

Dissonance in Political Communication: An Analysis of Speech Acts and Symbolic Violence in the ‘Tolol’ Utterances of Political Elites and Their Implications for Post-Polarization Peacebuilding

Suryanti Galuh Pravitasari

Tiga Serangkai University, Indonesia

suryantigaluh@tsu.ac.id

Evi Murti Wardhani

Universitas Duta Bangsa, Indonesia

evi_murti@udb.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the pragmatic function and social implications of the utterance 'tolol' used by politician Ahmad Syahrani in the context of political communication in Indonesia. Amidst peace-building efforts after electoral polarization, the language used by political elites plays a crucial role. This study uses a qualitative approach with the critical discourse analysis (CDA) method combined with speech act theory (Searle) and the concept of symbolic violence (Bourdieu). Primary data consists of a video transcript of Syahrani's speech during a working meeting visit to the West Sumatra Regional Police on August 22, 2025, and secondary data include media coverage and public responses on social media. The results show that the utterance 'tolol' is not merely an expressive speech act (emotional outburst), but rather an assertive illocutionary act (assessing) and a directive (delegitimizing) that functions as an *ad hominem*. This utterance operates as a form of symbolic violence that normalizes verbal aggression in the public sphere. The implication is that the use of this diction directly hinders the creation of positive peace by destroying social trust and strengthening polarization barriers, instead of building deliberative dialogue.

Keywords: *Political Communication, Speech Acts, Symbolic Violence, Peace Building, Political Polarization, Syahrani.*

Introduction

Political communication in the era of deliberative democracy ideally functions as a bridge for the rational exchange of ideas to reach consensus (Habermas, 1989). However, the contemporary global and national political landscape is characterized by post-truth phenomena and sharp polarization, shifting substantial debate into a battle of sentiments (Waisbord, 2018). In the context of Indonesia's post-electoral polarization (the 2014, 2019, and 2024 presidential elections), peacebuilding efforts—particularly social reconciliation—have become a crucial agenda.

This is where the role of political elites as public communicators becomes vital. The language they use not only reflects political stances but also actively shapes social reality and is emulated by the public (Melati, 2024). When elites use polite and data-driven language, they contribute to "positive peace" (Galtung, 1969), a condition in which dialogue and structural justice are fostered.

However, the opposite often occurs. The public sphere is often filled with dissonance in political communication, namely the use of aggressive, demeaning, and personal attacks (*ad hominem*) to delegitimize political opponents. One prominent example is politician Ahmad Sahroni's use of the term "tolol" during a live-streamed working meeting with the West Sumatra Regional Police on August 22, 2025.

Previous research on political language in Indonesia has focused largely on election campaign strategies or media framing analysis (Susanto, 2019). However, there is a research gap in studies that specifically analyze a single linguistic unit, namely the negative diction of a political elite, unpack its pragmatic function, and theoretically link it to Bourdieu's concept of symbolic violence and its impact on peacebuilding efforts, as advocated by Galtung.

Therefore, this study focuses on two questions: (1) What is the function of the speech act/illocutionary act of Syahroni's use of "tolol" in the context of political communication? (2) What are the implications of using this diction as a form of symbolic violence for post-polarization peacebuilding efforts in Indonesia?

Discussion

Language is not only a tool for description, but also for action (Austin, 1962). Searle (1976) developed this by dividing speech acts into three levels: locution, or the act of saying something; illocution, or the intention behind the utterance; and perlocution, or the effect of the utterance on

the listener. In a political context, illocutionary analysis is crucial. A question, for example, "Are you sure?" may not be a question, but rather an assertive illocutionary act, expressing doubt, or a commissive act, or a threat. The utterance "Tolol" will be analyzed for its illocutionary function: is it expressive of anger, assertive of Tolol or directive, meaning to command silence.

Discourse, Power, and Symbolic Violence

According to Foucault (1972) and Fairclough (1995), linguistic discourse in practice is not neutral; it is an arena for power struggles. Pierre Bourdieu (1991) introduced the concept of symbolic violence, namely violence that is not physical, but rather through language, symbols, and culture that legitimize domination. When an elite, possessing political and social capital, uses derogatory language such as "Tolol" toward another who may be in a lower position, they are not "speaking" words; they are "perpetrating" domination. This violence is accepted doxically, considered normal and normalizing inequality.

Peace-building

Johan Galtung (1969) stated that peace encompasses negative peace and positive peace. Negative peace is characterized by the absence of war/physical conflict, while positive peace is characterized by the presence of social justice, dialogue, and harmonious relations. In a post-polarization context, simply the absence of street violence, known as negative peace, is not enough. What is needed is positive peace, where different groups can engage in dialogue with mutual respect, or what is known as social trust. Hate speech and derogatory language directly attack the foundations of this positive peace.

Research Method

This research employs a qualitative-interpretive paradigm with a case study approach, focusing on Sahroni's remarks following a working meeting with the West Sumatra Regional Police, which were broadcast live on August 22, 2025. The analytical method used is Teun A. van Dijk's (2008) Critical Discourse Analysis model, which focuses on the triad of "text, social cognition, and context," combined with Searle's pragmatic or speech act analysis. 1. Primary Data: Verbatim transcript of Sahroni's 'tolol' utterance, taken from a video recording of a press conference held by Deputy Chairman of Commission III of the Indonesian House of Representatives, Ahmad Sahroni, after a

working visit to the West Sumatra Regional Police Headquarters, which was uploaded to the CNN Indonesia YouTube channel on Friday, August 22, 2025.

Secondary Data: (1) Reporting from five national mainstream media outlets: Kompas, Tempo, Detik, CNN Indonesia, and Suara Merdeka to examine the framing of the event, (2) 50 top comments purposively selected from the YouTube video comment section to analyze the perlocutionary effect or public response.

Data Analysis Techniques:

Text/Pragmatic Analysis: Identifying the locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts of the 'tolol' utterance. Context/Discourse Analysis: Analyzing Sahroni's position of power, his target audience, and the political context in which the utterance was delivered. Implications/Synthesis Analysis: Connecting findings (1) and (2) with Bourdieu's theory of symbolic violence and Galtung's theory of peacebuilding.

Results and Discussion

Analysis of the Speech Act of Sahroni's "Tolol" Primary data was taken from video footage of a press conference held by Ahmad Sahroni, Deputy Chairman of Commission III of the Indonesian House of Representatives, following a working visit to the West Sumatra Regional Police Headquarters on Friday, August 22, 2025.

Transcript of Speech:

"Bubarin DPR nih kadang-kadang nih ya masyarakat boleh kritik, boleh komplain, boleh caci-maki, enggak papa kita terima tapi ada adat-istiadat yang musti disampaikan. Apakah dengan membubarkan DPR emang meyakinkan masyarakat bisa menjalani proses pemerintahan sekarang ini, belum tentu. Maka jangan menyampaikan hal hal seenaknya. Bubarkan DPR, jangan. Memang yang ngomong itu rata rata orang yang nggak pernah jadi duduk di DPR. Kita boleh dikritik, mau bilang anjing, babi, bangsat enggak apa apa, mampus nggak apa apa. Tapi ingat bahwa kita selaku wakil rakyat juga punya kerja, kerja, juga punya empati. Jangan merasa bahwa komplainan, Silahkan kritik mau ngapain saja boleh. Tapi jangan mencaci maki berlebihan karena, karena itu merusak mental. ***Mental manusia yang begitu adalah mental orang yang 'tertolol' sedunia. Catat nih! Orang yang cuman mental bilang bubarin DPR itu adalah orang tolol sedunia.*** Kenapa? Apa kita ini orang pinter semua? Enggak kita ini bodoh semua kita. Tapi ada cara tata kelola bagaimana menyampaikan kritik yang harus dievaluasi oleh kita. Kita memang belum tentu benar. Belum tentu hebat, nggak. Tapi minimal kita mewakili kerja kerja masyarakat yang mumpuni untuk teman teman masyarakat semuanya. Jangan dikit-dikit DPR ngomongin masalah ini dihujat, ini dihujat. Enggak papa. Mau

dihujat sampai mampus juga nggak papa. Masih berdiri DPRnya. Sampai kapanpun, tidak akan berubah, sama saja. Terima kasih ya," kata Sahroni kepada awak media usai kunjungan kerja di Sumatera Utara pada Jumat, 22 Agustus 2025"

Pragmatic Analysis of Speech Acts and the Pragmatic Impact of the Utterance “Tolol” in Public Criticism Discourse on Social Media

In pragmatic studies, language is not merely understood as a system of signs that conveys lexical meaning, but also as a form of social action that carries intentions, effects, and power implications. Utterances that appear simple often contain complex layers of meaning, especially when they emerge in political contexts and on social media platforms. One particularly compelling case for analysis is the use of the word “tolol” by a public figure named Syahroni in response to public criticism demanding the dissolution of the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR) following regulations on legislators’ salaries and allowances, which reportedly reach hundreds of millions of rupiah.

This utterance generated widespread reactions, ranging from strong support to outright rejection, and attracted significant media attention. Consequently, speech act theory provides a relevant analytical framework to examine how a single utterance can function as a linguistic action imbued with ideological interests and produce tangible social consequences.

Locutionary Act: Form and Lexical Meaning

At the locutionary level, the utterance under analysis consists of the word “tolol,” which, according to the Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (KBBI), is classified as an adjective meaning “very stupid” or “extremely foolish.” At this level, the analysis is limited to what is literally uttered, without reference to the speaker’s intention or the effect on the hearer.

However, it is important to note that the word “tolol” carries a strong pejorative connotation and is socially categorized as an insult or verbal abuse. Thus, even at the locutionary level, this lexical choice already contains a high potential for conflict, as it violates norms of linguistic politeness—particularly in public communication involving asymmetrical power relations between political elites and ordinary citizens.

Illocutionary Act: Intentions and Functions of the Utterance

At the illocutionary level, the utterance “tolol” performs a complex and multifaceted function rather than a single communicative act. At least two primary types of illocutionary acts can be identified: First, the utterance functions as an assertive act, whereby the speaker expresses a subjective evaluation of the party delivering the criticism. Syahroni is not asking a question or seeking clarification; instead, he is making a direct claim that the critic is “stupid” or, at the very least, has the potential to appear “stupid.” In political contexts, such assertive acts are frequently employed to delegitimize criticism without engaging substantively with the issue at hand—in this case, public concerns regarding budgetary justice and the ethical implications of legislators’ salaries and benefits.

Second, the utterance can also be interpreted as an implicit directive act. Although it does not take the form of an explicit imperative such as “be quiet” or “stop talking,” the use of the word “tolol” functions pragmatically as a veiled command intended to silence the critic. The implicit pragmatic message is that the criticism is unintelligent, invalid, and therefore unworthy of continuation. Such indirect directive acts are common in power-laden discourse, where speakers seek to control the discursive space without issuing overt commands.

Ad Hominem Strategy in Digital Rhetoric

The utterance “tolol” can further be analyzed as an ad hominem strategy—namely, an attack on the personal character of the interlocutor rather than on the substance of the argument presented. In this case, public criticism regarding the call to dissolve the DPR and the issue of excessive salaries and allowances is not addressed through rational argumentation or empirical data, but instead redirected into a personal attack on the critics themselves.

This strategy is particularly prevalent in social media discourse due to its emotional immediacy, brevity, and capacity to mobilize group loyalty. From an academic standpoint, however, ad hominem attacks constitute a logical fallacy, as they fail to engage with the core argument. The broader effect is a shift in public discourse away from structural issues—such as economic inequality and political accountability—toward interpersonal conflict and spectacle.

Perlocutionary Act: Social Effects and Consequences

At the perlocutionary level, the utterance produces multiple observable effects, as evidenced by secondary data analysis of netizen comments and media coverage. First, Legitimization of Aggression (Pro-Syahroni Camp), comments such as that from @RobertHutapea-s7z, stating “Top, my brother!”, indicate that the utterance succeeded in legitimizing verbal aggression among supporters. For this group, the use of “tolol” is perceived as a display of firmness, courage, or even entertainment. This effect contributes to the normalization of abusive language in political discourse and encourages the replication of similar expressions by other users. Second, Shock and Rejection (Contra Camp) Conversely, the opposing camp expresses shock, anger, and rejection. Comments such as @hafniwati4361, who warns that such speech constitutes oppression of the people, or @AgungAj799 and @willinoysitorus1509, who frame the utterance as a provocation against the public, demonstrate that the speech act also generates critical awareness and resistance.

The perlocutionary effect in this context includes heightened tension between political elites and citizens, as well as the reinforcement of narratives portraying representatives as arrogant and detached from public concerns. Third, Media Sensationalism. Mainstream and online media outlets tend to emphasize the controversial nature of the utterance. Media attention shifts away from the substantive issue—namely, the regulation of DPR salaries and allowances—toward interpersonal drama and linguistic controversy. This effect aligns with media logics that prioritize virality and engagement, but it undermines the quality of public discourse by marginalizing policy substance.

Academic and Social Implications

This analysis demonstrates that a brief utterance can function as a powerful instrument of symbolic domination, capable of silencing criticism, shaping public opinion, and redirecting discursive focus. Within the context of digital democracy, the use of insulting language by public figures cannot be dismissed as trivial, as it contributes to the erosion of ethical standards in political communication and intensifies social polarization. From an academic perspective, this case underscores the importance of pragmatic analysis and critical discourse studies in understanding the relationship between language, power, and ideology in the public sphere. Language operates not merely as a means of communication, but as a mechanism of control and resistance.

The utterance “tolol,” when analyzed through the framework of speech act theory, reveals the multifaceted nature of language use in political social media contexts. At the locutionary level, it is a word with insulting meaning; at the illocutionary level, it functions as both an evaluative statement and an implicit command; and at the perlocutionary level, it produces polarization, legitimizes aggression, and fuels media sensationalism. Ultimately, this analysis illustrates that linguistic inquiry is essential not only for understanding language itself, but also for critically examining power relations and social conflict in contemporary society, for example; 1) *News in CNN Indonesia pada tanggal 22 Agustus 2025 "Sahroni Balas kritik Desak Bubarkan DPR: mental Orang Tolol Sedunia."*; 2) *News in tribunnewsbanyumas pada tanggal 22 Agustus 2025 " Ngamuk Dengar Seruan Bubarkan DPR";* 3) *News in Kompas.com pada tanggal 30 Agustus 2025 "MKD DPR RI Sebut Pernyataan 'Tolol' Sahroni Melanggar kode Etik";* 4) *News in detik.com pada tanggal 22 agustus 2025 "Muncul seruan BubaRkaN DPR, Sahroni: Orang Tolol Sedunia";* 5) *News in suaramerdeka.com pada tanggal 05 November 2025 "Ucapan 'Orang Tolol Sedunia' Picu Sidang Kode Etik DPR RI"*

The 'Tolol' Utterance as Symbolic Violence Symbolic Violence and Political Discourse: A Bourdieusian Analysis

Using Pierre Bourdieu’s theoretical lens, the utterance under discussion should not be interpreted merely as a linguistic “mistake” or a momentary emotional outburst. Rather, it constitutes a practice of symbolic violence—a subtle, often unrecognized form of domination exercised through language and symbolic power. Symbolic violence operates not through physical force, but through meanings, classifications, and communicative acts that appear natural, legitimate, and socially acceptable.

First, the utterance must be situated within power relations shaped by political and symbolic capital. Syahroni, as the Deputy Chair of Commission III of the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR RI), occupies a structurally dominant position within the political field. According to Bourdieu, symbolic capital—such as institutional authority, public recognition, and political legitimacy—amplifies the effectiveness of speech acts. When a political elite speaks, their words are not neutral; they carry institutional weight and are perceived as authoritative. Consequently, the utterance “tolol” does not function merely as a personal insult but as a politically charged act backed by institutional power.

Second, the utterance exemplifies a practice of domination through symbolic means. By labeling the interlocutor as “tolol,” Syahroni positions the critic as intellectually inferior and socially illegitimate. This classification effectively removes the critic from the realm of rational political subjects worthy of participation in debate. In Bourdieusian terms, this is a form of symbolic coercion: criticism is silenced not through repression or legal sanction, but through the imposition of shame, delegitimization, and the attribution of incompetence. The dominated party may even internalize this judgment, which is precisely what makes symbolic violence so effective—it is often misrecognized as “natural” or “deserved.”

Third, the most significant danger lies in the process of normalization, or doxa formation. Doxa refers to taken-for-granted beliefs that structure social reality without being questioned. When segments of the public interpret such utterances as “assertive,” “bold,” or “authentic political communication,” symbolic violence becomes normalized. The political field is then reshaped into an arena where verbal aggression is accepted as legitimate practice, while reasoned argumentation and ethical discourse are devalued. This normalization reinforces hierarchical relations between political elites and citizens and erodes democratic deliberation.

In this sense, symbolic violence does not only harm individual interlocutors; it restructures the broader political habitus. Citizens may gradually accept that being insulted by those in power is part of political life, while elites become increasingly emboldened to use degrading language without fear of moral or symbolic sanction. Over time, this dynamic weakens democratic accountability and transforms politics from a contest of ideas into a spectacle of domination.

In conclusion, viewed through Bourdieu’s framework, the utterance functions as a strategic—or at least structurally conditioned—exercise of symbolic power. It reproduces inequality, legitimizes domination, and risks redefining the norms of political communication itself. Recognizing such practices as symbolic violence is therefore essential for critically defending democratic discourse and resisting the normalization of linguistic domination in the political sphere.

Implications for Peacebuilding

Aggressive communication by political elites has profound implications for efforts to build positive peace in post-polarized societies. Positive peace, as conceptualized by Johan Galtung, extends beyond the mere absence of direct violence and encompasses the presence of social justice, trust,

and constructive dialogue. In highly polarized political environments, language used by elites plays a critical role in either facilitating reconciliation or entrenching division. The use of derogatory language, such as labeling critics as “tolol,” directly undermines the conditions necessary for sustainable peacebuilding.

First, such communication undermines social trust, a foundational pillar of peacebuilding. Trust is not only built horizontally among citizens but also vertically between the public and political elites. When political leaders delegitimize critics through insults rather than engaging substantively with their concerns, they signal that dissent is not valued or respected. This creates a climate of suspicion, where groups begin to doubt the intentions and goodwill of those holding power. If elites themselves model antagonistic and dismissive communication, it becomes increasingly difficult for communities at the grassroots level to cultivate mutual trust. Rather than de-escalating tensions, such utterances sow the seeds of resentment and deepen existing fractures within society.

Second, aggressive communication reinforces “in-group” versus “out-group” polarization. The use of the term “tolol” functions as a symbolic boundary marker that divides society into opposing camps: “us,” the rational and intelligent supporters of the speaker, and “them,” the allegedly ignorant and illegitimate critics. This binary framing aligns with social identity theory, which suggests that individuals derive self-worth from group membership while denigrating out-groups. In political contexts, this dynamic hardens attitudes, reduces empathy, and discourages cross-group understanding. Rather than promoting reconciliation, such language entrenches polarization and transforms political disagreement into moralized conflict, where opponents are not merely wrong but inherently inferior.

Third, aggressive speech destroys the space for deliberative dialogue, which is essential for democratic peacebuilding. Instead of fostering discussion on substantive public issues—such as demands to dissolve the DPR due to perceived discrepancies between institutional performance, ethical standards, and salary and allowance policies reaching hundreds of millions of rupiah—public attention is diverted to interpersonal drama. Media coverage and online discourse become fixated on “who insulted whom,” marginalizing critical debate on governance, accountability, and public ethics. As a result, public spheres that should function as arenas for rational deliberation are reduced to spectacles of confrontation. This erosion of deliberative space has long-term consequences. When political communication is dominated by insults rather than arguments, citizens become disengaged

or radicalized, and policy discussions are replaced by emotional reactions. Over time, this weakens democratic institutions and hampers peacebuilding efforts by normalizing antagonism as the primary mode of political interaction.

In conclusion, aggressive political communication does not merely reflect polarization—it actively reproduces and intensifies it. By undermining social trust, reinforcing in-group versus out-group divisions, and killing spaces for deliberative dialogue, such language obstructs positive peacebuilding. For societies seeking to move beyond polarization, the ethical responsibility of political elites to model respectful, dialogical communication cannot be overstated. Language, in this sense, is not a neutral tool but a decisive factor in shaping the prospects for peace and democratic resilience.

Conclusion

This study concludes that the utterance “tolol” employed by the politician Syahroni cannot be understood merely as an unintentional emotional outburst or careless choice of diction. From a pragmatic perspective, the utterance functioned simultaneously as an assertive and directive illocutionary speech act, strategically deployed to delegitimize the interlocutor through an *ad hominem* rhetorical maneuver. Rather than engaging with the substantive criticism directed at institutional performance and ethical concerns, the utterance shifted the communicative focus toward personal denigration. Beyond its pragmatic function, the utterance must also be situated within a broader discourse of power. In this context, it operates as a form of symbolic violence, as conceptualized by Pierre Bourdieu. Backed by institutional authority and political capital, the utterance contributes to the normalization of verbal aggression in the public sphere. Its effectiveness lies precisely in its symbolic nature: it silences criticism not through coercion or formal sanction, but through delegitimization, shame, and the construction of intellectual inferiority. When such practices go unchallenged, they risk becoming an accepted mode of political communication.

The most significant implications of this finding concern post-polarization peacebuilding efforts in Indonesia. Rather than functioning as a mechanism of reconciliation and democratic engagement, this form of political communication acts as an agent of polarization. It actively erodes social capital by undermining trust between political elites and citizens, reinforces antagonistic “in-group versus out-group” identity formations, and constricts the deliberative space necessary for democratic dialogue. In line with Johan Galtung’s conception of positive peace, which emphasizes

justice, participation, and constructive communication, such discourse represents a serious obstacle to sustainable peace. Moreover, by diverting public and media attention away from substantive policy debates toward interpersonal conflict and sensational controversy, aggressive political communication weakens the quality of democratic deliberation. Issues of governance, accountability, and public ethics become secondary to spectacle, thereby diminishing citizens' capacity to engage critically with political institutions.

In light of these findings, this study recommends two key interventions. First, there is an urgent need to enhance communication ethics literacy among political elites, emphasizing the responsibility of public officials to model respectful, deliberative, and inclusive discourse. Second, the mass media must assume a more critical and reflective role, moving beyond the reproduction of sensationalist narratives to interrogate the substantive quality and democratic implications of political communication. Only through these combined efforts can political discourse contribute to reconciliation rather than division, and support the realization of positive peace in Indonesia's democratic landscape.

Bibliography

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Harvard University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Longman.
- Galtung, J (1969). Violence, Peace, and Peace Research . *Journal of Peace Research*. VI (3). 167-191
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. MIT Press.
- Melati Budi Srikandi. (2021). Komunikasi Politik Elite dan Polarisasi Publik: Studi Literatur dari Perspektif Kritik. *Governance: Jurnal Ilmiah Kajian Politik Lokal dan Pembangunan*. ISSN: 2406-8985 (Media Online). Volume 11 Nomor 2 Desember 2024
- Searle, J. R. (1976). A Classification of Illocutionary Acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 1-23.
- Susanto, E. H. (2019). Politik Framing: Analisis Pemberitaan Kampanye Pilpres 2019 di Media Online. *Jurnal Ilmu Politik dan Komunikasi*, Vol(No), hlm. XX-XX.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and Power*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Waisbord, S. (2018). The elective affinity between post-truth communication and populist politics. *Communication Research and Practice*, 4(1), 17-34.
- <https://www.youtube.com/shorts/4j1ie8hJw1Y>
- <https://www.kompas.com/tren/read/2025/09/03/084500165/ahmad-sahroni-dari-blunder-diksi-tolol-hingga-laporkan-penjarahan-rumah>
- <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20250822195736-32-1265453/sahroni-balas-kritik-desak-bubarkan-dpr-mental-orang-tolol-sedunia>
- <https://www.suaramerdeka.com/nasional/0416203589/ucapan-orang-tolol-sedunia-ahmad->

[sahroni-picu-sidang-etik-dpr-nasdem-langsung-tindak-tegas
https://www.detik.com/kalimantan/berita/d-8074165/muncul-seruan-bubarkan-dpr-sahroni-
orang-tolol-sedunia](https://www.detik.com/kalimantan/berita/d-8074165/muncul-seruan-bubarkan-dpr-sahroni-orang-tolol-sedunia)