# Speech Acts of Government Officials as Illegal Acts by the Ruler

Endra Wijaya[1], Rocky Marbun[1], Muhamad Fahkri Athalla[1]

[1] Pancasila University, Faculty of Law, Jakarta, Indonesia
rocky_marbun@univpancasila.ac.id

**Abstract.** Every action and decision of a government official must be based on the authority that accompanies their position. This obligation contains an implicit meaning of a model of accountability that is inherent in every normative authority. However, the interpretation of Government Officials' actions, in particular, is always identified with physical actions or bodily movements. Whereas, every physical action cannot separate itself from speech acts. Even a physical action cannot be understood without a verbal and nonverbal communication model. The problem that will be discussed in this study is limited to the question "What is the response of Law Science, especially Administrative Law, to speech acts in a Government Official's action that creates social framing phenomena against one of the other branches of state power?" This article aims to analyze and find a legal accountability model for Government Officials' actions that exercise hegemony through truth-games by utilizing mass media and social media. This research uses the Legal Reseach by utilizing approaches from the fields of Political and Social Sciences and Linguistics. According to the findings of this research an effort to maintain the government's credibility through framing communication that utilizes mass media and social media applications to attack the Judicial Power stakeholder, which is a form of Illegal Acts by the Ruler.

**Keywords:** Administration Law, Communication, Government Official, Linguistics.

## 1. Introduction

Language is words that are used as a tool for humans to express or describe a will, feeling, thought, experience, especially in relation to other humans.[1] In order for language to be used as a means of communication, information, interpretation, and transfer of messages from speakers to recipients of messages, the language must be accepted by human society.

Language is an instruction transmitted via expression as an element for interaction in multiple settings and actions. In this situation, the way something is said is linked to segmented and supra segments aspects, whether verbal or kinesic, so that a sentence can operate as an instrument of communication with a different message if expressed differently. This verbal aptitude is combined with rhetorical ability, both in writing and speaking. Rhetoric in this context refers to a capacity to interpret speech successfully and effectively in the form of ethos (character or good intentions), pathos


A. A. Nassihudin et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Law, Governance, and Social Justice (ICoLGaS 2023)*, Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research 805,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-164-7_107

(emotional transport of the listener or reader), and logos (logical evidence) in order to impact the person who reads or listens with messages expressed with written communication or orally.[2] As a result, language is a unique human talent that allows us to develop interactions among other people, both on our own and in communities.

On the other hand, every expression in language is not free from value and importance. This is because every language will always be understood by a group of people where the speaker of that language comes from. The reason why language is an attempt to convey interests, is because, language itself is a collection of phrases, clauses, and sentences that are “intentionally” grouped to refer to a particular object[3].

Language, which contains speech acts, will give the wrong meaning if the ambiguous meaning cannot be limited to its use, especially what often happens between the authorities and their people. In fact, in every way, usually the authorities will obscure facts that are not pleasing to the people. The rulers, will never say "I am wrong", but will say "sorry I made a mistake". As a result, language influences everybody's pondering, especially leaders that may use language as a tool of communication in order to retain their authority.[4]

The description above shows that there is a close relationship between spoken language through communication [speech acts], which later becomes the object of study in Sociolinguistics and Psycholinguistics. However, what happened in the Science of Law—through divisions in pursuit of independent knowledge, the same thing happened with Linguistics. So that, as it were, studies on Sociolinguistics and Psycholinguistics have been separated from studies from Communication Studies or from studies of other branches of linguistics, for example Speech Act Theory or Pragmatics. Which then also differentiates itself from semantic studies when it comes to language expressions in written form.

In this position, both spoken and written expressions cannot be separated from their context. Because of this, efforts to release context, in order to seek purity of meaning, actually distance *the original intents* from the Speaker/Writer. Thus, everyone will express their inner interests by using the chosen language precisely to obscure ideological aspects which will hinder the achievement of the objectives of the hidden interests. However, the disclosure of language through the choice of words actually shows the sharpness of language due to the choice of words. So, do not be surprised when there is an expression that " word" is a semantic weapon (*word constitute semantic weaponry* ). Where humans express words with utterances which are referred to as spoken language.[5] Sometimes without realizing it, language as a tool for humans to express or describe a will, feeling, thought, experience, especially in relation to other humans in association can lead to language crimes (language crime).[6]

In relation to the object of this study and the description above, the researcher starts from a hypothesis that it is impossible for a government official, in exercising his power and authority, to be able to break away from language activities based on

his linguistic competence. In satire, of course in carrying out basic tasks and functions based on legal norms, government officials are definitely not disabled. That is, when exercising power and authority, it is of course impossible to avoid speech acts conveyed through public spaces.

The problem is the impact of speech acts accompanying the exercise of this authority has intervened in other areas of state power. For example, what was done by the Minister of Law and Human Rights (KEMENKUMHAM) Moh. Mahfud MD, when commenting on the criminal case of the Indosurya Savings and Loan Cooperative (KSP). Where, in full, the MENKUMHAM emphasized the following [7] :

> *"Ladies and gentlemen,, eee... this afternoon we held a coordination meeting Along with the Prosecutor General's Office, the National Police Headquarters, UKM, Cooperatives, which and small and medium-sized enterprises, then with the Presidential Staff Office. Eee..to discuss Indonesia's surprise, both the Government and its people, because the Indosurya case which has been discussed for a long time that it was a perfect legal action as a criminal offense, both from the Attorney General's Office, the Police, PPATK...was apparently acquitted...onslag...by the Supreme Court . We cannot avoid avoid the choice of the Supreme Court, to replace the word we have to respect. You can't just avoid it, you can……..eee..you can't do anything because that's a Supreme Court decision. Because of what, the indictment is clear, violation of the Banking Act Article 46 of collecting funds from the public...even though he is not a bank...without a license...that's clear. Then if he acts on behalf of the cooperative, the twenty-three thousand people who are suing this are not members of the cooperative saving money there, right? So because of that, we must not lose in upholding the law and truth. The Government, the Attorney General's Office…..will cassation."*

The goal of this research is to examine and develop a model of legal liability. for the actions of government officials who exercise hegemony through truth -*games* by utilizing mass media and social media. Therefore, in order to maintain the originality of this study, we compared it with several previous studies.

Research conducted by Bagus Oktafian Abrianto, Xavier Nugraha, and Nathanael Grady with the title "Development of Lawsuits for Unlawful Acts by the Government after Law Number 30 of 2014" which was published through the Negara Hukum Journal, Volume 11, Number 1, 2020. In this research, according to Bagus Oktafian Abrianto, Xavier Nugraha, and Nathanael Grady [8] that with the development of the concept of state administrative decisions in Article 87 of Law no. 30 of 2014, it can be seen that real action is a form of state administrative decisions. Thus, the litigation over real action, that is an onrechtmatige overheidsdaad legal action, which was formerly the District Court's absolute competence, has become the State Administrative Court's absolute responsibility. By changing the absolute competence of the *onrechtmatige overheidsdaad lawsuit* , there are various juridical consequences, namely changes in terms of procedural law.

In addition to changes to the procedural law, there are changes to *the petitum* that can be requested in an *onrechtmatige overheidsdaad lawsuit* when submitted to the district court and when submitted to the Administrative Court. Apart from that, the most important thing is the change related to the implementation of the decision or execution, Previously, since the onrechtmatige overheidsdaad case was the only jurisdiction of the district court, it was reliant upon the federal government's good will. Yet, despite depending on the State Administrative Court's full ability, there have been various attempts to make this decision enforceable by the relevant government institution (the defendant). In fact, when the relevant government agency (defendant) does not carry out the PTUN decision, criminal sanctions can be imposed.

Concerning the aforementioned research, there are some resemblance in the thing of study, such as behaves towards the law committed by the authorities/government (onrechtmatige overheidsdaad) performed from the Government in connection with the idea of "real action" in the structure of State Administrative Decrees (KTUN), which were originally the sole ability of the General Courts. Therefore, in this case, there is a difference that is to be studied and examined, namely regarding the concept of "Action" - which in this study, is in the form of Speech Acts (utterances/speech) by Government Officials through mass media both print and online towards *decisions* made made by other state agencies.

Research conducted by Bram Mohammad Yasser with the title "Testing Elements of Abuse of Authority in State Administrative Courts in Relation to Corruption Crimes" which was published through Soumatera Law Review, Volume 2, Number 1, Year 2019. As for Bram Mohammad Yasser [9 ] — as a researcher, explaining that testing It is an essential issue to determine whether or not there is misuse of jurisdiction by general administrative agencies or officials in the occurrence of charges of Corruption Crimes regarding the use of claimed power through the State Administrative Court, in accordance with the provisions in Supreme Court Regulation No. 4 of 2015 concerning Guidelines for Procedures in Assessing Elements of Abuse of Authority, testing for the Assessment of Elements of Abuse of Authority is carried out before the start of the criminal process. and inversely, When there is no harm of legitimacy, it serves as an argument for government officials who may be accused of performing a violation of corruption in utilising their duties, even if there are actual fiscal expenses, which could be caused by technical issues or extensive research in the setting of purchasing of items and services.

The above-mentioned study focuses on assessing the aspects of abuse of power perpetrated by State Administrative Officers in relation to the emergence of state financial losses as a result of their judgements. In addition, as a researcher, Bram Mohammad Yasser wishes to maximise the vitality and circulation of Supreme Court Regulation No. 4 of 2015 regarding Guidelines for Procedures in Assessing Elements of Abuse of Authority, as procedural regulations that ought to be utilised prior to an issue of neglect of control crosses into the field of criminal law.

Research conducted by Jojo Juhaeni with the title "Abuse of Authority by Public Officials in the Perspective of Sociology of Law" which was published through

the Constituent Journal, Volume 3, Number 1, Year 2021. As for Jojo Juhaeni [10] — as a researcher, With regard to this misuse of influence, it is important to note that the form of neglect of power (detournement de pouvoir) by public authorities from the standpoint of legal sociology is a person or public official who is given authority in a position and uses it for personal and group interests with the aim of enriching themselves or certain groups and harming many people or the general public . Sociology of law plays an important role in eradicating Abusing power ( *detournement de pouvoir* ) as a tool/media for outreach to the public about the abuse of authority by people (public officials) in the form of corruption or other actions that are detrimental to the state/society so that the community can play an important role in overseeing the course of process of law enforcement so that a sense of justice arises for the community.

Based on the results of the research conducted by Jojo Juhaeni mentioned above, it is clear that the differences in the studies to be carried out in this study are clear. Where, the research conducted by Jojo Juhaeni focused on studying the urgency of the operationalization of studies in the field of Sociology of Law in order to be able to detect acts that contain elements of abusing power by public officials, in relation to actions that cause harm to the state and/or public.

## 2. Problems

Based on the descriptions above, then as a limitation in conducting this research, the researcher proposes a framing of the issue, namely "How is the response of the Science of Law - especially State Administrative Law, to speech acts in an Action of Government Officials which gives rise to the phenomenon of social framing *towards* one other branch of state power?”

## 3. Method

This research employs a legal method of inquiry based on additional information obtained from a Legal Studies database. approach and a Multidisciplinary approach, namely Linguistics through the Concept of Speech Acts and Critical Discourse Analysis (AWK). The concept of speech acts is used to detect the structure of spoken language against the response of the listener. Thus, we use commentary data from newsreaders in the comments column from online mass media, which react to the utterances or utterances of government officials. Meanwhile, Critical Discourse Analysis is used to find out and analyze historical elements, context, types of speech, and the use of powerful language to cover their interests.

The use of a multidisciplinary approach in the form of linguistics, obtains justification from Johnny Ibrahim's opinion [11] that legal research methods can use various approaches. And, also the opinion of Margarito Kamis [12] , who emphasized that the Science of Law does not have concepts to study things that are subjective.

## 4. Discussion

In the initial view of jurists, related to *onrechtmatige overheidsdaad* (acts against the law by the ruler) , then we can also witness the influence of thoughts about the special position of the government due to its different duties and nature. Originally it was the opinion of legal experts, that the government cannot be blamed, if with this act, it has committed an action in the field of public law, that is if the government acts as a government. Strictly speaking, when the government has acted in the civil field then it can be sued for its unworthy actions. [13]

According to Indroharto [14] , that public law is a regulation of things or circumstances that are in an atmosphere of political culture that encourages government activities to be set forth in the form of regulations. In other words, every public law regulation is always about legal relations that arise or can arise as a result of the government's interference or concern in a field of public life. Meanwhile, in private law/civil law, especially contract law, it contains three kinds of principles, namely: (1). the principle of autonomy (freedom of the parties to enter into or not enter into a relationship and the freedom to determine its form; (2). the principle of trust, and (3) the principle of cause and effect, in which the agreement is a means to achieve a goal.

Meanwhile, one form of the concept of *onrechtmatige overheidsdaad* (Acts Against the Law by Rulers) , is abuse *of power* or what in the French administrative law concept is called *détournement de pouvoir* is a type of invalidity that causes decisions of government agencies or officials to be annulled. Misuse of authority happens when an agency of government or figure utilises its power for a goal other than the one for which the power was granted.[15]

*Detournement de pouvoir* comes from the words *detourne* and *pouvoir* , *detourne* is deviating, rotating, indirect, taking a deviating path to reach the goal. Meanwhile, *Detournement* is deviating, deflection, fraud, embezzlement. Meanwhile, *pouvoir* is ability, power according to law [10] . Meanwhile, the criteria for the concept of "abuse of authority" are as follows [16] :

a. It is considered an abuse of authority if it takes actions aimed at the public interest, but these actions deviate from the purpose of granting authority by laws and regulations;

b. It is considered an abuse of authority if it takes actions with procedures that deviate from the established procedures; and

c. It is considered an abuse of authority if it takes actions to benefit personal, group or class interests that are contrary to the public interest.

The term "violation of power" " ( *détournement de pouvoir* ), normativelyLaw Number 30 of 2014 respecting Government Administration (UU No. 30/2014) regulates this. Whereas, in Article 17 paragraph (2) of Law no. 30/2014, there is a restriction against abuse of authority, which takes three (three) forms: (1) prohibition of exceeding authority, (2) prohibition of mixing authority, and/or (3) prohibition of acting arbitrarily.

Each of the three prohibition models share a common focus, which pertains to the idea of "authority" - which is defined in Article 1 number 5 of Law no. 30/2014, namely "authority is a right owned by a government agency and/or official or other state administrators to make decisions and/or take actions in administering government." As a result, the object of investigation in the idea of "authority" .

In Law no. 30/2014, the concept of "Decisions and/or Actions" is always juxtaposed with the concept of "Government Administration", which based on Article 1 point 1 of Law no. 30/2014 which confirms " *Government Administration is the procedure for making decisions and/or actions by government agencies and/or officials* ." Thus, the concept used hereafter is "Government Administration Decisions and/or Actions".

As for the concept of "Government Administration Decisions" emphasized in Article 1 number 7 of Law no. 30/2014 which contains the definition, namely " *Government Administration Decisions, also called State Administration Decisions or State Administration Decisions, hereinafter referred to as Decisions, are written decisions issued by Government Agencies and/or Officials in the administration of government.* " Meanwhile, Government Administration Actions-as a legal concept, is emphasized in Article 1 number 8 of Law no. 30/2014 which contains the definition that is " *Government Administration Actions, hereinafter referred to as Actions, are actions of Government Officials or other state administrators to carry out and/or not carry out concrete actions in the framework of administering government* ."

Based on the two legal concepts above, a different object can be seen between Government Administration Decisions (KAP) and Government Administrative Actions (TAP). Where, KAP is in the form of "written decisions", while in TAP it is in the form of "concrete actions"—which in some doctrines is known as the concept of "Real Action" ( *feitelijkehandelingen* )—besides the concept of "Legal Action ( *rechtshandeling* ).[17] As also emphasized by SF. Marbun and Moh. Mahfud MD [18] and Sadjijono [19] , who divided the activities of government officials into two types, namely *rechtshandelingen* (legal actions) and *feitelijke handelingen* (non-legal actions).

However, there is Article 87 of Law no. 30/2014 which confirms " *With the enactment of this Law, the State Administrative Decision as referred to in Law Number 5 of 1986 concerning the State Administrative Court as amended by Law Number 9 of 2004 and Law Number 51 of 2014 2009 must be interpreted as: a written determination which also includes factual actions* ." So that, normatively, there is no longer any difference between *rechtshandelingen* (legal actions) and *feitelijke handelingen* (not legal actions). That is, in real action ( *feitelijkehandelingen* ) as long as it is based on and/or accompanies an Authority, it is *a rechtshandelingen* (legal action).

Regarding the conceptual study above, in *common sense* , the concept of Government Administration Action is always associated with actions that are empirically sensed or visible. However, there are not many studies that link Language with these Actions. In fact, in linguistic studies, every action is always accompanied by language activities, both spoken and written. It's just that language activities in

written form have been represented through the concept of Government Administration Decrees in the form of State Administration Decrees. *Meanwhile ,* Law Academics do not require much demand for Government Administration Actions in the form of speech or speech acts .

Speaking in acts (speech of act) was a language employ concept suggested by John Langshaw Austin (1962) in his book "How To Do Things With Words." Austin was part of the organisation called as the Oxford School of Ordinary Language Philosophy. The idea was further elaborated on by his pupil, Searle (1979), and their ideas have dominated the study of language usage, particularly pragmatics, ever since. In contrast with classical phonology (phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics), which examines exclusively constructed linguistic frameworks, practicality (including speech act theory) analyses language using non-linguistic interaction options, or circumstances. In this situation, Austin (1962) focuses on the relationship between language and action.[20]

The position of language and communication basically cannot be separated from everyday human life. In communicating between speakers and addressees aims to describe the information to be conveyed. The information is in the form of thoughts, ideas, feelings or emotions directly. In fact, language always appears when individuals perform actions or actionsThe act of speaking is a person's mental manifestation whose persistence is defined by the speaker's spoken competence in coping with particular circumstances. It is more focused on examining the purpose or purpose of what happens in the speech [21] in the manner of expressing oneself in speech acts.

In basic terms, everybody is allowed to interact, and this procedure occurs in a variety of mental, physical, and social circumstances due to conversation can't take place in a vacuum. As a result, communication as a method of living serves numerous functions, including control, inspiration, knowledge, and expressing one's feelings. [22]

Speech and language circumstance can't be isolated; they are inextricably linked and enhance one another. Language is used as a medium for transferring messages during the course of communication. The one who speaks (speaker), communicant (speaker), information, and talking context are the components of a conversation that must be effortless to deliver the message. When speakers obtain asynchronous comprehension, their ability to convey messages is impeded. Pragmatics attempts to interpret this. The study of the interaction between language and its context is known as pragmatics. According to Yule, context is the environment in which the language is used. Meanwhile, Leech explained context as a background that is shared by speakers and speech partners, which helps speech partners interpret the meaning of speech.[23]

One example is the speech act put forward by Moh. Mahfud MD, as we previously described above. In this study, the object of study will be focused on Speech Acts uttered by the Coordinating Minister for Politics, Law and Security of the Republic of Indonesia (Menkopolhukam RI), where on several occasions through the mass media, both online and print, which gave statements or comments on the

institution's *work* pattern other countries. However, as a government official, it is necessary to normatively review the duties and functions of the Menkopolhukam RI.

In Article 2 paragraph (1) of the Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 73 of 2020 concerning the Coordinating Ministry for Politics, Law and Security (Perpres No. 73/2020) which confirms "The Coordinating Ministry for Politics, Law and Security has the task of organizing coordination *, synchronizing, and controlling the affairs of the Ministry in administering government in the fields of politics, law, and security* ."

Meanwhile, the purpose of granting this authority is regulated in Article 2 paragraph (2) of Presidential Decree No. 73/2020 which confirms " *The task of the Coordinating Ministry for Politics, Law and Security as referred to in paragraph (1) is carried out to provide support, implement initiatives and control policies based on the national development agenda and assignments from the President.* "

Regarding the two authoritative texts mentioned above, a conclusion can be drawn regarding the duties and functions of the Indonesian Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs that cognitive work patterns are only related within the scope of inter-ministerial administration in the fields of politics, law and security an *sich* .

In this regard, it is interesting to examine the phenomenon of the utterance of the Menkopolhukam regarding the Court's Decision on the alleged banking crime case committed by KSP Indosurya, which has received an acquittal, as has been online through the Official *Channel* of Kemenkopulhukam RI, namely https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3jpHx_hopY0&ab_channel=KemenkoPolhuka m RI dated 27 January 2023 and via https://www.cnbcindonesia.com/market/20230127182738-17-408872/mahfud-soal - indosurya-perhaps-no-need to-respect-the-ma decision , dated January 27 2023 , where specifically in the series of utterances/speech acts, the Indonesian Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs emphasized "……. *because that's the decision of the Supreme Court…..maybe we don't need to respect it …..*".

However, before entering into a study of these remarks, the Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs first conducted *a framing* through the utterance "*... to discuss the shock of Indonesia, both the Government and its people, because the Indosurya case which has been discussed for a long time that it was a perfect legal act as a criminal offence, both from the Attorney General's Office, the Police, PPATK …..*". The use of this statement aims to show that the Government and its law enforcement instruments have the same interpretation of the KSP Indosurya case as a perfect crime.

The word "perfect" is used to frame *that* law enforcement officials-especially the Attorney General's Office-PPATK-PPATK, have believed in this evidence. Therefore, the appearance of an acquittal from a court of first instance was communicated using the phrase "...the shock of Indonesia". Of course, methodically, it is still *debatable* when comparing the entire victims of KSP Indosurya with the entire Indonesian people.

This speech act, through the Critical Discourse Analysis (AWK) approach, utilizes the Press Conference method—by inviting various mass media, after coordinating with relevant agencies regarding the KSP Indosurya case. In the AWK approach, it is not only a matter of the type of communication uttered by the speaker. However, there is also a problem with the context of this speech which is related to *the context* from the end of 2022 to January 2023, the world of law enforcement was shaken by the rampant arrests of judges from the Supreme Court who were caught up in corruption cases.

The phenomenon of the arrest of these judges is a background knowledge (*hintergrundwissen* ) that drives *not* only the speech acts of the Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs and also the people who watch and listen to the Press Conference. As we observe each of the comments on the speech act discourse, as follows:


If, referring to these comments, through the AWK Approach, then there is a common understanding of *the hintergrundwissen* between the Speaker (speaker) and the Petutur (listener). Therefore, the speech act/utterance put forward by the Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia is a type of Perlocutionary Speech Act. Where, as previously explained, Perlocutionary Speech Acts - as a result of Illocutionary Speech Acts, have had an impact on the Speaker (Listener) to react. The speaker—in this case the Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs, utilizes his power and authority

through the mass media—which does have a function in driving opinion, based on social anger against the deviant behavior of judges who have been caught for criminal acts of corruption.

Thus, these speech acts actually increase social anger against the institution holding judicial power, namely the Supreme Court. Therefore, when referring to Presidential Decree No. 73/2020, the Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs is not allowed to interfere in other affairs, apart from the affairs of the government administration ministries. Meanwhile, if we examine and examine the structure of the perlocutionary speech act, it is very clear that this is a direct intervention from the Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs on the authority and powers of the judge deciding the KSP Indosurya case.

## 5. Conclusion

According to the preceding explanations and the legally binding text in the provisions of Article 17 paragraph (2) letter an of Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, the perlocutionary speech act uttered through the Minister in Charge for Political, Legal, and Security Affairs satisfies all requirements in the concept of "Prohibition of Excessive Power" regulated in Article 18 section (1) of Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration. The Minister in Charge of Political, Legal, and Security Affairs in this particular instance. has taken an action in the form of a speech act (perlocutionary act) which has elicited a negative reaction from the public towards not only judges but also towards the institution of the Supreme Court. Based on these conclusions, the Researcher advises the President to give a direct warning to the Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs not to comment directly on the realm of judicial power which is not subject to executive power.

The perlocutionary speech acts uttered by the Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs have fulfilled the elements of "Prohibition of Exceeding Authority" stipulated in Article 17 paragraph (2) letter a and Article 18 paragraph (1) of Law Number 30 Year 2014 on Government Administration. The actions of the Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs as a government official are a concrete form of decisions and/or actions that exceed the limits of authority and are also contrary to the provisions of the applicable laws and regulations. Factually, the Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs has performed perlocutionary speech acts that have led to negative reactions from the public towards - not only - the judges, but also towards the institution of the Supreme Court. In this case, it means that the Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs as a government official (executive) has "violated or interfered" with the affairs (authority) of other spheres of power - in this case the judicial power. Based on these conclusions, the researcher suggests that the President as the supreme leader of the state administration - in the Indonesian context - should give a direct warning to the Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs so as not to make direct comments on the domain of judicial power, which is structurally not subject to executive power. In addition, it is also suggested that the

public - for example through NGOs - can take legal action such as filing a lawsuit through the State Administrative Court against the Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs. The filing of a lawsuit to the State Administrative Court can then also be interpreted as an effort to exercise juridical control over the exercise of government authority by executive (government) officials.

## References

[1] H. Hadikusuma, *Bahasa Hukum Indonesia*. Bandung: Alumni, 2010.

[2] Noermanzah, "Bahasa sebagai Alat Komunikasi, Citra Pikiran, dan Kepribadian," in *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Bulan Bahasa (Semiba)*, 2019, pp. 306–319.

[3] S. W. Littlejohn and K. A. Foss, *Teori Komunkasi*. Jakarta: Salemba Humanika, 2009.

[4] Z. Nasution, "Bahasa sebagai Alat Komunikasi Politik dalam Rangka Mempertahankan Kekuasaan," *Sodality J. Sosiol. Pedesaan*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 445–464, 2007, doi: 10.22500/sodality.v1i3.5897.

[5] J. D'Aspremont, "Wording in International Law," *Leiden J. Int. Law*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 575–602, 2012, doi: 10.1017/S0922156512000283.

[6] F. M. Elprianty, *Ujaran Kebencian Dalam Tindak Pidana Makar Berdasarkan Perspektif Psikolinguistik*. Jakarta: Fakultas Hukum Universitas Pancasila, 2023.

[7] Kompas.com, "Bos KSP Indosurya Divonis Bebas, Pemerintah Lakukan Kasasi," *Youtube*, 2023.

[8] B. O. Abrianto, X. Nugraha, and N. Grady, "Perkembangan Gugatan Perbuatan Melanggar Hukum oleh Pemerintah Pasca-Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014," *Negara Huk.*, vol. 11, no. 30, pp. 43–62, 2020, doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.22212/jnh.v11i1.1574.

[9] B. M. Yasser, "Pengujian Unsur Penyalahgunaan Wewenang Pada Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara Dalam Kaitannya Dengan Tindak Pidana Korupsi," *Soumatera Law Rev.*, vol. 2, no. 1, p. 1, 2019, doi: 10.22216/soumlaw.v2i1.3558.

[10] J. Ibrahim, *Teori dan Metodologi Penelitian*. Jakarta: Bayumedia Publishing, 2012.

[11] M. Kamis, "Keterangan Ahli Dr. Margarito Kamis, SH, M.Hum Dalam Pemeriksaan Perkara Pengujian Konstitusionalitas Norma Batal Demi Hukum pada Pasal 143 ayat (3) UU Nomor 8 Tahun 1981 Tentang KUHAP," Jakarta, 2022.

[12] S. Gautama, *Pengertian Tentang Negara Hukum*. Bandung: Alumni, 1983.
[13] Indroharto, *Perbuatan Pemerintahan Menurut Hukum Publik dan Hukum Perdata*. Jakarta: LPP-HAN, 1999.
[14] A. Efendi, "Interpretasi Modern Makna Menyalahgunakan Wewenang Dalam Tindak Pidana Korupsi," *J. Yudisial*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 327–344, 2020, doi: 10.29123/jy.v12i3.380.
[15] J. Juhaeni, "Penyalahgunaan Wewenang oleh Pejabat Publik dalam Perspektif Sosiologi Hukum," *J. Konstituen*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 41–48, 2021.
[16] A. Wibowo, "Penentuan Kriteria Unsur Penyalahgunaan Wewenang Dalam Perkara Tindak Pidana Korupsi (Studi Putusan Pengadilan)," *J. Yuridis*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 120–148, 2020.
[17] R. Marbun, *Tindakan Hukum Penyelidik/ Penyidik Kepolisian Republik Indonesia Sebagai Objek Gugatan Tata Usaha Negara Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan*. Jakarta: Program Doktor Ilmu Hukum Universitas Jayabaya, 2017.
[18] M. SF. and M. M. Mahfud, *Pokok-Pokok Hukum Administrasi Negara*. Yogyakarta: Liberty, 2006.
[19] Sadjijono, *Bab-Bab Pokok Hukum Administrasi*. Yogyakarta: LaksBang Pressindo, 2011.
[20] A. Saifudin, "Teori Tindak Tutur Dalam Studi Linguistik Pragmatik," *LiTE J. Bahasa, Sastra dan Budaya*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–16, 2019, doi: https://doi.org/10.33633/lite.v15i1.2382.
[21] D. J. Ningrum, Suryadi, and D. E. C. Wardhana, "Kajian Ujaran Kebencian di Media Sosial," *J. Ilm. Korpus*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 241–252, 2018, doi: https://doi.org/10.33369/jik.v2i3.6779.
[22] P. C. Suryawin, M. Wijaya, and H. Isnaini, "Tindak Tutur (Speech Act) dan Implikatur dalam Penggunaan Bahasa," *Sinar Dunia J. Ris. Sos. Hum. dan Ilmu Pendidik.*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 34–41, 2022, doi: 10.58192/sidu.v1i3.130.