

TELEVISION AND LANGUAGE OF COMMUNICATION

Ridha Ahida
Institut Agama Islam Negeri Bukittinggi, West Sumatera, Indonesia
ridhaahida@iainbukittinggi.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This research aims at discussing the relationship between television and language of communication in human life as well as its relation to hermeneutics. The object of this research are television, history and definition of hermeneutics, hermeneutic functions, hermeneutics of texts on television, understanding in the form of experience, theory and practice, rationalization of communicative actions in society. This research uses a philosophical approach to identify how television is considered as a more effective communication media for delivering messages from a person, group of people or the government as compared to other communication media. Moreover, television is also considered to have a high hypnotic power. It is able to influence the mindset and the behavior of the audience. The research findings indicated that there are many goals that people want to achieve in enjoying the television shows, such as; to find out news, sports, entertainment, lifestyle, etc., and also as to enjoy free time, to overcome boredom and work routines. It is also identified that there are several mindset and the behaviors that are considered inappropriate, deviate, destructive or causing madness which are all addressed because of the influence of the television shows.

. There are many kinds of the television shows, such as news, sports, art, entertainment, and infotainment. All of these shows have their own segments in the society. Not all messages delivered on television can be understood by the message recipient. Thus, it seemed inappropriate that all the damage of the mindset and the behavior that occurs in the society is inflicted on television as a communication and information media. Whether someone is a passive or active audience is not something to be discussed, the problem is related to the fact that television is a means of communication. Therefore, it is necessary to comprehend the messages in television media correctly. Interpretation through hermeneutics is considered as an alternative way in comprehending the messages conveyed through television as media of communication

Keywords— tell, explain, comprehend and give meaning

INTRODUCTION

The word *communication* is originally derived from Latin *communication* which means connected and together. Communication is a process of transmitting messages from someone to someone else to give information, change attitude, opinion and behavior directly or orally and indirectly through media. Communication would only take place if there is a common meaning and intention among people who are communicating. Therefore, a conversation is considered communicative if it results in both, the speaker and the listener understanding of the conversation.

Carl I. Hoveland explained that the science of communication is actually a systematic effort to explain clearly the principles of transmitting information as well as the process of forming and opinion and attitude. In line with this idea, Laswell argued that communication is a process of transmitting a message from the communicator to the recipient through a media that causes a special effect. If it is explored deeply, in a very simple way, communication can be defined as a process of delivering a declaration from someone to someone else[1]

Despite the meaning of communication in the general sense, there is also another kind of communication which is called *mass communication*. In this sense, mass communication is interpreted as a kind of communication

which is aimed at a group of people which are scattered, heterogenic and anonym through printed or electronic media and the message is accepted at the same periodic of time. Therefore, mass communication is communication through mass media like newspapers, magazines, radios, televisions and films. A part from the meaning of mass communication as a communication through mass media, mass communication can also be defined as communication in the future.

Mass communication has several functions; they are, 1) transmitting information, 2) educating and 3) entertaining. Mass communication can transmitted information quickly, precisely and efficiently to a lot of people with a wide range of area, locally, nationally, regionally and internationally. Mass communications can also contribute to education through messages depicted in several program. Mass communication can also give entertainment in a form of infotainment for the recipient. Therefore, mass communication is mostly considered as a tool to overcome boredom of a person or a group of people[2]

Beside the three function of mass communication mentioned above, it can also influence, guide and criticize the recipient. It can influence someone's perception and behavior through the message. Thus, someone will think and

act based on what they see in mass media. Moreover, mass communication could also change someone's perception and behavior which has been formed before and already exists for years. Mass communication could also guide someone and a group of people from not knowing something or knowing something until knowing many kinds of different things. Mass communication gives direction, guidance or to be more precise, it gives instruction and education.

DISCUSSION TELEVISION

Television is the most common communication form that attracts the community since a long time ago. There is no other media could ever compete television in term of the volume of culture produced and in terms of the number of the viewer. Television is the source of power, open to almost all industrial community and continue to become popular in the developing world. It is the source of popular science about the world and help connecting people with different ways of life. Television is part of precondition and selective construction of social science, the picture of the social condition, and in the imaginable way, reconstruct peoples life and finally it become the whole world which make sense to them[3]

Television should be understood, in terms of the text, it is a program, connection between the text and its viewer (viewers research), politic and economy (organization or industry) and the pattern of cultural meaning. News is one of the important texts in television. All television station around the world has news and it already became the main subject of several TV station, scattered in global scale. News plays an important and strategic role in debate about television because of the assumption that television has an influence on the public life.

Many viewer researches conclude that watching television is something passive and the meaning as well as the message from television can be easily accepted by the viewers. Watching television in behavioral frame, which consider that most viewers replicate the violence on television, or use statistic correlation "to prove" that watching television has a certain influence on its viewers. There is a textual tendency in cultural studies that believes the viewers understanding "can be read" through comprehensive study on meaning contained in television texts. Watching television was formed and formed by the form of cultural identity. Television has become the source of the process of forming cultural identity and the viewers also use their identity and cultural competency to decode program by using their own special way. In line with the globalization of television, its role in forming ethnic and national identity has become more important[4]

HISTORY AND THE MEANING OF HERMENEUTICS

Hermeneutics is a word often heard and said in the last decades especially in philosophy, theology and literature. The epistemology of the root of the word hermeneutics is originally derived from the Greek, the verb *hermeneuein* means *interpreting* while the noun *hermeneia* means interpretation. *Hermeneuein* and *hermeneia* are associated with the mythology figure, Dewa Hermes, a messenger who

sent the message of Jupiter to human beings. Hermes duty was to translate the messages from the Gods in Olympus Mountain to a language that could be understood by human beings. Hermes was associated with the transmittion function of what is behind human understanding into a form which can be grasped by human intelligences. The wide variety of words provides an assumption that there is a process of something which cannot be clarified by human intelligences into something which can be understood. Therefore, hermeneutics is finally interpreted as process of changing something or situation from not knowing until understanding[5]

Webster Third New International Dictionary elaborated that hermeunatics is the study about the principle of methodology of interpretation and explanation. Hermeunatics reveals something that carry message as far as it can transmit message. The act of revealing the message is an organized explanation about what has been said by someone or a group of people. Hermeneutics assumes that a process of carrying something to be understood involves language as the most suitable media in the process it self. All in all Hermeneutics means: 1) revealing words, for example to say something, 2) explaining, like explaining a situation and 3) interpreting like translating something into foreign language.

Basically, Hermeneutics is closely related to language. Hermeneutics is the latest way "to deal with" language. People mostly think, talk and write by using language. People understand and are able to make interpretation by using language. When people are able to understand a language, they would also be able to understand many things. In other words, understanding a language makes it possible for people to take part in using the language for the future time. Language is a link for human relationship all over the world[6]

Gadamer explained that language is the ulterior motif of the way how people live and it is a kind of manifestation that covers the whole constitution about the world. It would be impossible for human beings to do things without language. People should understand and think that language has purposes. Through language people can communicate but through language people can also have a misunderstanding or misinterpretation. The meaning that people get from the language depends on several factors, they are; who is talking, special condition that is related to time, and place or situation that gives color to the language event. Special characteristic of the function of a language to identify, to understand or to convince can be seen through the use of language as a media in communicating an idea[7]

All interpretation is about understanding. But, understanding is very complex that the brain thinker or psychologists had never been able to declare when someone has actually understood something. To make an interpretation someone has to first understand the idea. If someone has understood something it means that he has interpreted it and vice versa. There is a kind of cycle between understanding and making interpretation and it is what creates "a hermeneutics cycle".

According to Emilio Betti, the responsibility of people who are doing the interpretation is to clear obstacles in the process of understanding that is by investigating every detail of the process of interpretation. That person would also have to be able to formulate a methodology that would be used later to estimate the subjectivity element on the objective interpretation expected. Interpretation is a tool to understand. It is clear that, comprehensive understanding can be developed if it is based on the right knowledge. The meaning of something can be identified if it isn't reconstructed in such a way. According to Betti, meaning is not based on conclusion but it should be derived from or it should be instructive. So, the interpretation should not be passive, it should reconstruct meaning[8]

Interpretative activity is a triangle process (it has three connected angle). In this process there is a contradiction between the thought which is directed to the object and the thought of the interpretation. Someone who is doing the interpretation should understand the message or the tendencies of a text and then absorb the content of the text, thus that person who was initially "someone else", now, he or she become "me" or the interpretation. Every individual is always in the situational condition and can only be understood in its own situation. Every object has its own space and time; there is no object which is on the isolated condition. There is always a reference frame, dimension, boundary, real or apparent and all give special characteristics to an object.

Interpretation deals with three different problems, they are; oral utterances, reasonable explanation and translation of foreign language. Something strange, odd, different time, place, real experience, present, comprehensive, something that require representation, explanation or translation lead to an understanding and that is reinterpretation. In a simple way, declaration, confirmation is an important element in interpretation. Interpretation should be able to make something not clear, far, dark, become something clear, close and can be understood.

THE FUNCTION OF HERMEUNETICS.

1. UTTERING

There is a slight difference from the word uttered which means utterances. It is an utterance for the speaker and it is also an interpretation. Because of this reason the speaker is directed towards how something is expressed to "the style" of presenting something. Oral utterance has magic power but in visual form it wipes away the magic power. Language in its real form is mostly heard compared to be seen, and it is one of the reason spoken language is easier to understand compared to written language.

Oral interpretation needs an understanding to be able to reveal it. The goal of oral interpretation is technically pure to express meaning which is fully transcribed, it is something philosophical and cannot be separated from the problem about the understanding itself. The problem about understanding is something intrinsic and it becomes the problem of hermeneutic. Language loses its expressive power when it is reduced into visual form[9]

2. EXPLAINING

Interpretation as an explanation emphasizes the aspect of discursive understanding. It stresses on the explanation rather than the dimension of expressive interpretation. The most essential element of words is not only about saying things but also explaining it, making it rational and making it clear. Messages are "interpretation" of a situation. Message carries something to be expressed, but what message carries is also an explanation about something not explained before. Message formulate "verbal meaning" of situation, it explains the message which is sometime not stated. Meaning is never hidden in the way someone say something. It is an explanation in the sense of saying something by using something else[10]

Expression has something to do with pattern, and utterance is almost an action. Someone is already in the process of forming and choosing to get the essence of utterance, as long as that utterance is considered as a declaration, the rational element after the process, declare itself and become the static and informative truth. It is a declaration about the essence of something. After the truth become "the correspondence", and the utterances become "declaration", the truth about "certain event" is changed into static truth about the principles of declaration.

Explanation should be seen in the context of deeper explanation or interpretation that is interpretation made in the way that someone changes an object. Explanation uses certain instrument in objective analysis and the choice of relevant objective analysis instrument is interpretation of an understanding. Analysis is interpretation; the need for analysis is also interpretation. The real analysis is not the main interpretation; it is more a derivation form. It has already set the stages of primary and essential interpretation before data is used.

Meaning is a matter of context. The explanation procedure brings the arena of understanding. Only special context of an event is meaningful. An object doesn't have any significance unless it related to someone and that relationship determines its significance. The idea that the object is separated from the understood subject is a conceptual mistake caused by realistic concept which is not sufficient about perception and world. Basically all principle is "for us". All explanative interpretation assumes an intention where the explanation is aimed at.

Explanative interpretation makes people realize that explanation is contextual and horizontal. Explanation should be made in the meaning horizon and definite intention. In hermeneutics, the arena of understanding which is assumed is called pre understanding. According to interpreters, they have to "understand" the text when "presenting" it, and they must do a pre understanding of a subject and its situation before they move forward to the mysterious cycle from its own horizon. This is actually what the term mysterious "hermeneutics circle" means, and there will be no text without it. A certain pre understanding of a subject is something important, without it communication wouldn't take place. But, understanding should be transformed into the act of understanding[11]

TRANSLATING

When the text is in the language of the reader, the clash between the world and the text would distract attention. The different perspective and horizon can no longer be ignored. Translating is a special form of the basic process of interpretation, "bringing something to be understood". In this context, someone brings anything strange, far and can't be understood into the mediation of that person's language. The translator becomes the media between one world and another world. The translator make people realize about the truth that the language itself make interpretation about the world, where the translator should be sensitive as if he is interpreting individual expression. Again, translator makes people realize that words are actually help someone create an opinion and perception about the world. Language is the element of cultural experience. People exist in it and by using this media people can see through its vision[12]

Our understanding horizon should meet and blend with the understanding horizon in the text. The mediation process doesn't only take place through foreign language but also through historical event. Translator make people realize that there is a clash between the worlds of our consciousness with something which is being created. The phenomena of translating is actually the heart of hermeneutics, where someone confront basic situation of hermeneutics to get the meaning of the text, its grammatical, its history and other instrument use to derive the original text. There is always the world, the text world, the reader world and they should be bridged .

HERMENEUTICS ON TEXTS ON TELEVISION

According to Ricoeur every interpretation is an effort to reveal meaning which is concealed or an effort to open a folded meaning contained in a message. Hermeneutics open the real meaning of something that would limit the varieties of meaning of symbols. One of the targets to be achieved by hermeneutics is to struggle to fight cultural distance that is the translator should create the distance to be able to make a good interpretation[13]

The main goal of hermeneutic is to find internal dynamics that govern the structure of a text and the energy that the text have to project itself to the outer part and makes it possible for the text to emerge to the surface. What people say, write or watch has more than one meaning when it is connected to the different context. The goal of hermeneutics becomes very heavy because it should be able to read from inside the text without being have to take part in the text and the way of understanding the text should be far from the cultural and historical frame. To get good result in its effort, hermeneutics should be able to clear the distance and should be able to handle dichotomist situation as well as to be able to breakdown the dispute between subject and object.

The autonomy of the text has there types: intention of the text creator, cultural situation and social condition in the text compiling and for whom is the text intended to. Based on this idea, decontextualization defined that the material on the text revealing itself from the limited horizon of the intention of the creator. The text is opening itself to the possibilities to be read widely where the readers are different. Ricoeur said that the connection with the world of the text is

in the relationship of the subjectivity of the creator and at the same time the subjectivity of the reader is left behind. To understand a text we don't have to project ourselves into the text, instead open ourselves to the text[14]

By opening up ourselves to the text it means that we are allowing the text to give trust to ourselves using an objective way. In the process of interpreting a text, we should not act as if the text are something frozen, instead we have to be able to look what is inside the text. We also have to have a clear concept that we get from our own experience and we can't avoid it existence, these concept could be changed or adjusted in accordance to the text. But still we should focus on the text even though in making the interpretation we bring our entire space and time specialty. Watching television is social and cultural activities with meaning as the focus. The viewers are the active meaning creator in its relation with television (they don't merely accept the text as it is) they do it based on the cultural competence that they already have in language context and social relationship. Text has meaning in several forms and not only one set of meaning which is clear and not ambiguous. Text brings several kinds of meaning and only half of it is received by the viewers. Different viewer will have different interpretation of the textual meaning[15]

Viewers are considered as an active, smart meaning creator, not the product of the structured text. The meaning is bound to the way how the text is structured and domestic context as well as the cultural activities of watching television. Viewers should be understood in the context where they watch television which means meaning construction and daily routines. The process of constructing meaning and the place of television in daily routines varied from one culture to another and it also different in terms of gender and class in a cultural community.

In hermeneutics tradition, textual meaning is associated with the writer intention (the director in the context of television show) and that textual meaning can arrange meaning created by reader (in television context is called the viewers). According to Gadamer the relationship between the text and the reader (television and the viewer) is interactive relationship where the readers (viewers) approach the program with certain hopes and anticipation that undergo modification in the process of understanding and will be replaced by new projection. Understanding is always derived from position or someone's point of view who is trying to understand, involving not only reproduction from textual meaning but also the result of interaction between text and the readers (viewers) imagination.

UNDERSTANDING IN THE FORM OF EXPERIENCE

Hermeneutics principle is an interpretation formed by the problem when the translator is identifying the subject. A theory of understanding is relevant for hermeunitices when live experience, understanding activities are decided as the basis. In this way the process of thinking is oriented to the fact, an event in its concrete form rather than only an idea, it become the phenomenology of the understanding event. The phenomenology of understanding can't be understood in a

narrow and doctrinal way. No matter what the condition is, it should be open for all aspects where it can contribute a more comprehensive understanding about what and how an understanding process could take place, just like epistemology, ontology and perception phenomenology, the theory of instruction, philosophy, symbols, logical analysis and others.

A wide interpretation of hermeneutics problem tries to see the event of understanding a text (written or oral) as something which always has a special moment in relation to the actual context. When hermeneutic focus is defined to cover general understanding of phenomenology and special phenomenology from text interpretation moment, the sphere of hermeneutics become wider. For human, understanding it is not a kind of ability that one possesses; understanding is something fundamental about human's existence in this world. Through understanding we can have judgments from where we exist; grasp meaning through language and the world could give horizon in which we live. If we are subjective at the beginning, our understanding would look like human ability. But when we are facticity about the world therefore understanding is a way where facticity about the world is presented for human[16]

Understanding is seen as something tact not to the autonomy of human reflective activities but in an action about the world facticity, about the world and human. Understanding is mediation where the world had already exists before human, and understanding is the ontologism explanation of mediation. Understanding is not an instrument for something else, like consciousness, but it is more like mediation where someone exists in and through it. It will forever could never be something objective because in the process of understanding it is where objectivity takes place. Human existence cannot estimate understanding from the outer part, understanding will always be in a position where everything is clear. Understanding always need to say something about the character of a perception and understanding of current situation and also understanding about whether the future can or cant survive.

Understanding is linguistic, historic and ontologism. The essence of understanding is not subjective but something that bridges human from the outer part and reveal it for understanding of the world. So, understanding is not a projection of reflective consciousness but is more a mediation which is revealed by a situation or problem as the way it is. Understanding doesn't define categories to the world, the world subject matter defined itself to the understanding and understanding adjusts them to it. The subject understands through understanding of the world by using language, the position where the understanding is based on. About the subjectivity or to find it in a person's consciousness is defensible especially when the individual can't create an overall understanding and language because they can only take some part of it. They are reflected in words, in the objective side, they are not looking from an empty reflective consciousness or from transcendental ego. Understanding, historical aspects and language are the basis of where the position can be derived which is more than

science and the centered subject from the subject and object scheme[17]

Language just like understanding is never a simple subject in the world when it attacks the world as mediation in the way someone perceives an object. Only a misconception of using it, something which is linguistic can furthermore lead to the belief that language is an object of the world which can be manipulated and mediated in someone personal behavior. Just like language, experience is not an object for human; instead it took part in real event of understanding. Experience taught human that there isn't enough fact that would makes it possible to solves problems in a better way in the future, but it is more important to expect what is not expected, to explore new experiences. Shortly, experience completes the insufficient of knowledge by comparing it to the experience.

THEORY AND PRAXIS

Habermas like other member of Frankfurt School think that a theory can't be separated with the praxis. No science is free from value. Theoretical attitudes is always influenced and directed by certain human interest. Human would not discover new science, based on certain neutral relation with reality but is always guided by certain interest that leads into recognition. According to Habermas there are three kinds of interests, they are; technical recognition interest, practical recognition interest and emancipators recognition interest[18]

Recognition is achieved through the technical recognition interest for example science recognition and social technological recognition interest can only be used to solve technical problems but it is useless to preserve the communicative process or to lessen an unbalanced power. Recognition achieved through practical recognition interest for example is the recognition about the past in historical science which is struggled by hermeneutics cant be use to solve technical problems but it is suitable for communicative purpose to preserve tradition and deepen the self understanding of culture. Finally emancipators recognition, for example, the meaning of psychological analysis and critical theory about society directed to emancipation or liberation from certain power and the dependency and because that is all that can be operated in the context of process which is aimed at increasing emancipators awareness.

Habermas wanted to show that he point of view of positivistic science was altered by the effort to make the technical recognition absolute. In fact, human still have other fundamental interest, not only about the way to get technical knowledge to be applied in the process of their work like in the modern industry. One of Haberman objection about positivist thought is that they ignored specific logic from the communicative process. In the second period Habermas has succeed to understand and analyze specifically the structure of communicative praxis especially in the normative instances that take part in the process. With communicative praxis, Habermas, understand all human action that is aimed at gaining confirmation from others in the community context[19]

Communicative praxis should be differentiated from instrumental praxis (or jobs). Instrumental praxis is bound to the technical law and the usage of job instrument. However, communicative praxis should also be differentiated from strategic praxis. Strategic praxis is what Habermas called as something to do with someone else but not to have an agreement with them, instead, for the sake of accomplishment of personal goal, sometimes, if necessary, we should fight against someone's intelligence and willingness. In other word, strategic praxis deals with how someone tries to influence someone who is trying to make a decision. Habermas also classify the strategic praxis into open and hidden strategic praxis.

Habermas analyze special characteristics of communicative praxis by using the theory of creating an utterance from John Austin and John Searle. The essence of their thought was that in using a language a person should be understood in doing certain activities that is the speech act. Every speech act consist of two parts, the propositional part which is directing to the fact or certain reality and performative part where the speaker explain how the reality is and should be understood by the partner.

The speaker delivers the communicative nature of the speech act to the listener that is depicted in the performative part that is the claim of truth, normative and sincerity. Claim about truth, should be accepted because every action the speaker is making, is intended to reveal the truth in the part of its propositional side. Beside the claim about truth, the performative part is also connected to a claim about accuracy that is a claim that the speaker has the normative right to give prohibition in a certain situation or to ask question, promises, etc. Finally, every speech act of the speaker cant be uncertain that it is connected to the claim of sincerity and it also means that the speaker really means what he says.

To Habermas, those absolute claims, principally can be criticize. It means that the listener can reject the claim about the truth, accuracy and sincerity of the speaker and confront hoe own different claims. As long as the two parties still, look for an agreement. In addition, have no intention to move to open or hidden strategic praxis they can examine critically the claims from the other party and if they want to purpose their own opinion they should give argumentative reason. Therefore, the absolute claims are made in calculated way and should be wholly accepted[20]

Those absolute claims are connected internally to the reasons the speaker has to propose their own claims as a demand that should be taken into account. The reason to relate to argument and to a possibility for a critic as well as a discussion. Communicative praxis is characterized by a rational and internal structure. The agreement resulted through communicative praxis is not based on enforcement or manipulation, it is more about voluntarily acceptance because that absolute claims is always open to criticism. In other word, agreement concentrate on rational believes.

THE RATIONALIZATION OF COMMUNICATIVE ACTION IN SOCIETY

Habermas tried to formulate theory about evolution in society and the individual who are the member, especially when all these emerged inside the norm and the form of creative symbols. Habermas tried to shoe the existence of normative element, which is dominant in human interaction as well as instrumental and linked with the effort of the fulfillment of the need. Norm and value should be the critical object contemplation even when it is only because of the differentiation between technical and normative depends on the kind and normative form. Because of that the most technical interest or even it is very strategic cant be seen separately outside the universal principle of interest informed in an ethical way.

Habermas found that the basic and nature of the language as a means of communication is found in the meaning that even the speaker and listener of a conversation in a priory way have the intention to understand each other. Understanding each other here means that the participant already have an agreement. Agreement indicates that there is recognition between speaker and legality of the listener. In this process, each participant will get their own reflection about their position in communication. It means that the structure of language is basically hermeneutics, it call the participant to be involved in the interpretation of every stages and this point will develop the self understanding of each participant because of their interaction and this is the final goal of language[21]

Language should be understood according to the rules formed by consensus. Whatever the way, the right language function is giving an opportunity for communication to take place. If, systematically, communication is not successful, therefore what happens is the form of problematic language. Cultural poverty is the result of exaggerate suppression on the aspects of technical rationality with the goal of the level of the system is an example of problematic social formation. To Habermas, pathologist situation emerges when there is an unbalanced condition that is the basic problem that happens in society.

As the form of social and cultural or economic condition, modernity has the risk of becoming something pathologist. To avoid the consequences. Which cause the loss, there should be a correction found in the modern tradition itself, correction by going back to the use of commonsense like what is done in the enlightenment era. Because the correction is needed, it is necessary that normative foundation of life be revealed clearly. Habermas claimed that critic about modernity collect differences about alleviation and emancipation. He rejects the assumption that the mind in modern enlightenment takes part in doing the politic repression in its worse form. Habermas think that modernity sees itself as what is thrown into someone's body without having the ability to release itself.

According to Habermas, live covers all supposition and assumption, which is merely accepted, without being questioned or doubt. The live always alter communication in society. Life look like as if it is covered in culture and become the context where communication continuous, in fact, it happens repeatedly without realizing it. In other words, communicative praxis never takes place in vacuum

situation but it searches from the available source and it is used as a communicative vehicle to come to an agreement. All those things from the world altered and sustained communicative praxis. On the other side, life itself survives because of communicative praxis[22]

Social communication has source on life and it is not enough to preserve the society. The defense of the society happens through work. In prehistoric community communicative and material defense mingled and almost can't be separated. Work looks as if it continuously happens in life. However, in modern society, communicative and material defense is separated. Material defense doesn't happen in an institution stabilized through communicative way but most of it.

System consists of two subsystems; economic and political subsystem. In these subsystem human does not build relationship in communicative way but dealing each other in a strategic way. In other words, they are not after the agreement based on critical reasons but they are trying to make a realization of personal goal. Habermas said that people usually go after their own interest as the way they wanted it, without expecting the ability to take the responsibility of their action and words communicatively. Communicative praxis is already eliminated from the system of the context. In the context system, relationship between human is arranged in formal way and no longer in communicative way, therefore they can act in strategic way without limit. Responsibility on normative integrity from society and on the defense of identity from economic and political actor as if it happens in life.

The condition of modern society is confronted by a lot of interests, which are concealed, this is what Habermas criticized. The essence of Habermas' critic is colonialism of life. Because it is governed by capitalism relationship, which constitutes material defense in modern society, life is colonized by economic and political subsystem. The media of power and money do not only give color to human relation in society system instead, it sneaks into the life and there it pushes communication. In order to solve it and that modernization could still take place, communication rationalization among society should be open a consensus form achieved through the process of dialog. Thus all members of society know what interest to be achieved by people involved in communication is no longer wrapped by fake rationality cover[23]

CONCLUSION

Television has become the most popular communication media and it has gained popularity in all elements of society. Television is an inanimate object that is able to interact with humans, not only through cognition, but also through physical contact, through the incorporation of television, telephone and internet technology. Television is an inexpensive audio visual media that is generally owned and easily accessible to the majority of people from various groups. In other words, television is a popular mass media that has maximum publicity, so it is also called as a mass cultural channel. Language is the main tool to describe reality. The use of language is related to language as a

communication media and language as a media for creating social reality.

The language used on television in the form of advertisements, news, films, and other types of television shows are delivered by using simple languages to complex languages. Hermeneutics is a model used to interpret messages conveyed on the television. Thus, the messages from the messenger will be easily understood by the message recipient. Habermas, in his theory of rationalizing communicative actions, claimed that there is an intention in every message conveyed through television media. The messenger wants to provide information, influences the mindset and the behavior, and even wants to hypnotize the audience as the recipient of the messages. Therefore, it needs a discourse from all parties so that television as a mass media can educate audiences through every television shows.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Winoto, "The Application of Source Credibility Theory in Studies about Library Services," *EduLibs*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 5–6, 2015.
- [2] E. D. S. Watie, "Komunikasi dan Media Sosial," *THE MESSENGER*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 73–74, 2011.
- [3] A. Duplantier, "Technological Recursivity and the Contested Subject on Reality TV," *J. Lit. Cult. Lit. Transl.*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 1–13, 2013.
- [4] S. E. Erickson, "An Experimental Examination of Binge Watching and Narrative Engagement," *soc.ci*, vol. 8, no. 19, pp. 5–6, 2019.
- [5] G. e o r g e H. T. a y l o r R, *Legal Hermeneutics: The Text and Beyond*. USA: University of Pittsburgh, USA, 1995.
- [6] T. Georgakakis, "TRADITION AS GELOTOPOESIS: AN ESSAY ON THE HERMENEUTICS OF LAUGHTER IN MARTIN HEIDEGGER," *Cosm. Hist. J. Nat. Soc. Philos.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 185–187, 2011.
- [7] M. W. KNOTTS, "READERS, TEXTS, AND THE FUSION OF HORIZONS: THEOLOGY AND GADAMER'S HERMENEUTICS," *THEOLOGICA*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 235–238, 2015.
- [8] H. H. Adinugraha, "YAUMIDDIN DALAM PERSPEKTIF HERMENEUTIKA EMILIO BETTI," *RELIGIA*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 114–116, 2017.
- [9] A. H. Ridwan, "Implikasi Hermeneutika dalam Reinterpretasi Teks-teks Hukum Islam," *AL-ADALAH*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 103–104, 2016.
- [10] M. D. Habibi, "INTERPRETASI HERMENEUTIKA JORGE J.E. GRACIA DALAM AL-QUR'AN SURAH AL-MAIDAH:51," *QOF*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 196–198, 2019.
- [11] F. Attamimi, "HERMENEUTIKA GADAMER DALAM STUDI TEOLOGI POLITIK," *Hunafa J. Stud. Islam.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 322–324, 2012.
- [12] R. Stolz, "Hermeneutical Approach to Translation," *VERTIMO Stud.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 34–36, 2012.
- [13] F. Henriques, "The Need for an Alternative Narrative to the History of Ideas or To Pay a Debt to

- Women,” *Ricœur Stud.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 7–14, 2013.
- [14] J. P. Roberts, “Conceptual Blending, the Second Naïveté, and the Emergence of New Meanings,” *Open Theol.*, vol. 4, pp. 30–32, 2018.
- [15] P. W. Harsanto, “Metamorfosis Kebudayaan (Sebuah Tinjauan Media Televisi dan Budaya Kekerasan),” *J. Desain Komun. Vis. Nirmana*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 14–17, 2009.
- [16] V. Dubininal, “Hermeneutics as the Methodology of Interpretation of Languages and Texts of Extraterrestrial Intelligence,” *Philos. Cosmol.*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 105–107, 2019.
- [17] A. L. L. Petruescu, “REQUIREMENTS FOR A GENERAL INTERPRETATION THEORY,” *Analele Univ. Constantin Brâncuși din Târgu Jiu Ser. Econ.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 151–157, 2013.
- [18] G. Roger D.Sell, “Habermas and A Rehumanized Literary Scholarship,” *ELOPE English Lang. Overseas Perspect. Enq.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 217–219, 2006.
- [19] P. Kaplanova, “Essay on legitimacy and democracy,” *Izzivi Prihodnosti*, pp. 21–24, 2017.
- [20] H. Rehg, William, “Argumentation Theory, and Science Studies: Toward Interdisciplinary Cooperation,” *Informal Log.*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 165–167, 2003.
- [21] M. Marsonet, “Pragmatism and Political Pluralism Consensus and Pluralism,” *Entrep. Train. Cent. Albania*, vol. 12, no. 12, pp. 50–52, 2015.
- [22] M. Subuki, “UNIVERSAL PRAGMATICS: MEMPERTIMBANGKAN HABERMAS DALAM PENELITIAN LINGUISTIK,” *DIALEKTIKA*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 112–114, 2015.
- [23] K. W. Gray, “The Autopoietic Turn in Habermas’ Legal Philosophy,” *Ancilla Iuris*, pp. 41–57, 2014.

AUTHORS

Ridha Ahida is Lecture at Institut Agama Islam Negeri Bukittinggi, West Sumatera, Indonesia.