

The Rhetoric of Javanese Legislative Vote Getters in the 2004 Campaign

Agustinus Ngadiman

English Department, Faculty of Letters, Widya Mandala Chatolic University,
Surabaya

e-mail: ngadiman@mail.wima.ac.id

Abstract: This study explored the characteristics of the rhetorical discourse employed by Javanese legislative vote getters in the 2004 campaign in their efforts to win public support for their candidates. The data of the study were the discourses written by Javanese legislative vote getters of Indonesian political parties. The study reveals that (1) the discourses were marked by the use of Javanese metaphorical form called “parikan”, (2) various strategies, such as testimony technique, religious citations, and historical involvement were employed.

Key words: rhetoric, legislative vote-getters, campaign, rhetorical devices, “parikan”

Language is used to do things. It is also used to promise, to insult, to agree, to criticize, to persuade or influence beliefs or attitudes. Language is also a weapon and a potential tool in winning public support, especially during the current information revolution (Zheng, 2000). According to Kempson (1977, p. 50) in uttering a sentence, a speaker is generally involved in three acts. First there is the locutionary act. This is the act of uttering a sentence with a certain meaning. In addition, the speaker may have intended his utterance to constitute an act of praise, criticism, agreement, etcetera. This is the so-called illocutionary act. Finally, he may have uttered a sentence he did utter to achieve certain consequent response from his hearer – for example to frighten him, to amuse him, to get him to do something. This is the perlocutionary act.

The art of speaking effectively by which a speaker or writer can influence the beliefs or attitudes a speaker or writer has about something is called rhetoric (Strayer, 2004). Rhetoric usually works through the emotive or rhetorical force or words and phrases – the emotional associations they express and elicit; for example, saying that someone did

not play a part very well is not nearly as strong as saying that he butchered the role. Rhetoric then relies on an additional or alternative meaning in a statement (given by a particular word or phrase in the statement) to give the statement a certain spin.

Rhetoric can be seen as a cultural tradition. The linguistic self-consciousness, the skills and methodologies are brought into play in shaping convictions of particular audience. Rhetoric is also a powerful weapon in the struggle of community against community, worldview against worldview (Zheng, 2000). Rhetoric thereby comes to be viewed as the tool of particular interests, and therefore linguistic means for improving a politician's life.

The effectiveness of a discourse delivered in public, such as political campaign, also depends upon the appropriateness of the rhetorical devices employed. A political discourse is a mixed product of personal development and the relevant social and cultural environment in which an individual grows. An individual political discourse is the result of personal development in social and cultural setting. Personal development itself is affected by such factors as the impact a cultural environment has upon a process in which an individual develops his personality, the individual's educational experiences, parental influence, social circles, economic status, etc. The personal development of the speaker which is affected by such factors as social, cultural and educational background also affects the rhetorical style employed in the discourse delivered.

The characteristics of that political discourse during the 2004 campaign so far have not been examined. Since an individual speech is affected by the development of the speaker it is therefore still possible for one to investigate what constitutes the underlying influences of the speech patterns of such a speaker. The study is then to address the following question: What are the characteristics of the rhetorical discourse employed by Javanese legislative vote-getters in winning public support to put up their legislative candidates? Specifically the study tried to uncover: (1) the linguistic features of the political discourse of Javanese legislative vote getters in the 2004 campaign, and (2) the rhetorical devices utilized by the vote getters in their efforts to gain public support for their legislative candidates.

METHODOLOGY

The data of the study were the discourses written by Javanese legislative vote getters of Indonesian political parties, PKB (*Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa*), PDIP (*Partai Demokrasi Indonesia Perjuangan*), PKS (*Partai Keadilan Sejahtera*), PDS (*Partai Damai Sejahtera*), Partai Golkar, PPP (*Partai Pembangunan Nasional*), Partai Demokrat, PAN (*Partai Amanat Nasional*), and PBB (*Partai Bulan Bintang*) during the 2004 campaign (April, 2004). The discourses were written in banners exposed in some strategic places all over Surabaya. The data were recorded by the investigator in his field notes. They were then qualitatively analyzed to classify the kinds of rhetorical devices used to gain public support for legislative candidates. The forms and the messages embedded in those rhetorical devices employed were qualitatively described

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Javanese politicians are multilingual. They speak Javanese, their regional language, and Indonesian, their national language and also one or more foreign languages. The study revealed that Javanese and Indonesian were used by Javanese vote getters in their efforts to gain public supports. When Javanese was used, metaphorical expressions, such as “*parikan*”, and inversion sentences were utilized. In addition, several kinds of rhetorical strategies or the techniques were employed by legislative vote getters during the political campaign in 2004. Each rhetorical strategies found in the study is described below.

The Linguistic Features

The political rhetoric of Javanese legislative vote getters is marked by the use of Javanese metaphorical discourse called “*parikan*”. *Parikan* is a form of Javanese rhetoric consisting of two sentences or *ukara* which rhyme with each other (Padmosoekotjo, 1960, p. 16, Ngadiman, 1998, pp. 81-84, Wahab, 1984, pp. 92-95). Each sentence consists of two phrases or *gatra*. The first sentence is the introduction or *purwaka*, while the second sentence is the message or the content or the intended meaning or *wose*. The introduction, which is the first sentence, is meant to attract the reader's attention to the message conveyed in the second sentence.

Based on the number of syllables, “*parikan*” can be divided into three types. The first type is the one in which each sentence consists of two phrases in which each phrase has four syllables. The construction of the syllabic scheme of this type of *parikan* is as follows:

4 syllables + 4 syllables

4 syllables + 4 syllables

The first phrase (noun phrase) of the first sentence rhymes with the first phrase (noun phrase) of the second sentence and the second phrase (verb phrase) of the first sentence rhymes with the second phrase (verb phrase) of the second sentence. For example:

Tawon madu, ngisep sekar. (4 syllables + 4 syllables)

Calon guru, kudu sabar. (4 syllables + 4 syllables)

((A) Honey bee, (is) sucking a flower

Teacher candidate(s) must be patient.)

The second form of *parikan* consists of two sentences. Both sentences are constructed in the same pattern. The first part, which is the first phrase (noun phrase) of each sentence, consists of four syllables, while the second phrase (verb phrase) of each sentence consists of eight syllables. The syllabic scheme of this kind of “*parikan*” is constructed in the following pattern:

4 syllables + 8 syllables

4 syllables + 8 syllables

The following is an example of this pattern of “*parikan*.” The first part of the first sentence “*adas*” rhymes with the second part of this sentence “*alas*”. And the first part of the second sentence “*tiwas*” rhymes with the second part of this sentence “*waras*”.

Kembang adas, sumebar tengahing alas. (4 syllables + 8 syllables)

Tuwas tiwas, nglabuhi wong ora waras (4 syllables + 8 syllables)

(*Adas* flowers, scattering in the middle of the woods

It is in vain sacrificing oneself for an insane person)

The third type is the one in which the first (noun) and the second (verb) phrases of each sentence consists of eight syllables each. The noun phrase or the first phrase of the first sentence rhymes with the first phrase or the noun phrase of the second sentence and the second phrase or the verb

phrase rhymes with the second phrase or the verb phrase of the second sentence. This type of “*parikan*” is constructed in the following syllabic scheme.

8 syllables + 8 syllables

8 syllables + 8 syllables

The following example illustrates this kind of “*parikan*” in which the last word of the first phrase of the first sentence “*jawa*” rhymes with the last word of the second part of the sentence “*sanga*”. And the last word of the first phrase of the second sentence “*siswa*” rhymes with the last word of second phrase of the sentence “*basa*”.

Enting enting gula jawa, sabungkus isine sanga

Ing atase para siswa, wajib seneng nggubah basa.

(Enting-enting made of brown sugar, each pack has nine loaves.

It is obligatory for every student to learn and to speak Javanese correctly and properly.)

“*Parikan*” performs several communicative functions. Wahab (1984: 92) identifies that *parikan* is used to describe love, to express critiques, to give advice and to amuse. The intended meaning, however, is not directly stated. It is delayed, that is it is stated after the introduction, the first sentence. Let us discuss the communicative functions of the examples above.

Kembang adas sumebar tengahing alas

Tuwas tiwas, nglabuhi wong ora waras

(*Adas* flowers, scattering in the middle of the woods

It is in vain sacrificing oneself for an insane person)

The first sentence of this *parikan*: *Kembang adas sumebar tengahing alas* ‘an *adas* flower, scattering in the forest’ is the introduction. Its function is to attract the attention of the reader or listener. This sentence does not convey any message related to the message to be conveyed. The intended meaning is expressed in the second sentence: *Tuwas tiwas, nglabuhi wong ora waras* ‘it is in vain sacrificing oneself for an insane person’. The illocutionary force in this “*parikan*” is thus to warn or to advice someone who sacrifices oneself for or dedicates one’s time, money, etcetera to some one who is insane since it will be in vain; nothing can help.

*Enting-enting gula jawa, sebungkus isine sanga.
Ing atase para muda, wajib seneng nggubah basa.*

(Enting-enting made of brown sugar, each pack has nine loaves.
It is obligatory for yourger generation to learn and speak Javanese correctly and properly.)

The communicative function or the illocutionary force of this “*parikan*” is to present a pedagogical advice to the younger generation to learn language, the *unggah-ungguhing* 'the principles of the use' of Javanese. They are obliged to learn to speak and write in Javanese correctly and properly. The intended meaning or the illocutionary force is expressed in the second sentence: *Ing ngatase para muda, wajib seneng nggubah basa* 'it is obligatory for the younger generation to learn and speak Javanese correctly and properly'. The first sentence has no message related to the intended meaning expressed in the second sentence. Its function is to introduce the message. It is only used to make the decoder pay attention to the message to be conveyed. Thus in this kind of rhetorical form, the intended message is not directly expressed. By employing this rhetorical form, uneasy feeling and conflict caused by critiques and warnings can be avoided.

Based on the form, there were three types of *parikan* employed by Javanese legislative vote getters. The first type was the one in which each sentence consisted of two phrases; each phrase of which had four syllables. The syllabic scheme of this type of “*parikan*” was then constructed as follows:

4 syllables + 4 syllables
4 syllables + 4 syllables

The first phrase (noun phrase) of the first sentence rhymed with the first phrase (noun phrase) of the second sentence and the second phrase (verb phrase) of the first sentence rhymed with the second phrase (verb phrase) of the second sentence. For example:

Arek cilik mangan bubur (4syllables + 4 syllables)
(A child eats porridge)

Dewan becik, rakyat makmur (4 syllables- 4 syllables)
((Because) the legislators are wise and clean, people become prosperous)

The introduction of the above “*parikan*” was “*Arek cilik mangan bubur*” (A Child eats porridge). The intended meaning or the illocutionary force of the above “*parikan*” was found in the second sentence “*Dewan becik, rakyat makmur*”. The statement meant “people would become prosperous if the legislatives were honest and wise”. The “*parikan*” above was written by the vote getters of PKB (*Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa*). The writer of the above “*parikan*” claimed that the PKB legislative candidates were honest, free from corruptions. The function or the illocutionary force of the “*parikan*” above was thus to persuade people to choose the legislative candidates of PKB, since they were honest, clean, and free from corruptions.

Similar to this type was the one having two sentences. The first sentence was the introduction (clue), while the second sentence was the answer (the intended message). The first sentence consisted of two phrases. The first part of this sentence consisted of 4 syllables; the second part of the sentence consists of 5 syllables, instead of 4 syllables. The second sentence, which was the answer of the first sentence, consisted of two phrases. The first part was a noun phrase with 5 syllables, and the second part consisted of 7 syllables, instead of 4 syllables. It was then constructed in the following syllabic scheme

4 syllables + 5 syllables

5 syllables + 7 syllables

This kind of “*parikan*” was not common in Javanese rhetoric. The “*guru wilangan*” or the syllabic scheme of this “*parikan*” did not accord with the conventional rule of the second “*parikan*” described above.

Wadhah ngombe jarene gelas (4 syllables + 5 syllables)

(A drinking container is called a glass)

Sing pancen OK, nyoblos nomer nembelas (5 syllables + 7 syllables)

(The right choice is number sixteen)

The first phrase of the first sentence above “*wadhah ngombe*” rhymed with the first phrase of the second sentence “*sing pancen OK*”, and the second phrase of the first sentence “*jarene gelas*” rhymed with the second phrase of the second sentence “*nyoblos nomer nembelas*”. The intended meaning was “the right choice is number 16” (*Sing pancen OK, nyoblos nomer nembelas*). Number 16 is PKS. The first sentence which was the introduction was “*Wadhah ngombe jarene gelas*” (a drinking container is

called a glass). The second sentence which was the answer (the message) was “*Sing pancen OK, nyoblos nomer nembelas*” (the right choice is number sixteen). The intended message or the illocutionary force was then party number sixteen, PKS was a good, clean party and thus it was the right choice. The communicative function or the illocutionary force of this “*parikan*” was then to persuade people to choose number 16, which was the legislative candidate of PKS. This candidate was wise and honest.

The second type of “*parikan*” found consisted of only one sentence. The first part of the sentence was a noun phrase having 4 syllables, and the second part was also a noun phrase, but it had 5 syllables, instead of 4 syllables. The last syllables of the first phrase of this “*parikan*” rhymed with the last syllables of the second phrase. It was constructed in the following syllabic pattern

4 syllables + 5 syllables

The syllabic scheme of this kind of “*parikan*” then did not accord with the syllabic scheme of the conventional “*parikan*” as described above (type one). This kind of “*parikan*” was thus uncommon in Javanese. It had no introduction but directly stated the answer or the intended message “*Rakyat balane, nemblas pilihe*” (People are the forces, number sixteen is the choice). Look at the following “*parikan*”.

Rakyat balane, nemblas pilihe (4 syllabuses + 5 syllabuses)
(People are the forces, sixteen is the choice)

The “*parikan*” above was constructed by the vote getters of PKS. The intended meaning of this “*parikan*” was that people were the forces of PKS (Party number 16). The communicative function or the illocutionary force of this “*parikan*” was then to persuade people to choose PKS, because the folks were the forces (*bala*) of this party.

The third kind of “*parikan*” employed by Legislative vote getters was exemplified below. This kind of *parikan* consisted of two sentences. The first sentence was the clue or the introduction, while the second sentence was the answer, containing the intended message. Both were complex sentences. The first sentence of the *parikan*, which was the introduction, said “*Mlaku-mlaku neng Driyorejo, ojo lali tuku bakwan*” “whenever you go to Driyorejo (a name of a sub-district or Kecamatan in Surabaya district), don’t forget to buy “*bakwan*” (meat balls). The second sentence, which contained the intended message said “*Yen nyoto wargo Mulyorejo, ojo lali nyoblos Rudi Bahalwan.*” If you are really the

residents of Mulyorejo district, don't forget to vote for Rudy Bahalwan". The first parts of those sentences were conditional clauses. The second parts of those sentences were the main clauses. The last syllable of the first clause of the first sentence rhymed with the last syllable of the first clause of the second sentence. The last syllable of the second part of the first sentence rhymed with the last syllable of the second clause of the second sentence.

Mlaku mlaku neng Driyoreja, ojo lali tuku bakwan

(9 syllables + 8 syllables)

(When you go to Driyorejo, don't forget to buy 'bakwan' (meat balls))

Yen nyoto wargo Mulyorejo, ojo lali nyoblos Rudi Bahalwan

(9 syllables + 11 syllables)

(If you are really the people /habitants of Mulyorejo, don't forget to choose Rudy Bahalwan)

What was uncommon of this "parikan" was the number of syllabic scheme. The first sentence consisted of two clauses. The first clause contained 9 syllables, instead of 8 syllables. The second clause of this sentence contained 8 syllables (it accorded the common rule of Javanese "parikan"). The second sentence also consisted of two clauses. The first clause consisted of 9 syllables, instead of 8 syllables, and the second clause consisted of 11 syllables, instead of 8 syllables. This kind of "parikan" was then constructed in the following pattern (syllabic scheme)

9 syllables + 8 syllables

9 syllables + 11 syllables

The communicative function or the illocutionary force of this "parikan" was to remind the people of Mulyorejo to vote for Rudy Bahalwan because Rudy Bahalwan was the right person who represented the people of Mulyorejo district.

The following "parikan" was similarly constructed to the above "parikan". But it had different number of syllables (syllabic scheme). In this "parikan", the first line was the clue and the second line was the answer. The first line consisted of two sentences, each of which had 8 syllables. The second line also consisted of two sentences; the first sentence of this line consisted of 9 syllables and the second sentence of this line consisted of 12 syllables. It was then constructed in the following syllabic scheme:

8 syllables + 8 syllables
9 syllables + 12 syllables

Kretane kreto kencana, rodane roda tembaga

(8 syllables + 8 syllables)

(The wagon is made of gold, its wheels are made of brass)

Critane para muda kawula, melok PKB wiwit jaman semono

(9 syllables + 12 syllables)

(The story is that (Javanese) young generations have belonged to PKB since those remote days)

The last syllable of the first sentence in the first line rhymed with last syllable of the first sentence of the second line, and the last syllable of the second sentence of the first line rhymed with the last syllable of the second sentence in the second line. The introduction of the “parikan” above was “Kretane kreto kencana, rodane roda tembaga” (The wagon is made of gold, the wheel is made of brass). The intended message or the illocutionary force of the “parikan” above was “Critane para muda kawula, melok PKB wiwit jaman semono”, (The story is that (Javanese) young generations have belonged to PKB’s activities since those remote days). Through this parikan then the vote getters tried to persuade Javanese youths in Surabaya to choose the legislative candidates of PKB, since they have been involved in PKB’s action since those remote days.

Beside the use of metaphorical expressions such as “parikan” as described above, direct persuasion was also employed. The following quotations exemplify this kind of technique.

Coblos moncong putih

(Choose the white nose)

Beri kami mandat untuk membangun Sukolilo

(Give us authority to develop Sukolilo)

Jangan ragu pilih PKB

Pasti aman

(Don’t hesitate to choose PKB, the country will be peaceful)

The quotations above tend to be imperative rather than persuasive. The notions carried in the expressions are then authoritative; the folks are forced to choose the individual candidates of those parties. The first

quotation “*Coblos moncong putih*” (Choose the white nose) was the quotation of PDIP rhetoric. The message carried in this quotation was then forcing the folks to choose the candidates of PDIP. The same notion was also carried in the following quotations:

“*Beri kami mandat untuk membangun Sukolilo*”

(Delegate us to develop Sukolilo)

“*Jangan ragu pilih PKB. Pasti aman*”

(Don't hesitate to choose PKB. The country will be peaceful).

The Rhetorical Strategies Employed

Several rhetorical strategies were employed by Javanese political vote getters. Through these strategies the vote getters tried to strengthen the illocutionary forces of their statement so that the persuasions became more penetrating. Hence, the folks would vote for their legislative candidates. The strategies employed by the vote getters in gaining public support were inclusive technique, testimony technique, historical involvement, religious citations, and denials. In addition, sarcastic statements and empty promises are utilized. Those techniques were thought to be effective and potential weapons to win public supports. Each strategy is described below.

1. The Inclusive Technique

Some political party vote getters utilized an inclusive technique which Zheng (2004) calls the “plain-folks” technique. The following quotations are the rhetoric written by PKS and PKB.

1. *Coblos caleg perempuan no 6*

Peduli perempuan, pemuda dan lansia

(Choose the female legislative candidate's party number 6

They are concerned with female people, young generation and old people)

2. *PKB memberi kiprah lebih besar kepada generasi muda*

PKB provides young generations with wide opportunity to take part in Community activity)

Quotation 1 was written by PKS vote getters and Quotation 2 was written by PKB vote getters. Through the above persuasions the vote getters of

PKB and PKS attempted to convince their audience that both they themselves and their ideas are “of the people”. They tried to convince people that they were not exclusive and ensured them that they really concerned with all levels of generation, younger and older generations. In addition gender discrimination was never employed. The main function of this inclusive or “plain-folks” technique was to assimilate the vote getters themselves into the society, and then to win the support of the members of the society. This “plain-folk” technique was also employed in other countries such as America and Australia (Zheng, 2000). One significant difference that can be found was that the rhetoric of American and Australian politicians was oral speech exposed in TV, while the rhetoric of Javanese rhetoric was written exposed in banners displayed in some strategic places. In addition, the rhetorical discourses of Javanese political parties were commonly coated in metaphorical expressions, such as “parikan”.

2. Testimony Technique

The other common technique employed by Javanese politicians was that it can be referred to as the “testimony technique”, in which politicians listed series of the quality of individual parties. This technique was also employed by political parties in other countries, such as Australia and America (Zheng, 2000). The testimony technique employed by Javanese politicians was different from the one employed by Australian and American politicians in that Australian and American politicians listed their achievement or deeds of individual parties, while Javanese politicians only listed the quality of their parties. The following quotations of PKS vote getters illustrate this kind of technique.

*Terbukti lebih bersih, lebih peduli,
Masiha cilik, sing penting apik*

(It is proved that (the party) is cleaner, more concerned (with the folk)

Though the party is small and new, the most important is that it is good)

*Bersih dari korupsi lebih peduli
Masiha cilik, sing apik 16*

(Clean/free from corruption, more concerned with the folk
Though it/the party is small, the right choice is number 16)

In the quotations above, the vote getters of PKS “Partai Keadilan Sejahtera” (number 16) listed the quality of the individual party “lebih bersih” (cleaner), “lebih peduli” (more concerned (with the folk)), “apik” (good), and “bersih dari korupsi” (free from corruptions). Though they realized that this party was still small and new “masiha cilik” (though the party is small (and new)), by listing those series of quality and exposing the vision of this party, the vote getters tried to win the sympathy of the folks so that they would choose the legislative candidates of this party

The following example also illustrates the testimony technique. The quotation was written by the vote getters of PPP (Partai Persatuan Pembangunan)

Kalau anda ingin kejayaan Islam, Cobloslah PPP.
(If you want the glory of Moslem, choose PPP).

The politicians of PPP, Partai Persatuan Pembangunan (the Party of Development Unity), claimed that Moslem political party had achieved its glory. Through the quotation above the vote getters tried to convince Moslem people that this party as well as the folks had been successful in the efforts of achieving the glory. The vote getters then persuaded Moslem people to choose the legislative candidates of the PPP so that Moslem folks in general and this Moslem party would keep maintaining the glory of Moslem people in Indonesia. Thus they asserted them to vote for the legislative candidates of PPP.

3. Historical Involvement

In order to enhance the illocutionary force of their political rhetorical discourses the vote getters of Javanese political parties tried to convince the folks that historically their parties and the folk had been involved in their struggles and deeds since the remote days. The “parikan” quoted below illustrates the illocutionary force built by the vote getters of PKB. The message conveyed in the second line of the “parikan” was that young generations had been involved in the PKB’s deed since the remote time. The politicians of this party believed that the folk really understood that PKB belonged to NU “Nahdhatul Ulama”.

Kretane kretone kencono, rodane roda tembaga
Critane para muda kawula, melok PKB wiwit mula buka

(The wagon is made of gold; its wheels are made of brass)
(The story is that (Javanese) young generations have belonged to PKB since those remote days)

Through the “parikan” above, the party tried to convince young generations that since the remote days young generations had been involved in the PKB’s deeds. However, there was no proof that supported the claim that they historically had been involved in their deeds and struggle for building the nation. The illocutionary force was then “you young generations, do not hesitate to choose PKB candidate because young generations had been involved in the PKB’s deed since the remote days”.

4. Religious Citation

A certain religious party believed that biblical citation was an excellent panacea of winning public support. The following biblical quotation, which was taken from Mathew 11: 28, was employed by PDS (Partai Damai Sejahtera, a party under the umbrella of Christian belief) in Surabaya. The party quoted Jesus’ invitation to the folk in His era who had been exhausted in struggling for life. This invitation is still quoted by Christian church in the liturgy. In the quotation below the personal pronoun ‘Aku’ and ‘-Ku’ refer to Jesus.

*Marilah kepada-Ku, semua yang letih lesu dan berbeban berat,
Aku akan memberi kelegaan (Mathew 11:28)*

(Come to Me, you who are exhausted carrying heavy burden
I will make you relieved)

The party felt that people had been exhausted because of the tragedies that people had experienced repeatedly. The politicians of this party tried to convince the audience that the party would make them relieved. Through the biblical quotation the politicians of the party invited the audience to choose their legislative candidates because the candidates would relieve, and free them from such deadly tragedies that they had ever experienced. The illocutionary force was then “choose PDS so that you will be relieved”.

5. Denials

Some people changed their support. They were no more loyal to the party they once had chosen. Because of some reasons those who once supported PKB (National Resurgence Party) changed their mind. They left PKB and supported PDIP (Indonesian Democratic Party in Fight).

Some others who once supported PDIP changed their mind. They left PDIP and supported PKB. The following quotations illustrates this phenomenon

Sepurane Gus, aku kok lebih sreg melu Ibu

(Sorry Gus, it is safer for me to be with Mother, Megawati)

The quotation above was written by vote getters that once belonged to PKB. The address “Gus” in the quotation above referred to Gus Dur (Abdul Rachman Wachid). Abdul Rachman Wachid was associated to PKB (Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa). Because of some reasons, they denied PKB. They did not support PKB anymore but PDIP. “Ibu” (Mother) in the quotation above is referred to Ibu Megawati Sokarno Putri, the main chairwoman of the PDIP (Partai Demokrasi Indonesia Perjuangan). The illocutionary force was then “to persuade those who had supported PKB not to choose PKB anymore, but PDIP”.

The following quotation was constructed by PKB vote getters that once supported PDIP. The quotation was addressed to his friends who once together with him supported different party (perhaps PDIP). He changed his mind, no more supported another party (PDIP) but PKB “aku saiki bala Gus Dur” (I now support Gus Dur, head of Dewan Suro of PKB).

Sepurane Cak, Aku saiki bala Gus Dur

(Sorry, friends, Now I support Gus Dur)

The expression “saiki” (now) is contrasted to “biyen” (in the previous days). The word “saiki” in this quotation then indicates that the writer had changed his mind, from supporting another party (perhaps Bu Mega) to supporting Gus Dur (PKB). The writer thus tried to convince public that he had changed his mind and then persuaded the folk to change their mind as he did, from supporting another party to supporting PKB. The illocutionary force was then “do not choose PDIP anymore, but PKB”.

6. Sarcastic Technique

Some politicians identified some other political parties had cheated the people by implementing money politics. They scorned them by using the following expressions.

Pasang sepandug, simpen kaose

Terima uangnya

(Display the banner, keep the T-Shirt

Receive the money)

Through this rhetorical form, they reminded the folks that certain parties made use of money politics by bribing the targeted audience with some amount of money and/or T-shirt. They suggested the folk not to be loyal to those unclean parties. They suggested them to receive the money and the T-shirt they bribed and to keep it at home, but not to wear it for campaign.

7. Empty Promises

One of the most common techniques employed by Javanese politicians was giving empty promises. This technique was also common in other countries such as Australia and America (Zheng, 2000). The following quotations exemplify the empty promises given by Javanese vote getters during the legislative campaign in 2004. PKB, for example, promised to give wider positions and opportunities in political activities to young generations. However, the kinds of positions and political activities promised were ignored. The illocutionary force was then to persuade young generations to choose PKB

PKB memberikan tempat dan kiprah lebih besar kepada generasi muda

(PKB gives places and wider opportunities to act to younger generation)

Through the following quotations, PKB would always struggle for the truth and justice to achieve social welfare. However, in reality struggling for the truth and achieving social welfare were not as easy as they promised. Great efforts were therefore needed.

PKB tetap eksis membela kebenaran dan keadilan

(PKB will always struggle for truth and justice)

Membawa kesuksesan, berjuang untuk kesejahteraan

(We will be successful, struggle for social welfare}

The PKB vote getters stressed that the promise would not be denied. Promise should be fulfilled. This message is carried in the following quotation.

Kami memberi bukti bukan janji

(We will fulfill our promises)

The illocutionary forces of the above quotations are then reinforced through the following quotations

Jangan ragu, pilih PKB

Pasti aman

(Don't hesitate, choose PKB
The country will be peaceful)

Using this rhetorical form, the PKB politicians tried to convince the folks that the country would be peaceful if they chose PKB.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion above, in general, the political discourse employed by Legislative vote getters under study in their efforts to win public support during the 2004 campaign consisted of the following features

1. Javanese and Indonesian were used simultaneously. Code mixing was sometimes employed. The privileged language, Javanese, was utilized just to show that they were really Javanese. The message was coated in metaphorical expressions such as “parikan”, but the “parikan” utilized deviates the common rules of Javanese classical “parikan”, especially the syllabic schemes.
2. Classical rhetoric techniques including inclusive technique, testimony, historical involvement, religious citation were utilized and developed with modern information technology such as graphics and texts to maximize its persuasive function.
3. The rhetorical discourses reflected the social and religion backgrounds of the vote getters involved in the campaign as well as the targeted audience.
4. The discourses were predominantly comprised of slogans and propaganda, rather than statements of truth or facts. It contained many acceptable and unacceptable lies and empty promises.
5. They differed from classical; oratory tradition in terms of locutionary and illocutionary forces in that it merely tried to persuade rather than summon and guide the public.
6. Because the vote getters targeted different sections of the community, they all used different range of strategies and techniques in their rhetoric to help them achieve their political objectives. The discourses

of PPP and PKB, the parties under the umbrella of Moslem belief, for example, were directed towards Moslem people. The style and the content of their discourses were therefore adjusted to the daily life and experience of Moslem people. PDS which addressed its rhetoric towards Christian people utilized biblical citations. PKS, PAN and PDIP, the parties which tried to embrace the people of all levels utilized general slogans directed to all levels of community. Through those general slogans and propaganda they tried to convince the people that those parties were not exclusive.

REFERENCES

- Dollery, B., & Lin C. 2002. Rhetorical patterns in the Australian debate over war with Ira. *Working Paper Series in Economics*. Retrieved August 27, 2004, from <http://www.une.edu.au/febl/EconStud/wps.htm>
- Kempson, R. 1997. *Semantic theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ngadiman, A. 1998. *Javanese cultural thought patterns as manifested in Javanese expository discourse*. Unpublished Dissertation. Malang: IKIP Negeri Malang.
- Padmosoekotjo, S. 1960. *Ngengrengan kasusastran Djawa*. Jogyakarta: Hien Hoo Sing.
- Scaife, R. 2004. *A glossary of rhetorical terms with examples*. Retrieved May 18, 2004, from <http://www.uky.edu/ArtsSciences/Classics/rhetoric.html>
- Strayer. 2004. *Persuasion through rhetoric*. Retrieved August 27, 2004, from <http://www.ipfw.edu/phil/faculty/Strayer/persuasionthroughrhetotirc.ppt>
- Wahab, A. 1986. *Javanese metaphors in discourse analysis*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Urbana: University of Illinois.
- Wahab, A. 1988. *Linguistik: dari pra Socrates ke pragmatik*. IKIP Malang: Proyek Peningkatan/Pengembangan Perguruan Tinggi.
- Wahab, A. 1991. *Issu linguistik: pengajaran bahasa dan sastra*. Surabaya: Airlangga University Press.
- Zheng, T. 2000. Characteristics of Australian political language rhetoric: tactics of gaining public support and shirking responsibility. *Intercultural Communication, November (4)*. Retrieved May 15, 2004, from <http://www.immi.se/intercultural/>