Speech Acts as Persuasive Devices in Selected Speeches of Dr. Mahathir Mohammed

Abdulrahman Alkhirbash, Ph.D
Department of English, Faculty of Arts and Humanities,
Jazan University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: aalkhirbash@yahoo.com or aalkhirbash@jazanu.edu.sa

Abstract

It has been observed that rhetorical studies focus on Western rhetoricians and societies. Research and studies from non-western societies and cultures is still inadequate and limited. The present study investigates the utilization of speech acts as persuasive devices by a non-western politician as an effort to expand the scope of rhetoric from different societies. The study conducts a rhetorical analysis on selected speeches of Mahathir Mohammad (the fourth Prime Minister of Malaysia) to identify how he employed speech acts to persuade his audience to accept or perform a specific action. The findings revealed that 'Directives and Assertives' speech acts were utilized as persuasive devices. 'Directives and Assertives' speech acts were employed by Dr. Mahathir as central elements of persuasion in his rhetoric to influence his audience and attain persuasion.

Keywords: speech acts, persuasion, rhetoric

_____

1. INTRODUCTION

Dr. Mahathir Mohammed (The Forth Malaysian Prime Minister) is one of those few leaders who capture your mind when he speaks. His outstanding rhetorical abilities have placed him at the forefront of eloquent leaders in the eye of his audiences (Somun, 2003). A leading Malaysian politician like Dr. Mahathir with his charismatic character created the impression that his success is not isolated from his persuasive abilities and raised the curiosity to investigate his rhetoric particularly in this age which witnesses an interest among researchers to understand the nature of rhetoric and the application of rhetorical techniques in persuasion and communication. Donahue and Prosser (1997) argues that there is a need for a new rhetoric or a philosophy that could illuminate human problems of freedom and its absence in life and "suitable for the discussion and resolution of problems peculiar to the age of international conflict and cooperation,

technological innovation, and rapid change" (pp. 171-172). In other words, a new rhetoric is required as an appropriate tool for discussing problems in relation to the changes of modern life. This study attempts to address the lack of rhetorical studies from non-Western societies as the majority of rhetorical studies only focus on western societies and cultures. It intends to examine how speech acts are utilized by Mahathir Mohammed as a prominent non-Western orator to attain persuasion. In this study, persuasion is understood as the speaker's attempts to influence his audience and it can be achieved through honesty, transparency, respect, appreciation and activation but not through deception.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH

This study intends to examine the utilization of speech acts in selected speeches of Mahathir Mohammed as persuasive techniques. Specifically, it aims to address the following research questions;

a. How are speech acts employed by Dr. Mahathir to attain persuasion?
b. Which speech acts are utilized by Dr. Mahathir as a central persuasive device?

3. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

3.1. Speech Acts

The speech act theory was proposed by the philosopher Austin who was interested in natural language pragmatics and published in his book "How to do things with words" (1962). Speech act theory as postulated by Austin and developed by Searle demonstrates that utterances are not only to say things but they have the power to do things. Utterances do not only carry ideas or opinions, they also accomplish missions and tasks such as apologies; *I am sorry I am late*, request; *can you bring me a glass of water* or commands; *Close the door please*. Look at the following sentences taken from Georgakopoulou and Goutsos (2001, p. 2)

A: Excuse me, could you tell me where High Street is?

B: Thank you so much.

Georgakopoulou and Goutsos here indicate that the answer "thank you so much" is not by any means the answer you expect from a person when you ask him for directions. In such a context, the combination of these sentences in this sequence is not meaningful and it would fail to perform the act of giving directions. Georgakopoulou and Goutsos conclude that linguistic communication is not only to say things but also to do things and perform actions with language. They claim that the identification of the speech acts which we perform is a prerequisite for establishing meaning in communication.

Austin (1962, p. 99) defines speech acts as "the actions performed in saying something". Austin emphasizes that language is not used to describe the world but to perform different actions. He points out that speech acts consist of three elements. To analyze speech acts we need to differentiate between these three elements. He calls them locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary. By locutionary he means the actual form of words used by the speaker and their semantic meaning. By illocutionary he means the action intended by the speaker. Perlocutionary is the actual result and effect of the illocution.

Austin asserts that speech acts can be used as a tool to persuade people stating:

> "Perlocutionary acts: what we bring about or achieve by saying something, such as persuading, convincing, deterring and even say, surprising or misleading" (Austin,1975, p. 109).

Nastri et al. (2006) emphasize that utterances can be used to convince others saying in conversations, most types of utterances do not involve simply communicating a meaning; rather, they are designed to accomplish something, such as convince someone of a belief, get someone to do something, etc.

David (1999, p. 3) states that perlocutionary acts are those which are performed by saying something in order to achieve effects. For example, in an utterance such as 'could you close the door please' the locution is the form of the words and the semantic meaning whereas the illocutionary act is a request to close the door. The perlocutionary act is the result of this request which is 'opening the door'. Speech acts focuses on the interpretation of acts via words. Hence, it could be claimed that speech acts are important in persuasion because they reflect the intent of the speaker in the type of the speech act selected.

Austin also observed that utterances not only perform a speech act but also describe the speech act itself. These kind of performative verbs create a result themselves. These utterances contain performative verbs such as promise, admit, suggest and apologize. Georgakopoulou and Goutsos (2001) state that Austin (1962) looked systematically at what speakers do with language starting from clear examples of speech acts:

I name this ship Aurora.

I pronounce you husband and wife.

I find the accused guilty as charged.

They claim that when examples like these are uttered by authorized individuals, they bring about a new state of affairs, of saying and doing at the same time. The illocutionary force is performed in saying them and the act is easily identifiable.

David (1999) states that illocutionary acts are composed of illocutionary force and propositional content. David explains that illocutionary force determines the type of the action (requesting, suggesting, warning, apologizing, informing) but propositional content specifies the details of the action (e.g. what the hearer is requested to do).

Austin (1962, p. 150) classifies the illocutionary acts into five categories. His classification based on the type of the action (illocutionary force). Below are Austin's five categories of illocutionary acts:

a) Verdictives, which provide a tentative or preliminary verdict about something. Examples of verbs in this class are; acquit, assess, grade, estimate, rate, describe and analyze.

b) Exercitives are the exercising of powers, rights, such as appointing, voting, ordering, urging, advising or warning.

c) Commissives, are typified by promising or otherwise undertaking; they commit the speaker to do something in the future.

d) Behavatives, are a very miscellaneous group and have to do with attitudes and social behavior, such as apologizing and congratulating.

e) Expositives have to do with how an utterance fits into a conversation or argument, how we are using words. Examples are 'I reply, I argue, I concede, I illustrate, I assume, I postulate'.

Despite the efforts exerted by Austin, he admits that he finds 'behabitives' and 'expositives' most troublesome and they are not clear or are cross-classified. He believes that behabitives are troublesome because they seem too miscellaneous altogether. Expositives are troublesome because they are enormously numerous.

Austin is said to be the founder of the theory of speech acts, but Searle is the one who advances a principled taxonomy. Searle's book (1979) is by far the more influential in the end (Burkhardt, 1990). Searle (1979, p. 11) claims that Austin advances his taxonomy very tentatively as a basis for discussion than as a set of results. He suggests that Austin's taxonomy needs to be seriously revised. Searle sees that there are several weaknesses in Austin's taxonomy of speech acts. He summarizes his criticisms to Austin's work as follows:

1. Not all the verbs are illocutionary verbs. For example intend, sympathize, and regard as saying "I intend" does not report speech act. It may express an intention could be but not always.

2. The most important weakness of Austin taxonomy is that there is no clear principle or set of principles on the basis of which the taxonomy is constructed.

3. Because there is no clear principle of classification and because there is a persistent confusion between illocutionary acts and illocutionary verbs, there is a great overlap from one category to another and a great deal of heterogeneity within some of the categories.

4. There is not only overlap from one category to another but within some of the categories there are quite distinct kinds of verbs. For example Austin lists "dare", "defy" and "challenge" as behabitives. But "dare", "defy" and "challenge" have to do with the hearer's subsequent actions.

5. Many of the verbs listed in the categories do not satisfy the definition given for the category.

Therefore, Searle (1979) as an extension of Austin's exploration of speech acts theory expanded and refined Austin's work on illocutionary acts and proposed that all acts fall into five basic primitive forms of illocutionary act. He calls them "five illocutionary points". Searle's alternative taxonomy can be summarized as follows:

1. Assertives

The speaker asserts a proposition to be true, using verbs such as: affirm, state, believe, conclude, deny, report.

2. Directives

The speaker tries to use words that make the hearer do something, such as: ask, beg, challenge, command, dare, invite, request.

3. Commissives

The speaker commits himself (or herself) to a (future) course of action, with verbs such as: promise, pledge, swear, guarantee, vow, warrant, undertake.

4. Expressive

The speaker expresses an attitude to or about a state of affairs, using verbs such as: congratulate, detest, regret, apologize, thank, and appreciate.

5. Declarations

The speaker alters the external status or condition of an object or situation, solely by making the utterance: I sentence you to be in prison for two years. I now pronounce you a husband and a wife, I name this Hall ….

Searle (cited in Grenwendrof and Meggle 2002) believes that his taxonomy is a strong claim that there are not an indefinitely large number of different uses of language, but there are only five basic types of things one can do with language in the illocutionary line of business. Searle adds one can tell people how things are (assertives); tries to get people do something (directives); one can express his feeling (expressives); one can commit himself to do things (commissives); and one can cause changes in the world through an utterance (declarations).

Searle (1979), in his taxonomy of illocutionary acts offers an improved classification based on a distinction between two "direction of fit", between language and reality. Some illocutions have as part of their illocutionary purpose (point) to get the words (their propositional content) to match the world, other illocutions to get the world match the words. To illustrate what is meant by "direction of fit" Searle (1979, p. 3) provides the example below:

Suppose a man goes to the supermarket with a shopping list given him by his wife on which are written the words "beans, butter, bacon and bread". Suppose as he goes around with his shopping

cart selecting these items, he is followed by a detective who writes down everything he takes. As they emerge from the store both shopper and detective will have identical lists. But the function of the two lists will be quite different. In the case of the shopper's list, the purpose of the list is, to get the world to match the words; the man is supposed to make his actions fit the list. In the case of the detective, the purpose of the list is to make the words match the world; the man is supposed to make the list fit the actions of the shopper.

Searle also notes that the different functions of the two lists can be demonstrated by observing the role of "mistake" in the two cases. If the detective gets home and suddenly realizes that the man bought pork chops instead of bacon, he can easily erase the word "bacon" and write pork chops. But if the shopper gets home and his wife points out he has bought pork chops when he should have bought bacon he cannot correct the mistake by erasing "bacon" from the list and write "pork chops". Searle states that in the above examples the list provides the propositional content of the illocution and the illocutionary force determines how that content is supposed to relate to the world. Searle calls this difference a difference in "direction of fit". The detective's list has the word to world direction of fit as in statements, assertions, descriptions and explanation; but the shopper's list has a world to word direction of fit as in requests, commands, vows and promises.

Mey (1993, p. 132) explains briefly the term 'fit' used by Searle, emphasizing that the term 'fit' describes the correspondence between reality and language.
He explained in a words-to-world fit, language is fitted to the environment such as in reporting events or in describing scenery. In a world-to-words fit, the world changed by what is said by the speaker, as in directives and commissives. In expressives there is no fit, and so that there may not be strict correspondence between what is said and the situation.

Smith (2003) states that Searle explained his term 'fit' saying that assertives (statements, averring) have a word to world direction of fit. Directives (requests, commands, and entreaties) have a world to word direction of fit, and also commissives, which commit the speaker to perform a certain action in the future. Expressives such as congratulations, apologies and condolences have no direction of fit. Declaratives such as baptizing, appointing and marrying, in

contrast bring about the fit between world and words by the very fact of their successful performance.

There are many researchers who have conducted different studies using Searle's taxonomy. For example, Hardin (1999) conducted a study on persuasive discourse. Part of her study focuses on the speech acts and their influence in persuasion. Using Searle's speech acts theory as a framework for the analysis, she examined how speech acts are employed in Spanish television advertising to persuade the audience. The result demonstrated that most speech acts contributed to the force component of persuasion. Representatives (assertives) type of speech acts were used to contribute to persuasion. They contribute to the force of the speech acts. Assertions in announcement contributed to the goal of attention and memory. The study also showed that directives were used in the Spanish ads. Orders were the most directives used in advertisements to evoke the obedience of the audience. Other directives used to recommend, suggest or invite seeking the audience participation. Commissives were also used to give promises and guarantees which are important to build confidence between viewers and products. Expressives were also used to compliment, flatter and praise. However, declaratives were not used as a means of persuasion.

Alhudhaif (2005) used Searle's principles to examine the micro speech acts that constitute the speech acts of persuasion in American and Arabic editorials and how these speech acts contribute to persuasion. The study illustrated that speech acts that generally contributed to the overall persuasiveness of the editorials are categorized into: representatives, directives and expressives. However, the findings of the study revealed that commissives and declaratives did not contribute to persuasion.

Searle's taxonomy was also employed by Bach and Harnish (1979). They employed all of Searle's classes; they used six classes splitting Searle's declaration into 'effectives' and 'verdictives'.

This study prefers to utilize Searle's taxonomy than Austin's because Searle's taxonomy is constructed on the basis of a set of principles. Searle introduces a clear classification of speech acts where there is no overlap between categories, whereas Austin's classification has great overlap from one category to another and there is too much heterogeneity within the categories

and many of the verbs listed in the categories do not satisfy the definition given for the category (Bach and Harnish 1979). Austin himself (1962, p.151) admits that he finds 'behabitives' and 'expositives' most troublesome and they are not clear or are cross-classified. He believes that behabitives are troublesome because they seem too miscellaneous altogether. Expositives are troublesome because they are enormously numerous. Therefore Searle's theory is found to be much more effective and appropriate for this study.

Bach and Harnish (1979) for example claim that theorists introduced different taxonomies to improve Austin's work but they believe that the only effective taxonomy is introduced by Searle because it is tied to a general theory of illocutionary acts. Loxley (2007, p. 63) states that "Austin's lectures had briefly offered a characterization of literary or fictional speech acts as non-serious; but it was Searle who developed such hints into a full-blown theory of fiction." Generally and according to a widespread opinion, an adequate and useful account of "illocutionary acts" has been provided by John R Searle, (1969, 1979) (Wikipedia Encyclopedia).

4. RELATED STUDIES

Hardin (1999) conducted a study on persuasive discourse. Part of her study focuses on the speech acts and their influence in persuasion. Using Searle's speech acts theory as a frame work for the analysis, she examined how speech acts were employed in Spanish television advertising to persuade the audience. The result demonstrated that most speech acts contributed to the force component of persuasion. Representatives (assertives) speech acts were used to contribute to persuasion and to the force of the speech acts. Assertions in announcements contributed to the goal of attention and memory. The study also showed that directives were used in the Spanish ads. Orders were the most directives used in ads to evoke the obedience of the audience. Other directives used to recommend, suggest or invite seeking the audience's participation. Commissives were also used to give promises and guarantees which are important to build confidence between viewers and products. Expressives also used to compliment, flatter and praise. However, declaratives were not found to be used as a means of persuasion.

Alhudhaif (2005), in his study, examined the micro speech acts that constitute the speech acts of persuasion in American and Arabic editorials and how these speech acts contribute to persuasion.

The study illustrated that speech acts that generally contributed to the overall persuasiveness of the editorials were: representatives, directives and expressives. However, the findings of the study revealed that commissives and declaratives did not contribute to persuasion.

5. THE LINK BETWEEN RHETORIC AND SPEECH ACTS

Although rhetoric is an ancient discipline and pragmatics is a new discipline, they share one important characteristic which is the "intentionality" of the speaker. Using speech acts means there is an intended action to be achieved. Similarly, in using rhetoric there is an intended action the speaker attempts to motivate his listeners to do.

In describing communication in terms of intentions and inferences Sperber and Wilson (1986) claim that we as speakers, intend our listeners to recognize our intention to inform them of some state of affairs. As listeners, we are only interested in the meaning of the sentence uttered by the speaker. Focusing on the meaning may not make the communication successful since it does not give priority to the intention of the speaker.

To assert the importance of understanding the intention of the speaker, Sperber and Wilson state that:

> Communication is successful not when hearers recognize the linguistic meaning of the utterance, but when they infer the speaker's "meaning" from it (Sperber and Wilson, 1986, p. 23).

Charteris-Black (2005) claims that persuasion either seeks to confirm or to challenge existing beliefs, attitudes and behaviors. Persuasion is never devoid of intention. Bach and Harnish (1965) also emphasize the importance of recognising the intention of the speaker by stating that "an illocutionary act is communicatively successful if the speaker's illocutionary intention is recognized by the hearer."

The speaker can use both rhetoric and speech acts to achieve an intended action since they share the quality of intentionality and both of them require listeners to recognize the speaker's intention. Rhetoric and speech act for example, can both achieve an intended action such as persuading listeners to change their attitude and fulfill specific action. Campbell and Huxman (2009, p. 7) asserts the intentionality of the rhetorical act saying "a rhetorical act is an

intentional, created, polished attempt to overcome the challenges in a given situation with a specific audience on a given issue to achieve a particular end."

6. METHODOLOGY

This study attempts to get an in-depth analysis of two selected speeches of Dr. Mahathir from the perspective of persuasion. A rhetorical analysis is conducted to examine speech acts as persuasive devices and how Dr. Mahathir employed them to persuade his audience. It also investigates which type of speech acts Dr. Mahathir relied on as a central persuasive device to achieve persuasion. The two speeches were selected from the speeches delivered in international conferences since they were delivered by Dr. Mahathir in English. Selection of the speeches was made according to the importance of the conference and the theme of the speech. Thus, where it is felt that the theme requires demonstrating more persuasive skills and techniques, the speech is selected. The selected speeches are:

> Speech 1: Delivered on 16 October 2003 at the Opening of Islamic Conference (OIC) in Putrajaya, Malaysia. (length 4259 words)
>
> Speech 2: Delivered on 5 February 2007 at the War Criminal Conference at Dewan Merdeka, PWTC, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. (length 5453 words)

6.1. Analytical framework

The framework shown in table 1 below is for the purpose of analyzing the speech acts used by Dr. Mahathir to achieve persuasion. The table includes five types of speech acts as demonstrated by Searle (1979), the classification of the speech acts and examples of each type.

Table 1: Characteristics of speech acts based on Searle's speech acts theory (1979)

Type of speech acts	Characteristics of speech acts	Examples
Assertive	In assertive, the speaker: - describes a state of affairs or an event. - asserts a proposition to be true - uses verbs such as affirm, state, conclude.	- asserting - stating - reporting, - denying - claiming, - concluding

Directive	In directive, the speaker uses: - speech acts to make the hearers do something. - verbs such as command, request, ask, challenge, beg , and invite.	- instructing - requesting - ordering - suggesting - commanding - challenging
Commissives	In commisives, the speaker uses: - speech acts to commit him to do an action in the future - verbs such as promise, pledge, swear, guarantee, vow, warrant, undertake	- promising - guaranteeing - offering - swearing - threatening
Expressive	In expressive, the speaker uses: - speech acts to express the attitude about a state of affairs - verbs such as congratulate, detest, regret, apologize, thank and appreciate	- congratulating - greetings - thanking - compliments - leave-taking
Declarative	In declarative, the speaker uses: - speech acts that change the state of affairs in the world and perform an action using certain verbs such as announce, sentence, and name.	- naming - appointing - announcing

7. ANALYSIS

7.1. Analysis of Speech Acts (Speech 1)

This section provides the analysis for the speech acts employed by Dr. Mahathir to convince his audience. It examines five speech acts, namely; assertives, directives, expressives, commissives and declaratives, utilized in Mahathir's discourse as tools to influence the audience's perception. As it is mentioned above, the analysis of speech acts is based on the view of Searle's speech act theory.

7.1.1. Assertives speech acts

In this speech act, the speaker describes a state of affairs or events and asserts a proposition to be true. Assertives can also be used to demonstrate the speaker's beliefs.

Extract 1
1 We are all Muslims. We are all oppressed. We are all being humiliated. But
2 we who have been raised by Allah above our fellow Muslims to rule our

3   countries have never really tried to act in concert in order to exhibit at our
4   level the brotherhood and unity that Islam enjoins upon us.

In Lines 1-2, Dr. Mahathir uses an assertive when he said, "we are oppressed, we are being humiliated, we have been raised, etc." In addition, to assure the oppression exercised upon Muslims, he utters, "we are all oppressed". The word "all" implicitly suggests an exaggeration hidden in the generalization used by Dr. Mahathir as an attempt to persuade the audience that oppression is not exercised on some people but on all people without exception and to show that the situation is true. He assures the situation of oppression in order to convince the audience about a true issue. Dr. Mahathir also dogmatizes that the Muslims are not unified, as evident in Line 3 when he says, "Muslims have never tried to act in concert." The word "never" suggests his assertiveness that the Muslims lack a unified action. It is used as a technique to call and convince them to act as one team in accordance with the Islamic principles.

Extract 2
1   But not only are our Governments divided, the Muslim ummah is also
2   divided, and divided again and again. Over the last 1400 years the interpreters
3   of Islam, the learned ones, the ulamas have interpreted and reinterpreted the
4   single Islamic religion brought by Prophet Muhammad S.A.W., so differently
5   that now we have a thousand religions which are often so much at odds with
    one another that we often fight and kill each other.

The extract above illustrates the application of 'assertives' speech act by Dr. Mahathir presents his opinion through statements and assertions to illustrate his beliefs as if they are actual facts. This can be observed in Lines 1-3 when he says, "the Muslim Ummah is divided", "Ulamas have interpreted Islam differently and we have a thousand religions instead of one." Dr. Mahathir uses 'assertives' to assert his beliefs and present his opinions as true issues to convince the hearers to admit these weaknesses and persuade them to interpret Islam properly. To support his argument, Dr. Mahathir employs repetition as a rhetorical device to consolidate his proposition in Lines 1-2 when he says, "our governments are divided; the Muslim ummah is also divided, and divided again and again." The repetition of the words 'divided' and 'again' assert his claim.

Extract 3
1   We are now 1.3 billion strong. We have the biggest oil reserve in the world.
2   We have great wealth. We are not as ignorant as the Jahilliah who embraced
3   Islam. We are familiar with the workings of the world's economy and

4   finances. We control 57 out of the 180 countries in the world. Our votes can
5   make or break international organizations. Yet we seem more helpless than
6   the small number of Jahilliah converts who accepted the Prophet as their
7   leader. Why? Is it because of Allah's will or is it because we have interpreted
8   our religion wrongly, or failed to abide by the correct teachings of our
    religion, or done the wrong things?

In the above extract, Dr. Mahathir asserts a number of issues about the Muslims. In Lines 1-2, for example, he says, "We are now 1.3 billion strong, we have the biggest oil reserve in the world, we have great wealth, we are not as ignorant as the Jahilliah who embraced Islam." He raises these issues as they are facts. He expresses his beliefs using 'assertives' with the purpose of persuading his listeners that the Muslims have the qualifications, potentials and abilities to build a powerful society since they have oil, wealth and knowledge in economy and finance, and they also exist in international organizations. The assertions used above are socially determined. They are linked to some socio-economic facts of the Muslims, such as the number of population, oil reserve, level of education and wealth. However, Dr. Mahathir emphasizes in his speech that the Muslims are still helpless and are not capable to exploit these potentials to develop their countries. He asserts that the Muslims have all the qualifications for progress as a technique to convince the leaders of the Muslim countries to exploit these qualities for the welfare of the Muslim nations.

Extract 4

1   I will not enumerate the instances of our humiliation and
2   oppression, nor will I once again condemn our detractors and
3   oppressors. It would be an exercise in futility because they are not
4   going to change their attitudes just because we condemn them. If
5   we are to recover our dignity and that of Islam, our religion, it is
    we who must decide, it is we who must act.

The extract above shows that Dr. Mahathir uses 'assertives'. In Line 1, he confirms that he would not enumerate the instances of humiliation, and in Line 2 not to condemn the detractors and oppressors. This commitment implies that Dr. Mahathir believes that enumerating instances of humiliation and condemning is not the right solution. Instead, he tries to encourage and persuade the audience to take decisions and actions in different domains to recover the dignity of Islam and the Muslims themselves. This can be observed in Line 5 when he says, "it is we who must decide, it is we who must act".

7.1.2. Directives speech acts

One of the effective strategies used to influence people is using directives. For instance, John F. Kennedy, in his famous speech, employed directives during his inauguration on January 20, 1961, when he spoke, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country." In addition, Ronald Reagan's speech in West Berlin, Germany, in the attempt to help end the Cold War, also employed directives when the former US president verbalized, "Mr. Gorbachev tear down this wall." Apparently, these famous extracts from the presidential speeches remain vivid examples of the power of persuasion presented by the use of directives. In the following extract, Dr. Mahathir also used directives effectively to persuade the people to perform actions.

Extract 5
1   If we are to recover our dignity and that of Islam, our religion, it is we who
2   must decide, it is we who must act. To begin with, the Governments of all the
3   Muslim countries can close ranks and have a common stand if not on all
4   issues, at least on some major ones, such as on Palestine

In this extract, directives are employed as a persuasive device. Dr. Mahathir directed and instructed the audience to perform a number of acts in the future. He attempts to persuade his audience instructing them to decide and act. These directives can be seen in Lines 1-2 when he says, "we who must decide, we who must act." Dr. Mahathir also uses directives to suggest some actions as resolutions when he said, "Muslim countries can close ranks and have a common stand." Dr. Mahathir's substantial purpose is to encourage the audience and persuade them to take a decision and a common stand in order to recover Islam and the dignity of the Muslims.

Extract 6
1   We must not antagonize everyone. We must win their hearts and minds. We
2   must win them to our side not by begging for help from them but by the
3   honourable way that we struggle to help ourselves. We must not strengthen
4   the enemy by pushing everyone into their camps through irresponsible and
5   unislamic acts. Remember Salah El Din and the way he fought against the so
6   called Crusaders, King Richard of England in particular. Remember the
7   considerateness of the Prophet to the enemies of Islam. We must do the
    same. It is winning the struggle that is important, not angry retaliation, not
    revenge.

In this extract, Dr. Mahathir uses directives, for instance, "mustn't antagonize," "must win their hearts and minds", "mustn't strengthen the enemies" and "remember Salah Aldin", as a means to direct, instruct, suggest and command the audience to do some specific actions. Dr. Mahathir endeavors to encourage the audience to eschew antagonizing other parties and to reject violence. Instead, he calls upon them to be peaceful and to work to win others' hearts and minds. He advised the audience by using verbs which carry the illocutionary force. His illocutionary force in the text above is to persuade the hearers not to resort to any irresponsible or un-Islamic actions. He tries to create awareness among the listeners that their aim is to win the struggle and not to do angry retaliations or revenge which only strengthen the enemies and weaken the Muslims. Dr. Mahathir uses the imperative verb "remember" in Line 6 to remind the audience of how the Prophet and other Islamic leaders resorted to peaceful means in dealing with enemies. He uses imperatives and suggestions to persuade the audience to be persuasive and peaceful rather than aggressive. It seems that the use of directives and imperatives above reflects his competence as an element of the ethical proof on one hand, and the power relationship between Dr. Mahathir and the audience on the other hand. Dr. Mahathir places an authority on himself which Fairclough terms as the subject position of authority. This authority might be originated because Dr. Mahathir was the chairman of this Islamic conference and he believed it was part of his responsibility to direct the audience to do specific actions. In addition, this power relationship between him and his audience might be established because of the frequent role played by Dr. Mahathir in defending the Islamic world. Hamayotsu (2002) asserts that Dr. Mahathir always stands as a force against the West, taking up the self-ordained guardianship of the Muslim world.

Extract 7
1 We must build up our strength in every field, not just in armed might. Our
2 countries must be stable and well administered, must be economically and
3 financially strong, industrially competent and technologically advanced. This
4 will take time, but it can be done and it will be time well spent. We are
5 enjoined by our religion to be patient. 'Innallahamaasabirin'. Obviously there
   is virtue in being patient.

Directives are employed in the extract above as a tool to encourage the audience to perform actions. The power of this type of speech act resides on the instructions and suggestions made by the speaker as a contribution or resolutions to change the present situation. Dr. Mahathir uses

directives in Line 1 when he says, "we must build up our strength, our countries must be stable and well administered, must be strong." He attempts to make the audience adopt his ideas and suggestions and encouraged the Muslim countries to establish stability and strengthen their economy, industry, technology and administration. Whilst Dr. Mahathir uses directives as a tool of persuasion, he also employed the device of parallelism in Lines 2-3 to give his argument smoothness and conciseness.

7.1.3. Expressives

Dr. Mahathir uses 'expressives' but he does not use it for the purpose of persuasion. Instead, he used 'expressives' in order to achieve three purposes, namely; to thank, to welcome the attendees in the conference and to praise Qatar for its former chairmanship.

7.2. Analysis of Speech Acts (Speech 2)

This section examines the speech acts employed by Dr. Mahathir to convince his audience. In more specific, it is meant to determine the speech acts 'assertives, directives, expressives, commissives and declaratives' which are utilized in Dr. Mahathir's discourse as endeavors to influence the audience's attitude.

7.2.1 Assertives speech acts

Assertives are speech acts that assert a proposition to be true and describe a state of affairs or an event.

Extract 8
1   As I have said over and over again, war is about killing people. Killing
2   people as we all know is regarded as a crime in any human society claiming
3   to be civilised. Even if the killing is justified, it would still be wrong, it would
4   still be a crime, it would still be murder. No one may take the law into his
5   own hands and execute a person even if he is a murderer. That is how
    strongly we feel about taking someone's life.

In this particular extract, assertives are utilized to assert that war is a crime since it involves the killing of people. Dr. Mahathir uses the speech act of assertives, "I have said over and over, war

is about killing people", to demonstrate the fact of war and its disastrous consequences. He emphasizes his rejection to killing people even if the killing is justified. His rejection is observed through the use of the parallel patterns of the assertive speech acts when he says, "it would still be wrong, it would still be a crime, it would still be murder" (lines 3-4). This parallel pattern gives more power to his assertion and assists in displaying his beliefs influentially as a try to change his audience's attitude, as well as persuade them to condemn and criminalize war and killing of people.

Extract 9
1 But present day wars kill millions of people, mostly innocent non-
2 combatants, children and old people, sick people and invalids, the totally
3 defenseless. Today's wars can wipe out whole cities with hundreds of
4 thousands of people, buildings and all in just 24-hours as happened to
5 Dresden, Germany in the last World War, when it was carpet-bombed. The
  fireball created sucked up all the oxygen and people in bomb shelters
  suffocated to death.

In the above paragraph, Dr. Mahathir continues to present the effects of wars. He uses the assertive speech act "wars kill millions" (line 1) claiming that wars randomly kill innocent people including children, old and sick people, and invalids. In addition, he also uses "wars can wipe out cities" (lines 2-3) assuming the effectiveness of modern weapon. In more specific, Dr. Mahathir uses assertives to assume and confirm the negative effects of wars in the effort to convince his audience to struggle against wars.

Extract 10
1 In Malaysia we fought against people who used terror tactics and we won.
2 We did not win through force alone but through winning the hearts and
3 minds, firstly of the sympathizers and supporters and then of the insurgents
4 themselves. Indeed it was the hearts and minds that won the day. We value
5 the sacrifices made by our security forces but they know that the battle for the
6 hearts and minds of the enemy saved many of their lives, and helped us win
  the war. The most effective action was removal of the causes.

Dr. Mahathir follows up his argument by reporting some events that took place in the past. He reports this by saying, "we fought against terrorism and we won", to assert that force is not the ideal way to fight terrorism. He enhances his ideas by emphasizing the uselessness of force when he states "we did not win through force but through the hearts and minds (lines 1-2).

Dr. Mahathir continues using assertiveness to confirm the importance of persuasion, "it was the hearts and minds that won the day" (line 4). The use of the word "hearts" indicates that Dr. Mahathir is aware of the importance of emotion in persuasion, while the word, "minds", indicates that he knows the role of logic in persuasion to win people's attitude. In lines 5-6, Dr. Mahathir also uses the assertive speech act to report that "the battle for the hearts and minds of the enemy saved many of their lives." He further illustrates that the advantage of persuading the enemy through winning their hearts and minds resulted into saving many of people's life. This can be observed in the following extract, whereby Dr. Mahathir uses the assertive speech acts to assert, report, and confirm some events that happened in the past as a technique to persuade his listeners.

> Extract 11
> 1   The war in the Middle East will be an endless war unless the hearts and
> 2   minds of the people there are won. And they can only be won if the big
> 3   powers are willing to admit the root causes of the conflict and remove them.

Dr. Mahathir uses assertions in the extract above. He particularly asserts that "the war in the Middle East will be an endless war" (line 1). In other words, he predicts that there will be an endless war if the hearts and minds are not won. The use of assertiveness can also be seen in line 2 when Dr. Mahathir says, "they can only be won if the big powers are willing to admit the root causes of the conflict and remove them." Dr. Mahathir uses this particular assertion to show the correlation between winning the hearts and the minds of people and admitting the causes of conflict by big powers. Thus, this assertion serves in clarifying the consequences of wars as a way to persuade his audience with the sequels of wars.

7.2.2. Directives speech acts

Directives speech acts are acts that intend to make the hearer performs a specific action. The extracts below show how directives are employed to encourage the audience do actions.

> Extract 12
> 1   We have to build a base for spreading the word, the idea that wars are crimes
> 2   against humanity, that those who resort to wars in furtherance of their
> 3   ideology or agenda are common criminals and must be labelled as such and

punished.

In the above extract, Dr. Mahathir establishes persuasion by using directives when he says, "we have to build a base" (line 1). He uses the speech acts "have to build" to suggest a base for spreading awareness that wars are crimes against humanity. Through his suggestion, Dr. Mahathir tries to persuade his listeners to struggle against wars. In line 3, he uses the directive "must be labelled" to recommend and suggest that those who resort to wars in furtherance of their agenda and ideology must be labelled as criminals and therefore punished.

Extract 13
1 The first move must be the establishment of a worldwide network of Non-
2 Governmental Organisations (NGOs) for peace, to encourage peace activists
3 everywhere, to talk peace and the criminalisation of war, to physically
4 obstruct war and the preparations for war, to condemn the military industrial
5 complex, to do everything possible to gain support for the movement to make
   war a crime in the statute books of the international community.

Dr. Mahathir continues using directives speech acts when suggesting a number of resolutions. For instance, he states "the first move must be the establishment of a worldwide network" (line 1). Apparently, his purpose is to persuade the audience and mobilize them to establish non-governmental organizations to encourage peace activists and protest all forms of war. Dr. Mahathir uses the speech acts to suggest the first move against war and more importantly, to make war a crime in the statute books of the international community. In addition, Dr. Mahathir uses the infinitive verb parallelism, "to encourage, to talk, to obstruct, to condemn and to do", to make his speech even more effective. According to Harvard Business Essentials (2005), parallel structure is useful in presentation because repetition of parallel structure helps the audience to hear and remember what is said.

In general, all the directive speech acts utilized by Dr. Mahathir are supported with effective recommendations, reasonable resolutions, and logical suggestions. It is important to note that his purpose is to persuade his audience to adopt his ideas and spread them to create awareness among the people to protest and resist all forms of wars and killing. Cavender and Kahane (1989) claim that some conclusions can provide remedies to specific problems, and some others may stir people to action by a more general appeal.

From the beginning to the middle of his speech, Dr. Mahathir focused on revealing some facts and events about wars. He also pointed out the disastrous consequences of wars by using the assertive type of speech acts and he started using the directives speech acts as he was giving his audience conclusion (at the end of his speech) that urges his audience to take actions on the issues he was talking about.

8. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The findings revealed that the argument presented in Mahathir's speeches was developed persuasively supported by various rhetorical techniques. It was found that Dr. Mahathir had shown extraordinary abilities in using persuasive rhetoric. He tended to employ speech acts as rhetorical devices in his effort to make his argument more convincing to his audience. Notably, the application of speech acts as rhetorical devices was connected to the social interaction and contexts, and a reflective of the situation of the Muslim world.

Two types of speech acts were employed to persuade and encourage the audience to do something. "Assertives" is one type of speech acts employed by Dr. Mahathir to assure true propositions. Dr. Mahathir used "assertives" (Extract 1 and 2) to confirm his beliefs that the Islamic Ummah is divided. He stated some facts using "assertives" to assure his beliefs and the addressed facts. Through the use of "assertives", Dr. Mahathir asserted that the Muslims have various potentials and capabilities in order to persuade his audience to exploit these abilities for the welfare of the Muslim nations (Extract 2). Moreover, "assertives" was particularly used to assert the disastrous consequences of wars on humanity. His assertion was clearly shown in the use of repetition in Extract 8. Lucas (2009) notes that repetition unifies a sequence of ideas, emphasizes an idea by stating it more than once, and also helps to create a strong emotional effect. "Assertives" was also used to predict and report some events which had happened in the past as a technique to manifest the impacts of war and mobilize people to have one stance, i.e. to criminalize and reject wars (Extracts 10 and 11).

"Directives" is another type of speech acts used by Dr. Mahathir as an effective strategy to influence his audience. "Directives" was used to instruct and direct the audience to decide about specific issues. Furthermore, it was also employed to convince the audience to fulfill different actions. In Extract 4, "directives" was used to suggest that the Islamic countries should close

ranks and have a common stand. Meanwhile, in Extract 5, **"**directives" was used to encourage the audience to eschew antagonizing others, to advise them to win others' hearts and minds, and to command them to remember the Prophet's peaceful way of dealing with enemies.

In a nutshell, both "assertives" and directives" were utilized by Dr. Mahathir as central mechanisms to attain persuasion. Dr. Mahathir employed speech acts (assertives and directives) as rhetorical devices associating them with the ongoing realistic social events. The application of speech acts as rhetorical devices was linked to socio-political issues such as the situation of the Muslim world, Islam and terrorism, wars, and domination of the West in order to make his persuasive discourse indentified by the surrounding circumstances and to increase the chances of persuasion. The way he addressed these socio-political issues showed that assertive and directives are strong elements of persuasion in his discourse. Conversely, the findings showed that he did not use 'expressives, commissives or declaratives' to persuade. Table (2) below illustrates a summary of the speech acts utilized by Dr. Mahathir and how they were employed to accomplish persuasion.

Table2: Summary of the findings of speech acts as persuasive devices

Type of speech act	Application	Extract no.
Assertives	- to assure that Muslims are not unified - to assert oppression exercise upon Muslims -to assert claims and beliefs - to emphasize facts - to encourage the audience to take decision - to assume and confirm the negative effects of wars - to report and assert past events - to predict war and events in the future	1 1 2 3,8 4 9 10 11
Directives	- to instruct and direct the audience perform actions - to suggest and recommend actions - to encourage the audience take decisions - to command the audience to remember the prophet's behavior	5 5,7,12,13 5,6 6

References

Alhudhaif, A. M. (2005). A speech acts approach to persuasion in American and Arabic editorials. Retrieved in 21/5/2007 from ProQuest Dissertations & Thesis, Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words. Oxford University Press.

Austin, J.L. (1975). How to do things with words. 2nd edition. Harvard University Press.

Burkhard, A. (1990). Speech acts, meaning and intention. Walter de Gruyter. Belin.

David R. T. (1999). Speech acts for dialogue agents. Foundations of Rational Agency. pp.169-201.

Bach, K., & Harmish R. M. (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech Acts*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England.

Campbell and Huxman (2009). *The rhetorical act. Thinking, speaking and writing critically* (4th Edition). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Cavender, N., & Kahane, H. (1989). *Argument and persuasion. Text and readings for writers*. Wadsworth Publishing Company, Belment , California, a division of Wadsworth, Inc.

Charteris-Black, (2005). *Politicians and rhetoric: the persuasive power of Metaphor*. Palgrave, Macmillan

Donahue, M. & Prosser, M. (1997). *Diplomatic discourse*: *International conflict at the United Nations addresses and analysis*. U.S.A: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Georgakopoulou, A., and Goutsos, D. (2001). *Discourse analysis: An introduction*. Edinburgh University Press.

Grewend, G., & Meggle, G. (2002). *Speech acts, mind and social reality* (Ed). Kluwer Academic Publishers. Dordrecht , Boston, London.

Hamayotsu, K. (2002). Islam and nation building in Southeast Asia: Malaysia and Indonesia in comparative perspective. Journal paper: *Pacific Affairs*. Volume: 75. Issue: 3. pp. 353+. University of British Columbia.

Hardin K. (1999). *Pragmatics in persuasive discourse of Spanish television advertising*. Retrieved in 25/3/ 2006 from ProQuest Dissertations & thesis, Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Harvard Business Essentials (2005). Harvard Business Publishing.

Lucas, S. E. (2009). *The art of public speaking*. McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Mey, J. L. (1993). *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Nastri, J., Pena, J., and Hancock, J. T. (2006). The construction of away messages: A speech act analysis. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 11*(4), article 7. http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol11/issue4/nastri.html

Searle, J. R. (2002). Speech acts, mind and social reality. In G. Grewendorf, & G. Meggle (Eds.), *Speech acts, mind, and social reality: Discussion with J. R. Searle* (pp 3-16). Kluwer Academic.

Searle, J.R. (1979). Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts. Cambridge University Press.

Simon, H. (1990). *The rhetorical turn: Invention and persuasion in the conduct of inquiry*. University of Chicago press.

Smith, B. (2003). *John Searle. Contemporary philosophy in focus*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Sperber and Wilson (1986). Relevance : *Communication and cognition*. Basil Blackwell Ltd.