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ABSTRACT


The aim of this research is to describe the meaning relation and semantic change that happened in euphemistic terms that found in the script Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono speech at John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. The writer applies descriptive-qualitative method to describe the types of meaning relation and semantic change that happened in euphemistic terms. In the collecting data the writer applies the documentation method in which the script found on the book Words That Shook the World written by Richard Greene. Data analysis continued by using descriptive method. From all the data analysis taken from the speech, the writer found 1.08% euphemism used in the speech, the types of euphemism used are metonymy (32%), understatement (61%), and abstraction (7%). The writer found that 9 euphemistic terms out of 11 data does have synonymy relation, but only 2 euphemistic terms does not have semantic relation, they are respect and emerging. The writer also found that 5 euphemistic terms out of 11 data undergo the semantic narrowing, they are university, authoritarian, moderates, representative, and strategic, 3 euphemistic terms undergo the semantic broadening, they are conflict, problem, and low-income, 2 euphemistic terms undergo the semantic shift, they are respect and challenge, and 1 euphemistic terms undergo the amelioration, that is emerging.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of The Study

Language related to what the speaker experiences and how they react to people and their surroundings. There are some sort of code, moral, and culture limiting the ability of a speaker to express anything. Death, excretion, sex, body, religion, and politic are the subject which the speaker should be avoided because these topic are feared or believed by the society can give a harm to them. However, people itself can't avoid those topic. Things that shouldn’t be said doesn’t mean it can’t be said. One way to express those topic is using euphemism.

Euphemism, according to Rawson (1981) comes from the Greek word euphemos, meaning "auspicious/goodfortunate speech/kind" which in turn is derived from the Greek root- words eu "good/well" + pheme "speech/speaking". Fromklin and Rodman (1998) states that euphemism is “a word or phrase that replace a taboo word or serves to avoid frightening or unpleasant subjects”. Death for instance, believed by some society as a frightening subject. In order to talk about it, speaker use different expression such as “pass away”. This kind of expression used because death is believed as tabo.
According to Wardaugh (1986) Taboo is “one way in which society express its disapproval of certain kinds of behavior believed to be harmful to its member, either for supernatural reason or because such behavior is held to violate a moral code.” The word taboo borrowed from Tongan, a Polynesian language, in which it refers to acts that forbidden or to be avoided. Taboo related to many human activity or custom. It based on moral judgment, religious beliefs, or cultural norm.

Euphemism itself is a product of taboo. Fromklin dan Rodman (1998) states that “the existence of taboo words or taboo ideas stimulates the creation of euphemism.” If there is something taboo to say, people use another expression to avoid taboo. Because when the act is considered taboo, reference to this act may also became taboo.

Although, euphemism are less obvious than taboo. It appears in almost every our activity, written or spoken, formal and informal speech. Rawson (1981:1) states that “Euphemisms are powerful linguistic tools that are embedded so deeply in our language that few of us, even those who pride themselves on being plainspoken, ever get through a day without using them.” Euphemism allow people not only to avoid taboo but also to talk unpleasant things and neutralize the unpleasantness. We are constantly renaming things and repackaging them to make them sound better (Wardhaugh: 86). For instance, college is euphemism for university, position for job, limb for leg, and etc.
Allan and Burridge (2006) states that euphemism is driven by many things: euphemism can be motivated by desire not to offend, but also motivated by the wish to display in-group identity markers, the wish to upgrade to whatever they denote, and even the display of wit, to blur the reality, not so much to avoid offence, but to deceive.

Euphemism can also found in political speaking and writing. George Orwell in Politics and English Language stated that, “political language has consist largely of Euphemism, question-begging and sheer cloudy vagueness.” It is because political language itself “are largely the defense of the indefensible.” The act of kill which society against and considered as killing a person is taboo were disguised by expression such as final solution of special treatment, a generalized term for covering up crisis, catastrophe, death, disaster, etc. disguised into incident.

These euphemism uses to dissociate meaning from its reality and give a new sense for an act which leads to the meaning became broader, narrower, or even became a new perceived meaning. Although euphemism may have change, there might be some meaning relation undergoes between euphemistic expression and non-euphemistic expression (dysphemism).

This meaning relation occurs because word have the same semantic feature share between them or to distinguish itself from one to another. Hence, together with above explanation, the writer has in mind to bring about the research “A Semantics Study of Euphemism of Susilo Bambang
Yudhoyono Speech at John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University”. In this thesis, the writer intends to describe in detail meaning relation and semantic change undergone by euphemism terms that used in that speech based on the theory cited in theoretical framework

B. Focus of The Study

In doing the research, the writer would like to limit the discussion on semantic issue such as meaning relation and semantic change of euphemism taken from Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono speech at John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. The data are also found on the book Words That Shook the World. Addendum: the first decade of 21st century written by Richard Greene. In analyzing the data, the writer applies semantic theory proposed by Leech, Lyons, Jackson, Ogden and Richard, and soon.

The writer applies those theories in order to get all data of euphemism in that story can be used to analyze completely. The writer also chooses the data from scripts Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono speech at John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University after considering that these might be the best data for the analysis. It is because the speech goes a lot of area of relation between Muslim World and West World which have been going for many decades.
C. Research Question

Based on the background of the study, the writer formulates the research through the following question:

1. What is type of euphemism found from speech script of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono at John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University?
2. How do semantic change of euphemism terms from speech script of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono at John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University?

D. Significance of The Study

Basically, the significance of this research is to increase the study about linguistics especially about euphemism that related to semantic change in order to know what kind of words called “Euphemism”.

This study hopefully has some benefits for all students, especially at UIN English Letter Department student. Moreover, in this study, the student can apply their knowledge and comprehension in the appropriate daily conversation, especially in formal occasion.

E. Research Methodology

1. The Objective of Research

The objectives of this research are:
1. Describing the type of euphemism terms taken from the speech scripts of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono at John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University and giving explanation and giving explanation what kind of meaning relation give to euphemism terms applying componential analysis.

2. Giving explanation what kind of semantic change involve in the use euphemism terms.

2. Method of Research

According to Hammersley (2013), qualitative research is a method that tends to adopt data-driven research design, to use relatively unstructured data, to emphasize the essential role of subjectivity in the research process tends studying a small number of cases and usually used verbal rather than statistical forms of analysis. On the other hand, Holloway (1997) said that qualitative research is a form of social inquiry that focused on the way people interpret and make sense of their experiences and the world they live. Denzin and Lincoln (2005) said that qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consist of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. This means that qualitative research studying things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. To sum up, qualitative research is a type of social science
research that uses non-numerical data to interpret the meaning by using some theories on interpretation and human experience. This research used qualitative research because the Writer used a transcript data from the speech which is verbal data and the analysis will focus on the state of mind and ideas of the speakers.

3. The Instrument of The Research

The instrument in this research is the writer himself by collecting and noting the word related to the euphemism. The word will be analyzed carefully using the step formulated in the technique of data analysis and giving the explanation based on the theories used in this research. Besides analyzing the data, the writer also puts it as the evidence in this research.

4. Unit of Analysis

The analysis unit of the research is the scripts of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono speech at John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. The script of the speech are also found on the book Words That Shook the World. Addendum: the first decade of 21st century written by Richard Greene. The book published by Red and White Publishing in 2010. It is an acknowledgement of President Barack Obama and Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono for their speech.
5. Technique of Data Analysis

In this study, the main data will be analyzed by some ways. The writer use method to analyze the data in this study should be outlined in order to the writer doesn’t find confusion and go out of this study.

Here, the writer applies descriptive method that is a method used in order to make a description, an illustration, or a picture systematically, factually and accurately about the fact. Howard, Jackson (1984) states that the technique used to verify the semantics properties is binary semantic features. Next the data will be analyzed by using core meaning analysis. It is used to find the meaning of word, even though the data is not in a sentence.

In order to succeed in this research, the writer benefited the qualitative analysis data by implementing the following procedures:

a. Collecting the books that are relevant to semantics theory and the euphemism.

b. Reading and understanding some theories of semantic theory and euphemism.

c. Reading the scripts of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono speech at John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

d. Describing the euphemistic term found from the script of the speech.

e. Analyzing the data by using the set of components to
compare and identify the meaning relation and semantic change.

f. Analyzing the data by using core meaning analysis that is a technique to find out the meaning of the word even though the word is not in sentence.

6. Research Design

According to Flick (2007), he has described research design as a systematic plan for a research project, including who to integrate in research (sampling), who or what to compare for which dimension, etc. Additionally, Hammersley and Atkinson (in Flick: 2007) argue that research design should be reflexive process which operates throughout every stage of a project. In conclusion research design is a blueprint that explains a brief description about the process of research operates step by step.

The data of the research are the scripts Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono speech at John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. The data are also found on the book Words That Shook the World. Addendum: the first decade of 21st century written by Richard Greene. First, the writer reading the script, searching for euphemistic terms from the speech that guided by the speech scripts and giving a mark on euphemistic terms which are going to be observed. After the data already classified, the next step is using note technique to make a list
of euphemism and then classify into types of speech, then analyzing the euphemistic term and giving explanation what kind of semantic change involved in the use of euphemistic term by applying componential analysis. The output of this research is to explain the euphemism and semantic theory involve in the use of euphemistic terms.

The scripts Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono speech at John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. The data are also found on the book Words That Shook the World written by Richard.

Reading the script, searching for euphemistic terms from the speech that guided by the speech scripts and giving a mark on euphemistic terms which are going to be observed.

The result of semantic change involve in the euphemistic term used by Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono.

Analyzing the euphemistic term and giving explanation what kind of semantic theory involved in the use of euphemistic term by applying componential analysis.

Diagram: Research Design
CHAPTER II

THE THEORETICAL DESCRIPTION

A. Previous Research

In purpose to complete and develop the research, here are several related previous research the writer look up to:

The first is a journal by Oksana V. Shemshurenko and Liliya Sh. Shafigullina from Kazan Federal University, Rusia. The paper is study the approaches to the definitions of "euphemism" and "political correctness" offered by Russian and Western linguists, to analyze the classifications and functional peculiarities of euphemisms within the framework of the theory of political correctness.

The second is a thesis by Resmita Siska from Faculty of Adab and Humaniora, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah, Jakarta. This thesis using the theory of euphemism proposed by Allan and Burridge (1991). This thesis describe the meaning relation and semantic change happened in euphemistic terms that found in the script “Jennifer’s Body” movie using componential analysis.

The third is a thesis by Farid Munfaati from Faculty of Humanity and Culture, UIN Malang. This thesis using the theory of euphemism proposed by Allan and Burridge (1991). This thesis describe the types, the styles, and the function of euphemism used in headline of political articles in reuters.com.
B. Theoretical Framework

1. Euphemism

A. Definition of Euphemism

Rawson (1995) explains that the word *euphemism* comes from the Greek word *euphemos*, meaning "auspicious/good/fortunate speech/kind" which in turn is derived from the Greek root- words *eu* "good/well" + *pheme* "speech/speaking". The *eupheme* was originally a word or phrase used in place of a religious word or phrase that should not be spoken aloud; etymologically, the *eupheme* is the opposite of the *blaspheme* (evil-speaking). From the word’s root of euphemism we can conclude that euphemism is speak in good way.

Wardaugh (1986: 237) states that euphemism refers to certain things are not said. Not because people do not talk about those things, or, if those things are talked about, they are talked in very roundabout ways. It means that euphemism focuses on way when people or speaker communicates or people write. Euphemism considers the ways in communication and it has main purposes for politeness between the speaker and hearer especially reader. In written, it can be considered by the writer in writing.

Fromklin (1990:269) states that euphemism is a word of phrase that replaces a tabooos word or serves to avoid frightening or unpleasant subject. He says that it refers to prohibition on the use of mention of association on with particular objects or persons. It can be said that some
speakers would claim that utterance of taboo term would offend their own sensibilities because of the supposed unpleasantness or ugliness of the taboo term themselves.

Euphemism usually to express in direct terms, Rawson (1995) explains the euphemism is a word (a phrase) which people use in place of terms which more disagreeable or offensive to themselves to their audience. It means that when a phrase becomes a euphemism, its literal meaning is often pushed aside. Euphemism is used to hide unpleasant ideas, when the term for them is not necessary offensive.

According to Rawson (1981) euphemisms can be divided into two general types: positive and negative. The positive ones inflate and magnify, making the euphemized items seem altogether grander and more important than they really are. The negative euphemisms deflate and diminish. They are defensive in nature, offsetting the power of tabooed terms and otherwise eradicating from the language everything that people prefer not to deal with directly.

Positive euphemisms include the many fancy occupational titles, which salve the egos of workers by elevating their job status: custodian for janitor (itself a euphemism for caretaker), counsel for lawyer, and so forth. Other kinds of positive euphemisms include personal honorifics such as colonel, the honorable, and major, and the many institutional euphemisms, which convert madhouses into mental hospitals, colleges into universities,
and small business establishments into *emporiums, parlors, salons,* and *shoppes.* The desire to improve one's surroundings also is evident in geographical place names, most prominently in the case of the distinctly nongreen *Greenland* (attributed to an early real estate developer named Eric the Red), but also in the designation of many small burgs as *cities,* and in the names of some cities, such as *Troy,* New York (*née* Vanderheyden's Ferry, its name-change in 1789 began a fad for adopting classical place names in the United States).

Negative, defensive euphemisms are extremely ancient. It was the Greeks, for example, who transformed the Furies into the *Eumenides* (the Kindly Ones). In many cultures, it is forbidden to pronounce the name of God (hence, pious Jews say *Adonai*) or of Satan (giving rise to the *deuce,* the *good man,* the *great fellow,* the generalized *Devil,* and many other roundabouts). The names of the dead, and of animals that are hunted or feared, may also be euphemized this way. The bear is called *grandfather* by many peoples and the tiger is alluded to as the *striped one.*

When carried too far, which is what always seems to happen, positive and negative euphemisms tend finally to coalesce into an unappetizing mush of elegancies and genteelisms, in which the underlying terms are hardly worth the trouble of euphemizing, e.g., *ablutions* for washing, *bender* for knee, *dentures* for false teeth, *expectorate* for spit, *home* for house, etc.
B. Type of Euphemism

According to Allan and Burridge in “Euphemism and Dysphemism” mentioned that many euphemisms that are figurative can be formed through several ways, such as:

1. Metaphor used as means of comparing things that are essentially unlike in metaphor, the comparison is implied—that is, the figurative term is substituted for or identified with the literal term, for example: *miraculous pitcher* for “vagina”, *the cavalry’s come* replaces “I have got period”, *kick the buckers* for “die”.

2. Rhyming slang is a way of talking in which you use words or phrases that rhyme with the word you mean, instead of using that word, for example: *whistle* (and flute) for “suit”, *groan and grunt* for “cunt”, *jimmy-riddle* for “piss”.

3. Remodelling is the way of replacing part of the word like *sugar, shoot, and shucks* for “shit”, *tarnation* for “damnation” *darn, dang, and draft* for “Damn”, *tidbits* for “titbits”, *basket* for “bastard”, *cripes or crumb* for “Christ”, usually end up as one-for-one substitutions in which either the onset or rhyme of the dispreferred term is matched with that of a semantically word.

4. Circumlocution is a roundabout way of thinking (often includes in metaphor or metonymy). It is common in the form
of listen (compound or idiom) like little girl’s room for “toilet” and categorical inaccuracy or Terminology inexactitude for “lie”, rape become criminal sexual assault or a serious offense against a woman, feces become solid human waste, etc.

5. Clippings is the euphemisms starting off with a modifying word then the modifier is dropped as the phrase ceases to be euphemistic. For instance: Jeeze for “Jesus”, bra for “brassiere” (both end-clipped).

6. Acronyms are written and pronounced as the words in their own right like or acronym are proper word created from the initial letter or two of the words in phrase, and they are pronounced like others word, for instance snafu for “situation formal, all fucked up” or commfu “complete monumental military fuck up”, etc.

7. Abbreviations are written and pronounced as strings of letters like TS for “tough shit” etc.

8. Omission fall into:
   
a. Quasi-omission substitutes some no-lexical expression for the dispreferred term into dashes and asterisk like mmmm, er-mm, and soon.

b. Full-omission seems less common than quasi-omissions found need to go by omitting “to the lavatory”.  

c. One-for-one substitution is almost synonym and consists of two:

d. Metonymy: it is an associated concept making up for the one being referred to. It puts the words one-for-one-substitutions.

One name of change for another like the legal term person for “pennies” and region for “genitals”.

e. Synecdoche (part-for-whole euphemism) means to take with something else demonstrated in spend a penny for “go to the lavatory” and I’ve got a cough may occasionally ignore the accompanying “stuffed up nose, postnasal drip, and running nose”.

9. Hyperbole is simply exaggeration, but exaggeration in the service of truth, for example, flight to glory for “death”.

10. Understatement is saying less than one means. It is a construction whose primary is to abolish what it going to convey, like sleep for “die”, deed for “act of murder”. It is used to emphasis and to negate the opposite of what we wish to convey.

11. Abstraction.

The strength of particular taboos may be dissipated by casting ideas in the most general possible terms, also, abstractions, being quite opaque to the uninformed eye (and meaningless to the untrained ear) make ideal cover-up words. Often, it is only a
matter of finding the lowest common denominator. Thus, it, problem, situation, and thing may refer to anything under the sun: the child who keeps playing with it and the girl who is said to be doing it; problem days and problem drinking, the situation at the Three Mile Island, Pennsylvania, nuclear power plant, an economic thing (slump, recession, or depression), our thing (i.e., the Cosa Nostra), or the Watergate thing (elaborated by the president himself into the prething and the postthing).

12. Euphemism through borrowing.

The use of foreign language (Latin, France, etc) is considered to counteract taboo terms such as bodily effluvia, sex, and the associated acts and bodily organs. The used of perspire instead of “sweat” expectorate instead of “spit” defecate and feces instead of “shit”, genitals instead of “sex organs”, vagina instead of “cunt”.

C. Taboo

Wardaugh (1986) explains that the word taboo borrowed from Tongan, a Polynesian language, in which it refers to acts that forbidden or to be avoided. When an act is taboo, reference to this act may also became taboo.

Keith Allan and Kate Burridge, Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language said in contemporary western society, taboo
and euphemism are closely related to the concepts of politeness and face (basically, a person's self-image). Generally, social interaction is oriented toward behavior that is gracious and respectful, or at least inoffensive. Participants have to consider whether what they are saying will maintain, enhance, or damage their own face, as well as to be considerate of, and care for, the face needs of others.

Leech (1974: 40) described that, “language expresses the feeling and attitude of the speaker and writer. In conversation, people tend to use language with many variations in order to deliver what they want. In daily life, when someone speak to other their usually use feeling to avoid of using bad words whenever it is something taboo to say it.”

Common swear words such as “fuck! Include taboo words. Hence to avoid words seen as offensive, obscene, or somehow disturbing to listeners or readers, the taboo words will be euphemized. It is like what Allan stated in Natural Semantics Language as follows: A taboo term, a strong dysphemism, is often replaced by more positively euphemistic words or phrase whose original meaning has been semantically extended to create a new sense for it. For instance, instead of saying “my father died” someone may said “my father passed away.”
2. Semantics

A. Definition of Semantics

Semantics, cited from Keidler (1998), is the systematic study of meaning, and linguistic semantics is the study of how language organize and express meanings. Fromklin (1997) said that the study of the linguistic meaning of morphemes, words, phrases, and sentences is called semantics.

Keidler (1998) also said that linguistic semantics is an attempt to explicate the knowledge of any speaker to communicate facts, feelings, intentions and products of the imagination to other speakers and to understand what they communicate to him or her. Semantics is one part of the grammar. Subfield of semantics are lexical semantics, which is concerned with the meaning of words and the meaning relationships among words; and phrasal or sentential semantics, which is concerned with the meaning of syntactic units larger than the word.

B. Definition of Meaning

Mark Aronoff and Janie Rees (2002) in ‘The Handbook of Linguistics” cited that when people talk, they generally talk about things, events, and situations in the world. They are able to do this because they represent connections between the expression of their language and extra-linguistic phenomena in a fully systematic way. The meaning of a sentence is to a large extend, dependent on the ways in
which the words and phrases from which it is constructed can be related to situation in the world. Speakers of a language can speak effectively with each other, because they have internalized the same rules for pairing the lexical items, and they used the same procedures for computing the meaning of a syntactically complex phrase from the meanings of its parts.

Leech (1974) dividing meaning into:

a. Meaning as reference

It is said that the meaning of linguistics sign is what that sign refer to, what it stand for in the real word.

b. Meaning as mental concept

It is considered that the meaning of linguistics sign is the mental concept it stand for, that the meaning of a word is the idea it conveys or arouses in the mind of the speaker or hearer.

c. Meaning as usage

It is the meaning of a word as the ability to use that word in ways other people will understand, and to understand it when uttered by other people.

C. Type of Meaning

According to Geoffrey Leech (1974) in his ‘Semantics a Study of meaning’ breaks down meaning into seven types or ingredients giving primacy to conceptual meaning.
The Seven types of meaning according to Leech are as follows.


Conceptual meaning is sometimes called denotative meaning or cognitive meaning, it is widely assumed to be the central factor in linguistic communication. Larson noted that denotative meaning is also called as primary meaning, that is the meaning suggested by the word when it used alone. It is the first meaning or usage which a word will suggest to most people when the word is said in isolation. It is the meaning learned early in life and likely to have reference to a physical situation (Larson, 1984: 100).

The denotation of word is its agreed-upon sense what it refers to, stands for, or designates, a part from the feeling it may call up, and this again is able for a good deal on the context the words that appears in.

It is said that the aim of denotative meaning is to provide, for any given interpretation of a sentence, a configuration of abstract symbols, in which shows exactly what we need to know if we are to distinguish that meaning from all other possible sentence meaning in the language.

2. Connotative Meaning.

As we experience, words are human situations, they not only take on certain denotation, but also often acquire individual flavors. They have come to have emotive tone, the associations, and suggestiveness of the situation in which they have been a part. For example let us examine the words “brink”. This denotes on “edge”. However in the
phrase “The brink of the cliff” or” the brink of disaster” suggest
danger and its emotive tone is that of fear.

According to Leech (1974: 40-41) connotative meaning is the
communicative value an expression has by virtue of what it refers to,
over and above its purely conceptual content. It will be clear if we are
talking about connotation, we are in fact talking about the “real word
experience.” Someone associates with an expression when someone
uses and hears it. The fact that if we compared connotative meaning
with denotative meaning is that connotations are relatively unstable;
that is they vary considerably we have seen, according to culture,
historical period, and the experience of the individual.

Although all the speaker of particular language speaks the language
exactly the same conceptual framework, actually each of them has
individual perception of words. Connotative meaning is indeterminate
and open in the same way as our knowledge and belief about the
universe are opened-ended. Connotations play a major role in the
language of literature, of politics, of advertising, and a greeting card.

3. Stylistic Meaning.

Stylistic meaning is that which a piece of language conveys about
the circumstances of its use. A recent account of English has
recognized some main dimensions of stylistic variation. For instance:

a. They chucked a stone at the cops, and then did a bunk with the
   loot.
b. After casting a stone at the police, they absconded with the money.

Sentence (1) could be said by the two criminals, talking casually about the crime afterwards; sentence (2) might be said by the chief of the police in making the official report; both could describe the same happening (Leech, 1974: 15).

4. Affective Meaning.

Affective meaning is a sort of meaning which an effect the personal feeling of speakers, including his/her attitude to the listener, or his/her attitude to something he/she talking about. In order to get people attention to be quiet, we might say either (1)”I’m terribly sorry to interrupt, but I wonder if you would be so kind as to lower your voice as a little” or (2) “Will you belt up”. Factors such as intonation and voice timbre are also important here. The impression of politeness in the sentence (1) can be reserved by tone of biting sarcasm; sentence (2) can be turn into a playful remark between intimates if delivered with the intonation of a mild request.

5. Reflected Meaning.

Reflected meaning involves an interconnection on the lexical level of language, it is the meaning, which arises in case of multiple conceptual meaning, when one senses of word forms part of our response to another sense. For instance, on hearing the Church service,
the synonymous expressions The Comforter and The Holy Ghost both refer to the Third Trinity, but the Comforter sounds warm and comforting, while the Holy Ghost sounds awesome.

6. Collocative Meaning.

Collocative meaning consists of the associations a word acquires on account of the meanings of the words, which tends to occur in its environment. For instance the words pretty and handsome share common ground in the meaning of good looking. But may be distinguished by the range of noun in which they are like to occur or collocate; Pretty woman and handsome man. The ranges may well match although they suggest a different kind of attractiveness of the adjectives.

7. Thematic Meaning.

This is the final category of meaning, thematic meaning is the meaning that is communicated by the way in which the speaker or writer organizes the message, in terms of ordering, focus, and emphasis. It is often felt an active sentence such as (1) below has a different meaning from its passive equivalent (2) although in conceptual content they seem to be the same (Leech. 1974: 19).

a. Mrs. Bessie Smith donated the first prize.

b. The first prize was donated by Mrs. Bessie Smith

We can assume that the active sentence answers an implicit question “what did Mrs. Bessie Smith donate?”, while the passive sentence
answer the implicit question “who donates the first prize?”, that in other words (1) in contrast to (2) suggest that we know who Mrs. Bessie Smith.

3. Semantic Field

If we examine something of the nature of the relations words may enter into with other words of the same language that is sense relation: here we are concerned with so called semantic field. Lehrer (1974) cited that theories of semantic fields that the vocabulary of a language is structured, just as the grammar and phonology of language are structured – the words of language can be classified into sets which are related to conceptual field and divide up the semantic space or the semantic domain in certain ways. Nida explained that a semantic domain consist essentially of a group of meanings (by no means restricted to those reflected in single words) which share certain semantic components. For example when talking about a house, we can refer to the building and all of component itself such as window, door, floor, wall, root and ect. All of the component/ features of a house, we call as semantic field or semantic domain of house.

Lehrer as quoted by Akmajian (2001) noted that words belonging to the same semantic field undergo similar semantic change. Semantic field analysis uses feature to show the relationship of lexical items within a field or domain. For example, if we studied the word
iron, we would also look at toaster, vacuum cleaner, and the other items in the household tools domain. The features or components help us index the meaning of words, separate the various meanings of individual words, and analyze relationship between similar words. Matthews stated that semantics field is a distinct part of the lexicon defied by some general term or concept, e.g. in English the semantics field of color included words such as black, and red that distinguished colors, or are hyponyms of the more general term color.

Semantics field plays a role in semantic change. The words hot and cold are antonym describing physical temperature. With pair of antonyms, if one number undergoes a metaphorical extension, the other tends to change in a parallel position. In colloquial styles, we can speak of a hot car (stolen car), hence we would refer the phrase cold car to one that is not stolen, on the ground that semantic field in a parallel position, and not just single members of the field.

4. Componental Analysis

The assumption of systematic relationships of meaning between words is however independent of the problem of explaining the basis of these relationships: and considerable amount of detailed work on the structure of the vocabulary has been done in recent years. Many linguists have turned to what has been called componental analysis to give an explicit representation of the semantics relations between words.
Kempson added that in this theory words are analyzed not as unitary concepts but as complexes made up of components of meaning which are themselves semantic primitives. In this vein, *spinster* might be analyzed as a semantic complex made up of the features (equivalently called components or marker) [FEMALE], [NEVERMARRIED], [ADULT], [HUMAN]. This form of analysis was used in particular by anthropologist seeking to give an account of kinship terminology in various cultures.

Lehrer (1974) mentioned that semantic components (or features) are theoretical, constructs lexical item will be defined in terms of components. In a sense, a dictionary definition is an informal componential analysis, in which each part of the definition is a component.

O’Grady cited another approach to meaning to represent a word’s intention it down into smaller semantic components known as componential analysis or semantics decomposition. Many linguists have turned to componential analysis to give an explicit representation of the semantic relations between words. Then Lyon looked upon componential analysis is the broadening of the semantic field theory.

Leech (1974) stated that Componential analysis is a technique for describing interrelation of meaning by breaking concept down into minimal components, or features, which are distinctive in terms of a semantic opposition or dimension of contrast.
Meanwhile Allan in Euphemism and Dysphemism: language used as Shield and Weapon (1991:16) did support the usage the componential analysis to analyze euphemistic term by revealing that “the process involved here is a kind of componential analysis, the sense of the taboo terms are unpacked and each of the meaning components are listed... using this method, a new euphemism can easily be created”.

There are three kind of component of meaning:

1. Generic / Common component is one or more of components which are judged to be most significant factor. This component describes to which these lexem belong to as to differentiate it from other semantic domain. For instance: the lexemes man, woman, boy, and girl have the common component [HUMAN].

2. Diagnostic component is components that are important and sufficient to distinguish the sense of one lexeme from the sense of another lexeme. This diagnostic component is a core part that dictionary makers incorporate into their definition of words. For example” [ADULT] and [MALE] are the diagnostic components for man, woman, boy and girl.

3. Supplementary or incidental component is non-diagnostics components to identify the sense of the word. For instance: [MARRIED] is the incidental or supplementary components
for spinster, bachelor and wife.

Meanwhile, Jackson in *Word in Their Meaning* cited that are only 2 broad types of component. Those serve to identify a semantic domain, and to distinguish lexemes from each other within semantic domain. They are also shared by all the lexemes in the domain. Therefore, in this research, the writer is going to discuss only 2 types of components, common and diagnostic component.

Such as componential analysis can be applied many areas of the vocabularies. For example, the distinction between *murder* and *kill* can be stated explicitly and economically, if *murder* is analyzed as having a meaning which are components representing intention, causation, and death. Whereas *kill* as having the components that representing only causation and death. Using the method of componential analysis, we can then formally define synonymy, hyponymy, incompatibility etc. On the basis, a set of features follows that *spinster* is a hyponymy of *woman* because it contains all the features of *woman* as part of its specification, and that *spinster* is incompatible with *bachelor* by virtue of the contrast of sex specification and with *wife* by virtue of the material specification.

Another interpretation of lexical item of semantic components using a binary feature is conventionally written in capital letters and placed in square brackets, which is able to take only three values, either it is present [+], or it is absent [-], or it may be present or absent
[+/-] and also could be marked [0]. Accordingly *spinster* might be characterized as having for its meaning.

- [MALE] + [HUMAN] + [ADULT] - [MARRIED]

*Bachelor*, an item incompatible with *spinster*, as having

+ [MALE] + [HUMAN] + [ADULT] - [MARRIED]

*Wife*, another incompatible item, as having

- [MALE] + [HUMAN] + [ADULT] + [MARRIED]

### 5. Meaning Relation

When a word contains various relation of the meaning to one another, they may be related semantically. Words are connected by virtue of meaning from subgroups within the lexicon of the language. Words have a multiple sense, namely the primary and secondary meaning. The meaning relation is possibly derived by a variety of processes of semantic change. Semantic relations comprise synonymy, antonym or incompatible, hyponymy and meronymy defined by semantic field.

Lyon and Geckeler are of the opinion that there is a close relationship among semantic field, component analysis, and meaning relation. We should know that componential analysis is the broadening
of semantic field theory. The subset from all lexemes may create and blend the meaning relation of one element to the other.

Leech (1974) looked upon meaning relation under:

1. **Synonymy** is a relation in which words have same meaning. Yule added that we should keep in mind that the idea of ‘sameness’ of meaning in used in discussing synonymy is not necessarily ‘total sameness’. There are many occasions when one word is appropriate in a sentence but its synonymy would be odd. For example, whereas the word *answer* fits in the sentence *Sandy had only one answer correct on the test*, the word *replay* would sound odd.

2. **Antonym** is relation where words have opposite meaning. Akmajian (2001) added that “words can share an aspect of meaning but be ‘opposite’ in some other aspect of meaning called antonym”. Whereas Parera added there 2 kinds of antonym:
   a. **Contradiction or true antonym**: the opposite meanings of 2 items or lexemes are absolute. It consists of only 2 terms; the one is the opposite of the other.

   For example: *Alive* X *dead* that were visualized by Leech (1978:106) in diagram below:

   ‘alive’

   (+live)

   ‘dead’

   (-live)
3. **Hyponym** is a relation which is termed meaning inclusion of one meaning in another. Cruse reported that “the lexical relation corresponding to the inclusion of one class in another is hyponym”. For instance: in the sense of *crow, hawk, and duck* are included in *bird*. These typical terms mentioned that super ordinates as the upper term and hyponym as the lower term. Again a diagram will help:

Bird

[Crow hawk duck etc.]

4. **Meronymy** is relation which has hierarchical concept. Saeed (2004) pointed out meronymy is a concept used to explain a part–whole relationship between lexical items. To differentiate it from another hierarchical concept, meronymy can be identified by using “part of relationship. For instance: B is part of A, and A has B. This concept might be as follows:

Car

wheel seat engine door window etc

6. **Semantic Change**

Semantic change happens along with the time and the development of its society. According to Allan euphemism and
dysphemism motivate language change. They do it by promoting new expression or new meanings for old expression and causing existing vocabulary to be abounded.

Fromkin and Rodman stated that “there are three ways in which a lexical item may change semantically, its meaning may become broader, meaning may its meaning may become narrower, its meaning become shift”.

O’Grady stated that the changes involve one of the phenomena:

1. Semantic broadening is the process in which the meaning of a word turns into more general or more inclusive than the earlier form, such as: the word *aunt* used to mean “father’s sister” become father or mother’s sister”.

2. Semantic narrowing is process in which the meaning of a word turns into less general or less inclusive than the earlier meaning. Such as: the term *fowl* used to mean “any bird” becomes “a domestical bird”

3. Amelioration is the change of meaning in which the new meaning becomes more positive or favorable, such as: *pretty* used to mean “tricky, sly, cunning,” has a better meaning “attractive”.

4. Pejorative is the change of meaning in which the new meaning becomes more negative or unfavorable, such as: *Wench* means “girl”, but it is regarded worse with meaning”
wanton woman, prostitute”.

5. Semantic shift is a process in which a word loses some aspect of its former meaning, taking on a partially new, but related meaning. Such as: immoral used to mean “not customary” becomes “unethical”.

A. The Data Description

In this chapter, the writer analyzes the data taken from scripts of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono speech at John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. The writer chooses the speech because the speech undergoes the relation between Muslim World and West World which have been complicated from the last decades. War, terror, radicalism, and conflict are the main subject which can’t be denied from this relation and how the speaker put aside those topic by using euphemism to create a new perceived meaning. The euphemistic terms then categorized into types of euphemism which classified into the euphemistic application. After that, the writer goes to the next steps by analyzing the meaning relation and the semantic change the euphemistic terms undergo.

Based on the types of euphemism the writer found that there are three euphemistic terms in classification of metonymy, understatement, and abstraction as described at the following table:

Table: List of euphemism that found in the script of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono speech at John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Type of Euphemism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data 1</td>
<td>President Barack Obama delivered his speech at Al-Azhar University, one of the Oldest and best university in the Islamic world.</td>
<td>Metonymy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 2</td>
<td>These initiative should not always be confined to meetings of like-minded moderates, although this is also important.</td>
<td>Metonymy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 3</td>
<td>Today we are not a victim of past authoritarian, centralized government, but a model of democracy and decentralization.</td>
<td>Metonymy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 4</td>
<td>The G-20 is representative of a multi-civilizational global community.</td>
<td>Metonymy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 5</td>
<td>In the roller-coaster years following independence, Indonesia suffered separatist threats, ethnic and religious conflict, and Islamic insurgencies.</td>
<td>Understatement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 6</td>
<td>Out of 57 Muslim countries, 25 are classified as low-income countries, 18 lower middle income, and 14 as upper middle income or high income.</td>
<td>Understatement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 7</td>
<td>In Indonesia, elementary student are taught to respect religious tradition.</td>
<td>Understatement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 8</td>
<td>This is why Indonesia and America are now evolving a strategic partnership.</td>
<td>Understatement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indonesia today is a dynamic **emerging** economy, enjoying one of the highest growth rates in Asia after China and India.

In the roller-coaster years following independence, Indonesia suffered separatist threats, ethnic and religious conflict, and Islamic insurgencies. But we overcame these **challenges**.

But the answer to the world’s **problem** is are there, for it also there that hatred and prejudice breed.

---

**B. Data Analysis**

**1. Metonymy**

**Data 1: University**

(a) *President Barack Obama delivered his speech at Al-Azhar University, one of the Oldest and best university in the Islamic world.*

The word ‘university’ firstly used as described by Rawson (1981: 293) in 1870s and became widely used since 1876 to replace ‘college’. The term ‘university’, one of many institutional euphemism, used to make what it stands seem altogether grander and more important than they really are.

‘University’ is also a euphemistic metonymy. It is an associated concept making up for the one being referred to. It puts the words one-for-one-substitutions. The word ‘university’ has semantic features as follows:
The term of ‘university’ compromise more specific meaning to institution for academic degree. If ‘university’ replaced by intended reference, it will be:

(b) President Barack Obama delivered his speech at Al-Azhar University, one of the Oldest and best college in the Islamic world.

Sentence (b) is acceptable, but is not euphemism term expression because ‘college’ consist of components like:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ [PLACE] + [EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION] + [ACADEMIC DEGREE] + [UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT OR HIGER]</td>
<td>+ [PLACE] + [EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION] + [ACADEMIC DEGREE] + [UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT OR HIGER] + [HIGH SCHOOL]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For further information, the writer will identify the meaning relation by using semantic component of both words.
In description above semantic component, the writer finds out some component in common such as + [PLACE] + [EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION] + [ACADEMIC DEGREE] + [UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT OR HIGER] These similar components surely allow them replace each other (‘college’ can be replace by ‘university’) especially in the sentence: *President Barack Obama delivered his speech at Al-Azhar University, one of the Oldest and best university in the Islamic world.*

Base on description of semantic component, the writer conclude that they have synonymy relation, because those similar components allow ‘university’ to replace ‘college’, although the word ‘university’ has lesser components [HIGH SCHOOL] which refers to narrower meaning.

The new meaning ‘university’ become narrower than the previous one. It means that the new meaning is considered less general or more inclusive than the earlier one. According the above semantic components, ‘university’ and ‘college’ has identical components. The word ‘university’ has 4 (+) features and ‘college’ has 5 (+). It is clearly shown that the meaning gets narrower than previous one.

**Data 2: Moderates**

(a) *These initiative should not always be confined to meetings of like-minded moderates, although this is also important.*
According to Rawson (1981:184) the word ‘moderates’ is euphemism for more or less liberal. The term ‘moderates’ firstly used in 1976 to replace ‘liberal’. The term ‘moderates’ is coalition between positive and negative euphemism.

‘Moderates’ is also a euphemistic metonymy. It is an associated concept making up for the one being referred to. It puts the words one-for-one-substitutions. The word ‘moderates’ has semantic features as follows:

Moderates: + [CHARACTER] + [AVERAGE] + [MIDDLE] + [POLITICAL OR SOCIAL BELIEFS]

The term ‘moderates’ compromise more specific meaning for character on political or social beliefs. If ‘moderates’ replaced by intended reference, it will be:

(b) These initiative should not always be confined to meetings of like-minded more or less liberal, although this is also important.

Sentence (b) is acceptable, but is not euphemism term expression because ‘liberal’ consist of components like:

Liberal: + [CHARACTER] + [POLITICAL OR SOCIAL BELIEFS]

For further information, the writer will identify the meaning relation by using semantic component of both words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderates</th>
<th>Liberal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Political or social beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In description above semantic component, the writer finds out some component in common such as [CHARACTER], and [POLITICAL OR SOCIAL BELIEFS]. These similar components surely allow them replace each other (‘moderates’ can be replace by ‘more or less liberal’) especially in the sentence: *These initiative should not always be confined to meetings of like-minded moderates, although this is also important.*

Base on description of semantic component, the writer conclude that they have synonymy relation, because those similar components allow ‘moderates’ to replace ‘more or less liberal’, although the word ‘moderates’ has lesser components [AVERAGE] and [MIDDLE] which refers to narrower meaning.

The new meaning ‘moderates’ become narrower than the previous one. It means that the new meaning is considered less general or more inclusive than the earlier one. According the above semantic components, ‘moderates’ and ‘liberal’ has identical components. The word ‘moderates’ has 4 (+) features and ‘liberal’ has 2 (+). It is clearly shown that the meaning gets narrower than previous one.

**Data 3: Authoritarian**

(a) *Today we are not a victim of past authoritarian, centralized government, but a model of democracy and decentralization.*
According to Rawson (1981:25) the word ‘authoritarian’ is euphemism of totalitarian. The term used for justifying US support of foreign government, no matter how unsavory, so long as they are friendly.

‘Authoritarian’ is also a euphemistic metonymy. It is an associated concept making up for the one being referred to. It puts the words one-for-one-substitutions. The word ‘authoritarian’ has semantic features as follows:

Authoritarian: [CHARACTER] [POLITICAL REGIME] [CONTROL] [COOPERATE]

The term ‘authoritarian’ compromise more specific meaning for character of political regime. If ‘authoritarian’ replaced by intended reference, it will be:

(b) *Today we are not a victim of past totalitarian, centralized government, but a model of democracy and decentralization.*

Sentence (b) is acceptable, but is not euphemism term expression because ‘totalitarian’ consist of components like:

Totalitarian: [CHARACTER] [POLITICAL REGIME] [CONTROL]

For further information, the writer will identify the meaning relation by using semantic component of both words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Totalitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Character</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Political regime</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In description above semantic component, the writer finds out some component in common such as [CHARACTER] [CONTROL] and [POLITICAL REGIME]. These similar components surely allow them replace each other (‘authoritarian’ can be replace by ‘totalitarian’) especially in the sentence: Today we are not a victim of past authoritarian, centralized government, but a model of democracy and decentralization.

Base on description of semantic component, the writer conclude that they have synonymy relation, because those similar components allow ‘authoritarian’ to replace ‘totalitarian’, although the word ‘totalitarian’ has lesser components [COOPERATE] which refers to narrower meaning.

The new meaning ‘authoritarian’ become narrower than the previous one. It means that the new meaning is considered less general or more inclusive than the earlier one. According the above semantic components, ‘authoritarian’ and ‘totalitarian’ has identical components. The word ‘totalitarian’ has 4 (+) features and ‘totalitarian’ has 3 (+). It is clearly shown that the meaning gets narrower than previous one.

Data 4: Representative

(a) The G-20 is representative of a multi-civilizational global community.
The word ‘representative’ according to Rawson (1981:236) is euphemism for men, mostly use in term of sales representative, manufacturer’s representative, and publicity representative. The term ‘representative’ also euphemism for woman and person.

‘Representative’ is also a euphemistic metonymy. It is an associated concept making up for the one being referred to. It puts the words one-for-one-substitutions. The word ‘representative’ has semantic features as follows:

Representative: [HUMAN] [ADULT] [BELONGING IN PARTICULAR CATEGORY]

The term ‘representative’ compromise more specific meaning for person belonging in particular category. If ‘representative’ replaced by intended reference, it will be:

(b) The G-20 is the man of a multi-civilizational global community.

Sentence (b) is acceptable, but is not euphemism term expression because ‘man’ consist of components like:

Men: [HUMAN] [ADULT]

For further information, the writer will identify the meaning relation by using semantic component of both words.
In description above semantic component, the writer finds out some component in common such as [HUMAN] [ADULT]. These similar components surely allow them replace each other (‘representative’ can be replace by ‘man’) especially in the sentence:

*The G-20 is representative of a multi-civilizational global community.*

Base on description of semantic component, the writer conclude that they have synonymy relation, because those similar components allow ‘representative’ to replace ‘man’, although the word ‘representative’ has additional components [BELONGING IN PARTICULAR CATEGORY] which refers to narrower meaning.

The new meaning ‘representative’ become narrower than the previous one. It means that the new meaning is considered less general or more inclusive than the earlier one.

According the above semantic components, ‘representative’ and ‘man’ has identical components. The word ‘representative’ has 3 (+) features and ‘man’ has 2 (+). It is clearly shown that the meaning gets narrower than previous one.
2. Understatement

Data 5: Conflict

(a) *In the roller-coaster years following independence, Indonesia suffered separatist threats, ethnic and religious conflict, and Islamic insurgencies.*

The word ‘conflict’ according to Rawson (1981: 57) is euphemism for war. The term ‘conflict’ used to acknowledge part of the truth while concealing the extent of its grimness. The term war associated with the event that resulted casualties like death, crisis and starvation. Those casualties are feared by society. Unlike the war, the term ‘conflict’ doesn’t need a declaration from the government or the authority. It means that the authority or the government doesn’t have the responsibility for the event. For those reason, the use of euphemistic term is important in order to avoid the unpleasant or the responsibility along with the bad effect caused by its true meaning.

The word conflict is also euphemistic understatement. It is a construction whose primary is to abolish what it going to convey. The speaker used the word ‘conflict’ to dissociate meaning from its reality and creates a new sense that he has no responsibility for the cause of the event.

Supporting the description above, writer would like to describe semantic component of the term ‘Conflict’: [EVENT] [ABSTRACT] [FIGHT] [STRUGGLE]. If ‘representative’ replaced by intended reference, it will be:

(b) *In the roller-coaster years following independence, Indonesia suffered separatist threats, ethnic and religious war, and Islamic insurgencies.*
Sentence (b) is acceptable, but is not euphemism term expression because the word ‘war’ consist of components like:

War: [EVENT] [FIGHT] [STRUGGLE] [DECLARATION] [STRATEGY]

For further information, the writer will identify the meaning relation by using semantic component of both words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th></th>
<th>War</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fight</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to those semantic components, the term ‘conflict’ can be replaced by ‘war’ although having different sense. It may so because they share the same semantic features: [EVENT] [FIGHT], although they have too the different component. The word ‘Conflict’ have feature [ABSTRACT] and the word ‘war’ have features [STRATEGY].

Base on description of semantic component, the writer conclude that they have synonymy relation, because those similar components allow ‘conflict’ to replace ‘war’, although the word ‘conflict’ has additional components [ABSTRACT] which refers to broader meaning.
The new meaning ‘conflict’ become broader than the previous one. It means that the new meaning is considered more general or less inclusive than the earlier one. According the above semantic components, ‘conflict’ and ‘war’ has identical components. The word ‘conflict’ has 3 (+) features and ‘war’ has 3 (+). It is clearly shown that the meaning gets broader than previous one.

Data 6: Low-income

(a) Out of 57 Muslim countries, 25 are classified as low-income countries, 18 lower middle income, and 14 as upper middle income or high income.

According to Rawson (1981: 172) the word low-income is euphemism for poor. The term low-income used to describe people or country who lives below poverty level: under 2 dollars a day. Those who lives below poverty level, are susceptible to starving and couldn’t afford the basic standard for living. This is unacceptable for society, therefore speaker used ‘low-income’ instead of ‘poor’ to avoid losing face and also to separate the emotion related to the audience.

The word ‘low-income’ is also euphemistic understatement. It is a construction whose primary is to abolish what it going to convey. The speaker used the word ‘low-income’ to dissociate meaning from its reality and creates a new sense that he has no responsibility for the cause of the event.

Supporting the description above, writer would like to describe semantic component of the term ‘low-income’: [CONDITION] [LESS EARNING] [JOB]. If ‘low-income’ replaced by intended reference, it will be:
(b) *Out of 57 Muslim countries, 25 are classified as poor countries, 18 lower middle income, and 14 as upper middle income or high income.*

Sentence (b) is acceptable, but is not euphemism term expression because it shows the true meaning and the word ‘poor’ consist of components like:

**Poor:** [CONDITION] [LESS EARNING] [POVERTY]

For further information, the writer will identify the meaning relation by using semantic component of both words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low-income</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Less earning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In description above semantic component, the writer finds out some component in common such as [CONDITION] [LESS EARNING]. These similar components surely allow them replace each other (‘poor’ can be replace by ‘low-income’) especially in the sentence: *Out of 57 Muslim countries, 25 are classified as low-income countries, 18 lower middle income, and 14 as upper middle income or high income.*

Base on description of semantic component, the writer conclude that they have synonymy relation, because those similar components allow ‘low-income’ to
replace ‘poor’, although the word ‘low-income’ has lesser components [POVERTY] which refers to broader meaning.

The new meaning ‘low-income’ become broader than the previous one. It means that the new meaning is considered more general or less inclusive than the earlier one. According the above semantic components, ‘low-income’ and ‘poor’ has identical components. The word ‘low-income’ has 3 (+) features and ‘poor’ has 3 (+). It is clearly shown that the meaning gets broader than previous one.

**Data 7: Respect**

(a) *In Indonesia, elementary student are taught to respect religious tradition.*

According to Rawson (1981: 236) the word respect is euphemism for fear, one of positive euphemism created to hide the implication and its true meaning.

The word ‘respect’ is also euphemistic understatement. It is a construction whose primary is to abolish what it going to convey. The speaker used the word ‘respect’ to dissociate meaning from its reality and creates a new sense from its true meaning.

Supporting the description above, writer would like to describe semantic component of the term ‘respect’: [EXPRESSION] [ATTENTION] [REGARD]. If ‘respect’ replaced by intended reference, it will be:

(b) *In Indonesia, elementary student are taught to fear religious tradition.*
Sentence (b) is acceptable, but is not euphemism term expression because it shows the true meaning and the word ‘fear’ consist of components like:

Fear: [EXPRESSION] [ATTENTION] [DANGER]

For further information, the writer will identify the meaning relation by using semantic component of both words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Fear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Expression</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Attention</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Regard</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Danger</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to those semantic components, the term ‘respect’ can be replaced by ‘fear’ although having totally different sense. It may so because they share the same basic semantic features: [EXPRESSION] [ATTENTION]. The word ‘respect’ have feature [REGARD] and the word ‘fear’ have features [DANGER].

Base on description of semantic component, the writer conclude that they don’t have meaning relation between them, because the similar components allow ‘respect’ to replace ‘fear’ based only on feature [EXPRESSION] [ATTENTION].

The new meaning ‘respect’ is having a semantic shift. It means that the new meaning is considered loses some aspect of its former meaning and taking
partly new meaning than the earlier one. According the above semantic components, ‘respect’ and ‘fear’ has identical components. The word ‘respect’ has 3 (+) features and ‘fear’ has 3 (+). It is clearly shown that the meaning gets a semantic shift than previous one.

Data 8: Strategic

(a) *This is why Indonesia and America are now evolving a strategic partnership.*

According to Rawson (1981: 267-269) the word strategic is euphemism for an overarching word for justifying whatever means are necessary to obtain a particular end, frequently used when contemplating the unthinkable.

The word ‘strategic’ is also euphemistic understatement. It is a construction whose primary is to abolish what it going to convey. The speaker used the word ‘strategic’ to dissociate meaning from its reality and creates a new sense that he has no responsibility for the cause of the event.

Supporting the description above, writer would like to describe semantic component of the term ‘strategic’: [ACT] [PLAN] [IMPORTANT] [REQUIRED] [GOAL]. If ‘strategic’ replaced by intended reference, it will be:

(b) *This is why Indonesia and America are now evolving a necessary partnership.*

Sentence (b) is acceptable, but is not euphemism term expression because it shows the true meaning and the word ‘necessary’ consist of components like:

Necessary: [IMPORTANT] [REQUIRED]
For further information, the writer will identify the meaning relation by using semantic component of both words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic</th>
<th>Necessary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In description above semantic component, the writer finds out some component in common such as [IMPORTANT] [REQUIRED]. These similar components surely allow them replace each other (‘strategic’ can be replace by ‘necessary’) especially in the sentence: *This is why Indonesia and America are now evolving a strategic partnership.*

Base on description of semantic component, the writer conclude that they have synonymy relation, because those similar components allow ‘strategic’ to replace ‘necessary’, although the word ‘strategic’ has additional components [ACT] [PLAN] which refers to narrower meaning.

The new meaning ‘strategic’ become narrower than the previous one. It means that the new meaning is considered less general or more inclusive than the earlier one. According the above semantic components, ‘strategic’ and ‘necessary’ has identical components. The word ‘strategic’ has 4 (+) features and ‘necessary’ has 2 (+). It is clearly shown that the meaning gets narrower than previous one.
Data 9: Emerging

(a) *Indonesia today is a dynamic emerging economy, enjoying one of the highest growth rates in Asia after China and India.*

According to Rawson (1981: 85) the word emerging (as applied in countries) is euphemism for a poor or backward nation. The term ‘emerging’ replace ‘developing’, which also replace ‘underdeveloped’ term. Euphemism tend to become tainted by the bad meanings of the words for which they stand, with the result that new euphemism must continually be created to replace old ones.

The word ‘emerging’ is also euphemistic understatement. It is a construction whose primary is to abolish what it going to convey. The speaker used the word ‘emerging’ to dissociate meaning from its reality and creates a new sense that he has no responsibility for the cause of the event.

Supporting the description above, writer would like to describe semantic component of the term ‘emerging’: [CONDITION] [LESS EARNING] [JOB]. If ‘emerging’ replaced by intended reference, it will be:

(b) *Indonesia today is a dynamic poor economy, enjoying one of the highest growth rates in Asia after China and India.*

Sentence (b) is unacceptable, because the non-euphemistic expression shows the true meaning and the word ‘poor’ consist of components like:

Poor: [CONDITION] [LESS EARNING] [POVERTY]
For further information, the writer will identify the meaning relation by using semantic component of both words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Condition +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Growing -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Less earning +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poverty +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In description above semantic component, the writer finds out some semantic component in common such as [CONDITION]. These similar components surely doesn’t enough to allow them replace each other (‘poor’ can be replace by ‘emerging’) especially in the sentence: *Indonesia today is a dynamic emerging economy, enjoying one of the highest growth rates in Asia after China and India.*

Base on description of semantic component, the writer conclude that they don’t have meaning relation between them, because the similar components allow ‘emerging’ to replace ‘poor’ based only on feature [CONDITION].

The new meaning ‘emerging’ gets through amelioration. It means that the new meaning becomes more positive or favorable than the earlier one. According the above semantic components, ‘emerging’ and ‘poor’ has identical components. The word ‘emerging’ has 2 (+) features and ‘poor’ has 3 (+). It is clearly shown that the meaning gets broader than previous one.
Data 10: Challenge

(a) In the roller-coaster years following independence, Indonesia suffered separatist threats, ethnic and religious conflict, and Islamic insurgencies. But we overcame these challenges.

The word challenge is euphemism for problem. The word problem also consider as euphemism. Euphemism tend to become tainted by the bad meanings of the words for which they stand, with the result that new euphemism must continually be created to replace old ones. The term ‘challenge’ used to make whatever it stand for looks more positive and grander. The word ‘problem’ has an abstract meaning related to unsettled subject or beyond one’s power. By using ‘challenge’ instead of ‘problem’, the speaker gave a new meaning and a new sense to the actual meaning.

The word ‘challenge’ is also euphemistic understatement. It is a construction whose primary is to abolish what it going to convey. The speaker used the word ‘challenge’ to dissociate meaning from its reality and creates a new sense that he has no responsibility for the cause of the event.

Supporting the description above, writer would like to describe semantic component of the term ‘challenge’: [SITUATION] [MATTER] [OBJECTION] [PROVOKE]. If ‘challenge’ replaced by intended reference, it will be:

(b) In the roller-coaster years following independence, Indonesia suffered separatist threats, ethnic and religious conflict, and Islamic insurgencies. But we overcame these problems.
Sentence (b) is acceptable, but is not euphemism term expression because it shows the true meaning and the word ‘problem’ consist of components like:

Problem:  [SITUATION]  [ABSTRACT]  [MATTER]  [UNSETTLED]  [TROUBLE]

For further information, the writer will identify the meaning relation by using semantic component of both words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
<th>Matter</th>
<th>Provoke</th>
<th>Unsettled</th>
<th>Trouble</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to those semantic components, the term ‘challenge’ can be replaced by ‘problem’ although having totally different sense. It may so because they share the same basic semantic features: [MATTER].

The word ‘challenge’ have feature [OBJECTION] [PROVOKE] and the word ‘problem’ have features [ABSTRACT] [UNSETTLED] [TROUBLE]

Base on description of semantic component, the writer conclude that they have synonymy relation, because those similar components allow ‘challenge’ to replace ‘problem’, although the word ‘challenge’ has additional components
[OBJECTION] [CONFRONT] which refers to additional meaning and loses [ABSTRACT] [QUESTION] [TROUBLE] from its former meaning.

The new meaning ‘challenge’ is having a semantic shift. It means that the new meaning is considered loses some aspect of its former meaning and taking partly new meaning than the earlier one. According the above semantic components, ‘challenge’ and ‘war’ has identical components. The word ‘challenge’ has 2 (+) and ‘problem’ has 4 (+). It is clearly shown that the meaning gets a semantic shift than previous one.

3. Abstraction

Data 11: Problem

(a) But the answer to the world’s problems is are there, for it also there that hatred and prejudice breed.

According to Rawson (1981:221) the term ‘problems’ is euphemism for the most common of the common denominators for converting all life’s difficulties, from the most trivial to the most horrible, into a uniformly bland and boneless mush. The word ‘problems’ drained the emotional content from tense discussion.

The term ‘world’s problems’ can be anything. It can be economical problem, society problem, government problem, and so on. These endless lists of problem used to cover-up life’s difficulties and dissociate the emotion from the true meaning.
The word ‘problems’ is also euphemistic abstraction. It is a construction whose primary is to cover-up what it is going to convey by casting ideas in the most general possible terms. The speaker used the word ‘problem’ to blur the meaning and drain the emotional content related to the meaning.

Supporting the description above, writer would like to describe semantic component of the term ‘Problems’: [ABSTRACT] [MATTER] [UNSETTLED] [TROUBLE]. If ‘problem’ replaced by intended reference, it will be:

(b) But the answer to the world’s difficulties is are there, for it also there that hatred and prejudice breed.

Sentence (b) is acceptable, but is not euphemism term expression because the word ‘difficulties’ consist of components like:

Difficulties: [MATTER] [TROUBLE]

For further information, the writer will identify the meaning relation by using semantic component of both words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Difficulties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Unsettled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Trouble</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In description above semantic component, the writer finds out some component in common such as [MATTER] [TROUBLE]. These similar components surely allow them replace each other (‘problems’ can be replace by ‘difficulties’) especially in the sentence: But the answer to the world’s problems is are there, for it also there that hatred and prejudice breed.

Base on description of semantic component, the writer conclude that they have synonymy relation, because those similar components allow ‘problems’ to replace ‘difficulties’, although the word ‘problems’ has additional components [ABSTRACT] which refers to broader meaning.

The new meaning ‘problems’ become broader than the previous one. It means that the new meaning is considered more general or less inclusive than the earlier one. According the above semantic components, ‘problems’ and ‘difficulties’ has identical components. The word ‘problems’ has 6 (+) features and ‘difficulties’ has 3 (+). It is clearly shown that the meaning gets broader than previous one.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

Based on the previous analysis, the writer would like to take some conclusions from this study of semantic change in euphemistic terms that all of data sample taken from scripts of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono speech at John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. People apply euphemisms in their life is to protect themselves and others from the loss of face, to cover up or prettify motives and events or to avoid direct reference to topics they find unpleasant. Euphemisms are motivated by different taboos in society. Every culture has its own topics that are forbidden and should not be talked directly such as, death, disease, physical and mental defects, criminal actions, sex, certain body parts, etc. The important thing of the using euphemism and avoiding the taboo word is to keep good relationship between speaker and hearer. In the whole of countries, all people try to create the good relationship with do not using the taboo word and change it to euphemism term, this case is universal necessities.

From all of the data analysis taken from this movie, the writer found 3 kinds of classification euphemistic terms; they are metonymy, understatement and abstraction.
The writer then analyzed 3 types of euphemism. In there, the writer found that 9 euphemistic terms out of 11 data does have synonymy relation, only 2 euphemistic term does not have meaning relation, they are respect and emerging. The writer also found that 5 euphemistic terms out of 11 data undergo the semantic narrowing, they are university, authoritarian, moderates, representative, and strategic, 3 euphemistic terms undergo the semantic broadening, they are conflict, problem, and low-income, 2 euphemistic terms undergo the semantic shift, they are respect and challenge, and 1 euphemistic terms undergo the amelioration, that is emerging.

The speaker used the euphemistic term is in order to make what it stands seem altogether grander and more important than they really are, to avoid the unpleasant or the responsibility along with the bad effect caused by its true meaning, to dissociate meaning from its reality and creates a new sense, to avoid losing face, and drained the emotional content from tense discussion.

B. Suggestion

The research discusses types and semantic change in euphemistic terms in Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono speech at John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. The writer hopes the paper can contribute
a supporting reference in analyzing works of linguistic through semantic and sociolinguistic framework.

Based on the analysis, the writer would like to suggest to the readers or future researches more concern to analyzed the euphemistic terms on other media and topics such as politic issue, social issue or terms in economic field etc. For the further researcher, the writer suggest to pay attention in kind of types euphemism in order to can distinguish clearly between one type with the others, because there are some types that difficult to distinguish from one another.

The writer would also like to suggest to the writer of the book Words That Shook The World. Addendum: The First Decade of The 21st Century to give more explanation about the terms or the issue underlined by the speech, so the reader would understand the context or the term proposed in the speech.
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The scripts of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono speech at John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. The script were re-type by the writer hence the speech were taken from the book Words That Shook the World. Addendum: the first decade of 21st century written by Richard Greene.

Towards Harmony Among Civilization
Speech by Dr. Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono President of the Republic of Indonesia
At John F. Kennedy School of Government Harvard University, Boston, September 29, 2009.

Bismillahirrahmanirrahim

Professor David Ellwood, Dean of the John F. Kennedy School of Government,
Professor John Thomas,
Faculty members,
Students,
Dear friends,
I am honored to be here today, to address the distinguished faculty and students of Harvard University. I am impressed with the turn-out this evening, and, for the students, I hope you are not here today as an excuse to skip class.

I must admit, I have wanted to visit Harvard for a long time. Several of my Ministers, successful businessmen and military generals were fortunate to study here. Don’t take this the wrong way, but I find it interesting that I did not end-up working for people who went to Harvard; it’s actually people who went to Harvard who ended-up working for me!

I am proud that my son, Captain Agus, was able to join this prestigious Harvard program – I think he is somewhere in this room. So now other than being a loyal soldier in the Indonesian army, he is also another Harvard student working for me!
Several months ago, President Barack Obama made a historic speech in Cairo, seeking to redefine relations between America and the Muslim world. As President of the country with the world’s largest Muslim population, I would like today to respond to that speech.

President Obama delivered his speech at Al Azhar University, one of the oldest and best Universities in the Islamic world. I speak today at Harvard, the oldest and most prestigious University in America. (And please do not tell people in Princeton and Yale I said this.) But our objective is the same: to take a hard look at relations between the West and the Islamic worlds, and to chart a new course forward.

It is fitting that I come here after the G-20 Summit in Pittsburgh. For to me, the G-20 is one manifestation of the change taking place in global politics. The G-20 grouping, comprising some 85 per cent of the world’s GNP and 80 per cent of world trade, is not just an economic powerhouse - it is also a civilizational powerhouse.

The G-20 for the first time accommodates all the major civilizations - not just Western countries, but also China, South Korea, India, South Africa, and others, including significantly, three countries with large Muslim populations: Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Indonesia. The G-7, the G-8, or even the United Nations Security Council, does not boast this distinction. The G-20 is representative of a multi-civilizational global community.

Perhaps this is why the G-20 has been successful in arresting a global meltdown. The swift and coordinated actions of G-20 economies have started the stabilization of our financial systems and restored confidence, prompting today’s early signs of modest economic recovery. We are very pleased that at the close of Pittsburgh, the G-20 has been institutionalized, and looks set to be the premier forum for international economic cooperation. This comes not a moment too soon, for the world’s civilizations should be properly represented in one defining forum. Civilizations. They at once define us, and divide us. Is harmony between our civilizations truly elusive, so out of reach? Can we just not get along?

Sixteen years ago, the late Samuel Huntington, a son of this university, published an essay proposing that after the Cold War, civilizations, religions and cultures would become the defining feature of international relations and would constitute the primary cause of conflicts between and within nations.

To me, the term “clash of civilizations” itself is counterproductive. If they hear it often enough, some people may think that the world is such and accept it as reality. I don’t believe that civilizations are inherently incompatible and prone to conflict when they interact.

This is what I saw firsthand at the G20, where nations of diverse cultural backgrounds joined hands to address a common challenge. We spoke different languages through our headphones, but we understood one another. Huntington sought to understand post-Cold-War fault lines and warned us of potential
turbulence. This is not a trivial reminder. Civilizational issues are rife in modern politics. As policy-makers, our job is to prevent such prognosis from becoming reality.

Indeed, Huntington’s warning has been relevant to Indonesia’s experience. In the roller coaster years following independence, Indonesia has suffered separatist threats, ethnic and religious conflicts, and Islamic insurgencies.

But we overcame these challenges. We adapted. And instead of failing, we have thrived.

Today we are not a hotbed of communal violence; we are by and large an archipelago of peace.

Today we are not at the brink of ‘Balkanization’; we have instead fortified our national identity through three successful, peaceful national elections.

Today we are not a victim of past authoritarian, centralized governments, but a model of democracy and decentralization.

Today we are not paralyzed by financial crisis but forging ahead with sweeping reforms of our financial and industrial structure. And Indonesia today is a dynamic emerging economy, enjoying one of the highest growth rates in Asia after China and India.

Thus, no matter how deep and seemingly divisive the civilizational forces facing Indonesia - the ethnic differences and religious conflicts - we overcame them. This is despite the enormous challenges of democracy and development that still confront us.

Please do not misunderstand me. I am aware of the painful realities of our world. I am aware of the 4000 years of painful relations between Judaism, Islam and Christianity. I am aware of a traumatic collective memory that is not easy to erase. When dealing with matters of faith, we face basic human emotions that predated modern states. These emotions are complicated, stubborn, and will likely become more problematic as religiosity intensifies worldwide. According to some estimate, Islam will be the world’s largest religion by 2025, accounting for some 30% of the world population, and indeed Islam is currently the fastest growing religion in the United States.

As religiosity increases, so will the politics of identity. And aided by globalization and technology, extremism and radicalism can only grow. As we transition from G8 to G20 and perhaps beyond, mutual exposure between civilizations will become the most intense humanity has ever seen.

Perhaps we will even see the emergence of a “global civilization”.

And democracy has gained immense ground, spreading in the Islamic world, including in Indonesia. There were only a handful of democracies at the turn of the 20th century. At the turn of the 21st century, there are some 89 full democracies. Even the Organization of Islamic Conference has adopted the
historic Mecca Charter committing its members to the principles of democracy, human rights and governance. Indeed, more people now live under open pluralist societies, and under religious freedom, than at any other time in history. This trend can have only a positive impact on the global community. It may be naive to expect that the world can be rid of conflict and hatred. But I believe that we can fundamentally change and evolve the way civilizations, religions and cultures interact.

This is NOT utopia. It is a pragmatic vision. I have seen it work in Indonesia. I have seen it work in many countries. The question is: can we make it work globally? As Robert F. Kennedy once said, quoting George Bernard Shaw, ‘I dream of things that never were, and ask, why not?’ To highlight how I think this can possibly be achieved, let me outline 9 (nine) imperatives to achieve harmony among civilizations.

If you ask me “why 9?” well, it is a bit personal, because 9 is always my lucky number. Let me now outline these imperatives.

The first imperative is to make the 21st century the century of soft power.

Remember: The 20th century was the century of hard power. We saw two World Wars, several major wars and proxy wars, and a long Cold War which risked nuclear holocaust. One estimate suggests that some 180 million people died in the wars and conflicts of the last century. It is no wonder that the 20th century has been called the “age of conflict”. It has been the bloodiest Century in memory. In contrast, the 21st century should and must be the century of soft power.

But there exists a large of “soft power deficit” that the world’s civilizations must fill. I believe that this ‘clash of civilizations’ is actually a clash of ignorance.

We are weakest when we are alone. We are strongest when we join forces with one another. There are many examples of this power of exchange and connectivity.

In the 13th century, the Islamic civilization was the most sophisticated in the world because it had an enormous and indiscriminate thirst for knowledge and science, learning from all corners of the world. And this body of scientific knowledge from the Muslim world was later utilized by the Western Renaissance. Civilizations have built on each other’s knowledge and become enriched by them.

We have done the same in Indonesia, where we have built on our exposure to Eastern, Islamic, and Western influences, culminating in the open, pluralistic and tolerant society that we are today. In short: the cross-fertilization of cultures can produce something wonderful, something good. The more we exchange cultures and share ideas, the more we learn from one another, the more we cooperate and spread goodwill, the more we project soft power and place it right at the heart of international relations, the closer we are to world peace.

Experience has taught me that soft power is an effective weapon against conflict. Just ask the people of Aceh, Indonesia.
For 30 years, Aceh was rife with violence. Successive Indonesian governments opted for a rigid military solution, because a settlement seemed so elusive. When I assumed the Presidency, I pursued a new approach, one defined by goodwill and trust-building. I offered the separatists a win-win formula, promising them peace with dignity. Remarkably, we reached a permanent peace settlement in just 5 short rounds of negotiations. The peace agreement was fully in line with my objective to defend our sovereignty and territorial integrity but in a civilized and democratic way. That was when my faith in soft power multiplied, and why I believe it holds the key to resolving many global problems.

The second imperative is to intensify the process of dialogue and outreach that now seems to be proliferating.

We have seen many good initiatives. In 2001, the United Nations began the Dialogue among Civilizations. Spain and Turkey later launched the Alliance of Civilizations. The Asia Europe Meeting (ASEM) also took up Inter-faith Dialogue. Recently, Saudi Arabia convened the Interfaith Conference at the UN. Indonesia and Norway also launched, since 2006, the Global Inter-Media Dialogue in the aftermath of the cartoon crisis. All this represents a fresh approach to link civilizations and religions.

We must deepen the quality of these dialogues, so that they produce specific actions that, as UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon points out, (and I quote) “change what people see, what they say and ultimately how they act” (end of quote).

These initiatives should not always be a meeting of like-minded moderates, although surely this is also important. They should also include disbelievers, for a dialogue should not be a reaffirmation, but an honest attempt to understand the concerns of the other side. The point is to listen, and not just talk.

A true dialogue must address age-old grievances and confront false stereotypes, without presumptions and preconditions.

Indeed, the best dialogues are often respectful and honest, open-ended and constructive, intense, and solution-oriented. These were the quality of dialogues held in Indonesia between Muslims and Christians in conflict-zones in Poso and Maluku, which culminated in a commitment to peaceful reconciliation. The third imperative is the need to find a solution to burning political conflicts that have driven a wide wedge, specifically between the western and Muslim worlds.

Today, some two out of three Muslim countries are in conflict or face a significant threat of conflict. In contrast, only one out of four non-Muslim countries face similar challenges.

But despite these very complex conflict situations, Muslims must be able to differentiate between a conflict involving Muslims, and a “war against Islam”. I do not believe that any of the civilizations – Western, Hindu, Sinic, Buddhist, Japanese – are systematically and simplistically engaged in a “war against Islam”.


Of all the world’s conflicts, none has captured the passion of Muslims more than the plight of the Palestinians. But this is not a religious issue – there are Christians and Jews in Palestine, and Muslims and Christians in Israel.

Nonetheless, the establishment of the much-awaited Palestinian state, in the framework of a two-state solution where Palestine and Israel live side by side in peace, would be widely hailed by Muslims worldwide. It would remove a major mental barrier in their perception of the West, especially of the United States. Currently, many Muslims fail to notice the constructive role of the West in producing peace in Bosnia, and in Kosovo, but they would sure notice, and rejoice in, the resolution of the Palestine dilemma.

But the Palestinians too have a moral and political responsibility. It is difficult to attain and sustain statehood unless there is unity among the Palestinian factions. In my meeting with Palestinian leaders, I always told them very clearly that Indonesian freedom fighters would have never won the war for independence, if they had not united in spirit.

The bottom line is: we desperately need to end the vicious cycle of conflict and violence. The timely withdrawal of Western forces from Iraq and Afghanistan would also alleviate Muslim fears of a Western hegemony. And all these political solutions would help reduce terrorism, as a crime that deviates from the true teaching of Islam as a religion of peace. It would also turn the feelings of fear and humiliation among some Muslims into hope and self-esteem.

The fourth imperative is to strengthen the voice of moderation in our communities. By nature, moderates are open-minded, flexible and prone to an inclusive approach through outreach and partnership. In contrast, extremists are driven by xenophobic fear, and bent on confrontation and exclusion.

Because both moderation and extremism will grow in the 21st century, we must make sure the moderates are empowered, and take center stage in society. The moderates should no longer be a silent majority. They must speak up and defend their mainstream values in the face of opposition from the louder and more media-genic extremists.

In this vein, I find it very encouraging that Western media have unanimously refused to show the very offensive film Fitna by provocative Dutch politician Geert Wilders. This shows the media’s improved sensitivity towards Islam.

The moderates also have to be more proactive and less reactive. And they must show, with reason and results, that being a moderate brings real success, peace and progress. Extremists will always capitalize on hopelessness and desperation. We must present a better alternative.

The fifth imperative is multiculturalism and tolerance.
The most welcome trend in the 21st century is multiculturalism and tolerance. You could not say this of America and many Western nations several decades ago. But today, racism is in serious decline, apartheid is gone, inter-racial marriages are common, and the market place picks talents without regard for color, religion or ethnicity. Even the family portrait of President Barack Obama reflects this healthy multiculturalism, with his Kenyan and Indonesian roots.

We must all work together to ensure that multiculturalism and tolerance become a truly global norm. And when we speak tolerance, it should be more than just to “tolerate” others. Tolerance implies a deeper meaning. Tolerance means a full respect for others, sincerely accepting their differences, and thriving on our mutual diversity. Only this type of tolerance can heal deeply seated hatred and resentment.

The sixth imperative is to make globalization work for all.

I do not accept the precept that, as a rule, globalization produces winners and losers. Like peace, like development, globalization can be harnessed to make winners for all. Let us be clear on this. There can be no genuine harmony among civilizations as long as the majority of the world’s 1.3 billion Muslims feel left out, marginalized and insecure about their place in the world. They are part of the 2.7 billion people worldwide who live under two dollars a day.

These are the sad, hard facts. Out of 57 Muslim populated countries, 25 are classified as low-income countries, 18 lower middle-income, and 14 as upper middle income or high income. And even though 1 out of every 4 people in the world are Muslims, their economies constitute one tenth of the world economy. One in four people in Muslim countries live in extreme poverty. Almost 300 million Muslims aged 15 and above are illiterate. These statistics are, of course, unacceptable.

Muslims must take ownership in their destiny. Many Muslims reminisce too much about the glory days of centuries past, when Islam was on top of the world: politically, militarily, scientifically, (and) economically. Muslims today must be convinced that Islam’s best years are ahead of us, not behind us.

The 21st Century CAN be the era of the second Islamic renaissance. A confident, empowered and resurgent Muslim world can partner with the West and other civilizations in building sustainable peace and prosperity. But to do this, Muslims must change their mind-set. Like the remarkable 13th century Muslims before them, they must be open-minded, innovative, and take risks. There are inspirational Muslims everywhere: Nobel laureate Muhammad Yunus, Orhan Pamuk, Muhammad Ali, Zidane, Hakeem Olajuwon, Fareed Zakaria and rapper: Akon. Countries like United Arab Emirates and Qatar have shown that with good governance, self-esteem and a progressive worldview, they can change their nation’s fortune in one generation. And Indonesia has shown that Islam, modernity and democracy – plus economic growth and national unity – can be a powerful partnership.
In short, the world’s citizens, and children of all civilizations, must be equal partners and benefactors of globalization. A recent survey in The Economist found that, for the first time, more than half of the world population can be loosely considered middle-class. If this is true, then we have a reasonable chance to reach “zero poverty” worldwide by the end of this century. With the emerging economic order that is now unfolding, getting from here to there would require intense inter-cultural and inter-religious harmony. This should be the shared goal of all our nations.

The seventh imperative is to reform global governance.

Earlier, I talked about how the G20 Summit is more representative of today’s global dynamics. Unfortunately, this is the exception rather than the rule. For example, the UN Security Council today still reflects the power balance of 1945 rather than 2009, with exclusive veto powers reserved for four Western nations and China. It is unfortunate that recent efforts to reform the UN Security Council have not been successful. This situation is unsustainable. The UN Security Council will need to be restructured to keep up with 21st century geopolitical realities.

Imperative number eight is education.

Politicians often overlook educational opportunities in both our homes and our classrooms. But the answers to the world’s problems are there, for it is also there that hatred and prejudice breeds. These are the real battlegrounds for the hearts and minds of future generations.

It is at these places that we must turn ignorance into compassion, and intolerance into respect. The foot soldiers here are parents, teachers and community leaders. We must inculcate in our school curriculum the culture of moderation, tolerance, and peace. We must help our children and our students develop a sense of common humanity which allows them to see a world of amity, not a world of enmity.

In Indonesia, elementary students are taught to respect religious traditions. Exam questions ask Muslim students what they should do if their Christian neighbors invite them to celebrate Christmas. We are probably the only country in the world where each religious holidays – Islamic, Catholic, Protestant, Hindu, Buddhist – are designated as national holidays, even though Hindus and Buddhists account only 2.4 per cent of our population. Through education, we have sought to ensure that tolerance and respect for religious freedom becomes part of our trans-generational DNA.

Finally, the ninth imperative: global conscience.

It is not easy to describe this, but this is what I saw in Aceh during the tsunami tragedy. On 26 December 2004, giant tsunami waves crashed Aceh and Nias, and 200,000 people perished in half an hour. The whole nation was in grief. But in this tragedy, we also found humanity. The whole world wept, and offered helping
hands. Americans, Australians, Singaporeans, Chinese, Mexicans, Indians, Turks and other international volunteers worked hand in hand to help the Acehnese. I realized then … there exists a “powerful global conscience”.

One would think, that the enormous pain of World War 2 would usher in a new dawn of world peace. That is why the United Nations was formed. But the human race ended up with many more wars.

One would think the threat of the nuclear holocaust was enough to trigger nuclear disarmament, but the world saw more countries developing nuclear weapons.

The question now is whether climate change would be able to foster a new global conscience. We are still not sure that it will.

But a “global conscience” could well help transcend whatever civilization, religious and cultural divides that has faced humanity.

So these are my NINE imperatives for harmony among civilizations that I offer to you today. They will require a great deal of hard work. It will take the work of generations and decades. And it will require patience, perseverance, partnership and lots of thinking outside the box.

Eighteen years after the end of the Cold War ended, ten years into the 21st Century, we find ourselves at a crucial crossroads. In front of us may be the most progressive century mankind has ever known, a century where, as Fareed Zakaria says, more things will change in the next 10 years than in the past 100 years. It can be the century of possibility and opportunity.

President Barack Obama spoke in Cairo of a “new beginning” between America and the Muslim world. Today, I say that we can “reinvent a new world”.

It will be a world not of conquest, but of connectivity. It will be a world defined not by a clash of civilizations, but by the confluence of civilizations. It will be a world marked by plenty, not by poverty. And it will be a vast empire of global minds breaking down centuries of civilizational collisions and hostilities.

America, with all the economic, social and technological resources at her disposal, has much to contribute to this new world. America’s role in helping to reform the international system, spread prosperity, empower the world’s poor, resolve conflicts, and share knowledge is a critical asset to a transforming world.

Now is a golden opportunity for America to inundate the world with her soft power, not hard power. America should not worry about retaining its superpower status. America can help make the world anew -what could be more powerful and definitive than that?

Indonesia too has a significant role to play. We can bridge between the Islamic and the western worlds. We can project the virtue of moderate Islam throughout the Muslim world. We can be the bastion of freedom, tolerance and harmony. We can be a powerful example that Islam, democracy and modernity can go hand in
hand. And we will continue to advance Indonesia’s transformation through democracy, development and harmony.

This is why Indonesia and America are now evolving a strategic partnership. The world’s second and the third largest democracies. The most powerful Western country and the country with the largest Muslim population. Calibrated for the challenges of the 21st century, this partnership can strengthen regional stability, inter-civilizational unity and world peace. In the final analysis, vast oceans separate our countries but our common search unites. We are both trying to redefine our place in the world. President Obama insists the 21st century can still be the American Century. I am convinced that this could well be Asia’s Century.

Then I thought, why can’t it be everybody’s century? It can be the American Century. It can be the Asian Century. It can be the European Century. It can be the African Century. And it can be the Islamic Century.

This can be an amazing century where hope prevails over fear, where brotherhood of man reigns supreme, where human progress conquers ignorance. It can be a Century that not only brings us into a new millennium, but also elevates the bonds of humanity to greater heights.

In this Century, no one loses. And everybody wins.

Insya Allah!

I thank you.