*Corresponding author:

Najah J. Salman (MA Candidate)
Asst.Prof. Mazin J. al Hilu (Ph.D.)
University: Wasit University
College: Education for Human Sciences
Email: najah99j@gmail.com
malhilu@uowasit.edu.iq

Pejoration in Trump's Selected Speeches

ABSTRUCT

The current study tries to pragmatically investigate pejoration in Trump's Selected Speeches. This analytic-descriptive study examines how Grice's (1975) cooperative principles are broken and maintained in some of former President Donald Trump's speeches. The study involves viewing and studying his speeches and interviews for harsh and ridiculous interpretations in the context of a variety of events selected at random from online sites. Its goal is to evaluate the violation and observance of Grice's (1975) cooperative principles (CPs) and maxims from a practical standpoint. Pragmatically, this study looks into a novel approach of looking at speakers' non-cooperative and cooperative attitudes, as well as their violations of the Cooperative Principles and their maxims, throughout the communication process. Conversational implicature and evaluation of Grice's four proposed maxims under the cooperative principle, are used to examine the work samples. To investigate and evaluate the data in question, the researcher has used both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. Grice's (1975) model is adopted in the current study. The results of the present study show that language can be utilized to spread pejoration, which is often employed indirectly by implying more senses than is overtly established. Pejorative utterances are more achieved in terms of conversational implicature than conventional ones. Additionally, the analysis of the current study has revealed that the violation of quantity maxim scores (1) occurrence with a percentage of (25%). As for the violation of quality maxim, it scores (4) occurrences with a percentage of (100%). Concerning the violation of manner maxim, it is about (3) occurrences with a percentage of (75%). Thus, the quality maxim represents the one that is frequently violated.

الازدراء في خطابات مختارة للرئيس الأمريكي دونالد ترامب

الباحثة / نجاح جميل سلمان الباحث/ جامعة واسط/ كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية/ قسم اللغة الإنجليزية
أ. م. د. مازن جاسم الحلو / جامعة واسط / كلية الآداب/ قسم الترجمة

الخلاصة:

تحاول الدراسة الحالية التحقيق بشكل عملي في الازدراء في خطابات ترامب المختارة. يبحث هذا العمل الوصفي التحليلي في كيفية كسر مبادئ غرايس التعاونية (1975) والاحتفاظ بها في بعض خطابات الرئيس السابق، ترامب. وتضمن البحث مشاهدة وتحليل خطبه ومقابلاته من أجل تفسيرات ساخرة وعبثية في جوهر العديد من المناسبات المتميزة التي يتم اختيارها عشوائياً عبر مواقع الإنترنت. هدفها هو تقييم انتهاك ومراعاة مبادئ غرايس التعاونية (CPs) ومبادئها من وجهة نظر عملية. عمليا، تبحث هذه الدراسة في نهج جديد للنظر في مواقف المتحدثين غير المتعاونة والمتعاونة، بالإضافة إلى انتهاكاتهم للمبادئ التعاونية ومبادئهم، طوال عملية الاتصال. يتم استخدام مضمون المحادثة وتقييم المبادئ الأربعة المقترحة لـ غرايس بموجب المبدأ التعاوني لفحص عينات العمل. حيث انتجت الدراسة الحالية أنه

يمكن استخدام اللغة لنشر الازدراء والسخرية والتي غالبًا ما يتم استخدامها بشكل غير مباشر من خلال الإشارة إلى حواس أكثر مما هو واضح بشكل علني. يتم تحقيق أقوال الاحتقار والسخرية من حيث المضمون التخاطبي أكثر من تلك التقليدية. بالإضافة إلى مخالفة درجات الحد الأقصى للكمية (1) بنسبة (25٪). أما مخالفة مبدأ الجودة فقد حصلت على (4) وبنسبة (100٪). أما مخالفة أسلوب الحد الأقصى فهي حوالي (3) بنسبة (75٪). وبالتالي، يمثل مبدأ الجودة المبدأ الذي يتم انتهاكه بشكل متكرر. على أساس هذه النتائج، تم تقديم كل من الاقتراحات والتوصيات في نهاية الدراسة. المبدأ الوحيد الذي لم يتم انتهاكه هو مبدأ العلاقة حيث يتم التعامل مع الموضوع المعني الذي يتحدث عنه ترامب.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الأزدراء، التضمين ، التضمين الحوراي، التضمين التقليدي،

1. Introduction

The speaker's assessment of something as undesirable is referred to as pejoration. Pejoration is thus the exact opposite of melioration, which refers to the speaker's good opinion of something. If someone says, "This breakfast is horrible," for example, he/she is using pejorative language. And if someone says something like, "This breakfast is amazing," he/she is making things better. Pejoration, we argue, is tied to a cognitive attitude and hence belongs to a different conceptual field than language. All grammatical levels, including phonology (prosody), morphology (word building), syntax, semantics, and the lexicon, as well as pragmatics, can be used to transmit and achieve this attitude (for instance, speech acts and implicatures).

Linguistics, the scientific study of human language, is divided into several fields, one of which is pragmatics, which deals with meaning in context. This means that while decoding a statement, the context must be considered. While semantics is concerned simply with the meaning of joined words, pragmatics goes farther to provide adequate reasons for meaning. Both pragmatics and semantics are concerned with the meaning of utterances, but semantics is more concerned with an expression's literal meaning. It doesn't care about the context in which it's utilized (Cutting, 2002). Pragmatics sees the meaning of context, especially when illustrating the meaning of a word. Semantics refers to the dictionary definitions of words or phrases, while pragmatics pertains to the speaker's intent, according to Thomas (1995). The cooperative principle and implicature pragmatic theory were introduced by Grice, a notable linguist, in 1975. He says that participants follow certain standards and patterns in their interactions, which they may or may not be aware of. As a result, participants are required to make statements that are both interesting and effective. Grice (1975) claims that communication is based on a shared principle of collaboration, and his work on the Cooperative Principle (CP) helped to establish pragmatics as a distinct area within linguistics. Interlocutors strive to communicate ideas and information through conversation by acting together in order to convey their intentions and transfer their statements implicitly Grice (1975) reminds out that communication acts are based on the Cooperative Principle, and that most conversational discourse aims to collaborate. He proposes certain rules to account for the cooperative behavior of participants in their discussions. Grice (1975) studies both the cooperative principle and conversation in his paper "Logic and Conversation."

When it comes to analyzing utterances, he believes it is not a matter of decoding signals. Instead, it requires combining the meaning of the phrases with the data in the environment. To figure out what the speaker is saying, use inference rules and assume that the utterance follows the maxims. An implicature is a piece of information that is delivered indirectly through a speech. This indicates that an implicature is anything that logically follows from an utterance's statements.

2. Literature review

2.1 Definitions of Pejoration

Pejoration is particularly pernicious and hateful for conveying and reinforcing stereotypes about the target person, it also harms his/her target's self-worth, for this reason it has been considered taboo and prohibited word (Jeshion, 2013: 314).

Pejoration is a derogatory term which conveys hatred and disdain. It is a derogatory term targeting individuals and groups of individuals on the basis of race, nationality, religion, gender or sexual orientation (Bianchi, 2014: 35).

The main manifestation of pejorative language is reflected against minorities based on gender, sex, ethnicity and race. The regularity of evolution, Allen emphasizes, is one of the most persisting features of language especially the short lived slang terms (Allen, 1990: 31).

There are many types of pejoration that can be distinguished in accordance with the bases of race, gender, sex, ethnicity, and religion.

2.2. Pejoration in Pragmatics

Pejoration is linked to aspects in a variety of pragmatic domains, including speech acts, implicature, and impoliteness.

2.3. Gricean Implicature

Paul Grice made a distinction between what is said and what is implicated by an utterance: what is "said" is the literal (or semantic) meaning of the expressions, whereas what is "implied" is the information the speaker wants his audience to pragmatically infer from what is said, or what can be called a non-literal meaning that arises in the production and perception of speech, as well as in interlocutors' meaning negotiation.

On the assumption that there is a distinction between pragmatics (meaning beyond what is said) and semantics (coded meaning), such non-literal meanings are referred to as pragmatic implicatures (Grice, 1989: 312). For instance, what is said by uttering the expression "could you pass the salt" is a literally only a question about the hearer's physical capabilities, but it implicates a request to pass the salt. Conversationally implicated content like the offensiveness of pejoration also typically exceeds the scope of logical operators, which suggests a similar analysis might apply to both.

Hom for example, contends the wide-scoping tendencies of pejoratives are best explained in terms of a difference between literal semantic content and conversationally implicated offensive content (Hom, 2010: 18).

Gricean account of pejoratives provides a tidy explanation for cases of so-called appropriated uses of pejoratives (e.g., such as the "camaraderie" use of "nigger" among African Americans). On this account an in-group member's use of a pejorative word is best seen as flouting the Gricean maxim of relevance or quality, thus generating an implicature in manner analogous to Grice's account of irony, where the flouting of the relevant conversational maxim generates an implicature opposite to that of the pejorative's derogatory literal meaning. Likewise, members of an "in group" may reclaim a pejorative term for use as a marker of in-group camaraderie.

Camp (2013: 339) views that to employ rather than its neutral correlate a speaker signals their allegiance to a 'derogating perspective' in an overt and non-defeasible way, whereas using a neutral correlate merely implicates such a perspective, Consider the following pair of sentences as an example:

(1) They gave the job I applied for to a beaner.

(2) They gave the job I applied for to a Mexican American (Camp, 2013).

In (1) the speaker has wilfully inserted a derogatory way of thinking about a particular subset of Hispanic people into the conversation. In the second sentence, however, the speaker's choice to mention ethnicity at all merely implies a bigoted attitude. Camp sees (1) and (2) as a minimal pair which illustrates that a derogating perspective is a non-detachable part of (1)'s literal (semantic) meaning (Flores, 2015: 899).

According to Paul Grice, implicature is of two types: conventional implicature and conversational implicature.

2.3.1. Gricean Conventional Implicature

As already mentioned above, pejoratives seem to have two functions, descriptive and expressive (Hornsby, 2001:5). To account for these functions, Williamson advanced an explanation of the expressive content of pejoratives by means of Gricean conventional implicatures. For example, the term Boche (meaning cruel as applied to German people) has the conventional implicature that Germans are cruel (Williamson, 2009: 20).

 The fact that the implicature is conventional explains that its content neither refers to a particular individual nor is it fully determined by the speaker's attitude in context. The very use of the pejoratives generates implicature in accordance with the already established fact that its expressive meaning projects out of any linguistic structure in which embeds. The conventional implicature strategy answers questions to the facts that the expressivist view is emphasized. In contrast, the orthodox Gricean framework that Williamson endorses entails the assumption that on the semantic level the pejorative contributes its extension to the truth conditions of the sentence in which it embeds (Hom, 2012: 399).

 Moreover, Hom presents evidence that pejorative content is not detachable, against another essential characteristic of conventional implicatures. To show that this is the case, he considers the two sentences,
3. a. John: Institutions that treat Chinese as chinks are racist.
  .b. Mary: John said that institutions that treat Chinese as Chinese are racist.
The defectiveness in Mary's indirect report shows once more that the pejorative content is not detachable from what is said (Hom, 2010: 392).

As Hom remarks, in order for a pejorative use of language to be in force, a social context of discriminatory institutions and practices, the social institution of prejudice, must be in force and available to the participants.

As a matter of fact, the attitudes expressed by means of conventions, as accounting for the expressive value of pejoratives in terms of conventional implicatures, presupposes that what ultimately determines the linguistic meaning of pejoratives is the speakers' communicative intentions notwithstanding the social consequentiality of such intentions that lies beyond the communicative act.

Whiting (2013, p.370) distinguishes between non-derogatory, non-appropriated uses like "I am Chinese, not a chink" and appropriated uses like "I am Chinese, not a chink." Repetition or even "hyper repetition" of racial epithets (and other explicitly racist phrases) improves their circulation and helps the reproduction of racism, according to Hill (2008: 43).

2.3.2. Gricean Conversational Implicature

Pejoration can occur inadvertently, such as through conversational implicatures. For example,

>(4) Despite being German, my brother's friend has a wonderful sense of   humour.

>(5) A- 'For me, one of your households is equivalent to three Muslim families.'   'I despise Muslim households,' says B.

The speaker implies in (4), that the stereotypical German lacks humour, which he or she despises. In number (5), the speaker expresses a negative view about Muslim immigrants who are stereotypically connected with large families. The pejoration in these cases is not part of the propositional content of the statements. Rather, basic pragmatic principles governing the interpretation of the speech in the actual context of use can provide the hearer with the negative meaning element. As a result, interpreting sarcastic utterances, which are frequently employed to express a derogatory speaker attitude, requires conversational implicatures.

2.4. The cooperative principle

The four categorical maxims that comprise the Cooperative Principle are quality, quantity, relation, and manner. (Grice, 1975)

A. Quality Maxim - The speaker tells the truth or provides enough evidence to support his claim. The quality maxim has a moral connotation. Don't say something you know is false. Make no claims for which you don't have enough evidence.

B. Quantity Maxim - The speaker must include as much information as appropriate in his or her speech. Make sure your contribution to the conversation isn't any more informative than necessary.

C. Relationship Maxim- The speaker's response must be related to the current topic. Avoid padding and circumlocutions.

D. Maxim of Manner- To avoid ambiguity or obscurity, the speaker must speak plainly and simply. They ought to be brief and well-organized. High-sounding and jaw-breaking words and phrases, as well as difficult words and phrases, should be avoided because the essence of communication is that the hearer understands. Words should not be used for the sake of self-promotion or cheap praise. Furthermore, the maxim implies politeness (treat your listeners as you would like to be treated) in response to the enquirer's inquiry and discourse/text.

2.4.1. Flouting the Maxim of Quality

One way of disobeying a maxim is to "flout" it. The word implies that the speaker is flagrantly breaching the maxim. It isn't the product of a clever deception or confusion. The speaker is breaking one of the maxims and ensuring that his interlocutor is aware of it. (Grice, 1989)

3. Methodology

This study is concerned with describing the nature of both qualitative and quantitative study. It also describes the procedures of data collection and some background information for the source of data and the adopted model of this study. The analysis of the current study is based on thoroughly studying Trump's political speech.

Methodology is used to systematically solve the research problem. It is a science that is used to study how the research is done scientifically. Methodology is adopted by the researcher as steps or devices that are generally used to study the research problem and the logic behind them (Kothari, 2004, p.12).

This study is both qualitative and quantitative in nature. It is qualitative because it depends on arguments in interpreting texts. According to Shank (2002, p.5), a qualitative approach is "a type of systematic empirical analysis into meaning." Shank defines systematic as "planned, ordered, and public." By empirical, he indicates that this type of research is grounded in reality. As for quantitative approach, Williams (2011) mentions that a quantitative research methodology refers to "the holistic steps a researcher employs in embarking on research work" (p.14). Consequently, a quantitative study is concerned with measuring and analysing variables to reach specific results. This method involves utilising and analysing numeral data by using particular statistical procedures to reach some answers to questions like; how, how much, how many, where, what, and who.

This study is pragmatically examined in regard to the utterances' context. The speaker, the listener, and the physical surroundings all influence how language is evaluated in different situations. To analyze the data in this study, the researcher uses Grice's model of implicature and CP. The qualitative analysis in this study is devoted to describe the language used in Trump's political speech. He gives an idea about the way politicians use language to keep their status quo and their domination on people. He explains that politicians always use implication in their language. Words are not used directly, one word could mean different things, and language is used for domination.

4. Data Analysis

Only implicature and evaluation of Cooperative Principle Maxims are going to be investigated as follows:

4.1. Analysis of Extract (1)"I'm the least racist person you have ever interviewed."

4.1.1. The Context of Extract (1)

This extract, however, is about ex-president Donald Trump claimed to be the "least racist guy in the room" at the final debate before the Nov. 3 presidential election versus Democratic contender Joe Biden.

4.1.2. The Pragmatic Analysis of Text (1)

Pragmatically speaking, this extract consists of the Gricean maxims, which are based on the idea that interactors pursue a general CP, can be used to assess the current text. This idea is comprised of four key

maxims. Any violation of one of the aforementioned maxims will result in implicature. One of Grice's most important contributions to linguistics is the concept of implicature.

4.1.3. Gricean Maxims of extract (1)

Trump obeys the quantity maxim, but his contribution is not true i.e. since he says what you believe to be false, that means he violates the quality maxim. His speech is relevant to the topic concerned. He violates the maxim of manner where his speech is ambiguous. As for cooperative principles, Trumps obeys the maxims of quality and relevance, but he violates the quantity and manner maxims in that the contribution is not justified, clear, and ambiguous one.

4.1.4 Implicature of Extract (1)

The Gricean maxims, which are based on the idea that interactors pursue a general CP, can be used to examine the present text. There are four key maxims that make up this principle. Any of the related maxims that are disobeyed will result in implicature. One of Grice's most important contributions to linguistics is his concept of implicature. He's also prohibited Muslims for a variety of reasons, including the fact that they're Muslims. Trump also tries to link the Black Lives Matter movement to cries he claims he overheard from linked demonstrators, in which police are referred to as "pigs" who should be slain. Because everything is implied and not part of the phrases meaning, the form of implicature used here is conversational implicature.

2. Analysis of Text (2) "I will build a great, great wall on our southern border, and I will have Mexico pay for that wall. Mark my words."

4.2.1. The Context of Extract (2)

Trump's administration has failed to deliver on his promises after more than three years in power. When Trump says they have built 200 miles or more of border wall, he is referring to the replacement of old barriers with new fences, not the construction of new border barriers. Trump did not run on a platform of breaking down or strengthening existing barriers, yet that is exactly what he has done. Trump hinted that if he built a wall, he would seal portions of the border that weren't previously covered. His campaign rhetoric does not appear to be mirrored in his work. Mexico has also not paid for the structure.

4.2.2. The Pragmatic Analysis of Text (2)

Pragmatic analysis is focused with examining texts using ideas and methodologies developed by the discipline. Austin, Searle, Grice, Culpeper, Bousfield, and others are examples of pragmatics theories. These theories are applied to decipher the hidden meaning of texts based on environmental circumstances. Grice's maxims will be used to examine the current text, which are founded on the assumption that interlocutors are looking for a general CP. There are four basic maxims in this idea. Any violation of one of these tenets will result in prosecution.

4.2.3. Gricean Maxims of extract (2)

Trump doesn't violate the quantity maxim; his information is as informative as is required. Trump violates the quality maxim. The contribution is relevant to the topic. Trump observes this maxim of manner because his speech is brief, clear and not ambiguous. As for cooperative principle, Trump does not collaborate with his audience in terms of the cooperative principle. The audience's only responsibility is to listen. His contribution is both informative and necessary. In view of his approaching presidential campaign, which begins on June 16, 2015, the address is crucial. Trump promised to "build a big wall" on the US-Mexico border at a low cost. Trump follows all of the maxims, but he disregards the quality maxim, therefore his contribution is uncooperative since he asserts things for which he lacks sufficient evidence.

4.2.4. Implicature of Extract (2)

Trump breaks the quality rule by not saying anything he considers to be incorrect or for which he lacks sufficient evidence. Trump is purposely misleading and fooling his audience when he declares, "I will make Mexico pay for the wall," because he has failed to follow through on his promise to build a wall and

make Mexico pay for it. The type of implicature presented here is a generalized conversational implicature, which does not need the existence of specific context.

4.3. Analysis of Text (3) "We've been doing a lot of winning." "Actually, as you know, they just lost the White House."

4.3.1. The Context of Extract (3)

On February 28, 2021, former President Donald Trump addressed at CPAC. It was his first public speech since stepping down from the presidency.

4.3.2. The Pragmatic Analysis of Text (3)

This extract has a lot of implications and extra meanings that aren't stated directly, but can be deduced by understanding the devices and theories of speech. Implicature and Grice's theory are the terms used to describe these theories.

4.3.3. Gricean Maxims of extract (3)

Trump obeys the quantity maxim because the contribution is as informative as is required, but he disobeys the quality maxim since the contribution contains untruthful and unjustifiable information by repeating his false claims that he won the election instead of President Joe Biden. The contribution is relevant. The contribution is obscure. He does not explain how he won, although it is known that Biden won the presidency so that he violates the manner maxim.

As for cooperative principle the contribution of the ex-president because his speech demonstrates that he has no boundaries when it comes to lying. His material is completely inaccurate and confusing, and he has no proof that he will win the 2020 presidential election. He does not make an effort to be cooperative in a proper and unambiguous manner. In actuality, Republicans lost control of the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the White House. With 306 electoral votes, Joe Biden easily won the Electoral College.

4.3.4. Implicature of Extract (3)

It is noted that the most outrageous of Donald Trump's comments. Honestly, it is difficult to find anything he says that is completely true. It is as though he thought those in the audience are all stupid. In his ridiculous saying that they have been doing a lot of winning. He implies a lot of implications like that Republicans win the 2020 Election the senate majority and the White house while in reality they lost everything to the Democrats. Joe Biden handily won the Electoral College with 306 electoral votes. He also beat Donald Trump by more than 7 million votes. The type of implicature in this extract is CI since everything is implied in it and is not part of the words meaning.

4.4. Analysis of Text (4) "I got more votes -- I got more -- and which is me -- when I say 'I,' I'm talking about we. We -- we got more votes than any incumbent, any incumbent president in the history of our country, almost 75 million votes."

4.4.1. The Context of Extract (4)

This extract is said by the former president Trump speaks to a crowd at the Conservative Political Action Conference in Florida. Telling them that he proudly receives more votes than any previous president in the history of the United States to get them exited.

4.4.2. The Pragmatic Analysis of Text (4)

Trump's speech has a pragmatic function because the language used by Trump in this extract has hidden meanings. Ambiguity is obvious in this extract, it is not used directly, but through implications. The extract is interpreted according to the pragmatic approaches like Grice's theory of implicature is used.

4.4.3. Gricean Maxims of extract (4)

Trump violates the quantity maxim. The contribution is informative more than is required by giving redundant information. He violates the second maxim which is the quality maxim because the contribution contains truthful and justifiable information that he really gets more votes than any other president in American history. The contribution is relevant. The information is ambiguous and not clear because he implies through his words that he is the only winner that means he violates the manner maxim.

As for cooperative principle the speech is not cooperative. Trump wants to convince his supporters that he (his party) receives the highest number of votes. He violates the maxim of quantity and manner because he gives detailed information. At the same time, the information he gives is ambiguous. He implies that he wins in election 2020.

4.4.4. Implicature of Extract (4)

Two of the maxims, quantity and manner, are violated. There are inferred thoughts in this extract. While President Trump and his administration insist that he will not lose, the rest of the world is beginning to recognize Joe Biden's victory. In reality, he got 74,222,960 votes in November 2020, more than any other incumbent in American history. That's a lot! But not quite as many as Biden, who got 81,283,361 votes.

  President Trump has clearly succeeded in conditioning a substantial part of the American populace not to believe anyone but him. Despite Trump's refusal to accept the results, the rest of the world began to accept Mr. Biden's victory and prepared to work with him. Mr. Biden told reporters that President Trump's actions since Election Day have been a "utter disgrace" that will hurt him in the long run.

Mr. Trump has worked hard during his presidency to persuade a huge percentage of the American public not to believe anyone but him, and he has succeeded. Despite the fact that the evidence shows there was no widespread plot to steal the election in multiple states, as Mr. Trump says, there was no widespread conspiracy to steal the election in multiple states. Because the language employed in this extract is indirect, the type of implicature in this extract is conversational. The meaning is vaguely presented and hidden.

Language is a type of human understanding that plays a significant influence in shaping people's thoughts and behaviors. Trump's handpicked passages demonstrate the importance of words. He manipulates people's minds by using language to influence their thoughts.

As this study deals with showing the role of implicature in political conversation, the researcher attempts to focus on the types of implicature. Both conventional implicature and conversational implicature are clearly illustrated in Trump's (4) extracts of political speech. The usage of conventional implicature scores (0) with the percentage of (0%) whereas the conversational implicature scores (4) with the percentage of (100%). Thus, more dominant one is conversational implicature by which Trump expresses   his pejoration. In order to control people's thoughts and expressions, Trump expresses his ridicule and contempt through using language. Thus, he is always ready to manipulate language and justify his bad deeds. He uses certain expressions to dominate most situations.

Table (1)

Frequency of Conversational Implicature and Conventional Implicature

No. of Extract	Type of Implicature	
	Conventional	Conversational
1		Conversational
2		Conversational
3		conversational
4		conversational
Total	0	4
Percentages	0%	100%

  To justify his most usage of conversational implicature, Trump can flexibly manipulate the language. In other words, pejorative utterances are more achieved in terms of conversational implicature than conventional one. Additionally, manipulation of language can be more informative via conversational implicature.

 As far as pejoration is concerned, maintaining the cooperative principle is crucial otherwise the speaker will be regarded as being uncooperative. It has been evident that Grice's maxims of conversation have been violated in the selected extracts of Trump political speech. Such selected extracts that have been

analyzed, the only maxim that has been not violated is the maxim of relation since it is dealt with the concerned topic which Trump talks about it.

Table (2)
Frequency of Violating Grice's Maxim

No. of Extract	Grice's Maxims			
	Quantity	Quality	Manner	Relation
1	-	-	-	
2		-		
3		-	-	
4		-	-	
Total	1	4	3	0
Percentages	25%	100%	75%	0%

From the preceding table, the violation of quantity maxim scores (1) with the percentage of (25%). As for the violation of quality maxim, it scores (4) with the percentage of (100%). Concerning the violation of manner maxim, it is about (3) with the percentage of (75%). Thus, the quality maxim represents the one that is frequently violated. This is obvious through it percentages. Such percentages of maxims' violation reflect that Trump successfully performs the aspects of pejoration.

5. Conclusion

The present study has rounded up with following conclusions:

1-The study of the relevant extracts reveals that language can be used to spread pejoration, which is frequently done in an indirect manner by implying more senses than are explicitly stated.

2-In terms of conversational implicature, pejorative utterances achieve more than conventional ones. Furthermore, through conversational implicature, language manipulation can be more revealing.

3-In the selected extracts of Trump's political address, it is clear that Grice's conversational maxims have been violated. The only maxim that has not been violated in such selected extracts that have been evaluated is the maxim of relation, because it is concerned with the topic that Trump discusses.

4-The percentages of maxims that have been violated show that Trump is   successful in pejorative aspects.

6. References

Allen, I. L. (1990). Unkind Words: Ethnic Labelling from Redskin to WASP. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Bianchi, C. (2014). Slurs and Appropriation: An Echoic Account. Journal of Pragmatics, p.p 35-44, Available online www.sciencedirect.com.

Camp, E. (2013) Slurring Perspectives, Analytic Philosophy 54, no. 3, 334.

Cutting, J. (2002). Pragmatic and discourse: A resource book for student. London, New York: Routledge.

Flores, J. K. (2015). Demeaning and Use: a Pragmatic Account of Slurs as Instances of Social Deixis. In Proceedings of the National Conference On Undergraduate Research (NCUR), Eastern Washington University, Cheney, WA

Grice, H. (1975). Logic and conversation. In D. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and

Grice, H. (1989). Studies in the way of words. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Hill, J. H. (2008). The Everyday Language of White Racism. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. Holmes, J. (1995). Women, Men and Politeness. London: Longman.

Hom, (2010). Pejoratives, Philosophy Compass 5.2, 164-185.

Hornsby, J. (2001), Meaning and Uselessness: How to Think About Derogatory Words, In P.A. French and H.K. Wettstein (eds.), Midwest Studies in Philosophy XXV: Figurative Language. Issue, 25, Oxford: Blackwell. (Preprint available at URL:http://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/154).

Jeshion, R. (2013). Slurs and Stereotypes. In Analytic Philosophy, Vol. 3, p.54.

Kothari, C.R. (2004). Research methodology, methods and techniques. New Delhi: New Age International (P) Ltd: New Delhi. Semantics (vol3, pp.41-58). New York: Academic Press.

Shank, G. (2002). Qualitative Research: A Personal Skills Approach. NewJersy: Merril Prentice Hall.

Thomas, J. (1995). Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics. London, New York: Longman.

Whiting, D. (2013). It's Not What You Said, It's the Way You Said It: Slurs and Conventional Implicature, Analytic Philosophy Issue 54, Vol 3.

Williams, C. (2011). Research methods. Journal of Business & Economics Research,5, (3), 9-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres. 2015 .04.006

Williamson, T. (2009). Reference, Inference, and the Semantics of Pejoratives. In: Almog, Joseph & Leonardi, Paolo. (Eds.), The Philosophy of David Kaplan. Oxford: Oxford University Press.