

## Banality of Political Communication in Indonesian Presidential Election

**Widodo Agus Setianto**

Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

Corresponding Author, ✉ [widas@ugm.ac.id](mailto:widas@ugm.ac.id)

### Article History:

Received 2013-06-27

Accepted 2023-12-31.

### Keywords:

Banality, Discourse,  
Deconstruction,  
Online media, Political  
communication

---

### Abstract

*This study aims to describe the banality of discourse through the deconstruction of discourse on the discourse of political actors through viral political communications in online media. Through discourse deconstruction, an overview of the discourse meaning is obtained, and the discourse intent under study is revealed. This study uses five reports from four online media. The research uses linguistic and structural methods, objectives hermeneutic, and social semiotics. The results of the study show that there is power-oriented vulgarity with vulgar language, low political morality, political egoism, and political justification. This research shows that symbolic violence in political communication.*

## Introduction

In every election, the political situation often heats up and has an impact that is not conducive to society. Political intrigues in the 2019 presidential elections caused political turbulence and caused an uproar (Pambudhy, 2019). The dynamics of political communication are dominated by provocative discourse, clichés, sweet promises, lies, and imagery through narcissistic photos and vlogs of political actors that do not give meaning to the people's interests. Political life is distorted, filled with smears, lies, and falsehoods that eliminate the political substance based on honesty, truth, justice, ethics, and morality (Dwihantoro, 2013).

The chaos of discourse and counter-discourse in political contestation makes ordinary people confused about the existing political reality. Society is caught up in the battle of discourse and can no longer distinguish between the real and the virtual, the true and the untrue, the genuine or the manipulative. All meld in the tumult of pseudo-political reality

and get caught up in endorsements and even conflicts. Society is polarized into opposing political camps. On social media, conflicts of support for political actors are colored with hoaxes, smears, swearing, cursing, and profanity.

The practice of politics through discourse, as mentioned, has plunged this nation into a shallow, meaningless political civilization (Suyanto, 2019). This kind of political practice leads to a concept called banality. Therefore, banality refers to something ordinary, trivial, trite, superficial, pleasantries, or nonsense (*Merriam-Websters dictionary*). The political reality of Indonesia is tinged with nonsense and lies. A society that is supposed to be the main subject of a democratic party is faced with all kinds of chaotic choices. Hoax news on social media is managed as a weapon to bring down political opponents (Amilin, 2019). It is increasingly difficult for people to recognize the truth of information.

Banality in the political context is believed to be systemic, characterized by the workings of monopolistic power structures and corrupt behavior (Sarman, 2017). Forms of corrupt political behavior include political promises that are not fulfilled or inconsistent statements. In the United States, Joe Biden of the Democratic Party is considered to have failed to fulfill his political promises in a state with a majority of Democratic supporters. In Democratic-majority states, hypocrisy and nonsense are happening. This phenomenon is called liberal hypocrisy (Schweizer, 2005). Promises as a contradictory and inconsistent political discourse are a form of political lies, nonsense, and become a banal political discourse.

The Student Executive Board of the University of Indonesia (BEM UI) called President Joko Widodo "The King of Lip Service." BEM UI considers that Jokowi often sells sweet promises, but Jokowi's promises are often not in line with reality. It is also the basis for the label "The King of Lip Service" against Jokowi (Permana, 2021). The banality of this kind of political discourse is interesting to study because it is a political praxis phenomenon easily obtained as political dramatism (Burke & Gusfield, 1989). Politicians consider this kind of political practice normal (Runciman, 2008). Therefore, the question is, "how is the banality of discourse in political communication in the 2019 presidential election contest?" The study aims to describe the banality of political communication in Indonesia by deconstructing existing discourses.

Previous studies that used the concept of banality include (Minanto, 2014); (Rizkika et al., 2019); (Adinda S, 2013); (Meiji, 2016); (Ramadhan et al., 2019); and (Tiran, 2020). These studies looked at banality from psychological, philosophical, and political perspectives. Substantively, these studies illustrate that various practices of life in society have experienced banality. Political advertising is considered an imaging tool; transactional politics is considered a representation of prosocial actions that do not violate the values and norms of individuals and society; intellectual aspects experience the superficiality of thought due to ignorance of the purpose of science in creating human welfare in general. It also can be elaborate as political parties that are supposed to be inclusive containers for anyone precisely conduct exclusivity or discrimination; radicalism and violence are considered part of religious beliefs; clientelism and corrupt behavior are considered part of the consequences of democracy. It is the substance of several studies that use the concept of the banality of the phenomena studied. As far as the author traces, the study of political banality as a discourse in the communication science perspective has not been found much. Studying the banality of political discourse can contribute to understanding the phenomenon of banality in communication discourse.

Politics is a process of communication in which there is a transfer of meaning through discourse. The process of political communication through political messages is a deliberate

attempt to influence the political environment to seize or defend something (Saleh et al., 2021). Politics is words because politics is based on words. Words in politics are a means of expressing and articulating various political interests. A politician is a facilitator of the public interest. Through his words, the politician fights for the truth and his political beliefs and develops a humanitarian awareness for them. Plato illustrates politicians as navigators and moralists who spin words and look at the sky (Baihaki, 2018). Politics is power. A person's success in gaining power is due to his success in processing words and speaking effectively and persuasively. A politician must be able to present the substance of information appropriate to the situation or environment of the information being disseminated and the function of the information itself.

Laswell defined politics as "Who gets what, when, how." (Barbour & Wright, 2021) The phrase "How" in Laswell's definition means "How by saying what, in which channel, to whom, with what effect" (Kenski & Jamieson, 2017). This definition asserts that politics is a communication process in conveying political messages from communicators through the media to provide information, influence, or change communicant behavior. (Kenterelidou, 2005) states that political communication is the role of communication in the political process. In political communication, messages are exchanged among political actors, including all groups, organizations, and individuals who participate in a collectively binding decision-making process (Donsbach, 2008).

One of the theories in explaining political communication is the theory of discourse in political communication. The message in political communication is discourse. Discourse is the utterance of a meaningful unit of language used to communicate. Discourse is a complete series of utterances in an orderly and systematic communication action that contains ideas, concepts, or effects formed in a particular context (Jansen, 2008). By looking at the context, a word can be a clear message. Words can be understood because of the support of the communication situation. Political communication is a space where contradictory discourse is exchanged between different societal elements which have a legitimate right to express themselves in front of the public, both politicians, journalists, and public opinion (Jakubowicz, 2011). Political communication is also the arena in which different types of discourse revolve around politics, competing for influence in the political interpretation of the situation (Brugman et al., 2017). This definition emphasizes the contradictory discourse interactions of actors who share unequal status or legitimacy, but each has a position in the public arena that effectively ensures the functioning of mass democracy. It is a constant process in politics that is triggered by political problems that occur. In terms of political communication, the fragment of the word spoken will present a specific meaning because of the support of the communication situation. For example, the words "*Kampret*" and "*Cebong*" are understood as designations or identifications of Prabowo Subianto and Joko Widodo's supporters in the 2019 presidential election.

Banality can mean the highest things relegated to discourse pleasantries, *meaningless, superficial, or meaningless*. Merriam-Websters dictionary defines banality as cliché, commonplace, musty, stale, boring, dullness, or ordinariness. If something is described as banal, you do not like it because you believe it is so ordinary that it is not effective or interesting. In the Great Dictionary of the Indonesian Language, banal means rough; ordinary. Etymologically banality means to consider ordinary or to excuse. Hannah Arendt introduced the concept of banality. His book *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* tells the story of the *holocaust* in Austria by a Nazi chief executioner named Eichmann. Eichmann executed more than 150,000 Jews, or 60% of Austria's Jews, in less than eighteen months. At the trial in Jerusalem, Eichmann did not feel guilty about what he had done. He said he never killed anyone personally. He is just following orders.

Hence, Arendt argues that Eichmann was utterly unaware of his ungodliness. It is due to adherence to authority gained through propaganda, terror, and violence. Eichmann was incapable of making decision; his conscience was blunted by making the law and the Nazis a justification for the crimes committed. Arendt refers to this situation as the banality of evil; it is defined as a reasonable presumption of evil, perceiving evil as something ordinary, natural, not something wrong, or even assuming that evil does not occur or does not exist at all. Eichmann is the kind of mass murderer for whom extermination is neither evil nor terrible (Whitfield, 1981).

In the era of media mediation, the role of the media has become necessary to exchange discourse in political communication. The media mediates discourse between political actors in political organizations and citizens (McNair, 2011). Online media makes the interactivity of political communication in the media increasingly high. Online media or online is all forms of media platforms on the internet or online networks that have links, the actual content in multimedia, or facilitation of virtual meetings using information technology (Hendriyanto et al., 2023). Online media are not intended in the technical sense of media based on interactive communication technologies that span the entire world with internet access. However, media institutions, including complex and emerging configurations of companies or institutions that offer media products, try to achieve defined communication goals, implement content production processes and rules under public control and regulation, and produce specific types of media content for audiences with specific needs, gratifications, and media-exposed patterns. We can distinguish different types of online media, for example, news sites, television network sites, company or product sites, political campaign sites, thematic communities, or search engines (Donsbach, 2015). These include websites operated by established media organizations such as the BBC, CNN, and the Wall Street Journal; blogs and independent sites such as Wikileaks devoted to reporting, incorporating, or commenting on political issues; as well as social media that allows internet users to share information quickly (Kencana et al., 2022).

## Methodology

This study uses the constructivist paradigm. The constructivism paradigm focuses on the individual's freedom in interpreting reality. Reality depends on the individual's view of reality itself. Individuals exercise control over specific purposes that exist in discourse (Jailani, 2012). This research is qualitative descriptive. The object of his research is the corpus of the 2019 presidential election in online media reporting related to the themes studied, among others; 1) "Berani Berantem" on news portals <https://news.detik.com>, <https://nasional.kompas.com>. 2) "Jenderal Kardus" on the news portal <https://CNNIndonesia.com>, <https://news.detik.com>.

The research used Saussure's structuralist analysis method (1857-1913). Saussure distinguishes two kinds of relations in the study of language, namely syntagmatic relations and paradigmatic relations. The method of syntagmatic analysis decomposes discourse linguistically through the interrelationship of words or elements contained in one utterance that forms discourse, is concrete, linear-horizontal, and meaning as something objective. Discourse interpretation in the syntagmatic analysis is carried out through the Hermeneutic Objective of (Titscher et al., 2000), including internal and external analysis, extensive interpretation, thorough interpretation, and identification of the political and economic interests of the actors. The paradigmatic analysis analyzes language units or units of language that are vertical, concerning which the relationship is not concrete and the meaning is associative. Interpretation of discourse in paradigmatic analysis using social



semiotics (Halliday, 1978) by analyzing the discourse field (analysis of how discourses treat events), discourse involvement (analysis of the people involved and their social attributes), discourse means (analysis of the use of language in describing events), then make interpretations according to the theoretical perspective used (Hamad, 2007).

Table 1. Discourse Analysis Model

Methods	Scope of Analysis	Discourse Interpretation
Syntagmatic	Words or elements in one speech that are linear.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal and external (Titscher et al., 2000)</li> <li>• Extensive interpretation</li> <li>• Thorough interpretation</li> <li>• Identify the interests of the actor.</li> </ul>
Paradigmatic	Vertical units or units of language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discourse field analysis (Halliday, 1978)</li> <li>• Discourse involvement</li> <li>• Discourse tools</li> <li>• Interpretation of discourse</li> </ul>

## Results and Discussion

**Discourse 1:** *“Berani Berantem”* is the theme of discourse on online media news portals news. detik.com and kompas.com. The title is an excerpt of President Joko Widodo’s speech at the Jokowi Volunteer meeting at SICC, Sentul, Bogor, Saturday, 4 August 2018. The participants involved are political parties, politicians and volunteers, scholars, professionals, community organizations, and retired TNI (Indonesian National Armed Forces)-Polri (Indonesian Police Force) officers. As Jokowi volunteers throughout Indonesia, all participants expressed their commitment to supporting Jokowi to lead Indonesia back by winning the 2019 presidential election. Here is a quote from Jokowi’s direction to his supporting volunteers.

*“If there is militant, here must be more militant. If you work hard there, you have to work even harder here. If they are united there, we must be more united here.” “Do not criticize others; do not demonize others. However, you must be brave if you are invited to fight.” “But do not invite. I said, please underline. Do not invite. If you are invited, do not be afraid.” (Damarjati & Prasetya, 2018).*

The above discourse does not stand alone. It is an interdiscourse of discourse put forward by the Chairman of PROJO Volunteers (Pro Jokowi) when confirmed by journalists related to Jokowi’s direction.

*“Do not build hostility, do not build hate speech, do not build smears, do not always criticize, do not always demonize people. But if you are invited to fight, you must be brave.” (Damarjati & Prasetya, 2018).*

The volunteers welcomed Jokowi’s remarks. President Jokowi was surprised by the enthusiastic reaction of volunteers to welcome his statement.

*“Even President Jokowi was surprised that all the volunteers expressed their readiness to fight. It proves that Jokowi Volunteers are very militant and never afraid. Because most of Jokowi’s volunteers are activists and militant fighters, of course, if we are invited to fight, we will not avoid it. We are fighters.” (Damarjati & Prasetya, 2018).*

The media quoted Jokowi’s remarks from a video uploaded by Jokowi’s volunteers on social media. The video went viral and became the subject of online media coverage. Jokowi’s speech made noise and reaped the pros and cons. Many media outlets reported

speeches deemed inappropriate by a president. The public regretted the president's remarks to his supporters. Netizens' comments were generally damaging to the president's remarks. The president's remarks were widely criticized for being dangerous, provocative, and encouraging acts of violence and horizontal conflict in society. The public considers it inappropriate for the head of state to physically provoke his people to fight. Gerindra Party Secretary General Ahmad Muzani, for example, considered Jokowi as the head of state and failed to unite his community consisting of many tribes, ethnicities, religions, and backgrounds.

### **Syntagmatic Analysis and Interpretation of Hermeneutic Objectives**

The relationship between sentences in the discourse "*Berani Berantem*" is a presuppositional sentence relationship. The first assumption is made by political opponents, marked by using the word "if" (if there are militants, if there is hard work, if there are united). The reaction or response carried out by the incumbent camp is more action than that carried out by the rival camp with the use of the word "here must be more" (such as; here must be more militant, work even harder here, we must be more united here). The second supposition is a double-edged message, aimed at both internal and external, namely the interrelationship between the words in the sentence "Do not criticize others; do not demonize others." and the sentence "Do not build hostility, do not build hate speech, do not build smears, do not always criticize, do not always demonize people." The third assumption is an incumbent invitation to dare to serve any invitation made by competitors if the opponent invites fighting. It is contained in words in the series of sentences "But do not invite. I said, please underline. Do not invite. If you are invited, do not be afraid" and the phrase "if you are invited to fight, you must be brave." The diction used is comparative. It can be seen by comparing words such as more militant, more challenging work, more united, and so on. This word's diction motivates and encourages an action to have more effort in winning the fight as well as fights if necessary.

The interrelationship of words in these three assumptions shows linearity and consistency in their objective meaning, namely responding to each opponent's actions with a more robust response. Internal situations describe situations that are defensive and consolidative. It can be seen in the phrase of the sentence not to commit unspeakable acts such as smearing, denouncing, building hatred, and do not invite. Conversely, if the opponent invites a fight, the response must be faced with courage. The emphasis is on the phrase of the word invited to fight. The external situation describes the situation faced by the discourse in the form of threats from external parties, so it needs consolidation efforts to do more, remind and strengthen the position to dare to face challenges even though the challenge is a fight. An extensive interpretation of the discourse "*Berani Berantem*" is to motivate or encourage readiness to try harder and dare to face the opponent, whatever the opponent makes. The overall meaning reflected is to dare face any situation to win the struggle in the presidential election contest. The interest or advantage of the discourse is the militancy of supporters for the political purposes of the discourse.

### **Paradigmatic Analysis and Social Semiotic Interpretation**

In paradigmatic analysis, words in a sentence can be replaced with other words that are different and have associative meanings. The word brave to fight in the sentence "if you are invited to fight, you must be brave" vertically can be replaced by the phrase "if you are invited to war, you must be brave". To be in war means to dare to kill, and so on. Its associative meaning can manifest the subconscious discourse to do anything as an action that must be done in response to the dynamics of the actions of political opponents. It reflects a form of thinking that is not clear and can have an effect on chaotic social situations.

Discourses treat events as leaders who motivate and provoke their supporters, who are members of Jokowi's volunteers to be militant and dare to fight it out. Discourse involves all supporters in various lines and circles who are members of the Jokowi Volunteers consisting of supporting political parties, politicians, volunteer members, scholars, professionals, community organizations, retired TNI-Polri and other community groups. Means of discourse with language that describes events in the form of suppositions. The language used is structurally instruction and motivation; intertextually, it describes symbolic violence with harsh words such as total war, undaunted militants, militant fighters, and brave fights. The interpretation based on the theoretical perspective describes an unfair competition, nuanced political contestation, and an unsettling democratic party full of threats and makes political violence a reasonable choice in the face of opponents to win the contestation.

**Discourse 2.** A political tweet shook the online media from the Demokrat Party's Deputy Secretary General. In a tweet on 8 September 2018, Andi Arif wrote:

*"Prabowo is kardus...Prabowo values money more than struggle". "Jenderal kardus."*

The following tweet contains an explanation of what is meant by a *Jenderal Kardus*.

*"Jenderal kardus has poor quality. Meeting the Demokrat General Chairman yesterday afternoon with the sweet promise of struggle. It has not been twenty-four hours, and his mind falls on sandi uno money to entertain PAN and PKS." (Dalimunthe, 2018).*

Andi Arif's tweet went viral on social media, stomping the world of Indonesian politics. The tweet was quoted by various online media and reaped various responses from the public. Andi Arif's tweet was an expression of disappointment and anger related to the determination of the vice president who will accompany Prabowo Subianto. The election of the president and his deputy in the 2019 election was followed by two pairs of presidential candidates, namely President Joko Widodo as the incumbent and Prabowo Subianto as the opponent. The public highly awaits the determination of the vice-presidential candidate of the two candidates for the presidential candidate. In addition to the certainty in determining the pair for the consolidation of supporting political parties, it is also to end various speculations in the community.

President Jokowi, on Thursday afternoon, 9 September 2018, declared himself a presidential candidate in the 2019 election, with Prof. Dr Kyai Ma'ruf Amin as vice-presidential. Meanwhile, Prabowo's camp has not agreed on the vice-presidential candidate who will accompany him. Prabowo will declare his candidacy for president on Thursday at noon on 9 August 2018, with Sandiaga S. Uno as his deputy. On Thursday night, however, the declaration was not made. Even Prabowo was seen leaving the declaration location located at his residence. Sources from the Gerindra Party said Prabowo Subianto went to the residence of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, the head of the Democratic party. After returning from the residence of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, at 21.00, Prabowo declared his candidacy as a pair of presidential and vice-presidential candidates with Sandiaga S Uno. The declaration was accompanied by an elite of supporting political parties, namely PAN and PKS. Representatives from the Demokrat Party did not appear on the scene. The absence of representatives from the Demokrat Party in the declaration event at Prabowo's residence left questions and led to speculation regarding the political stance of the Democratic Party.

Prabowo Subianto's choice of Sandiaga S Uno as the vice-presidential candidate disappointed the Demokrat Party because it felt rejected and betrayed by the agreement that had been made earlier between the Demokrat Party general chairman and the Gerindra Party general chairman.

*"SBY-Prabowo discussed restoring good and respectful politics without a dowry. SBY proposed that Prabowo find another vice president who is not Sandi, AHY, Zul Hasan, and Salim Al Jufri, as Zul Hasan requested for a neutral figure. Nevertheless, unfortunately, Prabowo still ignored SBY's suggestion of a neutral figure. Surprisingly, Zulkifli Hasan and Saleh Al Jufri also changed their stance from having to be PAN or PKS figures or neutral figures and suddenly agreed to choose Sandi, also from Gerindra. What is going on?" (Dalimunthe, 2018).*

Andi Arif wrote his tweet on 8 September. The phrase "Yesterday afternoon" refers to the day before 7 September. It means that on 7 September afternoon, there was a meeting and talks between the Demokrat Party and the Gerindra Party. The content of the conversation manifested in the phrase "sweet promise of struggle" in Andi Arif's tweet referring to Prabowo's promise at the meeting. Prabowo violated the sweet promise of this struggle, so Andi Arif was angry and wrote *jenderal kardus* on his Twitter page; "It has not been twenty-four hours, his mental falls on sandi uno money to entertain PAN and PKS".

From Andi Arif's unanswered tweet, the absence of Demokrat Party representatives during the declaration of Prabowo and Sandiaga's presidency on Thursday night on 9 September was because the Demokrat Party rejected Sandi S Uno as a vice presidential candidate. The Demokrat Party sees Sandi S Uno as part of the Gerindra Party. It is not in line with the ethics of the coalition. In addition, the Demokrat Party has not received reasons from Prabowo Subianto about not being elected as a vice presidential candidate for reasons of rejection from PAN and PKS. Andi Arif accused Sandiaga S. Uno has "entertain" PAN and PKS by giving dowries of Rp 500 billion each. It is what makes the Demokrat Party angry, expressed through Andi Arif's tweets about the *jenderal kardus*.

The day after Andi Arif's tweet about the *jenderal kardus* and his statement to reporters that the dowry of 500 billion each to PAN and PKS, it began to get responses from parties involved or interested in this issue. Sandiaga S Uno was reluctant to respond as the accused, and the questioned party did. He stroked his chest with concern over the accusations addressed to him. His position as a public official is a reason not to talk about political issues. Gerindra musician and politician Ahmad Dhani commented on the 500 billion dowry issue from Sandi Uno to PAN and PKS. According to Dhani, 500 billion is too small because previously, PAN and PKS were offered 3 trillion to move to Jokowi. Five hundred billion is too small, too cheap. He said the substance is not in the 500 billion. The substance of PAN and PKS fought with Prabowo. When talking about money, PAN and PKS have moved to Jokowi, 6 trillion rupiahs for two parties.

Given the severity of the sanctions that can be imposed on political parties due to the accusation of dowry, PAN and PKS demanded that Deputy Secretary-General of the Demokrat Party, Andi Arif, apologize for his accusation, which was considered defamation. He will be charged with the offence if he does not ask for forgiveness.

*"Andi Arief's statement is for PAN something that is not true, smear. Therefore, PAN asked Mr Andi Arief to retract the statement, clarify it publicly, and apologize to PAN. If it is not done, then PAN will take legal action, and we believe Andi Arief's statement is a personal statement, not a Demokrat statement." (Nurjiyanto, 2018).*

The same is true for PKS as well. PKS called Andi Arif's statement regarding the presidential dowry a smear.



*"Andi Arif's statement is a vile smear. It is a no-nonsense accusation that has legal consequences for the person concerned. There is no explanation from the Demokrat Party related to Andi's accusation. There was no official clarification from his party, so we concluded this was also the attitude of the party institution where Andi Arief took shelter." (Saputro & Minanto, 2018).*

That attitude is what further strengthens PKS reporting Andi to the police. It was stated by Ledia Hanifa, Chairman of DPP PKS, in a press statement received by detikcom Thursday (9/8/2018). The threat of PAN and PKS did not make Andi Arif or the Demokrat Party unmoved. They refused to apologize for their accusations. Andi Arif argues that it is not the Demokrat Party that should initiate an apology.

*"The question of dowry to PAN and PKS is not from the Demokrat Party. Information on a dowry of Rp 500 billion is based on information from the small Gerindra team. A small team from the PD also asked Gerindra for an explanation about why Sandiaga's name suddenly appeared as Prabowo's vice president's option. Gerindra and Sandiaga must explain directly to the coalition the existence of the dowry." (Prasetia, 2018).*

### **Syntagmatic Analysis and Interpretation of Hermeneutic Objectives**

There are six corpora in *Jenderal kardus*, constituting a unity of discourse. The first corpus of statements about the *jenderal kardus*. The second corpus explains the characteristics of the *jenderal kardus*. The third corpus discusses the explanation of a neutral figure who should be promoted as a presidential candidate. The fourth and fifth corpus objected to PAN and PKS's accusations and demanded an apology or face lawsuits. The sixth corpus explains that what is alleged has a solid basis. Syntagmatic analysis series can be sorted into phrases as follows. In the first phrase, Prabowo, the general chairman of the Gerindra party, is a retired general who is also a presidential candidate. A general who is considered a *jenderal kardus* and lacks quality. A general who is more concerned with money than struggle. Next, in the second phrase, SBY-Prabowo, discusses good politics, respectable politics without a dowry.

SBY proposed that Prabowo seek a neutral vice president. Prabowo ignored SBY's suggestion. PAN and PKS suddenly changed to agree to choose Sandi from Gerindra. The third phrase, PAN and PKS, accuses the dowry problem of smear. PAN and PKS asked for clarification and demanded that the discussers retract their statements. PAN and PKS will follow the legal path. The fourth phrase is about dowry based on information from Gerindra's small team, not from the Demokrat Party. The small Demokrat Party team asked Gerindra to explain Sandiaga suddenly appearing as Prabowo's vice-presidential option. Gerindra and Sandiaga must explain the truth to the coalition about whether there is a dowry.

The interrelationship between phrases shows linearity and consistency in their objective meaning. The objective meaning of the conflict in determining Prabowo's vice-presidential candidate who violates the ethics of the coalition is due to the existence of money politics in the form of dowry. The internal aspects of discourse illustrate the disappointment and anger of discourses over the internal political process of determining vice presidential candidates. It can be seen from the sentence, "Prabowo is *kardus*...Prabowo values money more than struggle". The external aspect illustrates the stubbornness and political intrigue among coalition parties. It can be seen from the phrase that recounts the meeting between SBY and Prabowo, which discussed respectable politics without involving money or dowry for the determination of vice-presidential candidates. SBY proposed that

the vice president be taken from a neutral figure, not from Gerindra, the Demokrat Party, PAN or PKS. It is a middle ground because each coalition member submits his candidate for the position of vice-presidential candidate. PAN and PKS also agreed to this neutral figure. However, PAN and PKS changed course to approve Gerindra's vice-presidential candidate. Demokrat is asking what is going on.

Extensive interpretation indicates an unsolid situation and poor communication. It can be seen from the phrase that tells of Gerindra's accusation to have "entertained" PAN and PKS to accept Sandiaga as a vice-presidential candidate by giving a sum of money or dowry. PAN and PKS consider the allegations to be untrue and defamatory. PAN and PKS demanded that the statement be retracted and accompanied by an apology from the Demokrat party. The Demokrat Party did not want to apologize because the information about the dowry was sourced from internal grinders themselves. Thorough interpretation illustrates the dynamics of power-oriented politics and is tinged with the issue of money politics. The actor's interest in this is to overturn the decisions that have been made concerning the vice-presidential candidate and make bargaining positions for his party.

### Paradigmatic Analysis and Social Semiotic Interpretation

Paradigmatically, the word *kardus* is a predicate of Prabowo as a subject. This *kardus* word can be replaced with another word, for example, trash can. Prabowo is a general. A general is also a predicate. The word Prabowo can also be replaced with another word. By discourse. The word *jenderal* is associated with *kardus*, so Prabowo as a subject is associated with *jenderal kardus* as a predicate. *Kardus* (cardboard) is a thick box-shaped paper usually used to store objects so they are safe. To value money more than struggle is a word that describes a *jenderal kardus*. *Jenderal kardus's* quality is poor. He talks sweet promises of struggle but falls mentally because of money. This is an additional description of the quality of the *jenderal kardus*. These words can be exchanged with other words and can change their meaning. Associatively, *kardus* in this context is a money storage box, so Prabowo *jenderal kardus* associative meaning is Prabowo is a general who values money more.

Discourse treats events as a game of money politics to embrace positions that must be challenged and straightened out. The actors involved in the discourse are Prabowo as a presidential candidate, Sandiaga as a vice-presidential candidate and PKS and PAN as a coalition party. Diction is used in describing events with vulgar and provocative diction. The diction equates a character's personality with *kardus* (Prabowo is *kardus*). The military post as a general is said to be *Jenderal Kardus*, a poor-quality general who values money more than struggle. His mind quickly falls on money. These words manifest a symbolic and degrading form of violence. Intertextually displays consistency towards accusations. Although there is a refutation, all cannot be proven. It ends and disappears just like that. Interpretation in a theoretical perspective, the discourse that emerges is only a political interest to reach power through symbolic violence by degrading and cornering the target.

The results showed a picture of the political face of the presidential election contest in Indonesia. The political face is littered with hostility, scandals and mismanagement. Moreover, politics are slipping on hostility and profanity, identity conflicts, party divisions, political dowry, corruption and broken promises. Political promises are blown like empty soar bubbles and cannot be caught. It means drowning in the hustle and bustle of cyberspace and critical reasoning snapped up in cursing on social media that without a solution, actions were taken hostage in the wilds of social media.

Politics should be viewed from a different perspective, not just from the perspective of power but culture. Power relations between the state and society must be social relations in the cultural sphere, daily life, media and institutional practice. Thus, politics becomes a possibility in every aspect of social life. Social life is based on meaning, manipulation, and the fight for meaning. Therefore, all aspects of all social life are related to meaning, manipulation and meaning struggle by itself is political (Nash, 2010).

David Hollenbach sees politics not only as a political institution such as the legislature, executive and judiciary but as encompassing the entirety of human activity in public life. Therefore, according to Hollenbach, civil society institutions, media, religious communities, and other non-governmental organizations can have a public role in influencing public policy through their influence on various communities, discourses, and cultural understandings of the state (Hollenbach, 2003). Through the political role of non-political institutions, enlightenment efforts against political darkness that saturates society with negative stories of the political world can be expected. The media and public opinion can play a role by suppressing political banality with fresh ideas and the struggle for positive success.

## Conclusion

The political dynamics in preparation for the 2019 presidential and vice-presidential elections show an unexpected escalation as well as anti-climactic, which can be said to be characteristic in politics in Indonesia. The escalation of the conflict that arises due to certain political discourses can suddenly disappear without any continuation. Likewise, with the discourses in political communication delivered in the 2019 presidential election. The object of this study, namely the discourse about "*Berani Berantem*" and "*Jenderal Kardus*", all show the same character. All are discourses thrown by political actors who then become big and end up rowdy in the political universe because of the role of online media and social media that quickly virtualize the discourses that develop.

Word diction represents the discourse of violence, intimidation, and degradation among political actors involved in contestation. The words "fight", "brave", "will not avoid", "fighter", "*jenderal kardus*", and "poor quality" are diction that can motivate the emergence of violence among supporters, and externally can be a message of threat and intimidation to political opponents. The actor's interest in the banality of this word is the growth of militancy and the spirit of fighting to win the actor.

The discourse displayed is a form of communication that is not in line with the essence of political communication in the framework of carrying out political communication functions to improve the quality of good communication, oriented to coolness by building understanding and community support. The discourse that is presented is not related to political interests for the welfare of the community but is a relatively meaningless discourse that only adds to the commotion in society.

Syntagmatically, the discourse conveyed does not educate the community and is oriented towards concentration to gain power alone. Paradigmatically discourse is delivered with no moral accountability and ends anti-climactic. The results of this study show the face of Indonesian political rudeness that ignores political ethics in achieving power.

## References

- Adinda S, A. J. (2013). Akar Banalitas (Suatu Kajian Filsafat Ilmu). *Jurnal Filsafat*, 23(2), 158–173. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22146/jf.13219>
- Amilin (2019). Pengaruh Hoaks Politik dalam Era Post-Truth terhadap Ketahanan Nasional dan Dampaknya pada Kelangsungan Pembangunan nasional. *Jurnal kajian Lemhanas RI*, Edisi 39 September 2019.
- Baihaki, E. (2018, February 4). Bicara Baik di Tahun Politik. *Kompas.Com*. <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2018/02/04/11151441/bicara-baik-di-tahun-politik>
- Barbour, C. & Wright, G. C. (2021). *Keeping the Republic: Power and Citizenship in American Politics* (9th ed.). SQ Press.
- Brugman, B. C., Burgers, C., & Steen, G. J. (2017). Recategorizing political frames: a systematic review of metaphorical framing in experiments on political communication. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 41(2), 181–197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2017.1312481>
- Dalimunthe, I. (2018, August 6). Andi Arief Ejek Mental Prabowo Jatuh Karena Uang Sandiaga Uno. *CNN Indonesia*. <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20180808215752-32-320713/andi-arief-ejek-mental-prabowo-jatuh-karena-uang-sandiaga-uno>
- Damarjati, D., & Prasetya, A. (2018, August 6). Kontroversi Jokowi Minta Relawan Berani Jika Diajak Berantem. *Detiknews*. <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-4151469/kontroversi-jokowi-minta-relawan-berani-jika-diajak-berantem>
- Donsbach, W. (2008). *The International Encyclopedia of Communication*. In the International Encyclopedia of Communication. Wiley-Blackwell Ltd.
- Donsbach, W. (2015). *The Concise Encyclopedia of Communication*. John Willey & Sons.
- Dwihantoro, Prihatin (2013). Etika dan Kejujuran dalam Berpolitik. *Politika*, Nomor 4 Volume 2, Oktober 2013.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. Edward Arnold Ltd.
- Hamad, I. (2007). Lebih Dekat dengan Analisis Wacana. *Jurnal Komunikasi*, 8(2), 325–344. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.29313/MEDIATOR.V8I2.1252>
- Hendriyanto, A., Purwasito, A., Rais, W. A., & Hastjarjo, S. (2023). The Local Online Media Professionalism Over Candidate Framing Inside Pacitan Election 2020. *Jurnal ASPIKOM*, 8(1), 137. <https://doi.org/10.24329/aspikom.v8i1.1129>
- Hollenbach, D. (2003). *The Global Face of Public Faith: Politics, Human Rights, and Christian Ethics*. Georgetown University Press.
- Jailani, M. S. (2012). *Interaksi Simbolik, Konstruktivisme, Teori Kritis, Postmodernisme dan Poststrukturalisme* (Vol. 3). Edu-Bio.
- Jakubowicz, K. (2011). *Media revolution in Europe: Ahead of the Curve*. Council of Europe Pub.
- Jansen, I. (2008). Discourse analysis and Foucault's "Archaeology of knowledge." *Technical Cooperation (GTZ) International Services P.O. Box*, 1(3), 107–111. <http://www.internationaljournalofcaringsciences.org>
- Kencana, W. H., Situmeang, I. V. O., Meisyanti, M., Rahmawati, K. J., & Nugroho, H. (2022). Penggunaan Media Sosial dalam Portal Berita Online. *IKRA-ITH HUMANIORA*:



*Jurnal Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 6(2), 136–145.

- Kenski, K., & Jamieson, K. H. (2017). *The Oxford Handbook of Political Communication*. Oxford University Press.
- Kenterelidou, C. (2005). *Public Political Communication and Media* (The Case of Contemporary Greece, Ed.). Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- McNair, B. (2011). *An Introduction to Political Communication*. [https://www.academia.edu/6227281/An\\_Introduction\\_To\\_Political\\_Communication](https://www.academia.edu/6227281/An_Introduction_To_Political_Communication)
- Meiji, N. H. P. (2016). *Bergerak di Tengah Banalitas Diskriminasi (Studi Mengenai Kader Anak Muda dalam Menantang Eksklusivisme di Partai Politik Kota Malang)* (Vol. 5).
- Merriam-Websters dictionary. *Banality*. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/banality>.
- Minanto, A. (2014). Fashionable Democracy: Banalitas Iklan Politik di Ruang Publik. *Komunikator*, 6(2).
- Nash, K. (2010). *Contemporary Political Sociology: Globalization, Politics, and Power*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Nurjiyanto. (2018, August 9). *PAN Ancam Laporkan Andi Arief Jika Tidak Minta Maaf*. *Media Indonesia*. <https://mediaindonesia.com/politik-dan-hukum/177577/pan-ancam-laporkan-andi-arief-jika-tidak-minta-maaf>
- Pambudhy, Agung (2019). Mengupas Tuntas Gejolak Pemilu 2019. <https://news.detik.com/foto-news/d-4545564/mengupas-tuntas-gejolak-pemilu-2019>
- Permana, R. H. (2021, June 27). UI: Postingan BEM Soal Jokowi 'The King of Lip Service' Langgar Aturan. *Detiknews*. <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-5622116/ui-postingan-bem-soal-jokowi-the-king-of-lip-service-langgar-aturan>
- Prasetya, A. (2018). *PD Tolak Minta Maaf Soal Tudingan Mahar Rp 500 M ke PAN-PKS*. *Detiknews*. <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-4161020/pd-tolak-minta-maaf-soal-tudingan-mahar-rp500m-ke-pan-pks>
- Ramadhan, M. N., Daniel, J., & Oley, B. (2019). Klientelisme sebagai Perilaku Koruptif dan Demokrasi Banal. *Jurnal Antikorupsi INTEGRITAS*, 5(1), 169–180. <https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v5i1.379>
- Rizkika, H. L., Ummah, H., Raider, A. W., & Rahmawati, E. I. (2019). Banal Politik Transaksional Para Pemilih (Tinjauan Psikologis). *Insight: Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Penelitian Psikologi*, 15(2), 289. <https://doi.org/10.32528/ins.v15i2.2094>
- Runciman, D. (2008). *Political Hypocrisy: The Mask of Power, from Hobbes to Orwell and Beyond*. Princeton University Press.
- Saleh, A., Rudianto, R., Anshori, A., & Adhani, A. (2021). Political Communication in Medan Regional Head Election during the Covid-19 Pandemic. *Jurnal ASPIKOM*, 6(1), 197. <https://doi.org/10.24329/aspikom.v6i1.849>
- Saputro, F. A., & Minanto, A. (2018, August 8). *Nilai Andi Arief Lempar Fitnah, PKS Siapkan Langkah Hukum*. *Republika.co.id*. <https://nasional.republika.co.id/berita/pd61fl409/nilai-andi-arief-lempar-fitnah-pks-siapkan-langkah-hukum>
- Sarman, M. (2017). *Kerumpangan dan Banalitas Politik: Praksis Demokrasi Politik di Ranah Lokal*. Deepublish. <https://opac.perpusnas.go.id/DetailOpac.aspx?Id=1144165>
- Schweizer, P. (2005). *Do as I Say (Not as I do): Profiles in Liberal Hypocrisy*. Doubleday.

- Suyanto, Bagong (2019). Bumerang Menebar Kebohongan Politik. Dalam <https://mediaindonesia.com/opini/208208/bumerang-menebar-kebohongan-politik>
- Tiran, R. (2020). Banalitas Kejahatan dan Radikalisme di Indonesia. *Jurnal Politiconesia*, 259(1), 25–31.
- Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R., & Vetter, E. (2000). *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis: In Search of Meaning*. SAGE.
- Whitfield, S. J. (1981). Society for History Education. *The History Teacher*, 14(4), 469-477.

---

**Copyright holder :**  
© Widodo Agus Setianto

**First publication right :**  
Jurnal ASPIKOM

**This article is licensed under:**

