INSTANCES OF VIOLATION AND FLOUTING OF THE MAXIM BY GADDAFI INTERVIEW DURING THE ARAB SPRING

Amer Mohammad Ayasreh* (1)
Nada AL-Sabti (1)
Ali Suleiman Awwad (1)
Mozaffar Mansoor (1)
Razlina Razali (2)

1College of Applied Studies and Community Service, Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University, Saudi Arabia
2Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland, New Zealand

Abstract: Theoretically, in communication, people usually apply the cooperative principle that consists of four maxims of conversational maxims for several reasons in several contexts. Speakers obey these maxims in order to have an effective communication without any miscommunication. Flouting the maxims is situation wherein the speakers cause misunderstanding on their participants’ part or to achieve some other purposes in conversation. Qualitative content analysis study was carried to identify and analyze the process of flouting of Grice’s maxim and to explain the causes why the Arab leader Gaddafi does violation of maxim during the Arab spring. The analysis of the maxims of the Arab leader speech reveals that the four maxims are flouted by the leader by playing upon words, talking too much, talking too short, changing the topic, and lying. The main reason of flouting the maxims to convey meanings in his favor and it also shows how the Arab leaders color the choices to produce particular shades of meanings which are not always conceivable to all readers in order to gain the support from the masses.

Background of the Study

Several studies have been conducted on flouting the Grice’s maxims in several context such as literature, religion, humour and jokes both in oral and written context (Ayasreh and Razali, 2018). For example, “Flouting Grice’s Maxims at Dinner” (Rundquist 1990), “some instances of violation and flouting of the maxim of quantity by the main characters (Barry and Tim) in Dinner for Schmucks” (Khosravizadehand and Sadehvandi 2011), “The Flouting Of Conversational Maxims By The Main Characters in Titanic Movie” (Purwanto, 2008) and “The Flouting And Hedging Maxims in the English Translation of Surah Yasin” (Mashudi 2007). On the other hand, it has been noticed that there is a lack of the flouting maxims on Grice’s maxim in the political context. This research can be a good beginning to analyze the political context according to Grice maxims theory, and the findings of this research hopefully will add to the existing literature. This study will also show how people are easily manipulated by their leaders who
know that they can use the language to get support from the masses (Rahmi et al., 2018). If we can educate the people to be aware of the strategies that people in power employ to manipulate language by playing upon words in order to mislead them and response to questions in ways that eventually mislead the listeners, the masses would not be misled while the leaders continue to abuse the power. In other words, this analysis will reveal how speakers, especially leaders can colour the choice to produce particular shades of meaning which are not always conceivable to all readers. This could be done by the flouting the four conversation maxims - Maxim of Quality, Maxim of Quantity, Maxim of Relation and Maxim of Manner (Senft, 2018). This study comes to identify which type of maxims is flouted by Gaddafi and explain the reasons of imprimatur meaning behind the flouting of the maxims by Gaddafi in the interviews.

Introduction

Language is a vehicle to inform and to transfer ideas and thoughts through communication and (Nastiti, 2018; Ayasreh, 2014; Awwad et al., 2015). Mankind has developed languages based on the need for communication (Ayasreh, M. Amer, Razak, 2017); people involved in any kind of conversation intend to communicate their messages so language is very important for mankind to maintain their life. Language is related directly to communication, and communication needs a speaker and hearer in every turn of speech (Taylor-Rubin, et. al. 2017). To have a successful communication, the speaker and the listener have to cooperate to be understood and to understand each other (Dimmick, 2017). In other words, the speaker and the listener will cooperate to convey and to get the messages clearly in each turn of speech, so the speaker intents to deliver his message clearly in an understandable fashion and the listener intends to understand the speakers’ message in each turn of the conversation. Otherwise, the speaker and the listener may misunderstand each other or there will be a break down in their communication and thus will not fulfill the aim of the conversation. To ensure the conversation is free from misunderstanding, the conversation should follow some principles.

In order to have a smooth and successful communication Grice (1975) suggests a principle called “cooperative principle”. He claims that people will have a successful and smooth conversation if he follows the cooperative principles that are associated with the four conversation maxims. The conversation maxims are: Maxim of Quality, Maxim of Quantity, Maxim of Relation and Maxim of Manner. Levinson (2001) explains those four maxims as the following:

- Maxim of Quality: Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence, do not lie or do not say what you believe to be false, the keyword of this maxim is truth or instatement.
- Maxim of Quantity: Do not make the contribution less or more informative than is required. In other words make the contribution as informative as required for the purpose of the conversation.
- Maxim of Relation: Requires the speaker to say something relevance.
Maxim of Manner: the speaker should avoid ambiguity and obscurity of expression and he should be brief and orderly.

Grice suggests that to have a smooth and successful conversation you should fulfill or observe the maxims and do not violate any cooperative principles of the maxims; in other words Grice proposes that to observe the maxims is to respect the authenticity, amount, relevance and the way information is provided at each turn of a conversation.

However, not all communication fulfills the cooperative principles or the four maxims in their conversation. People fail to fulfill or observe the maxims in many contexts of everyday life and at many occasions (Massanga, & Msuya, 2017). There are many reasons for not observing the maxims, for example some people are incapable of speaking clearly because of nervousness, fright, have stammer, anxious, do not know the culture or are not fluent or because someone wants to lie on purpose or other reasons. Previous researches claimed that the violation of maxim are sometimes caused by misunderstanding by the listeners or when the listener fails to make an inference from the speaker’s intention (Gumpers, 1982, McConnell, 2008).

Arab spring

‘The Arab Spring’ is a term that refers to the revolutionary wave of protests that have spread through many North African and Middle Eastern countries. Other terms include the Arab Awakening, the Arab Uprisings and the Arab Rebellion. The nature of the uprisings varies from country to country, ranging from relatively peaceful protests to civil war. Nations involved in the Arab Spring are reacting to a general degradation of socio-economic and political conditions in the MENA region, as well as to specific national regimes.

Many protesters used online social media tools (such as Twitter and Facebook) to disseminate information and coordinate large numbers of protesters, enlarging the scope of the demonstration and engaging the international community. An iconic phrase from the protesters that became very popular for the Arab Spring is ‘Ash-sha`byuridisqat an-nizam’ meaning ‘the people want to bring down the regime. The latest linguistic consensus is on “Arab spring”, a definition that conveys a sense of cultural geography, a feeling of seasonal renewal and the impression that a long winter of stagnation is gone for good. A series of activities ranging from political protests to civil war that happened in a number of Arab countries, including Libya, Egypt, Tunisia, and Syria, that began in the early months of 2011.

Violating a maxim

Violating a maxim is the “unostentatious non-observance of a maxim”. According to Grice (1975) if a speaker violates a maxim s/he did this because he wants to mislead the listeners. c is done by the speaker to have a misleading implicature and he points out that these types of
utterances are typically found in many contexts such as parliamentary speeches and arguments or in advertisements.

**Opting out a maxim**

According to Grice (1975) this type of non-observance a maxim occurs when “the speaker is unwilling to cooperate in the way the maxim requires”. Harris (1996) claimed that the speaker is willing to avoid generating a fake implicature or appearing uncooperative. Opting out occurs in different cases in public life, when the speaker unable or maybe for ethical or legal reasons, to reply in the way normally expected and doctors or police officer cannot say something clearly about it.

**Related studies**

Tupan and Natalia (2008) investigated in their study on the multiple violations by the characters in TV series (Desperate Housewives). The aim of their study was to investigate the reason behind violating the maxims by different characters. They found that the main reason of flouting the maxims was to eliminate the chance of speakers to respond.

Khosravizadeh and Sadehvandi (2011) analyzed the violation or flouting the maxim of quantity by the main characters in a movie entitled “Dinner for Schmuck.” They sum up the finding as it was claimed by other researchers that to achieve the cooperative principles in communication, the process of conversation should be smooth for both the listener and speaker but still people try to flout the maxims to achieve certain purposes.

According to Jacobs & Shapiro (2000) politicians always try to get the favor of their people or their audience or to gain the social power by using deferent technique of playing with the words by flouting cooperative principles. His study also revealed how politicians chose to colure their words to produce a particular shade of meaning which are not always conceivable to all people.

**Methodology**

The participants of the current study have been Colonel Muammar Gaddafi the former president of Libya, commonly known as Muammar Gaddafi or Colonel Gaddafi; he was a Libyan politician and political theorist. He served as the ruler of the Libyan Arab Republic from 1969 to 1977 and then the “Brother Leader” of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya from 1977 to 2011.

This study is purely qualitative where the collected data has been analysed based on the conversational implicature theory. In this study the writers are the key instrument of this research since the writers themselves observe, undertake, classify and analyze the data.

This study is a discourse analysis which focuses on analyzing the political conversations by the Arab leaders which is made on the basis of Grice’s theory of maxim by using following
steps: firstly, identified the places where the maxims are flouted. Then the researchers classified them in a number of categories according to Grice’s theory of Cooperative Principle. Then describing and discussing the findings based on the flouting of the conversational maxim.

**Discussion**

The purpose of the study is to analyse the cooperative principle in terms of flouting the maxim based on political context by analysing two interviews with the President of Libya and Syria. It was found that the four types of maxim were flouted by the leaders. The study revealed that the maxim of quality was the most flouted by the Arab leaders.

In terms of the way and the reasons of flouting the maxims, the analysis shows that there are a number of reasons of how and why the Arab leaders flouted the maxim. Gaddafi flouted the maxim of relevance to mislead the listener when the question is very critical. He changes the topic consciously by making their answers irrelevant to the topic. In other words, by un-matching their utterances he changed the topic. Example of such an answer is given below:

*Interviewer: The question is this: There is a rebellion in this country. As a leader, what can you do about the rebellion?*

*Gaddafi: This is the first time I am meeting with the journalist in these few days, as a mark of respect for the establishment you represent and because I was informed you are here to tell the truth and relay facts to the whole world. I don’t like to appear on television or give interviews.*

Gaddafi flouted the maxim of quantity when he made an exaggerated statement which makes the information too or more informative than that is required, and categorized as “overstatement.” He flouted the maxim of quantity to strengthen and to explain their statement in order that people believe their contribution or to have an agreement and to show strong opinion or to show something is worse than it is appear. The example is given below:

*Interviewer: So they're the people pulling down the posters and putting up the flag of the king?*

*Gaddafi: I would like to explain this point. Al-Qaeda is the one who started the killings and now they are terrorizing the people and they have taken to the streets. They have no claims, no demands. They are not staging such demonstrations at all. Anyway, whether it is Libya, Nigeria or Afghanistan, they are not taking to the streets and staging demonstrations. Those people who have weapons, are young people - youths - who do not know al-Qaeda. Now they have already started laying down their arms, selling them and returning to their homes. Now they start to recover from the hallucinogenic drugs which were given to them. These youths, they don't even know what al-Qaeda is. However the leaders of al-Qaeda, who are inside the mosques, have appointed themselves as pioneers. I would like to go out to see them. Some of them used to be Guantanamo inmates. This is another issue. They have nothing to do with*
al-Qaeda; some of these protesters lost their children during the terrorist attacks and some of them want some kind of revenge for the attacks. Al-Qaeda uses them. They are flying flags, they claim they have demands and they might announce peaceful demonstrations. Nobody can prevent them from organizing peaceful demonstrations. However al-Qaeda does not recognize these people. Just like the mainstay you just talked about, he requested and he asked, but al Qaeda doesn’t recognize him. They told him that he is not infidel.

Moreover, the maxim of quality that is “do not say what you believe to be false” is also flouted when Gaddafi produced utterances in the form of rhetorical question and when he do not say the truth and when their contributions are not based on sufficient evidence. The example is given below:

Interviewer: People are also concerned that you have some kind of savagery. Would you do that?
Gaddafi: It is them who are trying to do such things. The terrorists are trying to do this. They go by 4*4 cars at night and they open fire at oil fields and oil companies. They go to the desert.
Interviewer: Do you have day-to-day control of the armed forces? Do you give the orders in this country?
Gaddafi: First of all there is not army in Libya. We have an armed people.

Gaddafi flouted the maxim of manner when he made an ambiguous statement. It means that he did not give clear statement and this kind of flouting confused the hearer. The example is given below:

Interviewer: Col. Gaddafi, the leaders of the United States, and of Britain and other of countries have called for you to step down and to leave Libya, and resign from your position of power. Would you do that?
Gaddafi: Step down from what position? I don’t have a position. I don’t lead Libya. Libya does not have a leader, president or king. Libya is a state of the masses and power belongs to the people, congress and committee. Since 1977, I have not had any power.

Gricean maxims if observed or flouted in both cases serve a purpose. It is noticed from the interview that Gaddafi flouted the maxims in the interviews because sometimes he does want to show that he is against his people, while at other times he does not cooperate because he wants to send an implied message to the world that there is nothing to worry about in his country and the situation in the country is under control because he does not want NATO to interfere in the situation.

Gaddafi conveys information which excludes the reality on the ground. When observing or flouting maxims, there is a specific intention. In both cases, the flouting happens consciously. For Gaddafi, the purpose is to hide the truth from the general public, provides himself innocent
Gaddafi was able to manipulate his answers because he wanted to show the world that he was in control of the situation in his countries. The bloodsheds taking place in his countries were the results of foreign elements such as Al-Qaida. His military forces were not responsible for the killing of his own citizens. The other reason is that due to his position as ruler of his countries, he believes that the masses would just accept what he had said.

Summary

The main aim of this study is to investigate the flouting of Grice's conversational maxims by Arab leaders during Arab spring and type of maxims flouted by Gaddafi during interviews with ABC and ARD channels and explain the reasons for flouting the maxims by Gaddafi in the interviews. This study reveals that the four maxims are flouted by the leaders by playing upon words in order to give them meanings in their favour and it shows how the Arab leaders colour the choices to produce particular shades of meanings which are not always conceivable to all readers to gain the supports from the masses.

Conclusion

The four types of maxims are flouted by the Arab leader during the interview by giving answers which he thought would convince their people even if though he was not cooperating with the interviewer and he flouted the maxims in such an artistic ways to gain social power and public favour. the Leaders coloured the choice of answers to produce particular shades of meaning which are not always conceivable to all readers and in this way he is trying consciously or unconsciously to manipulate their people by using language to gain the support from the masses.
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