

*A Study of Argumentative Indicators in Chomsky's  
Article "It's the Oil, Stupid !"*

*Assist.Prof. Amin Ukaal Ghailan  
University of Basra/ College of Education for Human  
Sciences  
Prof. Dr. Majeed Hameed Jassim  
University of Basra /College of Arts*

**Abstract:**

Politicians' success mostly belongs to their ability to persuade their audiences with their argumentations. The listeners can know the politicians' thoughts through the argumentations which reveal who they are and whether they will convince their audience or not . Any politician has a specific way to express his own political opinions. In our age, there is no keeping out of politics, for all issues are political ones as George Orwell previously said. Any politician is required to choose his words and utterances with great care, for they convey the meanings he wants to send to the listeners. Similarly, the American politician Noam Chomsky attempts to express his standpoint and raise important points on the topic of the American invasion to Iraq. The present paper shows his standpoint on this matter through the study of the argumentative indicators in his article: *It's the Oil. Stupid.*

**Key Words :** Argumentation, Argumentative indicators, Pragma-Dialectics, Speech Acts, Utterance

## دراسة المشيرات النقاشية في مقالة تشومسكي "أنه النفط، أيها الأغبياء"

**الأستاذ المساعد**  
**أمين عكال فيلان**  
**جامعة البصرة /كلية التربية**  
**للعلوم الانسانية**

**الأستاذ الدكتور**  
**مجيد حميد جاسم**  
**جامعة البصرة /كلية الآداب**

### الملخص:-

أن نجاح رجل السياسة غالبا ما يعود الى قدرته على الإقناع من خلال المناقشات وطرح الأفكار السياسية بطريقة مقنعة ومقبولة لدى جمهور المستمعين. فأن المستمعين يستطيعون أن يقرأوا أفكار رجل السياسة من خلال المناقشات التي تظهر أفكاره وتوجهاته السياسية وكذلك فيما إذا كان سينجح في أفتناع الجمهور بتلك الأفكار. فلكل سياسي طريقته الخاصة التي تعبر عن آرائه السياسية. وفي عصرنا الحاضر ليس هناك منأى عن السياسة وذلك لأن كل القضايا سياسية في الأصل وكما ذكر الكاتب جورج أوروبيل ذلك من قبل . ويفترض برجل السياسة أن يختار كلماته وعباراته بحذر شديد وذلك لأنها تحمل المعاني والأفكار التي يريد أن ينقلها الى جمهور المستمعين، وبالمثل فأن اللغوي والسياسي الأمريكي نعوم تشومسكي يحاول أن يعبر عن وجهة نظره ويركز على نقاط مهمة حول موضوع الاحتلال الأمريكي للعراق. أن الدراسة الحالية تظهر وجهة نظره حول هذا الموضوع من خلال دراسة المشيرات النقاشية في مقالته الموسومة ( أنه النفط ،أيها الأغبياء)

### الكلمات الرئيسية

الجدل(أو المناقشة)، المشيرات النقاشية، الجدلية البراغماتية، الأفعال الكلامية، العبارة

## 1. Introduction

Argumentative indicators among different utterances are always relevant to the analysis of argumentative discourse. This is mainly due to the fact that, such indicators are usually markers of argumentative relations. They can lead the analyst to know the argumentation process and what will be the conclusion of such argumentation. Argumentation process , according to the pragma – dialectical approach, is not a mechanical process . Rather , argumentation is a social activity among arguers for convincing others of a certain standpoint so that the arguer can remove all other arguer's doubts .

The study is built on the hypothesis that argumentative indicators are a clear feature of Chomsky's article. The argumentative indicators in Chomsky's article are used for different functions and purposes( please check the appendix). For checking the validity of the hypothesis in this study, the researcher aims at analysing Chomsky's article by using the pragma-dialectical approach proposed by Eemeren. et al, (2007). Also, the researcher will attempt to identify the argumentative indicators so as to know the structure of the argumentation in study.

## 2. *The Pragma-Dialectical study of Argumentative Discourse*

Argumentation theorists like Eemeren, Grootendorst, Henkemans, and others pay a lot of attention to the oral and written argumentation. Also, they are interested in the evaluation and study of argumentative discourse. The argumentation theorists are concerned with various central areas in their study of argumentation. Such areas are "unexpressed elements in argumentative discourse", "argumentation structures", "argument schemes", and "fallacies"( Eemeren& Grootendorst, 2004:3).

In general, the argumentative discourse is a discourse containing notion, thought, or arguments with the discussed problems to persuade the listeners or readers or the opposite party using the logic and objective arguments ( Maimunah,2007). Any expression is considered as a standpoint if it includes a specific position( positive or negative). It is necessary to realize that verbal expressions are not, by nature, standpoints or arguments that are interesting to argumentation theorists. "They only become so when they occur in a context which allow them fulfill a specific function in the communication process. Then, these utterances are, in a specific way, instrumental in achieving a certain goal" ( Eemeren& Grootendorst, 2004:3). Henkemans(1998:1) thinks that "the model for critical discussion specifies which speech acts can contribute to the resolution of a dispute in the various stages of the resolution process".

### ***3. The Pragma- Dialectical Approach to Argumentative Indicators***

The pragma – dialectical approach is "an approach to argumentation initiated by Frans van Eemeren and Rob Grootendorst in the 1970s at the Speech Communication Department of the University of Amsterdam. It has gained ground among the most recent and popular multidisciplinary approaches to argumentative discourse. The model is distinguished by a set of theoretical assumptions regarding the nature of argument which are translated into procedural tools to analyse this kind of discourse. It has been applied to the examination of a variety of spoken and written argumentative genres, yielding practical outcomes(Touria Drid, 2016:20). It differs from other approaches in that it focuses on the way in which language is used in any argumentative discourse so as to attain its communicational and interactional goals. Henkemans (2014:52) states that "the analysis of argumentation from a speech act perspective undertaken by Van Eemeren and

Grootendorst and by Jacobs and Jackson in the 1980s has provided argumentation scholars with a basic framework for the application of pragmatic insights to problems of analysis in argumentative discourse ".

Henkemans continues his reference to the importance of the pragma – dialectical approach in the analysis of argumentative discourse in "the use of pragmatic insights in the pragma – dialectical theory of argumentation has enabled development of a model for critical discussion in which the constitutive moves are described as speech act : the basic units of communication(2014:54-55). This, in turn, has made it possible to use pragmatic insights concerning indirect speech acts and conversational implicatures to solve problems of analysis with respect to argumentative discourse.

Van Eemeren and Grootendorst develop an approach for reconstructing any argumentative discourse. It considers all the aspects that are related to a critical discussion. In their book "A systematic Theory of Argumentation"(2004:35-36) , we read that "according to this approach, the quality of the production , analysis , and evaluation of argumentative discourse can be raised only by improving the quality of the communication and interaction between the participants".

This approach represents a heuristic tool of the reconstruction of the discussion stages and the types of speech acts used . It is also a good tool for the dialectical analysis of the argumentative discourse. Pragma-dialecticians hold that unilateral approaches do not do justice to argumentative discourse. That is, adopting either a “descriptive” orientation or a “normative” one seems to be a partial treatment of the subject. Thus, they call for a comprehensive research programme which fuses these apparently irreconcilable outlooks in one model. Normative pragmatics has been expounded on at length in the basic literature on the subject (van Eemeren,

1992; van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1992; van Eemeren et al., 1993; van Eemeren et al., 1996; van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2004).

On the other hand, Garssen (2010:17) writes that "all papers in this special issue are written by scholars who approach argumentation from a pragma – dialectical perspective. Their contributions cover a wide array of subjects, ranging from philosophical considerations regarding dialectics to linguistic devices in argumentation . In all cases , however , it is clear that the authors are directly influenced by "speech acts "which is a doctoral dissertation in Dutch language published in (1982) . This book can be seen as the kick-off of the development of the pragma – dialectical approach to argumentation.

The pragma-dialectical approach has brought the study of argumentation significant outcomes. Henkemans(2014:55) writes that "recent publications in argumentation theory bear witness to the fruitfulness of a speech act perspective to the analysis of argumentative moves made within particular argumentative activity types". In accordance with the tradition that has developed in linguistics to refer to the study of language use in its broadest sense by means of the label of "pragmatics", we have expressed our theoretical position in naming our approach to argumentation " Pragma – dialectics".

There are rules to be followed by the parties in the argumentative discourse. The first rule is that the parties in the discussion should not prevent each other from producing their standpoints, or to express doubts to the others' standpoints. Another important rule is that each party should be prepared to tell his opinion and to listen to the opinion of the other party. The third rule mentioned by Eemeren& Grootendorst(2004:37) is "the third- order conditions remind us of certain political requirements: for conducting a critical

discussion, the circumstances must be such that individual freedom, the right to a free exchange of information and to voice criticism, non- violence, and intellectual pluralism are guaranteed".

If these rules are adapted in the discussion, the "reasonableness" of the argument will have intellectual meaning as well as a social one. Sometimes, there are factors beyond the control of the arguers which will lead to hinder the adoption of the reasonable attitude toward the process of the discussion. For carrying out a proper analysis of any argumentative text, the analyst should have a clear knowledge on the moves leading to the resolution of any dispute in the argument. He should have an insight into the nature of the speech acts used in the argument. The pragma- dialectical approach provides a description of the different stages in the process of the resolution of a difference of opinion. It also describes the different types of verbal moves which construct the different stages of the resolution process. Eemeren& Grootendorst ( 2004:57-58) assert that the pragma- dialectical approach is" based on the promise that a difference of opinion is only resolved when the parties involved in the difference have reached agreement on the question of whether the standpoints at issue are acceptable or not".

#### ***4.The Model of the Analysis of Argumentative Indicators in Chomsky's "It's the Oil, Stupid!"***

Concerning the features of any argumentative discourse crucial for the resolution of disputes, Van Eemeren, et al(1996)mention that the analysis of the argumentation should tackle a number of basic elements."These are:(1.)the standpoints existing in the discussion, (2.)the positions assumed by the discussants together with their starting and concluding points, (3.) the array of arguments advanced by the participants, (4.) the structure of argumentation and (5.) the argumentation schemes (Touria Drid, 2016:31)(check the stages of the analysis of Chomsky's argumentation with appendix 1).

The argumentation under study has a structure which is to a greater or lesser extent complex . The complexity of any argumentation structure not only reflects the complexity of the dispute in the argumentation itself, rather , it shows how the arguer can arrange the defense of his standpoint . In principle , every single argumentative move serves to remove some form of doubt that the other arguer may have with regard to the standpoint .

From the analytic point of view , compound argumentation can be broken down into single argumentations . Similarly , any multiple dispute can be broken down into a combination of more than one simple dispute . Thereby , it will be applicable to analyze a compound argumentation into two or more single argumentations . Also , the single argumentations in the compound argumentation are all defenses of the same standpoint . After the first argument, the arguer advances other arguments so that he will be more successful in convincing the reader with his defense of his standpoint (see the division of the arguments in the appendix ).Van Eemeren, et al, (2004:304) have pointed out that "the pragma-dialectical model is formal in the sense that it is procedurally regimented and in being a normative one".

One of the advantages of the application of pragma-dialectical model is the decomposition of a large text into several smaller constitution texts. So, such smaller texts can be performed in stages and by different discussants . Another advantage of the pragma-dialectical model is of a theoretical nature. By a gradual increase of the complexity of the discourse , the property of the model is to study its stages in isolation, without having all the features of the model complicating the investigation. The most important for the evaluation of the argumentative discourse is to notice how the argument proceeds to the resolution of a difference of opinion . The argumentation in Chomsky's article "It's the oil , Stupid"

consists of four arguments(see appendix 1) ,each of which has four stages followed in any argumentation , i.e. confrontation , starting , argumentation , and concluding stages . But , all of these arguments revolve around the main topic of the article which is the American aggression to Iraq . The arguer develops this main idea throughout the argumentation and discusses this matter from different angles . Auspiciously, the arguer uses different types of argumentative indicators in his contribution to the development of his argumentation and also assigning the stages of each argument .

Starting with argument 1. , the beginning discusses the deal signed between Iraq's oil Ministry and Four western oil companies . The arguer shows his suspicions concerning such deal and how, he considers it , to raise critical questions on the US occupation of Iraq . The expression "raises critical questions about the nature of the US invasion and occupation of Iraq" shows the explicit doubt of the arguer to the proposition to which the standpoint relates . Also, the repetition of the same expression "questions that should certainly be addressed .....and seriously discussed..." shows the assertive expression to assert the same questions about the deal aforesaid . Such indicators ensure that the adverbs followed by verbs are put next to each other in a complementary relation .

Another important indicator is the expression "the no-bid contracts , apparently written by the oil corporation with the help of US officials" . In this expression , the adverb "apparently" followed by "written" indicates a symptomatic relationship . Van Eemeren and Grootendorst consider symptomatic argumentation as "the argumentation is presented as if it is an expression , a phenomenon , a sign or some other kind of symptom of what is stated in the standpoint"(1992:97).

As for the starting stage , it consists of one expression open with "there was suspicion ....." which expresses the doubt of the arguer

concerning the U.S. going to war in Iraq . The arguer considers the Iraqi oil wealth is the main reason behind the American occupation . He uses the assertive "precisely" to show his doubt on the American occupation .

The argumentation stage starts with an expression indicating a symptomatic relationship as "X is a sign of Y". It refers to Andrew E. Kramer who wrote about the American occupation , in the New York Time . In this part of the argument, the arguer follows the "multiple" argumentation in showing his standpoint on the American aggression to Iraq . This is very clear from the use of indicators such as "furthermore" (utterance 2,6) and "later" (utterance 3) which refer to the use of expressions indicating enumeration . These indicators show that the argumentation proceeds in a way that the arguer gives more than one defense to prove his standpoint concerning the American military occupation .

Another expression "highly likely" in utterance (2) and "hardly" in utterance (5) indicate that the aspect of relationship between these utterances is a symptomatic one . From the above-mentioned indicators, it becomes clear that the arguer mostly uses indicators of symptomatic relationship to proceed in his argumentation concerning the American occupation to Iraq. Van Eemeren and Grootendorst (1992:97) consider symptomatic argumentation to be presented as if it were an expression, a phenomenon, a sign or some other kind of symptom of what is stated in the standpoint" .

Utterance (6) clearly shows the importance of Iraq as an oil country. It has the second largest oil reserves in the world . Its oil is very cheap to extract and has good economic features in the production and drilling . The whole utterance can be considered as assertion for the standpoint of the arguer. Utterance (7) also ascertains the importance of Iraq for the American military presence since it lies at the heart of the world's major energy reserves . This

represents irrefutable point in the discussion , especially with the use of the expression "it is imperative" in the utterance.

In the concluding stage, the arguer attempts to link all the argumentation above to prove his standpoint about the American invasion to Iraq . The concluding stage in argument(1) starts with "That these were the primary goals of the invasion was always clear enough" . The conclusion is that the arguer maintains his standpoint concerning the real reasons beyond the American occupation to Iraq

Concerning argument(2) , the main topic is "Declaration of principles" document signed by president Bush and Iraq's prime minister Nouri AIMaliki. The strong assertive "were made explicit" , which is a force modifying expression, serves to modify the force of the assertion. The argumentation of the arguer will focus on this deal and the real purpose of America to occupy Iraq .

The arguer opens the starting stage with discussing the results of the deal between President Bush and Iraq's prime minister. Therefore, it is natural to use indicators such as "left open" , "indefinite long term" , "would presumably" to refer to causal argumentation . Such indicators lead to a particular effect or result , which is the American military presence in air bases around the country and the embassy in Baghdad which is unlike any other embassy in the world . The expression "a city within a city" clearly expresses this meaning . Eemeren et al. (2007:164) write that " in argumentation based on a causal relationship the argument is presented as the cause (means, instrument , etc. ) of the standpoint , or the other way round : the standpoint as cause of the argument" . Utterance (2) in the starting stage "These are not being constructed to be abandoned" is very important for the reason that the arguer shows his evaluation for the results of the deal. He expresses his standpoint that the construction of such buildings and air bases will not be to abandon them. This standpoint is shown in the pragmatic

argumentation which shows the undesirable result of such a deal. In the argumentation stage , all of the four utterances devoted to this stage argue the results of the deal in different types of argumentations . In Utterance(1) , the expressions (also) and (remarkably) indicate aspects of the comparison , which is to exploit the resources of Iraq , especially oil. Utterance(2) asserts and continues Utterance(1) by quoting a sample of the items of the deal to announce that Iraqi oil resources are open to foreign investment , especially the American . In Utterance(3) , the expression " That comes close to" is of equality or similarity relation. It is an indicator in criticism of argumentation by negative analogy. This analogy is between Utterances(2,3) . Both of these utterances talk about controlling Iraqi oil resources by the American oil companies .

Utterance(3) clearly shows the standpoint of the arguer from the deal . Van Eemeren and Grootendorst (1992:97) explain that in argumentation by analogy "the argumentation is presented as if there were a resemblance, an agreement , a likeness , a parallel , a correspondence or some other kind of similarity between that which is stated in the argument and that which is stated in the standpoint ". Utterance(4) proves the standpoint of the arguer by reference to the "signing statement" signed by president Bush in January (regardless to the congressional legislation). Such statement allows the American government unrestricted funding for the control of the oil resources of Iraq . This Utterance comes as a defense of the standpoint of the arguer .

In the concluding stage , the two Utterances express that the arguer maintains his negative standpoint concerning the signing of the deal by American and Iraqi principals . Utterance(1) includes the indicator (yet another Bush innovation) which indicates complementary coordination argumentation . Also , the arguer

maintains his doubt when he mentions that the deal is "contrary to the rule of law and our constitutional separation of powers " as an approval to his doubt . This Utterance completes the argument in the argumentation stage about the "signing statement " .

Utterance(2) shows the objection of Iraqi unions to the deal. He opens this Utterance with the expression "Not surprisingly" as if this objection is expected , by the arguer , as a reaction to this deal .This also implies that he himself agrees with the objection of Iraqi unions. The Utterance is continued using "aroused immediate objections in Iraq" . The verb "aroused " indicates a process that produces a particular effect of the result . The rest of Utterance(2) refers to the rejection of the deal from all the sides of Iraqi unions. Both of Utterances(1)and(2) show that the arguer maintains his defense on the standpoint that the American occupation to Iraq is for the control of its natural resources , especially the oil reserves.

In argument(3) , the discussion turns to another topic which is the American and Iranian struggle for the domination of Iraq . The confrontation stage includes an indirect standpoint of the American , especially Washington propaganda , that the Iranian policy and influence over Iraqi government had spoilt the US . domination in Iraq . Utterance(1) in this stage includes an indication for causal argumentation. This can be shown in the expression "the spoiler of US domination in Iraq is Iran" . It is of the expression : [Y is caused by X] . Utterance(2) expresses that all U.S. problems in Iraq happen because of the Iranian presence . This Utterance has an expression which indicates that the mentioned result i.e. U.S. problems in Iraq are blamed on other means. This pragmatic argument is for showing that the mentioned result is undesirable. Also , the utterance shows the arguer's doubt for such claim.

In the starting stage, both Utterances show how the U.S. leaders especially secretary of state Condoleezza Rice , find a simple

solution , i.e. to withdraw all foreign forces and arms from Iraq. Noticeably , this solution does not include U.S. forces . Utterance(1) is a propositional attitude indicator (PAI) . Such expression can tell the reader about the force of the assertion and the estimation of the arguer for such point . In Eemeren , etal. (2007:29), we read that "pragma-linguistic knowledge of the mechanisms active in language use teaches us that the use of propositional attitude indicators or force modifying expressions can tell us something about the force the speaker wants his assertion to have , and about his estimation of situation" . With Utterance(2) , the arguer mentions another problem , namely , Iran's nuclear programme, and how this problem increases the tension between US and Iran.

The argumentation stage includes (9) Utterances in which the arguer discusses the failure of U.S. forces to end the problems faced in Iraq . One of these problems is the government of Al-Maliki which is supported by Iran and has the same policy. Utterance(1) tells about the policy of Bush administration which leads to other threats of force . The utterance has an indication for causal argumentation : [X leads to Y] . This indicator " comes with ominous threats of force " carries this indication . Utterance(2) completes the argumentation in Utterance(1) and adds that the adjective of "terrorism" is applied with Iran . The expression "the policy also is reported" shows the argumentation to be multiple . In this type of argumentation , the arguer makes more than alternative attempt to defend his standpoint.

Both of Utterances (3)and(4) refer to the nature of the American policy formation which is made regardless of public opinion . In Utterance (3) , the arguer considers that "a majority of the American people favours diplomacy and oppose the use of force" , as a reference to the objection against the American war in Iraq. The Utterance also indicates that the arguer himself expresses his

standpoint through the American people's opinion. He attempts to tell the reader that the American public opinion is different and opposite to the American formal policy .

A very important indicator for this opposition is the verbs (favours) and (oppose) which are different in their indications . This becomes clear in Utterance (4) which opens with the word "But". This indicator shows that is contrary to some thing mentioned before . Eemeren, etal(2007:58) mention that "the use of indicators like 'but' , 'on the contrary', and 'outstandingly' not only shows that an alternative is presented , but also that this alternative excludes what it is put opposite to". Also , the indicator "But" shows the argumentation to be multiple. In the same Utterance, the expression "not just in this case" shows the meaning of contrariness, i.e. all the times, the American public opinion is largely irrelevant to policy formation. Goble and Holm(2009:220) state that" given the centrality of the Iraq war to the politics of the Bush presidency and the extent to which Bush and his party have been identified with it, it is sensible to look to the war as a probable driver of the extraordinary loss of Republican dominance on national security".

From Utterance(5) to Utterance(9), the arguer turns to the other side of the problem which is the nature of the Iraqi government, established by U.S. , and how this government comes side to side with the Iranian policy. Starting with Utterance(5), it describes the situation in Iraq as an "irony" in that it is split between U.S. and Iran domination. The Utterance reads "An irony is that Iraq is turning into a U.S. Iranian condominium" which shows that the U.S. domination of Iraq has a negative effect . The Utterance can be like [X has the opposite effect] which expresses that the cause leads to the undesirable effect.

Utterance(6) has the same indication in that the Maliki government, established the control of U.S. , is mostly supported by

Iran . The Utterance can also look like [X has adverse effect] .Another defense of the arguer's standpoint is that in Utterance(7) he refers to the formula of the Iraqi army. The arguer considers that most of members of Iraqi army belong to the Badr brigade which was trained and was loyal to Iran during the Iran-Iraq war. So, this sentence also has the formula [X has a counterproductive effect] . Also, the indicator (just another militia) shows the contrariness since it can accentuate the contrast and therefore the dispute . This can be clear by noticing the expression "so-called Iraqi army" which refers to the same meaning . They show that the arguer doesn't consider Iraqi army to be similar to any other army. Rather, it is just another militia .

Utterance(8) represents a complementary indicator . It completes the argument started in utterance(5) about the Iraqi government. In this Utterance, the arguer mentions the observation of Nir Rosen, as the most astute and knowledgeable specialist in the middle east, that the main target of U.S. Maliki military operations is Moktada Al Sadr who is disliked by Iran . Finally, Utterance(9) completes Utterance(8) in discussing the Iranian support of prime minister Maliki against Moktada's Mahdi army in Basra. Also, the Iranian support results in the dominance of its main proxy in Iraq, i.e. The supreme Iraqi Islamic council . In this Utterance, the indicator "clearly supported" refers to the irrefutable point raised by the arguer to express that Iranian support is as clear as day to the Maliki government.

Another indicator is what Rosen writes "which is not surprising" to indicate that this situation has a counterproductive effect on the U.S. domination . This relates to the causal argumentation in which the proposed result may be caused by something else . Also, the expression "given that" refers to the relation [X brings about Y] which is another type of causal argumentation . This use of causal

argumentation shows the cause to be an accepted fact and the result as inevitable. Garssen (1997:19) writes that "by presenting something that is introduced as an accepted fact in the argument, as something that inevitably leads to the event that is mentioned in the standpoint or the other way round , a causal relationship is created that transfers the acceptability from the argument to the standpoint "(Eemeren, etal. 2007:164) .

The concluding stage consists of three Utterances which show the standpoint of the arguer from the war in Iraq . He considers that U.S. and Iran share the same proxy war in Iraq. Also, Iran is satisfied with seeing the Iraqi government receptive to its influence . Finally, the biggest loser, for the arguer, is the Iraqi people . In Utterance(1) which contains the structure :[main argument (because) subargument]:

There is no proxy way in Iraq because the U.S. and Iran share the same proxy.

main argument    subargument

The indicator "because" shows the subordinative argumentation. In this case, "it is clear that the protagonist (arguer) is of the opinion that single argumentation will not suffice, but that his argument might be open to question as well, and is therefore in need of additional support" (Eemeren,etal.,2007:197). In Utterance(2), the expression "presumably pleased" is a weak assertive of the type (force modifying expression). An expression such as (presumably) shows a weak assertion by the arguer. Of course, the arguer who uses this expression doesn't consider this addition to be necessary to assert the force of his assertive. Rather, he expects the reader not to accept his standpoint as an absolute fact. The arguer ends argument(3) with the evaluation of the Iraqi people and how they consider their government to be a disaster. Utterance(3) in the

concluding stage shows the subordinative argumentation with the structure :

For the Iraqi people that government continues to be a disaster.

-----  
 Main argument                      Subargument

Also, the indicator "very likely" shows a weak assertion for the standpoint that the Iraqi government is a disaster and the worse will be coming.

Concerning Argument(4), all of the argumentation is about the Americans war crime in Iraq and the middle east. There is a clear criticism for the American formal opinion which is based on the principle that achieving goals is a means for justifying the war and occupation. The confrontation stage consists of two Utterances which show the American planning for the control over the middle east in general and Iraq in particular. This strategy of planning might result in a powerful military government in Iraq.

Starting with Utterance(1), the arguer incites the opinion of Steven Simon, a principal in foreign affairs that the current American strategy is based on stoking three terrible problems: Tribalism, warlordism, and sectarianism. The verb "points out" is an indicator for symptomatic relation in one direction. It is of the structure :[X points out Y]. Utterance(2) completes the symptomatic relation in sentence(1) by giving the result of the American planning strategy. It refers to the possibility of establishing a military junta similar to Saddam's regime. The verb "might be" in this Utterance relates to the possibility or probability which shows the uncertainty of the success of such strategy.

In the starting stage, there is only one utterance. In this utterance, the "if" clause shows the multiple argumentation in this argument. The words "if .....then" refer to the multiple argumentation. The arguer maintains his standpoint on the

uselessness of American policy in Iraq. Such type of argumentation permits the reader to know completely the futility of the American policy in Iraq.

Turning to the argumentation stage, it consists of (6) Utterances which mostly discuss the predicament of the American domination to Iraq and the silence of the political principals. Such silence copes with the American idea that achieving the goals will justify the war as well as the occupation of countries. Utterance(1) comes with an expression indicating aspects of the comparison between what Vladimir Putin previously achieved in Chechnya and what David Petraeus has achieved in Iraq. The expressions "are quite different" and "to an extent well beyond what ...." show the indication of comparison between the Russian and American situations in dealing with the peace problems.

In utterance(2), the arguer shows his doubt by explaining the difference in the American criteria. He capitalizes the words THEM and US to show this difference. This makes utterance(2) continue the comparison that started in utterance(1). Utterance(3) refers to the silence of the Democrats because of the supposed future success in Iraq. This difference is shown through the indicator for causal argumentation "because of". So, the utterance has the structure :

The Democrats silenced now because of the supposed success of the US

main argument

subargument

military surge in Iraq.

This discussion about the Democrats' silence represents a subtype of causal relation. Van Eemeren and Grootendorst(1992: 97) refer to the same idea by writing that" argumentation subtypes based on a relation of causality include those pointing to the consequences of a course of action, presenting something as a

means to a certain end, and emphasizing the nobility of a goal in order to justify the means".

In utterance 4, the relationship of argumentation changes to a symptomatic one. The verb "reflects" in this utterance is an indication for the relation[X reflects Y]. The same thing is applicable to utterance 5 which shows the arguer to withdraw his position in the argumentation and express his doubt concerning the American principals that "if you're achieving your goals, the war and occupation are justified". The use of the conditional(if) is very useful for showing the corruption of the American policy in Iraq. So, the structure [ If that is the case, you are right] justifies the American occupation of Iraq. Also, utterance 6 arouses again the matter of the oil deals which represent the core and aim of all of this military domination.

The concluding stage consists of(6) utterances concluding the argument and the whole article. The concluding stage describes the invasion of Iraq by the American army and its evil result on the region as a war crime. The arguer considers this problem as impossible to discuss in the American presidential campaign or elsewhere. Starting with utterance(1), the indicators (in fact, indeed, supreme) are assertives. They are used in the concluding stage, especially at the very end of the argumentation, to assert the standpoint of the arguer. They are mostly used to express either positive or negative, and desirable or undesirable consequences.

It is clear from the argumentation that the American domination to Iraq has a negative and undesirable effect for the arguer, since he considers it to be the supreme international war crime. This assumed standpoint is used for the proof of the opinion. For the arguer, it encompasses all the evil resulting from it. Utterance(2) completes utterance(1) and adds that this matter of the American invasion to Iraq as war crime is not allowed to discuss whether in

the presidential campaign or elsewhere. Here, the arguer also maintains his standpoint. At this final stage of the argumentation (concluding stage), the arguer attempts to hint at the reader that it is not an easy matter to discuss the problem of the American invasion and its result on the region, and describe it as a war crime .

The whole argumentation is ended with questions about the American crime in Iraq. These questions seem to be directed first to the American principals and people, and next to all the readers of this argumentation. The first two questions "why are we in Iraq?" and "what do we owe Iraqis for destroying their country?" utterances(3,4) are about the unknown reasons for destroying Iraq. The arguer puts these direct questions before the American public opinion as an implicit proposal to reject the American invasion to Iraq. This is very clear from the use of the pronoun "we" as if he asks his fellow-citizens if they agree with him that America is responsible for what happens in Iraq. He also considers such invasion as unjustifiable crime which results in the destruction of Iraq. In utterances 5. and 6., the arguer explains that the majority of the American people rejects such criminal action and favours the withdrawal of US forces from Iraq. But, does this rejection have any importance, for what the public opinion wants is out of the thinking of the American men of decision.

Ending the argumentation in a way of asking questions will be more influential than saying the arguer's opinion openly. Athanasiadou (1990:108) thinks that "understanding others' intentions is central for the successful planning of interactions. Intentions are identified through the speech context as well as the speakers' attitude towards what is said. We thus judge how something is said and by whom. In other words, the meanings given to questions are determined by the status of the speakers involved in the question act and the way they convey intention".

In another place of his argument, Athanasiadou mentions that "in asking questions with certain kinds of intentions, a person intends not only to communicate meaning but also to actively influence the hearer in some way"(1990:115). Also, in Eemeren, etal. (2007:94) we read that "to a greater extent than a normal question, the use of a rhetorical question may indicate that the speaker is making an implicit proposal to the other party to accept a certain proposition: who ever asks a rhetorical question indirectly states that the other party should accept the proposition implied in the question". The following chart collects all of the argumentative indicators in the four arguments in Chomsky's argumentation "It's the Oil, Stupid !":

Argument 1	Argument 2	Argument 3	Argument 4
<u>Confrontation Stage</u> raises critical questions, should certainly, seriously discussed, apparently written	<u>Confrontation Stage</u> were made explicit (force modifying expression)	<u>Confrontation Stage</u> Y is caused by X(the spoiler of US domination in Iraq is Iran) , US problems in Iraq are blamed on Iran	<u>Confrontation Stage</u> X points out Y( Points out) , might be
<u>Starting stage</u> There was suspicion, precisely	<u>Starting Stage</u> left open, indefinite long term, would presumably, these are not being	<u>Starting Stage</u> Condolezza Rice sees a simple solution ( propositional attitude indicator)	<u>Starting Stage</u> If.....then

	constructed to be abandoned		
<u>Argumentation Stage</u> X is a sign of Y(Kramer's reference to "suspicion" is an understatement ) , furthermore, highly likely, later , hardly, perhaps, furthermore, it is imperative that	<u>Argumentation Stage</u> Also, remarkably, that comes close to	<u>Argumentation Stage</u> X leads to Y( the Bush administration's..... comes with ominous threats of force), The policy also is reported...., favours X oppose , But , not just in this case , X has the opposite effect (An irony is that Iraq is turning into a US-Iranian condominium) , X has the adverse effect (The Maliki government.....most supported by Iran ) , X has a counterproductive effect (The so-called Iraqi army ..... is largely based on the Badr brigade....which was trained in Iran) , just another militia , So-called Iraqi	<u>Argumentation Stage</u> Are quite different , to an extent well beyond what...., That is THEM and this is US, because of( main argument because of subargument) , X reflects Y ( Their silence reflects the fact....) , conditional(if)(If you're achieving your goals, the war and occupation are justified)

		army , The main target of the US-Maliki military operations, Muktada AlSadr, is disliked by Iran as well , clearly supported , which is not surprising , X brings about Y (given that)	
<u>Concluding Stage</u> That these were the primary goals , always clear enough	<u>Concluding Stage</u> yet another Bush innovation, contrary to the rules of law and our constitutional separation of powers , not surprisingly, aroused immediate objections in Iraq	<u>Concluding Stage</u> because (main argument because subargument) , presumably pleased( force modifying expression) , for( for main argument, subargument) , very likely	<u>Concluding Stage</u> In fact , indeed, the supreme international crime

***Argumentative Indicators in Chomsky's Argumentation "It's the Oil, Stupid!"***

### **5. Conclusion**

In sum, from the application adopted in this study, it is found that the pragma-dialectics holds within itself a very important and usable approach for showing the argumentation process and the stages of the arguments of topics (look back at the aim and hypothesis of this study in the introduction). Such approach can lead the analyst to accomplish his analysis and have a detailed discussion to the ideas raised throughout the argumentations. Also, finding the argumentative indicators can be very useful in tracing the line of argumentations followed in any political discourse.

Argumentative indicators among different utterances are always important to the analysis of argumentative discourse. By analysing Chomsky' argumentation according to the pragma-dialectical approach, argumentative indicators can be identified and described. The results of the analysis indicate that argumentative indicators and argument structures differ in the text under study, suggesting that such argumentation has distinct structure and number and type of argumentative indicators. This is mainly due to the fact that such indicators are usually markers of argumentative relations. They can lead the analyst to know the argumentation process and what will be the concluding stage of such argumentation. Such conclusion is presented for argumentative purposes and the speech is crafted to appeal to a variety of listeners.

**Bibliography**

Aristotle, (1944). *Politics. Aristotle in 23 Volumes*. Vol.21, London: William Heinemann.

Athanasiadou, A. (1990). "The Discourse Function of Questions" (revised edition). *Journal of Applied Linguistics*. Vol.9, pp15-21. Greece: Halkidiki.

Blommaert, J.(1997). "Language and Politics, Language Politics and Political Linguistics". *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*. Vol.11,pp.1-10.

Chilton, P. and Schaffner, C. (1997). *Discourse and Politics: Discourse as Social Interaction*. Teun van Dijk (ed.), London: Sage. pp.206-230.

Chilton, P. and Schaffner, C. (2002)." Introduction: Themes and Principles in the Analysis of Political Discourse". In *Politics as Text and Talk*. Paul Chilton and Christina Schaffner(eds.), pp.1-41. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Chilton, P.(2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. Routledge: London.

van Dijk, T.(1997). "What is Political Discourse Analysis? In *Political Linguistics*. Jan Blommaert and Chris Bulcean(ed.),pp.11-52. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Drid, T. (2016). "A Pragma- Dialectical Approach to Argumentative Discourse". *Journal of Khazar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. Vol.19(4), pp.20-35. Kasdi Merbah University, Algeria.

Dunmire, P. L. (2011). *Projecting the Future through Political Discourse: the Case of the Bush Doctrine*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Eemeren, F. H. van. (1992). "Argumentation studies: Five estates". In W.L. Benoit, D. Hample, and P.J. Benoit. (Eds.), *Readings in Argumentation*. (pp. 615–654). Berlin. New York: Foris Publications.

- Eemeren, F.H. van & Grootendorst, R. (1992). *Argumentation, Communication, and Fallacies. A Pragma-Dialectical Perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eemeren, F.H. van, Grootendorst, R., Jackson, S., & Jacobs, S.(1993).*Reconstructing Argumentative Discourse*. London: The University of Alabama Press.
- Eemeren,F.H.van, Grootendorst,R., Snoeck Henkemans, A.F., Blair, J. A., Johnson, R.H., Krabbe, E.C.W., Plantin, C., Walton, D.N., Willard, C.A., Woods, J., & Zarefsky, D.(1996). *Fundamentals of Argumentation Theory: A Handbook of Historical Backgrounds and Contemporary Developments*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eemeren,F.H.van &Grootendorst,R. (2004). *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation: The Pragma- Dialectical Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eemeren, F.H. van, Houtlosser, P., & Snoeck Henkemans, A.F. (2007). *Argumentative Indicators: A Pragma- Dialectical Study*. The Netherlands: Springer.
- Fairclough, N.(2006). " Genres in Political Discourse". *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Keith Brown(ed.),Vol.5, pp.32-38. Boston: Elsevier.
- Garssen, B.(2010)." Introduction to the Special Issue: Twenty- Five Years of Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussions". *Journal of Cogency*.Vol.2, No.1, pp.13-21.
- Goble, H. and Holm, P.M. (2009). " Breaking Bonds? The Iraq War and the Loss of Republican Dominance in National Security". *Journal of Political Research Quarterly*.Vol.62.No.2,pp.215-229. University of Utah: Sage Publications. Available at: [www.jstor.org/stable/27759863](http://www.jstor.org/stable/27759863)
- Henkemans, A.F.S. (1998)." Verbal Indicators of Argumentation and Explanation". *OSSA Conference Archive*. Available at:

- scholar.uwindsor.ca/ossaarchive/OSSA2/papersandcommentaries/100
- Henkemans, A.F.S. (2014). " Speech Acts Theory and the Study of Argumentation". Journal of *Studies in Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric*.DOI:10. 2478/SIgr- 2014- 0002
- Hudson, K.(1978). *The Language of Modern Politics*. London: MacMillan.
- Maimunah, S. A. (2007). *Buku Pintar Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Prestasi Pustaka Publiser.
- Okulska, U. and Cap, P.(2010). " Analysis of Political Discourse: Landmarks, Challenges, and Prospects". In *Perspectives in Politics and Discourse*. Urszula Okulska and Piotr Cap's(eds.), pp.3-22. Amsterdam: John Bejamins.
- Orwell, J.(1946).*Politics and the English Language*. Available at: [www.public-library.uk/ebooks/72/30.pdf](http://www.public-library.uk/ebooks/72/30.pdf)
- Pelinka, A.( 2007). " Language as a Political Category: the Viewpoint of Political Science". Journal of *Language and Politics*. Vol.6(1).pp. 129-143.
- Wodak, R. and de Cilia, R.(2006). " Politics and Language : Overview. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Keith Brown(ed.), Vol.9. pp.707-717. Boston: Elsevier.

### Appendix(1)

The analysis in this study is made on the argumentation in Chomsky's article "*It's the oil , stupid !*" as the following:

#### **It's the Oil, Stupid!**

**Noam Chomsky**

**[Khaleej Times](#), July 8, 2008**

#### **Argument 1**

##### **Confrontation Stage**

1.The deal just taking shape between Iraq's Oil Ministry and four Western oil companies raises critical questions about the nature of the US invasion and occupation of Iraq — questions that should certainly be addressed by presidential candidates and seriously discussed in the United States, and of course in occupied Iraq, where it appears that the population has little if any role in determining the future of their country.

2.Negotiations are under way for Exxon Mobil, Shell, Total and BP — the original partners decades ago in the Iraq Petroleum Company, now joined by Chevron and other smaller oil companies — to renew the oil concession they lost to nationalisation during the years when the oil producers took over their own resources.

3.The no-bid contracts, apparently written by the oil corporations with the help of U.S. officials, prevailed over offers from more than 40 other companies, including companies in China, India and Russia.

##### **Starting Stage**

“There was suspicion among many in the Arab world and among parts of the American public that the United States had gone to war in Iraq precisely to secure the oil wealth these contracts seek to extract,” Andrew E. Kramer wrote in The New York Times.

**Argumentation Stage**

- 1.Kramer’s reference to “suspicion” is an understatement.
- 2.Furthermore, it is highly likely that the military occupation has taken the initiative in restoring the hated Iraq Petroleum Company, which, as Seamus Milne writes in the London Guardian, was imposed under British rule to “dine off Iraq’s wealth in a famously exploitative deal.”
- 3.Later reports speak of delays in the bidding.
- 4.Much is happening in secrecy, and it would be no surprise if new scandals emerge.
- 5.The demand could hardly be more intense.
- 6.Iraq contains perhaps the second largest oil reserves in the world, which are, furthermore, very cheap to extract: no permafrost or tar sands or deep sea drilling.
- 7.For US planners, it is imperative that Iraq remain under U.S. control, to the extent possible, as an obedient client state that will also house major U.S. military bases, right at the heart of the world’s major energy reserves.

**Concluding Stage**

That these were the primary goals of the invasion was always clear enough through the haze of successive pretexts: weapons of mass destruction, Saddam’s links with Al-Qaeda, democracy promotion and the war against terrorism, which, as predicted, sharply increased as a result of the invasion.

**Argument 2****Confrontation Stage**

Last November, the guiding concerns were made explicit when President Bush and Iraq’s Prime Minister Nouri Al Maliki signed a “Declaration of Principles,” ignoring the U.S. Congress and Iraqi parliament, and the populations of the two countries.

**Starting Stage**

1.The Declaration left open the possibility of an indefinite long-term U.S. military presence in Iraq that would presumably include the huge air bases now being built around the country, and the “embassy” in Baghdad, a city within a city, unlike any embassy in the world.

2.These are not being constructed to be abandoned.

### **Argumentation Stage**

1.The Declaration also had a remarkably brazen statement about exploiting the resources of Iraq.

2. It said that the economy of Iraq, which means its oil resources, must be open to foreign investment, “especially American investments.”

3.That comes close to a pronouncement that we invaded you so that we can control your country and have privileged access to your resources.

4.The seriousness of this commitment was underscored in January, when President Bush issued a “signing statement” declaring that he would reject any congressional legislation that restricted funding “to establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq” or “to exercise United States control of the oil resources of Iraq.”

### **Concluding Stage**

1.Extensive resort to “signing statements” to expand executive power is yet another Bush innovation, condemned by the American Bar Association as “contrary to the rule of law and our constitutional separation of powers.” To no avail.

2.Not surprisingly, the Declaration aroused immediate objections in Iraq, among others from Iraqi unions, which survive even under the harsh anti-labour laws that Saddam instituted and the occupation preserves.

**Argument 3****Confrontation Stage**

1. In Washington propaganda, the spoiler to US domination in Iraq is Iran.
2. U.S. problems in Iraq are blamed on Iran.

**Starting Stage**

1. US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice sees a simple solution: “foreign forces” and “foreign arms” should be withdrawn from Iraq — Iran’s, not ours.
2. The confrontation over Iran’s nuclear programme heightens the tensions.

**Argumentation Stage**

1. The Bush administration’s “regime change” policy toward Iran comes with ominous threats of force (there Bush is joined by both US presidential candidates).
2. The policy also is reported to include terrorism within Iran — again legitimate, for the world rulers.
3. A majority of the American people favours diplomacy and oppose the use of force.
4. But public opinion is largely irrelevant to policy formation, not just in this case.
5. An irony is that Iraq is turning into a US-Iranian condominium.
6. The Maliki government is the sector of Iraqi society most supported by Iran.
7. The so-called Iraqi army — just another militia — is largely based on the Badr brigade, which was trained in Iran, and fought on the Iranian side during the Iran-Iraq war.
8. Nir Rosen, one of the most astute and knowledgeable correspondents in the region, observes that the main target of the US-Maliki military operations, Moktada Al Sadr, is disliked by Iran

as well: He's independent and has popular support, therefore dangerous.

9. Iran "clearly supported Prime Minister Maliki and the Iraqi government against what they described as 'illegal armed groups' (of Moktada's Mahdi army) in the recent conflict in Basra," Rosen writes, "which is not surprising given that their main proxy in Iraq, the Supreme Iraqi Islamic Council dominates the Iraqi state and is Maliki's main backer."

### **Concluding Stage**

1. "There is no proxy war in Iraq," Rosen concludes, "because the U.S. and Iran share the same proxy."
2. Teheran is presumably pleased to see the United States institute and sustain a government in Iraq that's receptive to their influence.
3. For the Iraqi people, however, that government continues to be a disaster, very likely with worse to come.

### **Argument 4**

#### **Confrontation Stage**

1. In Foreign Affairs, Steven Simon points out that current US counterinsurgency strategy is "stoking the three forces that have traditionally threatened the stability of Middle Eastern states: tribalism, warlordism and sectarianism."
2. The outcome might be "a strong, centralised state ruled by a military junta that would resemble" Saddam's regime.

#### **Starting Stage**

If Washington achieves its goals, then its actions are justified.

#### **Argumentation Stage**

1. Reactions are quite different when Vladimir Putin succeeds in pacifying Chechnya, to an extent well beyond what Gen. David Petraeus has achieved in Iraq.
2. But that is THEM, and this is US. Criteria are therefore entirely different.

3. In the US, the Democrats are silenced now because of the supposed success of the US military surge in Iraq.
4. Their silence reflects the fact that there are no principled criticisms of the war.
5. In this way of regarding the world, if you're achieving your goals, the war and occupation are justified.
6. The sweetheart oil deals come with the territory.

### **Concluding Stage**

1. In fact, the whole invasion is a war crime — indeed the supreme international crime, differing from other war crimes in that it encompasses all the evil that follows, in the terms of the Nuremberg judgment.
2. This is among the topics that can't be discussed, in the presidential campaign or elsewhere.
3. Why are we in Iraq?
4. What do we owe Iraqis for destroying their country?
5. The majority of the American people favour US withdrawal from Iraq.
6. Do their voices matter?