

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

2002

Gunsmoke: An investigation of conversational implicature and Guns & Ammo magazine

Kerry Lynn Winn

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Rhetoric and Composition Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Winn, Kerry Lynn, "Gunsmoke: An investigation of conversational implicature and Guns & Ammo magazine" (2002). *Theses Digitization Project*. 2069.
<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/2069>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

GUNSMOKE:
AN INVESTIGATION OF CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE
AND GUNS & AMMO MAGAZINE

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in
English Composition


by
Kerry Lynn Winn
March 2002


GUNSMOKE:
AN INVESTIGATION OF CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE
AND GUNS & AMMO MAGAZINE

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Kerry Lynn Winn
March 2002

Approved by:


Sunny Hyon, Ph.D., Chair, English


Rong Chen, Ph.D.

March 13, 2002
Date

ABSTRACT

In the United States, numerous citizens fear that their Second Amendment right to bear arms will be obliterated. One text that discusses this issue is a popular gun enthusiast's magazine. Guns & Ammo. I will analyze this magazine's content through linguistics, particularly Grice's implicature. As a result I hope it will give me a better viewpoint of the gun community's perspective regarding firearms. This analysis will closely examine the use of implicature in these texts and analyze if it strengthens the force of the writers' messages. It may reveal how the use of implicature may widen the chasm between gun control and Second Amendment rights advocates. Implicature often will enable writers to dispense vivid imagery to strengthen a claim; instill fear in or establish a relationship with an audience; denigrate their opponents.

Grice's theory of Conversational Implicature will be applied to Guns & Ammo magazine. This theory incorporates Grice's Cooperative Principle that in conversation individuals account for the situation surrounding the conversation and talk in a manner that will benefit all engaged parties. This principle incorporates four speech maxims: Quantity (don't give too much or too little

information), Quality (don't be untruthful), Relation (be relevant) and Manner (be clear). With this application, I hope to reveal why the contributors violate certain speech maxims and how these violations may reveal the writers' ideologies and tendencies in communication, which may increase the rift between gun enthusiasts and gun control advocates. I will apply the Gricean framework to six Guns & Ammo texts: Charlton Heston's January, June, and December 1999 monthly column "From the Capitol"; Jim Grover's January and December 1999 monthly column "Personal Security" and Chuck Klein's December 1999 freelance contribution to the monthly column "Second Amendment."

This study found that the these three contributors violate a number of maxims when discussing firearm regulation with the Quality and Quantity maxims being violated with the most frequency. These violations depict a violent world, present a positive image of Second Amendment rights advocates, and cast a negative light upon the character and credibility of gun control proponents and people of color. The resulting implicatures often suggest that gun control is tantamount to treason; that you must practice constant vigilance to ensure your personal security; and that you should fear individuals

unlike yourself. The writers may hope their audience will make these inferences while reading their claims regarding Second Amendment rights and personal security.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

With love for my parents, my son and Royce. I would like to credit my parents for their financial support while I pursued my graduate studies. I would like to thank my son for his unwavering emotional support. I'm grateful for Royce Patterson's emotional support and viewpoint as a gun enthusiast. His comments shed much needed insight into the world of gun enthusiasts.

Finally, I gratefully acknowledge Dr. Sung-Heh Hyon and Dr. Rong Chen for their patience and support. Sunny Hyon's quick, discerning suggestions and forbearance made this research possible. Rong Chen managed to overcome my terror of linguistics and encouraged me to pursue this topic. His insightful critiques and patience in tolerating my questions in his area of expertise I gratefully and humbly appreciate. Also, I would like to apologize for any detrimental effects this project may have had on my committee's longevity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER ONE: A RETROSPECTIVE ON GUNS & AMMO MAGAZINE	1
CHAPTER TWO: THE THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK	
Herbert Paul Grice	14
The Cooperative Principle	14
Definitions and Examples of the Quality, Quantity, Manner and Relation Maxims	15
Flouting the Maxims	20
Opting Out of the Maxims	21
Previous Applications of Grice	22
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS	26
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	
Analysis of the Quality Maxim	30
Analysis of the Quantity Maxim	49
Analysis of the Manner Maxim	58
Analysis of the Relation Maxim	63
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION	71
Quality Maxim Violations	73
Quantity Maxim Violations	75
Manner Maxim Violations	79
Relation Maxim Violations	79

Comments	80
WORKS CITED	84

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. The Frequency of Maxim Violations Across the Three Authors	30
------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER ONE
A RETROSPECTIVE ON
GUNS & AMMO MAGAZINE

"Fact is there are predators and there is prey. Jungle Rules to Live by" (Grover 11). "Fight for your firearms freedom!" (Klein 20). These are two examples of several similar bolded excerpts and titles that assaulted me as I scanned the current pages of Guns & Ammo for the first time. My curiosity aroused, I scanned the pages of several previous issues dating back to June 1962 noting a considerable contrast in the rhetoric and tone that began in the late 1970's. For example, Grotto's 1962 article "The Belgian Browning 1903" (24) describes this firearm as the forerunner of the automatic loading handgun. He explains that with a few modifications it is the equivalent of the Colt .32. These contrasting titles and my significant other piqued my interest in the world and language of firearm enthusiasts.

Although no research appears to have been done on the history and language of Guns & Ammo magazine, I did locate twelve limited reviews regarding the quality of the information it provided. This small sample gave Guns & Ammo an 85% approval rating for quality. Most agreed it is

informative, well written and concise. Some argue that it "Feels like the same magazine I was reading years ago" (Mattjoe 1). In contrast, my own overview of Guns & Ammo of the last four decades reveals some interesting shifts in the magazine's context and audience. When Guns & Ammo made its first appearance, in the 1960's, it offered articles that revolved around the use and history of firearms. For example, Arnold Chernoff's 1962 June article "Those Yankee Pepperboxes" details the creation of the machine gun's predecessor, why it was created and the problems encountered in its use. The illustrations show the Pepperbox's various designs from the Gatling gun to the .22 caliber handgun. It is described as the "...king of all pepperboxes" (34-37), and was originally designed for police work. Evidently, this gun boasted six to ten barrels that could all be fired at once. Consequently, it peppers an adversary with bullets. The history regarding the creation and development of this firearm demonstrate that it was a working tool.

Another example of the practical information given in earlier Guns & Ammo articles appears in Roger Barlow's 1962 June article "Single Shot Varmint Rifles." He details the usefulness of single-action rifles in eradicating woodchucks, crows and generally "varmints" from ranch and

farmland (Barlow 34). Evidently, these animals often consume crops and livestock and therefore, threaten a farmer's livelihood. It is important to note that the earlier issues of Guns & Ammo focus on weaponry as a useful tool rather than for personal defense or sport.

Barlow expands explaining why the bolt action, single shot rifles remain popular, stating:

It is partly due to the association of these venerable actions [bolt action] with a more colorful and exciting period of our past. Many of them hail from an era when guns were made not manufactured; when workmen were truly craftsmen and something of their pride and character was imparted to the products they created.

(Barlow 21)

His use of the adjectives "venerable," "colorful," "exciting," "craftsmen" and "pride" reveal his deep respect for firearms and American history.

Most of the advertisements in the 1962 issue suggest that if you buy their product you are buying a part of U.S. History. Some of these are for riflescopes (devices that assist in aiming a rifle); a few advertisements were for handguns, gun paraphernalia (e.g., ammunition, holsters, target scopes), and none were for knives. During

this time, firearm manufacturers attempted to have their customers identify with the Old West by applying names like Posse, Natchez, Longhorn and other similar titles to their firearms. These articles focus on what guns, rifles and types of ammunition were best used in what situation, gun safety and familial articles regarding the importance of firearms for the family. In other words they give practical advice for the use of firearms.

The image of the firearm as a tool and important part of history changes only once in this 1962 issue. This shift in tone occurred with the inclusion of an agitated letter to the editor by Richard J. M. Ray regarding gun regulation in the United Kingdom. Ray's letter, dated June 1962, begins:

I, like thousands of other Englishmen, am a gun-bug. [...he concludes] So take a timely warning from us; it has happened on this side of the Atlantic, and it will happen to you unless each and every shooter gets on his hind feet and throws these misguided legislators out of the arena. (Ray 6)

Ray's fearful tone regarding gun-control is the only aspect of this issue that shifts to a politically emotional dimension. The other articles are quite

informational. For example, Elmer Keith's article "Gunnotes" details firearm safety issues: how firing a firearm with the wrong ammunition can destroy it; how an inaccurate rifle sighting will not allow you to know exactly which direction the bullet will fly; how many accidental deaths occur because hunters mistake humans and pack animals for game and kill them (Keith 14). Many of these articles also discuss the quality of earlier makes of firearms.

In this 1962 Guns & Ammo issue some contributors describe hunting for sport in an unappealing light. For example, in the 1962 personal opinions column "Pinwheels and Flyers" Don Osborn wrote that hunters are sadistic (8). In this same article Jerry Rustad stated that use of riflescopes is slaughter, not sport (8). This language demonstrates a respect for wildlife as well as the unfair advantage technology gives to the hunter. A sense of fair play emerges in these words.

My overview reveals that this issue of Guns & Ammo seldom adopts political rhetoric. The informational, respectful tone of this magazine details the history and uses of various weapons, suggesting that the audience may not be concerned or threatened with the politics of gun control.

The political tone increases slightly in 1970. Of the twenty-five articles in the January 1970 issue of Guns & Ammo, four consider Second Amendment rights or social issues. One of the six letters to the editor discusses gun control legislation stemming from the harm a "disrespectful, irresponsible, unsporting 'gun jerk' can do" (Laska 10). Laska's word choice "disrespectful," "irresponsible," "unsporting," and "gun jerk" denote thoughtlessness rather than depravity. Another letter gives an interpretation of the Constitution explaining that:

...the right of the people to keep and bear arms will not be infringed upon [...] it [the Second Amendment] mentions "Militia" and Webster's definition of Militia is "male citizens between the ages of 18-45, not of the Reserves, Navy or Army. (Anderson 10)

Further arguments against gun control and the expense of such laws fill the rest of the argument. Another letter to the editor continues along Anderson's train of thought, arguing:

The Constitution was formulated by men who were masters of the English language. They wrote

exactly what they meant and they knew exactly
how to write what they meant. (Home 10)

Bob Neal's January 1970 column "Washington Report:
Buying a New Gun? It Isn't Tough Yet.....but It Could Be!"
details what he believes to be the devious means that gun
control advocates go to in attempting to restrict
firearms. The color format of this article appears to
denote good versus evil. That is, the half with his claims
is white with black print. The other half that details the
Congressional debate regarding gun regulation is black
with white print. The prevalence of black creates ominous
implications regarding firearm regulation. Neal begins by
utilizing the cliché "...more than one way to skin a cat"
(8). He argues that the first step in outlawing firearms
comes with the licensing of firearms. Furthermore,
regulation adds an economic burden on the gun enthusiast
and infringes on personal privacy. He continues detailing
that firearm regulation "...fails to fulfill its major
stated purpose—keeping guns out of the hands of criminals,
mental defectives, and the like" (9) and warns to guard
against future gun laws. Interestingly, Neal resorts to
cliché use only once in this article, and concludes that
all gun control advocates hope to ban firearms. He does

not resort to destructive value words to impinge upon the character of his opponents to make his case.

This same issue of Guns & Ammo boasts an article, by Alien Hargrove, titled "How the Press Can 'Lie' About Guns 'Erroneous Conclusions of Unqualified 'Experts' Are Quoted As News, but Accepted As Fact" (24) that incorporates destructive value words. He argues that reporters often write stories in haste and may not be objective. Consequently, the public is being "brainwashed" by "...the daily diet of subtle, insidious antigun sentiment contained in news stories" (24). The public is brainwashed because, "...any newscast, in any newspaper" that mentions firearms connects them to war, crime and "...the decimation of our wildlife" (24). In other words newscasters slant their stories toward the idea that a disarmed society is somehow safer, an "insidious suggestion" (24). This implies that the public is forced, by the constant repeated message, to think a certain way. Additionally, the adjective "insidious" suggests that newscasters are sneaky, an assault on their moral character. Hargrove attempts to explain that the use of word murder instead of homicide misleads the audience in that murder is "...illegal, unjustified homicide" (25) and homicide is the killing of another human being. Hargrove

concludes "These people [gun-control advocates] intend to disarm the American people at any cost--make no mistake about that" (25).

These articles from 1970 indicate how the content of this magazine begins to shift from information regarding gun use and safety to a political text tinged with fear and anger.

The January 1980 Guns & Ammo issue incorporates three articles that discuss political issues. The "Washington Report" is similar to "The Second Amendment's" format in that it uses freelance contributions. The "Washington Report," by James Oliver, discusses the appointment of a gun-control proponent, Abner Mikva, to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Oliver explains the lawsuit challenging the constitutionality of Mikva's lifetime appointment and the Senatorial debate that ensued. Oliver does not engage in destructive value words.

In this same 1980 issue two of the five letters to the editor consider gun-control. One short letter, by Representative Philip M. Crane, explains his opposition to Mikva's appointment. He describes Mikva as "...a fine man" (8), though, a man he often opposes in Congress, especially regarding gun control (8).

The second letter discusses "Your Right to Keep and Bear Arms" column of March 1979 which faults bureaucrats instead of Congress for wrong-headed legislation. John D. Shafer suggests that Congress is solely to blame regarding the gun-control legislation (8) without outright stating the word gun-control.

During the 1970's and 1980's most of Guns & Ammo's content revolved around firearms and their use with a limited number of articles and letters arguing against gun control. Most of these describe the wrong-headedness of gun control, but do not portray gun control proponents as demonic. The tone of most these articles did not exhibit strong, emotional rhetoric regarding Second Amendment rights, a tone that drastically changed in the 1990's.

In the December 1998 Guns & Ammo's rhetoric is quite combative as shown in a dark letter to the editor from Jim Gampetro entitled, "Gun-Control Ghouls" (Gampetro 7). In this letter he describes gun control proponents as "gun-control ghouls" "fanatics," "talking heads," "Handgun Control Inc.," "shills," "self-serving," and "money-grabbers." He then concludes:

The Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution is, [...] an individual right, not a state right and not a privilege. It is not to be infringed,

let alone abrogated. [...] It is the final resource of free men in the event of tyranny from their own government or invasion by other governments. Those who would trade their freedom for security neither deserve--nor do they ever achieve--either. (Gampetro 7)

Gampetro's aggressive tone suggests that he may be fearful regarding his right to own and bear arms. This tone demonstrates that some of his audience's interest has shifted to incorporate the politics of firearms along with their history and use.

An index of articles for 1998 listed in The June 1999 issue of Guns & Ammo indicate that out of one hundred thirty-three articles twelve discuss Second Amendment rights. However, a deeper analysis of the December 1998 issue reveals that seven of twenty-seven of the articles revolve around Second Amendment rights or social issues. Consequently, this index may be misleading. I do not have access to all the 1998 issues and could not do a more detailed analysis of the articles. The number of articles that revolve around Second Amendment rights and social issues are as follow: January 1999, seven of twenty-eight; June 1999, seven of thirty-seven; December 1999, four of twenty-six. These numbers may demonstrate that during the

late 1990's Second Amendment rights and societal issues absorbed approximately 20 of Guns & Ammo format.

During 1999 many articles and advertisements attempt to instill fear for personal security into the audience. Several nonpolitical articles appear in 1998, but a number of articles and letters to the editor include vehement, negative rhetoric regarding gun control proponents. The destructive metaphors, "ghouls," "shills," "fanatics," "power-mongers," "money-grabbers" and allusions to Nazi Germany's gun control policy, frequently appear regarding gun control, something that did not occur in earlier issues. As I read, a sense of alarm, alienation and anger emerges in these pages, something that previously did not exist in this magazine's rhetoric. Similarly, the advertisements suggest that individuals must purchase weaponry, its paraphernalia or a security system to avoid becoming a victim. Some of the weapons are named after venomous animals whose bite often leads to death, for example "Bushmaster." Other names "Savage" and "Combat" indicate violent conflict. Unless the firearm came from established gun manufacturers like Colt, Winchester or Berreta, the general trend in naming weaponry tends to denote aggression, which sharply contrasts with 1962's less violent names of "Natchez" and "Posse."

As of June 2000, Guns & Ammo boasted a national circulation of 429,225 and 1,916 in Canada; these numbers represent a powerful, political force in North America. My overview suggests that changes in the themes and tone of this magazine have occurred during the last three decades. Some of these changes reflect the writers' linguistic and rhetorical strategies such as implicature. To date, no study analyzes how implicature is used in Guns & Ammo to help achieve its powerful, combative and fraternal tone which strengthen its political messages. The purpose of my study is to do such an analysis. Chapter Two offers an explanation of implicature followed by definitions and examples of the Quality, Quantity, Manner and Relation speech maxims. Chapter Three presents the methodology and research questions. Chapter Four reveals the results of this study, highlighting the maxim violations and the implicatures they create. Chapter Five will consider these violations and implicatures in context with previous research in Psycholinguistics.

CHAPTER TWO
THE THEORETICAL AND
METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Herbert Paul Grice

Herbert Paul Grice (1913-1988), a well-known linguist, worked in various positions at Oxford University between the late 1930's until 1967. In 1967 Grice moved to Berkeley, California, where he taught full and part time until 1986. His work in language and semantics created the shift in philosophical debate from linguistic to mental representation (Gauker 1). That is, he is well known for analyzing meaning in conversations.

The Cooperative Principle

The focus of this study is Grice's theory of Conversational Implicature. This concept incorporates the Cooperative Principle and four speech maxims. Grice argues that when communicating individuals work within something he calls the Cooperative Principle for understanding. When operating within this principle the participants in conversation understand that they are to make the conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged

(Grice Studies 26). The Cooperative Principle centers on the assumption that participants in communication wish to be understood and to understand and they continually make assumptions to do so. For example, if A states "I'm hungry" and B states that "There's a steak in the freezer," A may assume that B either intends to cook the steak or intends for A to cook the steak in spite of the literal irrelevance of B's comment.

Definitions and Examples of the Quality, Quantity, Manner and Relation Maxims

Grice further defines four subcategories, or speech maxims, that operate within the Cooperative Principle. They are "Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner" (Grice Studies 26-27). With respect to Quantity, Grice claims that in conversation you need to give as much information as necessary. To omit or give too much information may mislead your audience. When a speaker utilizes this tact, it hints at the need to beguile the audience and violates the Quantity maxim. The Quality maxim operates on the presumption that the speaker must be truthful and not deliberately make a false statement or a statement that cannot be supported with sufficient evidence. The Relation maxim asserts that the speaker's conversational

contributions⁴ relate to the topic. Grice also argues that speakers should "Be perspicuous" (Grice Studies 27) in conversation (Manner maxim). That is, be clear, avoid obscurity and ambiguity, and be brief and orderly.

The following examples illustrate how the maxims may be broken in conversation:

1. Quality. An individual decides to clean a trashcan after several months of use. The significant other states, "Oh, you're cleaning the trashcan." The cleaner replies, "Well, it's been a day or two."
(Untruthful)
2. Quantity. An individual inquires "Why do you oppose capital punishment?" The hearer replies "Just because" (too little information) or "Capital punishment is a barbaric crime against humanity and those who uphold it are murderers of the worse sort." (Too much information)
3. Relation. The significant other arrives home and inquires, "Would you like to go to the mountains tomorrow for a picnic." The hearer responds "I have to work on my

thesis." (The answer does not literally relate to the question)

4. Manner. Significant others discuss taking their child out for ice cream. "A" states "Do you want to take the y-o-u k-n-o-w w-h-o for i-c-e c-r-e-a-m? (Unclear)

As part of the Cooperative Principle, conversational implicature revolves around the idea that individuals communicate through a series of cooperative efforts with a common purpose. Grice argues that what a word "means" stems from the speaker's intended meaning and the circumstances surrounding that conversation. This may diverge from the literal meaning of the words spoken (Grice Studies 24). The speaker uses implicature to suggest or hint rather than literally state his/her meaning, and the audience often makes inferences from what is actually said to make meaning. For example, when an employee believes that he or she merits a raise in pay, that individual may frequently mention how pleased a client was with her/his efforts. In other words, that person may imply that he or she works well, is an asset to the company and deserves a raise in pay. He or she hopes that the hearer will make the proper inference and increase the speaker's pay. In contrast, when discussing

this same topic with their significant other he or she may literally state, "I deserve a raise in pay" and detail their reasons for their claim. In both scenarios the topic is the same, but different situations and listeners create the need to use different words and behaviors. In both situations the speaker and audience understand the meaning of the conversation by following Grice's Cooperative Principle. In the first situation an employer may understand what the speaker/employee's words mean and either choose to ignore or acknowledge the "hints." That is, the employee has only implied that he or she deserves a raise. This graciously allows the employer to "save face" if the employer decides that a raise is not warranted. The use of implicature in this situation avoids straining the relationship between employer and employee. This practice of distinguishing between what an individual literally states and the implied meaning of words is commonly practiced in the English language for the sake of politeness.

Maxim violations often result in implicature. For example, another employee hoping to receive an increase in pay may violate the speech maxims to diminish fellow employees believing that he or she will appear superior and as a consequence earn a promotion. He or she may state

within their supervisor's hearing, "I wonder why that beached whale works here? His appearance gives the company the wrong image? I always take the extra effort to look my best for the company." Also, the speaker may state, "Why does it take Bruce forever to get his work done? He's as slow as molasses in January." By doing so the speaker violates the Quality maxim of truthfulness in that his or her peer obviously is not a beached whale or as slow as molasses. By violating this maxim the speaker uses implicature to suggest that he or she is the superior employee and hopes the supervisor will make the same inference.

Whether intended or inadvertent, implicature is created when the maxims are violated. From habit, a speaker may resort to clichés or idioms when speaking. For example, after an adolescent runs the same stop sign three times, and receives a ticket and fine all three times, his or her parent may use the often repeated idiom, "You're not the sharpest tool in the shed are you," a violation of the Quality maxim. Obviously, the child is not a tool. By utilizing this idiom the speaker hopes the child will infer that he or she is not too intelligent because he or she did not learn from his or her mistake.

Flouting the Maxims

Grice applied another rule within the Cooperative Principle's subcategories of maxim violations. He claims that a maxim violation may occur when the speaker intends for the listener not to recognize a violation. However, two exceptions occur when the speaker intends for the listener to know a maxim is being violated. Grice describes one as flouting (Grice Studies 30). For example, Mark Twain rebuffed the academic community stating:

Persons attempting to find a motive in this narrative will be prosecuted; [Quality] persons attempting to find a moral will be banished. [Quality] ...I have never tried in one single instance to help cultivate the cultivated classes. [...] And I never had any ambition in that direction, [Quantity] but always hunted for bigger game [Quality]--the masses. (Twain 6)

Here, Twain deliberately breaks the Quality maxim; therefore he flouts it because the listener realizes that individuals attempting to find a motive or moral in Twain's tales will not be prosecuted or banished by the judicial system. The comment regarding ambition provides an additional negative slight directed toward the literati to further insult their worth and Twain's audience

understands this, a Quantity maxim violation. The metaphor "game" turns the masses into prey and Twain into the predator, a Quality maxim violation.

Similar to Twain, the science-fiction author Robert Heinlein frequently flouted the speech maxims. In response to literati's vehement, negative reviews of his work he humorously replied:

Each copy is guaranteed--or double your money back--to be printed on genuine paper of enough pages to hold the covers apart.

(Heinlein 3)

Here Heinlein dismisses the academic community's critique by responding with unrelated comments on the paper and binding of his books and does not reply to their critique of the actual language he employed in his works. By flouting the speech maxims, both Twain and Heinlein humorously dismiss the academic criticism and imply that their critiques are not worthy of serious consideration.

Opting Out of the Maxims

Another violation exception occurs when an individual "opts out" of the conversation by simply refusing to continue with the conversation (Grice Studies 30). For example, when discussing the issue of gun-control with an

acquaintance he simply stated "I do not wish to continue with this topic because this is something I strongly believe in and I will become angry." By doing so, he intended for me to know he was not going to operate within the conversational principle. That is, he opted out of the conversation.

Previous Applications of Grice

Many academics have found Grice interesting enough to apply his theory to various texts. For example, Smith (1997) used Conversational Implicature to examine weight-loss advertisement. She found that advertisers broke most the speech maxims "...in order to imply that which they did not want to openly declare" (Smith 67). That is, these advertisers attempt to avoid liability with vague and misleading advertising. Smith cites Cooper's findings to support her conclusion:

...those who hide their violation (and are caught) are taken to be liars and disbelieved; those who violate maxims as to obstruct communication are taken to have reasons for their uncooperativeness. (qtd. in Smith 69)

Smith also cites Kennamer's findings: (1988)

...a purposeful violation of the Cooperative Principle by a message sender, without the knowledge of the receiver, constitutes deception on the part of the sender, (qtd. in Smith 70)

Smith concurs with Kennamer that weight-loss advertisers use implication to deceive and/or mislead their audience, but argues that individuals cannot assume that all who break the speech maxims are deceptive because of the limited research in this area.

Chen applied implicature to the fictional characters in Rose's Twelve Angry Men and focused on how often each maxim violation occurred and what these violations suggest about the characters. He asserts that violating the Quality maxim may indicate "...that the speaker is humorous, interesting, sarcastic, colourful in speech, or a downright liar" (Chen 32). Chen found that jurors who frequently broke the Quality maxim did so "...to insult, to satirize, and to attack personally their fellow jurors who do not agree with them" (46), traits generally viewed as unappealing. On the other hand, he concludes that Juror Eight violates the Relation and Quantity maxims to keep the jury focused and to argue in a non-combative manner, therefore, increasing his power of persuasion. Thus, Juror

Eight appears as "...positive, likeable, and possibly admirable" (46).

Chen determined that although this summary is "...fairly accurate, [it] may be misleading" (46) in that the use of implicature must be analyzed by the breaking of the maxims and the situation in which the maxim violation occurs. Chen cites Bennison's (1933) application of implicature to Anderson's Professional Foul and Harris' (1992) study on Joyce's The Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man to support his claim that when applying implicature to fictional characters:

...we need not only to look at the type of implicature, but also various aspects of the implicatures themselves: the prepositional contents of the utterance, the effects of the implicature, the motivation for the violation of the maxim in question. In a word, to yield insights into characterization, the analyst needs to look into the intricacies of the implicature involved. (Chen)

Smith and Chen assert that currently we cannot attribute positive or negative traits to a speaker simply by analyzing how often that individual violates a maxim.

This study will build on the groundwork laid by Smith and Chen and may reveal why communicants, in this case three contributors' to Guns & Ammo magazine, use implicature to present their messages in particular ways. The analysis may reveal how implicature is used to strengthen their messages.

CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH
QUESTIONS

This analysis aims to demonstrate the effects of implicature on the texts in Guns & Ammo magazine. In addition, given the fearful tone in these three articles, the data may possibly reveal some aspects of the contributors' perceptions regarding United States society and government. In subsequent discussions, I will address the following research questions:

1. Do these writers use implicature and, if so, how and why do they do so?
2. How do their maxim violations strengthen their argument or tone?
3. With what frequency does each writer violate each maxim.
4. What may these violations reveal about the author's tendencies in communication?

The data for this study were taken from six 1999 Guns & Ammo texts. These texts appear to be generally representative of the change from strictly information regarding guns and their use to include political and

social commentary and reflect Guns & Ammo's present day language, tone and format.

A general overview of Guns & Ammo 1999 issues show that approximately 80 of the articles revolve around one of the following: weaponry and its use; the other 20 exudes emotional language regarding security, Second Amendment rights or society. For example many letters to the editor exhibit negative metaphors and adjectives when discussing gun control. Three of the six articles analyzed are from Charlton Heston's monthly column, "From the Capitol." The January subtitle is "The Cost of Freedom and the Price of Silence: Defending the Second Amendment is Tantamount to Swimming in a Shark-Infested Pool--It's Not for the Faint of Heart." The June subtitle is "Lawsuits Against Liberty; How Tobacco-Settlement Attorneys Threaten to Bankrupt the American Gun Industry." The December subtitle is "Lies, Damn Lies and Statistics: How Media Polls Misrepresent Public Opinion and Pervert National Debate." In addition, two articles from Jim Grover's recurring column "Personal Security" were evaluated. The January column subtitle is, "The Biggest Steal: Credit Criminals Can Use Information About You to Live High and Handsome. It's Called Identity Theft." The December column is subtitled "Hot Spot Hubris: Want to Stay Out of Harm's

Way? Well, Unless Your Presence Is Really Required, Avoiding Dangerous Locales Is the Most Sensible Way to Do It." Finally, one freelance article by Chuck Klein in the monthly column "Second Amendment: Fight for Your Firearms Freedom!: The Other Right to Keep and Bear Arms: Use the Ninth Amendment to Save The Second." The four texts by Heston and Klein revolve around Second Amendment rights. Grover's two articles give advice on personal security. All six texts demonstrate the writers' fear regarding the loss of their rights and security. The recurring articles by Heston and Grover are of similar length. Heston's articles are approximately 884-960 words in length. Grover's consists of about 710 words. Klein's freelance contribution consists of roughly 2,346 words. They do not discuss any specifics regarding gun safety or firearm essentials. Instead, their concerns are of a social nature focusing on fear, victimization, Second Amendment rights, patriotism, and the lack of character in United States society.

The data was compiled and put into Table 1 to show how often each writer violates each maxim. In analyzing the data, the frequency with which each contributor violates each maxim was calculated. The resulting

implicatures stemming from the maxim violations was then studied in order to answer the research questions.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Analysis of the Quality Maxim

Table 1 reveals the frequency of maxim breaking. This table illustrates the authors' inclinations in communicating.

Table 1.

The Frequency of Maxim Violations Across the Three Authors

Article	Quantity	Quality	Relation	Manner
"From the Capitol" (Heston)	6	9	15	0
"Personal Security" (Grover)	5	11	2	1
"Second Amendment" (Klein)	19	9	3	4
Totals	30	29	20	5

As can be seen in the table, the disparity in the frequency of maxim violations is apparent. The writers violate the Quality and Quantity maxims substantially more often than the Manner and Relation maxims. Consequently, I will begin the analysis with them. Before discussing each

maxim violation I must point out that one violation often overlaps the others. For example, if you describe a gun control advocate as a ghoul (a demon or grave robber) this breaks the Quality (truthfulness), Relation (relevance) and Manner (clarity) maxims. First, it would be difficult to prove the truthfulness of gun-control proponents being demons or grave robbers. Second, how does a demon or grave robber relate to the argument at hand, gun control? Third, utilizing extraneous, negative, metaphoric language simply clouds the issue with too much information instead of clarifying it. Nevertheless, for the sake of organizational clarity, the maxim violations in Guns & Ammo will be presented separately.

The frequent breaking of the Quality maxim (truthfulness) appears in Charlton Heston's recurring column "From the Capitol: Lawsuits Against Liberty: How Tobacco-Settlement Attorneys Threaten to Bankrupt the American Gun Industry." Heston claims that class action lawsuits against gun manufacturers and retailers are:

...a marriage of convenience. Bankrupt politicians seeking easy "solutions" to crime are being seduced by ambulance-chasing attorneys who promise them political cover, and a cut of the proceeds, from their next planned courtroom

kill: the American firearms industry. And the anti-gun lobby couldn't be happier. (39)

The article's title reveals Heston's premise that the anti-tobacco lawsuits (to knowingly sell a hazardous material) will eventually be applied to bankrupt the gun industry. Heston appears to be on a slippery slope suggesting that similar to tobacco products, guns will eventually be declared "a hazardous material" and, like the tobacco industry, gun manufacturers will be sued for damages. This breaks the Quality maxim (truthfulness) because it presupposes something will happen and no individual knows what will happen until it happens. Furthermore, he uses implicature to portray his opponents as corrupt with the terms "bankrupt" and "ambulance-chasing." Both adjectives break the Quality maxim by depicting gun control politicians and attorneys as moral destitutes who are only interested in personal economic gain. His argument regarding "easy solutions" also presupposes that class-action lawsuits do not require extensive time and cost. In addition, Heston's final assertion of a "courtroom kill" metaphorically changes the gun industry into the prey of gun-control advocates. This breaks the Quality maxim by presenting gun-control advocates actively attempting to destroy the gun industry

instead of controlling it. The ironic imagery of the hunter now being the hunted may not be lost on the audience.

Similar to the maxim-breaking of Juror Three in Chen's analysis, Heston's Quality maxim violations strengthen the aggressiveness of the message and communicates a sense of willingness to do "...whatever it takes [to win], including causing offense to others" (Chen 37). Heston may intend to provoke fear regarding gun regulations in his audience with his maxim violations. The negative, metaphoric language continues throughout this article and may possibly reveal his aggressive communication tendencies when his stance is contested.

In another section of the article, Heston argues that:

Like shrewd investors, these legal predators have even put up millions of dollars [...] to bait plaintiffs and bankroll their extortionist schemes. [...] Which means that cities could walk away with millions in settlement awards without having to spend a nickel to file their suits. (39)

The simile "Like shrewd investors" breaks the Quality maxim. This stereotypical claim assumes that all

gun-regulation class action lawsuit lawyers are astute, discerning, cunning, tricky, sharp and clever (The American Heritage Dictionary 1200). Heston also implies that lawyers will earn a great deal of money in settlement fees by instigating a lawsuit. This is impossible to know; thus, he violates the Quality maxim. By using the negative, stereotypical metaphor "legal predators" he identifies these lawyers as hunters stalking the gun industry, again breaking the Quality maxim. Also, for the negative adjective "extortionist" to be accurate these lawyers would have to ask the gun industry for money not to instigate these lawsuits. Here, Heston's breaking of this maxim results in an implicature that denigrates gun-control lawyers and communicates his fear of gun regulation.

To help demonstrate the power of Heston's implicature, a revision of Heston's argument without the maxim breaking follows:

Politicians, attorneys and the gun control lobby have recently joined forces to create stronger gun control legislation that includes the fire arm industry. Attorneys have invested millions of dollars to assist cities in their efforts to gain financial compensation incurred

by gun violence. Consequently, these cities may gain millions in settlement awards from the gun industry without having to bear the cost of a lengthy legal battle.

The reworking of this passage reveals the strength implicature gives the original argument and increases the aggressiveness of the message. Please note the difference in language in the rephrasing of Heston's paragraph without the explosive language. For example, the use of "politicians" without the adjective "bankrupt"; "attorney" instead of "legal predator" and "ambulance chasing"; "invested" instead of "bait," and "compensation" instead of "extortionist schemes," and "cut of the proceeds" cause paragraph to lose its impact.

Similar to Heston, Grover frequently indulges in violating the Quality maxim. His article "Personal Security: Safety and Sense: Hot Spot Hubris" begins,

I'm writing this column after two recent attacks. One involved the binding, blindfolding and shooting of three Americans along the Venezuelan border with Columbia. The other was in Uganda and involved the hacking to death of several Americans and Brits engaged in a gorilla-watching tour. [...] Remember, depending

on your ethnic background, some places are okay for you to be and other places just aren't. (10) Grover implies that if you are white and visiting another area populated by people of color, you just are not safe, a stereotypical and racist comment. Not all members of one group exhibit the same traits. His racial stereotyping breaks the Quality maxim of truthfulness. Bold, large-font subtitles strengthen his message, "Fact is there are predators and there is prey [...] Jungle Rules to Live by" (11). Grover hopes to instill fear into his audience with the words "predators," "prey" and "jungle." His stereotypical claim that individuals who travel to certain areas of the world are either the prey or the predator expresses the disturbing judgment: you are either the hunter or the game. Consequently, he uses implicature to suggest that your survival in these areas depends on adopting a paranoid persona. In this statement, he breaks the Quality maxim in that not all people fall into one or the other category when traveling in hazardous areas, areas which Grover fails to identify.

Further, he outlines the rules which individuals need to follow to survive in the "Jungle" we live in. The "Jungle Rules" are as follows:

- The bad guy wants what you have.
- You will always be attacked when conditions are least advantageous to you and most advantageous to your attacker.
- If it can go wrong, it will.
- If you snooze, you lose.
- Proper preparation prevents poor performance.
- Go lightly.
- Your most powerful weapon sits on your shoulders.
- You reap what you sow.
- Look for trouble, and you'll always find more than you can handle.
- There is always someone sharper, tougher, meaner, nastier, hungrier and more prepared than you. (11)

Here, Grover violates the Quality maxim on several counts. Grover argues that 1) you will be attacked when you least expect it; 2) you will encounter more problems that you expect; 3) you will lose your property, health and possibly you life if not alert; and 4) you will find trouble if you look for it. All four claims indicate that attacks, theft and harm will assail you if you are not vigilant. This violates the Quality maxim in that you

don't know what will happen until it happens.. This maxim breaking results in an implicature suggesting the benefits of apprehension. For example, his claim that "Your most powerful weapon sits on your shoulders" suggests your head is not a weapon, your intellect is. Here, Grover implies that your intellect provides more protection than brute force. The last rule, that there is always someone meaner, nastier, hungrier, etc., again breaks the Quality maxim, creating an implicature that fear is the best weapon to protect yourself. The use of implicature conveys Grover's fear and alienation of individuals unlike himself and demonstrates his aggression in communication. All may reveal his anxiety. His recurring use of the words "predators" and "prey" indicate a sense of alarm and appear to be the main theme that binds approximately 20 of Guns & Ammo together.

In the January 1999 issue, Grover's article, "The Biggest Steal: Credit Criminals Can Use Information About You to Live High and Handsome. It's Called Identity Theft" revolves around identity theft instead of firearms and violence. It exudes the same sense of alarm. Similar to his December 1999 article "Hot Spot Hubris," Grover uses implicature to strengthen his message. Here he claims:

Identity theft. If those two words don't alarm you, then you need to rethink your threat analysis. (Grover 12)

Again, Grover violates the Quality maxim in that he assumes that all individuals have a "threat analysis" and should be "alarmed" by identity theft. This violation creates an implicature to instill fear into the audience. Additionally, his use of the word "alarm" in contrast to "If you are not aware of these two words you should be" suggests fear is the best protection. Similar to the word "predator," "alarm" implies danger and that you, the audience, should practice continual vigilance in protecting yourself against the "bad guy." Grover asserts that many are in the business of collecting and selling information on individuals. These businesses have the ability to gather enough information about you to allow a predator to purchase your identity to ruin your credit and/or possibly commit crimes. Additionally, you cannot have your name stricken from these information businesses because writing a check will reinstate you in their database.

Grover concludes with his rules on "How to Prevent Identity Theft." These common sense rules are widely

followed with a few exceptions. For example, rules six and seven state:

6. Pay with cash whenever possible and refuse to give the clerk your name, address and phone number. If they insist, make it up.
7. Remember, when you request a catalog, you just requested about a gazillion more than you thought because that list is sold to other catalog providers. Make such request with discretion. Every three months or so, request a credit report to see who has been requesting credit data on you. (12)

First, many individuals find it unnerving to shop with cash. If cash is stolen, that is it; it is gone. His advice results in a Quality maxim violation in that it is untrue. Second, a perpetrator could easily observe a shopper making a purchase, note the amount of cash in the shopper's billfold and appropriate the remaining funds from the shopper at knife or gunpoint. This rule thus violates the Quality maxim because shoppers may create a threat to their personal security instead of securing it. Third, the exaggeration, "gazillion" breaks the same maxim with exaggeration, an untruth, because the word is not in the dictionary. Grover's Quality maxim violations create

implicature that suggests that there are advantages to having a fearful personality in light of the "gazillion" threats to personal security that exist daily life.

Similar to "From the Capital" and "Personal Security," the rhetoric in "Second Amendment, Fight for Your Firearms Freedom!: The Other Right to Keep and Bear Arms: Use the Ninth Amendment to Save the Second" (Klein 20) reveals how maxim violations strengthen a message. The emotional rhetoric incorporated in the title of this article prepares the audience for an argument regarding Second Amendment rights. In the body of his article, Klein breaks the Quality maxim asserting:

We, the constitutionally correct, the strict constructionists, the followers of the founders of this great nation, have always let our position be known. We have never hidden or shirked our commitment to the principles of the rule of law and the law of rules. Our detractors, on the other hand, have for the most part, hemmed, hawed, postulated, twisted, deferred, demurred and in general, attacked us based on "feel good" and political correctness.

(20)

Here, Klein violates the Quality maxim and creates the implication that individuals who interpret the Constitution as he does are always forthright and lawful and individuals with opposing opinions are shifty and dishonest. His negative and positive generalizations stereotypes, a violation of the Quality maxim, which implies that the audience will identify and agree with his argument.

He continues arguing:

Furthermore, must we commoners now accept whatever a tyrannical state decrees because we have no power to object to our state's rules?

(21)

The adjective "commoner," "a person not of the nobility" (The American Heritage Dictionary 295), alludes to the 1776 American Revolutionary War against England and metaphorically changes members of the gun community into subjects of the crown. Consequently, he again breaks the Quality maxim. He then asserts that "...a well-regulated militia" is an armed citizenry, not the 98 federally funded National Guard. He concludes that if the government legislates unconstitutional gun regulation laws, the citizenry would be unable to revolt as they did in the American Revolution. Furthermore, the charged word

"tyrannical" pertains to 1) a despot 2) a title of nobility 3) one who may be arbitrary, 4) determined by whim 5) oppressive, harsh, causing physical or mental distress (American Heritage Dictionary 1389). Far from being a tyranny, the United States has a representative government that is elected, is not a monarchy, and incorporates a massive bureaucracy which cannot move by whim and seldom by one individual. Granted, some argue that it's oppressive, harsh, and causes physical and mental distress, especially around tax time, but it still grants all of its citizens more freedom than many other governments. Thus, by utilizing the adjective tyrannical Klein breaks the Quality maxim of truthfulness. Here he thus creates an implication that citizens should fear the government of the United States.

Furthermore, Klein describes the incidents at Waco and Ruby Ridge as outrages, "...that would horrify the founding fathers" (21). We cannot communicate with our founding fathers; so how is it possible for Klein to know gun control legislation would horrify them? Again, Klein's presumption breaks the Quality maxim. By doing so he aligns himself with the founding fathers and utilizes implicature to suggest the unconstitutional nature of gun regulation. His powerful implicature suggests his

patriotism and casts a shroud of treason on gun regulation.

He continues, employing negative adjectives to describe those who disagree with his stance. For example, Klein's arguments regarding gun control utilize possibly slanderous language regarding control advocates. He states that the Ninth:

...doesn't refer to any right to keep and bear arms, [...] but it does spell out our other rights. These other rights, unlisted but nonetheless genuine liberties--and the powers to secure them--are what the pseudo scholars and alleged learned jurists uniformly and consistently fail to comprehend. You can't have it both ways! (Klein 22)

Klein violates the Quality maxim with these misnomers. Individuals considered to be scholars and jurists hold credentials issued to them by accredited academic institutions. To describe them as pseudo or alleged contends that they are fake, a violation of the Quality maxim. This implies that they lack credibility, perhaps reflecting Klein's perceptions. Additionally, this suggestion attempts to strengthen Klein's image and claim.

Unlike Heston and Grover, Klein implies that he is doing "God's will" in his fight for Second Amendment rights and utilizes implication in the form of religious language to strengthen his argument. He attempts to clarify his claim with an emotional discussion regarding the "sacredness" of Declaration of Independence. He argues that at the historic moment of its creation the founding fathers were fighting English oppression and they wanted to be clear that:

We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal that they are endowed by their Creator [...] each, upon birth, is endowed (granted, guaranteed) by their Creator (God, Jehovah, Buddha, Adonai...) with certain Inalienable Rights...These inalienable (cannot be taken away) rights (guarantees) are given (endowed), at birth, to each of the all men by their Creator. [...] that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. [...] Such pursuits include, but are not limited to, the right to worship as you believe or collect/shoot guns. (22)

Since Klein chooses to use "God" in the religious sense, he breaks the Quality maxim (truthfulness) as there are no

Biblical or other religious scriptures regarding firearm regulation. Klein's maxim-breaking creates an implicature that gun-control is unconstitutional and irreligious. This use of implicature suggests Klein's morality and the sinfulness of gun regulation.

Interestingly, the Declaration of Independence violates the Quality maxim and undermines his argument. The line, "We hold these truths to be self-evident," breaks the Quality maxim in that these "truths" were not self-evident to the English monarchy. Consequently, Klein's use of this document to support his claim actually undercuts it.

Klein continues violating the Quality maxim by asserting that:

The person seeking to secure his right to protect his family is obligated to commit some action, such as keeping and bearing arms. It is his duty, not the government's, to secure his personal rights and guarantees. Protecting individual life and liberty is not a function of any government. Government's well-established civilian defense role is that of protection against foreign invasion, keeping order and seeing that the people's constitutional rights

are not violated by its agents, employees and officials. (23)

Klein argues that our government illegally protects individual life, liberty and rights with its various federal, state, county, city agencies and laws. Also, he violates the Quality maxim by asserting that we do not have a well-established civilian defense because the National Guard receives federal funding and as a result cannot be considered civilian. The fact that this agency is comprised of civilians that militarily train once a month and are only called up in times of emergency negates his claim. The resulting implicature suggests the illegitimacy of the National Guard and that the government is illegally extending its authority which may effectively instill a fear of the government into his audience.

Peculiarly, Klein tends to support his claims with documents that exhibit his penchant for Quality maxim violation. For example, he draws on the ACLU's assertion that:

Bazookas, torpedoes, etc., might be needed, under the Second Amendment, to protect the people against a tyrannical state or national government, but small arms are most assuredly needed, permitted and required for individual

protection against everyday life and liberty threats. (20)

His use of the ACLU's extreme reasoning that allows individuals or groups access to Bazookas, torpedoes, etc. to defend themselves against a "tyrannical" government that may regulate, not ban, firearms violates the Quality maxim. Individual security would be jeopardized, not fortified, if untrained citizens or possibly unbalanced persons are allowed access to such firepower. By using the ACLU's maxim violation, Klein implies that citizens should rely on an excess of lethal weaponry to protect themselves against the government. His message may cause citizens to arm themselves with these weapons and possibly bomb federal facilities. In other words take the law into their own hands to rebel against a "tyrannical" government as Tim McVeigh did.

Klein concludes his argument with a summary and a possible legal remedy to the Second Amendment rights dilemma. He uses implicature in his question, "...why can't we, the gun owners and gun buyers sue for disparagements to our rights and well being?" (Klein 24), he breaks the Quality maxim with the term "disparagements." Regulation does not constitute a ban of firearms. Also, many are accidentally maimed or murdered

through gun violence which does not contribute to their well-being. He implies that gun-regulation is unconstitutional and has imposed an economic burden on gun-enthusiasts. His message may create a feeling of resentment toward the government in the gun community. Klein argues that the gun-regulation proponents:

...have made me feel like a criminal. Their disparagements have portrayed me, because of my interest in firearms, to be un-American--and I hold being an American to the highest esteem.

(24)

The alienation and fear Klein exhibits in his rhetoric appear to be recurring themes throughout many articles and editorials that appear in this magazine.

Analysis of the Quantity Maxim

Violating the Quantity maxim (giving too much or too little information) often obscures the topic of conversation. For example, too much information clouds the topic with irrelevant information, information the audience may deem relevant. The use of value words also has a similar effect in that they may change the audience's perception from positive to negative or vice

versa. Too little information omits facts that may be critical to the audience's understanding of an issue.

Heston excessively employs destructive value words and omits important facts when discussing his opposition to gun control. Some of the same examples from the last section reflect his Quantity maxim-violations. For example, his column, "From the Capitol: Lawsuits Against Liberty: How Tobacco-Settlement Attorneys Threaten to Bankrupt the American Gun Industry" (Heston 39) asserts that the anti-tobacco lawsuits will eventually be applied to and bankrupt the gun industry. Here, he misleads the audience by omitting the information that the tobacco industry lost a multimillion-dollar lawsuit because they knowingly sold a hazardous product, then perjured themselves, under oath, regarding this matter. His employment of the unnecessary value words "liberty," "threaten" and "bankrupt," violates the Quantity maxim, and bias his argument by implying that these lawsuits may damage the gun industry and conveys the message that our freedom will be destroyed along with this industry. Furthermore, Heston asserts that:

Bankrupt politicians seeking easy solutions to crime are being seduced by ambulance-chasing attorneys who promise them political cover, and

a cut of the proceeds, from their next planned courtroom kill: the American firearms industry.

(39)

His use of the negative adjective "bankrupt" to describe politicians filing these class action lawsuits for "...the costs of firearm-related violence" (39) breaks the Quantity maxim (too much information) because it unnecessarily and negatively clouds the issue. Bankrupt denotes financial or moral destitution. Thus, this description casts a needless, contemptuous shroud upon their character. The negative cliché "ambulance-chasing" implies that lawyers and reporters hope to make economic gain from the grief of those involved in tragedy. His employment of extraneous and destructive value words derisively wraps the issue in too much information. These Quantity maxim violations create an implicature that affirms the gun community's integrity and suggests the perverseness of gun-control proponents.

Similar to Heston, Klein creates implicature by breaking the Quantity maxim in order to embed his values into his audience. In "Second Amendment," he asserts that:

We, the constitutionally correct, the strict constructionist, the followers of the founders of this great nation, have always let our

position be known. [...] Our detractors, [...] have for the most part, hemmed, hawed, postulated, twisted, deferred, demurred and in general, attacked us based on "feel good" and political correctness. (20)

In this example, Klein fails to identify the "We" and what credentials the "We" hold; both omissions thus violate the Quantity maxim. Moreover, his use of the positive value words of "constitutionally correct" "followers of the founders" and "great nation" to describe Second Amendment rights advocates creates the implicature that he is aligned with the positive image of patriotism and the 1776 American Revolution. In contrast, his use of destructive value words "hemmed," "hawed," "postulated," "twisted," "deferred," "demurred," "attacked," and the sarcastic "feel good," implies an instability in gun-control opponents that suggests a shiftiness of character and violates the Quantity maxim. Further, his message attempts to instill treasonous shame in those who oppose his Second Amendment Rights platform. This excess of negative and destructive value words breaks the Quantity maxim with too much information. The resulting implicatures may create a sense of honor for the firearm enthusiast and unpatriotic shame in the gun control proponent.

Klein continues to use implicature to create fear of the government when he asks, "...must we commoners now accept whatever a tyrannical state decrees because we have no power to object to our state's rules?" (21). Klein fails to mention that the "commoners" that created our government only allowed white, landowning males to vote at its inception and permitted slavery. This omission violates the Quantity maxim and creates the implicature that our founding fathers were egalitarian. In fact, they were some of the richest and most selective individuals in the North American colonies. The effect of his message suggests that as brothers we are in this battle against gun-control together. His use of the unnecessary negative adjective "tyrannical" also violates the Quantity maxim by obscuring his opponents in the cloud of monarchial totalitarianism. These maxim violations help achieve Klein's implication that the government of the United States is returning to the stern practices of the British monarchy before the American Revolution and is unconstitutional. The resulting message is that to revolt for our rights, as our founding fathers did, is both honorable, justifiable and patriotic.

Klein continues using implicature and Quantity maxim violation throughout his article. He considers present-day government agencies and acts of violence as king:

If we had a "'real' militia," [...] these "state militia units" would have used their power to protect their citizens from civil rights violations such as unconstitutional taxes, laws and edits, the withholding of federal highway funds and such outrages as Waco and Ruby Ridge. [...] Instead, these de facto "federal" guard units [...] are under the complete control of the federal government--a condition that would horrify the founding fathers. (21)

Klein's value words "control" and "horrify" are extraneous to the argument and indicate his aggressiveness in communication. Klein utilizes implicature to suggest that governmental militias are unconstitutional. Further, his assertion regarding illegal taxes omits the fact that our government is elected by the people, and the people will vote elected officials out of office if they impose taxes that are too burdensome for the populace to bear. Also, most of these people have not violently revolted against unfair taxation as they did in the Revolutionary War. In addition, Klein fails to discuss that the victims in Waco

and Ruby Ridge violated federal law and refused to surrender to the officers hired to enforce the law created by a representative government. Consequently, Klein breaks the Quantity maxim, implying that our government is illegal. He may thus instill a sense of fear and alienation toward the government in his audience.

Klein continues violating the Quantity maxim arguing that:

Government's well-established civilian defense role is that of protection against foreign invasion, keeping order and seeing that the people's constitutional rights are not violated by its agents, employees and officials. (23)

Here Klein implies that the government is not fulfilling its role and violates civilian rights. Additionally, he fails to recognize that currently we have many civilian and military agencies and laws to protect citizens from invasion, to protect their rights, and to keep order. As a consequence, he violates the Quantity maxim. The resulting implicature is that our government does not fulfill the founding father's original plan, suggesting that it has illegitimately seized more power than the Constitution allows and has become oppressive.

Similar to Klein, Grover violates the Quantity maxim to create a sense of danger in the audience in "Personal Security; Identity Theft." Grover suggests that we should be vigilant at all times and fear for our personal security and economic health. He details how thieves obtain your personal information and create credit accounts in your name, accounts that are sent to the thief's address without your knowledge. He continues, claiming that "In a few cases, some of the criminals had legally changed their names to assume the identity of their victims" (Grover 12). According to Grover, if this happens, even if you report it to the police, you still will be hounded by creditors that employ late night phone calls and threatening letters to obtain monies due them in spite of the fact you did not incur the bill; you will become one of a growing number of the victimized by fraud. Grover describes this crime as insidious, because you usually are exploited for a period of time before receiving the bills. Grover explains that, "Some never did recover losing retirement money, college funds and other treasured nest eggs" (12).

However, Grover fails to discuss the actual location, economic status, or the percent of the population that suffer identity loss, thus breaking the Quantity maxim

with too little information. Grover's use of implicature is that we live in a dangerous world and must be constantly aware of the hazards that may find us. His defensive tone may indicate his hostile tendencies in communication. Grover attempts to instill his fear into the audience by omitting pertinent facts, thereby making it appear that identity theft is far more prevalent than it may actually be.

In "Jungle Rules," Grover's fearful tone continues. Grover suggests that there are many dangerous areas in the world for members of the white race. His rules are previously cited on page forty-two. This example illustrates that maxim violations often overlap one another. In chapter one, this study demonstrates how "Jungle Rules" violates the Quality maxim. This chapter will illustrate how this list violates Quantity maxims in that Grover fails to identify the areas that may be hazardous to your health if you are white. His statement regarding "bad guys," which does not identify the "bad" guy, again breaks the Quantity maxim with too little information. His maxim breaking creates an implicature that racism against whites exists in many parts of the world. He insinuates that if you are white you must be aware of these unspecified areas.

Analysis of the Manner Maxim

Interestingly, this research found that in contrast to the fifty-nine Quality and Quantity maxim violations, Heston, Grover and Klein violate the Manner and Relation maxims seventeen times. Grice incorporated four submaxims under Manner:

1. Be perspicuous or easily understood.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief.
4. Be orderly.

These rules mirror Grice's concept of how individuals conduct their communication (Grice Studies 27).

Grover breaks the Manner maxim, in his recurring column, "Personal Security: Hot Spot Hubris," with the following contradictory lines:

People the world over are generally good and will leave you alone. [...] You may assume locals will tell you if there's any trouble. No, they won't. (10)

Grover's wording is too general and contradictory for clarity. How can people (the mass of ordinary persons) be generally good and the locals (pertaining to a local person) not warn you of possible danger? Therefore, Grover breaks the Manner maxim of clarity because the mass of

people would include locals. Grover's mixed messages imply that, when traveling, individuals must be on guard instead of relaxing, and relaxing is often the purpose of travel. This message may reveal his xenophobia, a fear he tries to cultivate in his audience. Additionally, it betrays aggressive and possibly paranoid tendencies in his written communication.

Klein violates the Manner maxim five times in his freelance contribution by adopting double talk in his claim which usually results in ambiguity. He argues that gun enthusiasts could use the Ninth Amendment to save the II Amendment. The Ninth Amendment reads:

Regarding rights not enumerated. The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people. (qtd. in Baldwin and Kelley Survey 488)

Klein interprets the Ninth Amendment's meaning arguing that citizens shall not be deprived of their rights simply because these rights are not mentioned in the Constitution. He continues:

...if the court rules that the Second is not a direct and individual right then they cannot deny the Ninth Amendment's indirect right to

secure our individual unenumerated rights.

(Klein 22)

Klein supports his claim with the ruling, "...the right to bear arms is not left to the vagaries of the Ninth Amendment disputes at all" (San Diego County Gun Rights Committee v. Janet Reno). Here, Klein contradicts himself and violates the Manner maxim. This ruling on the Ninth Amendment excludes, not includes, the Second Amendment in that the Second clearly states citizens have the right to bear arms. This contrasts with his article's title "Save the Second Amendment with the Ninth." This maxim violation immerses his argument in a smokescreen of constitutionally clouded communication. The resulting implicature is that he is an authority on the Constitution and the resulting message legalizes his claim.

Klein continues to violate the Manner maxim and uses implicature to demonstrate his and other gun owners' noble character. He follows with the positive comments, "We, the American gun owners, are a very trusting and agreeable mix of civilians" (22). This violates the Manner maxim of clarity in that he follows with:

Must we commoners now accept whatever a
tyrannical state decrees [...] Outrages [such]
as Waco and Ruby Ridge [...] defacto "federal"

guard units [...] unconstitutional taxes [...] pseudo scholars and alleged learned jurists [...] This negative umbrella, this illegal conspiracy perpetuated by ABC, NBC, CBS, TBS, Gannett. (Klein 21-25)

This rhetoric does not reflect the language of a trusting and agreeable person. In fact, these words may reveal a person of aggressive communicative tendencies and extremes.

Klein continues violating the Manner maxim in his argument regarding Second Amendment rights. He states that:

Government's well-established civilian defense role is that of protection against foreign invasion, keeping order and seeing that the people's constitutional rights are not violated by its agents, employees and officials. (23)

He concludes that the government violates the Ninth Amendment with gun regulation because it denies its citizens the right to defend themselves, and therefore, the government is unconstitutional. Klein contradicts himself and oversimplifies the complex nature of internal and external political affairs. First, according to him we do not have a well-established civilian defense because

the National Guard receives federal funding. The fact that this agency is comprised of civilians that militarily train once a month and are only called up in times of emergency negates his claim that this institution is not a civilian defense force; he thus violates the Manner maxim. The resulting implicature suggests the illegitimacy of the National Guard and that gun control strips citizens of the ability to defend themselves against a tyrannical government.

Klein again connects to the English colonial rule in North America and further violates the Manner maxim by arguing:

If one has a right to life but is denied a means (use of arms) to secure this right, then the right to life is disparaged (lessened) and not a guaranteed right to life at all, and if we have no rights we are mere subjects of the government such as the colonists were to the King of England, circa 1775. (24)

The fact is that firearm regulation does not prohibit owning firearms. The regulation and licensing of automobiles, dogs, and businesses, has not impeded individuals from purchasing them. Again, this violates the Manner maxim in that he appears to define the Second

Amendment's word impede as prohibition. This implicature suggests that gun regulation deprives citizens of their right to personal security. The resulting message attempts to create fear of government regulation.

Analysis of the Relation Maxim

Grice's theory of Conversational Implicature claims that in communication you must be relevant or your audience may misunderstand the pertinent information. If a speaker digresses into irrelevant information, the audience may conclude that the divergent information is the topic at hand. For example, if you engage in a conversation regarding animal rights it may be unwise to bring the unrelated topic of Second Amendment rights into the discussion, as this may create confusion in your audience.

In Heston's article "The Cost of Freedom-and the Price of Silence: Defending the Second Amendment is Tantamount to Swimming in a Shark-Infested Pool-It's Not for the Faint of Heart" (Heston 34), Heston attempts to relate two unrelated topics: swimming with sharks and defending Second Amendment rights. Heston utilizes implicature to portray himself as a victim of the gun-control shark and in doing so violates the Relation

maxim. Swimming in a shark tank is not the same as advocating Second Amendment rights. The former could be hazardous to your physical well-being; the latter may subject you to indignity. This maxim violation results in the implicature that promoting Second Amendment rights is dangerous and that, in spite of the danger, Heston is courageous enough to fight for these rights.

Heston continues to violate the Relation maxim with negative metaphoric language arguing that:

We've all seen the media demonize someone by attacking his beliefs. When attacking an idea directly won't work, the media target the messenger instead. In that sense, I suppose, I've served as a whipping boy for the Second Amendment recently. In their fever to discredit the NRA and demonize our defense of the right to keep and bear arms, the media have, [...] called me everything from "ridiculous" and duped to a brain-injured, senile, crazy old man. (34)

The adjectives "ridiculous" "duped" "brain-injured" "senile" and "crazy old man" do not demonize Heston. To demonize is to make someone into a demon or devil-someone evil. The adjectives that Heston claims the media applies denote wrong-headed, not Satanic thinking. Heston's claim

fails to demonstrate a relationship between demon and wrongheadedness and suggests that the media have unfairly portrayed him. Additionally, the term "whipping-boy" fails to relate to the advocacy of gun-control. Historically, a whipping boy was reared in the same manner as a prince and received physical punishment for the prince's misconduct. Heston's maxim violations imply that he is being whipped for defending the Second Amendment, this sends a message of his martyrdom.

Heston continues using negative, metaphoric language that fails to relate to the topic. He targets the media claiming:

60 Minutes host Mike Wallace was never anything but polite in his questioning. Yet behind the smiles and manners, all the while he's interviewing you, you know he's doing his best to ambush you. It's SWAT-team journalism. (34)

Here, Heston attempts to align the media with an aggressive military-type police force specializing in the arrest and control violent perpetrators. The media may often exhibit aggressive language, but they do not use firearms in the course of their work as the Swat-team does.

Heston continues violating the Relation maxim and uses implicature to indicate "God" is on his side. He argues that:

To think that something as sacred as the Second Amendment could be subject to the pipe dreams of pop-culture "philosophers," and ignorance of newscast know-it-alls and the squishy morality of a Clintonian world. (34)

Here, Heston indulges in destructive words he complained about in "Shark Tank." The negative nouns "pipe dreams," "pop-culture philosophers," "know-it-all" and "squishy morality" do not directly relate to the argument surrounding Second Amendment rights. Here he creates implicature suggesting that gun control proponents are capricious and indecent, resulting in the message that they lack credibility.

Heston continues to violate the Relation maxim in his article "Lawsuits Against Liberty: How Tobacco-Settlement Attorneys Threaten to Bankrupt the American Gun Industry." Heston argues that class-action, lawsuit lawyers are "Like a pack of jackals running down a deer" (40). In this statement, he characterizes these lawyers as the most unsavory of predators hunting the Bambi-like gun manufacturers. His interjection of this simile does not

relate to the lawsuit debate and draws upon value words to relay destructive imagery. The resulting implicature suggests the innocence of gun manufacturers and the bestiality of gun-regulation.

Heston continues violating the Relation maxim in "Lies, Damn Lies and Statistics: How Media Polls Misrepresent details the bias that exists in polls with the example "Please answer 'yes' or 'no.' Have you stopped beating your wife yet?"(45) to make his point. This example demonstrates the unreliability of polls. His argument again digresses into unrelated topics. He claims that:

If there's anything that's been revealed about the American people's view of gun control over the decades it's a kind of schizophrenic desperation. (46)

Here he implies that citizens of the United States have contradictory views on this issue. In reality, schizophrenic views would be "characterized by indifference, withdrawal, hallucinations and delusions of persecution and omnipotence" (The American Heritage Dictionary 1303). This is not contradictory in nature, does not relate to gun control and violates the Relation maxim. His maxim-breaking creates an implicature that our

society is misled by the polls, media, and generally, those who petition for gun regulation. The message is: do not believe the polls and media.

Similar to Heston, Klein periodically attempts to create comparisons between unrelated topics. In "Second Amendment, The Other Right to Keep and Bear Arms" Klein argues:

...must we commoners now accept whatever a tyrannical state decrees because we have no power to object to our state's rules? (Klein 21)

Klein attempts to compare the commoners of 1770's to present day citizens that live in the democratic United States of America. However, the two do not relate in time or circumstance. The former lived in a monarchy with no representation in Parliament. The latter live in a representative government, not in an arbitrary and tyrannical state. By violating the Relation maxim, he implies that gun control will, in effect, turn the United States of America into a totalitarian state.

Furthermore, Klein violates the Relation maxim when he implies that the implementation of gun-control would cause the price of owning a firearm to be prohibitive for the lower and working classes. Klein asserts:

...if you are a judge who has citizen-paid personal police protection and enough salary to afford to live and work in a crime-free neighborhood, you're no better than we are. Just because we, the common citizens, are void of your "perks" you have no right to rule against our means to seek constitutionally allowed protection for ourselves. (22)

This suggests that an affluent judge assumes him or herself to be "better" than those less affluent does not relate to the topic of gun-regulation. This violation results in the implicature that suggests gun control judges can and do hire protection. This implication results in the message that gun-regulation judges do not consider the common citizen capable or sensible enough to know how to use firearms. Additionally, Klein's assertion that judges with "perks" do not have the right to prevent the gun community from owning a firearm relates to prevention not regulation.

In "Personal Security: Hot spot Hubris" Grover violates the Relation maxim on only two occasions. First, he argues that:

...failure to ask yourself, "What will I do should some of these 'bad' people happen on to

me?" is negligent. It is analogous to going to the North Pole without proper gear. (10)

An individual may be assaulted by the rugged terrain and weather of the North Pole, but this is not the same as being attacked by a "bad" person. By connecting these unrelated events, Grover implies that we must always exercise caution, which results in his message that we live in a hostile world and must protect ourselves.

Grover's second violation of the Relation maxim appears as he asserts, "...depending on your ethnic background, some places are okay for you to be and other places just aren't" (10). An individual's ethnic background does not dictate what areas are safe and what areas are not. For example, the history of civil wars, brother against brother, demonstrate the frequent irrelevance of ethnicity to safety. That is, ethnicity and safety do not relate. This maxim violation results in an implicature that areas dominated by individuals of color pose a threat to whites. The resulting xenophobic message is that whites should fear people of color. This implicature may reveal Grover's underlying xenophobic attitudes.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study show how three Guns & Ammo writers violate maxims and create implicature. In so doing, they strengthen their message to validate their claims and persuade their audience. Heston, Grover and Klein's maxim violations create implicatures that reveal an aggressive style in written communication.

Heston, Grover and Klein's writings exhibit combative language and tone. Similar to Chen's conclusions regarding Juror Three in Twelve Angry Men, this analysis found that approximately 20 of the contributors to Guns & Ammo, including Heston, Grover and Klein, exhibit the communicative traits of intolerance, rudeness and anger directed toward individuals or groups with opposing opinions. These three contributors' writings violate the speech maxims and create implicatures to intimidate, manipulate and convince their audience that gun regulation will eventually diminish most Constitutional rights. Smith found that weight-loss advertisers use implicature to obscure their claims. In contrast, Heston and Klein openly declare their opposition to firearm regulation. Grover argues that we live in a dangerous world. All three often

cloud their claims with untruthfulness, needless value words, omissions, contradictions and unrelated information. These contributors attempt to persuade their audience into accepting their arguments and employ implicature to suggest that supporting gun control is tantamount to treason. Several psycholinguistic studies conducted by Deborah A. Kashy and Bella M. DePaulo, Robert M. Krauss & Susan R. Fussell, R. Christie, F.L. Geis & T. Falbo, Kari Edwards & Edward E. Smith, J. Howard, & M. Rothbart, T. Pyszczynski & J. Greenberg, H. Tajfel & J. C. Turner may shed light on the reasons behind and the effects of Heston, Grover and Klein's aggressive tendencies in written communication.

Heston, Grover and Klein share the common expectation that their audience agrees with their belief that gun regulation is unconstitutional. To add strength to their argument regarding the dangers of gun control they frequently violate the speech maxims creating implicatures to shed an attractive light on themselves and disparage gun control proponents. Similar to Grice's Cooperative Principle of discourse, Krauss and Fussell found that "Much social behavior is predicated upon assumptions an actor makes about the knowledge, beliefs, and motives of others" (Krauss & Fussell 2), and that communication is

created for a particular audience for it to be understood (2). Heston, Grover and Klein's claims are directed at the gun owning audience, and they may anticipate that their arguments will instill a fear for their Constitutional rights in that audience.

Quality Maxim Violations

The frequency of Heston, Grover and Klein's maxim violations may reveal their aggressive tendencies in written communication when opposed. Table 1 shows that the authors violate the Quality (truthfulness) and Quantity (too little or too much information) maxims with more frequency than the Manner and Relation maxims. Grice did not delve into personality and implicature, but Kashy and DePaulo conducted a study titled "Who Lies" to discover 1) Who frequently lied? 2) Why did they lie? 3) Did they differ from those who seldom lied? 4) If there is a mendacious personality type? (Kashy and DePaulo 1037).

They found:

People who told more lies were more manipulative, more concerned with self-presentation, and more sociable. People who told fewer lies were more highly socialized and

reported higher quality same-sex relationships.

(1037)

Additionally, they found that those who infrequently lie did so out of the need for politeness and that responsible individuals were less likely to lie (Kashy and Depaulo 1050). They support their conclusion with Christie, Geis and Falbo's findings that liars, "...will lie, cheat, and manipulate others to get what they want" (qtd. in Kashy & De Paulo 1038). Two linguistic studies, by Chen and Smith, came to like conclusions that individuals who often violate maxims do so for self-serving purposes. The number of Quality maxim violations in this small sample might suggest that Heston, Grover and Klein's writings distort facts. These distortions create implicatures that attempt to embed fear of gun control into their audience and may manipulate that audience into believing that they might lose the "Right to Bear Arms" (qtd. in Baldwin and Kelley Survey 487). Their use of destructive value words to belittle their opponents are untruthful, revealing that they will resort to writings that denigrate their opponents. These men exhibit hostile tendencies in communication when challenged in order to achieve their goal of maintaining the unrestricted right to own and shoot firearms.

Quantity Maxim Violations

Heston, Grover and Klein frequently break the Quantity maxim by employing unessential value words to invoke distrust for the United States and gun control in the audience. These violations suggest that gun-regulation may threaten their prior beliefs and thus, their self-esteem. For example, these writers utilize alarming words (e.g., predators, prey, tyranny, jackals) to strengthen the hostile tone of their texts and imply that if you do not own a firearm, you will become the prey of predators and a tyrannical government. Individuals generally do not resort to negative metaphors, similes and adjectives to describe individuals they admire and respect. This implicature may reveal that the writers' feel threatened and resort to aggressive writing to protect themselves from the threat of gun regulation.

Heston's, Grover's and Klein's use of unnecessary destructive and positive language, a Quantity maxim violation may be related to the fact that their writings revolve around social issues, issues that they feel so strongly about that they utilize unnecessary language to denigrate the character of their opponents. Krauss and Fussell's analysis "Perspective-Taking in Communication; Representation of Others' Knowledge in Reference" found

that social messages tended to be twice as long as nonsocial messages (6). Krauss and Fussell's research may partially explain why Heston's, Grover's and Klein's writings employ excessive language in their writings.

Heston's, Grover's and Klein's texts exhibit negative attitudes toward the "out-group" of gun control proponents. That is, Heston, Grover and Klein use the language of gun enthusiasts to portray them as patriotic and defame their opposition. Consequently, they frequently violate the Quantity maxims. For example, Heston describes tobacco/gun control attorneys as ambulance chasing. Both of which violate the Quality and Quantity maxims. Grover explains that your ethnicity and location determine your safety. In other words, Grover considers certain ethnic groups as the out-group and a possible threat to his group's safety. He fails to name the out-groups or their locations, a violation of the Quantity maxim. Klein's arguments regarding unconstitutional taxes, state militias and gun control implies that the government of the United States is illegal. Consequently, he violates the Quality maxim with distortion and Quantity maxim with excessive language. Anne Maass, Angela Milesi, Silvia Zabbini, and Dagmar Stahlberg's research "Linguistic Intergroup Bias: Differential Expectancies or In-Group Protection?" found

that language may maintain a group's belief system. Their study incorporated H. Tajfel and J.C. Turner's social identity theory. This theory revolves around the idea that intergroups tend to characterize its members in a positive light while denigrating the outgroup. The analysis found that "...competing social groups share stereotypic beliefs" (qtd. in Maass 117). Specifically, Maass found that the competing groups of hunters and environmentalists could not find "...a single positive quality in the opposing group" (Maass 118). Similarly, Howard and Rothbart found that individuals expect favorable conduct from their group and negative behavior from the outgroup (qtd. in Maass 117). This study may shed light on Heston's, Grover's and Klein's unnecessary language that violate the Quantity maxims and resulting implicatures.

Grover may believe that people of color or ethnic background, the out-group, pose a threat to whites. His violations of the Quantity maxim might possibly reveal a vigilant individual who obscures reality in a smokescreen of unnecessary language while omitting important facts. Thus, his words create implicatures that may terrorize his armed audience. Kari Edwards and Edward Smith's study, "A Disconfirmation Bias in the Evaluation of Arguments" discuss behavior when prior beliefs are challenged.

Edwards and Smith found "...that individuals are motivated to defend their beliefs, not why they are [...] Thus, when one looks at the details or search for disconfirming evidence, irrationalities begin to surface" (19-22).

Grover may be exhibiting some irrationalities through his word choice of predators, prey.

The Constitution represents one facet of Heston and Klein's prior beliefs and may consider gun regulation as a personal threat. In response to this danger they violate the maxims creating implicatures that they hope will render gun-regulation impotent. Five of the texts analyzed violate the Quantity maxim with destructive value words and often create implications that denigrate the character of people whom they feel threatened by. Edwards and Smith's analysis incorporated Pyszczynski and Greenberg conclusion that:

When an event is ego relevant, consideration of an undesirable hypothesis [...] which in turn motivates the person to process information in such a way as to provide evidence for a more palatable alternative hypothesis, (qtd. in Edwards and Smith 21)

Heston and Klein appear to have come to the less damaging conclusion that gun-control is unconstitutional and that its advocates are unpatriotic.

Manner Maxim Violations

Although the Manner maxim violations occur only five times in these six texts, they nonetheless had important effects. Heston never violates this maxim. Why did Grover and Klein violate the Manner maxim? This research suggests that Grover's perception of a hostile world and possible xenophobia do not reflect clarity of thought. Similarly, Klein's strong emotions regarding the Second Amendment rights may impair his logic. That is, he never really gives careful consideration to the arguments for gun control. Klein encounters difficulty in clearly formulating his claim and, instead of "ducking the topic," as is often the case with Manner maxim violations, he blurs the issue with unclear legal language.

Relation Maxim Violations

This analysis found that much of the information in these Guns & Ammo articles attempts to relate gun-regulation to hazardous creatures, areas or unpatriotic behavior. Thus, they often make these irrelevant comparisons appear related to their arguments.

A 1982 study conducted by Norbert Schwartz, Fritz Strack, Denis Hilton and Gabi Naderer, "Base Rates, Representativeness, and the Logic of Conversation: The Contextual Relevance of 'Irrelevant' Information," found that in communication the audience often will incorporate irrelevant discourse information as relative information. They found that the audience often inferred the speaker's intent instead of what was actually spoken. In other words, in a social context they heard what they thought the speaker wanted them to hear instead of what was actually said. Thus, Heston, Grover and Klein's use of irrelevant words may be deemed relevant by Guns & Ammo's audience.

Comments

A final word regarding the speech maxims, implicature, and the firearms issue. Considering the change in the language of this magazine from 1962 to 1999, the Second Amendment rights issue has become severe. In 1962 the rhetoric in Guns & Ammo seldom violates the speech maxims, a sharp contrast to 1999. This study found that the contributors often violate the maxims to create positive implicature regarding gun enthusiasts and

destructive implicature regarding gun regulation. These implicatures reveal that they feel threatened.

In contrast, I have never owned a firearm in spite of the fact that I have twice been threatened with a handgun. Additionally, I have only come into contact with firearm enthusiasts in the last eleven years. This study stemmed from my desire to better understand them through language. The firearm enthusiasts I have come into contact with are conservative and quiet. They seldom indulge in destructive language and generally "opt out" of conversations that run contrary to their beliefs. In other words they, "Walk Softly, But Carry" (Berry). The divisive issue of gun control has major societal repercussions which partially explains Heston, Grover and Klein's excessive use of positive and negative words. Many believe that there is a very real conflict between the issues of safety and freedom. For example, with respect to safety, 30,000 die each year by firearms, making them the second leading cause of death in the United States. For every person that kills another in self-defense, there is one accidental death, five murders and thirty-seven suicides by firearms. It is twelve times more often that a friend or family member will be shot and killed than an intruder (Addressing Violence In Oklahoma 1). Nearly 800

individuals die annually as a result of a child shooting a gun. The approximate cost for firearm related injuries in 1995 was \$4 billion. Eighty percent of these expenses rest on the taxpayer's shoulders (State Action 1). The number of incidents of children and their friends that have been accidentally killed or maimed by firearms grows because precautions are not taken by many gun owners. Sometimes, firearms of inferior quality misfire resulting in the killing or maiming the shooter. Regulation in the form of background checks and instruction in the use and storage of firearms may diminish some of the anguish, something that most of my gun enthusiast acquaintances do not oppose.

In contrast to the safety arguments regarding guns. Second Amendment rights advocates voice concerns regarding freedom. At times, these concerns become violent. Heston, Grover and Klein's language may fuel fear in their audience. In light of Tim McVeigh's execution for implementing what he considered a justifiable war against the United States infringement on his Constitutional rights, Heston's, Grover's and Klein's language may be irresponsible. Guns & Ammo's 1999 content demonstrates that only 20 of the contributors exhibit extreme language use which leads me to believe that this is a limited, but

significant number of citizens. Guns & Ammo's circulation of 429,225 in the U.S. and 1,916 in Canada reveals only a fraction of the numbers. There are many other firearm publications such as HUNTING, GUNS & GEAR, GUNS, HANDGUNS, SHOOT and numerous firearm owners that do not subscribe to any firearm publications. These are citizens who claim they are entitled to their rights guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States which declares that:

A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed. (qtd. in Baldwin and Kelley Survey 487)

To infringe means to "break, impair, violate [...] fail to observe the terms of" (The American Heritage Dictionary 750). To regulate is to "control, direct, or govern according to rule [...] to adjust to a particular standard [...] to make uniform, methodical, orderly, etc." (1225). I believe this is where the Second Amendment advocates misinterpret the law. To regulate does not prohibit citizens from owning and shooting firearms; rather it adjusts this right to present day society in the form of training in safety and background checks to somewhat increase security in our society.

WORKS CITED

Addressing Violence In Oklahoma. 20 May 2001 .

<[http://www.health.state.ok.us/program/injury/violence/
firearmv.html](http://www.health.state.ok.us/program/injury/violence/firearmv.html)>.

Anderson, K.B. Letter. "Keep and Bear Arms" Guns & Ammo
Jan. 1970 : 10.

Baldwin, Leiland D., and Robert Kelley. Survey of American
History. 2nd. ed. New York: American Book Company,
1967.

Barlow, Roger. "Varmint Guns Are Single Shots!" Guns &
Ammo June 1962: 18-23.

Berry, Steve. "Walk Softly, but Carry" Los Angeles Times
Magazine. 18 Nov. 2001.

Chen, Rong. "Conversational Implicature and
Characterization in Reginald Rose's Twelve Angry
Men." San Bernardino: n.p. n.d.: 31-47.

Chernoff, Arnold. "Those Yankee Pepperboxes" Guns & Ammo
June 1962: 34-37.

"Commoner." Def. The American Heritage Dictionary of the
English Language. New College Edition. 1976.

Crane, Philip M. Letter. "Set the Record Straight." Guns &
Ammo Jan. 1980: 8.

Encyclopedia of World Problems and Human Potential. Human

Values Project. 28 Aug. 2000

<<http://www.uia.org/values/vztabl2.htm>>.

Edwards, Kari. Edward E. Smith. "A Disconfirmation Bias in the Evaluation of Arguments." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 71:1 (1996) : 5-24.

Gampetro, Jim. Letter. Guns & Ammo December 1998: 7.

Gauker, Christopher. "Grice, Herbert Paul" Dictionary of Philosophy of Mind. 16 Aug. 2001

<<http://www.artsci.wustl.edu/~philos/MindDict/grice.html>>.

Grice, H.Paul. Studies in the Way of Words. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP. 1989.

Grover, Jim. "Personal Security: The Biggest Steal." Guns & Ammo Jan. 1999: 12.

Grover, Jim. "Personal Security: Hot Spot Hubris." Guns & Ammo April 1999: 10.

Hargrove, Alien. "How the Press Can 'Lie' About Guns:

'Erroneous Conclusions of Unqualified "Experts" Are Quoted As News, but Accepted As Fact.'" Guns & Ammo Jan. 1970: 24-25.

Heston, Charlton. "From the Capitol: The Cost of Freedom--
and the Price of Silence: Defending the Second
Amendment Is Tantamount to Swimming in a
Shark-Infested Pool-It's Not for the Faint of Heart."
Guns & Ammo Jan. 1999: 34.

--. "From the Capitol: Lawsuits Against Liberty: How
Tobacco-Settlement Attorneys Threaten to Bankrupt the
American Gun Industry." Guns & Ammo June 1999: 39-40.

--. "From the Capitol: Lies, Damn Lies and Statistics: How
Media Polls Misrepresent Public Opinion and Pervert
National Debate." Guns & Ammo June 1999: 45-46.

Home, E.W. Letter. "The Clarity of the Constitution" Guns
& Ammo Jan. 1970: 10.

"Infringe." Def. The American Heritage Dictionary of the
English Language. New College Edition. 1976.

Kashy, Deborah A. Bella M. DePaulo. "Who Lies?" Journal of
Personality and Social Psychology 70:5 (1996):
1037-51.

Keith, Elmer. "Gunnotes." Guns & Ammo June 1962:14-16.

Klein, Chuck, "Second Amendment: Fight for Your Firearms
Freedom! The Other Right to Keep and Bear Arms: Use
the Ninth Amendment to Save the Second." Guns & Ammo
Dec. 1999: 20-23.

Krauss, Robert M. and Susan R. Fussell.

"Perspective-Taking in Communication: Representation of Others' Knowledge in Reference." Social Cognition. 9:1 (1991) 2-24.

Laska, Paul R. Letter. "The Gun Jerk" Guns & Ammo Jan. 1970: 10.

Maass, Anne, Angela Milesi, and Silvia Zabbini; Dagmar Stahlberg. "Linguistic Intergroup Bias: Differential Expectancies or In-Group Protection?" Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 68 : 1 (1995): 116-26.

Neal, Bob. "Washington Report: Buying a New Gun? It Isn't Tough Yet.....but It Could Be!" Guns & Ammo Jan. 1970: 8-9.

Oliver, James. "Washington Report." Guns & Ammo Jan. 1980: 6+.

Osborn, Don. "Pinwheels and Flyers" Editorial. Guns & Ammo June 1962: 8.

Ray, Richard J.M. Letter. Guns & Ammo June 1962: 6. San Diego County Gun Rights Committee v. Janet Reno. 98f.3D 1121 CA Ninth Cir. 1996. Rpt. in Guns & Ammo Dec. 1999: 22.

"Regulate." Def. The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. New College Edition. 1976.

Rustad, Jerry. Pinwheels and Flyers" Letter. Guns & Ammo
June 1962: 8.

Schafer, John D. Letter. "Don't Blame Bureaucrats!" Guns &
Ammo Jan. 1980: 8.

"Schizophrenia." Def. The American Heritage Dictionary of
the English Language. New College Edition. 1976.

Schwarz, Norbert, Fritz Strack, Denis Hilton, Gabi
Naderer. "Base Rates, Representativeness, and the
Logic of Conversation: The Contextual Relevance of
"Irrelevant" Information." Social Cognition. 9:1
(1991) : 67-84.

"Shrewd." Def. The American Heritage Dictionary of the
English Language. New College Edition. 1976.

Smith, Karen A. Dancing on the Edge of Truth: A Study of
Weight-loss Advertising and Implication. Thesis.
California State U San Bernardino, 1977.

State Action Women & A Challenge to Secure America's
Economic Future. Solutions for the New Economy:
Building Blocks for a Strong and Healthy Economy,
Families and Communities. Preventing Gun Violence.
<[http://www.stateaction.org/programs/women/challenge2000/
report/gunviolence.cfm](http://www.stateaction.org/programs/women/challenge2000/report/gunviolence.cfm)>.

Stover, Leon. Robert A. Heinlein. Boston: Twayne
Publishers, 1987.

Studies in Machiavellianism. Ed. R. Christie and F.L.

Geis. New York: AP, 1970. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 70:5 (1996): 1038.

"Tyrannical." Def. The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. New College Edition. 1976.