

تحليل تداولي لخطب مختارة من الحملات السياسية  
"الأمريكية في ضوء مبدأ التعاون لـ "غرايس

## A Pragmatic Analysis of Selected American Political Campaign Speeches in Light of Grice's Cooperative Principle

م.م. همسة عمر فاروق

Asst.Lect.Hamsa Omar Farouq

كلية الفارابي الجامعة / كلية التربية / قسم اللغة الإنجليزية

Al-Farabi University\ College of Education\English Department

الكلمات المفتاحية: الحملات السياسية، التداولية، الحكم الغرايسية، الاستلزام الحواري.

**Keywords: Political campaigns, Pragmatics, Gricean maxims, Implicature**





## الملخص:

تبحث هذه الدراسة في التقنيات التداولية المستخدمة في خطابات حملات سياسية مختارة لدونالد ترامب وكامالا هاريس، بالاعتماد على "مبدأ التعاون" لغرايس ودور الاستلزام الحواري في الإقناع السياسي. تهدف الدراسة إلى فحص كيفية التزام الفاعلين السياسيين بحكم غرايس أو خرقهم لها لتحقيق تأثيرات أيديولوجية تتجاوز المعنى الحرفي. واعتمد البحث على منهج التحليل التداولي النوعي لأربعة خطابات انتخابية. وأظهرت النتائج تبايناً واضحاً؛ إذ يخرق ترامب متعمداً حكمتي "الأسلوب" و"الكيف" عبر الغموض والمبالغة لحشد الجمهور وتحدي الشرعية المؤسساتية، في حين تلتزم هاريس بالحكم محققاً الوضوح والمنطق لبناء الثقة والقيم المشتركة. يخلص البحث إلى أن الإقناع السياسي يرتكز على الإدارة الاستراتيجية للحكم والاستلزام الحواري لتوجيه إدراك الجمهور.

## Abstract

This study investigates the pragmatic techniques employed in selected campaign speeches by Donald Trump and Kamala Harris, drawing on Grice's Cooperative Principle and the role of implicature in political persuasion. It aims to examine how political actors adhere to or flout Gricean maxims to achieve ideological effects beyond the literal meaning. Employing a qualitative pragmatic analysis, the study examines four election speeches. The findings reveal a stark contrast: Trump frequently flouts the maxims of manner and quality through ambiguity and exaggeration to mobilize support and challenge institutional legitimacy, whereas Harris consistently adheres to the maxims, using clarity and logic to build trust and shared values. The study concludes that political persuasion relies heavily on the strategic management of maxims and implicature to shape audience perception.



## Introduction

Political campaigns are essential to the functioning of protestant republics; They provide the main avenues through which political figures connect with the voting public and contest for political influence. Campaigns are planned methods of persuading, organizing and informing voters through planned messaging, mass media use and coalition-building (Norris, 2000). Campaigns are not only aimed at protecting electoral successes, but also at supporting or countering community discussion, established policy plans, and political legitimacy. Technological developments have been carefully utilized in the advancement of campaign strategy. While older methods of campaigning relied on radio, print, and TV, modern campaigns increasingly use numerical tools and media platforms to appeal to specific voter groups (Chadwick, 2017; Kreis, 2016). This digital revolution has reciprocally improved the possibilities and dangers of political messaging, and raised concerns about fabrication, opposition, and manipulation (Benkler et al., 2018).

Political campaigns are basically talking pieces aimed at convincing voters. An appropriate practical framework for examining the strategies used in campaigns is Grice's cooperative theory and its associated conversational principles: quantity, quality, relationships, and manner (Grice, 1975). The four maxims specify the possibilities hidden beneath cooperative communication, insofar as political language deliberately adheres to or violates them to achieve influential goals.

### 1. Literature Review

Pragmatics is concerned with how meaning is produced and interpreted in context, focusing on the relationship between linguistic form, speaker intention, and hearer inference. Foundational contributions by Grice (1975), Levinson (1983), and Mey (2001) establish pragmatics as the study of meaning in interaction rather than meaning encoded solely in linguistic structures. Grice's (1975) theory of the Cooperative Principle and its four conversational maxims—quantity, quality, relation, and manner—offers a systematic explanation of how interlocutors derive meanings that go beyond what is explicitly stated. When these maxims are deliberately flouted, hearers infer additional, implied meanings known as conversational implicatures. This framework has become central to pragmatic analysis, particularly in contexts where indirectness and strategic ambiguity are prominent.

Building on Grice's work, Levinson (2000) distinguishes between generalized and particularized conversational implicatures, emphasizing that many implied meanings arise as default



interpretations in everyday communication. Thomas (1995) further develops this perspective by highlighting the interactive nature of meaning-making, arguing that pragmatic interpretation depends on both speaker intention and the socio-cultural knowledge shared by participants. These insights are especially relevant to political discourse, where speakers often rely on inference to convey sensitive or controversial messages without stating them explicitly.

Political language is inherently strategic and frequently exploits pragmatic mechanisms to achieve persuasive goals. Wilson (1990) and Chilton (2004) argue that politicians systematically use implicature to suggest positions indirectly, thereby maintaining plausible deniability while influencing audience interpretation. By flouting Gricean maxims, political actors can imply evaluations, intentions, or ideological stances without committing themselves overtly. Fairclough (1995) situates such practices within broader power relations, showing how implicit meanings contribute to the reproduction of dominance and inequality in political discourse. Similarly, van Dijk (2006) emphasizes the ideological function of implicit discourse structures, noting that implied meanings often serve to construct in-groups and out-groups and to legitimize political action.

The persuasive dimension of political discourse has been extensively examined in relation to rhetoric and ideology. Charteris-Black (2014) demonstrates that rhetorical strategies such as metaphor, evaluation, and framing play a crucial role in shaping political meaning, often operating through implicit rather than explicit communication. Wodak (2015) shows that populist political discourse relies heavily on presupposition and implicature to evoke fear, nationalism, and moral polarization. From a cognitive perspective, Lakoff (2016) argues that political language activates conceptual frames that guide interpretation and judgment. These frames frequently function pragmatically, allowing complex ideological messages to be conveyed indirectly and efficiently.

The evolution of political communication in contemporary media environments has further intensified the reliance on implicit meaning. Chadwick's (2017) concept of the hybrid media system explains how traditional media and digital platforms interact to amplify political messages, encouraging brief, ambiguous, and context-dependent forms of communication. In such environments, meaning is often completed by audiences through pragmatic inference rather than explicit explanation. Benkler, Faris, and Roberts (2018) illustrate how networked media ecosystems facilitate the spread of disinformation and propaganda through implied meanings, insinuations, and strategic



ambiguity. Norris (2000) similarly highlights the reciprocal relationship between media exposure and political engagement, suggesting that implicit messaging plays a central role in shaping political attitudes.

Political campaigns constitute a rich domain for investigating pragmatic meaning, as the language employed by candidates frequently conveys messages that extend beyond literal interpretation. Pragmatic scholars emphasize that political discourse often relies on presupposition, implicature, and other forms of indirect meaning to influence audiences without making explicit claims (Levinson, 1983; Thomas, 1995). In this context, analyzing political speeches through Grice's Cooperative Principle provides a systematic framework for understanding how political actors generate meaning beyond what is overtly stated. Despite the centrality of implicit meaning in campaign discourse, relatively few studies have examined American political campaigns from a Gricean pragmatic perspective, particularly with regard to how political figures intentionally flout conversational maxims to generate implicature. Much of the existing literature focuses on rhetoric, persuasion strategies, or media framing, rather than on the pragmatic mechanisms that underlie implicit meaning construction. This study addresses this gap by examining selected American political campaign speeches to identify patterns of maxim observance and flouting and to explain how implicature contributes to the pragmatic force of political statements.

### 1.1 Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975)

Grice (1975) proposes that effective communication is governed by the Cooperative Principle, which is realized through four conversational maxims: quality, quantity, relevance, and manner. These maxims guide speakers to be truthful, sufficiently informative, relevant, and clear. In political campaign discourse, however, candidates frequently flout these maxims deliberately, thereby generating implicatures that invite audiences to infer meanings aligned with particular ideological or persuasive goals.

#### Maxim of Quality:

Politicians flout the maxim of quality by making statements that lack sufficient evidence or by exaggerating claims without directly stating falsehoods. Such strategic ambiguity allows speakers to influence public perception while avoiding explicit accountability for unverified assertions (Thomas, 1995).

### **Maxim of Quantity:**

The maxim of quantity is often flouted when political speakers provide either less or more information than required. Candidates may withhold specific details or selectively emphasize certain achievements, prompting audiences to draw favorable inferences without the speaker making explicit claims (Cutting, 2002).

### **Maxim of Manner:**

Flouting the maxim of manner involves the use of vagueness, ambiguity, or figurative language. By avoiding clarity and precision, political speakers allow multiple interpretations, enabling listeners to construct meanings that align with their own beliefs and expectations (Mey, 2001).

### **Maxim of Relevance:**

Political discourse may appear tangential or indirect when the maxim of relevance is flouted. However, such deviations are often intentional, as speakers shift topics to imply associations, highlight underlying issues, or divert attention from unfavorable matters, thereby encouraging audiences to infer implied connections (Levinson, 1983).

## **1.2. Implicature in American Political Campaigns**

The implied that means is the core function in research on American political campaigns. For instance, Trump's speeches frequently flout the maxims of quantity and best, via exaggeration and careful prominence to create interpretations about hazard, functionality or danger without clear statements (Enos & Fowler, 2019). In the identical manner, Harris's speeches from time to time flout the maxim of manner by means of the use of metaphorical language, allowing listeners to numerous interpretations of coverage situations or social fears (Lakoff, 2016).

The emphasis on implied meaning highpoints that political statement inferred by the audience, it is not just about what is said, but what is meant. The pragmatic approach, especially Gricean analysis, lets researchers to recognize forms in how meaning is intentionally conveyed and how spectators are asked to infer it, even when the literal meaning is ambiguous.

## **2. Methodology**

The research layout of this examine is a qualitative one based totally on pragmatic analysis. The most important intention is to scrutinize how selected American political speeches use language in manner that hides



that means past the obvious one, emphasizing the styles of adherence or flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principle (Grice, 1975). A qualitative technique is suitable for coming across the functions of context-structured in political discourse together with presupposition, conversational inference, and implicature (Cutting, 2002; Thomas, 1995).

This study emphasis on cautiously selected campaign in 2020 American political campaigns, precisely those of Trump and Harris. Those politicians have been selected for his or her distinct patterns, that provide precise fabric for pragmatic evaluation. The campaigns were carefully chosen grounded on specific criteria including accessibility that the campaigns to be had on websites and YouTube transcripts. The 2d criterion is the relevance that the speeches addressing healthcare, economy and foreign policy subsequently the political campaigns have suitable duration for the systematic evaluation.

The analytical framework of this examine is Grice's Cooperative Principle and the conversational maxims satisfactory, amount, manner and relation. The analysis consists of recognizing examples where the applicants:

- Adhere or flout the maxim of satisfactory via selective fact, understatement or exaggeration.
- Adhere or flout the maxim of quantity via giving quite facts than predictable.
- Adhere or flout the maxim of manner the use of figures of speech, or that specialize in complicated shape.
- Adhere or flout the maxim of relation by supplying speeches which can be indirectly applicable to the hidden message.

### 3. Data Analysis

The statistics of this observe is 4 American Political campaigns. Tow are associated with Donald trump (Election Night Speech- Circle, Ohio Rally) and the alternative speeches associated with Kamala Harris (Vice President, Elect Victory Speech- Democratic National Convention Speech).

#### **Campaign 1: Donald Trump November 3, 2020 Election Night Speech (<https://www.rev.com/transcripts/donald-trump-2020-election-night-speech-transcript>)**

##### **1. Flouting and adhering to Grice maxims**

Donald Trump's Election Night speech demonstrates a complex and problematic relationship with Grice's Cooperative Principle, as his communicative style frequently involves deliberate flouting of



conversational maxims to serve specific political objectives. The most salient violations occur in relation to the maxims of quality, quantity, and manner, while the maxim of relevance is largely maintained at a thematic level.

The maxim of quality is repeatedly flouted through assertions presented as factual despite the absence of verification at the time of delivery. Trump's claim that "millions and millions of people voted for us tonight" employs absolute and generalized language without supporting evidence, thereby projecting certainty rather than accuracy. More explicitly, his repeated assertions of having won key swing states such as Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Georgia disregard the provisional nature of vote counting on election night. This flouting culminates in the statement, "Frankly, we did win this election," which constitutes a direct violation of the maxim of quality, as an unverified assumption is asserted as an established fact. Such statements undermine truth conditions and invite audiences to accept personal conviction in place of empirical confirmation.

The maxim of quantity is also strategically flouted. Trump provides an abundance of numerical data and partial vote counts—for example, references to vote margins in states such as Texas, Michigan, and Pennsylvania—yet this information remains incomplete and selectively framed. Rather than supplying sufficient and balanced information, the excessive use of figures creates an illusion of transparency while obscuring the ongoing nature of the electoral process. Additionally, his frequent overstatements, such as describing results as "tremendous" or claiming that "there's never been anything like it," contribute to informational excess without enhancing clarity, thereby overwhelming listeners instead of informing them adequately.

With regard to the maxim of relevance, Trump's speech largely remains focused on the central topic of the election outcome. Even expressions of gratitude toward the First Lady and his supporters are contextually relevant, as they function to reinforce his claims of legitimacy and popular support. However, rapid shifts between declaring victory, questioning media projections, and alleging electoral misconduct create moments of pragmatic instability. Although these shifts remain topically related to the election, they blur the intended message and generate ambiguity rather than coherence.



The maxim of manner is applied inconsistently throughout the speech. At certain points, Trump's discourse appears orderly and precise, particularly when citing specific numerical leads, such as being "up 690,000 votes in Pennsylvania." However, this apparent clarity is repeatedly disrupted by vagueness and ambiguity. For instance, Trump refers to Arizona as both potentially lost and still "in play," producing contradictory interpretations. His persistent use of emphatic repetition "We won Texas. We won Texas. We won Texas" adds rhetorical force but reduces conciseness and precision, thereby flouting the maxim of manner. Furthermore, phrases such as "called off" or "a fraud on the American public" lack explicit explanation, leaving listeners to infer meaning without sufficient clarification.

## 2. Implicature in Political Campaign Discourse

Trump's Election Night speech generates a range of implicatures that extend beyond the literal content of his statements and shape audience interpretation of the electoral process. His repeated expressions of gratitude to the "millions and millions" of supporters imply that such widespread backing is incompatible with electoral defeat, thereby suggesting that any loss could only result from irregularities rather than legitimate outcomes.

This implicature is reinforced by his declaration, "Frankly, we did win this election," which implicitly frames subsequent vote counts that contradict his claim as suspect or illegitimate. Similarly, Trump's detailed listing of states in which he was "ahead" during partial vote counts conveys the implicature that these states had been effectively secured, despite his awareness that official results were incomplete. This framing encourages the belief that later changes in vote totals represent manipulation rather than the normal progression of democratic counting procedures. Moreover, his references to pursuing legal action and involving the Supreme Court suggest that institutional legitimacy resides not in the electoral process itself but in judicial endorsement of his claims.

By characterizing the election as "a fraud on the American public" and asserting that "as far as I'm concerned, we already have won it," Trump implies that personal authority and self-declared victory supersede officially certified results. Collectively, these implicatures promote the interpretation that the democratic process is unreliable and that loyalty to the speaker should outweigh acceptance of institutional outcomes. Through systematic maxim flouting and carefully constructed implicatures, Trump's discourse leaves audiences with the implied meaning that the election was stolen and that electoral legitimacy is contingent upon his success rather than procedural validity.



## Campaign 2: Donald Trump– October 24, 2020 Circleville, Ohio Rally

<https://www.rev.com/transcripts/donald-trump-circleville-ohio-rally-speech-transcript-october-24>

### 1. Flouting and adhering to Grice maxims

Trump's discourse demonstrates a complex interplay between adherence to and deliberate violation of Grice's Cooperative Principle. The maxim of quality is the most visibly flouted, as Trump repeatedly asserts premature claims of victory, most notably in the statement "we did win this election," despite the fact that vote counting was still in progress and no final results had been certified. In addition, his characterization of the election as "a fraud on the American public" presents suspicion and opinion as factual reality. Such utterances lack sufficient evidential support and therefore violate the maxim of quality. However, these violations appear to be strategic, as they construct an impression of certainty and legitimacy for his supporters, encouraging acceptance of his claims despite the absence of verification.

The maxim of quantity is applied inconsistently. On the one hand, Trump frequently provides numerical details, such as "we're up 690,000 votes in Pennsylvania" and "we won Texas by 700,000 votes," which create an appearance of precision and informational adequacy. On the other hand, he repeatedly resorts to vague and exaggerated expressions, including "millions and millions" and "extraordinary results," which are too general to be informative. These overstatements function less as sources of factual information and more as rhetorical devices intended to amplify the perceived magnitude of his success.

With respect to the maxim of relevance, Trump largely maintains topical coherence throughout the speech. His focus consistently remains on the election, the status of key states, and allegations of irregularities. Even digressions involving expressions of gratitude toward family members and supporters remain contextually relevant, as they reinforce his narrative of victory, legitimacy, and popular mandate. Thus, while shifts in focus occur, they do not constitute a clear violation of relevance.

In contrast, the maxim of manner is applied unevenly. At certain points, Trump's speech is relatively clear and orderly, particularly when listing vote margins and naming specific states. However, this clarity is undermined by frequent repetition—such as "we won Texas, we won Texas, we won Texas"—as well as by vague phrasing and internal inconsistencies. For example, Trump acknowledges that



Arizona had been declared for Biden while simultaneously asserting that the result might still be overturned. These contradictions, combined with imprecise language, reduce clarity and conciseness, thereby flouting the maxim of manner. Such ambiguity allows listeners to interpret the situation in a way that aligns with Trump's preferred narrative.

Overall, Trump's speech reflects a pragmatic pattern in which relevance is generally maintained, quantity is selectively observed, while the maxims of quality and manner are frequently flouted. These violations serve to frame the election outcome as deceptive while simultaneously presenting an appearance of authority and informational credibility.

## 2. Implicature in Political Campaign Discourse

Beyond the explicit content of Trump's speech, a range of implicatures emerge that shape audience perceptions of the election process. His repeated emphasis on the "millions and millions" of people who voted for him carries the implicit suggestion that such extensive support makes electoral defeat inherently illegitimate. This invites listeners to infer that any loss could only occur as a result of deception or manipulation rather than through legitimate democratic procedures.

The statement "we did win this election," delivered while votes were still being counted, generates the implicature that any subsequent results contradicting his claim must be incorrect or fraudulent. Similarly, his detailed listing of states in which he was leading implies that those states had been decisively secured, despite the provisional nature of the vote counts. References to Arizona as both lost and still "in play" further produce implicatures of uncertainty, signaling to supporters that unfavorable outcomes should be questioned or rejected.

Moreover, Trump's invocation of legal action and references to the Supreme Court imply that electoral legitimacy depends on judicial intervention rather than on the democratic counting process itself. By framing the election as "a fraud on the American public" and asserting, "as far as I'm concerned, we have already won it," Trump suggests that personal authority and conviction override officially certified results. Collectively, these implicatures redefine democratic legitimacy as loyalty to the candidate rather than acceptance of institutional outcomes. The cumulative effect is the construction of an implied narrative in which the election is portrayed as stolen, resistance to



official results is justified, and the speaker's leadership is positioned as the sole authentic representation of the popular will.

**Campaign 3: Kamala Harris- Vice President-Elect Victory Speech –  
November 7, 2020 [https://www.astrid-online.it/static/upload/harr/harris\\_07\\_11\\_20.pdf](https://www.astrid-online.it/static/upload/harr/harris_07_11_20.pdf)**

**1. Flouting and adhering to Grice maxims**

Harris's victory speech emphasizes a strong adherence to Grice's cooperative concepts, though with occasional pragmatic expansions that to some extent stretch the maxims for stylistic consequence. The quality maxim is frequently respected, as Harris lands her statements in supportable data, ancient indicators, and widely time-honored data. She admits the contributions of volunteers, poll workers, and election officers who confirmed every vote became counted, and he or she exactly refers to the voter crowd and the election result. Even whilst she speaks with emotional language together with celebrating the power of the American human beings or glorifying the struggles of ladies and in records marginalized groups, these declarations are grounded in truth and serve to motivate as opposed to misinform. The maxim of amount is largely stored, offering listeners with correct data about her circle of relatives, historic context, campaign staff, and the incoming management's priorities. Even though a few sections are explained with personal stories or past narratives, these extensions serve to reinforce her primary message in place of surplus or indistinct data. The maxim of relation is constantly supported in the course of the speech, as almost each component relates in a straight line to the election, the democratic process, or the responsibilities and imaginative and prescient of the acquired authorities. Even while Harris deviates into non-public replications approximately her mother or the Biden family, these departures are relevant to illustrating the broader subject matters of devotion, civic, and service engagement. The maxim of way is carried out with wonderful intelligibility and organisation. Harris systems her speech in a rational and comprehensible manner, transferring easily from thankfulness to greeting of encounters, to popularity of societal donations, and subsequently to forward-searching targets. Her language is correct and handy, evading ambiguity or complex phrasing, even when discussing complicated matters which includes weather trade, systemic racism, or pandemic regaining. Generally, Harris demonstrates how a political discourse can follow to the cooperative principle while leveraging narrative and pragmatic strategies to inspire and set off the target market.



## 2. Implicature of political campaigns

Harris's speech is complete of implied meanings that make bigger beyond the literal meaning, inspiring the audience to attract optimistic implications approximately the obtained government, public duty, and social progress. Through repetitively stressing the contributions of women, especially Black women and other traditionally marginalized people, she includes the implicature that her vice leadership is both a personal landmark and a consultant victory for inclusivity and equality, referring to young ladies and girls that control roles are attainable. His personal references to family, Biden, and historical figures like Congressman John Lewis indicate stability, moral ground, and continuity, suggesting that the receiving government is trustworthy, compassionate, and rich in experience. When Harris acknowledges encounters like the pandemic, the climate crisis and systemic racism, the implication is that social progress requires active participation and communal effort, positioning both herself and Biden as partners who will work together with the American people rather than dictate solutions individually. Phrases like "America is ready. And so are Joe and I" carry optimism and shared potential, meaning the country has the strength and resilience to face challenges together. Celebrating the extended struggle for voting rights and the historical implications of the 2020 election, Harris implies that democracy is fragile and must be actively protected, thereby encouraging citizens to participate in civic life. Furthermore, his emphasis on optimism, harmony, decency, science and truth carries the implication that these values should guide the National Address, which should suggest a clear moral and political framework for receiving government without conveying explicitly partisan directives. In general, Harris's speech deliberately uses implication to motivate, organize, and reassure supporters, delivering messages of inclusion, civic responsibility, and forward-looking hope that reinforce her and Biden's vision for the nation.

### Campaign 4: Kamala Harris- Democratic National Convention Speech – August 19, 2020

<https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/read-kamala-harris-full-speech-at-the-democratic-national-convention-2>

#### 1. Flouting and adhering to Grice maxims

Harris's victory speech emphasizes a strong adherence to Grice's cooperative concepts, though with occasional pragmatic expansions that to some extent stretch the maxims for stylistic consequence. The quality maxim is frequently respected, as Harris lands her statements in supportable data, ancient indicators, and widely time-honored data. She



admits the contributions of volunteers, poll workers, and election officers who confirmed every vote became counted, and he or she exactly refers to the voter crowd and the election result. Even whilst she speaks with emotional language together with celebrating the power of the American human beings or glorifying the struggles of ladies and in records marginalized groups, these declarations are grounded in truth and serve to motivate as opposed to misinform. The maxim of amount is largely stored, offering listeners with correct data about her circle of relatives, historic context, campaign staff, and the incoming management's priorities. Even though a few sections are explained with personal stories or past narratives, these extensions serve to reinforce her primary message in place of surplus or indistinct data. The maxim of relation is constantly supported in the course of the speech, as almost each component relates in a straight line to the election, the democratic process, or the responsibilities and imaginative and prescient of the acquired authorities. Even while Harris deviates into non-public replications approximately her mother or the Biden family, these departures are relevant to illustrating the broader subject matters of devotion, civic, and service engagement. The maxim of way is carried out with wonderful intelligibility and organisation. Harris systems her speech in a rational and comprehensible manner, transferring easily from thankfulness to greeting of encounters, to popularity of societal donations, and subsequently to forward-searching targets. Her language is correct and handy, evading ambiguity or complex phrasing, even when discussing complicated matters which includes weather trade, systemic racism, or pandemic regaining. Generally, Harris demonstrates how a political discourse can follow to the cooperative principle while leveraging narrative and pragmatic strategies to inspire and set off the target market.

## 2. Implicature of political campaigns

Harris's speech is complete of implied meanings that make bigger beyond the literal meaning, inspiring the audience to attract optimistic implications approximately the obtained government, public duty, and social progress. Through repetitively stressing the contributions of women, especially Black women and other traditionally marginalized people, she includes the implicature that her vice leadership is both a personal landmark and a consultant victory for inclusivity and equality, referring to young ladies and girls that control roles are attainable. His personal references to family, Biden, and historical figures like Congressman John Lewis indicate stability, moral ground, and continuity, suggesting that the receiving government is trustworthy, compassionate, and rich in experience. When Harris acknowledges



encounters like the pandemic, the climate crisis and systemic racism, the implication is that social progress requires active participation and communal effort, positioning both herself and Biden as partners who will work together with the American people rather than dictate solutions individually. Phrases like "America is ready. And so are Joe and I" carry optimism and shared potential, meaning the country has the strength and resilience to face challenges together. Celebrating the extended struggle for voting rights and the historical implications of the 2020 election, Harris implies that democracy is fragile and must be actively protected, thereby encouraging citizens to participate in civic life. Furthermore, his emphasis on optimism, harmony, decency, science and truth carries the implication that these values should guide the National Address, which should suggest a clear moral and political framework for receiving government without conveying explicitly partisan directives. In general, Harris's speech deliberately uses implication to motivate, organize, and reassure supporters, delivering messages of inclusion, civic responsibility, and forward-looking hope that reinforce her and Biden's vision for the nation.

#### 4. Findings

An evaluation of selected political speeches well-known shows clean and regular styles within the use of Gricean standards and the era of cues, highlighting how both Donald Trump and Kamala Harris hire pragmatic techniques to shape audience perceptions and acquire persuasive desires. Trump's conversation style, across his speeches, is characterised by using a selective push aside for positive standards, in particular those of great and fashion. He regularly asserts his claims without substantiating proof and makes use of repetition, ambiguity, and circularity. These tropes serve a rhetorical purpose, developing a feel of urgency, putting forward non-public authority, and guiding audience interpretation in the direction of his favored conclusions. Despite those tropes, Trump normally adheres to the principle of relevance, making sure that everyone speeches stay relevant to the electoral context, his belief of legitimacy, and the mobilization of supporters. Quantity is likewise on occasion prolonged via repetition and emphasis, enhancing persuasion and emotional engagement. Harris, in assessment, demonstrates a consistent commitment to the principles of collaboration in her speeches. Her language is fact-primarily based, logically organized, and clear, with occasional quantitative expansions for narrative and rhetorical effect. These additions, which include recounting her family history, professional studies, or ancient struggles for equality, provide context, establish credibility, and enhance the target audience's identity, at the same time



as maintaining relevance and readability. The rule of style is carefully reputable, with properly-organized storytelling and easy-to-recognize language, even if discussing complex social, political, or historic troubles.

Implicature emerges as a pivotal pragmatic device in both audio system' techniques, though their features range markedly. Trump's speeches are rich in implicatures that specific the illegitimacy of the election, query institutions, and align fact with his electricity. Phrases that emphasize allegations of election fraud or predicted felony demanding situations invite the target audience to finish that institutional strategies are unreliable, effectively making him the primary arbiter of truth and justice. Harris uses implicatures to convey inclusivity, ethical management, civic obligation, and desire. Her references to her mom's immigrant adventure, her upbringing, her civil rights affects, and her expert dedication implicitly imply resilience, moral foundations, and a commitment to public provider. Her narratives advocate that management is built on empathy, community guide, and lively engagement in addressing societal challenges. Through those implicatures, Harris encourages the target audience to deduce participation in democratic strategies, the significance of social justice, and the need of collective duty to uphold equity and ethical governance.

The comparative analysis highlights a clear evaluation among the 2 audio system' techniques. Trump is based on strategic mockery of middle concepts and extreme innuendo to persuade, mobilize, and project institutional narratives, prioritizing directness and aligning the target audience with his point of view. In assessment, Harris adheres carefully to ideas of cooperation, the use of cautiously crafted innuendo to inspire, construct believe, and convey moral and civic values. In both cases, pragmatism performs a pivotal position: the manipulation of middle standards, narrative structure, and innuendo all allow speakers to form audience interpretation, establish credibility, and enhance rhetorical goals. These findings demonstrate that political communicate operates no longer simplest thru express statements but also through the strategic use of implicit which means and adherence to or push aside for core standards, underscoring the centrality of pragmatic analysis in understanding contemporary marketing campaign rhetoric.

## 2. Conclusion

This examine examines selected political speeches by Donald Trump and Kamala Harris from a realistic attitude, focusing



specifically at the collaborative Gricean standards and the position of implicature in political communication. The analysis demonstrates that each audio system rent pragmatic strategies to influence, persuade, and interact their audiences, albeit in markedly exceptional methods. Donald Trump's speeches regularly ignore positive standards—especially nice and style—the usage of repetition, hyperbole, and ambiguity to assert authority, task institutional narratives, and mobilize supporters. In assessment, Kamala Harris's speeches display a consistent dedication to Gricean principles, the use of readability, relevance, and logical structure to establish credibility, foster consider, and speak ethical and civic values. Implicature plays a pivotal function in both cases, serving as a device to carry multilayered meanings beyond literal content. In Trump's speech, implicatures emphasize electoral legitimacy, personal authority, and query institutional tactics, leading the target audience to include his factor of view. On the opposite hand, Harris uses allusions to focus on inclusivity, resilience, civic responsibility, and ethical leadership, encouraging the target audience to engage in democratic strategies and guide ethical governance.

## References

1. Benkler, Y., Faris, R., & Roberts, H. (2018). *Network propaganda: Manipulation, disinformation, and radicalization in American politics*. Oxford University Press.
2. Bennett, W. L., & Livingston, S. (2018). *The disinformation order*. *European Journal of Communication*, 33(2), 122–139.
3. Cap, P. (2013). *Proximization: The pragmatics of symbolic distance crossing*. John Benjamins.
4. Chadwick, A. (2017). *The hybrid media system: Politics and power* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
5. Charteris-Black, J. (2019). *Metaphors of power in political discourse*. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 18(1), 1–22.
6. Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.
7. Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. Routledge.
8. Enos, R. D., & Fowler, A. (2019). The persuasive power of political rhetoric: Evidence from American campaigns. *Political Communication*, 36(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2018.1507547>
9. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*. Longman.



10. Fetzer, A. (2014). *The pragmatics of political discourse*. John Benjamins.
11. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
12. Huang, Y. (2017). *Pragmatics* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
13. Jamieson, K. H., & Taussig, D. (2017). *Disruption, demonization, deliverance, and norm destruction: The rhetorical signature of Donald J. Trump*. *Political Science Quarterly*, 132(4), 619–650.
14. Karpf, D. (2019). *Analytic activism: Digital listening and the new political strategy*. Oxford University Press.
15. Kreiss, D. (2016). *Prototype politics: Technology-intensive campaigning and the data of democracy*. Oxford University Press.
16. Lakoff, G. (2016). *Language and politics*. Oxford University Press.
17. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
18. Levinson, S. C. (2000). *Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature*. MIT Press.
19. Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
20. Norris, P. (2000). *A virtuous circle: Political communications in postindustrial societies*. Cambridge University Press.
21. Ott, B. L. (2017). *The age of Twitter: Donald Trump and the politics of debasement*. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 34(1), 59–68.
22. Sobieraj, S., & Berry, J. M. (2011). *The outrage industry*. Oxford University Press.
23. Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
24. Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Longman.
25. Trump, U.S. *Campaigns & Contemporary Political Rhetoric*.
26. van Dijk, T. A. (2006). *Politics, ideology, and discourse*. In R. Wodak (Ed.), *Elsevier encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (2nd ed.). Elsevier.
27. Wilson, J. (1990). *Politically speaking: The pragmatic analysis of political language*. Blackwell.
28. Wodak, R. (2015). *The politics of fear: What right-wing populist discourses mean*. Sage.
29. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2016). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed.). Sage.
30. Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.