

# The Role of Argumentative Indicators in Tracing Argumentation; Chomsky's "The Case Against U.S. Adventurism in Iraq" as a Case Study

Prof. Dr. Majeed Hameed Jassim

Dept. of English, College of Arts  
University of Basra

Assist.Prof. Amin Ukaal Ghailan

Dept. of English, College of Education for Human Sciences  
University of Basra

## Abstract

Along the history, politicians' success relates to their skilful use of language so that they may persuade their audiences with their standpoints. Politicians trade in discourse, arguments, speeches, pamphlets and so on. The way they express their thoughts determines who they are and whether they will succeed in their profession. Language is utilised in political matters to unify, organise and criticise in order to show a political viewpoint. Politics has a relation with power i.e., the power to have decisions, to affect other people's behaviour. Any writer has a kind of rebel to express his private political opinions. In our age, there is no keeping out of politics, for all issues are political ones in case that politics is a mass of lies, folly, hatred, etc. The writers and politicians are required to choose their words and utterances with great care, paying close attention to meaning. So is the case with Noam Chomsky, the American linguist and politician, who attempts to shed some light and express his standpoint on the debatable topic of the American invasion to Iraq in 2003. The present paper studies his article "The Case Against US Adventurism in Iraq".

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

## دور المشيرات النقاشية في استقصاء المناقشة: دراسة في مقالة تشومسكي "الدعوى بالصد من المغامرة الأمريكية في العراق"

□ أ.د. مجيد حميد جاسم

□ قسم اللغة الأنكليزية، كلية الآداب، جامعة البصرة

□ الأستاذ المساعد أمين عكال غيلان

□ قسم اللغة الأنكليزية، كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية، جامعة البصرة

## خلاصة

على مر التاريخ، كان يعزى نجاح رجل السياسة في عمله الى الاستخدام الماهر للغة والتي تؤدي الى اقتناع الجمهور بوجهة نظره السياسية. أن السياسي يتاجر في الحديث والمناقشات والكلمات وكتابة الكراريس وألح. وأن الطريقة التي يعبر بها السياسي عن أفكاره تحدد هويته السياسية وفيما إذا كان سينجح في عمله كسياسي أم لا. ويتم الاستفادة من اللغة في المواضيع السياسية من أجل توحيد وتنظيم الجمهور وكذلك انتقاد الآخرين وذلك لإظهار وجهة النظر السياسية. وتوجد علاقة بين السياسة والسلطة من أجل اتخاذ القرارات والتأثير في سلوك الناس، فكل كاتب أو سياسي لديه نوع من الرفض وذلك للتعبير عن آرائه السياسية الخاصة. ففي عصرنا الحالي ليس هناك منأى عن السياسة وذلك لأن كل القضايا هي سياسية بطبيعتها. ويفترض بالكاتب أو السياسي أن يختار كلماته وعباراته بحذر شديد وأن يعنى النظر في معاني تلك الكلمات والعبارات التي يستخدمها. وهذا ينطبق كثيرا على اللغوي والسياسي الأمريكي نعوم تشومسكي، الذي يحاول جاهدا أن يسلط الضوء ويعبر عن وجهة نظره فيما يتعلق بموضوع الاحتلال الأمريكي للعراق في عام ٢٠٠٣ والذي أثار جدلا كثيرا في الأوساط السياسية والأدبية على حد سواء. أن الدراسة الحالية تبحث في إحدى مقالات تشومسكي والمعنونة (الدعوى بالصد من المغامرة الأمريكية في العراق).

الكلمات الرئيسية: الجدال (أو المناقشة)، المشيرات النقاشية، الجدلية البراغماتية، الأفعال الكلامية

## **Introduction**

Argumentation theorists 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. Some of these areas are elements of argumentative discourse, argumentation structures, argument schemes, fallacies, etc. The study is built on the hypothesis that Speech acts form a salient feature of Chomsky's article. Speech acts used in this text are of different kinds. Speech acts in the text under study are used for different functions, purposes, and motives. Also, it is hypothesized that the Pragma-Dialectical approach provides a practical and insightful one that can be used to deal with the argumentation chosen to be studied in the text under study. In order to check the validity of the formulated hypotheses, the researcher will adopt a procedure that includes the following steps:

- 1- An analysis of Chomsky's article using the pragma- dialectical approach proposed by Eemeren. etal (2007) .
2. The identification of argumentative indicators so as to know the structure of the argumentation under study.
- 3- The focus will be on the identification, classification, and interpretation of the speech acts used in the studied text.
- 4- The functions, purposes, and meanings of these acts will be revealed through the analysis.

Generally speaking, 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 becomes 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. Expressions take on the form "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).

For the sake of the analysis of argumentative discourse which should resolve a difference of opinions, the analyst must put into consideration the following analytic operations:

1. Determining the points at issue,
2. Recognizing the positions that the parties adopt,
3. Identifying the explicit and implicit arguments, and
4. Analyzing the argumentation structure.

The words and phrases which indicate the argumentative moves are very important in the analysis of any argumentative text. Eemeren(2007:62) explains that "the analyst who wants to build on words and phrases that can be indicative for certain discussion moves also needs to know the conditions under which those words and expressions fulfil the presupposed indicative function".





Another important thing is that the analyst should consider the context in which the words and expressions are used. The analysis should show the differences of opinion, the distribution of dialectical roles, and the argumentation structure.

### **1. Argumentation in the Pragma-Dialectical Approach: An Overview**

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 other's 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 is that "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" (Eemeren& Grootendorst 2004:37).

For carrying out a proper analysis of any argumentative text, the analyst should have a clear knowledge of the moves leading to the resolution of any dispute in the argument. S/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 according to which a difference of opinion is resolved. 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".

As a matter of fact, the resolution of a difference of opinion is not similar to the settlement of a dispute. A dispute is settled down when the difference of opinion is ended by, for instance, a vote or by an outside party who has an authority over the parties in a dispute. This does not mean that the difference of opinion has been really resolved. An arguer of a standpoint attempts to make it clear whether the standpoint can be defended or not in relation to the other party's critical reactions.

### **2.The Distribution of the Different Types of Speech Act**

Speech act theory provides a suitable means for the analysis of verbal communication directed at resolving a difference of opinion by the application of the pragma-dialectical principles. By using this theory, the argumentative moves in the stages of any critical discussion, to resolve a difference of opinion, are considered as speech acts. We should analyze the argumentative indicators in the different stages of the resolution process through deciding the words and expressions which indicate the argumentative moves in any stage. Depending on the speech act theory proposed by Searle (1979), it will be possible to know which speech acts have a contribution to resolving a difference of opinion. We believe that argumentation can be treated as an illocutionary act complex. This act complex is composed of elementary illocutions which belong to the category



of *assertives* and which at sentence level maintain a one-to-one ratio with (grammatical) sentences. The total constellation of the elementary illocutions constitutes the illocutionary act complex of *argumentation*, which at a higher textual level maintains, as a single whole, a one-to-one ratio with a (grammatical) sentence sequence (Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1992:34).

In this perspective, argumentation is construed as an illocutionary act related to a whole piece of discourse rather than a single sentence. The component parts belong to the category Searle (1975a) calls *assertives*. Taken together, however, they jointly have the communicative function of arguing and may lead to the interactional consequence of convincing. The theory distinguishes five types of speech acts. Some of these speech acts are important to any critical discussion, whereas other acts are not. Anyhow, all of the speech acts can have a significant role in any critical discussion even if they indirectly express other types of speech acts. Depending on speech act theory, Eemeren (1987) in Eemeren, et al (2007) considers five forms of speech acts: Assertive, Declarative, Commissive, Directive and Expressive.

### **3. Argumentative Indicators in Chomsky's "The Case Against U.S. Adventurism in Iraq"**

In Chomsky's "The Case Against US Adventurism in Iraq", the writer of the article adopts a negative standpoint against the problem of US aggression against Iraq. First of all, the writer makes clear his standpoint towards the US use of force. He does not accept the attitude adopted by US leaders towards Iraq and other countries which stand in their way. This is why he describes the US aggression of Iraq as an "adventure" undertaken by the most powerful state against another country. So, it is clear that there are two arguers: the writer who adopts the standpoint that US aggression against Iraq was a foolish adventure, and on the other side, the US principals who support using aggressive power against those who stand in their way.

The arguer's standpoint that US adventurism in Iraq is incorrect as well as the US leaders' attitude that America has all the right to defend its national security against all enemies represent the main concern of the confrontation stage in this argumentation. The same thing is applicable to the arguer's belief that the war against Iraq is intended. This is only to refer to what will happen when US forces decide to strike a blow against any country. Also, the arguer's insistence that Saddam's regime no longer represents any kind of threat beyond the Iraqi territory, and that Saddam remains a terrible threat to those within his reach, represent parts of the confrontation stage. Since no change is given to any further developments in the arguer's or US principals' standpoints, no contributions are made to resolve this dispute.

The starting stage in this argumentation opens when the arguer expresses his opposition to the US leaders' attitudes, suggesting that the consequences of such adventure can be catastrophic to Iraq and even the world, and may explode the region resulting in terrorist retaliations and even a possibility of a nuclear Armageddon. Another starting point discusses the role of propaganda warnings that Saddam Hussein would destroy America, in the future, if the latter doesn't



stop him today. Also, in a third starting stage, the arguer mentions that till now Saddam has kept his chemical and biological piles under control, and that he will not let such weapons fall into the hands of the terrorists such as Osama bin Ladens and his likes.

As regards the argumentation stage, it is represented by the arguer's subordinative argumentation concerning US use of accessive power in dealing with Iraqi case, and for arguing the intended US aggression against Iraq, and also for the threat Saddam regime represents to US national security. All of these argumentation stages are put forward by the arguer in support of his standpoint that US government had committed a deadly mistake in attacking Iraq.

In the concluding stage, the arguer maintains his standpoint that US adventurism gives a dangerous lesson for other countries to have a credible power ( such as North Korea) so as to avoid an American aggression. Another conclusion by the arguer is that the end of Saddam's rule would lift a heavy burden from the shoulders of Iraqi people. A third conclusion is about the disasters resulting from the use of violence in personal life or international affairs. The arguer concludes that nothing has yet come of the overwhelming use of force. In some argumentations, a standpoint is not always presented directly and clearly, it may pose as a question, or may not appear directly as an argumentation. Therefore, the aim of such analysis is to examine argumentative discourse and look at it as part of a critical discussion. In any dialectical analysis, the concentration on the argumentation stage represents the very heart of the argumentative discourse.

In the article under study, it is important to recognize the implicit argumentation it contains. Obviously, the contextual indication plays a major role in the interpretation of the indirect argumentation. Eemeren( 2015:335) writes that "in the case of indirect argumentation ( and in the case of implicit argumentation in general) contextual indicators can have a clarifying effect and assist in interpreting the communicative force of the utterance.....Serious problems of interpretation, generally speaking, only arise in an " undefined" context devoid of helpful points".

Eemeren ( 2015: 335) writes that " the communicative force of argumentation presented directly proved to be significantly easier to recognize than indirect argumentation. In the latter case, the language users needed some extra information in order to know that something more was meant than what was expressed literally". In the case of Chomsky's article on Iraq, the analyst must take a closer look at the context so that s/he can identify the argumentation on US adventurism. So, the conventional form of the article will be insufficient to accomplish this job. In this case, the pragma- dialectical approach to argumentation using speech acts as indicators can be of great help.

Avery important fact about pragma- dialectical approach is that speech acts are not restricted to the level of the individual sentences, as John Searle's speech acts relate. So, according to such approach, argumentation is a complex of illocutionary acts which constitute, at a higher textual level, the illocutionary act





complex of argumentation. Thereby, such illocutionary act is connected with another complex illocution so as to express a certain standpoint. So, the criterion for considering verbal utterances to constitute an argumentation is that they should be related to a standpoint. In this way, any utterances which are considered as argumentation in, for instance, a situation of disagreement, can be represented as explanations or statements or anything else when the circumstances of the context are different. So, the verbal utterances should be related to a certain standpoint so as to be constituents of an argumentation. Eemeren (2015:336) explains that "rather than *being* certain illocutionary acts, under certain conditions, utterances *serve* as these speech acts. The communicative meaning of a speech act not only depends on the formal properties of its verbal expression, but also, and primarily, on the context and situation in which it is performed".

Communicative acts are to be linked, depending on their interactional role in the argument, with other communicative acts of the other arguer. Thereby, there will be an advancing of a certain point of view from one arguer and either accepting or rejecting it by the opposing arguer. Eemeren(2015:338) writes that "in terms of structural dialogical organization, these communicative acts are then said to constitute an adjacency pair: standpoint/ acceptance or standpoint/ rejection, the former second pair part being a preferred response and the latter a dispreferred. If a dispreferred second pair part has come up or may be anticipated, a repair is called for, which in the case of the rejection of a standpoint is most adequately supplied by argumentation to make the standpoint acceptable". A combination of both standpoint and argumentation can be found in Chomsky's article. So, in this argumentation, the following arguments can occur:

### **The Case Against US Adventurism in Iraq**

**Noam Chomsky**

#### **Argument 1**

##### **Confrontation Stage**

1. powerful state in history has proclaimed that it intends to control the world by force. (**Assertive as indirect standpoint**)
2. The dimension in which it reigns supreme. (**Assertive as direct standpoint**)
3. President Bush and his cohorts evidently believe that the means of violence in their hands are so extraordinary that they can dismiss anyone who stands in their way. (**Assertive as indirect argumentation**)

##### **Starting Stage**

1. The consequences could be catastrophic in Iraq and around the world. (**Assertive as direct argumentation**)
2. The United States may reap a whirlwind of terrorist retaliation — and step up the possibility of nuclear Armageddon. (**Usage declarative as direct argumentation**)

##### **Argumentation Stage**

1. Bush, Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld and company are committed to an



“imperial ambition,”(**Commissive as indirect standpoint**)

2. as G. John Ikenberry wrote in the September/October issue of Foreign Affairs — “a unipolar world in which the United States has no peer competitor” and in which “no state or coalition could ever challenge it as global leader, protector and enforcer.”(**Assertive as indirect argumentation**)

3. That ambition surely includes much expanded control over Persian Gulf resources and military bases to impose a preferred form of order in the region.(**Assertive as direct standpoint**)

4. Even before the administration began beating the war drums against Iraq, there were plenty of warnings that U.S. adventurism would lead to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, as well as terror, for deterrence or revenge.( **Usage declarative as direct argumentation**)

### **Concluding Stage**

1. Right now, Washington is teaching the world a dangerous lesson: If you want to defend yourself from us, you had better mimic North Korea and pose a credible threat.( **Usage declarative as indirect standpoint**)

2. Otherwise we will demolish you.(**Assertive as indirect standpoint**)

### **Argument 2**

#### **Confrontation Stage**

1. There is good reason to believe that the war with Iraq is intended, in part, to demonstrate what lies ahead when the empire decides to strike a blow — though “war” is hardly the proper term, given the gross mismatch of forces.(**Assertive as direct standpoint**)

2. A flood of propaganda warns that if we do not stop Saddam Hussein today he will destroy us tomorrow.( **Usage declarative as indirect argumentation**)

3. Last October, when Congress granted the president the authority to go to war, it was “to defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq.” ( **Usage declarative as direct argumentation**)

#### **Starting Stage**

1. But no country in Iraq’s neighborhood seems overly concerned about Saddam, much as they may hate the murderous tyrant. ( **Usage declarative as direct standpoint**)

2. Perhaps that is because the neighbors know that Iraq’s people are at the edge of survival. ( **Usage declarative as direct argumentation**)

#### **Argumentation Stage**

1. Iraq has become one of the weakest states in the region. ( **Assertive as direct argumentation**)

2. As a report from the American Academy of Arts and Sciences points out, Iraq’s economy and military expenditures are a fraction of some of its neighbors’.( **Usage declarative as indirect argumentation**)

3. Indeed, in recent years, countries nearby have sought to reintegrate Iraq into the region, including Iran and Kuwait, both invaded by Iraq.(**Assertive as direct argumentation**)

4. Saddam benefited from U.S. support through the war with Iran and beyond, up



to the day of the invasion of Kuwait.(Usage declarative as direct standpoint)

5. Those responsible are largely back at the helm in Washington today.( Usage declarative as direct argumentation)

6.President Ronald Reagan and the previous Bush administration provided aid to Saddam, along with the means to develop weapons of mass destruction, back when he was far more dangerous than he is now, and had already committed his worst crimes, like murdering thousands of Kurds with poison gas.(Assertive as direct argumentation)

7.An end to Saddam’s rule would lift a horrible burden from the people of Iraq. ( Usage declarative as direct standpoint)

8.There is good reason to believe that he would suffer the fate of Nicolae Ceausescu and other vicious tyrants if Iraqi society were not devastated by harsh sanctions that force the population to rely on Saddam for survival while strengthening him and his clique.(Assertive as direct argumentation)

### Concluding Stage

1.Saddam remains a terrible threat to those within his reach.( Usage declarative as direct standpoint)

2.Today, his reach does not extend beyond his own domains, though it is likely that U.S. aggression could inspire a new generation of terrorists bent on revenge, and might induce Iraq to carry out terrorist actions suspected to be already in place . (Assertive as direct argumentation)

### Argument 3

#### Confrontation Stage

Right now Saddam has every reason to keep under tight control any chemical and biological weapons that Iraq may have.( Usage declarative as direct standpoint)

#### Starting Stage

1.He wouldn’t provide such weapons to the Osama bin Ladens of the world, who represent a terrible threat to Saddam himself.( Assertive as direct argumentation)

2.And administration hawks understand that, except as a last resort if attacked, Iraq is highly unlikely to use any weapons of mass destruction that it has — and risk instant incineration.(Assertive as indirect argumentation)

#### Argumentation Stage

1.Under attack, however, Iraqi society would collapse, including the controls over the weapons of mass destruction.( Usage declarative as direct standpoint)

2.These could be “privatized,” as international security specialist Daniel Benjamin warns, and offered to the huge “market for unconventional weapons, where they will have no trouble finding buyers.” ( Assertive as indirect argumentation)

### Concluding Stage

That really is “a nightmare scenario,” he says.( Usage declarative as indirect





standpoint)

#### Argument 4

##### Confrontation Stage

As for the fate of the people of Iraq in war, no one can predict with any confidence: not the CIA, not Rumsfeld, not those who claim to be experts on Iraq, no one. (**Assertive as indirect standpoint**)

##### Starting Stage

But international relief agencies are preparing for the worst. (**Commissive as indirect argumentation**)

##### Argumentation Stage

1. Studies by respected medical organizations estimate that the death toll could rise to the hundreds of thousands. (**Assertive as indirect argumentation**)

2. Confidential U.N. documents warn that a war could trigger a “humanitarian emergency of exceptional scale” — including the possibility that 30 percent of Iraqi children could die from malnutrition. (**Assertive as indirect argumentation**)

3. Today the administration doesn’t seem to be heeding the international relief agency warnings about an attack’s horrendous aftermath. (**Usage declarative as indirect argumentation**)

##### Concluding Stage

1. The potential disasters are among the many reasons why decent human beings do not contemplate the threat or use of violence, whether in personal life or international affairs, unless reasons have been offered that have overwhelming force. (**Usage declarative as direct standpoint**)

2. And surely nothing remotely like that justification has come forward. (**Assertive as direct standpoint**)

In this argumentation, the arguer makes his standpoint clear on the topic of US adventurism in Iraq. Apparently, opinions differ on the topic of US aggression against Iraq. So, it is clear from the introductory part of this analysis, especially of the confrontation stage, that the arguer adopts and defends the standpoint that US should not attack Iraq because the latter has no ability to threaten US national security. "One must assume that the participants in a discourse are making sense, the things they are saying being relevant to the stage of the speech event they have reached and the communicative acts performed at an interactional level relating adequately to one another and to the overall and local interactional goals in force" (Edmondson, 1981:14; Eemeren, 2015:338). Obviously, the arguer's standpoint in the context of the article is very accurate. It is crystal clear that the aim of writing this article is to criticise the US adventurism in Iraq and this, in its part, is a good reason to consider that the communicative act of the topic in the article is intended. This is only done by considering the arguer's article as an argumentation. Thereby, the analyst's interpretation of the article will be an attempt to repair the disagreement between the arguer's and US principals by making his standpoint justifiable to the readers so that it may have their satisfaction.

In the above- mentioned division, the clear connection between any



standpoint and argumentation can become clear due to the effect of the correctness conditions of a standpoint. In argument 1, the standpoint "powerful state in history has proclaimed that it intends to control the world by force" has been satisfied and fulfilled by four utterances in the argumentation stage. The argumentation stage refutes the standpoint previously produced in the confrontation stage. By virtue of the main standpoint assumed by the US leaders for America to be the most powerful state along history which has the right to defend its national security and attack those who represent a vital threat to its peace, the arguer assumes himself responsible for refuting the US behaviour against others, and he has the responsibility to defend his opposing standpoint.

Chomsky's article includes four arguments, all of which are about the US adventurous domination to Iraq. To start with the first argument, in the confrontation stage, the arguer mentions that US (as the most powerful state in history) intends to control the world by force. The three utterances of the confrontation stage explain the same idea about US intention to control the world. In utterance 1, the weak assertive (has proclaimed) is a propositional attitude indicator which shows that the arguer doesn't think that the intention of US to control the world by force to be necessarily true. In utterance 2, the strong assertive "supreme" refers to the undesirable result or the side-effect of US intention. Also, utterance 3 talks about the belief of US president and principals that they have the power to dismiss anyone standing in their way. The weak assertive (believe that) shows that the arguer doesn't stand in the side of US principals. This propositional attitude indicator is used to support the preceding two utterances in the confrontation stage. This shows that the arguer commits himself to defend his opposite standpoint about the US intention, which consists of one or more utterances. Eemeren, et al (2007: 28) write that "in the case of standpoints, the preparatory conditions that the party who advances the standpoint assumes that the other party will not accept it just like that, but that he will be able to defend his standpoint with the help of arguments".

In the starting stage, there are two utterances which reflect the doubt of the arguer concerning the consequences of the US adventurism in Iraq and other parts of the world. The indicators of doubt in both of utterance 1 (could be catastrophic) and utterance 2 (may reap a whirlwind of terrorist retaliation) are used to show the uncertain probability of the results of such adventurism (especially the indicator "may reap").

The argumentation stage has 4 utterances in which the arguer continues his discussion of US imperial ambition to create a unipolar world in which US is the supreme power. Utterance 2 completes utterance 1 in using G. John Ikenberry's quotation about the American ambition as "a unipolar world in which the united states has no peer competition and in which "no state or coalition could ever challenge it as global leader, protector and enforcer". The use of the indicator "as" at the beginning of utterance 2 as a force modifying expression is for concluding the idea produced in utterance 1.

Utterance 3 continues the discussion of the imperial ambition by using the expression "that ambition" to refer to utterance 1. Also, the strong assertive



"surely" reinforces the negative consequences of that ambition which "includes much expanded control over Persian Gulf resources and military bases". Such expressions express a certain degree of certainty. "A speaker who avails himself of such an expression or adjunct makes, in fact, two assertions: he asserts the complementary proposition, and he asserts that it is certain or likely that the complementary proposition is correct"( Eemeren,etal,2007:33). In utterance 4, the indicator " Even " relates to the complementary expression in that the arguer completes his argumentation on the expected negative results of US adventurism. Also, the indicator " would lead to" refers to a causal argumentation[x leads to y] to show the undesirable result of such adventurism. The indicator " as well as " refers to the addition of new information to the present argumentation. This does not mean that the added argumentation may be less or more important than the previous ones. All the preceding indicators in the argumentation stage help discuss one topic which is the US imperial ambition to control the world.

In the concluding stage, there are 2 utterances which complete each other. In both utterances, the arguer concludes his previous argumentation that Washington, through its adventure in Iraq, is teaching the world a dangerous lesson. The beginning of utterance1" right now" indicates a conclusion of what is achieved till now by US adventure in Iraq. Also, the "if" conditional shows that the arguer withdraws his standpoint and allows the other side to prove its standpoint. The US lesson or standpoint is that" if you want to defend yourself from us, you had better mimic North Korea and pose a credible threat". The expression " you had better"[ x is better] is an indicator of the pragmatic argumentation to tell that it is preferable to do as North Korea to defend yourself from America. The indicator" otherwise" in utterance 2 shows a contrary standpoint. This pragmatic consequence ( undesirable result) is for showing that only one of these standpoints is to be chosen, and that the other should be rejected.

By looking at argument 2 whose standpoint is that" there is good reason to believe that the war with Iraq is intended, in part, to demonstrate what lies ahead when the empire decides to strike a blow- though "war" is hardly the proper term, given the gross mismatch of forces", the utterances in the argumentation stage seem enough to comment on this standpoint( in the confrontation stage). The eight utterances in the argumentation stage justify the standpoint of the arguer that the US war with Iraq is intended. Gompert(2014:166) advocates that" in march of 2002, Bush informally told a group of senators" we're taking him[ Saddam] out". That same month, Cheney told Senate Republicans that " the question was not longer if the US would attack Iraq, the only question was when". The utterances in the argumentation stage explain that Iraq doesn't, any more, represent any form of threat to America. Reading the utterances of the argumentation( see utterances 1-8 in argument 2, argumentation stage)makes clear how the arguer explains the faulty thinking of the American leaders about Iraq having any power to threaten America or countries territorial to Iraq. These utterances show how Iraq became too weak compared with the surrounding

countries, and also how Saddam's regime benefitted from the blockade against Iraq. The results of such blockade seem to be disastrous on Iraqi people, not Saddam's regime.

Furthermore, American men of authority actually supported Saddam during the Iraqi- Iranian war and in the massacres, with poison gas, against the Kurds during the eighties. The arguer concludes his argumentation with the standpoint that "Saddam remains a terrible threat to those within his reach", and his argumentation that today, Saddam has no reach beyond his own domains and that US aggression may inspire terrorist actions in the region.

In argument 2, the confrontation stage consists of 3 utterances which discuss one issue " the war with Iraq is intended". In utterance1, the use of the weak assertive " There is good reason to believe" before the main topic " the war with Iraq is intended" shows the importance of the assertive expressions to support the attitude of the arguer. Alkadiri and Mohamedi(2003:20) think that " the war party in Washington has big plans for Iraqi oil- from repairing damage done by US bombs to smashing the power of OPEC and undermining oil- producing regimes. Postwar chaos may derail these plans at the outset". Also, the use of the indicator " though" in this utterance shows an indication of contrariness to the idea of war. The use of the indicator " hardly" expresses the one sided refusal of the US war against Iraq. In utterance 2, the use of "if conditional" expression: "if we do not stop Saddam Hussein today he will destroy us tomorrow" is an indication for the arguer to withdraw his standpoint and leave the opponent( US principals) to maintain his standpoint. This discussion is completed by utterance 3 which talks about the grant given to the president to go to the war against Iraq. This is clear from the adverb of time" last October". All these three utterances prove the idea that the war against Iraq is intended by US leaders.

In respect of the starting stage, it opens with the indicator of doubt" But" in utterance1. which is also an indicator of contrariness. The indicator " But" shows the discussion to be multiple and the arguer gives different opinion to his opponent. Eemeren and Henkemans( 2017: 46) write that" when these expressions are used, the proposition to which the standpoint relates is in most cases explicitly doubted". It also shows the arguer to have more than one attempt to support his standpoint. Utterance 2 in the starting stage continues the argument raised by the arguer. This utterance opens with the force modifying expression( weak assertive)" perhaps" to assert his standpoint. Also, the expression " the neighbors know that Iraq's people are at the edge of survival" is a generally accepted starting point. It tells how the neighbouring countries show a sort of sympathy with the bad economic situation of Iraqi people. The arguer tries to emphasize his standpoint as general and shared by other countries bordering Iraq.

In the argumentation stage, the arguer discusses the difficult situation of Iraqi people and how Saddam had benefited from US support during the war with Iran. At the time, Saddam represents a horrible burden over the shoulders of Iraqi people, and putting an end to his regime will end their suffering. Starting with utterance 1, it completes utterance 2 from the starting stage. The use of the







superlative case( weakest) shows the amount of the weakness of Iraq. It is an assertion used, by the arguer, to show his certainty on Iraq being weak. In utterance2, the verb" points out" is an indication for a symptomatic relationship in one direction by virtue of its formula [ X points out Y] . Also, the expression " a fraction" is used for showing the weakness of Iraqi economy and military expenditures. In utterance 3, the assertive" Indeed" is a force modifying expression. It is an assertion to utterance 2 for showing the weakness of Iraq.

All of utterances4,5,6 discuss the cooperation between Saddam's regime and US government during the war with Iran. These utterances are linked to one topic( US government's support to Saddam's regime in the past). This US support ended with the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. The arguer considers US principals, namely president Ronald Regan and the previous Bush administration, responsible for reinforcing Saddam's regime and killing Iraqis; especially thousands of Kurds with poison gas. The result of utterances 4,5,6 appears in utterance 7 in which the arguer considers the end of Saddam's regime as a must for putting an end to the suffering of Iraqi people. The propositional attitude indicator( a horrible burden) describes the disaster of the Iraqi people under Saddam's rule.

With utterance 8, the arguer ends his argumentation concerning the fate of Saddam's rule. The expression ( good reason) is an assertive to maintain the arguer's standpoint. He states his standpoint on the relation of US government with Saddam. The weak assertive ( to believe) is an indicator of the arguer's belief that the fate of Saddam was similar to that of Nicolae Ceausescu and other tyrants. There is an analogy expression of equality[ Saddam= Nicolae Ceausescu] in this utterance. Another important indicator is the use of ( if-conditional) which relates to the attempt of the arguer to give an alternative defence of his standpoint.

In the concluding stage, the arguer spells out his estimation of the situation of Iraq and the possible disastrous results of US aggression. This stage consists of two utterances. In utterance1, the argumentative indicator" remains a terrible threat" is an expression indicating an aspect of the symptomatic relationship. The arguer considers that Saddam has no power outside the borders of Iraq. Utterance 2 continues and supports utterance 1 in that US aggression may evolve a new generation of terrorists and there will be a new stage of terrorism. The force modifying expression (weak assertive) "though it is likely" shows the possibility of the raise in terrorist activities as a result of US aggression. Also, the verb "might", in this utterance, relates to the possibility of the emergence of such revengeful actions.

In argument 3, the arguer mentions that Saddam had kept his chemical and biological weapons under tight control. In the argumentation stage, the arguer clarifies that Iraqi society and government will collapse under US attack which will lead to a chaos and selling weapons of mass destruction in the black markets of unconventional weapons. With argument 3, the discussion turns to another important topic i.e., the control of chemical and biological weapons that Iraq may have. The arguer believes that attacking Iraq will lead to a loss of

control over such weapons, thus they will find their way to the market of unconventional weapons.

Starting with the confrontation stage, it contains only one utterance which talks about the ability of Saddam to keep his chemical and biological weapons under a tight control. The strong assertives ( has every reason) and ( tight control) indicate the ability of Saddam's regime to have a complete control over such weapons. Also, the verb(may have) which indicates a possibility or uncertainty refers to the doubt of the arguer concerning the possession of such weapons by Saddam's regime.

In the starting stage, two reasons, for supporting the arguer's standpoint in the confrontation stage, are mentioned in utterances1 and 2. The first reason is that in utterance1, Osama bin Laden represents a terrible threat to Saddam himself; therefore, Saddam wouldn't provide him with such weapons. Another reason listed in utterance2 is that the administration hawks in US government believe very well that it is very unlikely for Iraq to use any weapons of mass destruction in the war with US. The use of the weak assertive( highly unlikely) which is a force modifying expression supports this belief. Thereby, the arguer doesn't think that the matter of using weapons of mass destruction represents a reliable cause for starting the war against Saddam's regime.

In the argumentation stage, there are two utterances which discuss the result of US attack to Saddam's regime. In utterance 1, the word" however" expresses an indication of acceptance to the idea of US attack with some restriction. This can be explained by noticing the negative results of such an attack. Utterance 2 completes utterance 1 in showing the negative sequences of US attack. The arguer used to cite the speech of the international security specialist Daniel Benjamin who warns that one of the results of US attack is to privatize weapons of mass destruction and offer them for sale in the market for unconventional weapons. With such possible happening, it is wise to think that these weapons will be at the hands of the terrorists. The arguer describes such possible disasterous happening to be a " nightmare scenario" as Daniel Benjamin describes in the concluding stage. The use of the strong assertive " really" as a force modifying expression ascertains the possibility of the happening of such event.

Regarding argument 4, the arguer describes, in the confrontation stage, the unpredictable fate of the Iraqi people under US attack. He mentions that the CIA, Rumsfeld, those who claim to be experts on Iraq, and no one else can predict the future of the people in Iraq if war happened. In the starting stage, the arguer refers to the preparations of the international relief agencies for the catastrophes happening as a result of such attack. In the argumentation stage, the arguer mentions some studies adopted by respected medical organizations and confidential U.N. documents on the expected losses of hundreds of thousands of Iraqi people, especially children, as eventual result of such attack. As for the concluding stage, the arguer also uses two acts ( usage declarative and assertive) to conclude that the potential disasters happening as a result of the use of violence should not happen both in personal life or international affairs. He also



believes that till now nothing deserves using power to attack Iraq, or any other regime.

In argument 4, the main discussion is on the fate of the people of Iraq in a wartime. The arguer looks pessimistic about the disasters facing Iraq as an outcome of US attack. In the confrontation stage, the frequent use of the negation "no" is for the assertion of the melancholic fate of Iraqi people. The negative "no" is repeated five times in one utterance which refers to the contrariness of the action. The arguer mentions the centres of power and decision in US, including CIA, Rumsfeld, and experts on Iraq after the negative "not". This repetition is a matter of emphasis of the standpoint of the arguer and his refusal to the idea of US war against Iraq.

With the starting stage, the word "But" shows the argumentation to be multiple. This indicator not only shows that an alternative standpoint is presented, but also that this alternative standpoint excludes what it is put opposite to, which makes the utterance in the starting stage opposite to the confrontation stage.

All of the three utterances in the argumentation stage are mentioned to argue and support the standpoint previously raised about the melancholic fate of the people of Iraq. In utterance 1, there is a mention of the studies by respected medical organizations on the huge amounts of death (hundreds of thousands) as a result of the war. The verb "estimate" indicates the formula [X has bad side effect] which is an assertion to the standpoint in the confrontation stage. Also, the verb "could rise" is an indicator of doubt. It also exaggerates the expected numbers of killed people in the war.

Utterance 2 also supports the confrontation stage about the unexpected result of war. The verb "warn" shows the undesirable effect of the war, for the high amount of the death of children as a result of malnutrition. On the contrary with the two preceding utterances, utterance 3 tells that US administration doesn't listen to the warnings of international relief agency and confidential UN documents. The expression "doesn't seem to be heeding" shows the indifference of US administration to such warnings. Also, the expression "horrendous aftermath" expresses an exaggeration of the undesirable result of such war. Thereby, the argumentation stage seems to be split between supporting the standpoint in the confrontation stage (utterances 1 and 2) and showing the attitude of US administration to be indifferent to all the warnings of disastrous results of the war.

In the concluding stage, both utterances complete each other in showing the arguer's standpoint that threat or use of violence has potential disasters whether in personal life or international affairs. In utterance 2, the use of "and" shows an indication of complementary ideas. It links utterance 2 with utterance 1 through the use of the indicator "and". Also, the indicators "surely" and "remotely" are assertives for the standpoint of the arguer. However, in both utterances, the arguer attempts to assert his standpoint that no real and important, or acceptable matter, can justify the US war against Iraq. By collecting the argumentative indicators in the four arguments in Chomsky's argumentation "The Case



Against US Adventurism in Iraq", we have the following chart :

Argument 1	Argument 2	Argument 3	Argument 4
<p><u>Confrontation Stage</u> has proclaimed, supreme, believe that</p>	<p><u>Confrontation Stage</u> There is good reason to believe, though hardly, If conditional(If we do not stop Saddam Hussein today, he will destroy us tomorrow), Last October</p>	<p><u>Confrontation Stage</u> has every reason, tight control, may have</p>	<p><u>Confrontation Stage</u> no one, not, not, not, no one</p>
<p><u>Starting stage</u> Could be catastrophic, may reap</p>	<p><u>Starting Stage</u> But, perhaps, the neighbors know that Iraq's people are at the edge of survival</p>	<p><u>Starting Stage</u> Highly unlikely</p>	<p><u>Starting Stage</u> But</p>
<p><u>Argumentation Stage</u> as, that ambition surely, even, would lead[X leads to Y](US adventurism would lead to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction), as well as</p>	<p><u>Argumentation Stage</u> Weakest, points out[X points out Y], fraction, Indeed, a horrible burden, good reason, to believe, [Saddam= Nicolae Ceausescu](he would suffer the fate of Nicolae Ceausescu), If conditional(he would suffer the fate of Nicolae Ceausescu and other tyrants if Iraqi society were not devastated by</p>	<p><u>Argumentation Stage</u> However</p>	<p><u>Argumentation Stage</u> Estimate[ X has badside effect], could rise, warn, doesn't seem to be heeding, horrendous aftermath</p>







	harsh sanctions)		
<u>Concluding Stage</u> Right now, if conditional(If you want to defend yourself from us, you had better mimic North Korea and pose a credible threat), [X is better](You had better), Otherwise(undesirable result)	<u>Concluding Stage</u> remains a terrible threat, though it is likely, might	<u>Concluding Stage</u> Really	<u>Concluding Stage</u> And , surely, remotely

**Chart.1 Argumentative Indicators in the Argumentation "The Case Against US Adventurism in Iraq"**

<b>Argument 1</b>	<b>Argument 2</b>	<b>Argument 3</b>	<b>Argument 4</b>
<u>Confrontation Stage</u> Assertive , Assertive, Assertive	<u>Confrontation Stage</u> Assertive, Usage Declarative, Usage Declarative	<u>Confrontation Stage</u> Assertive	<u>Confrontation Stage</u> Assertive
<u>Starting stage</u> Assertive , Usage Declarative	<u>Starting Stage</u> Usage Declarative, Usage Declarative	<u>Starting Stage</u> Assertive, Assertive	<u>Starting Stage</u> Commissive
<u>Argumentation Stage</u> Commissive , Assertive, Assertive, Usage Declarative	<u>Argumentation Stage</u> Assertive, Usage Declarative, Assertive, Usage Declarative, Usage Declarative, Assertive, Usage Declarative, Assertive	<u>Argumentation Stage</u> Usage Declarative, Assertive	<u>Argumentation Stage</u> Assertive , Assertive , Usage Declarative
<u>Concluding Stage</u> Usage Declarative, Assertive	<u>Concluding Stage</u> Usage Declarative, Assertive	<u>Concluding Stage</u> Usage Declarative	<u>Concluding Stage</u> Usage Declarative, Assertive

**Chart 2. Speech Acts in the Argumentation "The Case Against Us Adventurism in Iraq"**

**Speech Acts in the Argumentation "The Case Against US Adventurism in Iraq"**

Speech Act	Argument 1	Argument 2	Argument 3	Argument 4	Total
Usage Declarative	3	9	2	2	16
Assertive	7	6	4	4	21
Commissive	1	Zero	Zero	1	2
Directive	Zero	Zero	Zero	Zero	Zero
Expressive	Zero	Zero	Zero	Zero	Zero
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>39</b>

From chart.2 and the table above, it becomes clear that the argumentation, made by the arguer, mostly depends on the “usage declarative” and “assertive” acts ( 16 usage declaratives and 21 assertives). This can relate to the type of the argumentation and the arguer’s resort to such speech acts to clarify his opinion on the topic of US aggression against Iraq.

Both of the usage declarative and assertive acts are the best ones, among other types, to persuade the reader of the viewpoints of the arguer and to focus his attention on the subject under discussion. The arguer heavily depends on these speech acts ( especially the assertives) to show his standpoint towards the American invasion of Iraq. Eemeren, etal.( 2007: 28) write that" an assertive may be considered a standpoint if it is clear that the speaker supposes( or may be expected to suppose on the basis of the listener's response) that the assertive is not immediately acceptable to the listener". So, they are used to make the reader agree with the arguer's standpoint concerning the actual purposes of the American domination to Iraq.

As for other acts, the arguer uses the commissive acts twice in the argumentation and starting stages, a matter that relates to the importance of this speech act in showing the commitments made in this argumentation. There are no directive or expressive acts in the argumentation. In both of the commissive acts, there is a commitment by US principals and interactional relief agencies. First, US principals are committed to an” imperial ambition”, whereas international relief agencies prepare themselves for the worst in case of US aggression to Iraq. In both cases, the commissive acts are made sides other than the arguer. Finally, the directive acts seem not possible for use in this argumentation and this is due to the type of the argumentation itself and the nature of the topic under discussion.

**Conclusion**

The understanding of the discourse can lead to interpretation which will be led by such understanding. This becomes clear when the analyst knows the standpoint of the arguer concerning a certain subject, in this case US adventurism in Iraq. This can fulfil the introductory standpoint that” powerful state in history has proclaimed that it intends to control the world by force, the





dimension in which it reigns supreme". Of course, there is a reasonable justification for advancing this standpoint, by assuming that this point of view (proposed by US principals) should be refuted in Chomsky's argumentation. This has a relation with the final conclusion of the arguer at the end of the article "the potential disasters are among the many reasons why decent human beings do not contemplate the threat or use of violence, whether in personal life or international affairs, unless for overwhelming reasons. And nothing remotely like that justification has come forward".

The most important conclusion in the previous analysis is on the interpretation of parts (arguments) of the discourse as argumentation. This is made due to the use of speech act theory which is important in solving problems of interpretation through the knowledge of the language users of the speech acts. Thereby, the dialectical starting point provides a rationale for the transformation from one argument to another one through the discourse. Throughout the analysis of this discourse, the arguer has the merit of the doubt, and the interpretation of the discourse will be very beneficial to the resolution of the dispute. Also, it is not necessary for the analyst to ask whether this speech act or that is a good defence of a certain standpoint.

It is clear from the results of this study of Chomsky's argumentation that speech acts are very important (especially the Assertives<sup>21</sup> and Usage declaratives<sup>16</sup>) feature in the argumentation. Also, the application of the pragma-dialectical approach to this text shows a new detailed understanding of the argumentation. This is made through the identification of the argumentative indicators used by the arguer throughout the argumentation.

The analyst can check the single argumentations individually as related to the main standpoint. Also, the analyst can consider them as a conclusive defense of such standpoint. Therefore, in the pragma-dialectical analysis, the strategy is to have a multiple interpretation of the argumentation structure. In this way, the study of each single argument will be at the service of the justification or refutation of the standpoint being defended.

### **Bibliography**

Alkadiri, R. and Mohamedi, F. (2003). "World Oil Markets and the Invasion of Iraq". *Journal of Middle East Report*. No.227, pp.20-27+ 30-31. Available at: [www.jstor.org/stable/1559320](http://www.jstor.org/stable/1559320). Accessed :9/7/2018.

Chomsky, N.(2003). *The Case Against US Adventurism in Iraq*. Available at: [CHOMSKY.INFO](http://CHOMSKY.INFO)

Edmondson, W. (1981). *Spoken Discourse. A Model for Analysis*. New York: Longman.

Eemeren, F.H. van & Grootendorst, R. (2004). *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation: The Pragma-Dialectical Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eemeren, F.H. van, et al. (2007). *Argumentative Indicators: A Pragma-Dialectical Study*. The Netherlands: Springer.

Eemeren, F.H. van. (2015). *Reasonableness and Effectiveness in Argumentative Discourse: Fifty Contributions to the Development of Pragma-Dialectics*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.

Eemeren, F.H. van and Henkema, A.F.S. (2017). *Argumentation: Analysis and Evaluation (2nd Edition)*. New York and London: Routledge.

Gompert, D.C., et al. (2014). "The U.S. Invasion of Iraq, 2003". In *Blinders, Blunders, and Wars*. RAND Corporation. Available at: [www.jstor.org/stable/10.7249/j.ctt1287m9t.21](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7249/j.ctt1287m9t.21)

Maimunah, S. A. (2007). *Buku Pintar Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Prestasi Pustaka Publisher.

### Appendix

The analysis in this paper is made on the following article written by the famous linguist and politician *Noam Chomsky*, about the American occupation of Iraq in 2003:

#### **The Case Against US Adventurism in Iraq**

**Noam Chomsky**

**Star Tribune, March 13, 2003**

powerful state in history has proclaimed that it intends to control the world by force, the dimension in which it reigns supreme.

President Bush and his cohorts evidently believe that the means of violence in their hands are so extraordinary that they can dismiss anyone who stands in their way.

The consequences could be catastrophic in Iraq and around the world. The United States may reap a whirlwind of terrorist retaliation — and step up the possibility of nuclear Armageddon.

Bush, Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld and company are committed to an “imperial ambition,” as G. John Ikenberry wrote in the September/October issue of *Foreign Affairs* — “a unipolar world in which the United States has no peer competitor” and in which “no state or coalition could ever challenge it as global leader, protector and enforcer.”

That ambition surely includes much expanded control over Persian Gulf resources and military bases to impose a preferred form of order in the region. Even before the administration began beating the war drums against Iraq, there were plenty of warnings that U.S. adventurism would lead to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, as well as terror, for deterrence or revenge.

Right now, Washington is teaching the world a dangerous lesson: If you want to defend yourself from us, you had better mimic North Korea and pose a credible threat. Otherwise we will demolish you.

There is good reason to believe that the war with Iraq is intended, in part, to demonstrate what lies ahead when the empire decides to strike a blow — though “war” is hardly the proper term, given the gross mismatch of forces.

A flood of propaganda warns that if we do not stop Saddam Hussein today he will destroy us tomorrow.

Last October, when Congress granted the president the authority to go to war, it







was “to defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq.”

But no country in Iraq’s neighborhood seems overly concerned about Saddam, much as they may hate the murderous tyrant.

Perhaps that is because the neighbors know that Iraq’s people are at the edge of survival. Iraq has become one of the weakest states in the region. As a report from the American Academy of Arts and Sciences points out, Iraq’s economy and military expenditures are a fraction of some of its neighbors’.

Indeed, in recent years, countries nearby have sought to reintegrate Iraq into the region, including Iran and Kuwait, both invaded by Iraq.

Saddam benefited from U.S. support through the war with Iran and beyond, up to the day of the invasion of Kuwait. Those responsible are largely back at the helm in Washington today.

President Ronald Reagan and the previous Bush administration provided aid to Saddam, along with the means to develop weapons of mass destruction, back when he was far more dangerous than he is now, and had already committed his worst crimes, like murdering thousands of Kurds with poison gas.

An end to Saddam’s rule would lift a horrible burden from the people of Iraq.

There is good reason to believe that he would suffer the fate of Nicolae Ceausescu and other vicious tyrants if Iraqi society were not devastated by harsh sanctions that force the population to rely on Saddam for survival while strengthening him and his clique.

Saddam remains a terrible threat to those within his reach. Today, his reach does not extend beyond his own domains, though it is likely that U.S. aggression could inspire a new generation of terrorists bent on revenge, and might induce Iraq to carry out terrorist actions suspected to be already in place.

Right now Saddam has every reason to keep under tight control any chemical and biological weapons that Iraq may have. He wouldn’t provide such weapons to the Osama bin Ladens of the world, who represent a terrible threat to Saddam himself.

And administration hawks understand that, except as a last resort if attacked, Iraq is highly unlikely to use any weapons of mass destruction that it has — and risk instant incineration.

Under attack, however, Iraqi society would collapse, including the controls over the weapons of mass destruction. These could be “privatized,” as international security specialist Daniel Benjamin warns, and offered to the huge “market for unconventional weapons, where they will have no trouble finding buyers.” That really is “a nightmare scenario,” he says.

As for the fate of the people of Iraq in war, no one can predict with any confidence: not the CIA, not Rumsfeld, not those who claim to be experts on Iraq, no one.

But international relief agencies are preparing for the worst.

Studies by respected medical organizations estimate that the death toll could rise to the hundreds of thousands. Confidential U.N. documents warn that a war could trigger a “humanitarian emergency of exceptional scale” — including the

possibility that 30 percent of Iraqi children could die from malnutrition. Today the administration doesn't seem to be heeding the international relief agency warnings about an attack's horrendous aftermath. The potential disasters are among the many reasons why decent human beings do not contemplate the threat or use of violence, whether in personal life or international affairs, unless reasons have been offered that have overwhelming force. And surely nothing remotely like that justification has come forward.

*No. : 1    Vol. : 44    Yr. 2019*



*Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences*