

Critical Discourse Analysis of Two Political Speeches in Light of Bakhtin's Dialogism

Farzad Salahshoor*

Dept. of English, Azarbaijan Shahid Madani University, Tabriz, Iran

Bahram Behin†

Dept. of English, Azarbaijan Shahid Madani University, Tabriz, Iran

Hamideh Baggali‡*

MA in Applied Linguistics

Abstract

Bakhtin's dialogism respects differences and appreciates dialogue. Different fields of the humanities are increasingly apprehending dialogism; few studies, however, have applied it in the realm of critical discourse analysis. Respecting different human voices stands as a fundamental similarity between dialogism and critical discourse analysis presupposed by this research. Thus, embracing dialogism in the given field, this research analyzed Martin Luther King's *I Have a Dream* and Malcolm X's *The Ballot or the Bullet*, as two leading political speeches in the history, exploiting two master concepts of dialogism, self and other, in line with utterance, polyphony, centripetal or centrifugal forces and architectonics. The analysis revealed the explored political utterances were the locus of struggle between centrifugal and centripetal forces through which self-other architectonics in *The Ballot or the Bullet* appeared primarily in the form of binary opposition and relative dominance of a single voice; in contrast, the architectonics in *I Have a Dream* showed various examples of polyphony and reconciliation of the voices. The domina-

* E-Mail: farzad.salahshoor@gmail.com

† E-Mail: bahram.behin@gmail.com

‡ E-Mail: baggali_h@yahoo.com; *corresponding author

tion of a single voice in the former and plurality of the voices in the latter yielded the speech utterances respectively as the monologic and dialogic utterances where covert maintenance of power in monologism, in contrast to dialogism, can serve the aim of critical discourse analysis to study the relation between discourse and power.

Keywords: Bakhtin's dialogism; Critical discourse analysis; *The Ballot or the Bullet*; *I Have a Dream*

1. Introduction

Bakhtin's dialogism valorizing human individuality inherent with plurality has been increasingly found worth contemplating in various fields of the human sciences. The following section is an attempt to introduce Bakhtin's dialogism, its key concepts and a literature upon. It will be followed by clarification of the underlying similarity between dialogism and critical discourse analysis, and the statement of research objectives.

1.1. Bakhtin's Dialogism

Mikhail M. Bakhtin (1895-1975) has been posthumously enhancing his worldwide reputation for his epistemological stance (Holquist, 1990) towards a dialogic interpretation of the whole event of existence, which is called **dialogism**. Bakhtin (1984) believes that "life by its very nature is dialogic. To live means to participate in dialogue" (p. 293).

Elaborated meticulously by Holquist, Bakhtin proposes every self in the world of creation acts in an everlasting dialogue with others. Every human is a "unique and unified event of being" (1990, p. 24); that is, s/he is unique since her/his life with all its particular features has been exclusively bestowed to her/him, and unified since the mentioned existence is impossible without other humans and creatures. This tie is more highlighted when a human endeavors to understand the (a) truth. Say, when each human is given a limited existence in time and place, s/he can see a single aspect of an issue, which is named "surplus of seeing" (p. 36). Consequently, expanding the horizon of seeing for making a whole demands a dialogic relation where the surpluses of seeing are shared.

As a counterpart of dialogism, Bakhtin objects **monologism** that impels a person to assume a right to say the ultimate word from a personalized point of view. Bakhtin (1984) says, "Monologism, at its extreme, denies the existence outside itself of another consciousness with equal rights and equal responsibilities, another *I* with equal rights" (p. 292). In contrast to mono-self, **self** and **other** stand as two protagonists of Bakhtin's drama of dialogic philosophy. In the communication of self and other, dialogism celebrates the dif-

ferences of perspectives since by "occupying a unique position in time/place, each [*self* and *other*] sees what the other cannot see" (Good, 2001, p. 60).

To emphasize the value of communication in a dialogic relation between self and other, Bakhtin (1986) introduces the concept of **utterance**, which he chooses to see as the unit of language analysis. It can vary from "a short (single-word) rejoinder in everyday dialogue to the large novel or scientific treatise" (p. 71). Bakhtin argues that a dialogic utterance can be realized via a multi-vocal communication between self and other. He refers to this multi-vocal communication as **Polyphony**, which means "*a plurality of consciousnesses, with equal rights and each with its own world*" (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 6). Polyphony is one of dialogic principles whereby each voice in an utterance can realize its perspective and independence. These differences of perspectives are not only tolerated but also celebrated based on what Ahmad (2009, p.42) calls "dialogical civility".

A dialogic relation internalizes **centripetal** and **centrifugal** forces. A centripetal force is any tendency towards centralization, formalization and normalization; on the contrary, a centrifugal force is any tendency to invention, innovation and expansion. Bakhtin (1981) argues that "every concrete utterance of a speaking subject serves as a point where centrifugal as well as centripetal forces are brought to bear" (p. 272). These two forces can be verbal and ideological; that is, in any language established rules stand as centripetal forces and the individualistic preferences as centrifugal ones. In the same manner, an established authorized ideology, as a centripetal force, tries to drive its dominance through times while a centrifugal force struggles to detach from the focal point via questioning or opposing tendencies. If these opposing forces can negotiate an issue to achieve either an agreement or a peaceful coexistence of the differences, they can be perceived to be in dialogic relationship.

The above componential concepts can locate a whole under the term of **architectonics**. It is one of the central concepts in Bakhtin's analyses, which relates to the combination of different parts to make a whole. According to Bakhtin (1986), every entity is an architectonic whole composed of the unique and unified interrelation of its individual members. Accordingly, the interconnected self-other relations in an utterance compose the architectonics of that utterance. It is "a matter of constructing relationships" (Green, 2003, p.412) or "the activity of forming connections between disparate material" (Clark & Holquist, 1984, p. 84) in which different constructing parts determine the wholeness of an entity. It may be worth mentioning that the selection of varying linguistic and structural constituents in an utterance is not a neutral tendency, but it "serves a more comprehensive authorial intention"

(Vines, 2007, p. 110). To sum up the above concepts in a sentence, *polyphonic self-other relations between centripetal and centrifugal forces in an utterance can lead to a dialogic architectonics*.

1.2. Bakhtinian Concepts and Human Sciences

Bakhtin's realm of thinking has been interpreted and benefited in a variety of fields such as education, literature, psychology and feminism. In a humanistic outlook to education, dialogic education has been much appreciated. Texts are encouraged to be read and interpreted in light of dialogic relationship with one another (Høines, 2004). The dialogic nature of writing has been the focus of Braz's (2012) work. In literary criticism, Bakhtin's dialogism has been very popular recently. For instance, Kershner (1992) has found a dialogic imagination in James Joyce's works; and Berman (2009) has found it useful for analyzing novels. In psychology, Salgado and Clegg (2011) have discussed the influence of Bakhtin on the field, and Wegerif (2008) has compared Bakhtin's dialogic and Vygotsky's dialectic. Feminist critics advocate Bakhtin's pluralistic views on re-establishment of human interaction from a hierarchical order to a multi-voiced relation. For example, Booth (1982) has discussed the combinations of Bakhtin's theories and feminist criticism, and Eigler (1995) has explored the Bakhtinian concepts of voice and dialogic within the field of feminism.

While Bakhtinian concepts are leading in the stated areas, critical discourse analysis (CDA henceforth) is yet to apprehend Bakhtin's philosophy with hardly any research in this regard.

1.3. Critical Discourse Analysis and Dialogism

Generally speaking, CDA studies how language is used in a society by powerful groups to establish and maintain social, economical and political power by exercising hegemonies on less powerful groups. It is particularly interested in shedding light on the covert (as opposed to overt), unequal inter-relations reflected in and reproduced by verbal discourse (Fowler et al, 1979).

Elsewhere, Fairclough (2010) sets the aim of CDA "to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality... and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony" (pp. 132-3) of powerful groups in a society. Van Dijk (2008), another key figure in CDA prefers a socio-cognitive approach and believes CDA "studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk" (p. 352). Wodak, who favors a socio-historical approach, sees the goal of CDA as "being fundamentally interested in analyzing opaque as well as transparent struc-

tural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language" (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p.10).

The clarified scope of CDA shows that its predominant focus stands on illuminating transparent and obscure relations between discourse and society to enhance awareness about injustice. Given this framework, one may think of Bakhtin's dialogic outlook in opposition with the dialectic concerns of CDA, which is originally founded on Marxist interpretation of Hegel's and Marx's concept of dialectics. This is not the case, however. For instance, we find in Fairclough and Graham's (2002) words a reassurance that dialectic in CDA does not mean biased and unjust omission of the opposite pole, but "a healthy skepticism towards common sense, dogma, and taken-for-grantedness" (p. 198) in an attempt to raise awareness about social injustice and discrimination. From this perspective, it seems that CDA is not in contrast with Bakhtinian dialogism in advocating fair opportunities for all voices in a society to be heard.

Given Bakhtin's dialogic communication and CDA's perspective for a biased-free society, the current paper is a report of an investigation of the dialogic and monologic language uses in two political speeches, namely Martin Luther King's *I Have a Dream* and Malcolm X's *The Ballot or the Bullet*. Thus, the research questions are as followings,

1. How are the self-other architectonics presented in *I Have a Dream* and *The Ballot or the Bullet*?
2. What are the monologic and dialogic tendencies manifested by the textual realizations of the self-other architectonic relations?
3. How can Bakhtinian perspective be insightful in critical discourse analysis of the given utterances?

2.Design

The data in this study comprised transcribed texts of two prominent political speeches entitled *I Have a Dream*¹ and *The Ballot or the Bullet*² during the African American Civil Rights Movement in the United States. *I have a dream* was delivered by Martin Luther King in 1963 in Washington, and *The Ballot or the Bullet* was delivered by Malcolm X in 1964 in Ohio. As for the analytical approach, Bakhtin's dialogism was adopted with three overarching phases. To investigate the self-other architectonics, the two speech utterances were repeatedly explored for the established relations between the speaker as a *self* and the present entities as *others*. The results of the analysis were categorized based on the type of self-other relations under defining subheadings.

To note on the chronological distortion of the reporting, the results of analysis for *The Ballot or the Bullet* was reported prior to that of *I Have a Dream*. The rationale was to serve the aim of juxtaposing CDA and use of Bakhtinian view to reveal and object the practice of various levels of domination by discourse, which revealed to be more dominant in *The Ballot or the Bullet*. Furthermore, *I Have a Dream* as a counterpart of *The Ballot or the Bullet* in approach was followingly represented to highlight the differences between monologic and dialogic approaches.

Following the procedure in the second phase, the categorized self-other relations of the two political speech utterances were respectively discussed by the help of illustrative evidences extracted from architectonics of the utterances. The main foci were on identifying monologic and dialogic tendencies codified in the textual references. Deriving on the analysis, their dominant orientations, i.e. monologic or dialogic, were introduced. The third phase was realized by elaboration of the identified architectonics in Bakhtinian terms of centripetal and centrifugal forces and polyphony. Considering the space limitation, the analysis was reported based on the most illustrative textual examples, and a comprehensive list of the references were categorized and presented in Appendix for any further interest. Finally the significance and implications of the research were expressed in Conclusion.

3. Results of Analysis

3.1. Self-Other Architectonics and Textualization in *The Ballot or the Bullet*

Relying on Bakhtin's concepts, our analysis considered *The Ballot or the Bullet* as an 'utterance', its componential structure as an 'architectonics', and its paramount members as 'self' and 'others'. Blacks and Whites were directly or indirectly addressed through a non-immediate responsive dialogue in this speech utterance. Close inspection of this utterance yielded a dichotomous self-other architectonics, namely *self (X) and Blacks* and *self (X) and Whites* illustrated in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1

Self- Other Architectonics between X, Blacks and Whites in The Ballot or the Bullet

Black Others	Self	White Others
Blacks in General	X	Whites in General
Audience	X	White Government and the Leaders
Black Community	X	White Community
Black Nationalism	X	White Nationalism
Black Leaders	X	America
Uncle Tom	X	Uncle Sam

The evident categorized relations in self-other architectonics of *The Ballot or the Bullet* can approve Bakhtin's view that every utterance is a dialogue in essence. Addressing others, namely Blacks, Whites, leaders or communities, establishes a dialogue with them showing happiness, sadness, approval, disapproval or humiliation; however, the nature of the identified relations and their dialogic or monologic orientation depend on the characteristics of the textual references and codifications.

Bakhtin (1986) argues that any kind of language use is "within the boundaries of a specific authorial intent" (p.77), which can be a gateway towards an author's conscious or unconscious intention or reasoning. What this means in essence is that any particular choice of textualization of a dialogue, amongst indefinite number of other possibilities is neither accidental nor neutral. Thus, the textualization and codification of the relations between X (self) and others (Blacks and Whites) can be an inferential pathway towards the discourse orientation of the uttered speech, explored upon the premise of Bakhtin's dialogic and monologic illuminations in the following analyses (see appendix for a detailed categorization).

3.1.1. Blacks-X-Whites

Blacks were addressed by some phrases like *brothers and sisters, our people, our African brothers and sisters* and *our African brothers* in examples like,

You can see brothers and sisters this afternoon.

Know how our African brothers and sisters feel toward us.

The use of such kinship phrases connotes the speaker's (self's) intention to show his tie with the people of his race, which is directly articulated in,

We are one; we are the same.

This type of addressing appears in accordance with the aim of the speech utterance, which is addressing a shared problem of Blacks. However, a closer analysis revealed some sort of distortion of the tie between the self, X, and his audience, Blacks, by various monologic and authoritative utterances such as,

If you are black you should be thinking black ...

I'm sorry for you.

You Blacks could have been replaced by *we Blacks*, which carries a dialogically unifying overtone. Further analysis revealed stronger evidence for numerous uses of *you* instead of *we*. The statistical analysis of first/second person pronoun showed 19% for *I*, 58% for *you*, 19% for *we* and 5% for *you and I*, as exemplified in the following utterances,

*You're going to do as a sit-in.
I say you have been misled.*

What these utterances display is an over-dominated use of *you* connoting *you* vs. *me*, or *you* vs. *we*, hence evidence for the monologic perspective of the speaker (self). As for *X and Whites*, as the second category of self-other relationship, a more criticizing tone was observed. Apart from relatively neutral references like *white people* and *white men*, there were strongly marked references, e.g. *enemy*, associated with such negative qualities as *trickery*, *lies* and *genocide*,

*We suffer political oppression, economic exploitation, and social degradation - all of them from the same enemy.
You don't have a revolution in which you love your enemy.
Negroes have listened to the trickery, and the lies, and the false promises of the white man now for too long. And they're fed up.
You have to take that government to the World Court and accuse it of genocide.*

Accordingly, labeling some people as *enemy* creates a socio-cognitive line between *friends self* (Blacks), and *enemy other* (whites), an obvious case for Black Nationalism!

3.1.2. Black Community/ Nationalism-X-White Community/ Nationalism

In the *The Ballot or the Bullet* what can be seen further are such collocations as *Black Community*, *Black Nationalism* and *separation*,

*My political, economic, and social philosophy is Black Nationalism.
I think separation would get me freedom.
Gospel is Black Nationalism.*

These texts connoting the impossibility of cooperation with Whites and dictation of separation are further evidence for the lack of a dialogic perspective in *The Ballot or the Bullet* speech.

3.1.3. Blacks -X-White Government, America and Leaders

Referring to America, a place where X lived, fought and was assassinated; the speech contains evidence that bears witness to the belief that X (self) did not feel at home in America,

You wouldn't be in this country if some enemy hadn't kidnapped you and brought you here.

As for the government of the land and its leaders the speech contains some aggressive and humiliating utterances,

*Any kind of dilly-dally, that's government.
Any kind of pussy footing, that the government.*

By these references, an everlasting opposing line is drawn between Blacks, particularly X (self), and White government (other). This demarcation is solidified further by describing American governors in such mocking and critical terms as,

So-called liberal, so-called Democrat and so-called white man

3.1.4. Uncle Tom-X-Uncle Sam

X criticized the symbol of Black tolerance, Uncle Tom, and declared the days of tolerance were long past,

That old Uncle Tom action is outdated.

What this utterance is trying to imply to the listening audience is that a new era is about to begin for Blacks, and that the time of slavery and tolerance of oppression, symbolized in the Old Uncle Tom belongs to the past. In this way, the speech creates another binary opposition between self (new age Blacks) and other (old age Blacks), or in more covert terms between self (age of protest and revolution) as opposed to other (age of slavery and tolerance).

3.2. Self-Other Architectonics and Textualization in *I Have a Dream*

The analysis of self-other architectonics in *I Have a Dream* yielded a triple category (see Table 3.2). King addressed not only Blacks and Whites separately, but also he persuaded the unity and brotherhood of both Blacks and Whites. As a result, three types of categorization, *self and Blacks*, *self and Whites*, and *self and Blacks and Whites* are apparent in this utterance. Delving into the text, there may be a point to mention that in *The Ballet or the Bullet* the members of the dichotomy were rather symmetric and capable of simultaneous analysis, while the asymmetric relations of *I Have a Dream* present in Table 3.2 demand a separate analysis.

Table 3.2

Self-Other Architectonics between King, Blacks and Whites in I Have a Dream

Blacks	Self	Blacks and Whites	Whites
Audience	King	Blacks and Whites	Whites in General
Blacks in General	King	America	Problem
People like Blacks	King	Government	
Emancipation Proclamation	King	Religion	
Aim	King		

3.2.1. King-Blacks

The first category stands as the relation of King as *self* with Blacks as *others*. King addressed the audience emphatically in the opening and throughout *I Have a Dream*,

I am happy to join with you today in what will go down in history as the greatest demonstration for freedom in the history of our nation.

He showed his unity with the audience by the use of *I am happy to join you*. As the speech continued, the use of *we* and *my friends* signified unity. Then in another utterance,

I am not unmindful that some of you have come here out of great trials and tribulations.

King showed that he is also capable of seeing and feeling things from 'some of you' perspective before inviting them for a non-violent struggle. He continued to demonstrate their unity as a nation by phrases like *our nation*, *my people* and *brotherhood* activating Christ's message of religious brotherhood and unity,

With this faith we will be able to transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood.

Other people similar to Blacks comprises another identified category. In *I Have a Dream*, the overwhelming scenes of justice and brotherhood were depicted, and the name of the places (e.g. *Mississippi, New York, and Alabama*) whose citizens were suffering like the audience were counted and invited not to "*wallow in the valley of despair*". The dream of tolerance and unity was reinforced by intertextual references to the religious discourse in phrases like *brotherhood* or *valley of despair* to invoke the spirituality of love and forgiveness as a requirement of dialogic coexistence. In an attempt not to distort the unity spirit of the speech, Emancipation Proclamation which was supposed to guarantee the equal rights for Blacks and Whites was not introduced as a betrayal of American government that needed to be answered in a violent way, but as *a light of hope, joyous daybreak*, etc., that simply had been disregarded as a *bad check*,

*This momentous decree came as a great beacon light of hope to millions of Negro slave.
America has given the Negro people a bad check.*

A very implied way of criticism and protest was shown in this speech utterance and the problem was introduced as an empty check that needed to be paid hopefully. So the presence of positive references and implied way of criticism were implicitly aimed to avoid any type of harshness and separation between all the people involved, particularly Blacks who suffered, and Whites who made them suffer. The conveyed aim of this utterance was dominance of *justice, freedom, equality* and *brotherhood*. The desired dream was not introduced as separation of Blacks and Whites but unity and brotherhood. It was attempted to meticulously visualize this wish through use of the nature's elements colored by his imagination as following,

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave owners will be able to sit down together at a table of brotherhood. I have a dream that my four children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. I have a dream that one day... little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls and walk together as sisters and brothers.

Accordingly, the impossibility of coexistence between Blacks and Whites was not prescribed to Blacks; in contrast, unity in peace was the dominant message of this speech utterance, which required their mutual understanding and respecting their rights. This approach can be in accordance with Bakhtin's dialogic understanding that proposes the coexistence of differences by looking from each other's points of view and allowing all the voices and all the rights to have the opportunity of realization.

3.2.2. King-Whites

The second identified self-other architectonics in *I Have a Dream* is *King and Whites* under two headings of *King and Whites in general* and *King and the problem* outlined in Table 3.2. Before the speech, an expectation had been built up, due to the nature and objectives of the gathering (civil rights movement against injustice against Blacks) that Whites as *other* would be the core of his addresses. However, the analysis of the speech yields a different picture. Let's take the following extract,

Many of our white brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny.

What can be inferred from this utterance is a sense of '*inclusion*' rather than '*otherness*' which was intended as a prerequisite for a dialogic relationship for a convergence between Blacks and Whites. Further analysis depicted yet another aspect of this dialogic intention. Throughout the speech whenever there was a need to refer to the unfairness or brutality of Whites' treatments with Blacks, the nominalization strategy, as in terms like *injustice*, *captivity* and *segregation*, was used to avoid direct mentioning of Whites in the agent position.

Now is the time to lift our nation from the quick sands of racial injustice....It came as a joyous daybreak to end the long night of their captivity...Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation.

These references to Black problems without directly referring to the agents involved, seem to serve the purpose of avoiding or creating any further resentment and detachment between Blacks and Whites, which in turn has implication in the form of a call for a non-violent struggle and future coexistence. To sum up, King's dialogic strategies of *inclusion* and *accusation*

avoidance primarily served the goals of unification in the discourse of *I have a dream*.

3.2.3 King-Blacks-Whites

The last categorization of self-other architectonics located in the center of Table 3.2 is *King and Blacks and Whites*. Underlying this architectonic move lies a dialogic outlook, more specifically the tendency for respecting and embracing differences and peaceful co-existence. In contrast to the discourse of *The Ballot or the Bullet*, which was based on a clear binary position of Blacks against that of Whites; what can be observed here is a third architectonic category in which Blacks and Whites are juxtaposed not in terms of their differences but their unity,

We will be able to transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood...The whirlwinds of revolt will continue to shake the foundations of our nation until the bright day of justice emerges....Many of our white brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny.

Our nation is a phrase that was used in *I Have a Dream* to address Americans without referring to their color or race. It connotes an overarching possessive adjective of *our* was used sup- instead of all other possibilities like *my*, *your* or *their*. In fact, a message of unity was aimed to be conveyed: '*you and me, Blacks and Whites all are one, all are we and this nation is ours*'. Furthermore, addressing of Whites with components of *our-white-brothers* connotes a zeal for the unity and brotherhood of Whites and Blacks and an endeavor to transfer this attitude to the audience, both Blacks and Whites. When a peaceful coexistence between the little Black boys and girls, and White girls and boys was portrayed, they were called as *Sisters and brothers*, and once more he showed his dream of unity,

One day right down in Alabama little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers.

Therefore, it is apparent that a hope for oneness in opposed to the separation and hostility runs over architectonics of *I Have a Dream*. America is covertly referred to as a shared land between Blacks and Whites amid *I Have a Dream*

in references like *his own land, our nation's capital, my country, land where my fathers died* and *her citizens of color* in statements like,

Negro ... finds himself an exile in his own land.

We've come to our nation's capital to cash a check.

The above statements connote America is a land of Blacks as well, not exclusive to Whites, and the Negro is struggling for their citizenship rights to cash a check. As a religious man, King believes that all lands are God's territory, not man's, so no group, race or even a nation can claim the ownership of God's land. Likewise, America's government was not verbally attacked for Blacks' distressing condition. They were addressed with references like *the governor* or connotatively positive phrases such as *a great American*. These mild references show that he did not consider the government opposed to Blacks and did not put them in two opposite poles while he was criticizing their unfair treatment. Moreover, in his clarifications, he called the politicians of America *the architects of our republic*, and the American system *our republic*.

The architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution.

Hence, as America was conceptualized the country of Blacks and Whites, the government and republic were regarded as theirs shared possessions. In accordance with the depicted overall unifying atmosphere, religion was benefited for displaying another element of union. Blacks and Whites were codified as *God's children*, no one inferior or superior to the other. It was remarked that the hands should be joined regardless of any color, race or religion when finally he cried out,

All of God's children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands.

Joining hands regardless of differences in *I Have a Dream* is inspired intertextually by Christian premise of brotherhood, which is built upon love for all God's children as brothers and sisters. The given pluralism is the prerequisite and consequence of dialogic coexistence to live in peace with tolerance and understanding.

4. Discussion

The analysis of self-other architectonics of the two speech utterances showed two different approaches, one, *The Ballot or the Bullet*, depicting totally binary oppositions between the participants and a strong tendency to say the ultimate monologic word, and the other, *I have a dream*, visualizing a peaceful co-existence and talking in dialogic terms on this relationship. We have discussed it further in the following section.

4.1. Dialogism and *The Ballot or the Bullet*

The analysis of *The Ballot or the Bullet* speech utterance revealed an underlying discourse characterized by binary opposition and void of any reconciliatory attempt to unite Blacks and Whites. In fact, what this discourse was trying to achieve, in effect, was strengthening polarized outlooks, advocating further separation and advertising confrontation and violence. This is an orientation objected in dialogism of Bakhtin which favors the reconciliation of different surpluses of seeing, understanding different points of views and creating a fair situation for all the voices to be heard. Although *The Ballot or the Bullet* discourse can be seen as a reaction against the monologic and centripetal discourse of Whites, any possibility of a dialogic approach to the problem of ethnic discrimination is distorted in its binary and monologic solution based on separation, no-negotiation strategy and confrontational responses. What is achieved normally in this kind of discourse is a dialectic rather than dialogic, exclusive and eliminative rather than inclusive and negotiative.

This solution is in contrast with Bakhtin's concept of polyphony that values providing an opportunity for all voices to be heard. In *The Ballot or the Bullet* the voices of Whites, integration seeking Blacks, government and Uncle Toms were criticized. Deriving on the weak polyphonic status of this speech, it is introduced as a discourse with a strong monologic orientation and weak dialogic tendency. From CDA perspective, too, this type of discourse can be seen as a sign of potential practice of domination and hegemony of one person or group over another person or group, which is inherently capable of creating injustice. The characteristics of a monologic discourse can be more highlighted if it is compared with a different one possessing some dialogic features. The discussion in the next section will demonstrate the dialogic approach of *I Have a Dream* discourse in accordance with Bakhtin's Dialogism.

4.2. Dialogism and *I Have a Dream*

Self-other architectonics in *I Have a Dream* demonstrated a zeal for a united whole and togetherness. To put it in Bakhtin's terms, King's leadership is a centrifugal movement against the dominant centripetal power that practices the centralization of power. While King criticizes the unjust centripetal power of Whites and their oppression of any Blacks' reaction, confrontational or reconciliatory, he does not believe in separation and establishment of another monologic domination in favor of Blacks. *I Have a Dream* advocates equality of all God's children, all Blacks and Whites and establishment of a society with a polyphonic coexistence, a society in which every voice has the opportunity of being heard. This polyphony was manifested in this speech by the utilized unity seeking strategies as textually materialized and explained above. Whites and Blacks were introduced as brothers and sisters living in one shared family; all comprised one nation with a same government and republic; all were God's children whose voices should be respected and valued regardless of race, color, religion, nationality and age. This utterance persuades Blacks toward a struggle for a fair balance of centripetal and centrifugal forces based on a polyphonic dialogue. The advocacy of peaceful and pluralistic coexistence of all differences makes *I Have a Dream* as a representative of a dialogic discourse expounded by Bakhtin.

5. Conclusion

Bakhtin's philosophy says one man, as a self, lives in constant dialogue with others, namely the Creator, parents, teachers, friends, nature, history, culture, past, present future, etc. These self-other relations are monologic whenever the self considers her/himself the center and her/his point of view is seen as the only dominant perspective. In contrast, the relations can lean towards a dialogic one whenever not only the self respects its own point of view and strives to get the right of a self, but also it takes for granted the importance and right of others' points of view. Consequently, multiple logics and multiple voices become worth considering.

In sum, this study attempted to merge Bakhtin's dialogism with analytic principles of critical discourse analysis as a method of discourse analysis of various texts and genres, for instance, *The Ballot or the Bullet* and *I Have a Dream* political speeches. Via this combinatory method our research was able to identify monologic and dialogic orientations, and demonstrate how these orientations are textually realized.

Due to the decisive role of communication in today's world, an ability to recognize monologic and dialogic orientations in communicative events can

provide a window to the world of thought and practice of interlocutors and equip them with more sophisticated reactions and decisions at social and political levels. Moreover, providing dialogic opportunities in educational contexts seems to have fruitful educational and psychological results as well. For example, if a teacher can establish a dialogic relation with learners rather than a monologic dictation of instructional process, it can not only enhance learners' motivation and performance but also facilitate conducting educational programs.

Notes

1. *I Have a Dream* was retrieved on January 12, 2012, from www.pbs.org/.../extra/teachers/lessonplans/english/mlk_transcript.pdf.
2. *The Ballot or the Bullet* was retrieved on January 12, 2012, from [www.cis.aueb.gr/Besides%20Security/TALKS/TALKS-10-X%20\(The%20...](http://www.cis.aueb.gr/Besides%20Security/TALKS/TALKS-10-X%20(The%20...)

References

- Ahmad, C. M. (2009). Authoring a dialogical working knowledge: A Bakhtinian approach. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi :The Journal of International Social Research*, 2, 37-43.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981). *The Dialogic imagination* (M. Holquist, Ed., & C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics* (C. Emerson, Ed. & Trans.). Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. (V. W. McGee, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Berman, C. V. (2009). The known world in world literature: Bakhtin, Glissant, and Edward P. Jones. *Novel*, 42(2), 231-238.
- Booth, W. C. (1982). Freedom of interpretation: Bakhtin and the challenge of feminist criticism. *Critical Inquiry*, 9, 45-76.
- Braz, R. (2012). The teaching of argumentative writing in the dialogic perspective. *Bakhtiniana*, 7(1), 194-214.
- Clark, K., & Holquist, M. (1984). *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Cambridge : Harvard UP.
- Eigler, F. (1995). Feminist criticism and Bakhtin's dialogic principle: Making the transition from theory to textual analysis. *Women in German Yearbook: Feminist Studies in German Literature & Culture*, 11, 189-203.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd edition). London: Pearson.

- Fairclough, N., & Graham, P. (2002). Marx as a critical discourse analyst: The genesis of a critical method and its relevance to the critique of global capital. *Estudios de Sociolingüística*, 3, 185-229.
- Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and control*. London: Routledge.
- Good, P. (2001). *Language for those who have nothing: Mikhail Bakhtin and the landscape psychiatry*. New York: Plenum Publishers.
- Green, B. (2003). *A dialogical study of King Saul in 1 Samuel*. London: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Høines, M.J. (2004). Textual differences as conditions for learning. *Proceedings of the 28th Conference of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education*, 3, 105–112.
- Holquist, M. (1990). *Dialogism: Bakhtin and his world*. London: Routledge.
- Kershner, R. B. (1989). *Joyce, Bakhtin, and popular literature: Chronicles of disorder*. North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press.
- Salgado, J., & Clegg, J. (2011). Dialogism and the psyche: Bakhtin and contemporary psychology. *Culture & Psychology*, 17, 421–440.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen and H. E. Hamilton (eds.), *The Handbook of discourse analysis* (pp.349-371). Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- Vines, M. E. (2007). The apocalyptic chronotope. In R. Boer (ed.), *Bakhtin and genre theory in biblical studies* (pp.109-118). Georgia: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Wegerif, R. (2008). Dialogic or dialectic? The significance of ontological assumptions in research on Educational Dialogue. *British Educational Research Journal*, 34, 347-361.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp.1-13). London: Sage.

Appendix

Table A.1

Textual References of Self-Other Architectonics between X and Blacks in The Ballet or the Bullet

Self-other relation	Textual reference
X and Blacks in general	<i>Brothers and sisters/Our people/Our African brothers and sisters/Our African brothers/The black man/The black men/Negro(es)/The people/22 million Africo-Americans/22 million Africo American black people/22 million black victims of Americanism/They/The young generation/Black people/You black/American Negro</i>
X and audience	<i>Mr. Moderator/ Reverend Cleage/ Brother Lomax/ Brothers and sisters/ Friends / Enemies</i>
X and Black leaders	<i>Reverend Clee/ Dr. King/ Reverend Galamison,/ Adam Clayton Powell/ Negro leaders</i>
X and Black community	<i>His own community/Our community/ Our own community/The community/ Black community/ Negro community/ Your community/Run down community</i>
X and Black nationalism	<i>The political philosophy of Black Nationalism/ the economic philosophy of Black Nationalism/ The political, economic philosophy of Black Nationalism</i>
X and Old Uncle Tom	<i>They don't want to hear old Uncle Tom Handkerchief heads talking about the odds./Those Uncle Toms can't pass up the coffee.</i>

Table A.2
Textual References of Self-Other Architectonics between X and Whites in The Ballet or the Bullet

Self-other relation	Textual reference
X and Whites in general	<i>White people/ White man(men)/ A (the) man/ White liberals/ White politicians/ The Whites/ They/ He/ Some enemy(ies)/ Your enemy/ The same enemy</i> <i>A dead man named Lincoln/ Another dead man named George/ Don't call Governor Wallace a Dixie governor/ A President who's nothing but a Southern segregationist/ Paul Douglas, a so-called liberal, so-called Democrat, so-called white man/ Political leaders/ Southern segregationists</i>
X and White government and the leaders	<i>Northern segregationists/ Democrat party/ They/ Any kind of dilly-dally, that's government/ Any kind of pussy footing, that the government.</i> <i>Any kind of act that's designed to deprive you and me right now of getting full rights, that's government</i>
X and White community	<i>Their community/ A White community / His community/ The community</i>
X and White Nationalism	<i>White Nationalism</i>
X and America	<i>America/ This country/ The only country/ She</i> <i>Uncle Sam is guilty of violating the human Rights of 22 million Afro- Americans</i>
X and Uncle Sam	

Table A.3
Textual References of Self-Other Architectonics between King and Blacks in I Have a Dream

Self-other relation	Textual reference
King and Audience	<i>You/ We/ Some of you/ My friends</i>
King and Blacks in general	<i>Our nation/ Negro slaves/ Negro/ Citizens of color/ Negro people/ My people</i> <i>A Negro in Mississippi/ A Negro in New York/ Alabama/ Georgia/ Louisiana/ Our northern cities</i>
King and Other people like Blacks	<i>Light of hope/ Joyous daybreak/ Rights of life, liberty, ... happiness/ Promissory note/ Sacred obligation</i> <i>Cash a check/ Justice/ Freedom/ Brotherhood / Equality/ Citizenship rights/ Meeting physical force with soul force / " I Have a Dream" .../ Together/ Join hands</i>
King and Emancipation Proclamation	
King and Aim	

Table A.4

*Textual References of Self-Other Architectonics between
King and Whites in I Have a Dream*

Self-other relation	Textual reference
King and the Whites in general	<i>All White people/ Our white brothers</i>
King and the problem	<i>Injustice/ Captivity/ Tragic fact/ Segregation/ Discrimination/ Poverty / Bad check</i>

Table A.5

*Textual References of Self-Other Architectonics between
King and Blacks and Whites in I Have a Dream*

Self-other relation	Textual reference
King and Blacks and Whites	<i>This nation/ Our nation / The nation/ Our white brothers/ Sisters and brothers</i>
King and America	<i>American society/ Great America/ His own land/ Our nation's capital/ America/ My country/ Land where my fathers died/ Her citizens of color</i>
King and the government	<i>A great American/ Architects of our republic/ Our republic/ governor</i>
King and religion	<i>God's children/ Jews and Gentiles/ Protestants and Catholics / Thank God Almighty</i>