

Types of Implicature in Piers Morgan vs Bassem Youssef on Palestine Treatment

Baiq Nurul Asikin¹, Abdul Muhid², Wiya Suktiningsih³, Titik Ceriyani Miswaty⁴, Agus Syahid⁵

^{1,2,3,4,5} Universitas Bumigora

Corresponding Author:

Baiq Nurul Asikin^{1*}

¹2004020005@universitasbumigora.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines the use of implicature in an interview between Piers Morgan and Bassem Youssef discussing the Israel-Hamas conflict. It is based on the theory of implicature by H.P. Grice, which explains how speakers convey meanings beyond what is explicitly stated. The analysis focuses on conventional and non-conventional implicatures in their dialogue, demonstrating how Grice's theory can be applied to understanding indirect communication in political discourse. By analyzing the use of irony, sarcasm, and other conversational strategies, this study offers insight into how these language techniques influence audience interpretation of sensitive issues. The method used in this research is qualitative. The data is taken from a YouTube interview titled "Israel-Hamas War: Piers Morgan vs Bassem Youssef Regarding the Treatment of Palestine." The findings emphasize the importance of pragmatics in understanding how public figures communicate complex topics and shape public opinion.

Keywords: *pragmatic, Grice theory, implicature, conventional implicature, non-conventional implicature*

Introduction

Implicature refers to additional meaning conveyed by the speaker that can be understood by the listener even though it is not stated explicitly. In pragmatics, implicature plays an important role in helping us understand how meaning is interpreted in a broader conversational context. It allows communication to be more complex and layered, where messages are not always direct but implied, depending on the context and the listener's interpretation. Grice in Lalić (2020) introduced this concept through his theory of cooperation, explaining that speakers and listeners work together in conversation to convey and understand intended meaning. Levinson (1983) emphasized the significance of implicature in interpreting everyday speech, while Yule (1996) stated that implicature makes communication more efficient by expressing more than what is literally said. This research aims to analyze both conventional and non-conventional implicatures in the interview between British journalist Piers Morgan and Egyptian comedian Bassem Youssef, especially when discussing sensitive issues such as the Israel-Hamas war and the treatment of Palestinians.

This interview is interesting because both figures come from different backgrounds and use different communication styles. Piers Morgan is known for his firm and direct

journalistic approach, while Bassem Youssef often uses satire, irony, and humor to deliver his criticism. Their conversation touches on sensitive political issues and has sparked a range of public reactions. Many of the statements in the interview can be interpreted both explicitly and implicitly. These different communication styles provide space for pragmatic analysis, especially in understanding how implicatures affect the way messages are delivered and received. While previous studies have discussed implicature theory, most have focused on basic theory or its use in literature and everyday conversations. There is still very limited research on implicatures in interviews that involve political tension and humor, like this one. Therefore, this study seeks to fill that gap by presenting a concrete analysis of the interview, particularly identifying types of implicature and their impact on speaker-to-speaker communication.

Previous studies offer a strong theoretical foundation for this research. Crystal in Iswara (2019) defined pragmatics as the study of factors that influence language choice in social interaction. Levinson (1983) viewed pragmatics from a functional perspective, linking linguistic structure with non-linguistic influences. Leech (1983) emphasized the importance of situation in understanding the meaning of speech. Indonesian scholars such as Wijana (1996) and Subroto in Alfira (2021) also highlighted that pragmatics studies meaning from an external perspective, unlike semantics which focuses on internal meaning. In pragmatics, one of the key focuses is implicature. Grice in Arifianti (2018) states that implicature can be divided into two types, conventional implicature which arises from certain language structures such as the word "and" and non-conventional implicature which depends on context and often appears in the form of irony, sarcasm, or humor. This study uses H.P. Grice's theory as the main analytical framework. His theory explains that communication is not only about what is said, but also about how meaning is interpreted based on social context and the principle of cooperation. By applying Grice's theory to the interview between Piers Morgan and Bassem Youssef, this study offers a pragmatic approach that is not only theoretical but also practical in real-life situations.

The research questions of this study are how the conventional and non-conventional implicatures found in this study are explained. The objectives of this study are to identify and classify the implicatures used by both figures, to analyze the function of implicatures in shaping political meaning, to explore how communication strategies differ between a journalist and a comedian when delivering political criticism, and to provide empirical contribution to the application of Grice's theory in political and media discourse. The novelty of this research lies in the application of Grice's implicature theory to a political interview that is rich in humor, satire, and ideological tension. This study combines pragmatic theory with media discourse analysis, which is still rarely done, especially in the context of the Israel-Hamas conflict and the treatment of Palestinians. By using a relevant and current case study, this research not only expands the scope of Grice's theory but also provides deeper insight into how communication shapes public opinion on complex global issues.

Method

This research uses a Qualitative Method. Denzin (2023) explain that qualitative method is directly involved in the social context being studied to understand the meaning behind the participants behavior or speech. This study aims to analyze conventional and non-conventional implicatures in an interview between Piers Morgan and Bassem Youssef regarding the Israel-Hamas conflict using Grice's theory. The research data is in the form of an interview transcript from a YouTube video entitled ["Israel-Hamas War: Piers Morgan vs Bassem Youssef Regarding the Treatment of Palestine | Complete Interview"](#)

uploaded on October 18, 2023 (Piers Morgan Uncensored, 2023). The data source was obtained directly from the YouTube channel through the video along with metadata such as the number of views, likes, and comments. Data collection techniques were carried out through determining the objectives and criteria for selecting videos, searching and identifying relevant content, extracting transcripts, and analyzing verbal and nonverbal content with the help of digital tools. Data analysis techniques include coding, categorizing implicatures, analyzing discourse contexts, applying Grice's principles, identifying additional meanings, validating through triangulation and expert discussions, and compiling results in the form of scientific reports. This method ensures that the research captures a comprehensive understanding of the communicative strategies used by the participants in the context of the interview, as emphasized by (Creswell, 2015).

Results

Conventional Implicature and Non-Conventional Implicature

Table 1. Conventional and Non-conventional Implicature

No.	Conversation	Identification
1.	<i>B.Y: "Amazing. So let's, I mean, I mean, I would say I would say I really applaud Israel for doing one thing that no military force in the world does because I heard I heard Ben Shapiro and I heard Ron de Santis and they said they said Israel is the only military force in the world that warned civilians before bombing them. I mean, how FUCKING cute. That is so nice of them. Because with this logic, if a Russian troops started warning Ukrainians before bombing their houses. We're cool with Putin, right? I mean, okay habibi. You have warned them. Go invade. It's fine. You have done your job. I mean, The thing is, and I understand all. And I also heard Ben Shapiro talking about about human shield. So you remember my wife's family. They live in Gaza. So I asked her. I told them when Israel give you the nice warning, the cute warning does Hamas force you to stay in your home so you can be bombed and use as human field. You know what it hasn't here? My my wife's voice because he's a loser. You know, he told me, you know, when I asked him, does that happen? He told me. No, the lying SON OF BITCH lied to me. I told him you don't understand. Ben Shapiro and Ron de Santis keep saying that Israel warned you and Hamas asked you to keep to stay put. So I told you he's a loser. He never kept a job. He even like failed in all of the interviews to become like a human shield. I would believe friendship you."</i> Israel-Hamas War: Piers Morgan vs Bassem Youssef On Palestine's Treatment The Full Interview - YouTube	Non-Conventional Implicature
2.	<i>B.Y: "Let say Hamas is removed. Yeah, I I'm agreeing with everything about. You want me to put that hammas? I will condemn Hamas homeless Hassan. Everybody, Let's say, for example, Hamas sees to exist. Okay, do you hear me? Yes. Yeah. hamas sees to exist today. Now, right now in Palestine, in West Bank and and Gaza, 20% of Palestinians go through Israeli prison system, whether imprisonment, whether. Interrogation, whether torture and the rest of them, they live a life of daily loss of land of homes, of life. And they are. They are suffocated by this. So let me ask you something. If you are a Palestinian living into these conditions for decades, would you? Would you sympathize with your oppressor or sympathize with the people who claim they resist them even if they are terrorists?"</i>	Non-Conventional Implicature

3.	<i>B.Y: "I haven't met some Mandela, so I wouldn't know. But like III there is a point. There's a there's a very important point here. You know, I want to understand what is the logic of Israel carpet bombing Gaza. I mean, if there's a logic, if it is a good if this will make Israel safe, I want to hear the logic. So if they continue bombing, what are they hoping to achieve?"</i> Israel-Hamas War: Piers Morgan vs Bassem Youssef On Palestine's Treatment The Full Interview - YouTube	Conventional Implicature
4.	<i>B.Y: "By the way my my my wife's family is is all right and they sent us a house it's it's bombed it's beautiful it's it's going to be a good like Halloween theme."</i> Israel-Hamas War: Piers Morgan vs Bassem Youssef On Palestine's Treatment The Full Interview - YouTube	Non-Conventional Implicature
5.	<i>P.M: "Let me bring Bassem back in. You've been listening to this, Bassett. What's your response to what Jeremy's been saying?"</i> <i>B.Y: "I'm sorry I didn't catch you. Gentlemen's name."</i> <i>P.M: "As Jeremy boring. He's the chief executive of the Daily Wire, co-founder with Ben Shapiro of a daily wire."</i> Israel-Hamas War: Piers Morgan vs Bassem Youssef On Palestine's Treatment The Full Interview - YouTube	Conventional Implicature

Note: P.M as Piers Morgan, and B.Y as Bassem Youssef

Discussion

Data 1 Identified as Non-Conventional Implicature

B.Y: "Amazing. So let's, I mean, I mean, I would say I would say I really applaud Israel for doing one thing that no military force in the world does because I heard I heard Ben Shapiro and I heard Ron de Santis and they said they said Israel is the only military force in the world that warned civilians before bombing them. I mean, how FUCKING cute. That is so nice of them. Because with this logic, if a Russian troops started warning Ukrainians before bombing their houses. We're cool with Putin, right? I mean, okay habibi. You have warned them. Go invade. It's fine. You have done your job. I mean, The thing is, and I understand all. And I also heard Ben Shapiro talking about about human shield. So you remember my wife's family. They live in Gaza. So I asked her. I told them when Israel give you the nice warning, the cute warning does Hamas force you to stay in your home so you can be bombed and use as human field. You know what it hasn't here? My my wife's voice because he's a loser. You know, he told me, you know, when I asked him, does that happen? He told me. No, the lying SON OF BITCH lied to me. I told him you don't understand. Ben Shapiro and Ron de Santis keep saying that Israel warned you and Hamas asked you to keep to stay put. So II told you he's a loser. He never kept a job. He even like failed in all of the interviews to become like a human shield. II would believe friendship you."

Analysis

Sarcasm and Irony: The use of phrases like "how FUCKING cute" and "That is so nice of them" implies sarcasm. The speaker does not genuinely find the warnings admirable but is mocking the idea that these warnings justify the bombings. This is an implicature derived from the tone and context.

Critique of Justification: By comparing Israel's warnings to hypothetical Russian warnings before bombing Ukrainians, the speaker implies that warnings do not make the bombings acceptable. This comparison is meant to critique the justification of military actions based on warnings, which is a conversational implicature.

Disbelief and Dismissal: The speaker expresses disbelief and dismisses the claims that Hamas forces civilians to stay as human shields. The repeated phrases "the lying SON OF BITCH lied to me" and calling the person "a loser" imply strong skepticism and rejection of the narrative promoted by Ben Shapiro and Ron DeSantis. This skepticism is a conversational implicature, inferred from the context and the speaker's tone.

Critique of the Narrative: By recounting their wife's family's experience and juxtaposing it with the narrative of human shields, the speaker implies that the mainstream narrative is misleading or false. This critique is a non-conventional implicature based on the listener's understanding of the context and the speaker's argument.

Data 2 identified as Non-Conventional Implicature

B.Y: "Let say Hamas is removed. Yeah, I I'm agreeing with everything about. You want me to put that hammas? I will condemn Hamas homeless Hassan. Everybody, Let's say, for example, Hamas sees to exist. Okay, do you hear me? Yes. Yeah. hamas sees to exist today. Now, right now in Palestine, in West Bank and and Gaza, 20% of Palestinians go through Israeli prison system, whether imprisonment, whether. Interrogation, whether torture and the rest of them, they live a life of daily loss of land of homes, of life. And they are. They are suffocated by this. So let me ask you something. If you are a Palestinian living into these conditions for decades, would you? Would you sympathize with your oppressor or sympathize with the people who claim they resist them even if they are terrorists?"

Analysis

Questioning Effectiveness of Removing Hamas: By suggesting that even without Hamas, Palestinians would still face severe hardships, the speaker implies that the removal of Hamas alone would not resolve the underlying issues.

Critique of Israeli Policies: The mention of the high percentage of Palestinians going through the Israeli prison system and the loss of land and homes implies a critique of Israeli policies and their impact on Palestinian lives.

Empathy for Palestinian Perspective: The rhetorical question at the end implies that, given the described conditions, it is understandable why Palestinians might sympathize with groups that claim to resist their oppressors, even if those groups are labeled as terrorists.

Condemnation of Simplistic Solutions: The overall tone and content suggest that simplistic solutions like merely removing Hamas do not address the broader, systemic issues faced by Palestinians.

Data 3 identified as Conventional Implicature

B.Y: "I haven't met some Mandela, so I wouldn't know. But like III there is a point. There's a there's a very important point here. You know, I want to understand what is the logic of Israel carpet bombing Gaza. I mean, if there's a logic, if it is a good if this will make Israel safe, I want to hear the logic. So if they continue bombing, what are they hoping to achieve?"

Analysis

Literal Meaning: Bassem Yousseff has not met Nelson Mandela. He's also acknowledges the importance of understanding the rationale behind Israel's actions in Gaza. And Bassem also questions the logic and effectiveness of Israel's bombing of Gaza in terms of achieving safety.

Data 4 identified as Non-Conventional Implicature

B.Y: "By the way my my my wife's family is is all right and they sent us a house it's it's bombed it's beautiful it's it's going to be a good like Halloween theme."

Analysis

Irony or Dark Humor: The mention that the bombed house is "beautiful" and could be a good Halloween theme introduces a potential non-conventional implicature. It may imply a dark humor or irony in the face of a tragic event, where the speaker is finding a strange positive or humorous angle in an otherwise grim situation.

Data 5 Identified as Conventional Implicature

P.M: "Let me bring Bassem back in. You've been listening to this, Bassett. What's your response to what Jeremy's been saying?"

B.Y: "I'm sorry I didn't catch you. Gentlemen's name.

P.M: "As Jeremy boring. He's the chief executive of the Daily Wire, co-founder with Ben Shapiro of a daily wire."

Analysis

Identifying Jeremy Boring: "He's the chief executive of the Daily Wire, co-founder with Ben Shapiro of the Daily Wire." This statement is conventional as it provides factual information about Jeremy Boring's identity and his role in relation to the Daily Wire, a straightforward and informative detail for the audience.

Conclusion

This study shows how Bassem Youssef uses implicature, especially non-conventional implicature, to indirectly share his political views during his interview with Piers Morgan. By applying Grice's theory, the analysis reveals how techniques like irony and sarcasm communicate deeper meanings beyond what is directly said. This highlights the importance of pragmatics, particularly implicature, in shaping how sensitive issues are discussed in public.

However, this study has limitations, such as focusing on just one interview and not including non-verbal cues or how the audience interprets the conversation. For future research, it would be useful to analyze more interviews and include non-verbal communication like gestures and tone of voice. Studying how different audiences understand implicatures could also offer valuable insights into how these language strategies influence public opinion.

References

- Alfira, N. (2021). *Definition of Pragmatics*. 1–13.
- Arifianti, I. (2018). Implikatur Konvensional dan Non Konvensional Tuturan Pengunjung Kawasan Lawang Sewu Semarang Jawa Tengah. *Jurnal Pena*, 32(1), 44–52.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S., Giardina, M. D., & Cannella, G. S. (2023). The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research. *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 0, 1–27.
- Iswara, J. W. (2019). The Applications of Adjacency Pair Patterns and Communicative Functions in Spoken Interaction of Roundtable Discussion With Susi Pudjiastuti at Stimson Center. *Universitas Negri Semarang*.
- Lalić, E. L. (2020). *Grice's Theory of Implicature*. 1–22.
<https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:186:320523>
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*.

- Piers Morgan Uncensored. (2023). *Israel-Hamas War: Piers Morgan vs Bassem Youssef On Palestine's Treatment / The Full Interview*. Youtube.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4idQbwsvtUo&t=482s>
- Pipit Mulyah, Dyah Aminatun, Sukma Septian Nasution, Tommy Hastomo, Setiana Sri Wahyuni Sitepu, T. (2021). *Buku Ajar Pragmatik (Kajian Teoritis dan Pragmatok)*. 0(0), 1–145.
- Yule, G. (1996). *[George_Yule]_Pragmatics(BookFi).pdf*. 138.