan, T. (2021). *Ambacide: The genocide and extermination reminiscent of the extermination of jews (holocaust) by Adolf Hitler*. Langaa RPCIG. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1z7kgjr>
- Middeldorp, N., & Le Billon, P. (2019). Deadly environmental governance: Authoritarianism, eco-populism, and the repression of environmental and land defenders. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 109(2), 324–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2018.1530586>
- Miller, D. (1992). Deliberative democracy and social choice. *Political Studies*, 40(1\_suppl), 54–67. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1992.tb01812.x>
- Moroska-Bonkiewicz, A. (2021). Kształtowanie instrumentów ochrony demokracji w Polsce na przykładzie zakazu zgromadzeń. Perspektywa ideowa. *Studia Nad Autorytaryzmem i Totalitaryzmem*, 43(3), 341–369. <https://doi.org/10.19195/2300-7249.43.3.25>
- Motta, F. C. P. (1991). The theory of communicative action. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 31(4), 108–108. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-75901991000400012>
- Al'anam, M., & Salman, R. (2024). The relevance of Jürgen Habermas's theory of communicative action as the philosophical foundation of human rights enforcement in Indonesia. *Mimbar Hukum*, 36(1), 61–82. <https://doi.org/10.22146/mh.v36i1.11513>
- Newman, J. (2020). Critical realism, critical discourse analysis, and the morphogenetic approach. *Journal of Critical Realism*, 19(5), 433–455. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767430.2020.1758986>
- Putri, R., & Mardiah, Z. (2024). Corpus-assisted CDA of George Floyd's murder Reports on CNN and Al Jazeera. *JOURNAL ARBITER*. <https://doi.org/10.25077/ar.11.1.96-108.2024>
- Sabrina, A., Iskandarsyah Siregar, S., & Sosrohadi, S. (2021). Lingual dominance and symbolic power in the discourse of using the Peduli Lindungi application as a digital payment tool. *International Journal of Linguistics Studies*, 1(2), 52–59. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijls.2021.1.2.8>
- Samuel J., K. (2025). The power of persuasive language in judicial opinions. *Research Output Journal of Education*, 5(2), 6–11. <https://doi.org/10.59298/ROJE/2025/52611>
- Schudson, M. (2020). The shortcomings of transparency for democracy. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 64(11), 1670–1678. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764220945347>
- Scudder, M. F. (2023). Deliberative democracy, more than deliberation. *Political Studies*, 71(1), 238–255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00323217211032624>

- Silver, J. R., & Shi, L. (2023). Punishing protesters on the “other side”: Partisan bias in public support for repressive and punitive responses to protest violence. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World*, 9(2), 345-356. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23780231231182908>
- Skuczynski, P. (2020). Narrativity of legal language in the law-making process. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3755894>
- Slough, T., & Fariss, C. (2021). Misgovernance and human rights: The case of illegal detention without intent. *American Journal of Political Science*, 65(1), 148–165. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12529>
- Tempo. (2024). *Pasal karet UU ITE: Sejoli pembungkam kritik*. [interaktif.tempo.co](https://www.interaktif.tempo.co)
- Tian, L. (2021). Critical discourse analysis of political discourse — a case study of Trump’s TV speech. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 11(5), 516–520. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1105.08>
- Trouillard, P. (2022). Repressing the protests through law, police and discourse: The example of the yellow vests’ movement in France. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 30(3), 506–520. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14782804.2021.1915257>
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and power*. Sage Publications.
- Webb, D. (2019). *Environmental justice and the politics of resistance*. Oxford University Press.
- Willey-Sthapit, C., Jen, S., Storer, H. L., & Benson, O. G. (2022). Discursive decisions: Signposts to guide critical discourse analysis in social work. *Qualitative Social Work*, 21(1), 129–146. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325020979050>