How to Cite:
Laksana, I. K. D. (2021). Discourse of Indonesian language in public domain: its use in public debate prior to the presidential election 2019. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, *5*(S1), 922-934. https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5nS1.1477

Discourse of Indonesian Language in Public Domain: It's Use in Public Debate Prior to the Presidential Election 2019

I Ketut Darma Laksana
Universitas Udayana, Denpasar, Indonesia

***Abstract*---**This paper discusses the use of Indonesian language in the public domain, especially in public debate. It aims to give readers an understanding of its use in the public debate before the presidential election 2019, which has worried the people. The use of Indonesian through lexical choices that contain slander, incitement, and hate speech can threaten the nation's unity. Therefore, the issues discussed are: (1) What is the thing behind using the language having negative meaning? (2) What is the impact on the personal development of the nation? (3) How to avoid using language that is not following our national identity? These three research questions are discussed using deconstruction and ethnography of speaking methods. By applying these two methods, the results show that the speakers with a particular 'motivation' have created and developed a new system of deviation along with the hope that they can play the 'language market', the value of language production making one's position that he is right and tries to influent people in order to believe in perception he has built.

***Keywords*---**language, motivation, personality, politeness.

Introduction

The current paper discusses the following problems. (1) What is the background of individuals in using their language? (2) What is the impact on the personality development of the Indonesian nation? (3) How to counteract language ethics that are not following the nation's personality? Problem (1) is concerned with the reasons/motivations underlying the debate participants in using their language. Problem (2) is concerned with the influence caused by language, which tends to divide the unity of the nation. Meanwhile, problem (3) relates to the model that can be used that comes from two languages and Javanese and Balinese culture. The objectives of this research are (1) to reveal the system built by the debate participants; (2) to review seeing the negative impact of debates whose language

***Corresponding author**: Laksana, I. K. D.; Email: darmalaksana2020@gmail.com*
Manuscript submitted: 27 May 2021, Manuscript revised: 09 August 2021, Accepted for publication: 18 Sept 2021

ethics are not under the nation's personality, and (3) to construct a formula that can be used as an instrument in shaping the nation's polite personality (Cargile et al., 1994; Hermann, 2008).

The paper's urgency relates to research on the use of Indonesian in public debate, especially the choice of words, which violates language politeness. Words that mean 'incite' will have a significant impact on social stability. The government, concentrating on equitable development throughout the country, is disturbed by the frenzy of debates that are not based on sound thinking. The political conditions that are currently developing, which are suspected to be “the struggle for the palace”, have received tremendous attention from the public. The public needs to understand that the linguistic system built by politicians is full of political/group interests by justifying various ways (Love, 2004; Daskalovska et al., 2012).

Material and Method

This research is a qualitative type. The data source is the 2019 presidential election public debate broadcast on television and online media (YouTube) from January to mid-May 2018. This study was conducted and interviews with ten interviewees who were met by chance. Together with researchers, they are treated as research instruments in data collection, which acts as an "interpretive community" in interpreting the words used in the debate. Furthermore, the data were analyzed using the deconstruction method. Through the deconstruction method, it can be understood that language users are trying to distort meaning. In that way, namely through speech, he hopes to win the contestation in the upcoming 2019 presidential election. Halliday & Hasan (1989), state that to understand a speech, one must pay attention to the following three things:

- What is being discussed (field).
- Who is the participant in the communication (tenor).
- How to convey the message (mode).

This view can be used to examine the form, meaning, and function of speech used in the current public debate. The things discussed were related to the world of Indonesian politics ahead of the 2019 Presidential Election. Then, the participants in the debate were divided into those who were “pro” and those who were “con” of the government. Meanwhile, participants used Indonesian with a choice of words that could corner political opponents in conveying ideas (Murphy & Alexander, 2000; Torgersen et al., 2000).

According to Wardhaugh & Fuller (2021), greeting words can mark a person's social position. This can also be seen in its use in the public debate examined in this paper. So, the participants must carry out the character's self-image by empowering the language elements according to their interests. The discussion about language politeness has become the public spotlight after witnessing the use of language in the public debate before the 2019 Presidential Election. In this regard, it is essential to review some of the literature about language politeness, as follows. Duranti (2011), states that language, including politeness, is a cultural resource and its use in everyday life is a language practice. However, in the public

debate ahead of the 2019 Presidential Election, there is a wide gap between language as a cultural resource and language as a practice of that language (Furnham & Fenton-O'Creevy, 2018; Chen, 2001).

Then Salzmann (2014), also stated that politeness is a form of language practice, as exemplified in Japanese. In Japanese society, politeness in language persists. This happened because the older generation passed on their ancestral culture to the younger generation. However, in Indonesian society - for the sake of particular political interests - it is hoped that this incident will last for a moment; deviations from language politeness have given a bad image to the nation. The older generation should set a good example for the younger generation, not vice versa, a bad example. However, there are still efforts to overcome the conditions posed by the current political upheaval (Latupeirissa et al., 2019). In this regard, language ethics in regional languages can be applied in shaping one's language politeness. The literature study results show that language ethics in regional languages, in this case, Javanese and Balinese languages, can be used as examples of linguistic politeness. Experts and observers have studied both languages extensively regarding the relationship between language and culture, as presented below.

In his article Gonda (1948), examines Javanese vocabulary, which is related to "abhorrence", that the use of the two varieties of "kromo-ngoko" is not only related to taboo phenomena (prohibition) but more than that, namely the need for communication in Javanese society who know politeness in language. Furthermore, Gonda states that colloquial forms of language based on habits and manners are prohibited from being used by speakers if they address other people who have a higher status or social position. However, speakers with higher social status or position use this colloquial form of language. The views on the differences in the use of usuk steps may need to be considered. Whatever the social differences, for the sake of mutual respect, there is nothing wrong if people with a higher social position also speak chromo to their interlocutor who has a lower social position. However, if there is an understanding in the communication regarding the Kromo-ngoko, it certainly does not cause problems (Kasper, 1990; Sifianou, 2012).

Meanwhile Geertz (1975), suggests that the Javanese language recognizes language steps, namely kromo and ngoko. The speaking community still maintains it as social control in daily communication. Furthermore, he stated that what is complicated is that Javanese people pattern their speech behaviour in terms of subtle-rough stems around the social behaviour they build in general. Someone who talks to a speech partner with a higher status (superior), for example, a priyayi or an official, will use the Kromo language. On the other hand, someone who talks to a speech partner whose status is lower (inferior), called an abangan, will use the ngoko language (Geertz, 1975).

Poedjosoedarmo (1986), also talks about speech levels in Javanese. These language levels indicate the speaker's attitude towards his interlocutor. Poedjosoedarmo stated that the level of language is divided into three types. Ngoko is an unmarked level of social attitude. This attitude shows closeness and is informal. Krama is the level of formal and polite language. Intermediate is a semi-formal language level. However, the latest view obtained M. Wajdi, states

that the steps of usuk in Javanese are more straightforward than what Poedjosoedarmo stated above because the development of today's society requires ease of communication but still maintains the nature of communication. Politeness in society. Below are some examples of the use of ngoko-kromo in Javanese (Geertz, 1974).

- Penjenengan saking tindak pundi (Ngoko) (1)
- Kowe saka endi (Kromo) (2)
  Meaning: 'where do you come from?'

Sentence (1) is spoken by someone from a lower social status (inferior) to another person with a higher social status (superior). On the other hand, sentence (2) is spoken by a person of higher social status (superior) to another person with lower social status (inferior). Meanwhile, in Balinese, Laksana (2009), citing the views use of the form of respect in Balinese, it is stated that the politeness of language or the form of respect in Balinese also persists in the language practice of the people. However, it is undeniable that an embarrassing incident occurred in the 1970s. As a result of the violation of language politeness, inter-caste speakers quarrel in Bali. The use of undak usuk, known in Balinese society as alus and commonplace, is related to social stratification, in this case, the difference in caste (Brahmin, Ksatria, Wesya, and Sudra).

Kersten (1984), states that in every civilized society, people adapt their language to the position of the person they are talking to or to the position of the person they are talking about. If a Balinese speaks to someone of the same or lower position and has a close relationship with him, he is not picky about words: his language is ordinary. This type of language is often called rude, but it is not polite when used in conversations involving equality and intimacy. On the other hand, respectful language is used if someone speaks to the person he wants to glorify. He uses soft words, as far as there is. If there are no subtle words, he uses ordinary language. Compare the following two Balinese sentences. Compare the two examples below.

- I Kelor nyedayang Anake Agung (polite style) (3)
  'Kelor kills Anak Agung'
- Anake Agung ngamatiyang I Kelor (impolite style) (4)
  'Anak Agung kills Kelor'

The word nyedayang 'kill' in (3) is used for people of a higher caste. Meanwhile, the word ngamatiyang in (4) is used for lower caste people. With the same understanding, Tinggen (1995), suggests that undak usuk, the Balinese language called sor singgih, is essential to be understood by Balinese people who are familiar with social stratification. The impact of someone's lack of understanding of language is not uncommon for offences between speakers. Like stated above, the intercaste sparked a polemic about the importance of the usuk usuk being maintained. Foley (1997), in his discussion of linguistic politeness, pays attention to the Balinese language by using the example of usuk steps in the language concerned. Politeness in language functions to maintain the harmony of the speaker's social relations. The difference in the use of usuk undak in Balinese can be seen in the following example.

- Pekak Putu lakar was kija (Lumrah) (5)
  'Where will Grandpa Putu go?'
- Titiang jagi lunga ke pasar (Alus) (6)
  'I will go to the market'

A person speaks sentence (5) of a higher caste (Brahmna: Ida Bagus) to another person of a lower caste (Sudra: Pekak Putu): the use of the words 'will' and was 'go. On the other hand, sentence (6) is spoken by a Sudra against a Brahmin: the use of jagi and lunga 'to go'. The two regional languages mentioned above do show similarities in the history of the past. The alus and expected language levels in Balinese are a mixture of Javanese culture. The critical thing to note from the two regional languages is a standard view in dealing with other people as speech partners. In Javanese, there is a view that "it is better to respect others than to respect yourself". Meanwhile, the Balinese know a view called Tat Twam Asi, which means: 'I am you, you are me'. The two examples of language ethics can be applied in creating language politeness, even in a political context. Thus, the essence of the contribution of language ethics in regional languages is the application of "experience" of learning regional languages regarding language politeness, especially in public communication, which, in this case, is Indonesian as the medium (Borris & Zecho, 2018; Hartono et al., 2021).

Theoretical bases

The theory used as a reference in analyzing the data is as follows. First, the theory of post-structuralism or postmodernism proposed by Derrida (2008); Foucault (2002); Calhoun et al. (1993), etc. The theory developed by each of these figures has methodological similarities. The deconstruction method, which is characteristic of post-structuralism theory data analysis, is used as a reference in dismantling the system built-in political discourse in the form of public debate (Foucault, 2002). Below are presented their views one by one. Derrida (2008), rejects the view of Structuralism theory from Saussure (1988), regarding the relationship between the signifier and the signified, which is entirely arbitrary and purely syntactic-formal. According to Derrida in Sim & van Loon (2008), see also Lubis (2014), language users' relationship between words and their meanings allows for "motivation". In other words, the meaning of a word depends on its usage or context. However, Saussure's view can still be used to see that in "sentence structure", the meaning of a word is determined by the meaning of other words. This can be proven from two English sentences, quoted from Duranti (2011), as follows:

- I cannot draw a straight line without a ruler (7)
- People must form a line if they want to be served (8)

In sentences (7) and (8), the meaning of the word line is determined by the word that precedes it: draw in (7) and form in (8). However, the views in the Structuralism theory cannot be used to find the "motivation" behind the use of words. Second, Anthropological Linguistic Theory/ Linguistic Anthropology is referred to examine the relationship between language and culture. As quoted by Salzmann (2014), Benjamin Lee Whorf states that a person's way of thinking is reflected in the language used. In this regard, the regional languages used by

most Indonesians are considered to be able to influence speakers in their use of the Indonesian language. As a "bilingual" society, speakers who use Indonesian are expected to apply the experience of language ethics in their local language who knows language politeness. Thus, the application of politeness in the local language becomes the basis for forming the nation's personality as a whole.
Accordingly, according to Harris (1991), every individual has a "basic personality structure" reflected in the politeness of language that can be found in every member of society. If the covered population is organized into a state/nation, the basic personality structure is called the nation/national character. So, in the cultural context, politeness shared by the Indonesian people is the character of the Indonesian nation. Duranti (2011), view above regarding the relationship between language and culture is essential to observe, namely regarding the transmission of language politeness as a cultural resource. People from specific community groups may fail or do not want to put these cultural resources into practice in the language. Its transmission from one generation to the next will be a benchmark for cultural balance in a civil society like Indonesia. Therefore, the source of the problem must be sought whether the older generation has given a good or bad example regarding language politeness to the younger generation.

Discussion

Based on the interpretation of the use of Indonesian through these negative word choices, the problems posed in this paper will be discussed in the following subsections.

Individual motivation in using language

Based on the dismantling of the system built by the participants in the current public debate, the following results were obtained. Data:

- Pembagian sertifikat tanah adalah pengibulan (9)
- Indonesia akan bubar tahun 2030 (10)
- Partai Allah dan partai setan (11)

The meaning of pengibulan (embracing), Bubar (disbanding), Allah, and setan (devil) is “neutral”, which refers to the denotative meaning. However, in the context or usage as in the example above, these words are already open to other meanings connotative meanings. In other words, its use has been "motivated" by particular political interests. Its use is also motivated by individual interests by playing the "language market" to create status/bargaining in the contest for a power struggle in the 2019 Presidential Election. Readers or viewers in the public debate have a role as an "interpretive community". They can give a response whether the use of language by the debaters is positive or negative. The fact shows that of the ten respondents who were met by chance, all of them stated that the words used as in (9), (10), and (11) above were contextually classified as words with negative meanings. Their understanding is based on the current situation that the debating politicians have a particular agenda to win their group. Thus, the reality shows that there has been a polarization of society ahead of the 2019 Presidential Election.

The news entitled “Jokowi's Step Forward", written by Aji (2018), has denied the insinuation that the land certificate program is now a blatant agrarian reform. Although it triggers a polemic, the satire does not show a discursive contribution to agrarian reform thinking and policies. Both the criticism and the explanation of the polemic do not touch the substance of agrarian differentiation, which creates an inequality gap. In addition, the polemic also does not touch the political strategy of agrarian reform as a "quick move". However, the word ngibul or pengibulan itself needs to be matched with the explanation of its meaning contained in the dictionary. The word kibul, ngibul means 'to lie; feint'. Then, pengibulan means 'process, method, act of making money (Language Center, edition IV). Based on the explanation of this meaning and the reviews contained in the Kompas daily, the use of the word pengibulan in the sentence (9) contains 'lies/slander' made by political opponents.

Bubar means 'to scatter; finished; over' (Language Center, IV edition). In sentence (10), someone intends to satire the government without any proof or reasonable reason—the response by the palace that the "criticism" was not based on evidence at all. Indonesia will reach its "golden" peak in 2045. Thus, the meaning contained in the sentence (10) is also "fake news" (hoax). Furthermore, the words Allah and Satan each have the following meanings. Allah means 'the name of God in Arabic; the all-perfect creator of the universe; God Almighty who is worshipped by believers' (Language Center, edition IV). Meanwhile, Satan means 'evil spirit (which always tempts him to do evil)' (Language Center, edition IV). Sentence (11) is also used by someone to insinuate his political opponent. The speaker intends to say that which party agrees with his party (coalition) is the party of the believers, while the other party that does not agree is the "party of the devil". You can guess what the reaction of the so-called "devil's party" will be: We are religious, worship Allah, the creator of the universe, just like you. The one who knows about the "party of Allah" is Allah himself. The general chairman of a party (YouTube, May 2018) suggested that the person spreading the slander could use correct diction because his satire contained hate speech. Lies and hate speech contain the "motivation" of the debaters as a strategy to win the battle in the 2019 Presidential Election.

Negative impact of using language

The debate event that took place on KompasTv (Monday, April 26 at 0.9.00 WITA) was titled “Riuh Polarisasi Masyarakat Jelang Pilpres 2019” (Crowded Polarization of Society Ahead of the 2019 Presidential Election) already indicated that society was divided between the pro-government and the counter-government. The feud is not only at the party elite level, but also at the grassroots. Many counter-government people voiced “hostility”. The following data presents the fact that support the above statement.

- Tahun 2019 Ganti presiden (Change president in 2019) (12)
- Rakyat menginginkan presiden baru (People want a new president) (13)
- Presiden kita mestinya seperti Putin (Our president should be like Putin) (14)

The examples above illustrate that there has been a political battle in our country that is getting hotter and immoral, more “hard” than the 2014 presidential

election. It is the officials of certain parties who are opposed to the government who do such acts. The party's figure also deserves to be called the "primary" of the division between community members. There are specific political figures who vulgarly display in public spaces T-shirts that read "Change President 2019" (12) and "The people want a new president" (13), and there are figures who want "Our president should be like Putin" (Russian president) (14). What is the reaction of their political opponents? It is okay to change the president: with shirts again, not with a vision and mission (program) competition. Then, why should it be like Putin? Indonesia is not a communist country. So, for the sake of political ambitions/groups, people can do as they please. Confident people often misinterpret freedom. Indeed, a wise man said, "The human heart can indeed be returned to its nature: good and bad". However, it is still fortunate that this nation still has many polite, nurturing figures. Therefore, the general public always hopes that Indonesia will remain peaceful. Its people bear the title of "civil society", a society that respects differences. Thus, it can be understood that the older generation should set a good example for the younger generation, not the other way around, exhibiting "bad" behaviour in public. Against people who spread hate speech, lies, and the like, in the end, they also reap "blasphemy" from specific community groups (please see YouTube!). That is the impact of using language that contains incitement, especially its negative impact on developing the nation's personality.

Language politeness in Indonesian

In Indonesian, language politeness is not as complicated as in regional languages. However, Indonesian still distinguishes which words are appropriate and which are inappropriate to address someone in terms of vocabulary. For example, the word father is a polite word if addressed to a man who is old or respected. Language politeness is not only marked by the choice of words used by speakers, as stated above but is also determined by the whole speech. An impolite speech can be judged from the understanding of the Indonesian-speaking community, which is also reflected in the local language. The words of a party leader and also a santri background is inappropriate for the following speech (Kompas TV, April 19, 2018, at 09 WITA):

- Prabowo bisa menang kalau saya jadi cawapresnya (15)
  (Prabowo can win if I become his vice presidential candidate)
- Joko Widodo bisa kalah kalau saya tidak jadi cawapresnya (16)
  (Joko Widodo can lose if I don't become his vice president)

The two speeches above do not hate speech, but they are still not polite because they can offend someone or another group. A "statement" involving certain characters is marked by the use of words that also contain a particular "motivation" to frighten so that the utterances (15) and (16) need to be considered by interested parties.

Politeness in local language

The different allocations between Indonesian and regional languages automatically place Indonesian in a higher position than regional languages.

Indonesian is used as a symbol of the nation's identity as a whole, a position that regional languages cannot carry. Indonesia can be said to enjoy special treatment in many situations, especially in official state situations. It is used in administration, government, education, military, trade, religion, and information. However, in the view of local language speakers, their regional language is not automatically lower than Indonesian. At least the regional language stores regional traditional and cultural treasures that Indonesian cannot replace. On this basis, regional languages have "prestige". This prestige can become the glue at the regional level and is also expected to support national/national unity.

Why Javanese and Balinese?

Language etiquette in regional languages varies from one region to another in Indonesia. Javanese and Balinese languages have similar past histories, apart from being widely known so that they can be used as models for the language ethics of society in general. Historical traces of the similarity of the ethics of speaking the two languages can be traced from the remains of the expeditionary troops of the Majapahit kingdom. Under the leadership of Mahapatih Gajah Mada, Majapahit succeeded in conquering Bali in 1258 Saka (1336 AD). According to Zoetmulder & Hartoko (1983), the Majapahit troops who prided themselves on being Javanese nobles did not want to return to Majapahit (Java) but preferred to settle in Bali. Laskar Majapahit, who already speak Middle-Javanese, as used in the Book of Pararaton, has influenced the Balinese language to varying degrees. As previously stated, the language and culture of Java and Bali have then been used as material for study by experts or observers in the field of language and culture.

Javanese and Balinese vocabulary with the balance in Indonesian

This section presents Javanese and Balinese vocabulary in sentences and their counterparts in Indonesian. Based on the presentation of the three languages, it can be seen that the politeness of the Javanese and Balinese regional languages is complicated when compared to Indonesian.

Table 1
Javanese and Balinese vocabulary in sentences and their counterparts in Indonesian

Data	Javanese (*Ngoko)*	Javanese (*Kromo)*	Meaning
(17)	Bapak *wis* yuswa	Bapak *sampun* yuswa	Father is an old man
(18)	Sigit *nyaosake* permen-e marang Bapak	Sigit *nyaosaken* permen-ipun dhateng Bapak	Sigit gives the candy to father
(19)	Roti kui *di-pundhut* Bapak	Roti punika *dipun-pundhut* Bapak	The bread has been brought by father
(20)	Anggit nyuwun *dhuwit* Bapak	Anggit nyuwun *arta* Bapak	Anggit asked father money
(21)	Bapak sowan *marang* Pak guru	Bapak sowan *dhateng* Pak Guru	Father visits a teacher

Source: Poedjosoedarmo, 1986

Table 2
Balinese vocabulary in sentences

Data	Balinese (*Lumrah)*	Balinese (*Alus)*	Meaning
(22)	Tiang *ningeh orta* panak meme	Tiang *miragi orti* pianak meme	I heard about your (a woman) daughter
(23)	*Ia mara teka di* desa	*Ipun wawu rauh ring*desa	He just came from the village
(24)	*Kurenane suba mulih*	*Rabin-ida sampun mantuk*	His wife has come home
(25)	*Ia maang nyamane uma atuluk*	*Ipun nguwehin semeton-ida carik atuluk*	He gives his brother a land (field rice)
(26)	*Maketelun ia ditu*	*Maketigang raina ipun irika*	For three days, he was there

Source: Kersten, 1984

Greet and mention terms

In addition to general vocabulary that marks politeness in language, greeting and mentioning are also two critical things in greeting. In communication, primarily face-to-face, greeting words or designations are also essential to be considered by the communicant. The description below compares the Indonesian language used in the debate and the Javanese and regional Balinese languages used as models of language politeness. The term greeting is used to greet the second person or the person being spoken to. The greeting used is according to a person's age and position in society.

Greetings in Indonesian

The term greeting in Indonesian, such as you and you are commonly used to greet young people of the same age. In the debate, it is still seen the use of greeting you, short for you, by participants to greet other participants, as in the example below:

- Kuingatkan kau ya bagaimana (I remind you how) (27)

Your greeting in a general context, as in the debate, is not appropriate because the participant is old. Unlike soap operas where the players are young, your greeting is still appropriate to use. There are other greetings, namely brother or father that can be used to greet the other person, as in the following example:

- Siapa yang Saudara maksudkan? (What do you mean?) (28)
- Siapa yang Bapak maksudkan? (Who do you mean?) (29)

Later, it was known that your greeting has the same function as brother, but this greeting still has to take into account who the person is talking to. Compare:

- Siapa yang Anda maksudkan (30)
- *Siapa yang Anda maksudkan (misalnya, untuk Presiden) (31)

(Asterisk sign * means 'forbidden' to be used for a president. This is different from “you” in English).

Greeting in Javanese

In Javanese it is known and also used the greeting Mr, both ngoko and kromo, as in the example below:

- Bapak tindak pundi (more polite) (32)
- Bapak arep nyang ndi (polite) (33)
  (Meaning: 'Where are you going?')

In Javanese, as long as the word father does not have a kromo balance, the greeting father can be used in formal situations, as in example (34). However, in the Javanese language itself, the forms of Kromo, njenengan or kamuyan are known, as in the example (35).

- Bapak Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono X (34)
  ‘Mr. Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono X’
- Njenengan sampun dhahar? (35)
  ‘Have you eaten?’

Greetings in Balinese

In the language known greetings such as ragane or jerone to greet the interlocutor. The suffix -ne in both words means 'definite' (specific). Note the usage below:

- Ragane ane ngelah carik-e ento? (Common) (36)
- Jerone sane nuwenang carik-e nika? (Polite) (37)
  (Meaning: 'Are you the one who owns the rice field?)

In Balinese, the use of the greeting Mr. is felt inappropriate by speakers to replace the two greetings because the origin of the other person must be considered (Bagus et al., 1979).

Conclusion

The discussion presented above provides an overview of the use of written language. Linguistic forms are arranged in order to be an appropriate means of conveying ideas. The ideas in question should be compact and focused, marked by references, both anaphoric-cataphoric and endophoric-exophoric. The discourse presented in the current paper has complied with these requirements. In addition, the ideas presented in the discourse are very relevant to the editorial title "Politics Without Principles". The power of expression in discourse lies in some keywords: speech is different from action, supporters of the government and opposition, and opposition is not pure. This is a picture of the perception of Indonesian politicians. Could this be what is called “politics without conscience?” The answer lies in the writer's perception and the reader's interpretation.

However, linguistically and discourse is answered through the relationship built between grammatical meaning and discourse meaning.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on the earlier version of this paper. Moreover, I also offer my gratitude for my former student, Dr. David S. Latupeirissa, who has helped me translating this manuscript.

References

Aji, G. B. (2018). "Langkah Maju Jokowi". Kompas, Harian Nasional.

Bagus, I. G. N., Koentjaraningrat, R. M., & Teeuw, A. (1979). Perubahan pemakaian bentuk hormat dalam masyarakat Bali sebuah pendekatan etnografi berhasa.

Borris, D. ., & Zecho, C. . (2018). The linguistic politeness having seen on the current study issue. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, *2*(1), 32-44. https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v2n1.10

Calhoun, C., LiPuma, E., & Postone, M. (1993). *Bourdieu: critical perspectives*. University of Chicago Press.

Cargile, A. C., Giles, H., Ryan, E. B., & Bradac, J. J. (1994). Language attitudes as a social process: A conceptual model and new directions. *Language & Communication*, *14*(3), 211-236. https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309(94)90001-9

Chen, R. (2001). Self-politeness: A proposal. *Journal of pragmatics*, *33*(1), 87-106. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00124-1

Daskalovska, N., Gudeva, L. K., & Ivanovska, B. (2012). Learner motivation and interest. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *46*, 1187-1191. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.272

Derrida, J. (2008). *The animal that therefore I am*. Fordham Univ Press.

Duranti, A. (2011). Linguistic anthropology: Language as a non-neutral medium. *The Cambridge handbook of sociolinguistics*, 28-46.

Foley, W. A. (1997). *Anthropological linguistics: An introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Foucault, M. (2002). Wacana kuasa/pengetahuan. *Yogyakarta: Bentang Budaya*.

Foucault, M. (2002). *Arkeologi Pengetahuan*. BASABASI.

Furnham, A., & Fenton-O'Creevy, M. (2018). Personality and political orientation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *129*, 88-91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.03.020

Geertz, C. (1974). 1977."From the native's point of view": On the nature of anthropological understanding. *Symbolic anthropology: A reader*, 480-492.

Geertz, C. (1975). On the Nature of Anthropological Understanding: Not extraordinary empathy but readily observable symbolic forms enable the anthropologist to grasp the unarticulated concepts that inform the lives and cultures of other peoples. *American scientist*, *63*(1), 47-53.

Gonda, J. (1948). The Javanese vocabulary of courtesy. *Lingua*, *1*(3), 333-76.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1989). Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective.

Harris, M. (1991). Cultural anthropology.

Hartono, H., Suparto, S., & Hassan, A. (2021). Language: a 'mirror' of the culture and its application English language teaching. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, *5*(1), 93-103. https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5n1.835

Hermann, J. (2008). The 'language'problem. *Language & Communication*, *28*(1), 93-99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2007.08.001

Kasper, G. (1990). Linguistic politeness:: Current research issues. *Journal of pragmatics*, *14*(2), 193-218. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90080-W

Kersten, J. (1984). Bahasa Bali: Tata bahasa dan kamus lumrah.

Laksana, I. K. D. (2009). *Tabu Bahasa: Salah Satu Cara Memahami Kebudayaan Bali*. Udayana University Press.

Latupeirissa, D. S., Laksana, I. K. D., Artawa, K., & Sosiowati, I. G. A. G. (2019). On political language ideology: Critical view of Indonesian president speech. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *10*(4), 843-850.

Love, N. (2004). Cognition and the language myth. *Language sciences*, *26*(6), 525-544. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2004.09.003

Lubis, A. Y. (2014). Postmodernisme: teori dan metode. *Jakarta: Rajawali Pers*.

Murphy, P. K., & Alexander, P. A. (2000). A motivated exploration of motivation terminology. *Contemporary educational psychology*, *25*(1), 3-53. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1019

Poedjosoedarmo, G. R. (1986). *Role structure in Javanese* (Vol. 24). Universitas Atma Jaya.

Salzmann, Z., Stanlaw, J., & Adachi, N. (2014). *Language, culture, and society: An introduction to linguistic anthropology*. Westview Press.

Saussure, F. D. (1988). Pengantar linguistik umum. *Terj. Rahayu S. Hidayat. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University*.

Sifianou, M. (2012). Disagreements, face and politeness. *Journal of pragmatics*, *44*(12), 1554-1564. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.03.009

Sim, S., & Van Loon, B. (2008). Mengenal Teori Kritis. *Yogyakarta: Resist Book*.

Tinggen, I. N. (1995). *Sor singgih basa Bali: istilah Indonesia-Bali*. Rhika Dewata.

Torgersen, S., Lygren, S., Øien, P. A., Skre, I., Onstad, S., Edvardsen, J., ... & Kringlen, E. (2000). A twin study of personality disorders. *Comprehensive psychiatry*, *41*(6), 416-425. https://doi.org/10.1053/comp.2000.16560

Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2021). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. John Wiley & Sons.

Zoetmulder, P. J., & Hartoko, D. (1983). *Kalangwan: Sastra Jawa Kuno Selayang Pandang*. Djambatan.