

A STUDY COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE IN INDONESIAN POLITICAL LANGUAGE

Norwanto

STAIN SALATIGA

Email: psgk_stainsalatiga@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This study scrutinizes Indonesian Political Language from cooperative principle perspective. The object of the study is Indonesian political language in words, phrase, clause, sentence, or discourse taken from Indonesian newspapers. The data was analyzed using Grice's cooperative principle. The study shows that politicians exploit the maxims of cooperative principles regularly. Politicians violate the maxim of quantity to express strong commitment or hide information. Giving incorrect information violates the maxim of quality to obey quantity maxim. They also violate the maxim of relevance by saying things, which are not germane to the topic under discussion.

Key words: *Cooperative Principles, maxims of conversation, and violation.*

1. Introduction

The main concern of politic is to attract and hold political constituents. In this ritual, Hill (2000: 262) quoting Bundi (1980) reveals that politicians should practice "full disclosure," sharing with voters all information that has shaped their positions. From this perspective, political talk falls squarely within the Gricean cooperative theory; politicians are bound by Grice's (1975) maxim of quality to say only what to believe to be true and not say what they believe to be false (Sweetseer, 1987 in Hill, 2000: 262)

Hill (2000: 263) considers failures of political talk as the failures of reference and truth and hence these failures show bad characters of the politicians. Based on the Grice's theory, the failures take place because of violations of conversational maxims, for instance the violations of the maxims of quality and quantity. Exploitations of the maxim of quality characterize politicians that may speak "only to get elected" rather than to inform. Exploitations of

the maxim of quantity are characterized as inadequately referential, as mere imagery lacking the information necessary for rational choice, and thereby intended to appeal to voter emotion than rationality.

2. Research Method

The object of the study is Indonesian political language. The data are in form of discourses, which in context free can be in form of words, phrases, clauses, and sentences. The data sources are Indonesian newspapers – Kompas and Republika – published on June and July 2001.

In collecting the data, the writer read the newspaper and noted them. Meanwhile the method in analyzing the data was pragmatic correspondence; the determinant means of the method is outside the language (Djajasudarma, 1993: 58). The data were analyzed in the frame of pragmatics by applying cooperative principle and its conversation maxims.

3. Findings and Discussion

3.1 Indonesian Political Language in Cooperative Principle Study

Allan (1998) quoting Sperber explains that *Communication is successful not when hearers recognize the linguistic meaning of the utterance, but when they infer the speaker's "meaning" from it.* This statement brings us to assume that a speaker and a hearer in verbal interaction expect to cooperate each other; the speaker expects to be understood and to give effects to the hearer. The effects may be in form of verbal responds (critics, suggestions, supports, etc) and/or non-verbal responds (smile, a nod, etc) appropriately.

To govern the interaction, Grice proposes cooperative principle. This principle, in turn, consists of four conversational maxims: quantity, quality, relevance, and manner.

3.1.1 Maxim of Quantity

The maxim of Quantity concerns with the amount of information for the current purposes of the interaction. Grice (1975) (in Leech, 1984: 8) defines this maxim as follows:

Quantity: Give the right amount of information: i.e.

- 1) *Make your contribution as informative as is required.*
- 2) *Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.*

In political language, the regulations bind politicians not to give too much or too little information. The appropriate amount of the information will help political constituents to make up their decisions.

- (1) *“Tanggal 7 Juni nanti, fraksi MPR akan menyampaikan pemandangan umum di BP MPR. Sedangkan substansi materinya berkaitan erat dengan alasan DPR mengusulkan MPR segera menggelar SI, meliputi pandangan akhir fraksi-fraksi DPR sejak dikeluarkan Memorandum I*

hingga usulan SI.” (Rambe Kaharul Zaman, Republika 2 Juni 2001)

‘The fraction of general assembly (MPR) will extend their general overview to BP MPR in June 7th, relating to the reasons of the house of representative`s (DPR) proposal for holding SI. This will also convey the last general point of view of the DPR fractions on the memorandum I and their proposal for holding SI’.

The utterance (1) stated by the chief of PAH II BP MPR might fulfill the information required by those who wanted to know the agenda of BP MPR. The utterance was informative because it met the principle of *5W 1H* namely: the agent (*who*) was MPR factions, the agenda (*what*) and the reason (*why*) were a parliament convening to discuss the proposal of DPR factions concerning Memorandum I and SI, the date (*when*) was on June 7th, the place (*where*) was at BP MPR office, and the technique (*how*) was presentation of the common point of view of MPR factions.

3.1.2 Maxim of Quality

The maxim of quality requires high standard of morality and honesty because it governs politicians to give only true information. In his quotation, Leech says that this maxim has the following rules:

Quality: Try to make your contribution one is true: i.e.

- 1) *Do not say what you believe to be false*
- 2) *Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence*

Honesty is mandate and lie is the violation of this maxim. The regulations express someone’s generosity and responsibility not to plunge someone with false news. In the political field, this maxim guarantees the constituents to share true information. This maxim may create political conditions in which the constituents are not only fully informed, but they

may also accept the political policy with no hesitation and suspicious.

- (2) “*Saya ingin menegaskan, tidak ada satupun orang di Indonesia, tidak ada lembaga pun di dunia, tidak ada angkatan apapun di dunia ini untuk menetapkan dasar pemilu, kecuali atas dasar keputusan MPR.*”

‘I want to emphasize that there is no one, no institution, no forces in this world that has right to decide the reasons of holding general election except the decision of MPR’

This utterance was stated because the president proposed to hold general election. Illocutionary, the utterance (2) conveyed at least three messages: It denied the president’s proposal to hold general election, it warned the president to draw the proposal and it confirmed that MPR would not take this proposal. From the quality perspective, the utterance (2) fulfilled its regulations because general election in Indonesian is conducted only under MPR decision.

Violation of this maxim may cause social unrest. The following example is the example:

- (3) “*Saya sudah berusaha untuk mengajak kompromi. Tapi kalau memang tidak dapat diterima, ya tinggal tunggu saja. Besok tanggal 20 pada pukul enam, saya akan menetapkan negara dalam keadaan bahaya.*” (Abdurrahman Wahid, *Republika* 20 Juli 2001)

‘I have offered political compromise. However, if they disregard it, just wait for my next movement. Tomorrow at 06.00 a.m on 20th July, I will declare that this country is that the states of danger’

President’s statement (3) uttered on July 19th 2001 was generally interpreted that the President planned to issue a decree to disperse MPR. He thought that MPR’s plan to hold SI was unconstitutional. The illocution force of this

utterance had raised social unrest but the proposition of the utterance was not true, the president did not issue the decree the date.

3.1.3 Maxim of Relevance

The maxim of relevance states that conversational participants have to give relevant contributions, which are germane to the topic under discussion. This maxim ensures that the conversation be coherent (Foley, 2001: 276-77). This maxim, however, sometimes cannot be seen explicitly but it needs understanding contextually through its implicature.

In the political field, the relevance of the following utterance meets its contexts. The speaker uttered (4) to respond the installation of Chairudin Ismail as the temporarily chief of Kapolri. At the installation, the president stated that the chief of DPR approved the installation.

Confronted with the statement, the chief of DPR stated:

- (4) “*Saya memang menelepon Presiden, tapi tidak benar kalau menyetujui pelantikan Chairudin.*” (Akbar Tanjung, *Republika* 21 Juli 2001)

‘I phoned the president, but it does not mean that I agree on the installation of Chairudin’

The utterance (4) was germane to the topic under discussion; the speaker denied the president’s statement.

3.1.4 Maxim of Manner

The maxim regulates the effectiveness of the conversation: the contributions should not be ambiguous or obscure, long winded, or incoherent. It should be brief and clear in expressing one’s ideas (Foley, 2001: 276-77). Grice gives the following rules:

Manner: Be perspicuous; ie

- 1) *Avoid obscurity of expression*
- 2) *Avoid ambiguity*
- 3) *Be brief*
- 4) *Be orderly*

In the political field, the following denial expressed a strong and clear statement:

- (5) “*Besuk PDI-P tidak akan menghadiri undangan Presiden. Mbak Mega sudah menegaskan jangan ada yang datang mengatasnamakan PDI-P.*” (Sutjipto, *Republika* 9 Juli 2001)
‘PDI-P won’t attend at the invitation of the president. Mbak Mega has declared that there will be no one attending on behalf of PDI-P’

The statement (5) was uttered to respond the president’s invitation to discuss the political condition. The speaker employed direct and literal speech act in uttering it.

3.2. Violations of the Cooperative Principle

The four conversational maxims tend to govern an ideal communication based on some norms – norms to speak honestly, relevantly and clearly in appropriate amount. In other words, these maxims are normative. These maxims are not universal – they are not applicable to all society because the natures of human and culture are heterogeneous. Human being does not only have norm to act honestly, but human being also has tendency to lie for certain reasons. These maxims are also culturally determined, some cultures are typically much less informative as demonstrated by Keenan (1976, in Foley, 2001) that Malagasy peasants, especially men, are typically much less informative in their information exchanges than are Americans or Australians. Javanese typically talk around the bush before they come to the main information. Hence, violations of these maxims take place regularly. Foley (2001:277) states:

“In ongoing conversational interactions, speakers violate or flout Grice’s four Maxims regularly. They do this for a particular purpose; the hearer, assuming the operation of the Cooperative principle, tries to reason why the

speaker has flouted a particular Maxim, what she is implying by doing so, and so comes to a conclusion about her intentions, an implicature”.

Politic is characterized by conflict of interests to get political power. Based on its nature, politicians need many alternatives to express their interests and exploiting the conversational maxims can be part of the alternatives.

3.2.1 Violations of the Maxim of Quantity

Politicians often violate this maxim by giving too much information as the following political language discourses:

- (6) “*Jadi, saya terima kasih kembali. Keluarga juga mendapat kehormatan. Institusi juga merasa mendapat mandat. Namun, dengan tanpa mengurangi rasa hormat dan terima kasih pada penghargaan tersebut, pada saat ini saya merasa kehormatan yang diberikan tersebut belum dapat kami laksanakan karena keterbatasan-keterbatasan yang ada pada diri kami.*” (Bimantoro, *Kompas* 3 Juli 2003)

‘I am very grateful. My family and institution are honoured too. However, regardless of this, I feel that I am not able to do my new position, because of my weakness’

- (7) “*Sejak dulu, PPP tidak hanya siap sebagai Wapres tetapi juga sebagai Presiden.*” (Hamzah Haz, *Republika* 22 Juli 2001)

‘PPP has been ready to fill the position of vice president or president’.

Two utterances (6) and (7) above violate the maxim of quantity by giving information more than is required. In (6), Bimantoro, the chief of Kapolri who had just been resigned orally – he had not accepted Kepres nomor 49/Polri/2001 about the suspension – stated that he refused his new position as Indonesian ambassador in Malaysia. On June 1st, 2001

in the ceremony of Bayangkara day the president promoted him as the ambassador.

The speaker (6) has a tendency to act ironically. His statement is the opposite to the real political fact. Politically, however, he did not have good relationship with the president; the president insisted him to resign from his post – Kapolri – but he, supported by DPR, did not want to leave his post. The president, however, might not replace and installed new Kapolri without the approval of DPR but he did. In the political conflict, Bimantoro stated a very polite statement when he had a reason to give stronger answer. In other words, Bimantoro exploited the maxim of quantity to obey irony principle. This principle provides space for someone to utter politely in a situation that allow him or her to act impolitely. This can happen if the speaker overvalues the politeness principle by blatantly breaking a maxim of cooperative principle in order to uphold the politeness principle (Leech, 1984: 82). This principle has an ability to deliver aggressive attitude in verbal actions that are not as strong as critic, humiliation, denial, etc. If political strained situation had been responded with strong statement, it would have created uncondusive political situation. It can be said that the utterance (6) had pushed down the tension between the two political interests.

In (7), the speaker exploited the maxim for political purpose to strengthen his statement. The speaker employed utterance (7) to show his strong commitment to do his party policy that would nominate him for vice president. The violation of quantity maxim was expressed by the answer that he would be ready not only for vice president but also for president even though he understood that he had no opportunity at all for president. In the political situation, when the president gave a report to account his policies and MPR denied it, MPR would give a mandate for president to the definitive vice president – Megawati Soekarno Putri. Meanwhile the only opportu-

nity of the speaker (7) was only for vice president.

Politicians did another violation of the quantity maxim by giving less information than was required.

(8) “*Kami mengobrol cukup lama.*” (Hamzah Haz, *Republika* 11 Juli 2001)

‘We have a long conversation’

The utterance (8) did not give information in the right amount as much as required by those – journalists – who needed it. The required information was the substance of the meeting among the speaker, President Abdurrahman wahid, and Akbar Tandjung. This violation told that the speaker, actually, did not want to share the information but he also had to answer the hearers’ questions. He, then, violated quantity maxim to obey quality maxim in order to keep his secret information and to be friendly to the hearers. He, however, did not violate maxim of quality because in a meeting, there would be conversation among them.

3.2.2 Violations of The Maxim of Quality

The maxim of quality was exploited more often than the others. The maxim was usually exploited by giving “inappropriate” information. In this violation, the speaker very often did not intend to mislead the hearers but they did it because of their political reasons. Politicians often violated this maxim to fulfill the maxim of quantity. In the political field, however, there was a clash between the maxim of quantity and the maxim of quality.

(9) “*Orang tidak bisa bahasa Inggris, kok, jadi dubes. Saya, kan, enggak bisa bahasa Inggris.*” (Bimantoro, *Kompas* 3 Juli 2001)

‘I can’t speak English, how can I become an Ambassador’

(10) “*Kalau jawaban Presiden berisi perbaikan dan langkah-langkah signifikan, itu bisa mempengaruhi sikap*

dari fraksi-fraksi MPR.” (Akbar Tandjung, Republika 6 Juni 2001)

‘If the responses of the president contain some significant improvement and measures, it will influence the decision of MPR’

The utterance (9) was uttered by General Surojo Bimantoro to confirm the president’s intention to promote him as the Indonesian ambassador in Malaysia. The answer exploited the maxim because it brought hesitation that a general and a Kapolri could not speak English. Besides he said so with unserious mimic or face.

The utterance (9) was typically non-literal and direct speech act. Implicature is needed to interpret the meaning; he, however, denied the promotion but he did not want to tell the true reasons. Non-literal and direct speech act was often employed by Indonesian politicians to express denial speech act (Norwanto, 2005: 233-35).

The utterance (10) was uttered when the speaker was asked about the president’s proposal that SI should not become a mean to impeach him. This is a clear example of the violation of the maxim of quality to obey the maxim of quantity; that utterance was not what the speaker intended to say but it was stated only to answer the question. When the utterance is analyzed in isolated, this locution is normative and procedural. Meanwhile when the followings contexts are included, the utterance will raise many speculations.

(11) *“Diperkirakan pertanggungjawaban Presiden nanti akan sulit diterima MPR.” (Akbar Tandjung, Republika 5 Juni 2001)*

‘It is predicted that MPR won’t accept the president accountability’

The utterance (11) contradicts the above information (10). It raised an implicature that the speaker actually knew, based on the po-

litical constellation that the proposal was hard to do. Because of some reasons, he did not want to share the information in that day but he might not abandon the question. He, then, gave the answer to fulfill the maxim of quantity.

In uttering (10), the speaker actually preferred choosing weak statement than the stronger one. It is believed that he realized the political landscape that wanted to impeach Abdurrahman Wahid but he preferred stating (10). It can be said that the political landscape was stronger than the statement (10).

The weak statement (10) – because it was not in line with the political mainstream – was not intended to mislead the political constituents. Maxim of quality was exploited to obey the maxim of quantity; the speaker did not want to reveal his political decision but he tried to provide information for the given questions.

The violation of the quality maxim may be employed to intimidate the opposition groups.

(12). *“Saya sudah berusaha untuk mengajak kompromi. Tapi kalau memang tidak dapat diterima, ya tinggal tunggu saja. Besuk tanggal 20 pada pukul enam, saya akan menetapkan negara dalam keadaan bahaya.” (Abdurrahman Wahid, Republika 20 Juli 2001)*

‘I have offered political compromise. However, if they disregard it, just wait for my next movement. At 06.00 a.m, on 20th July, I will declare that this country at the state of danger’

The speaker uttered (12) in the middle of his struggle to offer political compromise in order to divert SI to a decision that would not be intended to impeach him. The utterance was merely intended to raise his bargaining position because on that date, July 20th 2001, he announced to delay the threat.

Politicians also uttered statements that were lack of rational evidences.

(13.a). “*Saya optimistis Gus Dur akan tetap bertahan sampai 2004. Pokoknya Gus Dur tidak akan jatuh.*” (Chotibul Wiranu, *Republika* 16 Juli 2001)
‘I am optimistic that Gus Dur will be in his position until 2004. I am sure that he will not fall from his position before that year’

‘Strong or weak’ in the discourses refers to the presence or absence of rational reasons given to support the statements. *Pokoknya* expresses weak statement because the nature of this word that was ‘absolute’ and denies any rational responds or arguments. The utterances would be stronger when it was uttered in the following schemes:

(13b). “*Karena X (facts or data), Saya optimistis Gus Dur akan tetap bertahan sampai 2004.*”

‘Because of X (facts or data), I am sure that Gus Dur will be in his position until 2004’

Opposing two facts contradicting each other did the violation of quality maxim in the political discourse. Sometimes, the contradiction was expressed with conjunction “*kecuali*” and “*tetapi*”.

(14). *Saya tidak kecewa, hanya sedikit agak kikuk. Ternyata ada sedikit inkonstitusional, karena ketika pertemuan di Istana Bogor ke dua tokoh itu menolak tidak mau datang, tapi kenapa sekarang bertemu diam-diam. Apalagi pertemuan itu sampai sekarang masih misterius.*” (Amien Rais, *Republika* 12 Juli 2001)

‘I am not disappointed, but a little awkward. When they were invited to the meeting in Istana Bogor, they refused to come. Now they meet secretly. Even, their meetings have been mysterious’

(15). “*Saya setuju SI, tetapi jangan sampai ada permintaan pertanggungjawaban kepada Presiden. Sebab dalam sistem*

kenegaraan kita, hal itu tidak dikenal.” (Abdurrahman Wahid, *Kompas* 3 Juli 2001)

‘I agree to hold SI, but don’t ask me to extend presidential accountability. It is not known in our government system’

The utterance (14) stated to respond a secret meeting among President Abdurrahman Wahid, Akbar Tandjung and Hamzah Haz. The meaning of the first clause became weak because the other clauses contradicted the clause; the speaker said that he was not disappointed but he stated that the meeting was unconstitutional.

In the political discourse (15), President Abdurrahman Wahid expressed his opinions about SI. The discourse expressed two opposing facts; the fact of the first clause was opposed with the fact of the second clause. The word “*tetapi*” provided information that the second clause negated the first clause; even though the first clause expressed the speaker’s agreement about SI but he, actually, denied SI because it was impossible to do the illocution of the second clause.

3.2.3 Violations of the Maxim of Relevance

Exploitations of the maxim were expressed with utterances, which were not germane with topics under discussion.

(16). “*Singkatnya, SI telah dibuat untuk segala cuaca. Apakah itu musim kemarau atau penghujan.*” (Amien Rais, *Republika* 4 Juli 2001)

‘In short, SI has been prepared for all weather condition, dry or rainy season is no problem’

(17). “*Saya tidak ingin dijadikan sekrup*” (Sarwono Kusuma Atmaja, *Republika* 8 juli 2001)

‘I don’t want to become a screw’

The speaker stated the utterance (16) when he was explaining SI schedules. The

speaker (16) stated the utterance to respond the president's proposal that wanted to promote him as minister of defense affair.

The two utterances did not seem germane with the topic, but when it was analyzed, the implicational relationship could be explained. The speaker (16) comparing political condition with weather might think that both had a similar characteristic, they changed quickly. So, the speaker tried to explain that the schedules had been prepared to anticipate all the changes possibly happened any times. The figurative language of the utterance might be functioned to cool down the political tension.

The utterance (17) was a denial. The implicature could be gained from the characteristics of *screw* that always provides a cover for a whole and strengthen positions of one thing with the others. The speaker might want to say that he did not want to fill the position of minister of defense affair, which had been left by the previous minister and strengthen the political position of the president. The utterance, however, violated politeness principle. Implicitly, it violated three maxims of this principle (modesty, agreement, and sympathy maxims) because it did not minimize praise of self and did not maximize dispraise of self, it did not minimize disagreement between self and other, it did not minimize antipathy between self and other.

3.2.4 Violations of the Maxim of Manner

Stating utterances, which is incoherent did the violation of the maxim.

(18). "*Kami berfikir, ketua partai supaya menyesuaikan dengan kepentingan rakyat dan bangsa. Saya sangat meyakini MPR mempunyai kapasitas untuk memikirkan nasib rakyat. Namanya tawaran, bukan harga mati. Kalau harga mati tidak perlu mengutus orang. Dan sampai hari ini Presiden masih tetap menyampaikan tidak akan mundur.*" (Mahfud MD, *Republika* 12 Juni 2001)

'We think that the leaders of political parties will consider to the interest of citizen and nation. I believe that MPR has the capacity to think about the condition of Indonesian people. Up to now, the president does not want to resign from his position'

The utterance (18) was stated by a speaker who was in duty to lobby the leaders of political parties in order to get compromise results of the political conflict. The utterance was not orderly, the speaker moved from one utterance to the others. First, he stated his view about a good political party leader. He, then, explained the duty of MPR, political compromise, and president intention not to resign from his position.

The maxim was also exploited by stating ambiguous utterances:

(19). "*Saya katakan kepada Presiden bahwa tidak ada yang menolak, tapi juga tidak ada yang menerima.*" (Mahfud MD, *Republika* 25 juli 2001)
'I informed the president that the factions neither refused not agreed'

The utterance (19) was a later confirmation to the president's statement that he had come to a deal about his position with five big factions in MPR and they would sign the declaration of agreement.

The utterance (19) was very difficult to understand. Contextually, the utterance was a denial toward the president statement but the implicational relationship between the utterance and the context was very difficult to get.

4. Conclusion

In the political language, politicians often exploit conversational maxim regularly. Politicians exploit quantity maxim by giving information less or more than is required. Less information is given to hide information that is not considered for mass consumption. More

information is intended to show speaker's strong commitment and be polite – exploiting irony principle does some of them.

The maxim of quality is exploited by giving untrue information. The exploitations are done to mislead the hearers or to get good political bargaining position and to obey the quantity maxim and politeness principle. The exploitations are also done by giving weak information or information that was not supported by enough data or facts. Statements

whose clauses oppose each other do the other exploitations. The last exploitations are aimed to obey agreement maxim of politeness principle, to minimize disagreement between self and other

The relevance maxim is exploited by giving information that is not germane with the topic under discussion. To understand the meaning and implicational relationship require implicature. Meanwhile, the maxim of manner is exploited by giving utterances which has good coherent.

REFERENCES

- Allan, Keith, 1998, *Meaning and Speech Acts*, Diakses dari www.Arts.monash.edu.au/ling/speech_acts_allan.html pada tanggal 14-1-2003
- Amal, Ichlasul, 1998, “*Peran Ideal Lembaga Legislatif dalam Format Politik Indonesia Baru*”, Makalah ilmiah yang disampaikan pada Upacara Harijadi ke-40 Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta
- Buchori, Mochtar, 2002, “*Strategi Pendidikan untuk Melahirkan Pembaharuan Budaya Politik di Indonesia*”, Makalah ilmiah yang disampaikan pada Upacara Harijadi ke-44 Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta
- Depdikbud, 1988, *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*, Balai Pustaka, Jakarta
- Djajasudarma, T. Fatimah, 1993, *Metode Linguistik: Ancangan Metode Penelitian dan Kajian*, PT Eresco, Bandung
- Foley, William A., 2001, *Athropological Linguistics: An Introduction*, Blackwell Publisher Inc, Massachuset
- Higgleton, E., 1995, *Chambers Essential English Dictionary*, Chambers
- Hill, Jane H., 2000, “Read My Article”: Ideological complexity and overdetermination of promising in American Presidential Politics, dalam Kroskirty, Paul V.(eds), *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*, School of American Research Press, New Mexico
- Leech, Geoffrey N., 1984, *Principles of Pragmatics*, Second impression, Longman, London
- Norwanto, 2005, *Tindak Penolakan dalam Bahasa Politik Indonesia*, Jurnal Sastra dan Bahasa Vol. 2 No.2 September 2004 – January 2005.
- White, Louise G. and Robert P. Clark, 1983, *Political Analysis: Technique and Practice*, Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, California
- Newspaper: Republika dan Kompas edisi bulan Juni – Juli 2001