A Pragma-Rhetorical Analysis of Persuasion in Malcolm X's Selected Speeches

By

Zahraa Safaa Ibrahim
College Of Education For Women, University Of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq,
Email: zahraa.safaa1203a@coeduw.uobaghdad.edu.iq

Lina Laith
College Of Education For Women, University Of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq,
Email: dr.lina@coeduw.uobaghdad.edu.iq

Abstract

Public speech is considered a vehicle through which a person communicates his/her desires for many purposes, including persuasion. Through persuasion, the speaker can influence the behaviour and desires of people and make them act according to his/her desires and views. This can be achieved in many ways, one of which is using rhetorical figures of speech. In addition to their aesthetic effects, they help to deliver the messages more effectively and purposefully. This study analyses Malcolm's speeches namely "Harlem Freedom Rally" and "The Ballot or Bullet" based on the pragma-rhetorical approach. It aims to identify the type of figures and flouted maxims used in selected speeches and indicate the most and least used ones in each type. The analysis shows that Malcolm x applies both types of figures, except the destabilization trope of pun, in his speeches. The most used destabilisation trope is the metaphor, whereas the least one is irony. In comparison, the most used substitution trope is the rhetorical question, while the least one is understatement. Respectively, these figures flout two types of Gricean maxims, particularly quality and manner. The quality maxim is highly flouted since the meaning of figures differs from what is uttered. While the manner maxim is the lowest flouted one since some figures give rise to a sense of ambiguity in what they mean.

Keywords: Pragma-Rhetoric, Persuasion, Malcolm X, Figures of speech, Grice Maxims (1975)

1. Introduction

Language has a critical value in any society. It serves as a platform for interpersonal interaction, maintaining relations with others, and exchanging ideas, opinions, and feelings. In this endeavor, people can use it to claim their rights in society, particularly their civil rights, since they are an essential component of democracy and provide guarantees of justice and protection under the law, despite race, religion, or other reasons. Such rights be achieved not only through individual attempts but by collaboration with others.

To accomplish this, civil activists shall employ some mechanisms in order to influence people to their side. One of these mechanisms is persuasion since it can change people's behaviors, convictions, and actions towards an individual or group of individuals, views, or ideas. Notably, one of the persuasive procedures used in context is figures of speech and their effect on flouting Gricean maxims.

It is important to note that this study analyses figures of tropes, in Macolom's speeches "Harlem Freedom Rally" and "The Ballot or Bullet." It only focuses on tropes that change an expression's usual meaning and in return cause flouting of Grice maxims. These figures are divided into two kinds: Destabilisation and substitution. The destabilisation tropes include metaphor, pun and irony, while the substitution tropes include overstatement, understatement and rhetorical question.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Rhetoric

The English word "rhetoric" is rooted back in the Greek "rhetorike", which refers to the art of the public speaker (rhetor) or politician (MacDonald, 2017, p.4). Aristotle (4th century B.C./2004, p.18) confirms that "Rhetoric may be defined as the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion." In addition, St. Augustine points out that "Rhetoric is the art of expressing clearly, ornately (where necessary), persuasively, and fully the truths which thought has discovered acutely" (as cited in Booth, 2004, p.6). Accordingly, rhetoric is "the discipline by which a speaker publicly delivers at least an opinion (thereby constructing a stance within a social territory) in view of gaining (part of) the audience's adhesion" (Oswald & Herman, 2016, p.301). As well, rhetoric cannot be entirely understood in terms of text and language, as distinct from the technical tools by which it is transferred to listeners and readers (Toye, 2013, p.3).

2.2 Pragmatics

Morris, Carnap, and Peirce established pragmatics as a discipline of linguistic investigation in the (1930s). It deals with "the study of the relation between sign and interpreters", while syntax addresses the formal ties of signs to one another, and semantics is the relationship of signals to what they represent (Horn & Ward, 2004, p.xi). From a pragmatic point of view, the interaction between language use and its users is considered to be primarily, rather than language as a system of signs or a set of rules (Bublitz & Norrick, 2011, p.4).

Leech (1983, p.1) defines pragmatics as "how language is used in communication." Similarly, Yule (1996, p.3) states that pragmatics deals with "the study of meaning as communicated by the speaker (writer) and interpreted by the hearer (listener)."

Furthermore, Pragmatics shows that comprehension of utterances depends on common knowledge of their context, including the speaker's goal, when and where the utterance takes place, and the status of the person/s involved in the context of an utterance, in addition to linguistic knowledge (Majeed, 2021, p.19).

Also, It concentrates on the sheds of meaning rather than the literal meaning of the words which helps to understand what may be meant by a phrase when one hears or reads it in a particular setting (Hussein, 2020, p.7).

2.3 Pragma-Rhetoric

M. Dascal and A. Gross (1999) propose a paper entitled "The marriage of Pragmatics and Rhetoric", which refers to the relationship between Aristotle's rhetoric and Grice's pragmatics. They believe that their efforts to restore the strong points of Grice's pragmatics and Aristotle's rhetoric are achievable and beneficial (as cited in Capone et al., 2013, pp.537-538). Therefore, Larrazabal and Korta (2002, p.1) reorient pragmatics and rhetoric in a novel direction, known as pragma–rhetoric. This direction of pragmatics and rhetorical analysis can

be described as cognitive. There are two purposes to consider: "Communicative and persuasive" purposes. They mention that "a pragmatic and rhetorical view in discourse analysis, combining both disciplines in order to explain the intentional phenomena that occur in most communicative uses of language, namely the communicative intention and the intention of persuading" (as cited in Capone et al. 2013, p.538).

2.4 Pragma-Rhetoric Devices
2.4.1 Figures of Speech

The word "figure" or "figurative" was derived from the Latin figura "shape", "form", or, more specifically, "attitude", or "posture". A figure of speech has an old-aged and powerful multidisciplinary notion (Strazny, 2005, p.335). Corbett (1990, p.426) typically states that a rhetorical figure is determined as "an artful deviation from the ordinary mode of speaking or writing." In this respect, McQuarrie and Mick (1996, P.425) more officially declare that a figure of speech appears when "an expression deviates from expectation, the expression is not rejected as nonsensical or faulty."

Thus, figurative language deviates noticeably from what speakers of a language generally understood as the content or arrangement of words to convey a unique message or impact. Although figures are sometimes thought of as purely poetic, they were essential to language use and all forms of communication (Abrams, 1999, p.96). Therefore, McQuarrie and Mick (1996, p.426) categorise figures of speech into schemes and tropes. For the aim of this study, the figures of tropes are the only ones that are discussed.

2.4.1.1 Tropes

The term "tropic" originated from "tropios", "tropos", which refers to "turn" in classical rhetoric. Tropes establish figures of speech or thinking by deviating from what is "usually" assumed and by creating linkages between ideas that are typically perceived as unrelated or related in ways other than what the used trope indicates (White,1978, p.2). McQuarrie and Phillips (2008, p.90) classify two kinds of tropes: Substitutional and destabilisation. Substitutional tropes include overstatement, understatement, and rhetorical question, while destabilisation tropes include metaphor, pun and irony. Simple tropes create by substitution have a strictly restricted decision, while complex tropes create through destabilisation have a freely restricted decision For (McQuarrie and Mick, 1996, p.432).

2.4.1.1.1 Destabilisation Tropes

McQuarrie and Mick (1996, p.433) refer that the rhetorical technique of destabilisation chose a term, so its primary situation makes its content "indeterminate". The word "indeterminate" here denotes several cohabit interpretations that are obtainable, and none provides a conclusive decision. These tropes shall be more complicated than substitution ones since they frequently have more potential interpretations and major differences between elements. They have primarily ambiguous intent, requiring efforts to decode or select from several interpretations (McQuarrie & Phillips, 2008, pp.90-94). For the aim of this study, three types of destabilisation tropes are discussed: Metaphor, pun and irony.

Metaphor

Different linguists, philosophers, and psychologists have given their definitions to this figure of speech (Abbood & Mustafa, 2014, p. 278). Aristotle claims that metaphor does indeed add "charm and distinctiveness" to human communication; in addition to that, it has a different means of making thoughts more "clear" and "lively" (as cited in Corbett, 1990, p.425). Bussmann (1990/1996, p.744) considers metaphors as linguistic representations found

on a relation of likeness between two things or notions; specifically, a denotational exchange placed depending on the same or comparable lexical qualities, such as It's raining, the clouds are pleading.

Cruse (2006, p.106) illustrates metaphor as a form of using figurative speech in which the metaphorical usage of a word is identified by the connection between its figurative and literal meanings. McQuarrie and Phillips (2008, p.89) confirm metaphor to contrast two different things suggesting that the characteristics of the second thing shall be applied to the first despite their literal inapplicability. While Poggi et al. (2013, p.121) describe metaphor as a figure of speech in which "an expression is used to refer to something that it does not literally denote, in order to suggest a similarity."

Although using metaphors as practical, persuasive tools are widely acknowledged, there is no general agreement on the qualities that influence their effectiveness. More commonly recognize is that metaphor's ability to persuade relies on how it defines a particular problem, specifically, how it chooses and highlights only a few aspects of the problem (Oswald et al., 2018, p.155).

Pun

McQuarrie and Mick (1996, p.433) state that pun is based on an unintentional similarity, such as two words that sound alike or one word that accidentally has two different meanings. Bussmann (1990/1996, p.968) views this figure of speech comparably as a repetitive wordplay creates by combining words with similar sounds but significantly different meanings and etymological properties, such as Is it worthwhile to live? According to the liver. Similarly, Cruse (2006, p.148) considers pun as a type of wordplay in which two or more interpretations of an expression are generated simultaneously.

Irony

Cruse (2006, p.90) states that irony is a type of figure that occurs when the intentional content of a term is typically different from its actual content; for example, If one comments, "You've been a big assistance!" to someone who acts or speeches cause a crisis. McQuarrie and Phillips (2008, p.90) refer that irony indicates the reverse of what is stated due to a contradiction between the participant's or the subject's character and the used language. Nevertheless, Baldick (2001, p.130) mentions irony as a delicately amusing sense of mismatch where a seemingly simple speech or action is defeated by its conditions and given an entirely distinct meaning.

It doesn't always mean expressing one thing while implying another. There are examples when it points to how the reality of a situation, a claim, or a thought that has already been made rests in the proposition that is contrary to it. It is an attitude-based statement that expresses an opinion about the viewpoint and behaviour of an opponent (the target of ridicule) but is typically delivered to a third person regardless of whether the victim is present or not (Qaiwer, 2020, p.3).

2.4.1.1.2 Substitution Tropes

McQuarrie and Mick (1996, p.432) indicate that the rhetorical technique of substitution chose a term that demanded the addressee to correct to comprehend the purposeful meaning. These tropes result from which the intended meaning must be determined by replacing the intent with the actual meaning. They can be explained by substituting what is said with what is intended (McQuarrie & Phillips, 2008, p.90). For the

aim of this study, only three types of substitution tropes are discussed: Overstatement, understatement and rhetorical questions.

Overstatement (Hyperbole)

Corbett (1990, p.444) describes hyperbole as overstating terminology used to intensify or increase impact. It can be a useful figure of speech if one can learn to utilise it carefully and achieve a specific impact. It will naturally come out under the pressure of emotion and then seem suitable. One will be capable of creating the appropriate sense of intensity or comedy by managing to generate new hyperboles. Besides, Cruse (2006, p.80) refers to hyperbole as a figurative device intentionally overstate for rhetorical impact to intensify influence or grab attention. It could exaggerate for good or bad; for illustration, "if someone says He shot off like a rocket when I told him you were here", a (typically) high speed of action is implied, as opposed to "The traffic was moving at a snail's pace", which overstate in the other way. In both cases, the term does not represent a literal fact or aim to be misleading.

Understatement

Harris (1997, p.8) elaborates understatement as intentionally conveying a concept as being less significant than it genuinely is for sarcastic emphasis or sense and politeness. Cruse (2006, p.186) as well denotes understatement as a figure of speech that involves the expression of "quantity, intensity, or seriousness of something that is less than what is objectively the case" to attain rhetorical impact. The consequence can be to minimise the matter due to humility; for instance, if a well-known scientist admits to having "made a small contribution to knowledge" frequently, it may be sarcastic to intensify the reverse.

Rhetorical Question

Bussmann (1990/1996, p.1009) states that rhetorical question is a figurative device in the appearance of a straightforward question that emphasises a relevant statement "such as Are you blind?" or demand "such as Would you like to keep quiet?" Moreover, Anderson (2007, p.12) identifies rhetorical question as a question intended to have a clear response that can be understood and rephrased as a declarative sentence conveying a thesis. In a rhetorical question, the question inquires for a persuasive purpose rather than as actual demand for details; the speaker hints that the reply is too clear to need an explanation (Baldick,2001, p.218).

2.4.2 Gricean Maxims

Grice (1975, p.45) states that conversational exchanges typically do not consist of a string of unrelated statements; otherwise, it will not make sense. They are incredible, to some extent, cooperative activities. Each speaker has to identify within them, to some degree, a familiar goal or group of goals, or at the very least, a rational, agreed way. A general notion known as "cooperative principle" (CP) has drawn up with four maxims and sub-maxims that speakers must follow as the following: "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." The four maxims are "Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner." Each one of them focuses on one area of language use and outlines what a cooperative speaker shill do concerning that maxim (Birner, 2013, p.42).

Quantity Maxim

This maxim, according to Grice (1975, p.45), is connected to the quantity of the information to be given, and it includes:

a.   Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).

b.   Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Quality Maxim

This maxim as referred to by Grice (1975, p.46) mainly contains, "try to make your contribution one that is true", in addition to other sup-maxims:

a.   Do not say what you believe to be false.

b.   Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Relation Maxim

Grice (1975, p.46) mentions only one sup-maxim in this type, known as "be relevant". He states that the formula of this maxim has many particularly challenging issues. They include questions regarding the various types and central principles of relevance that may exist, how they may change during a speech exchange, how to account for the truth that topics of talk may rightfully change and other issues.

Manner Maxim

Grice (1975, p.46) states that this maxim is attached to "how what is said is to be said" instead of referring to "what is said" as in relation maxim. He proclaims that the central principle in this maxim is "Be perspicuous", and he offers its various sub-maxims as the following:

a.   Avoid obscurity of expression.

b.   Avoid ambiguity.

c.   Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).

d.   Be orderly.

2.4.2.1 Flouting Gricean Maxims

Grice (1975, p.49) indicates that flouting a maxim happens when one "blatantly fails to observe a maxim." Assuming the speaker's capability of upholding the maxim and accomplishing it without violating another maxim (due to a clash) is not choosing to uphold the maxim and, in light of the bluntness, it is not of his/her performance attempting to deceive.

Moreover, the hearer faces a secondary problem: How can his/her words be comprehended despite the assumption that he/she was paying attention to the whole CP? This circumstance frequently results in a conversational implicature, and when it is produced in this condition, it will be remarked that a maxim is being "EXPLOITED" (Grice,1975, p.49). Flouting Gricean maxims is considered one of the most crucial types of non-observing maxims (Thomas, 1995, p.64).

In this respect, Thomas (1995) and Birner (2013) explain how each maxim is flouted as the following:

Flouting Maxim of Quantity

Thomas (1995, p.69) points out that the flouting maxim of quantity occurs when the speaker intentionally provides "blatantly" more or less information than the requirements of the situation as in the following example:

(1) "I finished working on my face. I grabbed my bag and a coat. I told Mother I was going out ... She asked me where I was going. I repeated myself. 'Out.'"

(Thomas,1995, p.70).

The speaker, Olivia, provides her mother with an evident and genuine response. However, she, in her response, provides less information than necessary, and her answer does not satisfy the aim of her mother's question. Olivia's mother notices that she is about to leave, but she is curious about "where she is going". She then flouts the maxim of quantity (Thomas,1995, p.71).

Flouting Maxim of Quality

Flouting in this maxim arises when the speaker plainly utters something incorrect or when he/she suffers from a scarcity of appropriate proof (Thomas,1995, p.67), for example:

(2) "Hate on Christmas Eve 1993 an ambulance is sent to pick up a man who has collapsed in Newcastle city centre. The man is drunk and vomits all over the ambulanceman who goes to help him. The ambulanceman says: 'Great, that's really great! That's made my Christmas!"

(Thomas,1995, p.55).

The ambulanceman flouts the maxim of quality and creates an implicature. Since his comments are blatantly incorrect and his intended meaning contradicts what he says (Thomas,1995, p.67).

Flouting Maxim of Relation

The speaker flouts this maxim by providing a reaction or statement clearly unrelated to the topic. It is illustrated by blatantly shifting the topic or by apparently failing to answer the main point of the person's question directly (Thomas,1995, p.70), for instance:

(3) "Dear X: I am writing in support of Sally Smith's application for a job in your department. Ms. Smith was a student of mine for three years, and I can tell you that she is a fine mother, a terrific practical jokester, and has my genuine admiration for her abilities in both table tennis and badminton."
　　　 "Sincerely"
"Betty J. Birne"
 (Birner,2013, p.56)

Birner (2013, pp.56-57) permanently harms Ms Smith's prospects of obtaining a job. The issue is that he does not describe any qualifications that an employer will likely value. The reader will believe that the speaker flouts the relation maxim since he chooses to discuss entirely different qualities irrelevant to Ms Smith's probable work performance and because it may be presumed that he knows what kinds of abilities those will be. The reader, however, will be free to assume that the speaker does not have anything good to say about Ms Smith's appropriate skills and imply the completely related truth that Ms Smith is unsuitable for the job.

Flouting Maxim of Manner

Thomas (1995,71) observes that the flouting of this maxim happens when the speaker provides incredibly lengthy and complicated remarks as in the following example:

(4) "This interaction occurred during a radio interview with an unnamed official from the United States Embassy in Port-au-Prince, Haiti:

Interviewer: Did the United States Government play any part in Duvalier's departure? Did they for example, actively encourage him to leave?

Official: I would not try to steer you away from that conclusion" (Thomas,1995, p.71)

The official flouts the maxim of manner; she can respond with "Yes" or decline to speak, "No comment". Her objective response is unnecessary and convolute, and no coincidence keeps her from speaking correctly (Thomas,1995, p.71).

The technique of flouting this maxim frequently acts intentionally unclear to imply that others shall not know the purpose of the talk. The aim of doing this is to hide from others or to show that they are not welcome in the talk (Birner,2013, p.59).

2.3 Persuasion

In the fifth BCE, Greek scholars such as Protagoras, Gorgios, Plato, Isocrates, and especially Aristotle dated the systematic thinking about persuasion (O'Keefe, 2004, p.31). Perelman (1979) views persuasion to be a component of argumentation; that is, regardless of the topic or audience, discourse aspires for persuasion and conviction (as cited in Orts, Breeze, Gotti, 2017, p.245). Therefore, persuasion can be illustrated as "all linguistic behaviour that attempts either to change the thinking or behaviour of an audience or to strengthen its beliefs should the audience already agree", according to Salmi-Tolonen (2005, p.61) (as cited in Orts, Breeze, Gotti, 2017, p.254). In such a case, this mental state is mainly recognized as attitude. Even though the persuader's primary goal is to alter another's behaviour, that goal is often regarded to be accomplished by changing a process of attitude.

As a result, this leads to the assumption that attitude change is an instrument of behavioural change (O'Keefe, 2016, p.26). Accordingly, audiences play a role in persuasion as interlocutors and onlookers, whether visible or invisible, actual or inferred. It is believed that the situational and socio-cultural context influence the persuasive process in which it occurs. At the exact moment, it significantly contributes to the construction of that context (Halmari & Virtanen, 2005, pp. 3-4).

Additionally, everyday life plays a significant part in influencing how others react in which the desire for influence is what is meant by persuasion. Different persuasion techniques are employed for various goals, such as its usage in businesses and organisations to gain an advantage by trying to convince others to buy their goods or to vote for them (Janam, 2019, p.37).

2.4 Malcolm X

Malcolm X (MLX) was a famous black activist and representative of Black Nationalism in America. He aimed to fight for African Americans' rights throughout his speeches to spread nationalism among his supporters and enlighten them about their rights as black people to persuade them to claim these rights. In his final years, he founded two organizations; the first was the Muslim Mosque which was based on religion. The second one was the Organization for Afro-American Unity, founded after the Organization of African Unity to carry out his plans and ambitions. He was assassinated on February 21st, 1965, in Harlem by one of Elijah Mohammad's followers. Despite his young age, he significantly influenced American society, and African Americans are still affected by his ideas.

3. Methodology

In order to achieve the goals of this paper, the researcher adopts a mixed method besides the usage of figures of speech (tropes) and Grice maxims (1975). A mixed approach combines both qualitative and quantitative data in one study (Bergman, 2008, p.1). The purpose of choosing a mixed method is that the qualitative method involves investigating the significance of individuals' lives and expressing their opinions and viewpoints regarding their settings. In comparison, the quantitative method emphasises measures and numbers of the variables shown by the individuals and circumstances under study (Thomas, 2003, p.1).

3.1 Data Collection and Description

This section describes the data collected in this study. The data is taken from MLX's speeches, "Harlem Freedom Rally" and "The Ballot or Bullet." It's worth noting that the researcher analysed the two speeches completely, but due to the length only four extracts, two from each speech, are presented to show how figures of speech are employed in these two speeches.

3.1.1 Summary of MLX's First Speech "Harlem Freedom Rally"

MLX presented this speech on the 31st of July (1960), reminding the black people of the freedom and rights that they did not obtain from the government. He then advised them to choose a successful leader who is not afraid of the American government and is not obedient to it. He insisted on the significance of bringing black people together, even though he wanted to accomplish this unification under the nation of Islam's leadership (NOI). He as well, repeatedly asked the government to give them a land of their own, so they could live in peace, free from American interference and develop their own educational and economic systems**.** The speech was taken from a web source, https://www.icit-digital.org/articles/malcolm-x-at-harlem-freedom-rally-1960

3.1.2 Summary of MLX's Second Speech "The Ballot or Bullet"

MLX made this speech on the 12th of April (1964) at King Solomon Baptist Church in Detroit, Michigan. He aimed to educate his audience about the significance of being politically educated, mindful, and aware so that African-American's understand the impact of their decision on electoral outcomes. Furthermore, he called for additional black electoral and domestic monitoring in any way available, involving force and its risk. He enthusiastically backed "Black nationalism", which placed segregationism and political separationism at its core. Besides, this speech played several roles during a crucial period in his life. It was a portion of his intention to separate himself from the NOI, which he gave with the purpose of connecting modest "civil rights" figures. The speech was taken from a web source, https://malcolmxfiles.com/malcolm-x-stories/malcolm-x/

4. Analysis

Extract (1)

"We don't want any more leaders who are puppets or parrots for the white man. We want brave leaders as our spokesmen, who are not afraid to state our case, who can intelligently demand what we need, what we want, and what is rightfully ours. We don't want leaders who are beggars, who feel they must compromise with the enemy. And we don't want leaders who are selfish or greedy...who will sell us out for a few pieces of silver."

MLX applies the destabilization trope of metaphor in "We don't want any more leaders who are puppets or parrots for the white man" to describe leaders who are submissive to the government. He intends to compare those leaders to "puppets" to show how they are loyal and faithful to the government. Then, he compares them to "parrots" in that they only repeat what they have been told by the government whether it is true or not. He sends a message to the audience, by using metaphor, that those leaders are unsuitable for leadership positions.

Consequently, he flouts the maxim of quality by using metaphor because the words "puppets or parrots" are not used in their literal sense. In which what he says is something incorrect and different from what he intends. He intends to show how those leaders behave in a way that is comparable to that of animals (puppets and parrots).

Extract (2)

"Why do we want some land of our own? Because land is essential to freedom. How else can 20 million black people who now constitute a nation in our own right, a NATION WITHIN A NATION, expect to survive forever in a land where we are the last ones hired and the first ones fired...simply because we have no land of our own?"

MLX uses the substitution trope of rhetorical question in "How else can 20 million black people who now constitute a nation in our own right, a NATION WITHIN A NATION, expect to survive forever in a land where we are the last ones hired and the first ones fired...simply because we have no land of our own?" to emphasise the importance of having a land for their own.

Through this, he tries to convince the black with the idea of segregation from the white community and depending on their powers. Otherwise, it will be too difficult for them to survive in a community that does not respect them and give them their right. Even in work, they are lastly hired but firstly fired simply because they have no land of their own so they can live, and work freely.

Therefore, he flouts the maxim of quality since this type of question is not asked to obtain an answer from the audience like a typical question. Rather it is utilized on the audience to **ra**ise their emphasis and attract their attention toward a specific point which is the importance of having a land only for black people**.**

Extract (3)

"No, you outta your mind. The political...the economic philosophy of Black Nationalism only means that we have to become involved in a program of re-education to educate our people into the importance of knowing that when you spend your dollar out of the community in which you live, the community in which you spend your money becomes richer and richer; the community out which you take your money becomes poorer and poorer. And because these Negroes, who have been mislead, misguided, are breaking their necks to take their money and spend it with The Man, The Man is becoming richer and richer, and you're becoming poorer and poorer. And then what happens? The community in which you live becomes a slum. It becomes a ghetto. The conditions become run down. And then you have the audacity to complain about poor housing in a run-down community. Why you run it down yourself when you take your dollar out?"

MLX applies the substitution tropes of understatement and overstatement together in "becomes richer and richer; the community out which you take your money becomes poorer

and poorer, The Man is becoming richer and richer, and you're becoming poorer and poorer" in order to display the economic situation of black people.

He uses these two tropes in the form of a comparison between the white community and the black community. Here, he refers to the white government as "the man", in which he states that it gets richer by increasing business and depending on black powers since they work for a long time for little money. This trope is used to exaggerate the economic powers of the white man.

On the contrary, the black community is getting poorer since it depends on governments. They have nothing to control in their community, whether it is economic or anything else. The reason that makes them in this situation is that the white government has controlled them to the extent it controlled the way of their living. This trope is utilized to understate the economic powers of black people.

In both uses of substitution tropes, he flouts the maxim of quality since he exaggerates and understands the actual situation to enlighten and educate black people so they can control their community. By flouting this maxim, he lacks a sense of sincerity in what he says. In addition, he wants to highlight the idea of economic power for black people to convince them indirectly to separate their economic power from the government. This separation guarantees black economic rights and prevents whites from controlling the economy. Consequently, the white powers will be effected because the black people will no longer need to work for them with little payment, which will cause short-handedness.

Moreover, he uses the substitution trope of rhetorical question in "And then what happens?, Why you run it down yourself when you take your dollar out?", to emphasize the problem of blacks' economic. He wants to direct black's attention to this problem so they be able to take some actions and control their economy by themselves.

By using this trope, he flouts the maxim of quality in which what is said differs from what is intended. This question is not like a typical question in that MLX does not seek an answer from the audience but highlights some points for them.

Extract (4)
"Up here, in the North you have the same thing. The Democratic party don't do it...they don't do it that way. They got a thing that they call gerrymandering. They maneuver you out of power. Even though you vote, they fix it so you're voting for nobody; they've got you going and coming. In the South, they're outright political wolves. In the North, they're political foxes. A fox and a wolf are both canine, both belong to the dog family. Now you take your choice. You going to choose a Northern dog or a Southern dog? Because either dog you choose I guarantee you you'll still be in the dog house. This is why I say it's the ballot or the bullet. It's liberty or it's death. It's freedom for everybody or freedom for nobody."

MLX uses the destabilization trope of metaphor numerous times in "they're outright political wolve, they're political foxes, A fox and a wolf are both canine, both belong to the dog family, You going to choose a Northern dog or a Southern dog?, I guarantee you you'll still be in the dog house", to describe American politicians during election time.

He states that both political parties whether they are from the South or North are the same despite their visible differences. He compares them to wolves and foxes which belong to dog families to describe firstly, their loyalty to the government, in the same way, dogs are

loyal to their masters. Secondly, they are unfaithful, like wolves and foxes, toward the public who in return enables them to be in this position.

He by deploying these metaphors flouts the maxim of quality in which what he intends is different from what he says. He does not mean that they look like dogs in their appearance but describes how those politicians act like animals "wolve(s), fox(es), dogs" in the jungle without paying attention to the public's needs.

At the same time, he uses the destabilization trope of irony in "Because either dog you choose I guarantee you you'll still be in the dog house", to show sarcastically how the American election is useless and its result is controlled by the politicians themselves. He wants to inform the audience that no matter whom they choose they will end up with the same government and be in the doghouse again.

As a result of applying this trope, MLX flouts the maxim of quality because he makes it as if he is saying the literal meaning of the proposition but in fact, he intends something different from what is said. He wants the audience to know the truth about America.

5. Findings and Discussion

In the two selected speeches of MLX, the following findings were gained: The destabilization tropes have **(25)** instances in which metaphor is highly earned **(56%)** since it is applied to influence the perception of his audience by arousing comparison of one thing in light of another. It flouts the maxim of quality with **(54%)** as a result of uttering something different from what is meant.

Irony made **(44%)** percentage since it is used to describe what black people suffer from during their struggle sarcastically and as a way of highlighting specific points to the audience. It flouts the maxim of quality with **(42%)** because what is said is something different from what is intended. Thus, it flouts the maxim of manner with **(4%)** since it utters something that arouses ambiguity to the audience. Notably, the trope of pun never appeared in these two speeches. This shows that MLX has no intention to state something that raises ambiguity to the audience.

While the substitution tropes have **(36)** instances in which rhetorical question is the most repeatedly used with **(75%)** to direct the audience's attention toward specific points and not for seeking an answer from the audience. In spite of the fact that it has the form of a typical question but the intention behind using it is totally different. By this, it flouts the maxim of quality with **(71%)** because it lacks sincerity in which what is said deviates from what is meant. Additionally, it flouts the maxim manner with **(5%)** since it raises ambiguity of what is said.

Furthermore, the trope of overstatement scored **(17%)**, with **(16%)** flouts for the maxim of quality. The understatement trope has only **(8%)** with **(8%)** flouts for quality maxim. MLX uses these two figures to either arouse a comparison, exaggerate or to belittling the situation. They flout the maxim of quality as a result of intending something different from what is said. Table (5.1) displays these percentages.

Table (5.1): *Frequency and Percentage of Figures and Flouted Maxims in MLX 's Two Selected Speeches.*

Figures of Speech		Fr.	Pr.	Flouting Maxims							
				Quality		**Quantity**		**Manner**		**Relation**	
		Fr.	**Pr.**	**Fr.**	**Pr.**	**Fr.**	**Pr.**	**Fr.**	**Pr.**	**Fr.**	**Pr.**
Destabilization Tropes	**Metaphor**	14	56%	14	54%	/	/	/	/	/	/
	Irony	11	44%	11	42%	/	/	1	4%	/	/
Substitution Tropes	**Pun**	0	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
	Rhetorical Question	27	75%	27	71%	/	/	2	5%	/	/
	Overstatement	6	17%	6	16%	/	/	/	/	/	/
	Understatement	3	8%	3	8%	/	/	/	/	/	/

6. Conclusion

MLX successfully used figures of speech in his two speeches as persuasive tools. He tries to get closer to his audience in order to unite efforts and get the rights of black people and bring justice to them in society. For this purpose, he uses both types of tropes with different frequencies. Concerning the usage of the destabilisation trope the highly used trope is the metaphor, while the lowest one is irony. Remarkably, the destabilization trope of pun is never used in the two selected speeches. For the usage of substitution tropes, the highly used trope is the rhetorical question, thus the lowest one is understatement. Though, both tropes, destabilisation and substitution, gained in total equal percentages in the two speeches. Regarding Grice's maxims, only two maxims are flouted, namely quality and manner. The quality maxim is flouted since most figures lack the sincerity of what is said, while the manner maxim is flouted as a result of saying something vague. Other types of maxims, quantity and relation are never used in the data.

References

Abrams, M. H. (1999). A glossary of literary terms (7th ed.). Heinle & Heinle.

Aristotle. (2004). The art of rhetoric (W. R. Roberts, Trans.; 1st.). Courier Corporation. (Original work published 4th century B.C.).

Baldick, C. (2001). The concise Oxford dictionary of literary terms. Oxford University Press.

Bergman, M. (2008). Advances in mixed method research. Sage.

Booth, W. C. (2004). The rhetoric of rhetoric: The quest for effective communication. Blackwell Publishing.

Bussmann, H. (1996) Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics. (G.Trauth & K. Kazzazi, Trans.). Routledge. (Original work published 1990).

Corbett, E. P. (1990). Classical rhetoric for the modern student. Oxford University Press.

Crews-Anderson, T. A. (2007). Critical thinking and informal logic. Humanities-Ebooks.co.uk. http://www.humanities-ebooks.co.uk

Cruse, A. (2006). Glossary of semantics and pragmatics. Edinburgh University Press.

Halmari, H., & Virtanen, T. (Eds.). (2005). Persuasion across genres: A linguistic approach. John Benjamins Publishing.

Harris, R. (1997). A handbook of rhetorical devices. Robert Harris. Retrieved March 2 2022 from http://www.vanguard.edu/rharris/rhetoric.htm

MacDonald, M. J. (Ed.). (2017). The Oxford handbook of rhetorical studies. Oxford University Press.

McQuarrie, E. F., & Mick, D. G. (1996). Figures of rhetoric in advertising language. Journal of consumer research, 22(4), 424-438. Retrieved from https://academic.oup.com/jcr/article-abstract/22/4/424/1790513

McQuarrie, E. F., & Phillips, B. J. (2008). Go figure! New directions in advertising rhetoric. M.E. Sharpe.

O'Keefe, D. J. (2004). Trends and prospects in persuasion theory and research. In J. S. Seiter & R. H. Gass (Eds.), Readings in persuasion, social influence, and compliance gaining (pp.31-43). Allyn and Bacon.

O'keefe, D. J. (2016). Persuasion: Theory and research (3rd ed). Sage Publications.

Orts, M. A., Breeze, R., & Gotti, M. (2017). Power, Persuasion and Manipulation in Specialised Genres (Vol. 277). Peter Lang.

Oswald, S., & Herman, T. (2016). Argumentation, conspiracy and the moon: A rhetorical-pragmatic analysis. In M. Danesi & S. Greco (Eds.), Case studies in discourse analysis (pp. 295-330). Lincom Europa.

Oswald, S., Herman, T., & Jacquin, J. (Eds.). (2018). Argumentation and language—linguistic, cognitive and discursive explorations (Vol. 32). Springer.

Poggi, I., D'Errico, F., Vincze, L., & Vinciarelli, A. (Eds.). (2013). Multimodal communication in political speech shaping minds and social action: International workshop, political speech 2010, Rome, Italy, November 10-12, 2010, revised selected papers (Vol. 7688). Springer.

Strazny, P. (Ed.). (2005). Encyclopedia of linguistics (Vol. 1&2). Taylor & Francis.

Thomas, R. M. (2003). Blending qualitative and quantitative research methods in theses and dissertations. Corwin Press.

Toye, R. (2013). Rhetoric: A very short introduction. Oxford University Press.

White, H. V. (1978). Tropics of discourse essays in cultural criticism. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Janam, I. J. (2019). A critical discourse analysis of the language of persuasion used in the election campaigns by American parliaments. ALUSTATH JOURNAL FOR HUMAN AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, 58(4), 33-46.

Qaiwer, S. N. (2020). A study of irony in political discourse. Arab World English Journal: Special issue on the English language in Iraqi context. 2-17. Retrieved from https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/elt2.1

Abbood, S. H., & Mustafa, S. S. (2014). Metaphor in political and literary texts: A pragmatic analysis. Arab World English Journal, 5(1).

Hussein, M. A. M. (2020). A Pragmatic Analysis of Oxymoron in Poetry: Tennyson's "Lancelot and Elaine" as an Example. ALUSTATH JOURNAL FOR HUMAN AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, 59(4), 1-16. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.36473/ujhss.v59i4.1202

Majeed, R. M. (2021). A pragmatic analysis of personal deixes in lyrical poetry: Ezra Pound's lyrics " Girl" and "A Virginal": Journal of the College of Education for Women, 32(1), 18-25. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.36231/coedw.v32i1.1475

Capone, A., Piparo, F. L., & Carapezza, M. (Eds.). (2013). Perspectives on pragmatics and philosophy (Vol. 1). Springer.

Larrazabal, J. M., & Koorta, K. (2002). Pragmatics and rhetoric for discourse analysis: Some conceptual remarks. Manuscrito: Revista Internacional de Filosofia, 25(2), 233-248.

Bublitz, W., & Norrick, N. R. (Eds.). (2011). Foundations of pragmatics (Vol. 1). Walter de Gruyter.

Horn, L., & Ward, G. (Eds.). (2004). The handbook of pragmatics. Blackwell Publishing.

Leech, G. (1983). Principles of pragmatics. Longman.

Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford university press.

Birner, B. J. (2013). Introduction to pragmatics. Wiley- Blackwell.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation, in P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds), Syntax and Semantic, 3: Speech Acts. Academic Press.

Thomas, J. (1995). Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics. Routledge.

Online References

The web of MLX's first speech: https://www.icit-digital.org/articles/malcolm-x-at-harlem-freedom-rally-1960

The web of MLX's second speech: https://malcolmxfiles.com/malcolm-x-stories/malcolm-x/