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The study in this paper concerns with the way the author explores the construction meaning in the set of component and sign in semiotic signification. The writer focuses on speech text and wants to know about the component meaning and sign system meaning in connotation and denotation level.

The method used in this paper was descriptive qualitative analysis with textual where the writer describes and interprets the text of Bush speech and Rove on Iraq War.

From the analysis, the writer concludes that each of the component construction and sign of two texts has a system and formed by textual, contextual idea. These elements contribute a meaning in denotation and connotation meaning and a cracked text. Finally, the writer concludes that two texts are established of supporting idea of cultural meaning of legalization war.

People is the social human that needs interaction with others, they need a language to keep their interactions. Language used to express their opinion and idea as the process of interaction. Language is the arbitrary system of sound, which used by the social member to corporate, interact
and identify their identity. Language is the system of communication, which used by sounds, symbols, and words in expressing the meaning of idea and thought. Language is a system of signs, which express ideas.¹

It cannot be counted that how many languages are existed in the population of human, with the result that every community in smallest unit or biggest unit like country has an interaction tool (language), so the language itself has variety in every community. In this global area, English language is one of language that used in every country in the world as the official or foreign language. In Indonesia, English language is the first foreign language that used by Indonesian people as the following of the development information and mass media. English language spreads rapidly in every aspects, it brings the information around the world to every people. It required to all people who does not recognize English language as the priority to communicate which other around the world because English language becomes an official language in the world as international language, the world’s agreement to use it. Therefore, if someone did not recognize it as well as possible, they will lose interactions in information and technology, which is spreading rapidly.

There are many information and technology in every major written in form of English language, until every nation in the world knows what happened in that time. A communication as the process interaction, which is conducted people to interact with each other, is language activity and

English language is the tool of interaction around the world. Using English language in every part of the world will be found in technological information that conducted electronic media such as television, radio, internet etc and printed media such as magazine, newspaper, journal and books.

One of media that is transferred information to the written form is journal, magazine and book. Because of the modernity of technology, the written form such as journal and others are accommodated to the media that known as an internet. Based on this theme, the written form that has recorded to the internet is Bush speech in ultimatum of Iraq war.

Speech is an utterance, which has a good structure to demonstrate for many people. For example: speech of presidential (national state), special day, encouragement or motivation, welcoming speech and etc. Commonly, speech holds in the formal events such as conference, council, wedding party, seminar, campaign. Because speech performs in the formal area, it is better to write it firstly.

The kind of written speech is the coherence sentence, which consists in whole words, so it can be read and analyzed. The kind of text speech includes as the argumentative texts, which means the writing of text attempts to convince reader and hearer to follow it. Hence, the goal of

---

speech performed is pursuing a reader and hearer to follow what the orator expected or in other hand attempting to convince hearer. The composition of speech commonly gives the evidences or proofs and the concrete facts. The expected reaction from hearer is appearing an appropriate opinion or conviction and trust or the problem that will be leaded.  

One of the examples of speech that has a goal to convince hearer is a Bush’s speech in Iraq war 1991:

Just two hours ago, Allied air forces began an attack on military targets in Iraq and Kuwait. These attacks continue as I speak. Ground forces are not engaged. This conflict started Aug. 2, when the dictator of Iraq invaded a small and helpless neighbor, Kuwait, a member of the Arab League and a member of the United Nations, was crushed, its people brutalized. Five months ago, Saddam Hussein started this cruel war against Kuwait; tonight, the battle has been joined.

In his speech, Bush gave the concrete facts when the attack had begun and would be continued. His political expression seems to convince people that his aggression war is necessary right and legal.

In this case, the speech that is transferred in written form has the logic and coherence meaning until become a text. Because of an accommodation of internet, Bush’s speech has recorded and can be analyzed as the text. Every text, especially English text will operate in the corridor of semantic that related to the meaning. The wisdom word said


that “langue without meaning is meaningless”, semantic is the study of the linguistic meaning of morphemes, words, phrases, and sentences.⁵ Something that is conveyed or signified; sense or significance is the meaning. There are many aspects to analyze of meaning; we can analyze meaning in the form of denotation or connotation, meaning in context, the change of meaning and the relation of meaning.

One of studies concerning on semantic as the relation of meaning is componential analysis. Componential analysis or lexical decomposition is a basic study of lexical fields in determining semantic relation of different lexical items in one lexical field.⁶ Meaning also related with the code of sign, its basic idea in definition and analysis of sign. Signs produce a meaning as denotation and connotation.

In the study of Componential, lexicon is the main of study. Lexicon is analyzed based on componential meaning to get a description about lexical system and semantic field structure. Besides that, writer will try to illustrate the semantic field of Bush’s speech on Iraq war with the most completely relation of meaning call as thesaurus with the reference of Roget’s international thesaurus. According to Harimurti Kridalaksana one of lexicography’s activities is thesaurus. Thesaurus is book of reference that contains information about the relation of meanings of word, such as

---


⁶ Wedhawati, “Lexical Fields Componential Analysis and Definition Of Lexical Sense” Rintisan dalam Kajian Leksikologi dan leksikografi, No1, (Desember 2003), p. 122
semantic field, synonym, or antonym and arranged by relation of meaning (semantically) or alphabetically or the combination of both of them. The writer is interested in doing research because there are still not many researches about Componential analysis in this university.

Based on the background study above, the writer is interested in studying and researching meaning components, denotation and conotation within the text of Bush’s speech on Iraq war and the message of meaning as expressed in the texts.

1. **Definition of Meaning**

One thing that’s remained in our concept to define meaning is not easy as the writer determined; it has a long wide debated problem since Plato was defined that meaning is a copy of ultra-reality. The writer may know that one single word has different sense, as Husserl said in the book of Wittgenstein’s work *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* that most proposition and question that have been written about philosophical matters are not false but senseless. Meaning is a word the writer use in our daily life in different sense. For example: the term color of red may occur in several context in which it gives a quite several different of meaning. The term of “meaning” is a confused term because the limitation

---

7 Harimurti Kridalaksana, *rintisan dalam kajian leksikologi dan leksikografi*, (Jakarta: Fakultas ilmu pengetahuan Budaya Universitas Indonesia), p. xi

is very wide variety; theoretically meaning is considered in linguistic, philosophy, logic, semiotic and etc.

Another explanation about meaning is the message that is intended or expressed or signified; "what is the meaning of this sentence"; "the significance of a red traffic light"; "the signification of Chinese characters"; "the import of his announcement was ambiguous" or the idea that is intended; "What is the meaning of this proverb?" what an artist expresses in an art work; or what a viewer understands and interprets from an art work.

In The Saussurian perspective, meaning is the product of linguistic conventions, the effect of a system of differences. To account for meaning is to set forth the relations of contrast and the possibilities of combination that constitute a language. However, as many have observed, a theory that derives meaning from linguistic conventions does not account for it completely. If one conceives of meaning as the effect of linguistic relations manifested in an utterance, then one must contend with the fact that, as the writer say, a speaker can mean different things by the same linguistic sequence on different occasions. "Could you move that box?" may be a request, or a question about one's interlocutor's strength, or even, as rhetorical question, the resigned indication of improbability.\textsuperscript{9} This perspective minded on the every meaning of word, sentence or expression has a varieties meaning, each of varieties meaning have a central meaning.

Based on F.R. Palmer from book of Alex sobur, to know what the
definition of meaning, the writer has to go to back from the theory of
Ferdinand de Saussure. In his book Course in General Linguistic (1916),
de Saussure mentions sign of linguistic. Every sign of linguistic consists
two elements, interpreted (the element of meaning) and to interpret (the
element of sound). One example I try to explain this definition, the word
“door” has one element of meaning (interpreted as door) and one element
of sound (spelled d-o-o-r). Those elements refer to the object that describe
as a device of house, a place of entering and exiting man, placed in the
back or the front.

Most theorists recognize that almost words have varieties meaning.
Every word of color like red, yellow, black and white has a different
meaning (connotative). In English language, there are hundred similar
words compiled in great book Rogert’s International Thesaurus. One
single word of black has the meaning of dark, negative thing, scare, and
etc.

2. Theory of componential analysis

Componential analysis (Nida, 1975), semantic components
(Lehrer, 1974) are theoretical constructs which can characterize the
vocabulary of a language; each lexical item will be defined in term of

---

10 Alex Sobur, Analisis Teks Media suatu pengantar untuk analisis wacana, analisis
semiotic dan analisis framing, (Bandung, Remaja Rosddakarya, 2006), p. 24
11 Ibid, p. 25
the components. Nida points out the analysis of component related to
the set of meaning, he recognizes three structurally important types of
components: common, diagnostic and supplementary. The common
components are those features that any set of meaning have in
common. The diagnostic components those that are characteristic of
one or more of the meaning but not for all, and the supplementary
components are those that may connotatively but not denotatively
relevant or that may be denotatively valid but not really necessary or
significant for establishing a minimal set of contrast. Componential
analysis is thus an attempt to describe the meaning of words in terms
of a universal inventory of semantic components and their possible
combinations.

The diagnostic components have structural relation of internal;
commonly the relation is logical or temporal relation. For example, the
meaning of *repentance* has temporal relation with regret, remorse,
guilty, commitment for not doing again.

On the other hand Nida explains what does mean as the
supplementary components, there are basically of two types: (1) those
which derive from the nature of the referent and (2) those which from

---

12 A. Lehrer. *Semantic Fields and Lexical Structures*, (Amsterdam: North Holland
13 Eugene A. Nida, Johannes P. Louw, and Ronald B. Smith, *Semantic Domains and
Componential Analysis of Meaning*, (USA: Indiana University Press), p. 149
E.A. Nida : The Componential Analysis of Meaning, An Intorduction to Semantic Structures
(1975)*, (Yogyakarta, Balai Penelitian Bahasa), p. 135
the nature of the lexical unit employed designate the referent. In the type one, Nida tries to explain that some concepts are associated as one set of cultural meaning, another hand, the type two is associated as one set of lingual that construct lexical or word to the type as formal, un formal or slang word.

To illustrate what is meant by this the writer has taken a simple example used for this purpose by many linguists.

Consider the following set of words: man, woman, boy, girl, bull, cow. The writer can arrange them as correlations of binary oppositions

\[
\begin{align*}
D_1 &= 'Boy' = 'man' = 'bull' \\
&\quad 'girl' = 'woman' = 'cow' \\
D_2 &= 'Boy' = 'girl' \\
&\quad 'Man' = 'woman' \\
D_3 &= 'Boy' = 'girl' \\
&\quad 'Bull' = 'cow'
\end{align*}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The meanings of words man, boy, bull on the one hand, and woman, girl and cow, on the other, have something in common. This distinctive feature, the writer calls as a semantic component or seme. In this case the semantic distinctive feature is that of sex — male or female. Another possible correlation is man : : boy = woman : : girl. The distinctive feature is that of age —

adult or non-adult. If the writer compare this with a third correlation
\[ \text{man} : : \text{bull} = \text{woman} : : \text{cow}, \]
the writer obtain a third distinctive feature contrasting human and animal beings. In addition to the notation given on p. 41, the componential formula may be also shown by brackets. The meaning of \textit{man} can be described as (male (adult (human being))), \textit{woman} as (female (adult (human being))), \textit{girl} as (female (non-adult (human being))), etc.

Here is the example meaning of \textit{looking} with the component itself:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Intensity or stressing</th>
<th>Manner</th>
<th>Goal or purposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Look at</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Common sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Common sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Specific sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peep</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Uncommon sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spy</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>Specific sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaze</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>Specific sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>Specific sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look back</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Common sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>Specific sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Common sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiz</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Specific sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stare</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>Specific sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gape</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Uncommon sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Specific sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glimpse</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>Specific sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behold</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gawk</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Specific sense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2**

The word *looking at* and *seeing* is classified in term of common sense as one activity of daily life that people usual to do it. It differed from the word *watch*, there is stressing sound and the intensity of looking is more intensively. Just like word *focus* is one activity which has more intensive and the way of eyes activity classified as specific sense and it has kind manner.

The word *stare* has a strong stressing, but it differed from *gawk*, it’s only a reaction activity of looking, there is no any purpose that will be gotten. On the other hand the word *peeping* usually indicates as impolite of looking.
In addition, the word of *observe* is differed from *focus* or *looking at*, the sign +++, indicates as the specific sense that need more intensively of looking, it’s not only activity of looking but also intentionally of some purpose.

The word *spy* also has different meaning and stressing than the word *focus* and *observe*. The closest similar meaning with the word *spy* is *observe*, but the way how they are acting (looking) are different. Sometimes observe has negative (-) or positive (+) manner.

It’s difficult to define the word *gaze*. Looking steadily and intently is specific sense but the object of looking can be people or anything. On the other hand, the word *quiz* is also similar with *gaze*. It’s only looking someone intently through or as if through an eyeglass.

The word *glimpse* is defined as looking momentary or partial view, or looking briefly or partially. It can be positive seeing or negative. *Glimpse* can be looking sarcastically or kindly.

*Gape* is the meaning of looking widely; it has strong stressing and classified as negative manner. *Regard* is the word that has a meaning as *gaze*, but the different way of looking is more intensively. *Regard* is only gaze at in specified fashion or a steady looking.

The word *glance*, it’s the way of looking with the object is written reading. Its reading quickly cursorily, when the writer look quickly, it identified as *glance*. The last word is *looking back*, it has similar meaning with stare. But the way of looking is only the backside.
Another example will be illustrated about vocal sound’s meaning in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Musical pitch sequence</th>
<th>Verbal/ non verbal/ pseudo verbal</th>
<th>Voiced-voiceless alternation/voiceless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Whisper</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Babble</td>
<td>Pseudo verbal</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Murmur</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Sing</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Hum</td>
<td>Non verbal</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3**

3. Theory of Sign

a. Ferdinand de Saussure

Ferdinand de Saussure is well-known as the father of modern linguistics and the founding father of structural linguistic in Europe. Saussure was born in Geneva in 1857, studied mainly in Germany, taught for a number of years in Paris, and then returned to the University of Geneva in 1981 and died there in 1913. His importance work, not in his detailed explanation in linguistic, but in his general view of representation and the way his model of language shaped the semiotic

---

56 Ibid, pp. 60-61
approach to the problem of representation in a wide variety of cultural fields.

There are a three element distinction from Saussure according to his Course in General Linguistic book as the fundamental element of the structural semiotic approach, between (1) signifier and signified, (2) langage, parole, and langue, (3) synchronic and diachronic.

1. Saussure defined the linguistic sign as two side entity. One side of the sign was what he called the signifier. A signifier is the thoroughly material aspect of a sign. If one feels one’s vocal when speaking, it is clear that are made from vibrations (which are undoubtedly material in nature). Saussure describes the verbal signifier as a sound image. Inseparably from the signifier in any sign, engendered by the signifier is what Saussure calls the signified as the mental concept. The word “chair” in English made up the signifier /c/, /h/, /a/, /i/ and /g/, what is engendered for the hearers is not the real chair but a mental concept of “chariness”.

These two inseparable of the Signified (mental concept) and the Signifier (material aspect) are described as the following diagram:

---

2. The general phenomenon of language (in French, langage) is made up by two factors, between parole (individual acts of speech) and langue (a system of difference between sign).\textsuperscript{18}

3. According to Saussure, the linguistic research must concern in Synchronic aspect before Diachronic aspect. Saussure describes this vital distinction as: “Synchronic linguistic will be concerned with the logical and physiological relations that bind together coexisting terms and form a system in the collective mind of the speaker. And Diachronic linguistics, on the contrary, will study relations that bind together successive terms not perceived by the collective mind but substituted for each other without forming a system.”\textsuperscript{19}

b. Charles Sander Pierce

Charles Sander Pierce, the founder of the philosophical doctrine as pragmatism, he defines a sign in the term of semiosis as “...something which stands to somebody for something in some respect or capacity...”. In this term, Pierce determines the subject of the sign as the part that unseparated from the prose of the signification. The Triadic model of Pierce (representamen + objek + interpretant = sign), show the important role of the subject in the language transformation. The sign according to Pierce is which stand in the proces of the unlimited

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid, p.15.
semiosis, or the prose of the unlimited semiosis series, which creating the interpretant in the nethe writerst form.\(^{20}\)

This is the triange model or the semiosis by Pierce:

![Triangle model of semiosis by Pierce](image)

(Figure 5. Meaning element from Pierce)

In the other name, a *sign*, is a fisrtines which stand in such a genuine triadic relation to a secondes, called it *object*, as to be capable on determining the thirdnes, called *representament*.

From this triadic model, Pierce determines the sign clasification. *Ground* or a *sign* itself clasified into Qualisign (quality on sign), Signsing (actual event on sign), and Legisign (a role or norm or a habit on sign).

Based on *object*, Pierce clasified a sign into Icon (the connection betthe writer en sign and object becouse its similiarities), Index (the connection betthe writer en sign and object its causalities and effect), and Symbol (the connection betthe writer en sign and object becouse the convention on the social agreement).

On the interpretant, a sign classified on Rheme (a sign interpreted to represent based on the choices), Dicisign (a sign interpreted to represent based on the fact), and the Argument (a sign interpreted to represent on the reason on something else).

One of signs form is words hence, the object is something that referred by sign. In one hand, interpretant is the concept of sign in the people mind. If the three elements are merged together in people mind or though, it will be appeared a meaning about what the sign is represented.

A. The Relation Between Speech and Componential Analysis

Speech is a complete and coherence sentence that constructed in whole word. The optional word is advised in making speech, in order to emphasize what will be leaded. The power of speech can change the world, so classification of word into the excellent component is the goal of making speech.

The selection of words in making speech as logical structure in order to perceive hearers is the only way to get their empathy, because words constitute lexical forms that are conventionally related or paired to meaning, and these form-meaning pairings are stored in a mental dictionary or lexicon.
Good and logical component words of speech reacts hearer to do something. The general interaction with the orator and hearer will be built, if the structural components of words are selected as the well as possible.

B. The Relation Between Speech and Sign Meaning

Speech produces meaning. Meaning has three components: sign, reference of sign and the signifier. The system of sign will construct the whole text in the speech until become meaning in definition of denotative and connotative. The role and definition of meaning is different.

After exploring the theory, the writer assumes that studying analyses of text has varieties approaches, each approaches has a weakness. A sign analysis text only focuses on the sign as system in determining meaning denotative and connotative. In one hand, the componential analysis focuses on the constructed meaning as structural component which is determining meaning in making vocabulary as varieties meaning.

In conclusion, the writers as the researcher takes advantage to merge those two different approaches in one research as general sense that semantics analysis in this research is a component theory within a larger semiotic theory about meaningful, symbolic, behavior. Hence the writer have not only a semantics of natural language utterances or acts, but also of nonverbal or preverbal behavior, such as gestures, pictures and films, logical systems or computer languages, sign languages of the deaf, and perhaps social interaction in general.
Classification of meanings component in the text of Bush speech

### Part I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun forms</th>
<th>Pressure (volition/non-volition)</th>
<th>Antagonism (conditional/active)</th>
<th>Power (operation/non operation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terror</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disarmament</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torture</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulwark</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb form</th>
<th>Pressure (volition/non-volition)</th>
<th>Antagonism (conditional/active)</th>
<th>Power (operation/non operation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invaded</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrain</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforce</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destroy</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disarm</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confront</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage to war</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective Form</th>
<th>Pressure (volition/non-volition)</th>
<th>Antagonism (conditional/active)</th>
<th>Power (operation/non operation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

21 This table illustration is taken from a classification of Roget's Thesaurus of English Words & Phrases.
The word *war* has a meaning as duel on an extensive scale. If we
would conceive as a unit the countless number of duels which make up a war,
we shall do the best by supposing to ourselves two wrestlers. Each strives by
physical force to compel the other to submit to his will; each endeavors to
throw his adversary, and thus render him incapable of further resistance. War
therefore is an act of violence intended to compel our opponent to fulfill our
will. Violence arms itself with the inventions of Art and Science in order to
contend against violence. Self-imposed restrictions, almost imperceptible and
hardly worth mentioning, termed usages of International Law, accompany it
without essentially impairing its power.

*Violence,* that is to say, physical force (for there is no moral force
without the conception of States and Law), is therefore the means; the
compulsory submission of the enemy to our will is the ultimate object. In
order to attain this object fully, the enemy must be disarmed, and disarmament
becomes therefore the immediate object of hostilities in theory. It takes the
place of the final object, and puts it aside as something we can eliminate from
our calculations.

The word *invaded* has similar meaning with the term of *war*; thesaurus
compiled that invaded has a meaning as wage to war.\(^{22}\) As the supplementary

\(^{22}\) Peter Mark Rogert, *Roget’s Thesaurus Of English Words and Phrases*, (USA, Longman), p. 464
meanings components of war, this word is associated with the structural relation as temporal meaning.

The word against, has a meaning as opposition in. The context use of term against in those texts is Iraq under control of Saddam Husain is different and disagrees with all the policy of USA. War is the only way to resolve his volition. Recognizing the threat to our country, the United States Congress voted overwhelmingly last year to support the use of force against Iraq.

Finding word of force needs much time in order to know the exact definition. But, the writer will find the suitable meaning based on the context use of the word. There are definitions of force as quantity of levity, deranged, compulsion and force in operation (war). The used of words constitute of supporting idea of operation of war as legal attack to defeat someone.

The word dictator has meaning as teach, speak direct, advice, dominate, compel and tyrant.23 This lexeme is repeated by bush fourth times to claim and spread a term that his enemy is really tyrant of the nation. Indeed, who is really dictator?

1. The United States and other nations have pursued patient and honorable efforts to disarm the Iraqi regime without war. The signifiers are letters or words as individual unit and signified about: Meaningful expression as social interaction in general to legalize attack, logical perception of doing a war and showing his authority of making decision of war.

---

23 Ibid, p. 534, 579, 689, 735
The first signified concept about meaningful expression as social interaction in general to legalize attack can be understood by viewing the concept of persuasive term to convince people to do war. The signifier of the text is *Iraqi regime*; Bush uses this expression as the representation of the object that should be attacked by war.

The second signified about the concept of war, based on the mental perception as Saussure explains as signified. There is no resolution except war. The signifier of war is *Iraqi regime* as the representation of legal war.

The third signified about the concept of the authority of making decision, the phrase “The United States and other nations have pursued patient and honorable efforts to disarm the *Iraqi regime* without war” influences to people that USA is the only nation that can make all decisions of war beyond other nations.

After knowing signified and signifier, the other step to understand sign meaning is determining and identifying a connotation meaning. Analyzing meaning in connotation term is needed to know the context use of the term at the time. The connotation meaning in the text above interpreted as signal of authority to legalize and attack war.

A. Conclusions

By approaching componential analysis, we will know what the exact sets construction of whole word in the texts. In other hand, by approaching
sign theory, we will get the connotation (cultural, ideology) meaning of the usage texts.

After explaining the research, finally the writer concludes the research as the following:

1. It can be inferred that the language use in Bush speech on Iraq war is included as associated as one set of cultural meaning (supplementary of meanings component) and structural relation of internal, mostly the relation is logical or temporal relation meaning (diagnostic of meanings component)

2. The speech, as text, is framed within a particular yet uneasy political context in which several segments of the speech analyzed are problems mediated by hidden ideological assumptions and power relationships.

3. The relation between component as unit lexemes and sign as signified and signifier of meaning is directly supported and correlated with the idea of doing legalization war.

B. Suggestion

According to the conclusion above, the writer suggests some points to the reader who wants to analyze the texts of Bush speech and Rove on Iraq war by finding the relationship of componential and sign theory:

1. The text of Bush speech on Iraq war uses any unfair meaning to maintain their wills to force a war. The set components which
constituted word in the texts are logical perception to distort audience and people conception.

2. The audience, reader and people in general should be more understand about the purpose of the text above. They have to be more understand and aware about the logical meaning and sign manipulation in the texts.

Finally, the writer hopes that this study will be useful for the future semantic research. Especially for the English letter department students who want to analyze the semantic research.
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APPENDIX

Full text: Bush's speech

A transcript of George Bush's war ultimatum speech from the Cross Hall in the White House

- guardian.co.uk, Tuesday 18 March 2003 02.22 GMT

My fellow citizens, events in Iraq have now reached the final days of decision. For more than a decade, the United States and other nations have pursued patient and honorable efforts to disarm the Iraqi regime without war. That regime pledged to reveal and destroy all its weapons of mass destruction as a condition for ending the Persian Gulf War in 1991.

Since then, the world has engaged in 12 years of diplomacy. We have passed more than a dozen resolutions in the United Nations Security Council. We have sent hundreds of weapons inspectors to oversee the disarmament of Iraq. Our good faith has not been returned.

The Iraqi regime has used diplomacy as a ploy to gain time and advantage. It has uniformly defied Security Council resolutions demanding full disarmament. Over the years, U.N. weapon inspectors have been threatened by Iraqi officials, electronically bugged, and systematically deceived. Peaceful efforts to disarm the Iraqi regime have failed again and again -- because we are not dealing with peaceful men.

Intelligence gathered by this and other governments leaves no doubt that the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised. This regime has already used weapons of mass destruction against Iraq's neighbors and against Iraq's people.

The regime has a history of reckless aggression in the Middle East. It has a deep hatred of America and our friends. And it has aided, trained and harbored terrorists, including operatives of al Qaeda.

The danger is clear: using chemical, biological or, one day, nuclear weapons, obtained with the help of Iraq, the terrorists could fulfill their stated ambitions and kill thousands or hundreds of thousands of innocent people in our country, or any other.

The United States and other nations did nothing to deserve or invite this threat. But we will do everything to defeat it. Instead of drifting along toward tragedy, we will set a course toward safety. Before the day of horror can come, before it is too late to act, this danger will be removed.
The United States of America has the sovereign authority to use force in assuring its own national security. That duty falls to me, as Commander-in-Chief, by the oath I have sworn, by the oath I will keep.

Recognizing the threat to our country, the United States Congress voted overwhelmingly last year to support the use of force against Iraq. America tried to work with the United Nations to address this threat because we wanted to resolve the issue peacefully. We believe in the mission of the United Nations. One reason the UN was founded after the second world war was to confront aggressive dictators, actively and early, before they can attack the innocent and destroy the peace.

In the case of Iraq, the Security Council did act, in the early 1990s. Under Resolutions 678 and 687 - both still in effect - the United States and our allies are authorized to use force in ridding Iraq of weapons of mass destruction. This is not a question of authority, it is a question of will.

Last September, I went to the U.N. General Assembly and urged the nations of the world to unite and bring an end to this danger. On November 8, the Security Council unanimously passed Resolution 1441, finding Iraq in material breach of its obligations, and vowing serious consequences if Iraq did not fully and immediately disarm.

Today, no nation can possibly claim that Iraq has disarmed. And it will not disarm so long as Saddam Hussein holds power. For the last four-and-a-half months, the United States and our allies have worked within the Security Council to enforce that Council's long-standing demands. Yet, some permanent members of the Security Council have publicly announced they will veto any resolution that compels the disarmament of Iraq. These governments share our assessment of the danger, but not our resolve to meet it. Many nations, however, do have the resolve and fortitude to act against this threat to peace, and a broad coalition is now gathering to enforce the just demands of the world. The United Nations Security Council has not lived up to its responsibilities, so we will rise to ours.

In recent days, some governments in the Middle East have been doing their part. They have delivered public and private messages urging the dictator to leave Iraq, so that disarmament can proceed peacefully. He has thus far refused. All the decades of deceit and cruelty have now reached an end. Saddam Hussein and his sons must leave Iraq within 48 hours. Their refusal to do so will result in military conflict, commenced at a time of our choosing. For their own safety, all foreign nationals - including journalists and inspectors - should leave Iraq immediately.

Many Iraqis can hear me tonight in a translated radio broadcast, and I have a message for them. If we must begin a military campaign, it will be directed against the lawless men who rule your country and not against you. As our coalition takes away their power, we will deliver the food and medicine you need.
We will tear down the apparatus of terror and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free. In a free Iraq, there will be no more wars of aggression against your neighbors, no more poison factories, no more executions of dissidents, no more torture chambers and rape rooms. The tyrant will soon be gone. The day of your liberation is near.

It is too late for Saddam Hussein to remain in power. It is not too late for the Iraqi military to act with honor and protect your country by permitting the peaceful entry of coalition forces to eliminate weapons of mass destruction. Our forces will give Iraqi military units clear instructions on actions they can take to avoid being attacked and destroyed. I urge every member of the Iraqi military and intelligence services, if war comes, do not fight for a dying regime that is not worth your own life.

And all Iraqi military and civilian personnel should listen carefully to this warning. In any conflict, your fate will depend on your action. Do not destroy oil wells, a source of wealth that belongs to the Iraqi people. Do not obey any command to use weapons of mass destruction against anyone, including the Iraqi people. War crimes will be prosecuted. War criminals will be punished. And it will be no defense to say, "I was just following orders."

Should Saddam Hussein choose confrontation, the American people can know that every measure has been taken to avoid war, and every measure will be taken to win it. Americans understand the costs of conflict because we have paid them in the past. War has no certainty, except the certainty of sacrifice.

Yet, the only way to reduce the harm and duration of war is to apply the full force and might of our military, and we are prepared to do so. If Saddam Hussein attempts to cling to power, he will remain a deadly foe until the end. In desperation, he and terrorists groups might try to conduct terrorist operations against the American people and our friends. These attacks are not inevitable. They are, however, possible. And this very fact underscores the reason we cannot live under the threat of blackmail. The terrorist threat to America and the world will be diminished the moment that Saddam Hussein is disarmed.

Our government is on heightened watch against these dangers. Just as we are preparing to ensure victory in Iraq, we are taking further actions to protect our homeland. In recent days, American authorities have expelled from the country certain individuals with ties to Iraqi intelligence services. Among other measures, I have directed additional security of our airports, and increased Coast Guard patrols of major seaports. The Department of Homeland Security is working closely with the nation's governors to increase armed security at critical facilities across America.

Should enemies strike our country, they would be attempting to shift our attention with panic and weaken our morale with fear. In this, they would fail. No act of
theirs can alter the course or shake the resolve of this country. We are a peaceful people - yet we're not a fragile people, and we will not be intimidated by thugs and killers. If our enemies dare to strike us, they and all who have aided them, will face fearful consequences.

We are now acting because the risks of inaction would be far greater. In one year, or five years, the power of Iraq to inflict harm on all free nations would be multiplied many times over. With these capabilities, Saddam Hussein and his terrorist allies could choose the moment of deadly conflict when they are strongest. We choose to meet that threat now, where it arises, before it can appear suddenly in our skies and cities.

The cause of peace requires all free nations to recognize new and undeniable realities. In the 20th century, some chose to appease murderous dictators, whose threats were allowed to grow into genocide and global war. In this century, when evil men plot chemical, biological and nuclear terror, a policy of appeasement could bring destruction of a kind never before seen on this earth.

Terrorists and terror states do not reveal these threats with fair notice, in formal declarations - and responding to such enemies only after they have struck first is not self-defense, it is suicide. The security of the world requires disarming Saddam Hussein now.

As we enforce the just demands of the world, we will also honor the deepest commitments of our country. Unlike Saddam Hussein, we believe the Iraqi people are deserving and capable of human liberty. And when the dictator has departed, they can set an example to all the Middle East of a vital and peaceful and self-governing nation.

The United States, with other countries, will work to advance liberty and peace in that region. Our goal will not be achieved overnight, but it can come over time. The power and appeal of human liberty is felt in every life and every land. And the greatest power of freedom is to overcome hatred and violence, and turn the creative gifts of men and women to the pursuits of peace.

That is the future we choose. Free nations have a duty to defend our people by uniting against the violent. And tonight, as we have done before, America and our allies accept that responsibility.

Good night, and may God continue to bless America