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ABSTRACT


Dari analisis data ditemukan bahwa aksi yang paling dominan dalam 3 pidato Bush adalah aksi pernyataan (statement) yakni sebanyak 667 klausa (95,69 %), diikuti oleh aksi perintah (command) sebanyak 20 klausa (2,86 %) dan aksi pertanyaan (question) sebanyak 10 klausa (1,43 %). Reaksi yang paling dominan dalam 3 pidato Bush adalah epitet yakni sebanyak 252 kasus (42,78 %), diikuti oleh modalitas sebanyak 195 kasus (33,10 %) dan proses mental sebanyak 142 proses (24,10 %). Dengan membaca keseluruhan isi pidato diperoleh variabel konteks situasi masing-masing pidato.


Keywords : Aksi, Reaksi, Variabel konteks situasi, dan pidato Bush.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of Analysis

Every part of human’s lives is filled with language. Language is used to express human’s needs, wishes, desires, and intention. Speech is one of the ways to communicate or express one’s ideas. Therefore, human need a means to convey what they want. And language is the best means to solve those problems.

Language is a systematic resource for expressing meaning in context and linguistics. According to Halliday, language is the study of how people exchange meanings through the use of language. This view of language as a system for meaning potential implies that language is not a well defined system not a "the set of all grammatical sentences." It also implies that language exists and therefore must be studied in contexts such as professional settings, classrooms, and language tests. In short, SF theory states that particular aspects of a given context (such as the topics discussed, the language users and the medium of communication) define the meanings likely to be expressed and the language likely to be used to express those meanings. (www.public.iastate.edu/~carolc/LING511/sfl.html, accessed on January 15th 2009 at 10.15 am)

Language is not only a means of communication but also a social phenomenon. Speech, for some cases, can be a social phenomenon. For example, a speech can influence and motivate somebody or group of people to do something. Language consists of three levels or strata i.e. phonology/ graphology (sounding or
writing), lexicogrammatical (saying or wording), and discourse/ semantic. Halliday (1978: 40) says, “…., any text represents an actualization (a path through the system) at each level: the level of meaning, the level of saying (or wording, to use the folk of linguistic term for the lexicogrammatical system), and of course the level of sounding or writing.” It means that phonology, lexicogrammatical and discourse express the system of semiotic which consist of the level of meaning, saying or wording, sounding or writing in language. Speech also consists of the level of meaning, saying or wording, sounding or writing.

One level of language mentioned above is discourse. There are many writers who define the definition of discourse. According to Halliday (2009), Discourse is a unit of language larger than a sentence and which is firmly rooted in a specific context. While (Tarigan, 1987: 2) discourse is the language above the level of sentence. In other words, it is a larger unit than sentence or clause. Discourse also focuses on the way of utterances related to each other.

The definitions above are concluded that discourse is a study related to text and language. Discourse can be a text, sentence, clause and other units whether it is in a written or spoken passage which is “in process”. There are many works of discourse which have been the products of men such as prose, poems, speech, conversation, composition, lyric of song, radio script, film, symbol, text in a book, newspaper articles, magazine, and newsmagazine articles. These kind of discourse or text that involve context. In this thesis, three Bush’s speeches are analyzed by using Discourse analysis approach.

This thesis is only concerned about the analysis of action and reaction in George W. Bush’s speeches. Action is an act by spoken or written to ask or to give any information or good and services. Action includes statement, question, command,
and offer in a text. Reaction is limited as personal opinion that is given by language users when they do their action (Sinar, 2003: 105). Reaction is realized by mental process, epithet, modality, euphemism, and connotative meaning. The register variables of discourse are tried to be found out which include field, tenor, and mode of discourse. This kind of analysis of speech text in three selected George Walker Bush’s Speeches focuses on an analysis of action and reaction. This kind of study has never been done in this faculty yet. Due to this reason, the writer chooses an analysis of action and reaction in Bush’s speeches by using Systemic Functional Linguistics Theory of Halliday as the bases of the analysis that emphasizes on the register variables and the uses of action and reaction in those speeches. Systemic Functional Linguistics is a well developed linguistic theory that has been used in many domains as a powerful resource for analysis of texts of a wide range of types. Three speeches are chosen because three speeches are more enough to fulfill the data in searching the most dominant one.

George Walker Bush (born July 6, 1946) is the 43rd President of the United States of America, inaugurated on January 20, 2001, and the eldest son of former United States President George H. W. Bush. George Walker Bush was elected president in the 2000 general election and re-elected in 2004. Previously, he had served as the 46th Governor of Texas since 1995.

George Walker Bush is a straight forward person and from his speech he has power to control and influence his environment. Language does not live in isolation but it lives in environments. These characteristics fulfill the functions of language where language is interpreted as a means of control over the environment. Hence, George Walker Bush is chosen as the object of the analysis.
According to the systemic theory, language is a network system that consists of interrelated meaning choices, forming the basis and framework of discourse analysis in language. There are 6 important definitions of language proposed by this theory, they are as follows:

1. Language is a Social-Semiotic
2. Language is a System
3. Language is Functional
4. Language is To Make Meaning
5. Language is a Social-Semiotic System
6. Language Use is Contextual

These 6 definitions about language are implemented in the real life situation where language is used and functioned. Language use is contextual in the sense that language is put in a situational context for the understanding of the words uttered by the speakers of language and the social semiotic can be interpreted as language consists of symbols and contains meaning. Language should be put into function in order to make meaning. It also has system of phonology, lexicogrammar, and discourse semantics. The variables of context of situation are called tenor of discourse, field of discourse, and mode of discourse. The variables of context of situation describes the situation in the text of speech. The speech text is analyzed by using action and reaction which both are the combination of interpersonal meaning and transitivity process.
1.2 Problems of Analysis

In this thesis, there are some problems that appeared and need to be answered. The problems are:

1. What is the most dominant action in three selected Bush’s speeches?
2. What is the most dominant reaction in three selected Bush’s speeches?
3. What are the register variables found in the three selected Bush’s speeches?

1.3 The Objectives of Analysis

Dealing with the analysis of action and reaction in three selected Bush’s speeches, the objectives of the analysis of this thesis are:

1. To find out the most dominant action in three selected Bush’s speeches.
2. To find out the most dominant reaction in three selected Bush’s speeches.
3. To find out the register variables in the three selected Bush’s speeches.

1.4 Scope of Analysis

The analysis only focuses on action and reaction in three Bush’s speeches. They are the text of George Bush’s speech to a joint session of Congress and the nation in September 20th, 2001, the text of George Bush’s speech to the Nation on the Economic Crisis in September 24th, 2008, and the text of George Bush’s speech held in United Nations Headquarters in September 22nd, 2008. These speeches are chosen randomly from the internet. Three speeches are more enough to fulfill the data in searching the most dominant action and the most dominant reaction.
1.5 Significances of Analysis

The findings of this thesis are expected to help the language learners of Discourse Analysis to find out action and reaction, and also register in discourse especially speeches. This thesis can also be used as one of the reference of analyzing action and reaction in speech by using SFL Theory of Halliday. And hopefully, this thesis will be useful for the readers who are interested in studying action and reaction, in which it can help them to master English and to understand discourse and analysis of action and reaction better.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Theoretical Framework

2.1.1 An Overview of Discourse Analysis

2.1.1.1 The definition of Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is widely recognized as one of the vastest, but also one of
the least defined areas in linguistics. The reason is that the understanding of discourse
is based on scholarship from a number of academic disciplines that are actually very
different from one another. The academic disciplines are not only disciplines in which
models for understanding and method for analyzing. Discourse first developed such
linguistics, anthropology, sociology, philosophy, but also disciplines that have applied
such models and methods to problems within their own particular academic domain,
i.e. communication, social psychology, and artificial intelligence.

Harris in 1952 published the article entitled “Discourse Analysis” that claims a
new opinion saying that the most complete unit of language is not a sentence, but a
discourse. This opinion has brought linguistics into new phenomenon. At least, the
linguists start to analyze language based on discourse.

There are some definitions of discourse which are stated by linguists. Some of
the definitions are mentioned as follows:

Tannen (Georgetown University: 2002) states,

“Discourse analysis is sometimes defined as the analysis of language
‘beyond the sentence’. This contrast with types of analysis more typical of
modern linguistics, which are chiefly concerned with the study of the
grammar: the study of smaller bits of language, such as sounds (phonetics),
morphology, semantics, and syntax. Discourse analysts study larger chunks of language as they flow together”.


The above statements can be concluded that several elements which are part of discourse. They are: language unit, the most complete one, above the level of clause or sentences tried well, continuity, sense of cohesion, oral or written, a concrete beginning and ending.

Hartmann and Stork (1972) states that discourse is a text which forms a fairly complete unit. It is usually restricted to successive utterances of single speaker conveying a message.

Stubbs (1983: 10) says, “Discourse analysis consists of attempts to study the organization of language above the sentence or above the clause, and therefore to study the larger linguistic units, such as conversational exchanges or written text”.

Kress (1985: 27) says, “Discourse is a category that belongs to and derives from social domain, and text is a category that belongs to and derives from the linguistic domain. The relation between the two is one of realization: Discourse finds its expression in text. However, this is never a straightforward relation; anyone text may be the expression or realization of a number of sometimes competing and contradictory discourses”. Kress adds where the materiality, form, and structure of language are at issue, the emphasis tends to be textual; where the content, function, and social significance of language are at issue, the study tends to be of discourse.

From the definitions, it can be seen the similarities and differences opinions from the linguists and it can be understood that discourse is the most complete and
highest of largest linguistics unit above sentences and clauses which contains a high coherence and cohesive continuously. Discourse forms are complete part of language which have a definable communicative functions as behavior units. So it can be concluded that the linguistic analysis relates the text to the fact that the language varies are when people speak or write according to the type of situation.

Sometimes the study of both written and spoken discourse is known as discourse analysis, but some experts however use discourse analysis to refer to the study of spoken discourse and text linguistic to refer to the study of written discourse. Therefore, it is necessary to insist on the importance of grammar in linguistic analysis. The current approach considers that discourse analysis or text linguistic can be carried on without grammar or even that it is somehow an alternative to grammar.

A text is semantic unit, not grammatical one. Meanings are realized through wordings, and without a theory of wordings, that is a grammar. There is no way of making explicit one’s interpretation of the meaning of a text. So, the present interest in discourse analysis is in fact providing a context within which grammar has central place.

Text also points the way to kind of grammar that is required. In order to provide insight into the meaning and the effectiveness of text, a discourse grammar needs to be functional and semantic in its orientation, with the grammatical categories explained as the realization of semantic pattern. Otherwise a discourse grammar will face inward rather than outwards, it only characterizes the text in explicit formal terms without providing basis which can relate it to the non linguistic universe of its situational and cultural environment.

Discourse analysis has to be found on the study of the system of the language. The main reason for studying the system is to make clear the discourse on what
people say and write and listen to and read. Both system and text have to be in focus of attention, or with what the text may relate.

2.1.1.2 The Functions of Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis analyzes not only large units of language such as conversation or written text but also attempts to achieve the exact meaning or at least the closest meaning intended by the writer in the written texts or speaker in conversation. In order to reach the aim of discourse analysis, there are some functions related to it. They are:

1. Enabling one to say why the text is or is not, an effective text for its own purposes in what respects it succeeds and in what respects it fails, or even less successful in order to get the evaluation of text.

2. Enabling one to show how and what the text means so that one can understand the text. This is the lowest of the two functions. It is one that should always be attainable based on grammar.

The Scope of Discourse Analysis

The scope of discourse analysis is wide because discourse analysis units of languages not only in text but also in spoken for example speech, interview, conversation, etc. We as listeners and readers try to understand every single meaning of the word. In reaching these aims, the speaker or the writer will try to find the best way in choosing words to link them each other so that the reader or the listener is easy to understand.

According to McCarthy (1992: 12), “Discourse analysis is not only concerned with the description and analysis of spoken interaction. In addition to all our verbal
encounters, we daily consume hundreds of written and printed words: newspapers articles, letters, stories, recipes, instructions, notices, comics, billboards, leaflets pushed through the door, and so on. We usually expect them to be coherent, meaningful communications in which the words and/ or sentences are linked to one another in a fashion that corresponds to conventional formula, just as we do with speech. Therefore discourse analysts are equally interested in organization of written interaction”.

The Types of Discourse Analysis

Countries in the world has their own language which is different one and another. A linguist, E.A. Nida in association with Tarigan (1987) says that each language has its own classification of discourse based on different point of view. He gives the classification of discourse into narrative, conversation, exposition, and poem.

Discourse can be classified based on different point of view. They are:

1. Based on the form of discourse

   Based on the form of discourse, it can be classified into:

   • Prose

   Prose is free composition. It is not ruled by stanza or rhythm. Prose can be spoken or written. It can also be direct or indirect. This includes novel, short story, articles, and thesis.

   • Play

   Play is discourse which is conveyed in the form of play dialogue, spoken or written. This includes drama, and other dialogue or conversation.

   • Poem
Poem is a type of composition which is ruled by stanza, line, and rhythm. It can be spoken or written. For example:

_Come to me in my dream, and then_
_By day I shall be well again!
_For then the night will more than pay_
_The hopeless longing of the day_ (Longing by Matthew Arnold)

2. Based on the directness of conveyance of discourse

Based on the directness of the conveyance, discourse can be classified into:

- **Direct discourse**

  Kridalaksana (1964: 208) states, “Wacana langsung atau direct discourse adalah kutipan langsung yang dibatasi oleh intonasi atau puntuasi”. For example:

  _My lecturer says, “Several years ago, I was confused about my life in the future time. I didn’t know about my carrier, family and choosing my suitable work. Then my friend suggested to be a lecturer, thus, here I am now, stand up as a lecturer”._

- **Indirect discourse**

  Kridalaksana (1964: 208) also says, “Wacana tidak langsung atau indirect discourse adalah pengungkapan kembali wacana tanpa mengutip harfiah kata-kata yang dipakai oleh pembicara dengan mempergunakan konstruksi gramatikal atau kata tertentu, antara lain dengan klausa bahwa, dan sebagainya”. For example:

  _My lecturer said that several years ago he was confused about his future. He didn’t know, what was he going to in the future. But later his friend_
suggested him to be a lecturer, so he is a lecturer now, stand up in front of our class.

3. Based on the medium used to convey the discourse

Based on the medium to convey the discourse, it can be classified into written and spoken discourse. Written discourse is discourse which is conveyed through the writing. This includes article in newspaper or magazine, short story, novel, written speech, etc. Spoken discourse is type of discourse which is conveyed orally such as conversation, speech, dialogue, interview, etc.

In this thesis, written speeches of George Walker Bush are analyzed by using action and reaction also register variables. Thus, the analysis focuses on the written discourse such written speech.

**Systemic Functional Linguistic Theory (SFLT)**

Linguistics studies about language scientifically. Linguists try to find out the particular features of language. From several schools of linguistics, it can be seen the diverse views and representations of language analysis. Systemic Functional Linguistic is a theory about language as a resource for making a meaning based on a context of situation and a context of culture. SFL was developed by Halliday, a professor of linguistics from University of Sidney, Australia. This theory is based on Firth’s system structure theory. Firth developed Malinowski’s concepts of context of situation and context of culture. His works were subsequently developed by Halliday, whose theory of language-in-context is generally known as systemic functional linguistics (SFL). The interesting development of systemic functional linguistics
theory in Malinowski and Firth’s time was the attention paid to the study of the inter-relatedness of language and context in theory and practice. Modeling language-in-context theoretically, describing and applying the model in question in various areas of human activity have been the trademark of Systemic Functional Linguistics Theory (SFLT).

Sinar (2002: 44-45) in her dissertation Phasal and Experential in Lecture Discourse: A Systemic Functional Analysis clarifies the abbreviation of SFLT in order to ease the meaning of SFLT such as the following:

“The letter “S” for “systemic” implies three main senses, that is, that this study pays attention to (1) the systemic relations and their choices in probabilities in a system network of relations and choices starting from general to specific features, which are vertical or paradigmatic in nature, (2) the systems of meaning that are involved and interrelated with respect to the phenomena being investigated, and (3) the systems of meaning that lie behind, below, around, above, or beyond the phenomena being investigated. The use of the letter “F” for “functional” implies three main senses, namely, that this study pays attention to (1) the functional realizations of the systems in structures and patterns, which are structurally horizontal or syntagmatic in nature, (2) the semiotic functions or meanings that are at work or in operation and (3) the semiotic functions or meanings that operate in various semiotic levels and dimensions. The letter “L” for “Linguistics” here is used to imply two main senses, namely, (1) that the framework of this study belongs to and derives from a ‘discipline’ called ‘linguistics’, (2) in its investigation of the phenomena this study applies a language-based approach which interpreted as being semiotic, thematic and transdisciplinary in nature. The letter “T” for “Theory” which is bound to the “SFL” and taken together as one term in this context, carries the meaning that this study adopts a theory that would be referred to by many as representing a particular theory within the so-called linguistics”.

It is obvious that when analyzing text, the grammar becomes prominent thing to describe how language works. SFL believes that grammar and meaning are closely related. Grammar becomes a study of how meanings are built up through the used of words when language acts are performed as the expressions of meaning. The way how language work involves the idea that a language consists of a set of systems, each of it offers the speakers (or writers) a choice of ways expressing meanings because the
forms of the language that is used by a speaker represent meanings. In short, we make meaning through our choice and use of works, and systemic study of language in use is how we make sense of our meanings.

**Language Functions and Use**

Some of the General Systemic Functional Linguistics Theory’s theoretical claims and how they are interrelated, which form the basis and framework of this study and will be discussed here under six major statements, are: (1) that language is a social-semiotic, (2) that language is a system, (3) that language is functional, (4) that the function of language is to make meanings, (5) that language is a social-semiotic system, (6) that language use is contextual.

**Language is a Social-Semiotic**

The concept of social semiotic is that every human’s relationship to their environment full of meanings and these meanings are understood through interaction with another that involve the environment of meaning. The concept of social-semiotic is not different with the concept of social-semiotic system because both are building human’s relationship to their environment full of meanings.

**Language is a System**

Someone can choose meanings that he wants to express when interact to another. A number of meaning choices (systems) are realized through the choices of language form that tend to paradigmatic than sintagmatic. The next system of language meaning is called semantic that can be expressed with the help of grammar and vocabulary. Actually meaning is given in words which grammatical and order that is sintagment consists of lexical and grammatical. The relationship between meaning and word is non-arbitrary. Grammatical form is naturally relate to the meanings expressed. The word rain (English), piogin (Italy), dorzhd (Russia) have
same meaning ‘hujan’ (Indonesia) and there is no natural relationship among those words with the sound and meteorology events beyond the code word although they have same meanings. This is just grammatical process naturally relate to the semantic because both of them are abstract system of code.

Language is Functional

The third claim stated above relates to the fact that language has evolved to serve human needs, as such that one needs to focus on how people use language in order to understand it. The way language is organized is functional with respect to the human needs; it is not arbitrary (Halliday, 1985b: xiii). Thus, as Halliday points out (1991: 608), GSFLT is a functional theory, and it is functional in three interrelated senses. The first sense of function is in the technical, grammatical sense, in which a grammar is interpreted in terms of functions rather than classes, to get one from the system to the text.

The second sense is that grammar is functional, as seen in the way the systems are interrelated. In this, the systems fall into the broad metafunctional categories of what are referred to as the ideational, the interpersonal, and the textual. This is what relates language to what is outside language, that is, to other semiotic systems. Halliday states that (1) the fundamental components of meaning in language are functional components, (2) all languages are based on two meaning components: the ideational or reflective and the interpersonal or active and (3) the two meaning components are related to the third meaning component, that is, the textual meaning component (Halliday, 1985b: xiii).

The metafunctional level of abstraction is the interface between language and the outside. It is the metafunctions as the theoretical concepts that enable one to understand the interface between language and what is outside language and it is this
interfacing that has shaped the form of the grammar. In other words, the notion of metafunction, in which you have the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual, is “an attempt to capture this relationship between the internal forms of the language and its use in context of social action” (Halliday, 1987: 607).

The third sense of function is related to the two, but which is more like a common-sense use of the term, where function equals use. Function here is the sense of functions of the systems which are paradigmatic in nature. In this, it is the paradigmatic basis of GSFLT which is the distinguishing factor between GSFLT as a functional theory and other functional theories.

The Function of Language is To Make Meanings

The fourth claim is that the function of language is to make meanings. When human beings express their needs through language, they are making meanings in a text, which is a functional language. Contextualizing this to language learning, Halliday views language learning as “learning how to mean”, that is, learning how to make meanings. Based on an ontogenetic study of child language development, it is identified that there are seven set of functions in which a child first learns to mean (Halliday, 1975: 37). Those categories are then compressed and have been conceptualized as such that there are three kinds of meaning in adult language, which have been referred to above as the ideational, the interpersonal, and the textual meanings. The three kinds of meaning are widely known as the “metafunctions of language”.

The metafunctions of language are inherent in every language use in social contexts. These functions, i.e. the ideational (the logical and the experiential), the interpersonal and the textual, represent the intrinsic functional organization of language that reside in the semantic system. The semantic system is one of the
systems of language, the others being the lexicogrammatical and the phonological/graphological systems are concerned with sounding/writing in phonemes/graphemes or sounds/letters.

Moving from the semantics to the phonology/graphology, one interpretation is that meaning in the semantics is turned into wording in the lexicogrammar, and is then turned into sounding/writing in the phonology/graphology. Grammatically speaking, Halliday’s hypothesis is that the logical function is realized by the clause complexity system of language, the experiential function is realized by the transitivity system, the interpersonal function is realized by the mood system, and the textual function is realized by the theme system of language (Halliday, 1978: 129). Semiotically, language seen as a system of systems embodies and performs three major metafunctions: the ideational (the logical and the experiential), the interpersonal, and the textual which makes language relevant to the contexts. The global functional construal/realization relationship of the metafunctions, different orders of ‘reality’ and grammatical realizations is shown below.

The ideational function is language as representation or reflection, in which the speaker as an observer of reality construes ‘natural’ reality. The interpersonal function is language as exchange or action, in which the speaker as an intruder of reality construes intersubjective reality. The textual function is language as message or relevance, in which the speaker construes semiotic reality by relating the realities to the contexts within which meanings are made (Halliday, 1979: 60).

Table 1: Metafunctions, Orders of Reality Construed and Grammatical Realizations (Martin in Sinar, 2007: 57)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metafunction</th>
<th>‘Reality’ construed</th>
<th>Work done</th>
<th>Grammatical Realizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Language is a Social-Semiotic System

The concept of social semiotic is that every human’s relationship to their environment full of meanings and these meanings are understood through interaction with another that involve the environment of meaning. Meaning potential is built by children in learning process to create language system for themselves that is social system experienced or social system constructed and found for themselves.

Language Use is Contextual

The last claim is that language use is contextual, particularly in the sense that it is contextually bound or motivated. This dates back to Malinowski’s proposal of “context-dependent”, in which he points out that “utterance and situation are bound up inextricably with each other and the context of situation is indispensable for the understanding of the words” (Malinowski: 1946)

Malinowski (1946) distinguishes three major functions of language: (1) the pragmatic function where language is interpreted as a form of action, (2) the magical function where language is interpreted as a means of control over the environment, and (3) the narrative function where language is interpreted as a storehouse filled with useful and necessary information preserving historical accounts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideational: Logical:</th>
<th>‘Natural’ reality</th>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>Clause complexity system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language as Natural logic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transitivity process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential: Language as Representation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal: Language as Exchange</th>
<th>Intersubjective reality</th>
<th>Intruder</th>
<th>Mood system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual: Language as Message</th>
<th>Semiotic reality</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Theme system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The contextualization of language proposed by Malinowski is extended by Firth, in which he argues that linguistics should be linked to cultural context because the meaning of linguistic item is dependent on cultural context (Firth: 1957). GSFLT views that language is an expression of social behavior in contexts. In Malinowski’s frequently quoted words (1946: 307), “the meaning of any single word is to a very high degree dependent on its context”.

In general terms, the language and context models develop as ways of critically understanding language and context (including the concepts of so-called text, discourse, register, etc.), the nature of their relationship, and the aspects, features and dimensions that are involved there in. While one needs to relate language to context in order to understand how and why language means what it does. In this context there will never be any clear-cut boundaries between whether one is in fact still talking about language as a system and process or one is already talking about context (situation, culture, and ideology) as a system and process. Despite the fact that attempts to relate language to context when Malinowski introduces the terms so-called context of situation and context of culture. In this respect, it is not surprising to find Halliday’s register that he sees as something linguistic being understood as something contextual (i.e. situational) by others (Halliday, 1987: 610).

In the global and general modeling of language and context, all the existing models of GSFLT generally share the same conceptual views. For example, they would share the same views as expressed in statements such as these: (1) language does not live in isolation but it lives in environments, social environments (i.e. social contexts), (2) to understand language is to see how and why language means what it does in social contexts, (3) to understand language is to relate language to the social contexts in which it lives, (4) to understand language is to see how language users use
language to talk to each other, (5) the relationship between language and social contexts is one of mutual engendering: language construes the social contexts in which language users live, and it is at the same time construed by the social contexts, and (6) the relationship is one of realization: language as a semiotic system realizes social context as a social system.

The three GSFLT’s theoretical claims on language in relation to context in particular will be presented as follow:

2.3.6.1 Context of Situation (Register)

The terms situation and discourse may be understood and interpreted differently by different people, and therefore they need clarification. The term situation is being used here to represent the semiotic space of GSFLT’s notion of the context of situation, within which have two major semiotic dimensions: (1) the dialectal semiotic dimension, and (2) the diatypic semiotic dimension. As this study interprets it, the dialectal dimension is concerned with language-in-context according to the user, in which we have the conceptual categories such as social dialect, geographical dialect, etc. The diatypic dimension, on the other hand, is concerned with language-in-context according to the use, within which we have the conceptual categories of field, tenor, and mode.

Specifically, the term situation here is being used in the general sense of Halliday’s context of situation, which is roughly equivalent to the general sense of Gregory’s discourse, except for the fact that the notion of ‘register’ is located within the discourse domain in Gregory’s model, which means register is something contextual (i.e. specifically situational in Halliday’s term) whereas in Halliday’s model register is at the semantic level-meaning it is located within the language domain, not above it, i.e. it is not something contextual (situational) (Halliday, 1987: 238).
In addition, as has been pointed out previously, Halliday’s situational context is also roughly equivalent to the general sense of Martin’s register, except for the fact that Martin’s register is defined and treated as a connotative semiotic in his stratified semiotic modeling of language-in-context (Martin, 1993: 158).

The focus of the conceptual statements and descriptions here is on the field, tenor and mode variables, which are interpreted by Halliday as features of the context of situation or of the situational context (Halliday, 1987: 610). In this respect, to avoid misunderstanding, it would be more appropriate to have expressions such as field of situation for Halliday’s theoretical model, field of register-in-discourse for Gregory’s model, or field of register for Martin’s model. Register variables are field of discourse (what is actually taking place), tenor of discourse (who is taking part), and mode of discourse (what role language is playing).

2.3.6.2 Context of Culture (Genre)

Halliday (1978: 34) places genre within the situational semiotic space of mode, specifically referring to it as a rhetorical mode. In this, genre has a structure that he calls generic structure, which gives a text a complete characterization of texture. Hasan (1995) adds that register and genre are interchangeable terms referring to the text type produced in any context of situation in one semiotic system. Both register and genre merge because both notions account for where the various genres come from and both explain how they are motivated linguistically.

Martin treats genre in a wider sense, referring to it as a contextual (cultural) variable, which is interpreted as a connotative semiotic, and defining it as “a staged, goal-oriented, purposeful activity in which speakers engage as members of a given culture” (Martin, 1984: 25). In this, genre is a term that is defined to capture the notion of context of culture, which stands as one of the semiotic systems outside
language, which is not intrinsically part of his register plane but one level above it. In this respect the relation between genre, register and language is one of realization: genre is realized by register and language, register is realized by language. To elaborate Martin’s notion of genre stated above: Firstly, a genre is a purposeful activity in the sense that it is an activity that has a purpose. Secondly, the activity in question is goal-oriented in the sense that it is oriented towards achieving a common goal. And thirdly, the activity is staged in the sense that it has stages or steps to achieve the goal. As a social activity, a genre represents people’s way of meaning and saying that is characteristic of a given culture in which speakers/listeners as members of the culture live.

The stages in genre are step-by-step activities that are carried out as semiotic processes for the purpose of arriving at the shared goal of communication through language. A genre is realized and characterized by a structure characteristic of its own, and Martin (1984) refers to that structure in question as schematic structure, which is roughly equivalent to Halliday’s generic structure. A schematic structure of a genre represents an overall organizational pattern of the genre-in-text. When speakers/listeners as members of a certain culture use a language, they interact socially and become the procedures of a genre of a particular kind, and this genre is the speakers/listeners’ product characteristic of the given culture. That is, the speakers/listeners’ genre has certain distinctive properties or features of its own. Genres may be classified into two major categories: story genre and factual genre. Each of these has various types. Narrative (e.g. moral tale, myth, serial, spoof), recount, anecdote and exemplum are examples of story genre whereas description, report, (auto)biography, procedure, exposition, explanation, discussion and exploration are examples of factual genre.

Gregory (1967) and Gregory and Caroll (1978) define genre as the organization of those patterns of language variation, which is related to the social intention of the speaker. Gregory initially treated the genre value under the tenor variable as a contextual category of language variation (i.e. of diatypic variety differentiation), in which it was specifically formulized under the notion of functional tenor as a sub-variable of tenor. In its development, however, Gregory has made modifications to the model, one of which is that he no longer distinguishes between personal and functional tenors, as it clearly indicated by the following statement:

“…and that it gave too limited a view of communicative function by confining it to the interactive relationship…..there is no place for a functional tenor with multi-functional realization, as a dimension of variety on a par with field, mode and personal tenor, all of which had a corresponding functional realization: ideational, textual and interpersonal, respectively” (Gregory, 1988)

2.3.6.3 Context of Ideology

References in philosophy, anthropology, politics, general sociology and sociology of religion talk a lot about things like so-called culture, ideology, ism, belief and religion. In one view, which is the exclusive view, cultural, ideological, ism, belief and religious values are seen and treated as different independent value systems of equal footing but they may be interrelated. Thus, cultural values live in cultural system, ideological values in ideological system, ism values (e.g. secular values) in ism system (.e.g. secular system), belief values in belief system and religious values in religious system. These systems may be interrelated but they are independent and not hierarchical in their relationships. However, there is a tendency among the experts to impose an inclusive view in which they conceptualize cultural, ideological, belief and religious values under one conceptual umbrella term, treating the values as deriving from and belonging to an all-inclusive or overall value domain that may be
referred to as “culture”, “ideology”, “ism”, “belief” or at times “religion”. Thus, treating the different values in question under cultural domain for example would mean that ideology, ism, belief and religion are part of or something sub-ordinate to culture. In other words, ideology, ism, belief and religion are seen as sub-sets or sub-systems of cultural system. One view is reflected in statements such as:

“It seems fairly obvious that the totalitarian ideologies that the totalitarian ideologies exhibit all three criteria. They qualify on all counts to be religions in the same way as Christianity and Judaism are. It might be better to treat them directly as that and not make them out to be surrogates of religion. Nazism and communism are religions….I am waiting to call them religions because they exceed political concerns and glow with a supernatural light” (Fallding in Sinar, 2007: 96)

The exclusive and inclusive perspectives that are imposed by experts coupled with their proponents and opponents result in the confusion or vagueness as to what the values in question really mean and how they are to be identified, described and explained. Discourse analysts and sociolinguists in general and Systemic Functional linguists in particular have offered conceptual models that relate so-called higher-order meanings or values in higher-order systems of meanings to lower-order meanings in lower-order systems of meanings. Halliday (Halliday & Martin, 1982: 37) would see culture not as a semiotic system but as an assembly of semiotic systems, which is constituted by the kind of shared set of cultural meanings or values within which institutional, ideological. Genre and any other higher-order values or meanings [and perhaps including what people would generally refer to as religious values or meanings] are exchanged (Halliday & Hasan, 1985: 44-49).

2.4 Relevance Studies
In supporting the idea of the analysis, some books which are relevant to the topic and give large contribution have been read and consulted. Several ideas can be seen, mentioned as follows:

Firstly, Sinar (2003), in her book *Teori dan Analisis Wacana: Pendekatan Fungsional Sistemik* says, “Aksi adalah tindakan dengan melakukan ucapan atau tulisan untuk meminta atau memberi informasi atau barang jasa”. Action includes statement, question, command, and offer. “Reaksi dibatasi sebagai pendapat pribadi yang diberikan pemakai bahasa ketika mereka menyampaikan aksinya. Reaction is realized by mental process, epithet, modality, euphemism, and connotative meaning. In this book, she analyzed Soeharto’s resign speech on May 21st 1998 by using action and reaction analysis with the results: statement 56 cases (100%), euphemism 13 cases (43,3%), epithet 7 cases (23,4%), mental process 6 cases (20%), modality 3 cases (10%), and connotative meaning 1 case (3,2%).

Secondly, Sinar (2007), in her book *Phasal and Experiential Realizations in Lecture Discourse: A Systemic-Functional Analysis* talks about Halliday’s description of register, “A register is: what you are speaking (at the time) determined by what you are doing (nature of social activity being engaged in), and expressing diversity of social process (social division of labour). Principal controlling variables: field (type of social action); tenor (role relationships); mode (symbolic organization). Characterized by: major distinctions of spoken/written; language in action/language in reflection”. The definition above can be concluded that register variables are field, tenor, and mode of discourse.

direkam dan dipelajari karena mempunyai susunan tertentu yang dapat diungkapkan dengan peristilahan yang sistematik. Teks merupakan proses dalam arti merupakan proses pemilihan makna yang terus menerus, sesuatu perubahan melalui jaringan tenaga makna, dengan setiap perangkat pilihan yang membentuk suatu lingkungan bagi perangkat yang lebih lanjut”. The definition above can be concluded that text is a product that can be learnt because the structure of text is systematic. Text can not be separated from its context of situation (register), there is relation between language (text) and situational context.

Fourthly, Suryani (1999) in her thesis entitled The Language of Advertisement: A Study Based on the Theory of Context of Situation, this thesis is about the usages of context of situation in advertisement. She analyzed how is language of advertisement related to its context of situation (register). She analyzed by using register variables: field of discourse, tenor of discourse, and mode of discourse. This thesis concludes that the language used in advertisement text is influenced by factors outside the language, they are types of the product, the purpose of the advertisement, consumers, and the image that has been built up in the mind of consumers.

Fifthly, Parhusip (2003) in his entitled An Analysis of text of Advertisement in Kompas Daily News Based on Context of Situation, just like the previous one, it also talks about the usage of context of situation in advertisement. This thesis also concerns with the language used in advertisement. This thesis concludes that to understand the purposes of an advertisement, we have to know the environment of the text of the advertisement, therefore the context of situation serves to make a bridge between text and the situation in which the text actually occur.

As a conclusion, General Systemic-Functional Linguistics Theory (GSFLT) has conceptual Language Functions and Use those are language is social-semiotic,
language is a system, language is functional, language is to make meanings, language is a social-semiotic system, and language is contextual. Language is contextual means that language is related to context of situation, context of culture, and context of ideology. Language is related to context of situation realized by field of discourse, tenor of discourse, and mode of discourse. An analysis of text in the context is realized by action and reaction. Action is an act by spoken or written to ask or to give any information or good services. Action includes statement, question, command, and offer. Reaction is limited as personal opinion that is given by language users when they do their action. Reaction is realized by mental process, epithet, modality, euphemism, and connotative meaning.

2.5 Action

Halliday (1984, 1985a: 68-71) approaches the grammar of interaction from a semantic perspective. He points out that whenever we use language to interact, one of the things we are doing with it is establishing a relationship between us: between the person speaking now and the person who will probably speak next. To establish this relationship we take turns at speaking, we take on different speech roles in the exchange. The basic speech roles we can take on are:

Giving:    
Would you like to borrow my copy of “The Broken Wings”?  
“The Broken Wings” is a novel by Kahlil Gibran

Demanding:    
Can I borrow your copy of “The Broken Wings”?  
Who wrote “The Broken Wings”?

At the same time as choosing either to give or demand in an exchange, we also choose the kind of “commodity” that we are exchanging. The choice here is between exchanging information:

Who wrote “The Broken Wings”?
“The Broken Wings” is a novel by Kahlil Gibran
Can I borrow your copy of “The Broken Wings”? 
Would you like to borrow my copy of “The Broken Wings”?

By cross-classifying these two dimensions of “speech role” and “commodity”, we can come up with the four basic “moves” we can make to get a dialogue.

Table 2: Speech roles and commodities in interaction (Halliday in Eggins, 1994: 150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEECH ROLE</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Goods and services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giving</td>
<td>statement</td>
<td>offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td>question</td>
<td>command</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These four basic moves types of statement, question, offer and command are what Halliday refers to as speech functions. So we say that every starting move in dialogue must be one or other of these speech functions, and each speech function involves both a speech role and a commodity choice.

But, as table 2 above clearly illustrates, dialogue is inherently interactive: typically it does not involve simply one move from one speaker. We need also to recognize that after one speaker has initiated an exchange, another speaker is very likely to respond. Thus we need also to see that there is a choice between initiating and responding moves:

e.g. initiating responding
Who wrote “The Broken Wings”? - Kahlil Gibran
“The Broken Wings” is a novel by Kahlil Gibran - Yea, I know
Can I borrow your copy of “The Broken Wings”? - Sure
Would you like to borrow my copy of “The Broken Wings”? - OK

Our choice of responding moves is constrained by the initiating move that has just been made. Every time I take on a role I assign to you a role as well. Every time I initiate an interaction I put you into a role of Responding if you want to interact with
me. The alternatives we face in responding can be broadly differentiated into two types: a supporting type of responding move, versus a confronting type:

Supporting

- Kahlil Gibran
  
  Who wrote “The Broken Wings”?  
  - How would I know?

- Yea, I know
  
  “The Broken Wings” is a novel by Kahlil Gibran
  - I think you’re wrong there

- Sure
  
  Can I borrow your copy of “The Broken Wings”?  
  - Sorry, I don’t lend my books

- OK
  
  Would you like to borrow my copy of “The Broken Wings”?  
  - What for?

In some registers, the expected response is a supporting move, but as table above illustrates in other registers (such as casual conversation), the confronting responses are more common. Incorporating this interactive dimension, we can now summarize our picture of the semantics of dialogue as in the above table.

Table 3: Speech function pairs (initiations and responses) (Halliday in Eggins, 1994: 151)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiating Speech Function</th>
<th>Responding Speech Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>Acceptance (may be non-verbal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command</td>
<td>Compliance (may be non-verbal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Acknowledgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from Halliday 1985a: 69

This now gives us a list of eight speech function classes, which we can use to describe the move sequences in a simple dialogue involving three speakers, A, B and C:

A: Have you ever read “The Broken Wings”?  question
B: I really wouldn’t know.  disclaimer
C: Yes, I have  answer
A: It’s by Kahlil Gibran.  
C: Yea,  
B: No it’s not!  contradiction
C: Would you like to borrow my copy?  offer

B: Well, OK
A: You’ll enjoy it.
C: Yea.
C: Here, take it!
B: [takes book] Thanks.

Having established a basic picture of how dialogue works, we need to ask how this relates to the clauses we produce as we interact. In other words, what grammatical structure “realizes” these meanings? What is particularly interesting to us about these different speech functions classes is that we can recognize a correlation between the semantic choice of speech function and the grammatical structure which is typically chosen to encode it. If, for example, you wish to make a statement, you will typically use a clause of a particular structure: a declarative clause, e.g.

A: It's by Kahlil Gibran. Statement

If, on the other hand you wish to make a command, you will use an imperative:

C: Here, take it! Command

If you wish to offer something, you are likely to use a “would..like” interrogative (what we call a modulated interrogative):

C: Would you like to borrow my copy? Offer

And finally if you wish to ask question, you will of course use the kind of clause we call an interrogative:

A: Have you ever read “The Broken Wings”? Question

There is also a correlation between the different structure of an initiating move and the structure of a responding move. You can see from the examples given above that most initiating moves are “long”, while most responding moves are “short”. Responding moves are short because they typically involve some kind of abbreviation or ellipsis or are what we call minor clauses (these terms will be explained below):

Answer
Yes, I have (instead of Yes I have read it)

Acknowledgement
Yea. (instead of Yea I know it’s by Kahlil Gibran)

Accept
Well, OK. (instead of Well OK I will borrow it)
Compliance Thanks. (instead of Thanks, I’m taking the book)

The kind of differences we are uncovering here are not random. They have to do with what is called the Mood structure of the clause. The Mood structure of the clause refers to the organization of a set of functional constituents including the constituent Subject. The basic Mood types have already been mentioned. It will be quite obvious to you that the examples of clauses presented above are not only possibilities. These are only the typical correlations. Not all demands for goods and services have to be imperatives. We need to consider the possibilities for both marked and unmarked correlations. Thus, while commands are typically expressed by imperative clauses (e.g. Read Kahlil Gibran), they can also be expressed by declaratives (I’m hoping you’ll read some Kahlil Gibran), or modulated interrogatives (Would you mind reading Kahlil Gibran, please?). while offers are typically expressed by modulated interrogatives (e.g. Would you like to borrow “The Broken Wings”?), they can also be expressed by imperatives (e.g. Take my copy of “The Broken Wings”) or declaratives (There’s a copy of “The Broken Wings” here).

Table 4: Speech Functions and typical mood of clause (Eggins, 1994: 153)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEECH FUNCTION</th>
<th>TYPICAL MOOD IN CLAUSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Declarative Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Interrogative Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command</td>
<td>Imperative Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>Modulated interrogative Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>Elliptical declarative mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Minor clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Minor clause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While questions are usually expressed by interrogatives (e.g. Is “The Broken Wings” by Kahlil Gibran?), they can also be expressed by modulated declaratives (e.g. I was wondering whether “The Broken Wings” might be by Kahlil Gibran). And while statements are usually expressed by declaratives (“The Broken Wings” was...
Kahlil Gibran’s last novel), they can also be expressed by tagged declaratives (“The Broken Wings” was Kahlil Gibran’s last novel, wasn’t it?). Now the findings about dialogue can be summarized.

Table 5: Summary of dialogue (Eggins, 1994: 153)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEECH FUNCTION</th>
<th>Typical clause Mood</th>
<th>Non-typical clause Mood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Command</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Modulated interrogative declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>Modulated interrogative</td>
<td>Imperative declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>Tagged declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>Modulated declarative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action is an act by spoken or written to ask or to give any information or good services. Sinar (2003: 105) says,

“Aksi adalah tindakan dengan melakukan ucapan atau tulisan untuk meminta atau memberi informasi atau barang jasa”

Action includes statement, question, command, and offer. An act of speaking is an interact, i.e. an exchange, in which there is something either given, which implies there is something received, or else demanded, which implies there is something given. If not, there is no interaction. In other words, in an interaction involving speaker and listener, the speaker is either giving something, which implies that the listener is receiving something, or else demanding something, which implies that the listener is giving something in response. What is exchanged (demanded/given or given/received) is a kind of commodity, and the commodity exchanged falls into two principal types: (1) information, and (2) good and services. These two variables or types of commodity exchanged define the four primary speech functions of (1) statement, (2) question, (3) command, and (4) offer.

2.5.1 Statement
Statement is usually realized by a non-exclamative declarative type but it could also be realized by an exclamative type.

For example: Queen Elizabeth II is delivering a speech.

2.5.2 Question

Question is usually realized by an interrogative which may be of a polar (yes/no) type or a content (wh-) type.

For example: What does the prime minister do overseas?

2.5.3 Command

Command is usually realized by negative/positive imperative mood type.

For example: Open the door, please!

2.5.4 Offer

Offer is usually realized by a positive imperative type but it could also be realized by some other mood type, for example by a polar (yes/no) interrogative subtype of the indicative mood type.

For example: Would you have coffee please?

2.6 Reaction

Reaction is limited as personal opinion that is given by language users when they do their action. Sinar (2003: 105) says,

“Reaksi dibatasi sebagai pendapat pribadi yang diberikan pemakai bahasa ketika mereka menyampaikan aksinya”.

Reaction is realized by mental process, epithet, modality, euphemism, and connotative meaning.

2.6.1 Mental Process
Mental process is process of *sensing*, in which a participant, i.e. a *conscious* being or thing, is engaged in a process of *seeing*, *feeling* or *thinking*, which may involve some other participants. Halliday divides mental process verbs into three classes: cognition (verbs of thinking, knowing, understanding, for example *I don’t understand her attitude*), affection (verbs of liking, fearing, e.g. *I hate snake*), and perception (verbs of seeing, hearing, e.g. *Brian saw her yesterday*).

For example: We *have seen* the decency of a loving.

2.6.2 Epithet

Epithet is a substance of language which function is to explain characteristic of substance. Epithet explains the characteristic of something. This indicates some quality of the subset, which may be either ‘objective’, such as ‘old’, ‘big’, ‘small’, or it may be an expression of the speaker’s attitude, such as ‘loathsome’, ‘nasty’. Attitudinal epithets (e.g. loathsome, nasty), while also being experiential have an interpersonal dimension. Attitudinal epithets (subjective epithets) tend to come before experiential (objective) ones; however, this is a tendency and not a rule. If we look at abuse, then we tend to find that the attitudinal epithets come first and build in intensity before we get to the experiential ones. So for example:

You *useless, hopeless, worthless, no good, little*...
Those two *loathsome, big snakes* or Those two *big, loathsome snakes*
Passengers like an *exceptional* man named Todd Beamer.

Attitudinal epithets also tend to be marked by stress and intonation, and are often intensified by swear words. There is also, theoretically anyway, no restriction on the number of epithets possible in a nominal group.

2.6.3 Modality

Modality is personal opinion, view, and consideration of the speaker by using modals auxiliary such as can/could, may/might, shall/will, must/have/has/had to, can’t
have, must have, certainly, always, probably, usually, perhaps, possibly, obliged to, required to, sometimes, never, definitely, most likely, conceivably, I reckon, I guess, I think, I suppose, I’m sure, and I sometimes.

For example: We will not forget moments of silence.

2.6.4 Euphemism

Euphemism is polite expression used by the speaker. A euphemism is a substitution of an agreeable or less offensive expression in place of one that may offend or suggest something unpleasant to the listener or in the case of doublespeak, to make it less troublesome for the speaker.

For example:

- *fatally wounded* instead of *killed*
- *correctional facility* for ‘prison’
- *ill-advised* for ‘very poor or bad’

2.6.5 Connotative Meaning

Connotative meaning consists of extra meaning. Connotative meaning refers to the associations, overtones, and feel which a concept has, rather than what it refers to explicitly (or denotes, hence denotative meaning). Two words with the same reference or definition may have different connotations. Connotative meaning is often researched using the semantic differential, based in part on the phenomenon of synaesthesia, where experience in one sense modality is perceived with (or replaces) another modality. For example, where a sound is perceived as a color or emotion, as in blue or sad music. *Rose* can be associated with love, passion, and beauty.

2.7 Register (Context of Situation)
'Register theory', people sometimes call it 'register analysis', is generally associated with a particular theory within the general SFLT. To put this in its historical context, this theory can be said to originate with Halliday, McIntoch and Strevens (1964: 77). When they discussed 'varieties in language', they talked about 'register' along with 'dialect'.

"...[dialects are] varieties according to users (that is, varieties in the sense that each speaker uses one variety and uses it all the time)...[registers are] varieties according to use (that is, in the sense that each speaker has a range of varieties and chooses between them at different times )" (words in square brackets added) (Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens, 1964: 77).

The two concepts were described further in the following:

"A dialect is a variety of a language distinguished according to the user: different groups of people within the language community speak different dialects. It is possible also to recognize varieties of a language along another dimension, distinguished according to the use. Language varies as its function varies; it differs in different situations. The name given to a variety of a language distinguished according to use is 'register'" (Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens, 1964: 77)

One might ask, "Why did they need the conceptual category of 'register' in the general theory of language-in-context? They argued that:

"The category of 'register' is needed when we want to account for what people do with their language. When we observe language activity in the various contexts in which it takes place, we find differences in the type of language selected as appropriate to different types of situation" (Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens, 1964: 87).

In his explanation of the term 'register', Halliday stated that:

"The term 'register' was first used in this sense, that of text variety, by Reid (1956); the concept was taken up and developed by Jean Ure (Ure and Ellis 1972), and interpreted within Hill's (1958) 'institutional linguistic' framework by halliday et al. (1964). The register is the semantic variety of which a text may be regarded as an instance" (italics added) (Halliday, 1978:110).

A general reading of the statements above suggests that there are key words or expressions related to register that need clarification. First, what part or dimension of
‘language’ characterizes a register? Is it the whole language in the sense of all internal linguistic components consisting of semantics, lexicogrammar and phonology/graphology, or is it just one of the components? Second, what ‘differences’ indicate a particular language variety distinct from other varieties? Third, when is a situation considered one ‘type of situation’ different from other situations? As far as the above statements go, there seems to have been a development of the concept, a shift in focus or orientation from ‘language variety’ to ‘text variety’, then to ‘semantic theory’ of which a text is an instance. As Halliday indicated, the general distinction was initially characterized largely by the ‘lexicogrammatical’ properties of language, but then he suggested it was to be defined more in ‘semantic’ terms (1978: 110-111). So the term ‘language’ that characterized ‘a register’ or ‘a language variety according to use’ was initially associated with ‘lexicogrammar’. In this, ‘a language variety according to use’ or ‘a register’ could be said to be roughly synonymous with ‘a lexicogrammatical variety’. Then, there was a shift in focus or orientation from ‘lexicogrammar’ to ‘semantics’. Consequently, ‘a register’ was then roughly equivalent to ‘a semantic variety’; and, as Halliday specified, ‘a text’ is ‘an instance’ of semantic theory.

Halliday’s description of register runs as follows:

“A register is: what you are speaking (at the time) determined by what you are doing (nature of social activity being engaged in), and expressing diversity of social process (social division of labour). So in principle registers are: ways of saying different things and tend to differ in: semantics (and hence in lexicogrammar, and sometimes phonology, as realization of this). Extreme cases: restricted languages, languages for special purposes. Typical instances: occupational varieties (technical, semi-technical). Principal controlling variables: field (type of social action); tenor (role relationships); mode (symbolic organization). Characterized by: major distinctions of spoken/written; language in action/language in reflection (Halliday, 1978: 35)
The term ‘register’ has been used differently by the two models. Martin uses the term ‘register’ to refer to his first context plane above language, which is roughly equivalent to Halliday’s more general term “context of situation”. Halliday, on the other hand, uses the same term “register” to refer to functional variation of language as an aspect of a separate dimension of organization within language (Martin, 1992: 502). Martin’s comparative statement runs as follows:

“Halliday uses the term [register] simply to refer to language as context’s expression plan – the linguistic meanings (entailing their expressions) at risk in a given situation type. English Text extends the notion to cover in addition part of context’s content plane; register is used in other words to refer to the semiotic system constituted by the contextual variables field, tenor, and mode… register is the name of the metafunctionally organized connotative semiotic between language and genre. This means that instead of characterizing context of situation as potential and register as (context’s) actual, English Texts treats register as a semiotic system in its own right, involving notions both of system and process” (emphasis and italics as original) (Martin, 1992: 501-502).

2.7.1 Field of Discourse

Field as the first contextual variable that characterizes the extrinsic functionality of the situational context can be described as follows:

“The social action: ‘what is actually taking place’. [This] refers to what is happening, to the nature of the social action that is taking place: what [activity/topic] is it that the participants are engaged in, in which the language figures as some essential component” (Halliday & Hasan, 1985: 12)

The analysis of field would be incomplete if an examination of its text-forming properties was not undertaken. As Halliday (1976: 23) puts it, a text must be coherent with respect to the context of situation and must therefore be consistent in register. Martin (1986) defines field as “a set of activity sequences oriented to some global institutional purpose”, and he includes taxonomies, configurations and activity sequences in the discussion of field of discourse. With all these, the analysis of field of discourse becomes broader and richer. It is argued that the lexical relation of items
and the taxonomic structure must be a corollary since they together define a text. In this respect, the discussion of field, according to Martin (1992: 292), can be broken down into the following:

(1) taxonomies of actions, people, places, things and qualities,

(2) configurations of actions with people, places, things and qualities
    and of people, places and things with qualities, and

(3) activity sequences of these configurations

Following the GSFLT’s hypothesis that the intrinsic functional organization of language closely interacts with the corresponds to the extrinsic functional organization of social context, it is argued that field is closely related to the ideational metafunction, tenor to the interpersonal, and mode to the textual (see e.g. Halliday, 1978: 143). In this, field is construed by the ideational, tenor by the interpersonal, and mode by the textual.

With reference to Martin’s conceptual statements, field would be characterized by the dimensions of the taxonomies, the configurations and the activity sequences stated above. In this, any discussion of field that is modeled as interacting with the ideational function of language would focus on characterizing the field in terms of the taxonomies, configurations and activity sequences, moving downward to focusing on characterizing the ideational function in terms of its experiential and logico-semantic systems and representations as realized by the transitivity and clause complexity systems and representations. In other words, any analysis of field would be associated with an analysis of the experiential and logico-semantic aspects within the transitivity and clause complexity system representation analyses.

2.7.2 Tenor of Discourse
Tenor as the second contextual variable that characterizes the extrinsic functionality of the situational context can be described as follows:

“the role structure: ‘who is taking part’. [This] refers to who is taking part, to the nature of the participants, their statues and roles: what kinds of role relationship obtain among the participants, including permanent and temporary relationships of one kind or another, both the types of speech role that they are taking on in the dialogue and the whole cluster of socially significant relationships in which they are involved. …[This] notion includes what Halliday includes what Halliday refers to as the “degree of emotional charge” in the relationship.]” (Halliday & Hasan, 1985: 12)

Internally, tenor is in turn characterized by three dimensions: (1) status, (2) contact, and (3) affect (Martin, 1992: 526), or (1) power, (2) contact and (3) affect (Poynton, 1985: 77). In this respect, any discussion of tenor that is modeled as interacting with the interpersonal function of language would focus on characterizing tenor in terms of the status, power, contact and affect, moving downward to focusing on characterizing the interpersonal function as realized by the mood system and representation. In other words, any analysis of tenor would be associated with an analysis of the interpersonal aspects within the mood system representation analysis.

Poynton (1985: 79-80) acknowledges that (1) the dimension of power “is realized primarily in terms of linguistic choices on the discourse stratum and at clause rank within lexicogrammar, with the equality or inequality of interactants which is indicated by the extent of reciprocity of those choices’, (2) the dimension of contact “is realized primarily within lexicogrammar, particularly in terms of lexis but also at all ranks of grammar: clause, group and morpheme”, and (3) the dimension of affect “is realized primarily at group rank and below within lexicogrammar and also, most importantly, on the phonological stratum in terms of variation in intonation, rhythm, rate of speech, etc.”.

2.7.3 Mode of Discourse
Mode as the third contextual variable that characterizes the extrinsic functionality of the situational context can be described as follows:

“the symbolic organization: ‘what role language is playing’. [This] refers to what part language is playing, what is it that the participants are expecting the language to do for them in the situation: the symbolic organization of the text, the status that it has, and its function in the context, including the channel (is it spoken or written or some combination of the two” (Halliday & Hasan, 1985: 12).

Halliday continues, “…..and also the rhetorical mode, what is being achieved by the text in terms of such categories as persuasive, expository, didactic, and the like” (Halliday & Hasan, 1985: 12). Halliday’s rhetorical mode is set up to capture the dimension of what would be referred to by people in general as goal, something to be achieved by the text. This rhetorical mode is treated under genre in Martin’s model (Martin, 1993: 166).

As has been indicated, mode is the kind of role that language is playing in a text-creating social interaction. Hasan specifies mode of discourse-in-text into two dimensions: (1) channel, and (2) medium (Halliday & Hasan: 1985). As interpreted, the notion of channel relates to the question of whether the text comes to the participants through their eyes or whether the text comes to the participants through their ears, finger tips or other body parts or senses. In the first case, it is visual; in the second case, it is non-visual. On the other hand, the notion of medium relates to the question of whether the text comes to the participants when the text is still being processed or created (not yet finished, still a process), or whether the text comes to the participants when the text has already been processed or created (already finished, already a finished product). In the first sense, it is spoken; in the second case, it is written.
Gregory’s major classification of medium is that it falls into two dimensions: (1) speaking, and (2) writing. If it is speaking, it can be spontaneously speech or non-spontaneously speech. If it is writing, it can be written-to-be-spoken, written-to-be-spoken-as-if-not-written, or written-not-necessarily-to-be-spoken (Gregory & Carroll, 1978: 37-47). Taking up Gregory’s proposal, Benson and Greaves (1973: 82) further divide spontaneous speech into monologuing and conversing, as described in the following:

“Monologuing is the speaking by one individual in such a way as to exclude the possibility of interruption by others. Conversing is speaking in such a way as to invite the participation of others” (Benson & Greaves in Sinar, 2007: 88)

Martin (1984: 26) states that mode can be interpreted in terms of distance which can be further divided into (1) experiential distance, and (2) spatial/interpersonal distance. The distance between speaker and listener is known as feedback which can be further divided into (1) immediate feedback, and (2) delayed feedback.

A spatial/interpersonal distance mode of the immediate feedback type may be represented by an active casual conversation, or an active conversing lecture, whereas a spatial/interpersonal distance mode of the delayed feedback type may be represented by a one-way communication such as that of a radio mode. On the other hand, an experiential distance may be represented by a distance between language and the social process occurring (Eggins, 1994: 54).

With reference to lecture discourse mode, it can be characterized that immediate feedback is the active conversing lecture while the delayed feedback is apt for monologuing lecture. Referring to the experiential distance, for example, in the conversing lecture language is used for asking questions, for checking, explaining and
giving tasks so the patterns flow. In such a situation, it is the language as action. But where the mode is not spontaneous and monologic, the language is used as reflection.

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF ANALYSIS

Research Method

There are three kinds of research based on the location of the research i.e. library research, laboratory, and field research (Bungin, 2005: 40-41). In this thesis, the library research method is applied by collecting some theories and informations about a text analysis of action and reaction from books, thesis, internet, and other sources which support the writing.

3.2 Data Collecting Method

According to Arikunto (2006: 223-232) there are five kinds of method in collecting data i.e. test, questionnaire, interview, observation, and documentation.
method. In this writing, the documentation method is used in collecting data. The data is collected randomly from the internet.

3.3 Data Analysis Method

The datum are analyzed by using descriptive qualitative and quantitative methods (Arikunto, 2006: 239) and applied by some procedures or steps. Firstly, the speeches texts are collected randomly from the internet and chosen only three of them. Secondly, each text of speech is divided into clauses. For example, “Whether we bring our enemies to justice or bring justice to our enemies, justice will be done.” This sentence can be divided into three clauses. They are:

1. Whether we bring our enemies to justice,
2. We bring justice to our enemies,
3. Justice will be done.

The total number of the clauses in each text of speech become population and sample in the analysis. Thirdly, types of action and reaction are identified and then classified into their types of action and reaction. Fourthly, the register variables are tried to be found in each text of speech. Fifthly, the most dominant types of action and reaction are tried to be found in those three speeches. Finally, some conclusions are made about the research and some suggestions are proposed.

In order to get the dominant action and reaction process, the following formula is used (Bungin, 2005: 171-172):

\[ n = \frac{fx}{N} \times 100 \% \]

Where: \( n \) = Percentage of types
\( fx \) = Total types frequency of the sub-category
N = Total types of all categories

For example:

An analysis of action: 1. America has no truer friend than Great Britain.
                   2. “Who attacked our country?”

First clause is a statement because it is realized by a declarative type while in
second is a question because it is realized by interrogative or (Wh-) type.

An analysis of reaction:

1. Mental process is process of sensing, in which a participant, i.e. a conscious
   being or thing, is engaged in a process of seeing, feeling or thinking, which
   may involve some other participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We</th>
<th>have seen</th>
<th>the unfurling of flags</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senser</td>
<td>Process: mental, perception</td>
<td>Phenomenon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Epithet is a substance of language which function is to explain characteristic
   of substance. Epithet explains the characteristic of something.

For example: “...but not at the center of a great city on a peaceful morning.”

The word peaceful is epithet because it explains the characteristic of morning.

3. Modality is personal opinion, view, and consideration of the speaker by using
   modals auxiliary such as can/could, may/might, shall/will, must/have/has/had to,
   can’t have, must have, certainly, always, probably, usually, perhaps,
   possibly, obliged to, required to, sometimes, never, definitely, most likely,
   conceivably, I reckon, I guess, I think, I suppose, I’m sure, and I sometimes.

For example: The Taliban must act.

The clause above consists of modals and personal opinion of the speaker.

4. Euphemism is polite expression used by the speaker. A euphemism is a
   substitution of an agreeable or less offensive expression in place of one that
may offend or suggest something unpleasant to the listener or in the case of
doublespeak, to make it less troublesome for the speaker.

For example:

- *fee* for ‘fine’.
- *adult entertainment* for ‘pornography’.
- *to cut excesses (in a budget)* for ‘to fire employees’.

5. Connotative meaning consists of extra meaning.

For example: *Rose* can be associated with love, passion, and beauty.

**Register Variables:**

1. Field of discourse is what is actually taking place in discourse-in-text.

   Field of discourse: The President’s nation speech after September 11th attack in 2001 to a joint session of Congress and nation. Bush made a declaration about who had attacked their country.

2. Tenor of discourse is who is taking part.

   Tenor of discourse: Members of United State Congress, America government, the victims of September 11th attack, and American people.

3. Mode of discourse is what role language is playing.

   Mode of discourse: Written text to be spoken to the audience. The text is a formal national document.
CHAPTER IV

THE ANALYSIS OF ACTION, REACTION, AND REGISTER IN THREE SELECTED GEORGE WALKER BUSH’S SPEECHES

4.1 The Analysis of Action, Reaction and Register

4.1.1 Action and Reaction of Speech 1

Action is an act by spoken or written to ask or to give any information or good and services. Action includes statement, question, command and offer in a text of speech. Reaction is limited as personal opinion that is given by language users when they do their action. Reaction is realized by mental process, epithet, modality, euphemism, and connotative meaning. The following data is the data where action and reaction types are really exist in speech 1. The data is the text of Bush’s speech to a joint session of Congress and the nation in September 20th, 2001.
Mr. Speaker,

Mr. President Pro Tempore,

members of Congress,

and fellow Americans,

in the normal course of events, presidents come to this chamber to report on the state of the union.

Tonight, no such report is needed; it has already been delivered by the American people.

We have seen it in the courage of passengers who rushed terrorists to save others on the ground.

Passengers like an exceptional man named Todd Beamer.

And would you please help me welcome his wife Lisa Beamer here tonight?

We have seen the state of our union in the endurance of rescuers working past exhaustion.

We've seen the unfurling of flags, the lighting of candles, the giving of blood, the saying of prayers in English, Hebrew and Arabic.

We have seen the decency of a loving and giving people who have made the grief of strangers their own.

for the last nine days, the entire world has seen for itself the state of union, and it is strong.

and called to defend freedom.

Our grief has turned to anger and anger to resolution.

Whether we bring our enemies to justice or bring justice to our enemies, justice will be done.

I thank the Congress for its leadership at such an important time.

All of America was touched on the evening of the tragedy and called to defend freedom.

I thank the Congress for its leadership at such an important time.

And you did more than sing.

You acted, by delivering $40 billion to rebuild our communities and meet the needs of our military.

Speaker Hastert,

Minority Leader Gephardt,

Majority Leader Daschle and Senator Lott,

I thank you for your friendship, and I thank you for your leadership and for your service to our country.

And on behalf of the American people, I thank the world for its outpouring of support.

America will never forget the sounds of our national anthem playing at Buckingham Palace, on the streets of Paris and at Berlin's Brandenburg Gate.
40. **We will not forget** South Korean children gathering to pray outside our embassy in Seoul, or the prayers of sympathy offered at a mosque in Cairo.

41. **We will not forget** moments of silence and days of mourning in Australia and Africa and Latin America.

42. Nor will we **forget** the citizens of 80 other nations who died with our own.

43. Dozens of Pakistanis, more than 130 Israelis, more than 250 citizens of India, men and women from El Salvador, Iran, Mexico and Japan, and hundreds of British citizens.

44. America has no **truer** friend than Great Britain.

45. **Once again, we are joined together in a great cause.**

46. **I'm so honored** the British prime minister had crossed an ocean to show his unity with America.

47. **Thank you for coming, friend.**

48. On September the 11th, enemies of freedom committed an act of war against our country.

49. Americans **have known** wars, but for the past 136 years they have been wars on foreign soil, except for one Sunday in 1941.

50. Americans **have known** the casualties of war, but not at the center of a great city on a peaceful morning.

51. Americans **have known** surprise attacks, but never before on thousands of civilians.

52. All of this was brought upon us in a single day, and night fell on a different world, a world where freedom itself is under attack.

53. Americans **have many questions tonight.**

54. Americans **are asking,**

55. ``Who attacked our country?''

56. The evidence we have gathered all points to a collection of loosely affiliated terrorist organizations known as al Qaeda.

57. They are some of the murderers indicted for bombing American embassies in Tanzania and Kenya and responsible for bombing the USS Cole.

58. Al Qaeda is to terror what the Mafia is to crime.

59. But its goal is not making money, its goal is remaking the world and imposing its radical beliefs on people everywhere.

60. The terrorists practice a fringe form of Islamic extremism that has been rejected by Muslim scholars and the vast majority of Muslim clerics;

61. a fringe movement that perverts the peaceful teachings of Islam.

62. The terrorists' directive commands them to kill Christians and Jews to kill all Americans and make no distinctions among military and civilians, including women and children.

63. This group and its leader, a person named Osama bin Laden, are linked to many other organizations in different countries, including the Egyptian Islamic Jihad, the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan.
73. There are thousands of these terrorists in more than 60 countries. (statement)
74. They are recruited from their own nations and neighborhoods (statement)
75. and brought to camps in places like Afghanistan (statement)
76. where they are trained in the tactics of terror. (statement)
77. They are sent back to their homes (statement)
78. or sent to hide in countries around the world (statement)
79. to plot evil and destruction. (statement)
80. The leadership of Al Qaeda has great influence in Afghanistan and supports (statement)
81. the Taliban regime in controlling most of that country. (statement)
82. In Afghanistan we see Al Qaeda’s vision for the world. (statement)
83. Afghanistan’s people have been brutalized, (statement)
84. many are starving (statement)
85. and many have fled. (statement)
86. Women are not allowed to attend school. (statement)
87. You can be jailed for owning a television. (statement)
88. Religion can be practiced only as their leaders dictate. (statement)
89. A man can be jailed in Afghanistan if his beard is not long enough. (statement)
90. The United States respects the people of Afghanistan— (statement)
91. after all, we are currently its largest source of humanitarian aid—but we (statement)
92. condemn the Taliban regime. (statement)
93. It is not only repressing its own people, (statement)
94. it is threatening people everywhere by sponsoring (statement)
95. and sheltering people and supplying terrorists. (statement)
96. By aiding and abetting murder, the Taliban regime is committing murder. (statement)
97. And tonight the United States of America makes the following demands on the (statement)
98. Taliban. (statement)
99. Deliver to United States authorities all of the leaders of Al Qaeda who hide in (command)
100. your land. (command)
101. Release all foreign nationals, including American citizens you have unjustly (command)
102. imprisoned. (command)
103. Protect foreign journalists, diplomats and aid workers in your country. (command)
104. Close immediately and permanently every terrorist training camp in Afghanistan. (command)
105. And hand over every terrorist and every person and their support structure to (command)
106. appropriate authorities. (command)
107. Give the United States full access to terrorist training camps, (command)
108. so we can make sure they are no longer operating. (command)
109. These demands are not open to negotiation or discussion. (statement)
110. The Taliban must act (statement)
111. and act immediately. (statement)
112. They will hand over the terrorists (statement)
113. or they will share in their fate. (statement)
114. I also want to speak tonight directly to Muslims throughout the world. (statement)
115. We respect your faith. (statement)
It's practiced freely by many millions of Americans and by millions more in countries that America counts as friends. (statement)

Its teachings are good and peaceful, and those who commit evil in the name of Allah blaspheme the name of Allah. (statement)

The terrorists are traitors to their own faith, trying in effect, to hijack Islam itself. (statement)

The enemy of America is not our many Muslim friends. It is not our many Arab friends. Our enemy is a radical network of terrorists and every government that supports them. (statement)

Our war on terror begins with Al Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated. Americans are asking "Why do they hate us?"

They hate what they see right here in this chamber: a democratically elected government. Their leaders are self-appointed.

(They hate) our freedom of religion, (They hate) our freedom of speech, (They hate) our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other.

They want to overthrow existing governments in many Muslim countries such as Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Jordan. They want to drive Israel out of the Middle East. They want to drive Christians and Jews out of vast regions of Asia and Africa.

These terrorists kill not merely to end lives, but to disrupt and end a way of life. With every atrocity, they hope that America grows fearful, retreating from the world and forsaking our friends. They stand against us because we stand in their way.

We're not deceived by their pretenses to piety. We have seen their kind before. They're the heirs of all the murderous ideologies of the 20th century. By sacrificing human life to serve their radical visions, by abandoning every value except the will to power, they follow in the path of fascism, Nazism and totalitarianism. And they will follow that path all the way to where it ends in history's unmarked grave of discarded lies.

Americans are asking, "How will we fight and win this war?"

We will direct every resource at our command—(We will direct) every means of diplomacy,
(We will direct) every tool of intelligence, (statement)
(We will direct) every instrument of law enforcement, (statement)
(We will direct) every financial influence, and every necessary weapon of
war—to the destruction and to the defeat of the global terror network. (statement)

Now, this war will not be like the war against Iraq a decade ago, with a
decisive liberation of territory and a swift conclusion. (statement)
It will not look like the air war above Kosovo two years ago, where no ground
troops were used and not a single American was lost in combat. (statement)
Our response involves far more than instant retaliation and isolated strikes. (statement)

Americans should not expect one battle, (statement)
but a lengthy campaign unlike any other we have ever seen. (statement)
It may include dramatic strikes visible on TV (statement)
and covert operations secret even in success. (statement)
We will starve terrorists of funding, turn them one against another, (statement)
drive them from place to place until there is no refuge or no rest. (statement)
And we will pursue nations that provide aid (statement)
or safe haven to terrorism. (statement)
Every nation in every region now has a decision to make: Either you are with
us or you are with the terrorists. (statement)
From this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor (statement)
or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime. (statement)

Our nation has been put on notice, (statement)
we're not immune from attack. (statement)
We will take defensive measures against terrorism (statement)
to protect Americans. (statement)
Today, dozens of federal departments and agencies, as well as state and local
governments, have responsibilities affecting homeland security. (statement)
These efforts must be coordinated at the highest level. (statement)
So tonight, I announce the creation of a Cabinet-level position reporting
directly to me, the Office of Homeland Security. (statement)
And tonight, I also announce a distinguished American to lead this effort,
to strengthen American security: a military veteran, an effective governor,
a true patriot, a trusted friend, Pennsylvania's Tom Ridge. (statement)
He will lead, (statement)
oversee and coordinate a comprehensive national strategy (statement)
to safeguard our country against terrorism (statement)
and respond to any attacks that may come. (statement)
These measures are essential. The only way to defeat terrorism as a threat
to our way of life is to stop it, (statement)
eliminate it and destroy it where it grows. (statement)
Many will be involved in this effort, from FBI agents, to intelligence
operatives, to the reservists we have called to active duty. (statement)
All deserve our thanks, and all have our prayers. And tonight a few miles from
the damaged Pentagon, (statement)
I have a message for our military: Be ready. (command)
185. I have called the armed forces to alert, and there is a reason. (statement)
186. The hour is coming when America will act, (statement)
187. and you will make us proud. (statement)
188. This is not, however, just America's fight. And what is at stake is not just America's freedom. This is the world's fight. This is civilization's fight. This is the fight of all who believe in progress and pluralism, tolerance and freedom. (statement)
189. We ask every nation to join us. (command)
190. We will ask (statement)
191. and we will need the help of police forces, intelligence service and banking systems around the world. (statement)
192. The United States is grateful that many nations and many international organizations have already responded with sympathy and with support—nations from Latin America to Asia to Africa to Europe to the Islamic world. (statement)
193. Perhaps the NATO charter reflects best the attitude of the world: (statement)
194. An attack on one is an attack on all. (statement)
195. The civilized world is rallying to America's side. (statement)
196. They understand that if this terror goes unpunished, their own cities, their own citizens may be next. (statement)
197. Terror unanswered can not only bring down buildings, (statement)
198. it can threaten the stability of legitimate governments. (statement)
199. And you know what? (question)
200. We're not going to allow it. (statement)
201. Americans are asking, (statement)
202. "What is expected of us?" (question)
203. I ask you to live your lives (command)
204. and hug your children. (command)
205. I know many citizens have fears tonight, (statement)
206. and I ask you to be calm and resolute, even in the face of a continuing threat. (command)
207. I ask you to uphold the values of America (command)
208. and remember why so many have come here. (command)
209. We're in a fight for our principles, and our first responsibility is to live by them. (statement)
210. No one should be singled out for unfair treatment or unkind words because of their ethnic background or religious faith. (statement)
211. I ask you to continue (command)
212. to support the victims of this tragedy with your contributions. (command)
213. Those who want to give can go to a central source of information, Libertyunites.org, (command)
214. to find the names of groups providing direct help in New York, Pennsylvania and Virginia. (statement)
215. The thousands of FBI agents who are now at work in this investigation may need your cooperation, (statement)
216. and I ask you to give it. (command)
217. I ask for your patience with the delays and inconveniences that may accompany tighter security and for your patience in what will be a long struggle. (command)
218. I ask your continued participation and confidence in the American economy. (command)
219. Terrorists attacked a symbol of American prosperity; they did not touch its source. (statement)
220. America is successful because of the hard work and creativity and enterprise of our people. (statement)
221. These were the true strengths of our economy before September 11, and they are our strengths today. (statement)
222. And finally, please continue praying for the victims of terror and their families, for those in uniform and for our great country. (statement)
223. Tonight I thank my fellow Americans for what you have already done and for what you will do. (statement)
224. And ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, I thank you, their representatives, for what you have already done and for what we will do together. (statement)
225. Tonight we face new and sudden national challenges. (statement)
226. We will come together to improve air safety, to dramatically expand the number of air marshals on domestic flights and take new measures to prevent hijacking. (statement)
227. We will come together to promote stability and keep our airlines flying with direct assistance during this emergency. (statement)
228. We will come together to give law enforcement the additional tools it needs to track down terror here at home. (statement)
229. We will come together to strengthen our intelligence capabilities to know the plans of terrorists before they act and to find them before they strike. (statement)
230. We will come together to take active steps that strengthen America's economy and put our people back to work. (statement)
231. Tonight we welcome two leaders who embody the extraordinary spirit of all New Yorkers, Governor George Pataki and Mayor Rudolph Giuliani. (statement)
232. As a symbol of America's resolve, my administration will work with Congress and these two leaders to show the world that we will rebuild New York City. (statement)
233. After all that has just passed, all the lives taken and all the possibilities and hopes that died with them, it is natural to wonder if America's future is one of fear. (statement)
234. Some speak of an age of terror. (statement)
235. I know there are struggles ahead and dangers to face. (statement)
236. But this country will define our times, not be defined by them. (statement)
As long as the United States of America is determined and strong, this will not be an age of terror. (statement)

This will be an age of liberty here and across the world. (statement)

Great harm has been done to us. (statement)

We have suffered great loss. (statement)

And in our grief and anger we have found our mission and our moment. (statement)

Freedom and fear are at war. The advance of human freedom, the great achievement of our time and the great hope of every time, now depends on us. (statement)

Our nation, this generation, will lift the dark threat of violence from our people and our future. (statement)

We will rally the world to this cause by our efforts, by our courage. (statement)

We will not tire, (statement)

we will not falter (statement)

and we will not fail. (statement)

It is my hope that in the months and years ahead life will return almost to normal. (statement)

We'll go back to our lives and routines and that is good. (statement)

Even grief recedes with time and grace. But our resolve must not pass. (statement)

Each of us will remember what happened that day and to whom it happened. (statement)

We will remember the moment the news came, where we were and what we were doing. (statement)

Some will remember an image of a fire or story or rescue. (statement)

Some will carry memories of a face and a voice gone forever. (statement)

And I will carry this. (statement)

It is the police shield of a man named George Howard who died at the World Trade Center trying to save others. (statement)

It was given to me by his mom, Arlene (ph), as a proud memorial to her son. (statement)

It is my reminder of lives that ended and a task that does not end. (statement)

I will not yield, (statement)

I will not rest, (statement)

I will not relent in waging this struggle for freedom and security for the American people. (statement)

The course of this conflict is not known, yet its outcome is certain. (statement)

Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty, have always been at war, (statement)

and we know that God is not neutral between them. (statement)

Fellow citizens, (vocative)

we'll meet violence with patient justice, (statement)

assured of the rightness of our cause and confident of the victories to come. (statement)

In all that lies before us, may God grant us wisdom (statement)

and may he watch over the United States of America. (statement)
After dividing George Walker Bush’s speech into clauses, the next step is that action and reaction in clauses above can be detailed in the following table.

Table 6: Action and Reaction in George Walker Bush’s Speech 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>Action type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>Reaction type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>91,39 %</td>
<td>Mental process</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30,76 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,43 %</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>33,38 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Command</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7,16 %</td>
<td>Modality</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>34,84 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Euphemism</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Connotative meaning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.1.1.1 Action**

According to the finding above, the most dominant action type is statement with 255 cases (91,39 %) while other action types such command with 20 cases (7,16 %), and question with 4 cases (1,43%) while offer is nothing. George Walker Bush tells his hope to American people.

262. We will not tire,       (statement)
263. we will not falter       (statement)
264. and we will not fail.    (statement)
265. It is my hope that in the months and years ahead life will return almost to normal.        (statement)

Through the action, it can be shown that George Walker Bush tends to share his ideas and thoughts to the audiences mostly through statement with little realization of asking, commanding, or offering something to his audiences in order to build relationships. Therefore, because the most dominant action in this text of speech is statement so this text is monologue with little other action types (question,
command, offer) that is actually the audiences can be included directly in the text of speech.

4.1.1.2 Reaction

Reaction includes mental process, epithet, modality, euphemism, and connotative meaning. In the George Walker Bush’s speech 1 the most dominant reaction is modality 77 cases (34,84%), then followed by other reaction types those are epithet 76 cases (34,38%), and mental process 68 cases (30,76%),

a. Mental Process

Mental process is process of sensing, in which a participant, i.e. a conscious being or thing, is engaged in a process of seeing, feeling or thinking, which may involve some other participants. This process can be looked in Bush’s speech 1 with number 68 times (30,84%) with the realization of words see (10 times), know (10 times), thank (7 times), forget (5 times), want (5 times), remember (4 times), hate (3 times), meet (2 times), threaten (2 times), respect (2 times), need (2 times), expect (2 times), pursue, oversee, comfort, determine, fail, watch, , honor, hope, believe, understand, regard, serve, deserve and suffer. As exemplified below:

1. We've seen the unfurling of flags, (clause 13)
2. Americans have known the casualties of war, but not at the center of a great city on a peaceful morning. (clause 53)
3. I thank you for your friendship, (clause 35)
4. We will not forget South Korean children gathering (clause 40)
5. Those who want to give can go to a central source of information, Libertyunites.org, (clause 213)
6. Some will remember an image of a fire or story or rescue. (clause 270)
7. They hate our freedoms: (clause 125)
8. we'll meet violence with patient justice, (clause 284)
9. it is threatening people everywhere by sponsoring (clause 92)
10. We respect your faith. (clause 110)
11. Tonight, no such report is needed; (clause 7)
12. "What is expected of us?"
13. And we will pursue nations that provide aid
14. or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime.
15. oversee and coordinate a comprehensive national strategy
16. I'm so honored the British prime minister had crossed an ocean
17. With every atrocity, they hope that America grows fearful
18. This is the fight of all who believe in progress and pluralism
19. Prayer has comforted us in sorrow
20. As long as the United States of America is determined and strong, this will not be an age of terror.
21. We have suffered great loss.
22. and we will not fail.
23. and may he watch over the United States of America.
24. They understand that if this terror goes unpunished, their own cities, their own citizens may be next.
25. They're the heirs of all the murderous ideologies of the 20th century. By sacrificing human life to serve their radical visions
26. All deserve our thanks, and all have our prayers. And tonight a few miles from the damaged Pentagon

b. Epithet

Epithet explains the characteristic of something can be seen in Bush’s speech

1 with the number 76 times (34.38%) with the realization of words great (8 times), radical (3 times), foreign (3 times), peaceful (2 times), single (2 times), different (2 times), vast (2 times), true (2 times), active (2 times), new (2 times), normal, exceptional, important, truer, enough, largest, appropriate, global, decisive, instant, isolated, lengthy, affiliated, dramatic, state, local, highest, effective, trusted, comprehensive, damaged, civilized, legitimate, unfair, unkind, ethnic, religious, central, direct, tighter, long, hard, sudden, domestic, extraordinary, grief, patient, murderous, hostile, proud, dark, first, defensive, safe, and longer. As exemplified below:

1. in the normal course of events, presidents come to this chamber
2. Passengers like an exceptional man named Todd Beamer.
3. I thank the Congress for its leadership at such an important time.
4. America has no truer friend than Great Britain.
5. Once again, we are joined together in a great cause.
6. Americans have known the casualties of war, but not at the center of a great city on a peaceful morning. (clause 53)
7. Americans have known surprise attacks, but never before on thousands of civilians. (clause 54)
8. All of this was brought upon us in a single day, (clause 55)
9. and night fell on a different world, a world where freedom itself is under attack. (clause 56)
10. The evidence we have gathered all points to a collection of loosely affiliated terrorist organizations known as al Qaeda. (clause 60)
11. and imposing its radical beliefs on people everywhere. (clause 66)
12. The terrorists practice a fringe form of Islamic extremism that has been rejected by Muslim scholars and the vast majority of Muslim clerics; (clause 67)
13. A man can be jailed in Afghanistan if his beard is not long enough. (clause 88)
14. after all, we are currently its largest source of humanitarian aid—but we condemn the Taliban regime. (clause 90)
15. Protect foreign journalists, diplomats and aid workers in your country. (clause 99)
16. They're the heirs of all the murderous ideologies of the 20th century. (clause 142)
17. (We will direct) every financial influence, and every necessary weapon of war—to the destruction and to the defeat of the global terror network. (clause 152)
18. Now, this war will not be like the war against Iraq a decade ago, with a decisive liberation of territory and a swift conclusion. (clause 153)
19. Our response involves far more than instant retaliation and isolated strikes. (clause 155)
20. but a lengthy campaign unlike any other we have ever seen. (clause 157)
21. It may include dramatic strikes visible on TV (clause 158)
22. or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime. (clause 166)
23. Today, dozens of federal departments and agencies, as well as state and local governments, have responsibilities affecting homeland security. (clause 171)
24. These efforts must be coordinated at the highest level. (clause 172)
25. to strengthen American security: a military veteran, an effective governor, a true patriot, a trusted friend, Pennsylvania's Tom Ridge. (clause 175)
26. oversee and coordinate a comprehensive national strategy (clause 177)
27. Many will be involved in this effort, from FBI agents, to intelligence operatives, to the reservists we have called to active duty. (clause 182)
28. All deserve our thanks, and all have our prayers. And tonight a few miles from the damaged Pentagon, (clause 183)
29. The civilized world is rallying to America's side. (clause 195)
30. it can threaten the stability of legitimate governments. (clause 198)
31. No one should be singled out for unfair treatment or unkind words because of their ethnic background or religious faith. (clause 210)
32. Those who want to give can go to a central source of information, Libertyunites.org, (clause 213)
33. to find the names of groups providing direct help in New York, Pennsylvania and Virginia.  (clause 214)
34. I ask for your patience with the delays and inconveniences that may accompany tighter security and for your patience in what will be a long struggle.  (clause 217)
35. America is successful because of the hard work and creativity and enterprise of our people.  (clause 221)
36. Tonight we face new and sudden national challenges.  (clause 229)
37. to dramatically expand the number of air marshals on domestic flights  (clause 231)
38. Tonight, we welcome two leaders who embody the extraordinary spirit of all New Yorkers, Governor George Pataki and Mayor Rudolph Giuliani. (clause 245)
39. Even grief recedes with time and grace. But our resolve must not pass.  (clause 267)
40. It was given to me by his mom, Arlene (ph), as a proud memorial to her son. (clause 274)
41. we'll meet violence with patient justice,  (clause 284)
41. so we can make sure they are no longer operating.  (clause 103)
42. or safe haven to terrorism.  (clause 163)
43. We will take defensive measures against terrorism  (clause 169)
44. We're in a fight for our principles, and our first responsibility is to live by them.  (clause 209)
45. Our nation, this generation, will lift the dark threat of violence from our people and our future.  (clause 260)

c. Modality

In Bush’s speech 1 there are 77 modality cases (34,84%) those are will (54 times), can (7 times), may (6 times), must (3 times) and should (2 times), never (2 times), perhaps, always, and is going to. As exemplified below:

1. and we will not fail.  (clause 264)
2. and may he watch over the United States of America  (clause 287)
3. You can be jailed for owning a television.  (clause 86)
4. The Taliban must act  (clause 105)
5. Americans should not expect one battle,  (clause 156)
6. Americans have known surprise attacks, but never before on thousands of civilians.  (clause 54)
7. Perhaps the NATO charter reflects best the attitude of the world:  (clause 193)
8. We're not going to allow it.  (clause 200)
9. Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty, have always been at war, (clause 281)

d. Euphemism

Euphemism is polite expression. There is no euphemism in Bush’s speech 1.
4.1.1.3 Register Variables in Speech 1:

1. Field of discourse is what is actually taking place in discourse-in-text.

   Field of discourse: The President’s nation speech after September 11th attack in 2001 to a joint session of Congress and nation. Bush made a declaration about who had attacked their country.

2. Tenor of discourse is who is taking part.

   Tenor of discourse: Members of United State Congress, America government, the victims of September 11th attack, and American people.

3. Mode of discourse is what role language is playing.

   Mode of discourse: Written text to be spoken to the audience. The text is a formal national document.

4.1.2 Action and Reaction of Speech 2

   Action is an act by spoken or written to ask or to give any information or good and services. Action includes statement, question, command and offer in a text of speech. Reaction is limited as personal opinion that is given by language users when they do their action. Reaction is realized by mental process, epithet, modality, euphemism, and connotative meaning. The following data is the data where action and reaction types are really exist in speech 2. The data is the text of Bush’s speech addresses to the nation on the Economic Crisis on Wednesday evening, September 24, 2008.

1. Good evening. (greeting)
2. This is an extraordinary period for America's economy. Over the past few weeks, many Americans have felt anxiety about their finances and their future. 

3. I understand their worry and their frustration. 

4. We've seen triple-digit swings in the stock market. 

5. Major financial institutions have teetered on the edge of collapse, and some have failed. 

6. As uncertainty has grown, many banks have restricted lending, credit markets have frozen, and families and businesses have found it harder to borrow money. 

7. We're in the midst of a serious financial crisis, and the federal government is responding with decisive action. 

8. Financial assets related to home mortgages have lost value during the house decline, and the banks holding these assets have restricted credit. 

9. As a result, our entire economy is in danger. So I propose that the federal government reduce the risk posed by these troubled assets and supply urgently needed money so banks and other financial institutions can avoid collapse and resume lending. 

10. This rescue effort is not aimed at preserving any individual company or industry. It is aimed at preserving America's overall economy. 

11. It will help American consumers and businesses get credit to meet their daily needs and create jobs. 

12. And it will help send a signal to markets around the world that America's financial system is back on track. 

13. I know many Americans have questions tonight: How did we reach this point in our economy? How will the solution I propose work? And what does this mean for your financial future? These are good questions, and they deserve clear answers. First, how did our economy reach this point? Well, most economists agree that the problems we're witnessing today developed over a long period of time. For more than a decade, a massive amount of money flowed into the United States from investors abroad because our country is an attractive and secure place to do business. 

14. This large influx of money to U.S. banks and financial institutions, along with low interest rates, made it easier for Americans to get credit. These developments allowed more families to borrow money for cars, and homes, and college tuition, some for the first time.
They allowed more entrepreneurs to get loans to start new businesses and create jobs. Unfortunately, there were also some serious negative consequences, particularly in the housing market. Easy credit, combined with the faulty assumption that home values would continue to rise, led to excesses and bad decisions. Many mortgage lenders approved loans for borrowers without carefully examining their ability to pay, assuming that they could afford to take out loans larger than they could refinance their homes at a higher price. Optimism about housing values also led to a boom in home construction. Eventually, the number of new houses exceeded the number of people willing to buy them. And with supply exceeding demand, housing prices fell, and this created a problem. Borrowers with adjustable-rate mortgages, who had been planning to sell or refinance their homes at a higher price, were stuck with homes worth less than expected, along with mortgage payments they could not afford. As a result, many mortgage-holders began to default. These widespread defaults had effects far beyond the housing market.

See, in today's mortgage industry, home loans are often packaged together and converted into financial products called mortgage-backed securities. These securities were sold to investors around the world. Many investors assumed these securities were trustworthy and asked few questions about their actual value. Two of the leading purchasers of mortgage-backed securities were Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Because these companies were chartered by Congress, many believed they were guaranteed by the federal government. This allowed them to borrow enormous sums of money, fuel the market for questionable investments, and put our financial system at risk. The decline in the housing market set off a domino effect across our economy. When home values declined, borrowers defaulted on their mortgages, and investors holding mortgage-backed securities began to incur serious losses. Before long, these securities became so unreliable that they were not being bought or sold. Investment banks, such as Bear Stearns and Lehman Brothers, found themselves saddled with large amounts of assets.
they could not sell. (statement)

They ran out of money needed to meet their immediate obligations, (statement)

and they faced imminent collapse. (statement)

Other banks found themselves in severe financial trouble. (statement)

These banks began holding on to their money, and lending dried up, (statement)

and the gears of the American financial system began grinding to a halt. With the situation becoming more precarious by the day, (statement)

I faced a choice, (statement)

to step in with dramatic government action (statement)
or to stand back (statement)

and allow the irresponsible actions of some (statement)
to undermine the financial security of all. (statement)

I'm a strong believer in free enterprise, so my natural instinct is to oppose government intervention. (statement)

I believe companies that make bad decisions should be allowed to go out of business. (statement)

Under normal circumstances, I would have followed this course. But these are not normal circumstances. (statement)

The market is not functioning properly. (statement)

There has been a widespread loss of confidence, and major sectors of America's financial system are at risk of shutting down. (statement)

The government's top economic experts warn that, without immediate action by Congress, (statement)

America could slip into a financial panic and a distressing scenario would unfold. (statement)

More banks could fail, including some in your community. (statement)

The stock market would drop even more, which would reduce the value of your retirement account. (statement)

The value of your home could plummet. (statement)

Foreclosures would rise dramatically. (statement)

And if you own a business or a farm, (statement)
you would find it harder and more expensive to get credit. (statement)

More businesses would close their doors, (statement)

and millions of Americans could lose their jobs. (statement)

Even if you have good credit history, it would be more difficult for you

to get the loans you need (statement)
to buy a car (statement)
or send your children to college. (statement)

And, ultimately, our country could experience a long and painful recession. (statement)

Fellow citizens, (vocative)

we must not let this happen. (statement)

I appreciate the work of leaders from both parties in both houses of Congress (statement)

and to address this problem (statement)
and to make improvements to the proposal (statement)

my administration sent to them. (statement)
There is a spirit of cooperation between Democrats and Republicans and between Congress and this administration. (statement)

In that spirit, I've invited Senators McCain and Obama (statement)
to join congressional leaders of both parties at the White House tomorrow (statement)
to help speed our discussions toward a bipartisan bill. (statement)

I know that an economic rescue package will present a tough vote for many members of Congress. (statement)

It is difficult to pass a bill that commits so much of the taxpayers' hard-earned money. (statement)

I also understand the frustration of responsible Americans who pay their mortgages on time, (statement)
file their tax returns every April 15th, (statement)
and are reluctant to pay the cost of excesses on Wall Street. (statement)

But given the situation we are facing, not passing a bill now would cost these Americans much more later. (statement)

Many Americans are asking, (statement)
how would a rescue plan work? (question)
After much discussion, there's now widespread agreement on the principles such a plan would include. (statement)

It would remove the risk posed by the troubled assets, including mortgage-backed securities, now clogging the financial system. (statement)

This would free banks to resume the flow of credit to American families and businesses. (statement)

Any rescue plan should also be designed (statement)
to ensure that taxpayers are protected. (statement)

It should welcome the participation of financial institutions, large and small. (statement)

It should make certain that failed executives do not receive a windfall from your tax dollars. (statement)

It should establish a bipartisan board (statement)
to oversee the plan's implementation, (statement)
and it should be enacted as soon as possible. (statement)

In close consultation with Treasury Secretary Hank Paulson, Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke, and SEC Chairman Chris Cox, I announced a plan on Friday. (statement)

First, the plan is big enough to solve a serious problem. (statement)

Under our proposal, the federal government would put up to $700 billion taxpayer dollars on the line (statement)
to purchase troubled assets that are clogging the financial system. (statement)

In the short term, this will free up banks (statement)
to resume the flow of credit to American families and businesses, (statement)
and this will help our economy grow. (statement)

Second, as markets have lost confidence in mortgage-backed securities, (statement)
their prices have dropped sharply, yet the value of many of these assets will likely be higher than their current price, (statement)
because the vast majority of Americans will ultimately pay off their mortgages. (statement)
The government is the one institution with the patience and resources to buy these assets at their current low prices and hold them until markets return to normal. And when that happens, money will flow back to the Treasury as these assets are sold, and we expect that much, if not all, of the tax dollars we invest will be paid back. The final question is, what does this mean for your economic future? Well, the primary steps – purpose of the steps to enforce laws and regulations protecting your money. The Treasury Department recently offered government insurance for money market mutual funds. And through the FDIC, every savings account, checking account, and certificate of deposit is insured by the federal government for up to $100,000. The FDIC has been in existence for 75 years, and no one has ever lost a penny on an insured deposit, and this will not change. Once this crisis is resolved, there will be time to update our financial regulatory structures. Our 21st-century global economy remains regulated largely by outdated 20th-century laws. Recently, we've seen how one company can grow so large that its failure jeopardizes the entire financial system. Earlier this year, Secretary Paulson proposed a blueprint that would modernize our financial regulations. For example, the Federal Reserve would be authorized to take a closer look at the operations of companies across the financial spectrum and ensure that their practices do not threaten overall financial stability. There are other good ideas, and members of Congress should consider them. As they do, they must ensure that efforts to regulate Wall Street do not end up hampering our economy's ability to grow. In the long run, Americans have good reason to be confident in our economic strength. Despite corrections in the marketplace and instances of abuse, democratic capitalism is the best system ever devised. It has unleashed the talents and the productivity and entrepreneurial spirit of our citizens. It has made this country the best place in the world to invest and do business. And it gives our economy the flexibility and resilience to absorb shocks, adjust, and bounce back. Our economy is facing a moment of great challenge, but we've overcome tough challenges before, and we will overcome this one.
170. I know that Americans sometimes get discouraged by the tone in Washington and the seemingly endless partisan struggles, (statement)
171. yet history has shown that, in times of real trial, (statement)
172. elected officials rise to the occasion. (statement)
173. And together we will show the world once again what kind of country America is: (statement)
174. a nation that tackles problems head on, (statement)
175. where leaders come together to meet great tests, (statement)
176. and where people of every background can work hard, (statement)
177. develop their talents, (statement)
178. and realize their dreams. (statement)
179. Thank you for listening. (statement)
180. May God bless you. (statement)

After dividing George Walker Bush’s speech into clauses, the next step is that action and reaction in clauses above can be detailed in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>Action type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>Reaction type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>96,62%</td>
<td>Mental process</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20,88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,37%</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>45,56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Command</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modality</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33,54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>offer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Euphemism</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Connotative meaning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2.1 Action

According to the finding above, the most dominant action type is statement with 172 cases (96,62 %) while other action types such question with 6 cases (3,37%), no command and offer. George Walker Bush tells his hope to American people about economic crisis that they will survive.

160. In the long run, Americans have good reason to be confident in our economic strength. Despite corrections in the marketplace and instances of abuse, democratic capitalism is the best system ever devised. (statement)
161. It has unleashed the talents and the productivity and entrepreneurial spirit of our citizens. (statement)
162. It has made this country the best place in the world (statement)
163. to invest (statement)
164. and do business. (statement)

Through the action, it can be shown that George Walker Bush tends to share his ideas and thoughts to the audiences mostly through statement with little realization of asking, commanding, or offering something to his audiences in order to build relationships. Therefore, because the most dominant action in this text of speech is statement so this text is monologue with little other action types (question, command, offer) that is actually the audiences can be included directly in the text of speech.

4.1.2.2 Reaction

Reaction includes mental process, epithet, modality, euphemism, and connotative meaning. In the George Walker Bush’s speech 2 the most dominant reaction is epithet 72 cases (45.56%), then followed by other reaction types those are modality 53 cases (33.54%), and mental process 33 cases (20.88%).

a. Mental Process

Mental process is process of sensing, in which a participant, i.e. a conscious being or thing, is engaged in a process of seeing, feeling or thinking, which may involve some other participants. This process can be looked in Bush’s speech 2 with number 33 times (20.88%) with the realization of words know (3 times), see (3 times), fail (3 times), need (3 times), meet (3 times), understand (2 times), believe (2 times), overcome (2 times), felt, realize, appreciate, oppose, oversee, expect, threaten, discourage, deserve, listen, thank, and witness. As exemplified below:
1. Over the past few weeks, many Americans have felt anxiety about their finances and their future. (clause 2)
2. I understand their worry and their frustration. (clause 3)
3. We've seen triple-digit swings in the stock market. (clause 4)
4. and some have failed. (clause 6)
5. supply urgently needed money so banks and other financial institutions can avoid collapse and resume lending. (clause 19)
6. and businesses get credit to meet their daily needs (clause 23)
7. These are good questions, and they deserve clear answers. (clause 30)
8. Well, most economists agree that the problems we're witnessing today developed over a long period of time. (clause 32)
9. many believed they were guaranteed by the federal government. (clause 58)
10. I'm a strong believer in free enterprise, so my natural instinct is to oppose government intervention. (clause 79)
11. I appreciate the work of leaders from both parties in both houses of Congress (clause 101)
12. I know that an economic rescue package will present a tough vote for many members of Congress. (clause 109)
13. to oversee the plan's implementation, (clause 125)
14. and we expect that much, (clause 140)
15. and ensure that their practices do not threaten overall financial stability. (clause 157)
16. and we will overcome this one. (clause 169)
17. I know that Americans sometimes get discouraged by the tone in Washington and the seemingly endless partisan struggles, (clause 170)
18. and realize their dreams (clause 178)
19. Thank you for listening. (clause 179)

b. Epithet

Epithet explains the characteristic of something can be seen in Bush’s speech 2 with the number 72 times (45,56 %) with the realization of words serious (4 times), good (4 times), long (4 times), bad (3 times), major (2 times), large (2 times), low (2 times), new (2 times), higher (2 times), widespread (2 times), immediate (2 times), normal (2 times), tough (2 times), troubled (2 times), best (2 times), great (2 times), easy, faulty, decisive, adjustable, daily, extraordinary, clear, massive, attractive, secure, actual, leading, enormous, questionable, imminent, severe, dramatic, irresponsible, strong, free, natural, top, distressing, painful, responsible, enough, current, vast, final, primary, small, insured, and real. As exemplified below:
This is an extraordinary period for America's economy. (clause 2)
We're in the midst of a serious financial crisis, and the federal government is responding with decisive action. (clause 11)
and businesses get credit to meet their daily needs (clause 23)
These are good questions, and they deserve clear answers. (clause 30)
For more than a decade, a massive amount of money flowed into the United States from investors abroad because our country is an attractive and secure place to do business. (clause 33)
This large influx of money to U.S. banks and financial institutions, along with low interest rates, made it easier for Americans to get credit. (clause 34)
to start new businesses (clause 37)
Easy credit, combined with the faulty assumption that home values would continue to rise, led to excesses and bad decisions. (clause 40)
or refinance their homes at a higher price later on. (clause 44)
Borrowers with adjustable-rate mortgages, who had been planning to sell (clause 48)
These widespread defaults had effects far beyond the housing market. (clause 51)
and asked few questions about their actual value. (clause 56)
Two of the leading purchasers of mortgage-backed securities were Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Because these companies were chartered by Congress, (clause 57)
This allowed them to borrow enormous sums of money, (clause 59)
fuel the market for questionable investments, (clause 60)
They ran out of money needed to meet their immediate obligations, (clause 69)
and they faced imminent collapse. (clause 70)
Other banks found themselves in severe financial trouble. (clause 71)
to step in with dramatic government action (clause 75)
and allow the irresponsible actions of some (clause 77)
I'm a strong believer in free enterprise, so my natural instinct is to oppose government intervention. (clause 79)
I believe companies that make bad decisions should be allowed to go out of business. (clause 80)
Under normal circumstances, I would have followed this course. (clause 81)
There has been a widespread loss of confidence, and major sectors of America's financial system are at risk of shutting down. (clause 83)
The government's top economic experts warn that, without immediate action by Congress, (clause 84)
America could slip into a financial panic and a distressing scenario would unfold. (clause 85)
And, ultimately, our country could experience a long and painful recession. (clause 98)
First, the plan is big enough to solve a serious problem. (clause 128)
to purchase troubled assets that are clogging the financial system. (clause 130)
their prices have dropped sharply, yet the value of many of these assets will likely be higher than their current price, (clause 135)
31. because the vast majority of Americans will ultimately pay off their mortgages. (clause 136)
32. The final question is, what does this mean for your economic future? (clause 142)
33. Well, the primary steps—purpose of the steps (clause 143)
34. It has made this country the best place in the world (clause 162)
35. Our economy is facing a moment of great challenge, (clause 167)
36. but we've overcome tough challenges before, (clause 168)
37. yet history has shown that, in times of real trial, (clause 171)

c. Modality

In Bush’s speech 2 there are 53 modality cases (33.54%) those are would (16 times), will (14 times), could (9 times), should (7 times), can (3 times), must (2 times), may, and would have. As exemplified below:

1. and we will overcome this one. (clause 169)
2. they could not sell. (clause 68)
3. Under normal circumstances, I would have followed this course. But these are not normal circumstances. (clause 81)
4. Foreclosures would rise dramatically. (clause 89)
5. Any rescue plan should also be designed (clause 120)
6. As they do, they must ensure that efforts to regulate Wall Street do not end up hampering our economy's ability to grow. (clause 159)
7. and where people of every background can work hard, (clause 176)
8. May God bless you. (clause 180)

d. Euphemism

Euphemism is polite expression. There is no euphemism in Bush’s speech 2.
e. Connotative Meaning

There is no connotative meaning in Bush’s speech 2.

4.1.2.3 Register Variables in Speech 2

1. Field of discourse is what is actually taking place in discourse-in-text.

Field of discourse: The President’s Nation Speech about the Economic Crisis of 2008 on Wednesday evening, September 24, 2008. Bush made a conference to state formally about the economic condition of USA. He proposed his economic strategy in facing the crisis.
2. Tenor of discourse is who is taking part.


3. Mode of discourse is what role language is playing.

   Mode of discourse: Written text to be spoken to the audience. The text is a formal national document.

4.1.3 Action and Reaction of Speech 3

   Action is an act by spoken or written to ask or to give any information or good and services. Action includes statement, question, command and offer in a text of speech. Reaction is limited as personal opinion that is given by language users when they do their action. Reaction is realized by mental process, epithet, modality, euphemism, and connotative meaning. The following data is the data where action and reaction types are really exist in speech 3. The data is the text of Bush’s speech to U.N. General Assembly, September 22, 2008 in United Nations Headquarters, New York.

1. Mr. Secretary General, (vocative)
2. distinguished delegates, (vocative)
3. ladies and gentlemen: (vocative)
4. I’m pleased to be here to address the General Assembly. (statement)
5. Sixty-three years ago, representatives from around the world gathered in San Francisco to complete the founding of the Charter of the United Nations. (statement)
6. They met in the shadow of a devastating war, with grave new dangers on the horizon. (statement)
7. They agreed on a historic pledge: “to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, and unite their strength to maintain international peace and security.” (statement)
8. This noble pledge has endured trying hours in the United Nations’ history, (statement)
9. and it still guides our work today. (statement)
10. Yet the ideals of the Charter are now facing a challenge as serious as any since the U.N.’s founding — a global movement of violent extremists. (statement)
11. By deliberately murdering the innocent to advance their aims, (statement)

these extremists defy the fundamental principles of international order.  

They show contempt for all who respect life and value human dignity.  

They reject the words of the Bible, the Koran, the Torah, or any standard of conscience or morality.  

They imperil the values of justice and human rights that gave birth to the United Nations — values that have fueled an unprecedented expansion of freedom across the world.  

To uphold the words of the Charter in the face of this challenge, every nation in this chamber has responsibilities.  

As sovereign states, we have an obligation to govern responsibly, and solve problems before they spill across borders.  

We have an obligation to prevent our territory from being used as a sanctuary for terrorism and proliferation and human trafficking and organized crime.  

We have an obligation to respect the rights and respond to the needs of our people.  

Multilateral organizations have responsibilities.  

For eight years, the nations in this assembly have worked together to confront the extremist threat.  

We witnessed successes and setbacks, and through it all a clear lesson has emerged: The United Nations and other multilateral organizations are needed more urgently than ever.  

To be successful, we must be focused and resolute and effective.  

Instead of only passing resolutions decrying terrorist attacks after they occur, we must cooperate more closely to keep terrorist attacks from happening in the first place.  

Instead of treating all forms of government as equally tolerable, we must actively challenge the conditions of tyranny and despair that allow terror and extremism to thrive.  

By acting together to meet the fundamental challenge of our time, we can lead toward a world that is more secure, and more prosperous, and more hopeful.  

In the decades ahead, the United Nations and other multilateral organizations must continually confront terror.  

This mission requires clarity of vision.  

We must see the terrorists for what they are: ruthless extremists who exploit the desperate, subvert the tenets of a great religion, and seek to impose their will on as many people as possible.  

Some suggest that these men would pose less of a threat if we’d only leave them alone.  

Yet their leaders make clear that no concession could ever satisfy their ambitions.
Bringing the terrorists to justice does not create terrorism — (statement)
it’s the best way to protect our people. (statement)
Multilateral organizations must respond by taking an unequivocal moral stand against terrorism. (statement)
No cause can justify the deliberate taking of innocent human life and the international community is nearing universal agreement on this truth. (statement)
The vast majority of nations in this assembly now agree that tactics like suicide bombing, hostage-taking and hijacking are never legitimate. (statement)
The Security Council has passed resolutions declaring terror unlawful and requiring all nations to crack down on terrorist financing. (statement)
And earlier this month, the Secretary General held a conference to highlight victims of terror, where he stated that terrorism can never be justified. (statement)
Other multilateral organizations have spoken clearly, as well. The G8 has declared that all terrorist acts are criminal and must be universally condemned. (statement)
And the Secretary General of the Organization of the Islamic Conference recently spoke out against a suicide bombing, which he said runs counter to the teachings of Islam. (statement)
The message behind these statements is resolutely clear: Like slavery and piracy, terrorism has no place in the modern world. (statement)
Around the globe, nations are turning these words into action. Members of the United Nations are sharing intelligence with one another, conducting joint operations, and freezing terrorist finances. (statement)
While terrorists continue to carry out attacks like the terrible bombing in Islamabad last week, our joint actions have spared our citizens from many devastating blows. (statement)
With the brutal nature of the extremists increasingly clear, the coalition of nations confronting terror is growing stronger. (statement)
Over the past seven years, Afghanistan and Iraq have been transformed from regimes that actively sponsor terror to democracies that fight terror. Libya has renounced its support for terror and its pursuit of nuclear weapons. (statement)
Nations like Saudi Arabia and Pakistan are actively pursuing the terrorists. (statement)
A few nations — regimes like Syria and Iran — continue to sponsor terror. (statement)
Yet their numbers are growing fewer, and they’re growing more isolated from the world. (statement)
As the 21st century unfolds, some may be tempted to assume that the threat has receded. (statement)
This would be comforting; it would be wrong. (statement)
The terrorists believe time is on their side, (statement)
77. so they made waiting out civilized nations part of their strategy.  (statement)
78. We must not allow them to succeed. (statement)
79. The nations of this body must stand united in the fight against terror. (statement)
80. We must continue working to deny the terrorists refuge anywhere in the world, including ungoverned spaces. (statement)
81. The nations of this body must not allow them to succeed.  (statement)
82. We must remain vigilant against proliferation — by fully implementing the terms of Security Council Resolution 1540, and enforcing sanctions against North Korea and Iran. (statement)
83. We must not relent until our people are safe from this threat to civilization. (statement)
84. To uphold the Charter’s promise of peace and security in the 21st century, we must also confront the ideology of the terrorists. (statement)
85. At its core, the struggle against extremists is a battle of ideas. The terrorists envision a world in which religious freedom is denied, women are oppressed, and all dissent is crushed. (statement)
86. The nations of this chamber must present a more hopeful alternative — a vision where people can speak freely, and worship as they choose, and pursue their dreams in liberty. (statement)
87. Advancing the vision of freedom serves our highest ideals, as expressed in the U.N.’s Charter’s commitment to “the dignity and worth of the human person.” (statement)
88. Advancing this vision also serves our security interests. (statement)
89. History shows that when citizens have a voice in choosing their own leaders, they are less likely to search for meaning in radical ideologies. (statement)
90. And when governments respect the rights of their people, they’re more likely to respect the rights of their neighbors. (statement)
91. For all these reasons, the nations of this body must challenge tyranny as vigorously as we challenge terror. (statement)
92. Some question whether people in certain parts of the world actually desire freedom. (statement)
93. This self-serving condescension has been disproved before our eyes. (statement)
94. From the voting booths of Afghanistan, Iraq, and Liberia, to the Orange Revolution in Ukraine and the Rose Revolution in Georgia, to the Cedar Revolution in Lebanon and the Tulip Revolution in Kyrgyzstan, we have seen people consistently make the courageous decision to demand their liberty. (statement)
95. For all the suggestions to the contrary, the truth is that whenever or wherever people are given the choice, they choose freedom. (statement)
106. Nations in these chambers have supported the efforts of dissidents and reformers and civil society advocates in newly free societies throughout the new United Nations Democracy Fund. (statement)

107. And we appreciate those efforts. (statement)

108. And as young democracies around the world continue to make brave stands for liberty, (statement)

109. multilateral organizations like the United Nations must continue to stand with them. (statement)

110. In Afghanistan, a determined people are working (statement)

111. to overcome decades of tyranny, (statement)

112. and protect their newly-free society. (statement)

113. They have strong support from all 26 nations of the NATO Alliance. (statement)

114. I appreciate the United Nations’ decision this week (statement)

115. to renew the mandate for the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan. (statement)

116. The United Nations is also an active civilian presence in Afghanistan, where experts are doing important work helping (statement)

117. to improve education, (statement)

118. facilitate humanitarian aid, (statement)

119. and protect human rights. (statement)

120. We must continue to help the Afghan people defend their young democracy — (statement)

121. so the Taliban does not return to power, and Afghanistan is never again a safe haven for terror. (statement)

122. In Iraq, the fight has been difficult, yet daily life has improved dramatically over the past 20 months — (statement)

123. thanks to the courage of the Iraqi people, a determined coalition of nations, and a surge of American troops. (statement)

124. The United Nations has provided the mandate for multinational forces in Iraq through this December. (statement)

125. And the United Nations is carrying out an ambitious strategy (statement)

126. to strengthen Iraq’s democracy, including helping Iraqis prepare for their next round of free elections. (statement)

127. Whatever disagreements our nations have had on Iraq, (statement)

128. we should all welcome this progress toward stability and peace — (statement)

129. and we should stand united in helping Iraq’s democracy succeed. (statement)

130. We must stand united in our support of other young democracies, from the people of Lebanon struggling (statement)

131. to maintain their hard-won independence, (statement)

132. to the people of the Palestinian Territories, who deserve a free and peaceful state of their own. (statement)

133. We must stand united in our support of the people of Georgia. The United Nations Charter sets forth the “equal rights of nations large and small.” Russia’s invasion of Georgia was a violation of those words. (statement)

134. Young democracies around the world are watching (statement)

135. to see how we respond to this test. (statement)
136. The United States has worked with allies in multilateral institutions like the European Union and NATO to uphold Georgia’s territorial integrity (statement)
137. and provide humanitarian relief. (statement)
138. And our nations will continue to support Georgia’s democracy. (statement)
139. In this chamber are representatives of Georgia and Ukraine and Lebanon and Afghanistan and Liberia and Iraq, and other brave young democracies. (statement)
140. We admire your courage. (statement)
141. We honor your sacrifices. (statement)
142. We thank you for your inspiring example. (statement)
143. We will continue to stand with all who stand for freedom. (statement)
144. This noble goal is worthy of the United Nations, and it should have the support of every member in this assembly. (statement)
145. Extending the reach of political freedom is essential to prevailing in the great struggle of our time — but it is not enough. (statement)
146. Many in this chamber have answered the call to help their brothers and sisters in need by working to alleviate hopelessness. (statement)
147. These efforts to improve the human condition honor the highest ideals of this institution. (statement)
148. They also advance our security interests. (statement)
149. The extremists find their most fertile recruiting grounds in societies trapped in chaos and despair — places where people see no prospect of a better life. (statement)
150. In the shadows of hopelessness, radicalism thrives. And eventually, that radicalism can boil over into violence and cross borders and take innocent lives across the world. (statement)
151. Overcoming hopelessness requires addressing its causes — poverty, disease, and ignorance. (statement)
152. Challenging these conditions is in the interest of every nation in this chamber. (statement)
153. And democracies are particularly well-positioned to carry out this work. (statement)
154. Because we have experience responding to the needs of our own people, we’re natural partners in helping other nations respond to the needs of theirs. (statement)
155. Together, we must commit our resources and efforts to advancing education and health and prosperity. (statement)
156. Over the years, many nations have made well-intentioned efforts to promote these goals. (statement)
157. Yet the success of these efforts must be measured by more than intentions — they must be measured by results. (statement)
158. My nation has placed an insistence on results at the heart of our foreign assistance programs. (statement)
We launched a new initiative called the Millennium Challenge Account, which directs our help to countries that demonstrate their ability to produce results by governing justly, and fighting corruption, and pursuing market-based economic policies, as well as investing in their people. Every country and institution that provides foreign assistance, including the United Nations, will be more effective by showing faith in the people of the developing world — and insisting on performance in return for aid. Experience also shows that to be effective, we must adopt a model of partnership, not paternalism. This approach is based on our conviction that people in the developing world have the capacity to improve their own lives — and will rise to meet high expectations if we set them. America has sought to apply this model in our Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief. Every nation that receives American support through this initiative develops its own plan for fighting HIV/AIDS — and measures the results. And so far, these results are inspiring. Five years ago, 50,000 people in sub-Saharan Africa were receiving treatment for HIV/AIDS. Today that number is nearly 1.7 million. We’re taking a similar approach to fighting malaria, and so far, we’ve supported local efforts to protect more than 25 million Africans. Multilateral organizations have made bold commitments of their own to fight disease. The G8 has pledged to match America’s efforts on malaria and HIV/AIDS. Through the Global Fund, many countries are working to fight HIV/AIDS, malaria, and TB. Lives in the developing world depend on these programs, and all who have made pledges to fight disease have an obligation to follow through on their commitments. One of the most powerful engines of development and prosperity is trade and investment, which create new opportunities for entrepreneurs, and help people rise out of poverty, and reinforce fundamental values like transparency and rule of law. For all these reasons, many in these chambers have conducted free trade agreements at bilateral and regional levels. The most effective step of all would be an agreement that tears down trade barriers at the global level. The recent impasse in the Doha Round is disappointing, but that does not have to be the final word. I urge every nation to seize this opportunity to lift up economies around the world — and reach a successful Doha agreement as soon as possible.
Beyond Doha, our nations must renew our commitment to open economies, and stand firm against economic isolationism. These objectives are being tested by turbulence in the global financial markets. Our economies are more closely connected than ever before, and I know that many of you here are watching how the United States government will address the problems in our financial system. In recent weeks, we have taken bold steps to prevent a severe disruption of the American economy, which would have a devastating effect on other economies around the world. We’ve promoted stability in the markets by preventing the disorderly failure of major companies. The Federal Reserve has injected urgently-needed liquidity into the system. And last week, I announced a decisive action by the federal government by purchasing illiquid assets that are weighing down balance sheets and restricting the flow of credit. I can assure you that my administration and our Congress are working together to quickly pass legislation approving this strategy. And I’m confident we will act in the urgent time frame required. The objectives I’ve laid out for multilateral institutions — confronting terror, opposing tyranny, and promoting effective development — are difficult, but they are necessary tasks. To have maximum impact, multilateral institutions must take on challenging missions. And like all of us in this chamber, they must work toward measurable goals, be accountable for their actions, and hold true to their word. In the 21st century, the world needs a confident and effective United Nations. This unique institution should build on its successes and improve its performance. Where there is inefficiency and corruption, it must be corrected. Where there are bloated bureaucracies, they must be streamlined. Where members fail to uphold their obligations, there must be strong action. For example, there should be an immediate review of the Human Rights Council, which has routinely protected violators of human rights. There should be a stronger effort to help the people of Burma live free of the repression they have suffered for too long.
And all nations, especially members of the Security Council, must act decisively to ensure that the government of Sudan upholds its commitment to address the violence in Darfur. The United Nations is an organization of extraordinary potential. As the United Nations rebuilds its headquarters, it must also open the door to a new age of transparency, accountability, and seriousness of purpose.

With determination and clear purpose, the United Nations can be a powerful force for good as we head into the 21st century. It can affirm the great promise of its founding. In the final days of the San Francisco Conference, the delegates negotiating the U.N. Charter received a visit from President Harry Truman. He acknowledged the enormous challenges they faced, and said success was only possible because of what he called an “unshakable unity of determination.”

Today the world is engaged in another period of great challenge. And by continuing to work together, that unshakable unity of determination will be ours.

Together, we confront and defeat the evil of terrorism. Together, we can secure the Almighty’s gift of liberty and justice to millions who have not known it. And together, we can build a world that is freer, safer, and better for the generations who follow.

Thank you.

After dividing George Walker Bush’s speech into clauses, the next step is that action and reaction in clauses above can be detailed in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Action type</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Reaction type</th>
<th>Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Mental process</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Command</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modality</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>offer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Euphemism</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.3.1 Action
According to the finding above, the most dominant action type is statement with 240 cases (100%) without any other action types such question, command, and offer. For examples:

237. Today the world is engaged in another period of great challenge. (statement)
238. And by continuing to work together, that unshakable unity of determination will be ours. (statement)
239. Together, we confront (statement)
240. and defeat the evil of terrorism. (statement)
241. Together, we can secure the Almighty’s gift of liberty and justice to millions who have not known it. (statement)

Through the action, it can be shown that George Walker Bush tends to share his ideas and thoughts to the audiences in statement without any realization of asking, commanding, or offering something to his audiences in order to build relationships. Therefore, because the most dominant action in this text of speech is statement so this text is monologue without any other action types (question, command, offer) that is actually the audiences can be included directly in the text of speech.

4.1.3.2 Reaction

Reaction includes mental process, epithet, modality, euphemism, and connotative meaning. In the George Walker Bush’s speech 3 the most dominant reaction is epithet 104 cases (49,52%), then followed by other reaction types those are modality 65 cases (30,95%), and mental process 41 cases (19,52%).

a. Mental Process

Mental process is process of sensing, in which a participant, i.e. a conscious being or thing, is engaged in a process of seeing, feeling or thinking, which may involve some other participants. This process can be looked in Bush’s speech 3 with
number 41 times (19,52 %) with the realization of words respect (4 times), see (4 times), meet (3 times), require (3 times), pursue (3 times), thank (3 times), know (2 times), overcome (2 times), renew (2 times), watch (2 times), need (2 times), believe, appreciate, admire, honor, witnessed, please, comfort, oppose, fail, deserve, and suffer. As exemplified below:

1. I’m please to be here to address the General Assembly.  (clause 4)
2. They met in the shadow of a devastating war, with grave new dangers on the horizon.  (clause 7)
3. We have an obligation to respect the rights  (clause 25)
4. We witnessed successes and setbacks, and through it all a clear lesson has emerged:  (clause 30)
5. The United Nations and other multilateral organizations are needed more urgently than ever.  (clause 31)
6. This mission requires clarity of vision.  (clause 40)
7. We must see the terrorists for what they are:  (clause 41)
8. This would be comforting; it would be wrong.  (clause 75)
9. The terrorists believe time is on their side, (clause 76)
10. and pursue their dreams in liberty.  (clause 93)
11. And we appreciate those efforts.  (clause 107)
12. to overcome decades of tyranny, (clause 111)
13. to renew the mandate for the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan.  (clause 115)
14. to the people of the Palestinian Territories, who deserve a free and peaceful state of their own.  (clause 132)
15. to see how we respond to this test.  (clause 135)
16. We admire your courage.  (clause 140)
17. We honor your sacrifices.  (clause 141)
18. We thank you for your inspiring example.  (clause 142)
19. Overcoming hopelessness requires addressing its causes — poverty, disease, and ignorance.  (clause 155)
20. and I know that many of you here are watching  (clause 198)
21. opposing tyranny,  (clause 212)
22. they have suffered for too long.  (clause 224)

b. Epithet

Epithet explains the characteristic of something can be seen in Bush’s speech

3 with the number 104 times (49,52 %) with the realization of words new (5 times), great (4 times), fundamental (4 times), young (4 times), devastating (3 times), free (3
times), effective (3 times), noble (2 times), unshakable (2 times), global (2 times),
clear (2 times), innocent (2 times), brave (2 times), determined (2 times), strong (2
times), highest (2 times), foreign (2 times), bold (2 times), powerful (2 times), joint (2
times), better (2 times), first, ruthless, best, unequivocal, universal, vast, modern,
terrible, brutal, civilized, ungoverned, historic, violent, unprecedented, religious,
radical, courageous, active, important, safe, ambitious, hard-won, peaceful,
humanitarian, fertile, natural, political, developing, similar, local, successful, severe,
disorderly, major, decisive, urgent, necessary, maximum, challenging, measurable,
unique, bloated, immediate, stronger, extraordinary, final, safer, freer, confident and
enormous. As exemplified below:

1. They met in the shadow of a devastating war, with grave new dangers on the
horizon. (clause 7)
2. They agreed on a historic pledge: (clause 8)
3. “to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, and unite their strength to
maintain international peace and security.” (clause 9)
4. This noble pledge has endured trying hours in the United Nations’ history,
(clause 10)
5. Yet the ideals of the Charter are now facing a challenge as serious as any
since the U.N.’s founding — a global movement of violent extremists.
(clause 12)
6. values that have fueled an unprecedented expansion of freedom across the
world. (clause 19)
7. We witnessed successes and setbacks, and through it all a clear lesson has
emerged: (clause 30)
8. to keep terrorist attacks from happening in the first place. (clause 35)
9. ruthless extremists who exploit the desperate, (clause 42)
10. subvert the tenets of a great religion, and seek (clause 43)
11. it’s the best way to protect our people. (clause 48)
12. Multilateral organizations must respond by taking an unequivocal moral stand
against terrorism. (clause 49)
13. No cause can justify the deliberate taking of innocent human life and the
international community is nearing universal agreement on this truth.
(clause 50)
14. The vast majority of nations in this assembly now agree that tactics like
suicide bombing, hostage-taking and hijacking are never legitimate.(clause 51)
15. The message behind these statements is resolutely clear: Like slavery and
piracy, terrorism has no place in the modern world. (clause 61)
16. While terrorists continue to carry out attacks like the terrible bombing in
Islamabad last week, (clause 65)
17. our joint actions have spared our citizens from many devastating blows. (clause 66)
18. With the brutal nature of the extremists increasingly clear, the coalition of nations confronting terror is growing stronger. (clause 67)
19. so they made waiting out civilized nations part of their strategy. (clause 77)
20. to deny the terrorists refuge anywhere in the world, including ungoverned spaces. (clause 81)
21. Advancing the vision of freedom serves our highest ideals, as expressed in the U.N.’s Charter’s commitment to “the dignity and worth of the human person.” (clause 94)
22. they are less likely to search for meaning in radical ideologies. (clause 97)
23. ….., we have seen people consistently make the courageous decision to demand their liberty. (clause 103)
24. And as young democracies around the world continue to make brave stands for liberty, (clause 108)
25. In Afghanistan, a determined people are working (clause 110)
26. They have strong support from all 26 nations of the NATO Alliance. (clause 113)
27. The United Nations is also an active civilian presence in Afghanistan, where experts are doing important work helping (clause 116)
28. so the Taliban does not return to power, and Afghanistan is never again a safe haven for terror. (clause 121)
29. And the United Nations is carrying out an ambitious strategy (clause 125)
30. With determination and clear purpose, the United Nations can be a powerful force for good as we head into the 21st century. (clause 231)
31. to maintain their hard-won independence, (clause 131)
32. to the people of the Palestinian Territories, who deserve a free and peaceful state of their own. (clause 132)
33. and provide humanitarian relief. (clause 137)
34. Extending the reach of political freedom is essential (clause 145)
35. The extremists find their most fertile recruiting grounds in societies trapped in chaos and despair — (clause 151)
36. places where people see no prospect of a better life. (clause 152)
37. and take innocent lives across the world. (clause 154)
38. we’re natural partners in helping other nations respond to the needs of theirs. (clause 159)
39. Every country and institution that provides foreign assistance, including the United Nations, will be more effective by showing faith in the people of the developing world — (clause 168)
40. We’re taking a similar approach to fighting malaria, and so far, (clause 179)
41. we’ve supported local efforts to protect more than 25 million Africans. (clause 180)
42. Multilateral organizations have made bold commitments of their own to fight disease. (clause 181)
43. One of the most powerful engines of development and prosperity is trade and investment, which create new opportunities for entrepreneurs, (clause 186)
44. The most effective step of all would be an agreement that tears down trade barriers at the global level. (clause 190)
45. and reach a successful Doha agreement as soon as possible. (clause 193)
46. to prevent a severe disruption of the American economy, which would have a devastating effect on other economies around the world. (clause 201)
47. We’ve promoted stability in the markets by preventing the disorderly failure of major companies. (clause 202)
48. And last week, I announced a decisive action by the federal government (clause 204)
49. And I’m confident we will act in the urgent time frame required. (clause 209)
50. and promoting effective development — are difficult, but they are necessary tasks. (clause 213)
51. To have maximum impact, multilateral institutions must take on challenging missions. (clause 214)
52. And like all of us in this chamber, they must work toward measurable goals, be accountable for their actions, and hold true to their word. (clause 215)
53. This unique institution should build on its successes (clause 217)
54. Where there are bloated bureaucracies, they must be streamlined. (clause 220)
55. For example, there should be an immediate review of the Human Rights Council, which has routinely protected violators of human rights. (clause 222)
56. There should be a stronger effort to help the people of Burma live free of the repression (clause 223)
57. The United Nations is an organization of extraordinary potential. (clause 228)
58. In the final days of the San Francisco Conference, the delegates negotiating the U.N. Charter received a visit from President Harry Truman. (clause 233)
59. He acknowledged the enormous challenges (clause 234)
60. And by continuing to work together, that unshakable unity of determination will be ours. (clause 238)
61. conducting joint operations, and freezing terrorist finances. (clause 64)
62. And together, we can build a world that is freer, safer, and better for the generations who follow. (clause 242)
63. In the 21st century, the world needs a confident and effective United Nations. (clause 216)

c. Modality

In Bush’s speech 3 there are 65 modality cases (30,95 %) those are must (31 times), can (10 times), will (7 times), should (6 times), would (5 times), never (2 times), could, may, would have and have to. As exemplified below:

1. we must cooperate more closely (clause 34)
2. we can lead toward a world that is more secure, and more prosperous, and more hopeful. (clause 38)
3. Yet their leaders make clear that no concession could ever satisfy their ambitions. (clause 46)
4. The vast majority of nations in this assembly now agree that tactics like suicide bombing, hostage-taking and hijacking are never legitimate. (clause 51)
5. As the 21st century unfolds, some may be tempted to assume that the threat has receded. (clause 74)
6. This would be comforting; it would be wrong. (clause 75)
7. We should all welcome this progress toward stability and peace. (clause 128)
8. We will continue to stand with all who stand for freedom. (clause 143)
9. The recent impasse in the Doha Round is disappointing, but that does not have to be the final word. (clause 191)
10. To prevent a severe disruption of the American economy, which would have a devastating effect on other economies around the world. (clause 201)

d. Euphemism

Euphemism is polite expression. There is no euphemism in speech 3.
e. Connotative Meaning

There is no connotative meaning in speech 3.

4.1.3.3 Register Variables in Speech 3

1. Field of discourse is what is actually taking place in discourse-in-text.

Field of discourse: President’s speech to UN General Assembly about global network of terrorism on September 22, 2008 in United Nations Headquarters, New York. Bush talked about the global movement of violent extremists and launched a new initiative called the Millennium Challenge Account.

1. Tenor of discourse is who is taking part.

Tenor of discourse: Mr. Secretary General of United Nations, the delegates of United Nations, leaders of world countries in UN General Assembly.

2. Mode of discourse is what role language is playing.

Mode of discourse: Written text to be spoken to the audience. The text is a formal national document.

From the analysis above, it is found 697 clauses of action in the three selected Bush’s speeches. In the first speech, it is found statement with 255 cases while other action types such as command with 20 cases, and question with 4 cases while offer is nothing. In the second speech, it is found statement with 172 cases while other action types such as question with 6 cases, no command and offer. And in the third speech, it is
found statement with 240 cases without any other action types such question, command, and offer.

It is found also 589 total reactions in the three selected Bush’s speeches. In the first speech, it is found modality 77 cases, then followed by other reaction types those are epithet 76 cases, and mental process 68 cases. In the second speech, it is found epithet 72 cases, then followed by other reaction types those are modality 53 cases, and mental process 33 cases. And in the third speech it is found epithet 104 cases, then followed by other reaction types those are modality 65 cases, and mental process 41 cases. By using Bungin’s formula, the percentages of action and reaction can be found. The findings of percentage are followings:

\[
\text{Percentage of statement clauses} = \frac{667}{697} \times 100\% = 95.69\%
\]

\[
\text{Percentage of command clauses} = \frac{20}{697} \times 100\% = 2.86\%
\]

\[
\text{Percentage of question clauses} = \frac{10}{697} \times 100\% = 1.43\%
\]

\[
\text{Percentage of epithet} = \frac{252}{589} \times 100\% = 42.78\%
\]

\[
\text{Percentage of modality} = \frac{195}{589} \times 100\% = 33.10\%
\]

\[
\text{Percentage of mental process} = \frac{142}{589} \times 100\% = 24.10\%
\]

4.2 Discussions
The findings above show that in these 3 Bush’s speeches the most dominant action in is statement, the most dominant reaction is epithet, and register variables have been found in these three speeches.

1. In these 3 Bush’s speeches, the most dominant action is statement. In speech 1, there are 255 statements (91.39%). In speech 2, there are 172 statements (96.62%). And in speech 3, there are 240 statements (100%). From the Bungin’s formula, statement is the most dominant.

2. In these 3 Bush’s speeches, the most dominant reaction is epithet. In speech 1, there are 76 epithets (34.38%) those are normal, exceptional, important, truer, great (8 times), peaceful (2 times), single (2 times), different (2 times), affiliated, radical (3 times), vast (2 times), enough, largest, foreign (3 times), appropriate, global, decisive, instant, isolated, lengthy, dramatic, state, local, highest, effective, true (2 times), trusted, comprehensive, active (2 times), damaged, civilized, legitimate, unfair, unkind, ethnic, religious, central, direct, tighter, long, hard, new (2 times), sudden, domestic, extraordinary, grief, patient, murderer, hostile, proud, dark, first, defensive, safe, and longer. In speech 2, there are 72 epithets (45.56 %) those are extraordinary, serious (4 times), decisive, major (2 times), daily, good (4 times), clear, long (4 times), massive, attractive, secure, large (2 times), low (2 times), new (2 times), easy, faulty, bad (3 times), higher (2 times), adjustable, widespread (2 times), actual, leading, enormous, questionable, immediate (2 times), imminent, severe, dramatic, irresponsible, strong, free, natural, normal (2 times), top, distressing, painful, tough (2 times), responsible, troubled (2 times), enough, current, vast, final, primary, small, insured, best (2 times), great (2 times), and real. In speech 3, there are 104 epithets (49.52%) those are devastating (3 times), new (5 times), historic, fundamental (4 times),
noble (2 times), global (2 times), violent, unprecedented, clear (2 times), first, ruthless, great (4 times), best, unequivocal, innocent (2 times), universal, vast, modern, terrible, joint (2 times), brutal, civilized, ungoverned, religious, highest (2 times), radical, courageous, young (4 times), brave (2 times), determined (2 times), strong (2 times), active, important, safe, political, ambitious, free (3 times), hard-won, peaceful, humanitarian, fertile, better (2 times), natural, foreign (2 times), developing, similar, local, bold (2 times), powerful (2 times), effective (3 times), successful, severe, disorderly, major, decisive, urgent, necessary, maximum, challenging, measurable, unique, bloated, immediate, stronger, extraordinary, final, enormous, safer, freer, confident and unshakable (2 times).

From the Bungin’s formula, epithet is the most dominant.

3. Register variables of the three speeches:

**Register Variables in Speech 1:**

Field of discourse: The President’s nation speech after September 11th attack in 2001 to a joint session of Congress and nation. Bush made a declaration about who had attacked their country.

Tenor of discourse: Members of United State Congress, America government, the victims of September 11th attack, and American people.

Mode of discourse: Written text to be spoken to the audience. The text is a formal national document.

**Register Variables in Speech 2**

Field of discourse: The President’s Nation Speech about the Economic Crisis of 2008 on Wednesday evening, September 24, 2008. Bush made a conference to state
formally about the economic condition of USA. He proposed his economic strategy in facing the crisis.


Mode of discourse: Written text to be spoken to the audience. The text is a formal national document.

Register Variables in Speech 3

Field of discourse: President’s speech to UN General Assembly about global network of terrorism on September 22, 2008 in United Nations Headquarters, New York. Bush talked about the global movement of violent extremists and launched a new initiative called the Millennium Challenge Account.

Tenor of discourse: Mr. Secretary General of United Nations, the delegates of United Nations, leaders of world countries in UN General Assembly.

Mode of discourse: Written text to be spoken to the audience. The text is a formal national document.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Conclusions

After describing about action, reaction and register variables and analyzing them, there come conclusions. The conclusions are as follow:

- Statement is the most dominant action in the three selected Bush’s speeches. From 697 clauses in the three selected Bush’s speeches, 667 clauses are statements (95.69%), then followed by command, 20 clauses (2.86%) and question, 10 clauses (1.43%).

- Epithet is the most dominant reaction in the three selected Bush’s speeches. From 589 total reactions, there are 252 epithets (42.78%), followed by modality 195 cases (33.10%), and mental process 142 cases (24.10%). The data can be detailed on the table below:

Table 9: Action and Reaction of three selected George Walker Bush’s speeches
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>Action type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Reaction type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>95,69%</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>42,78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Command</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,86%</td>
<td>Modality</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>33,10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,43%</td>
<td>Mental process</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>24,10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Euphemism</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Connotative meaning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Register variables of three speeches have been explained in discussions.

The data shows that statement is the most dominant action. It means that text is monologue with little or without any other action types (question, command, offer) that is actually the audiences can be included directly or respond in the speech. Monologuing text is the text where the speaking by one individual in such a way as to exclude the possibility of interruption by others (e.g. the audience). Epithet is the most dominant reaction, it means that many words are used in three Bush’s speeches to explain characteristic of something. It also shows that in those three Bush’s speeches are described more about the expressions of the speaker’s attitude.

5.2 Suggestions

The writer suggests the readers to do deeper study and research in action, reaction and register variables in order to get a better understanding of action and reaction and also register variables. Beside that, the writer hopes the future research will analyze in different scope and different object. As the discourse analysis has been one of the compulsory subjects in the university. The writer hopes the students can gain the knowledge from many sources whether they are text books or research.
articles. Finally, it is expected that the future can do the analysis other aspects of lexicogrammar i.e. theme/rheme or mood/residue that applied to other texts.
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Speech 1

Text: President Bush Addresses the Nation

eMediaMillWorks
Thursday, Sept. 20, 2001

Following is the full text of President Bush's address to a joint session of Congress and the nation.

BUSH: Mr. Speaker, Mr. President Pro Tempore, members of Congress, and fellow Americans, in the normal course of events, presidents come to this chamber to report on the state of the union. Tonight, no such report is needed; it has already been delivered by the American people.

We have seen it in the courage of passengers who rushed terrorists to save others on the ground. Passengers like an exceptional man named Todd Beamer. And would you please help me welcome his wife Lisa Beamer here tonight?

We have seen the state of our union in the endurance of rescuers working past exhaustion.

We've seen the unfurling of flags, the lighting of candles, the giving of blood, the saying of prayers in English, Hebrew and Arabic.

We have seen the decency of a loving and giving people who have made the grief of strangers their own.

My fellow citizens, for the last nine days, the entire world has seen for itself the state of union, and it is strong.

Tonight, we are a country awakened to danger and called to defend freedom. Our grief has turned to anger and anger to resolution. Whether we bring our enemies to justice or bring justice to our enemies, justice will be done.

I thank the Congress for its leadership at such an important time.

All of America was touched on the evening of the tragedy to see Republicans and Democrats joined together on the steps of this Capitol singing "God Bless America."

And you did more than sing. You acted, by delivering $40 billion to rebuild our communities and meet the needs of our military. Speaker Hastert, Minority Leader Gephardt, Majority Leader Daschle and Senator Lott, I thank you for your friendship, for your leadership and for your service to our country.

And on behalf of the American people, I thank the world for its outpouring of support.

America will never forget the sounds of our national anthem playing at Buckingham Palace, on the streets of Paris and at Berlin's Brandenburg Gate.

We will not forget South Korean children gathering to pray outside our embassy in Seoul, or the prayers of sympathy offered at a mosque in Cairo.

We will not forget moments of silence and days of mourning in Australia and Africa and Latin America.

Nor will we forget the citizens of 80 other nations who died with our own. Dozens of Pakistanis, more than 130 Israelis, more than 250 citizens of India, men and women from El Salvador, Iran, Mexico and Japan, and hundreds of British citizens.
America has no truer friend than Great Britain.

(APPLAUSE)

Once again, we are joined together in a great cause.

I'm so honored the British prime minister had crossed an ocean to show his unity with America.

Thank you for coming, friend.

(APPLAUSE)

On September the 11th, enemies of freedom committed an act of war against our country. Americans have known wars, but for the past 136 years they have been wars on foreign soil, except for one Sunday in 1941. Americans have known the casualties of war, but not at the center of a great city on a peaceful morning.

Americans have known surprise attacks, but never before on thousands of civilians.

All of this was brought upon us in a single day, and night fell on a different world, a world where freedom itself is under attack.

Americans have many questions tonight. Americans are asking, "Who attacked our country?"

The evidence we have gathered all points to a collection of loosely affiliated terrorist organizations known as al Qaeda. They are some of the murderers indicted for bombing American embassies in Tanzania and Kenya and responsible for bombing the USS Cole.

Al Qaeda is to terror what the Mafia is to crime. But its goal is not making money, its goal is remaking the world and imposing its radical beliefs on people everywhere.

The terrorists practice a fringe form of Islamic extremism that has been rejected by Muslim scholars and the vast majority of Muslim clerics; a fringe movement that perverts the peaceful teachings of Islam.

The terrorists' directive commands them to kill Christians and Jews, to kill all Americans and make no distinctions among military and civilians, including women and children.

This group and its leader, a person named Osama bin Laden, are linked to many other organizations in different countries, including the Egyptian Islamic Jihad, the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan.

There are thousands of these terrorists in more than 60 countries.
They are recruited from their own nations and neighborhoods and brought to camps in places like Afghanistan where they are trained in the tactics of terror. They are sent back to their homes or sent to hide in countries around the world to plot evil and destruction.

The leadership of Al Qaeda has great influence in Afghanistan and supports the Taliban regime in controlling most of that country. In Afghanistan we see Al Qaeda's vision for the world. Afghanistan's people have been brutalized, many are starving and many have fled.

Women are not allowed to attend school. You can be jailed for owning a television. Religion can be practiced only as their leaders dictate. A man can be jailed in Afghanistan if his beard is not long enough.

The United States respects the people of Afghanistan--after all, we are currently its largest source of humanitarian aid--but we condemn the Taliban regime.

(APPLAUSE)

It is not only repressing its own people, it is threatening people everywhere by sponsoring and sheltering and supplying terrorists.

By aiding and abetting murder, the Taliban regime is committing murder. And tonight the United States of America makes the following demands on the Taliban.

Deliver to United States authorities all of the leaders of Al Qaeda who hide in your land.

(APPLAUSE)

Release all foreign nationals, including American citizens you have unjustly imprisoned. Protect foreign journalists, diplomats and aid workers in your country. Close immediately and permanently every terrorist training camp in Afghanistan. And hand over every terrorist and every person and their support structure to appropriate authorities.

(APPLAUSE) Give the United States full access to terrorist training camps, so we can make sure they are no longer operating.

These demands are not open to negotiation or discussion.

(APPLAUSE)

The Taliban must act and act immediately.

They will hand over the terrorists or they will share in their fate.

I also want to speak tonight directly to Muslims throughout the world. We respect your faith. It's practiced freely by many millions of Americans and by millions more
in countries that America counts as friends. Its teachings are good and peaceful, and those who commit evil in the name of Allah blaspheme the name of Allah.

(APPLAUSE)

The terrorists are traitors to their own faith, trying, in effect, to hijack Islam itself.

The enemy of America is not our many Muslim friends. It is not our many Arab friends. Our enemy is a radical network of terrorists and every government that supports them.

(APPLAUSE)

Our war on terror begins with Al Qaeda, but it does not end there.

It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated.

(APPLAUSE)

Americans are asking "Why do they hate us?"

They hate what they see right here in this chamber: a democratically elected government. Their leaders are self-appointed. They hate our freedoms: our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other.

They want to overthrow existing governments in many Muslim countries such as Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Jordan. They want to drive Israel out of the Middle East. They want to drive Christians and Jews out of vast regions of Asia and Africa.

These terrorists kill not merely to end lives, but to disrupt and end a way of life. With every atrocity, they hope that America grows fearful, retreating from the world and forsaking our friends. They stand against us because we stand in their way.

We're not deceived by their pretenses to piety.

We have seen their kind before. They're the heirs of all the murderous ideologies of the 20th century. By sacrificing human life to serve their radical visions, by abandoning every value except the will to power, they follow in the path of fascism, Nazism and totalitarianism. And they will follow that path all the way to where it ends in history's unmarked grave of discarded lies.

(APPLAUSE)

Americans are asking, "How will we fight and win this war?"

We will direct every resource at our command--every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence, and
every necessary weapon of war--to the destruction and to the defeat of the global terror network.

Now, this war will not be like the war against Iraq a decade ago, with a decisive liberation of territory and a swift conclusion. It will not look like the air war above Kosovo two years ago, where no ground troops were used and not a single American was lost in combat.

Our response involves far more than instant retaliation and isolated strikes. Americans should not expect one battle, but a lengthy campaign unlike any other we have ever seen. It may include dramatic strikes visible on TV and covert operations secret even in success.

We will starve terrorists of funding, turn them one against another, drive them from place to place until there is no refuge or no rest.

And we will pursue nations that provide aid or safe haven to terrorism. Every nation in every region now has a decision to make: Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists.

(APPLAUSE)

From this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime. Our nation has been put on notice, we're not immune from attack. We will take defensive measures against terrorism to protect Americans.

Today, dozens of federal departments and agencies, as well as state and local governments, have responsibilities affecting homeland security.

These efforts must be coordinated at the highest level. So tonight, I announce the creation of a Cabinet-level position reporting directly to me, the Office of Homeland Security.

And tonight, I also announce a distinguished American to lead this effort, to strengthen American security: a military veteran, an effective governor, a true patriot, a trusted friend, Pennsylvania’s Tom Ridge.

(APPLAUSE)

He will lead, oversee and coordinate a comprehensive national strategy to safeguard our country against terrorism and respond to any attacks that may come.

These measures are essential. The only way to defeat terrorism as a threat to our way of life is to stop it, eliminate it and destroy it where it grows.

(APPLAUSE)
Many will be involved in this effort, from FBI agents, to intelligence operatives, to the reservists we have called to active duty. All deserve our thanks, and all have our prayers.

And tonight a few miles from the damaged Pentagon, I have a message for our military: Be ready. I have called the armed forces to alert, and there is a reason.

The hour is coming when America will act, and you will make us proud.

This is not, however, just America's fight. And what is at stake is not just America's freedom.

This is the world's fight. This is civilization's fight. This is the fight of all who believe in progress and pluralism, tolerance and freedom.

We ask every nation to join us. We will ask and we will need the help of police forces, intelligence service and banking systems around the world. The United States is grateful that many nations and many international organizations have already responded with sympathy and with support—nations from Latin America to Asia to Africa to Europe to the Islamic world.

Perhaps the NATO charter reflects best the attitude of the world: An attack on one is an attack on all. The civilized world is rallying to America's side.

They understand that if this terror goes unpunished, their own cities, their own citizens may be next. Terror unanswered can not only bring down buildings, it can threaten the stability of legitimate governments.

And you know what? We're not going to allow it.

(APIPLAUSE)

Americans are asking, "What is expected of us?"

I ask you to live your lives and hug your children.

I know many citizens have fears tonight, and I ask you to be calm and resolute, even in the face of a continuing threat.

I ask you to uphold the values of America and remember why so many have come here.

We're in a fight for our principles, and our first responsibility is to live by them. No one should be singled out for unfair treatment or unkind words because of their ethnic background or religious faith.

(APIPLAUSE)
I ask you to continue to support the victims of this tragedy with your contributions. Those who want to give can go to a central source of information, Libertyunites.org, to find the names of groups providing direct help in New York, Pennsylvania and Virginia.

The thousands of FBI agents who are now at work in this investigation may need your cooperation, and I ask you to give it. I ask for your patience with the delays and inconveniences that may accompany tighter security and for your patience in what will be a long struggle.

I ask your continued participation and confidence in the American economy. Terrorists attacked a symbol of American prosperity; they did not touch its source.

America is successful because of the hard work and creativity and enterprise of our people. These were the true strengths of our economy before September 11, and they are our strengths today.

And finally, please continue praying for the victims of terror and their families, for those in uniform and for our great country. Prayer has comforted us in sorrow and will help strengthen us for the journey ahead.

Tonight I thank my fellow Americans for what you have already done and for what you will do.

And ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, I thank you, their representatives, for what you have already done and for what we will do together.

Tonight we face new and sudden national challenges.

We will come together to improve air safety, to dramatically expand the number of air marshals on domestic flights and take new measures to prevent hijacking.

We will come together to promote stability and keep our airlines flying with direct assistance during this emergency.

(APPLAUSE)

We will come together to give law enforcement the additional tools it needs to track down terror here at home.

(APPLAUSE)

We will come together to strengthen our intelligence capabilities to know the plans of terrorists before they act and to find them before they strike.

(APPLAUSE)

We will come together to take active steps that strengthen America's economy and put our people back to work.
Tonight, we welcome two leaders who embody the extraordinary spirit of all New Yorkers, Governor George Pataki and Mayor Rudolph Giuliani.

(APPLAUSE)

As a symbol of America's resolve, my administration will work with Congress and these two leaders to show the world that we will rebuild New York City.

(APPLAUSE)

After all that has just passed, all the lives taken and all the possibilities and hopes that died with them, it is natural to wonder if America's future is one of fear.

Some speak of an age of terror. I know there are struggles ahead and dangers to face. But this country will define our times, not be defined by them.

As long as the United States of America is determined and strong, this will not be an age of terror. This will be an age of liberty here and across the world.

(APPLAUSE)

Great harm has been done to us. We have suffered great loss. And in our grief and anger we have found our mission and our moment.

Freedom and fear are at war. The advance of human freedom, the great achievement of our time and the great hope of every time, now depends on us.

Our nation, this generation, will lift the dark threat of violence from our people and our future. We will rally the world to this cause by our efforts, by our courage. We will not tire, we will not falter and we will not fail.

(APPLAUSE)

It is my hope that in the months and years ahead life will return almost to normal. We'll go back to our lives and routines and that is good.

Even grief recedes with time and grace.

But our resolve must not pass. Each of us will remember what happened that day and to whom it happened. We will remember the moment the news came, where we were and what we were doing.

Some will remember an image of a fire or story or rescue. Some will carry memories of a face and a voice gone forever.

And I will carry this. It is the police shield of a man named George Howard who died at the World Trade Center trying to save others.
It was given to me by his mom, Arlene (ph), as a proud memorial to her son. It is my reminder of lives that ended and a task that does not end.

(APPLAUSE)

I will not forget the wound to our country and those who inflicted it. I will not yield, I will not rest, I will not relent in waging this struggle for freedom and security for the American people.

The course of this conflict is not known, yet its outcome is certain. Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty, have always been at war, and we know that God is not neutral between them.

(APPLAUSE)

Fellow citizens, we'll meet violence with patient justice, assured of the rightness of our cause and confident of the victories to come.

In all that lies before us, may God grant us wisdom and may he watch over the United States of America.

Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)
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Good evening. This is an extraordinary period for America's economy.

Over the past few weeks, many Americans have felt anxiety about their finances and their future. I understand their worry and their frustration.

We've seen triple-digit swings in the stock market. Major financial institutions have teetered on the edge of collapse, and some have failed. As uncertainty has grown, many banks have restricted lending, credit markets have frozen, and families and businesses have found it harder to borrow money.

We're in the midst of a serious financial crisis, and the federal government is responding with decisive action.

We boosted confidence in money market mutual funds and acted to prevent major investors from intentionally driving down stocks for their own personal gain.

Most importantly, my administration is working with Congress to address the root cause behind much of the instability in our markets.

Financial assets related to home mortgages have lost value during the house decline, and the banks holding these assets have restricted credit. As a result, our entire economy is in danger.

So I propose that the federal government reduce the risk posed by these troubled assets and supply urgently needed money so banks and other financial institutions can avoid collapse and resume lending.

This rescue effort is not aimed at preserving any individual company or industry. It is aimed at preserving America's overall economy.

It will help American consumers and businesses get credit to meet their daily needs and create jobs. And it will help send a signal to markets around the world that America's financial system is back on track.

I know many Americans have questions tonight: How did we reach this point in our economy? How will the solution I propose work? And what does this mean for your financial future?

These are good questions, and they deserve clear answers.

First, how did our economy reach this point? Well, most economists agree that the problems we're witnessing today developed over a long period of time. For more than a decade, a massive amount of money flowed into the United States from investors abroad because our country is an attractive and secure place to do business.

This large influx of money to U.S. banks and financial institutions, along with low interest rates, made it easier for Americans to get credit. These developments allowed more families to borrow money for cars, and homes, and college tuition, some for the

first time. They allowed more entrepreneurs to get loans to start new businesses and create jobs.

Unfortunately, there were also some serious negative consequences, particularly in the housing market. Easy credit, combined with the faulty assumption that home values would continue to rise, led to excesses and bad decisions.

Many mortgage lenders approved loans for borrowers without carefully examining their ability to pay. Many borrowers took out loans larger than they could afford, assuming that they could sell or refinance their homes at a higher price later on.

Optimism about housing values also led to a boom in home construction. Eventually, the number of new houses exceeded the number of people willing to buy them. And with supply exceeding demand, housing prices fell, and this created a problem.

BUSH: Borrowers with adjustable-rate mortgages, who had been planning to sell or refinance their homes at a higher price, were stuck with homes worth less than expected, along with mortgage payments they could not afford.

As a result, many mortgage-holders began to default. These widespread defaults had effects far beyond the housing market.

See, in today's mortgage industry, home loans are often packaged together and converted into financial products called mortgage-backed securities. These securities were sold to investors around the world.

Many investors assumed these securities were trustworthy and asked few questions about their actual value. Two of the leading purchasers of mortgage-backed securities were Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

Because these companies were chartered by Congress, many believed they were guaranteed by the federal government. This allowed them to borrow enormous sums of money, fuel the market for questionable investments, and put our financial system at risk.

The decline in the housing market set off a domino effect across our economy. When home values declined, borrowers defaulted on their mortgages, and investors holding mortgage-backed securities began to incur serious losses.

Before long, these securities became so unreliable that they were not being bought or sold. Investment banks, such as Bear Stearns and Lehman Brothers, found themselves saddled with large amounts of assets they could not sell. They ran out of money needed to meet their immediate obligations, and they faced imminent collapse.

Other banks found themselves in severe financial trouble. These banks began holding on to their money, and lending dried up, and the gears of the American financial system began grinding to a halt.
With the situation becoming more precarious by the day, I faced a choice, to step in with dramatic government action or to stand back and allow the irresponsible actions of some to undermine the financial security of all.

I'm a strong believer in free enterprise, so my natural instinct is to oppose government intervention. I believe companies that make bad decisions should be allowed to go out of business. Under normal circumstances, I would have followed this course. But these are not normal circumstances. The market is not functioning properly. There has been a widespread loss of confidence, and major sectors of America's financial system are at risk of shutting down.

The government's top economic experts warn that, without immediate action by Congress, America could slip into a financial panic and a distressing scenario would unfold.

More banks could fail, including some in your community. The stock market would drop even more, which would reduce the value of your retirement account. The value of your home could plummet. Foreclosures would rise dramatically.

And if you own a business or a farm, you would find it harder and more expensive to get credit. More businesses would close their doors, and millions of Americans could lose their jobs.

Even if you have good credit history, it would be more difficult for you to get the loans you need to buy a car or send your children to college. And, ultimately, our country could experience a long and painful recession.

Fellow citizens, we must not let this happen. I appreciate the work of leaders from both parties in both houses of Congress to address this problem and to make improvements to the proposal my administration sent to them.

There is a spirit of cooperation between Democrats and Republicans and between Congress and this administration. In that spirit, I've invited Senators McCain and Obama to join congressional leaders of both parties at the White House tomorrow to help speed our discussions toward a bipartisan bill.

I know that an economic rescue package will present a tough vote for many members of Congress. It is difficult to pass a bill that commits so much of the taxpayers' hard-earned money.

I also understand the frustration of responsible Americans who pay their mortgages on time, file their tax returns every April 15th, and are reluctant to pay the cost of excesses on Wall Street.

But given the situation we are facing, not passing a bill now would cost these Americans much more later.

Many Americans are asking, how would a rescue plan work? After much discussion, there's now widespread agreement on the principles such a plan would include.
It would remove the risk posed by the troubled assets, including mortgage-backed securities, now clogging the financial system. This would free banks to resume the flow of credit to American families and businesses.

Any rescue plan should also be designed to ensure that taxpayers are protected. It should welcome the participation of financial institutions, large and small. It should make certain that failed executives do not receive a windfall from your tax dollars.

BUSH: It should establish a bipartisan board to oversee the plan's implementation, and it should be enacted as soon as possible.

In close consultation with Treasury Secretary Hank Paulson, Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke, and SEC Chairman Chris Cox, I announced a plan on Friday.

First, the plan is big enough to solve a serious problem. Under our proposal, the federal government would put up to $700 billion taxpayer dollars on the line to purchase troubled assets that are clogging the financial system.

In the short term, this will free up banks to resume the flow of credit to American families and businesses, and this will help our economy grow.

Second, as markets have lost confidence in mortgage-backed securities, their prices have dropped sharply, yet the value of many of these assets will likely be higher than their current price, because the vast majority of Americans will ultimately pay off their mortgages.

The government is the one institution with the patience and resources to buy these assets at their current low prices and hold them until markets return to normal.

And when that happens, money will flow back to the Treasury as these assets are sold, and we expect that much, if not all, of the tax dollars we invest will be paid back.

The final question is, what does this mean for your economic future? Well, the primary steps -- purpose of the steps I've outlined tonight is to safeguard the financial security of American workers, and families, and small businesses. The federal government also continues to enforce laws and regulations protecting your money.

The Treasury Department recently offered government insurance for money market mutual funds. And through the FDIC, every savings account, checking account, and certificate of deposit is insured by the federal government for up to $100,000.

The FDIC has been in existence for 75 years, and no one has ever lost a penny on an insured deposit, and this will not change.

Once this crisis is resolved, there will be time to update our financial regulatory structures. Our 21st-century global economy remains regulated largely by outdated 20th-century laws.
Recently, we've seen how one company can grow so large that its failure jeopardizes the entire financial system.

Earlier this year, Secretary Paulson proposed a blueprint that would modernize our financial regulations. For example, the Federal Reserve would be authorized to take a closer look at the operations of companies across the financial spectrum and ensure that their practices do not threaten overall financial stability.

There are other good ideas, and members of Congress should consider them. As they do, they must ensure that efforts to regulate Wall Street do not end up hampering our economy's ability to grow.

In the long run, Americans have good reason to be confident in our economic strength. Despite corrections in the marketplace and instances of abuse, democratic capitalism is the best system ever devised.

It has unleashed the talents and the productivity and entrepreneurial spirit of our citizens. It has made this country the best place in the world to invest and do business. And it gives our economy the flexibility and resilience to absorb shocks, adjust, and bounce back.

Our economy is facing a moment of great challenge, but we've overcome tough challenges before, and we will overcome this one.

I know that Americans sometimes get discouraged by the tone in Washington and the seemingly endless partisan struggles, yet history has shown that, in times of real trial, elected officials rise to the occasion.

And together we will show the world once again what kind of country America is: a nation that tackles problems head on, where leaders come together to meet great tests, and where people of every background can work hard, develop their talents, and realize their dreams.

Thank you for listening. May God bless you.
President Bush Addresses United Nations General Assembly
United Nations Headquarters | New York, New York
10:12 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Secretary General, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen: I’m pleased to be here to address the General Assembly.

Sixty-three years ago, representatives from around the world gathered in San Francisco to complete the founding of the Charter of the United Nations. They met in the shadow of a devastating war, with grave new dangers on the horizon. They agreed on a historic pledge: “to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, and unite their strength to maintain international peace and security.”

This noble pledge has endured trying hours in the United Nations’ history, and it still guides our work today. Yet the ideals of the Charter are now facing a challenge as serious as any since the U.N.’s founding — a global movement of violent extremists. By deliberately murdering the innocent to advance their aims, these extremists defy the fundamental principles of international order. They show contempt for all who respect life and value human dignity. They reject the words of the Bible, the Koran, the Torah, or any standard of conscience or morality. They imperil the values of justice and human rights that gave birth to the United Nations — values that have fueled an unprecedented expansion of freedom across the world.

To uphold the words of the Charter in the face of this challenge, every nation in this chamber has responsibilities. As sovereign states, we have an obligation to govern responsibly, and solve problems before they spill across borders. We have an obligation to prevent our territory from being used as a sanctuary for terrorism and proliferation and human trafficking and organized crime. We have an obligation to respect the rights and respond to the needs of our people.

Multilateral organizations have responsibilities. For eight years, the nations in this assembly have worked together to confront the extremist threat. We witnessed successes and setbacks, and through it all a clear lesson has emerged: The United Nations and other multilateral organizations are needed more urgently than ever. To be successful, we must be focused and resolute and effective. Instead of only passing resolutions decrying terrorist attacks after they occur, we must cooperate more closely to keep terrorist attacks from happening in the first place. Instead of treating all forms of government as equally tolerable, we must actively challenge the conditions of tyranny and despair that allow terror and extremism to thrive. By acting together to meet the fundamental challenge of our time, we can lead toward a world that is more secure, and more prosperous, and more hopeful.
In the decades ahead, the United Nations and other multilateral organizations must continually confront terror. This mission requires clarity of vision. We must see the terrorists for what they are: ruthless extremists who exploit the desperate, subvert the tenets of a great religion, and seek to impose their will on as many people as possible. Some suggest that these men would pose less of a threat if we’d only leave them alone. Yet their leaders make clear that no concession could ever satisfy their ambitions. Bringing the terrorists to justice does not create terrorism — it’s the best way to protect our people.

Multilateral organizations must respond by taking an unequivocal moral stand against terrorism. No cause can justify the deliberate taking of innocent human life — and the international community is nearing universal agreement on this truth. The vast majority of nations in this assembly now agree that tactics like suicide bombing, hostage-taking and hijacking are never legitimate. The Security Council has passed resolutions declaring terror unlawful and requiring all nations to crack down on terrorist financing. And earlier this month, the Secretary General held a conference to highlight victims of terror, where he stated that terrorism can never be justified.

Other multilateral organizations have spoken clearly, as well. The G8 has declared that all terrorist acts are criminal and must be universally condemned. And the Secretary General of the Organization of the Islamic Conference recently spoke out against a suicide bombing, which he said runs counter to the teachings of Islam. The message behind these statements is resolutely clear: Like slavery and piracy, terrorism has no place in the modern world.

Around the globe, nations are turning these words into action. Members of the United Nations are sharing intelligence with one another, conducting joint operations, and freezing terrorist finances. While terrorists continue to carry out attacks like the terrible bombing in Islamabad last week, our joint actions have spared our citizens from many devastating blows.

With the brutal nature of the extremists increasingly clear, the coalition of nations confronting terror is growing stronger. Over the past seven years, Afghanistan and Iraq have been transformed from regimes that actively sponsor terror to democracies that fight terror. Libya has renounced its support for terror and its pursuit of nuclear weapons. Nations like Saudi Arabia and Pakistan are actively pursuing the terrorists. A few nations — regimes like Syria and Iran — continue to sponsor terror. Yet their numbers are growing fewer, and they’re growing more isolated from the world.

As the 21st century unfolds, some may be tempted to assume that the threat has receded. This would be comforting; it would be wrong. The terrorists believe time is on their side, so they made waiting out civilized nations part of their strategy. We must not allow them to succeed. The nations of this body must stand united in the fight against terror. We must continue working to deny the terrorists refuge anywhere in the world, including ungoverned spaces. We must remain vigilant against proliferation — by fully implementing the terms of Security Council Resolution 1540, and enforcing sanctions against North Korea and Iran. We must not relent until our people are safe from this threat to civilization.
To uphold the Charter’s promise of peace and security in the 21st century, we must also confront the ideology of the terrorists. At its core, the struggle against extremists is a battle of ideas. The terrorists envision a world in which religious freedom is denied, women are oppressed, and all dissent is crushed. The nations of this chamber must present a more hopeful alternative — a vision where people can speak freely, and worship as they choose, and pursue their dreams in liberty.

Advancing the vision of freedom serves our highest ideals, as expressed in the U.N.’s Charter’s commitment to “the dignity and worth of the human person.” Advancing this vision also serves our security interests. History shows that when citizens have a voice in choosing their own leaders, they are less likely to search for meaning in radical ideologies. And when governments respect the rights of their people, they’re more likely to respect the rights of their neighbors.

For all these reasons, the nations of this body must challenge tyranny as vigorously as we challenge terror. Some question whether people in certain parts of the world actually desire freedom. This self-serving condescension has been disproved before our eyes. From the voting booths of Afghanistan, Iraq, and Liberia, to the Orange Revolution in Ukraine and the Rose Revolution in Georgia, to the Cedar Revolution in Lebanon and the Tulip Revolution in Kyrgyzstan, we have seen people consistently make the courageous decision to demand their liberty. For all the suggestions to the contrary, the truth is that whenever or wherever people are given the choice, they choose freedom.

Nations in these chambers have supported the efforts of dissidents and reformers and civil society advocates in newly free societies throughout the new United Nations Democracy Fund. And we appreciate those efforts. And as young democracies around the world continue to make brave stands for liberty, multilateral organizations like the United Nations must continue to stand with them.

In Afghanistan, a determined people are working to overcome decades of tyranny, and protect their newly-free society. They have strong support from all 26 nations of the NATO Alliance. I appreciate the United Nations’ decision this week to renew the mandate for the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan. The United Nations is also an active civilian presence in Afghanistan, where experts are doing important work helping to improve education, facilitate humanitarian aid, and protect human rights. We must continue to help the Afghan people defend their young democracy — so the Taliban does not return to power, and Afghanistan is never again a safe haven for terror.

In Iraq, the fight has been difficult, yet daily life has improved dramatically over the past 20 months — thanks to the courage of the Iraqi people, a determined coalition of nations, and a surge of American troops. The United Nations has provided the mandate for multinational forces in Iraq through this December. And the United Nations is carrying out an ambitious strategy to strengthen Iraq’s democracy, including helping Iraqis prepare for their next round of free elections. Whatever disagreements our nations have had on Iraq, we should all welcome this progress toward stability and peace — and we should stand united in helping Iraq’s democracy succeed.
We must stand united in our support of other young democracies, from the people of Lebanon struggling to maintain their hard-won independence, to the people of the Palestinian Territories, who deserve a free and peaceful state of their own. We must stand united in our support of the people of Georgia. The United Nations Charter sets forth the “equal rights of nations large and small.” Russia’s invasion of Georgia was a violation of those words. Young democracies around the world are watching to see how we respond to this test. The United States has worked with allies in multilateral institutions like the European Union and NATO to uphold Georgia’s territorial integrity and provide humanitarian relief. And our nations will continue to support Georgia’s democracy.

In this chamber are representatives of Georgia and Ukraine and Lebanon and Afghanistan and Liberia and Iraq, and other brave young democracies. We admire your courage. We honor your sacrifices. We thank you for your inspiring example. We will continue to stand with all who stand for freedom. This noble goal is worthy of the United Nations, and it should have the support of every member in this assembly.

Extending the reach of political freedom is essential to prevailing in the great struggle of our time — but it is not enough. Many in this chamber have answered the call to help their brothers and sisters in need by working to alleviate hopelessness. These efforts to improve the human condition honor the highest ideals of this institution. They also advance our security interests. The extremists find their most fertile recruiting grounds in societies trapped in chaos and despair — places where people see no prospect of a better life. In the shadows of hopelessness, radicalism thrives. And eventually, that radicalism can boil over into violence and cross borders and take innocent lives across the world.

Overcoming hopelessness requires addressing its causes — poverty, disease, and ignorance. Challenging these conditions is in the interest of every nation in this chamber. And democracies are particularly well-positioned to carry out this work. Because we have experience responding to the needs of our own people, we’re natural partners in helping other nations respond to the needs of theirs. Together, we must commit our resources and efforts to advancing education and health and prosperity.

Over the years, many nations have made well-intentioned efforts to promote these goals. Yet the success of these efforts must be measured by more than intentions — they must be measured by results. My nation has placed an insistence on results at the heart of our foreign assistance programs. We launched a new initiative called the Millennium Challenge Account, which directs our help to countries that demonstrate their ability to produce results by governing justly, and fighting corruption, and pursuing market-based economic policies, as well as investing in their people. Every country and institution that provides foreign assistance, including the United Nations, will be more effective by showing faith in the people of the developing world — and insisting on performance in return for aid.

Experience also shows that to be effective, we must adopt a model of partnership, not paternalism. This approach is based on our conviction that people in the developing world have the capacity to improve their own lives — and will rise to meet high
expectations if we set them. America has sought to apply this model in our Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief. Every nation that receives American support through this initiative develops its own plan for fighting HIV/AIDS — and measures the results. And so far, these results are inspiring: Five years ago, 50,000 people in sub-Saharan Africa were receiving treatment for HIV/AIDS. Today that number is nearly 1.7 million. We’re taking a similar approach to fighting malaria, and so far, we’ve supported local efforts to protect more than 25 million Africans.

Multilateral organizations have made bold commitments of their own to fight disease. The G8 has pledged to match America’s efforts on malaria and HIV/AIDS. Through the Global Fund, many countries are working to fight HIV/AIDS, malaria, and TB. Lives in the developing world depend on these programs, and all who have made pledges to fight disease have an obligation to follow through on their commitments.

One of the most powerful engines of development and prosperity is trade and investment, which create new opportunities for entrepreneurs, and help people rise out of poverty, and reinforce fundamental values like transparency and rule of law. For all these reasons, many in these chambers have conducted free trade agreements at bilateral and regional levels. The most effective step of all would be an agreement that tears down trade barriers at the global level. The recent impasse in the Doha Round is disappointing, but that does not have to be the final word. I urge every nation to seize this opportunity to lift up economies around the world — and reach a successful Doha agreement as soon as possible.

Beyond Doha, our nations must renew our commitment to open economies, and stand firm against economic isolationism. These objectives are being tested by turbulence in the global financial markets. Our economies are more closely connected than ever before, and I know that many of you here are watching how the United States government will address the problems in our financial system.

In recent weeks, we have taken bold steps to prevent a severe disruption of the American economy, which would have a devastating effect on other economies around the world. We’ve promoted stability in the markets by preventing the disorderly failure of major companies. The Federal Reserve has injected urgently-needed liquidity into the system. And last week, I announced a decisive action by the federal government to address the root cause of much of the instability in our financial markets — by purchasing illiquid assets that are weighing down balance sheets and restricting the flow of credit. I can assure you that my administration and our Congress are working together to quickly pass legislation approving this strategy. And I’m confident we will act in the urgent time frame required.

The objectives I’ve laid out for multilateral institutions — confronting terror, opposing tyranny, and promoting effective development — are difficult, but they are necessary tasks. To have maximum impact, multilateral institutions must take on challenging missions. And like all of us in this chamber, they must work toward measurable goals, be accountable for their actions, and hold true to their word.

In the 21st century, the world needs a confident and effective United Nations. This unique institution should build on its successes and improve its performance. Where
there is inefficiency and corruption, it must be corrected. Where there are bloated bureaucracies, they must be streamlined. Where members fail to uphold their obligations, there must be strong action. For example, there should be an immediate review of the Human Rights Council, which has routinely protected violators of human rights. There should be a stronger effort to help the people of Burma live free of the repression they have suffered for too long. And all nations, especially members of the Security Council, must act decisively to ensure that the government of Sudan upholds its commitment to address the violence in Darfur.

The United Nations is an organization of extraordinary potential. As the United Nations rebuilds its headquarters, it must also open the door to a new age of transparency, accountability, and seriousness of purpose.

With determination and clear purpose, the United Nations can be a powerful force for good as we head into the 21st century. It can affirm the great promise of its founding.

In the final days of the San Francisco Conference, the delegates negotiating the U.N. Charter received a visit from President Harry Truman. He acknowledged the enormous challenges they faced, and said success was only possible because of what he called an “unshakable unity of determination.” Today the world is engaged in another period of great challenge. And by continuing to work together, that unshakable unity of determination will be ours. Together, we confront and defeat the evil of terrorism. Together, we can secure the Almighty’s gift of liberty and justice to millions who have not known it. And together, we can build a world that is freer, safer, and better for the generations who follow.

Thank you. (Applause.)
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