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ABSTRACT

The feud that occurred between government agencies, in this case involving the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), and government agencies, in this case the National Police, became an ongoing problem that could be considered as a whole. The terminology regarding the KPK and Polri cases, which are synonymous with the term lizard and crocodile, is a separate understanding that needs attention. Public perception of the case varies. There is support for the KPK, but there are also those who justify the treatment of the Police themselves in looking at this case. Foucault's moral genealogy uses ad hominem arguments as the basis for forming his genealogy, used to expose the understanding of lizards and crocodiles. An understanding that society takes for granted as truth and morality. In the genealogy, Foucault sees that in the context of the lizard and the crocodile, there is a kind of power that is to be played and used for a certain interest. There is a purpose to be sought from such a political situation and condition. So, looking at the context of lizards and crocodiles in ad hominem studies is one of the studies of message communication. Political communication that wants to open up new understandings of the logic of human thinking as a whole.
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INTRODUCTION

The issue between the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) and the Indonesian National Police (Polri) has resurfaced. The unilateral dismissal related to the internal leadership structure of KPK has once again stirred up turmoil, bringing...
back tensions between these government institutions. This occurred after the Chairman of KPK, Firli Bahuri, dismissed Brigadier General Endar Priantoro as the Director of Investigations of KPK on March 31, 2032 (Mahendra, 2023).

Previous tensions had occurred around July 2009. This intergovernmental issue originated from allegations of wiretapping by KPK against the Chief of Criminal Investigation Department of the Indonesian National Police. During that time, Commissioner General Susno Duadji was accused of being involved in the disbursement of funds by Budi Sampoe in the Bank Century case (Rudy, 2021). This problem then escalated into a significant case, giving rise to tensions between the two government institutions.

In response to these events, Susno was the first to analogize the case using the terms "Cicak vs Buaya" (Lizard vs Crocodile). In his narrative, Susno further likened the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) to a small lizard (cicak) and the Indonesian National Police (Polri) to a crocodile (buaya) (Rudy, 2021).

The case involving these intergovernmental institutions was then seen as a form of rivalry between "animals," in this case, the lizard and the crocodile (Ruqoyyah et al., 2023). The case, in certain terminology, can be interpreted as a tension between two institutions that should collaborate in handling various cases in Indonesia.

Therefore, considering this matter, as Indonesia approaches the year of elections, it is common to encounter misunderstandings of words and phrases. This is exacerbated by terms that can sometimes have contradictory meanings. Not only are words used in the form of sarcasm, insults, and derogatory language, but they are also often used to undermine and eventually generate hostility (bbcnewsindonesia.com, 2018). The narrowing of word understanding is also supported by the limited knowledge possessed by the general public (bbcnewsindonesia.com, 2018).

The terminology of "cicak" (lizard) and "buaya" (crocodile) has become a phenomenon of language that needs to be examined in-depth. Therefore, having a good understanding of something in communication is an important context for building relationships and connections. A proper understanding that aligns with the intended message of the sender holds value (Amin, 2019). Thus, the effort to comprehend the meaning, message, and interpretations contained in a message becomes crucial, especially in how to interpret the message effectively.

It's intriguing to adopt a critical attitude in comprehending language contexts comprehensively. One form of words that is quite phenomenal is when we understand the terms "cicak" and "buaya" along with all the elements and aspects associated with those words. In line with the existing understanding (Setyowibowo, 2022), numerous interpretations can be openly observed regarding the "cicak dan buaya" phrase.

The terminology of "buaya" (crocodile) refers to an animal that is loyal to its partner. When crocodiles mate, they stay together and do not separate. Even if one of the partners dies, they will not seek new partners. In fact, the crocodile has been symbolized and used in Betawi culture's traditional marriages as a representation of "loyalty," symbolized by the "Roti Buaya" (Setya, 2020).

Some other natural characteristics of crocodiles are that they patiently wait to prey on their food, reflecting the patience required when both men and women eventually get married. Furthermore, crocodiles can live both on land and in water,
signifying that in marriage, one should be able to navigate through both joyful and challenging times together (Wibowo, 2021).

However, despite these positive natural traits of crocodiles, a figurative term or negative use of the crocodile animal is prevalent, signifying something else. It refers to a man with a roving eye or a mischievous nature who is not loyal to his female partner (Admin, 2018). This term is typically used for men who engage in infidelity, flirt with many women, play with women's emotions, and so on (Setyowibowo, 2022).

In fact, the term "buaya" tends to have negative connotations, as it contradicts the meaning of "loyalty" in Betawi culture. Interpreted as the crocodile that lives on land constantly seeking food, it implies a man who continually seeks other women to fulfill his needs, just like the crocodile hunting for prey (Wibowo, 2021).

In a different context, the term "cicak" refers to a small reptile that can be found in almost every part of the world. These creatures are known for their ability to move swiftly and their capacity to cling to vertical surfaces or walls of buildings (pikiranmuslim.com, 2023). Cicak animals are usually not considered frightening; instead, they are often seen as creatures that bring blessings and luck to those who see and keep them (pikiranmuslim.com, 2023).

Considering the diverse shifts in meanings and interpretations mentioned above, this can lead to misunderstandings for many people when using the terms "cicak dan buaya" (lizard and crocodile). Therefore, in this paper, the issue of using these terms will be discussed through the influence of Foucault's Genealogy perspective, which attempts to comprehensively view genealogy not only as a history of past events. It's not about seeking the origin of words and phrases, their verbal or material forms. Genealogy is a form of tracing, unveiling masks to move away from common meanings, and stripping away pretensions of universality and claims that only prioritize self-interest (Adlin, 2020).

**METHODS**

In the writing of this research, a qualitative research methodology is employed, with a moral approach using Michel Foucault's Moral Genealogy theory (Adlin, 2020). The approach is carried out using critical communication analysis by examining various perspectives.

Foucault observes the misconceptions regarding rationality and then formulates the emancipatory potential of a non-instrumental rationality, namely communicative rationality. This communicative rationality is inherent in human reason itself and in their ability to communicate with each other, making it always present and impossible to eliminate as long as humans exist (Wattimena, 2017b).

Foucault's focus of attention revolves around power not being centered on the definition or the social and political structure of a state. He is more interested in the mechanisms and strategies of power, how they are practiced, and how they are accepted and regarded as truth.

Hence, power is closely related to knowledge, and there is no power without knowledge, just as there is no knowledge without power. Knowledge and power cannot be separated, as these two words are like a coin with two sides: one side is knowledge and the other side is power (Wattimena, 2019a).
The exercise of power does not emerge suddenly but starts from discourse. Discourse is a game of truth; it is not something preexisting but is constructed and is not fixed in nature. Foucault is not concerned with whether a certain piece of knowledge is true or false; rather, his focus is on how something can be accepted by society at large (Wattimena, 2017a). For Foucault, knowledge is power, and both of them begin to work through language. Knowledge and power influence each other, leading Foucault to state that power shapes knowledge, and conversely, knowledge shapes power. Truth, according to Foucault, is not absolute nor objective. Truth depends on the discourse or the politics of the ruling elite during a certain period.

For Foucault, power is not an ontology, something that simply exists, but rather a strategy. Therefore, according to Foucault, power is everywhere and comes from everywhere. Power cannot be acquired, divided, inherited, added to, or subtracted from. Power can only be exercised within specific spaces and times (Pranowo, 2017).

The exercise of power creates and generates new objects of knowledge. Conversely, knowledge generates influences of power. Power cannot be implemented without knowledge, just as knowledge cannot avoid giving rise to power.

According to Foucault, power relations exist in all aspects of life, ranging from social, cultural, to political realms. Power is not manifested through the threat of punishment, but rather in the form of agreements built on allurements oriented towards specific outcomes (Adlin, 2020).

In his book "Discipline and Punish" (1979:27), Foucault explains the genealogy of power. Power and knowledge mutually influence each other. There is no power relationship without the shaping of knowledge, and conversely, simultaneously, there is no knowledge that isn't connected to power (Pranowo, 2017).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Genealogy in the Indonesian Dictionary: In the Indonesian language, genealogy is defined in the Great Indonesian Dictionary (KBBI) as stemming from the root word "gene," which refers to the carrier of inherited traits passed down from previous generations to the next (Setiawan, 2021). In this context, genealogy can be seen as the study of matters related to descent. Interpretation of Genealogy in the Context: This definition highlights the interdependence of generations, emphasizing that the young emerges from the old. This can be observed in ancient Javanese writings that were crafted from materials such as animal hides, trees, and more (kbbi.web.id, 2020).

Absolutely, that is a form of legacy from the past. Regarding that text, we can delve deeper and uncover more profound meanings. In a broader context, genealogy is a branch within the realm of knowledge that studies the history and cultural heritage of a specific nation derived from its development (Yudithadewi, 2021).

Genealogy is a serious study. It operates meticulously with collections of archives and detailed research. Genealogy can also be understood as a comprehensive effort to deconstruct existing assumptions and provide an understanding of values within traditional viewpoints, offering new alternative interpretations (Pranowo, 2017).
However, to achieve this, one cannot merely speculate and criticize without clear references. On the contrary, to reach such critiques, a genealogist must immerse themselves among stacks of historical documents or archives, gather various sources from anywhere, study them meticulously, and then use them as tools to dismantle traditional assumptions that are naturally accepted within a society (Yudithadewi, 2021).

In a deeper examination, Foucault perceives that the paragraph above exhibits a clear distinction between himself and Nietzsche. Foucault views genealogy as a rigorous academic study, centered around clear references. The results of this approach can be seen in Foucault's genealogical books, such as "Discipline and Punish," which is the outcome of meticulous research. This book contains detailed historical data presented clearly, systematically, and rigorously across about 300 pages (Pranowo, 2017).

In this book, Foucault investigates the political-technological changes on the body. From the entirety of his explanations and analyses, at least three significations emerge. First, the technology of punishment has shifted from being harsh and brutal to becoming softer and less physically invasive. Second, this transformation is accompanied by the advancement of knowledge and is inseparable from mechanisms of subjugation, which render individuals obedient and useful. The technology of disciplinary power becomes more effective in reaching its targets within the regime of discipline. According to Foucault, discipline is how power exercises control over individuals, resulting in compliant and useful individuals. The ideal form of the disciplined individual is exemplified by a soldier whose trained physique is recognizable even from a distance (Wattimena, 2017b).

According to Foucault, the body remains a continuous target of power. He also demonstrates power strategies that have evolved to be less physically invasive. However, this phenomenon is not indicative of the body's liberation from power or a result of the increasing display of humanism and human freedom. Instead, it is a moment when the body and the individual are further subjugated, rendered obedient, and made useful. Foucault views the modern individual as one who is incessantly surveilled, monitored, disciplined, subjugated, rendered obedient, and made useful in all their activities (Al-Hamdi, 2017).

In turn, this continuous subjugation of the individual gives rise to knowledge about the individual. Modern individuals are recorded, filed, documented, and known. The formation of knowledge about modern individuals never ceases, and through these techniques, the modern individual is created as an object (Pranowo, 2017).

Genealogy is a project aimed at tracing the origins of values. This endeavor is undertaken by both Nietzsche and Foucault as a response to their disagreement with the traditional view that values possess inherent truth (Haryono, 2019), regardless of human intervention. The historical tracing of values seeks to challenge metaphysical assumptions, turning towards real situations where these values actually emerge within society (Adlin, 2020).

The history Ree refers to is still intertwined with Darwin's theory of evolution, which aims to demonstrate a progressive trajectory in the development of humanity. Nietzsche vehemently rejects this notion (Pranowo, 2017).

Foucault meticulously constructs a structured exposition on how the examination of genealogy can be comprehensively understood. This study brings about a broad and comprehensive understanding that is subsequently revealed in the
form of a history of morality – a historiography that aims to provide a reevaluation of a concept's understanding in a more open, critical, and well-accounted manner (Adlin, 2020).

The concept of genealogy as developed by the French thinker Michel Foucault is rooted in his context of moral genealogy.

He straightforwardly explains that this concept is a method of self-hermeneutics. Through his ideas on the study of specific contexts, he invites us to delve deeply and critically, avoiding being trapped by things that may seem convincing, certain, and accountable. In the realm of genealogical thought, we are urged to approach it with depth, suspending beliefs and convictions (Khasanah, 2019).

The understanding of genealogical context further elaborated by Michel Foucault originates from what was initially proposed by the German thinker Friedrich W. Nietzsche. Therefore, both contexts surrounding what is called genealogy converge on a shared notion of Nietzschean and Foucauldian moral genealogy (Sasongko, 2021). They both employ the context of genealogy based on the ad hominem argument as the foundation of their genealogical approach. This method is used as a way to openly scrutinize and unveil what is uncritically accepted by society in terms of truth and morality.

The process of its application involves uncovering false facades that conceal something (Rachmad, 2020), which are believed by a society as unquestionable truths. The action is carried out by stripping away various concepts about truth and morality associated with a thinker's ideas, seeking the essential relationship between the thoughts or ideas within a concept and what is being considered.

Correlation Between Argumentum Ad Hominem and Genealogy

In everyday human life, when interacting with conversation partners, the context of the ad hominem argument is a method of interaction frequently employed, especially in various dialogues and deeper discussions (Hardianti, 2020). Within the context of dialogue, the exchange of complete opinions is common. Open discussions, sometimes even escalating to physical confrontations due to each party believing their arguments are correct and absolute, are events that often occur in society.

We can openly observe the reality of how individuals engaged in discussions can become tense. Instances where individuals engaged in discussions fail to find a solution are not uncommon. Consequently, in moments of deadlock and immaturity, they often resort to arrogant actions against their conversation partners. When disagreements arise in understanding, they frequently resort to using ad hominem arguments against their counterparts (Kumbara, 2018).

There are broader considerations when using the term ad hominem in conversations. Ad hominem arguments can be likened to weapons used to bring down conversation partners. This becomes evident when we argue convincingly to undermine our conversation partner, for example, by introducing issues related to race, religion, social background, and the like (Wijaya, 2022).

In other words, during a discussion or conversation, especially one that is engaging and requires deeper understanding, our conversation partners will inevitably
position themselves to explore differing viewpoints. Thus, in such discussions, there is often the use of ad hominem arguments in the conversation as an attempt to uncover diverse perspectives. This practice can be traced back to the past working of the "political enemy," including the credibility of the opposing party (Khasanah, 2019).

From a broader perspective, a more profound orientation toward the use of ad hominem arguments by each conversation partner in discussions, conversations, and even in written sentences as a form of expressive communication can be observed. Employing this context explicitly aims to show the wider community that their conversation partners or opponents in the discussion are not flawless individuals and are not equal (Khasanah, 2019).

As a result, the intention is to undermine and make them appear powerless against the arguments presented by the arguer against their conversation partner.

Upon closer examination, concerning the use of narrative in a discussion, the context of ad hominem arguments can be employed in a debate (Pranowo, 2017). However, to delve into this more deeply, it needs further criticism to determine whether the call for resistance in the argument presented by the speaker against their conversation partner, while emphasizing reasoning and intelligence, is appropriate. This is where the strength and important function lie in explaining each exposition and clarification in a thorough, complete, and systematic manner.

When engaged in a discussion with their conversation partner, someone might quickly point out that using ad hominem arguments is not appropriate. They could argue that when someone becomes a leader, they should naturally have ideas or a vision oriented toward the welfare of society, rather than solely based on their racial or religious background. However, it's not universally true that ad hominem arguments are inherently incorrect or differ significantly from one context to another (Wattimena, 2019b).

Ad hominem arguments can be applicable in specific cases, such as in court trials when a witness giving testimony is "attacked" with questions unrelated to the case, focusing more on the witness's personal life.

This can be done because a witness might be paid not to tell the truth, so the objectivity of their testimony can be questioned. Thus, the emphasis on ad hominem arguments is to thoroughly delve into the depths (Hafid, 2020).

Therefore, what is the goal of the material presented is something that refers to the existence of a truth. Ultimately, it becomes something that can be truly expressed and openly discussed, followed by an analysis of its purity or objectivity in the depth of the constructive discussion.

Through the ad hominem strategy, both Foucault and Nietzsche openly present and explain themselves as thinkers who don't readily accept what exists and happens in society because any dogmatic statement, which establishes certain concepts and theories, can be presented as a form that applies and is open, referring to laws that can be applied definitively and universally (Khasanah, 2019).

Furthermore, Nietzsche's suspicion can be understood as a form of diagnostic vulnerability. In this case, both Foucault and Nietzsche diagnose various forms of value references and reveal what truly drives people to obey or adhere to those values. This analysis is speculative and operates through the application of the ad hominem argument.
In an ad hominem argument, the very existence of the argument itself forms the basis of moral genealogy. By using Nietzsche's ad hominem method (and later continued by Foucault), they aim to uncover what is taken as fixed by tradition or religious institutions. In doing so, they seek to unearth deeper values from reality (Pranowo, 2017).

For Foucault, genealogy is an idea about questions that need to be explained with logical arguments to be understood as a whole. The arguments encapsulate what is truly intended when desiring something. The true desires of the will are traced and sought after. The philosophical content, doctrinal content, and scientific methods are only used as symptoms. The issues posed by genealogy are not about the truth or falsehood of ideal doctrines, but these issues are treated only as symptoms to be investigated by the physio-psychologist (Pranowo, 2017).

Indeed, Nietzsche goes further by stating that whatever is made fixed is subject to diagnosis all the way down to the bodily nature of the thinker, to the question of how the mechanism of the thinker's inclinations operates. This method doesn't just focus on rational argumentation; rather, it seeks to understand why such thoughts are desired, valued, and believed in.

**Genealogy of the Word "Buaya" in Entstehung**

If we observe the two sentences below: (1) The crocodile was found dead with its body shattered; (2) The foundation of the crocodile, Sukanya disrupts the household condition.

If we look at the two example sentences above, the genealogy of the word "crocodile," in this case, involves the analysis of Entstehung. This analysis refers to the 'emergence' or 'moment of emergence.' In the context of the word "crocodile" (Setyowibowo, 2022), the understanding of how to perceive this word refers to the effort to draw meaning comprehensively. This analysis of the word "crocodile" aims to reveal the relations of power that operate behind each moment of the emergence of an idea.

In the study of traditional theory, such theory emphasizes that the presence of an idea leads to further understanding in a particular context. Take the word "crocodile," for example. The context of the crocodile is presented to comprehend a more meaningful and comprehensive study about something that carries both positive and negative connotations.

Delving into the genealogy of discourse, this context brings about an ambiguity of understanding. Therefore, the arguments constructed in genealogy will reveal that what drives the emergence of ideas is not a rational goal that needs immediate comprehension and attention. In the play of genealogy, the context of the word "Crocodile" must be understood as an analysis of linguistic words in literature. The context of ad hominem in Foucault's genealogy is a form of play regarding the various forms of domination or power that can result in multi-interpreted understanding across various aspects (Pranowo, 2017).

In the interpretation that yields diverse understandings, there is a dominance that is identical to the independent meaning of the word. Thus, the dominance referred to is not the dominance of specific individuals, institutions, or personalities, but rather an anonymous, blind, and purposeless form of dominance. The aim of this dominance is to continually dominate by avoiding degeneration and always restoring strength.
Furthermore, Foucault demonstrates that every standing idea is a result of struggles of dominations to establish themselves. Wars that end in peaceful agreements should not be mistaken as the end of violence and mutual domination. What genealogy reveals is that the peaceful agreement itself is a manifestation of the winning domination (Pranowo, 2017).

Other dominations won't stop and will continue to shadow and repeat the same scenes behind the scenes. Peace agreements are always threatened by new forces that seek to dismantle them. Peace agreements are also not established for noble values like freedom, equality, peace, and the like, but rather for the enforcement of domination of power itself.

From here, genealogy, through Entstethung analysis, aims to show that ideas or values are tools of dominations that are mutually dominating each other to establish themselves (Pranowo, 2017). Noble values are merely results of domination. "The desire for peace, the serenity of compromise, and the tacit acceptance of the law, far from representing a major moral conversion or a utilitarian calculation that gave rise to the law, are but its [domination] result and, in point of fact, its perversion..." (Pranowo, 2017).

Regarding the above, for Foucault, behind humanism, there actually lies hidden a relationship of domination that can undoubtedly guide, move, and manipulate efforts to obscure a proper understanding. The actions taken in the ongoing effort to uncover comprehensive understanding, as analyzed by Foucault, affirm that relations of domination exist behind every value and virtue that can be properly understood, and this can emphasize the intended meaning (Adlin, 2020).

Therefore, upon closer examination, the key difference in genealogical studies, and the main point that differentiates Foucault from Nietzsche, lies in how the context of genealogy is perceived in depth. In a more comprehensive elaboration, according to Setyo Wibowo, a philosophy lecturer at a private university in Jakarta, in his presentation he asserts that in genealogical studies, Foucault makes a strong effort to incapacitate the subject. He not only intends to show that in fixed values the subject is only secondary, as an instrument of power, and thus dead; more than that (Wattimena, 2020)

Foucault also incapacitates the subject in every aspect and condition. This means that the subject has always been dead—lacks autonomy, completely heteronomous to power outside itself (Wattimena, 2017b). Therefore, according to Foucault, there is only one subject known, a subject that is dead. Hence, as a form of improvement, in Nietzsche's thought, the subject is never considered completely dead. In Nietzsche's thought, as Setyo Wibowo further expounds, the subject is never considered entirely dead.

What needs to be considered overall in this context is Foucault's concept of thought, where humans are always within the context of contemporary society. They live, think, and act in a society that is complex and currently trapped in deceptive understanding. This means that in their daily lives, their activities are constrained by the power play of authority in words that trap them beyond their current knowledge (Sasongko, 2020).

In a diverse life with various and comprehensive activities, this emphasizes that what Foucault is doing actually underlines that there is actually no place left for the depth of reality (Manuel, 2022). The locus of power actually directs us to be open and honest about the motivations we want to convey in the effort to understand the
context of every word that appears in human interaction and communication in their life activities.

**Beyond Cicak and Buaya**

When we look comprehensively at the context of the sentences about lizards and crocodiles, the overall understanding that can be drawn to approach comprehension in order to provide comprehensive insights and knowledge is to take an open action that does not have any hidden agendas within it.

In this context, we can see that the term "cicak" (lizard) can be analogized to the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in Indonesia. On the other hand, the term "buaya" (crocodile), is used to refer to a branch or unit within the Indonesian National Police (Polri).

In this analogy, we can observe the roles and positions of the KPK as an independent institution with the responsibility to combat corruption in Indonesia (News.detik.com, 2021). On the other hand, within the Polri, which is a government institution, one of its tasks and responsibilities is to address social problems, including combating crimes occurring within the society.

Therefore, the terms "cicak" and "buaya" broadly signify a dispute and a misunderstanding that points to a lack of integrated communication. The context of "cicak" and "buaya" reflects communication breakdowns and differing perceptions when these two institutions are working to fulfill their duties and responsibilities, aiming to collaboratively build a just and socially equitable society.

**CONCLUSION**

Various contexts. It pertains to the effort of bringing clarity to rational thought. What Foucault understands as genealogy, as discussed above, shares many aspects with Nietzsche. Both thinkers converge on the fundamental concept of genealogy as an endeavor that involves delving into history as a contextual backdrop from the past that needs to be deeply understood.

Foucault's genealogical studies are practiced as a means to uncover the intentions behind words within a comprehensive discipline of study. This implies that the investigation into genealogy also aims at a collective and comprehensive effort to reopen sensitive and critical understandings of specific concepts or matters. The approach taken in this analytical context can involve grappling with the study of historical documents and recording intricate facts. However, it becomes apparent that Foucault takes Nietzsche's ideas to an extreme.

In Foucault's thought, there is an effort to strengthen and optimize the context of language as a medium of critical and comprehensive communication. This means that Foucault strives to reopen the endeavor of reinterpreting the diverse meanings within language, which serves as the medium of human communication. Thus, in a broader sense, through Foucault's ideas, we are invited to be more open and to re-understand, in a profound manner, the approach to the truth of understanding and knowledge in order to comprehend a new meaning of the subject.

In Foucault's thought, there is an effort to strengthen and optimize the context of language as a medium of critical and comprehensive communication. This means
that Foucault strives to reopen the endeavor of reinterpreting the diverse meanings within language, which serves as the medium of human communication. Thus, in a broader sense, through Foucault’s ideas, we are invited to be more open and to re-understand, in a profound manner, the approach to the truth of understanding and knowledge in order to comprehend a new meaning of the subject.

According to Foucault, the human subject is not an autonomous entity but rather a product of power. This is where the role of authority in institutions or communities comes into play, eventually determining actions and behaviors. Consequently, everything leads back to the effort of diligently reinterpreting the context of language within the cultural life of humanity. This indicates the importance of thoroughly exploring and analyzing the linguistic and communicative aspects that shape our understanding of reality and power dynamics.
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