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الملخص:

كل لغة خطابية أساليب بلاغية خاصة بها، وهي فريدة من نوعها، هذه الأساليب قد تعبّر عن الأفضليات الثقافية في تنظيم الأفكار. ولكن الميل لتفصيل أساليب جدلي عن آخر لا يعني أن اللغة تتفاصر إلى هذا الأسلوب الآخر، ولكنه يعني أن، لأسباب معينة، مستخدمي اللغة يفضلون أسلوبا معيناً على الآخر. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى البحث والاستراتيجيات الجدلية التي يميل إلى الصحافيين محدثو اللغة الإنجليزية كلغتهم الأم، والعرب لتحظفها في الخطاب الصحفي السياسي الإنجليزي الذي ينافس القضايا التي تتضمن وجهة نظر صحافية. والجدل في سياق هذه الدراسة هو شكل من أشكال الخطاب الذي يحاول الإقناع، والتأثير على القراء من خلال استخدام سلسلة متعلقة من علاقات الفهم، والانتماء، والقيم، والأهمية، و التعارض، من أجل عمل إضافة أو مطالبة. ووجدت بيانات الدراسة أن أربع مقالات صحافية مكتوبة باللغة الإنجليزية من أربع صحف، و أجري تحليل البيانات وفقًا لنموذج التركيب الجدلي، ل. ب. حائم (1989، 1991، 1997).
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textual features we might find through the analysis of one text represent only one rhetorical option, which is typically preferred because they indicate solidarity and shared cultural beliefs within each language.

In conclusion, more empirical and comparative research is required in the field of the critical analysis of argumentative discourses. This study restricted its discussion to some of the linguistic features that characterize argumentation, it is equally important to consider other features in a more expanded study.

9. Implications for translation

In a good translation, the translator should take into account the interplay between the textual functions and the linguistic approaches of the source language, on the one hand, and the network of register conventions in the target language, on the other.

Where attitude function is concerned, there are some differences in levels of implicitness between the English native speakers and the Arab writers. Translators should apply the conventions of the target language to the text. It is suggested that the good translation entails an appropriate shift in the degree of implicitness.
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devices employed when writers do not want to force their opinion explicitly.

7.5 Conditional clauses

Although conditional clauses are considered as features used to indicate different perspectives of the issues discussed in journalistic texts (Biber, 1988 and 1989), the native English speakers journalistic texts show a relatively low frequency in the occurrence of conditional clauses. Whereas in the journalistic text by the Arabs, the results show no occurrence of any conditional type construction. It is safe to say that Arab writers seem to favour evaluating the issue or situation as an attempt for persuasion.

7.6 Lexical Repetition

Table 3 indicates that there is a clear significant difference between English and Arabs in the employment of lexical repetition as an argumentative strategy. Lexical repetition is said to be (Menacere, 1992:32) ‘not a result of non-linguistic patterns or randomness’ as has unjustifiably been claimed by linguists. It can be inferred from the results that Arab writers tend to favour repetition of what is considered to be implicit to the English native speakers. Menacere (1992:36) emphasizes that lexical repetition should not be signaled out from the textual analysis or considered in isolation, but should rather be seen as forms which combine together to fulfill the persuasive function in the process of communication. However, as table 2 illustrates, in the texts written by the English native speakers, lexical repetition is employed with an average occurrence ranging from two occurrences to eight per text. This study illustrates that lexical repetition is not uncommon in Arabic and that this recurrence is not only restricted to lexis and that complete phrases and clauses are likely to recur too.

7.7 Rhetorical questions

Rhetorical questions are usually defined as statements regarding one’s opinion rather than genuine requests for information. The results shown in table 3 seem striking; the Arab writers did not employ any rhetorical question. This is shown in the journalistic argumentative texts written by Arab writers, whereas the English journalistic texts written by the English native speakers show a limited number of use.

7.8 Persuasive verbs

The frequent use of persuasive verbs indicates the writer’s way of attempting to grip the reader’s attention in order to achieve a more ‘emphatic effect’ Jabr (1985). The texts written by Arabs show high frequency in the use of persuasive verbs with an average mean of 16. In fact, this average is more than doubles the average scored in English texts (table 3).

8. Conclusion

The linguistic argumentative strategies the native English speakers and Arabs tend to employ in a journalistic discourse may differ not only in the textual structure of argumentation but also in the linguistic strategies employed. Both through-argumentative and counter-argumentative approaches are used by the two types of journalists English and Arabs. But the counter-argumentative approach is used more frequently by the native English speakers than by Arabs. In order to generalize such a conclusion to all argumentative texts, more argumentative text forms (debates, political speeches etc.) need to be investigated. Moreover, probably more argumentative linguistic features should be studied. Moreover, this study reinforces the point that Arab writers have historically had the option to develop counter-arguments but that they prefer to develop through-arguments. As Sa’adeddin (1989) points out, the
### TABLE 6.1.1.4. Occurrence of linguistic features in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic feature</th>
<th>Text 3</th>
<th>Text 2</th>
<th>Text 1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concessive Adverbials</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessity Modals</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictive Modals</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional clauses</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical repetition</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensifiers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Questions</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive verbs</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Discussion

**7.1** One should bear in mind that the selection of an argument structure does not come random. Argument structure, as Nariyama (2001: 127) argues, is determined by recognized discourse properties of arguments as topic and readership. Even though the manifestation of preferred argument structure and what governs that preference may differ from the native English speakers to Arabs, the existence of the two argument constructions (i.e. through-argumentation and counter-argumentation) seems to be relatively cross linguistic.

**7.2** Further, the native English speakers and Arab journalists are dissimilar for reasons other than those of their different linguistic patterns such as writing conventions and styles of constructing thoughts.

**7.3** The textual linguistic features examined and analyzed in this study are considered to be notably central in the structuring of discourse (Biber, 1989).

**7.4** The linguistic features when compared tend to vary in the degree of occurrence frequency not only between the users of two different languages but also within a language itself:

#### 7.4.1 Concessive adverbials

Table 3 illustrates the significant difference between the native English speakers' and Arabs' employment of concessive adverbial. Based on the results, one can assume that the Arabs favor implicit concessions, whereas the native English speakers appear to prefer the use of explicit lexical concession.

**7.4.2 Modality**

Modals, like any other linguistic feature in this study, mark the writer’s attitude towards the issue being discussed in the English native journalistic argumentative texts as obligation, possibility and prediction (Biber, 1988).

**7.4.2.1 Necessity modals**

The Arab journalists seem to prefer not to employ any necessity expressions. It seems that they favour the frequent use of evaluative markers. These markers are considered, by some Arab researchers (Fakhri, 1993:147 and Obeidat, 1998), as sentence modifiers and their function is to emphasize the content of the whole sentence they introduce.

**7.4.2.2 Predictive modals**

It is clear by referring to table 3 that the predictive modals appear to be employed by the Arab and the native English speakers journalists with nearly the same frequency of occurrence.

**7.4.2.3 Possibility modals**

It is quite noticeable that there is a significant difference between the Arab and the native English speakers journalists in their frequent employment of possibility modals. This could be due to what Hatim (1997) claims to be a saving device by which the writer tries to avoid imposing his or her opposition. It seems though that the writers tend to use possibility modals to mark assessment of likelihood in their argument. It appears possible that the use of modal expressions such as may and could are convenient
Concessive adverbials, modality, conditional clauses, lexical repetition, conditional clauses, and persuasive verbs, direct speech, indirect speech, rhetorical questions. The occurrence frequency of these linguistic features is calculated in texts varying in length from 500 to 800 words. In order to achieve a meaningful comparison between texts of ranging length the raw results were processed in terms of a standard occurrence frequency of linguistic features per 1000 words. The results of the occurrence frequency of these features in the texts written by Arabs are as follows:

**TABLE 6.1.1.1. occurrence of linguistic features in Arabic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Text 1</th>
<th>Text 2</th>
<th>Text 3</th>
<th>Linguistic feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Concessive Adverbials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Necessity Modals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>Predictive Modals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>Possibility Modals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Conditional clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>Lexical repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>Intensifiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Rhetorical Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>Persuasive verbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is obvious from the above table that the Arabs opt for lexical repetition, demonstrating that it is the highest ranking strategy employed in the texts written by the Arabs. Features such as possibility modals and persuasive verbs also indicate a relatively high frequency of occurrence. However, features such as concessive adverbials, predictive modality and intensifiers demonstrated an infrequent occurrence. Table 1 reveals a zero mean reading in the case of necessity modals, rhetorical questions and conditional clauses. The following table represents the frequent occurrence of linguistic features in the English texts written by the native English speakers:

**TABLE 6.1.1.2. Occurrence of linguistic features in English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Text 1</th>
<th>Text 2</th>
<th>Text 3</th>
<th>Linguistic feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Concessive Adverbials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Necessity Modals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>Predictive Modals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>Possibility Modals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Conditional clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>Lexical repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>Intensifiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Rhetorical Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>Persuasive verbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that there is an extensive use of concessive adverbials in English. On the other hand, there is an insignificant employment of rhetorical questions. However, the results indicate that there is relative consistency in the occurrence of features of the English journalistic argumentative texts written by the native English speakers. The table below represents the comparison between the mean scores of the linguistic features occur in the texts written by both the native English speakers and Arabs.

**TABLE 6.1.1.3. A Comparison between the linguistic features in the texts written by the native English speakers and Arabs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Linguistic feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Concessive Adverbials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Necessity Modals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>Predictive Modals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>Possibility Modals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Conditional clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>Lexical repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>Intensifiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Rhetorical Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>Persuasive verbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Results

1. Organization of arguments

The English journalistic argumentative texts of the native English speakers and Arabs were analyzed by applying Hatims’ (1991 and 1997) approach to an argumentative text.

The structures of each of the texts written by Arabs follow the pattern of 'thesis cited to be argued through– substantiations – conclusion'. In each text the thesis sets the scene for the entire argument. Then substantial evidence or proof is given to support the thesis (e.g. the sequence of substantiation 1, 2, 3 and 4). The final part text offers the author's evaluation of the whole situation.

On the other hand, the English argumentative texts written by native English speakers opt to follow the construction of the subtypes of counter-argumentation (balance and lopsided).

6.1.1 Linguistic features

At this level of analysis, occurrence frequency of some linguistic features that characterize argumentative texts is represented. The analysis detects the linguistic strategies that recur more frequently. The linguistic features that are investigated are the following: concessive verbs, concessive nouns, concessive adjectival,
Analysts say part of NATO’s strategy is to use the attacks to hinder efforts by authorities to put down any future uprising in Tripoli.

Britain’s defense ministry said Apache helicopters hit three tanks and a bunker firing position in an attack on an army camp west of Tripoli late on Friday. Libyan state TV said NATO also bombed the central Al-Jufrah region on Saturday.

A document seen by Reuters showed African Union leaders had agreed on Friday that member states would not execute the arrest warrant for Qaddafi, leaving open the possibility that he could go into exile in one of the African Union’s 53 nations.

“We understood that the spirit of the document is that Qaddafi will not have a role to play in the future of Libya,” Mansour Sayf al Nasr, the rebel’s representative for France, told reporters at the summit in Equatorial Guinea.

In Tripoli, government spokesman Moussa Ibrahim did not comment on whether any AU–hosted negotiations should start on the assumption that Qaddafi would step down, saying only: “We have been saying for months that we will have talks with all parties.”

TABLE 5.3.5. Data analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis to be argued</th>
<th>Substantiation 1</th>
<th>Substantiation 2</th>
<th>Substantiation 3</th>
<th>Substantiation 4</th>
<th>Substantiation 5</th>
<th>Substantiation 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton stepped up Western calls on Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi to quit on Saturday, brushing off his threat to attack Europeans in their homes and offices.</td>
<td>NATO announced it had stepped up strikes on Qaddafi forces in west Libya including the capital Tripoli, saying it had carried out more than 50 attacks since Monday.</td>
<td>“Instead of issuing threats, Qaddafi should put the well–being and the interests of his own people first and he should step down from power and help facilitate a democratic transition,” Clinton told reporters on a trip to Spain.</td>
<td>Libyan rebels who had advanced to within 80 km (50 miles) of the capital were stopped in their tracks on Friday by a barrage of rocket fire from government forces, underlining the dogged resistance of Qaddafi troops to a five–month revolt.</td>
<td>Analysts say part of NATO’s strategy is to use the attacks to hinder efforts by authorities to put down any future uprising in Tripoli.</td>
<td>Britain’s defense ministry said Apache helicopters hit three tanks and a bunker firing position in an attack on an army camp west of Tripoli late on Friday. Libyan state TV said NATO also bombed the central Al–Jufrah region on Saturday.</td>
<td>African Union leaders had agreed on Friday that member states would not execute the arrest warrant for Qaddafi, leaving open the possibility that he could go into exile in one of the African Union’s 53 nations. The grouping also offered to host talks on a cease–fire and a transition to democratic government, but did not call on Qaddafi to step down and left open whether he had a future role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Just step down for Libyans' sake, Clinton tells Qaddafi

By ARSHAD MOHAMMED AND LUTFI ABU–AUN | REUTERS.
Published: Jul 2, 2011 15:05 Updated: Jul 3, 2011 00:15

MADRID/TRIPOLI: US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton stepped up Western calls on Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi to quit on Saturday, brushing off his threat to attack Europeans in their homes and offices. In a telephone address relayed to some 100,000 supporters in Tripoli’s Green Square on Friday, Qaddafi urged NATO to halt its bombing campaign or risk seeing Libyan fighters descend on Europe “like a swarm of locusts or bees.”

“Retreat, you have no chance of beating this brave people,” Qaddafi said in his address.

“They can attack your homes, your offices and your families, which will become military targets just as you have transformed our offices, headquarters, houses and children into what you regard as legitimate military targets,” he said.

NATO announced it had stepped up strikes on Qaddafi forces in west Libya including the capital Tripoli, saying it had carried out more than 50 attacks since Monday.

“Instead of issuing threats, Qaddafi should put the well-being and the interests of his own people first and he should step down from power and help facilitate a democratic transition,” Clinton told reporters on a trip to Spain.

Spanish Foreign Minister, Trinidad Jimenez, said the alliance stance was unchanged.

“Spain’s and the international coalition’s response is to maintain the unity and determination with which we have been working these past months,” she said.

Libyan rebels who had advanced to within 80 km (50 miles) of the capital were stopped in their tracks on Friday by a barrage of rocket fire from government forces, underlining the dogged resistance of Qaddafi troops to a five-month revolt.

“(It) was obviously a strategic withdrawal because of the battlefield situation and the amount of bombardment that the revolutionary forces were receiving,” said rebel spokesman Ahmed Bani. “But we hope to counter that within the next 48 hours.”

Coalition military officials refuse to characterize the situation on the ground as a stalemate after a 104-day bombing campaign that has strained alliance firepower and tested unity, with internal divisions over strategy surfacing.
In recent months, Ahmadinejad has sought to assert the presidential prerogative in hiring and firing ministers. He got his way in December, sacking the foreign minister, Manouchehr Mottaki, a Khamenei favourite, without warning.

But tensions exploded in April when Khamenei stopped Ahmadinejad from dismissing the intelligence minister, Heydar Moslehi, in a public intervention to limit the president’s power.

That provoked Ahmadinejad into a bizarre 11-day refusal to appear in public or carry out any duties.

The escalating power struggle in Tehran comes less than a year before parliamentary elections – due in March 2012 – in which prominent opposition figures are unlikely to be allowed to run, and rival conservative factions will battle for control of the legislature. Presidential elections are due in 2013.

TABLE 5.3.3. Data analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text2</th>
<th>Linguistic features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>illegally – Repeatedly – increasingly – temporarily –</td>
<td>Necessity Modals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>must</td>
<td>Possibility Modals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will</td>
<td>Conditional clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could – can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Iranian MPs say Ahmadinejad broke law in oil ministry takeover

Ian Black guardian.co.uk, Wednesday 1 June 2011 18.27 BST

Mahmoud Ahmadinejad: MPs say that declaring himself oil minister is an 'obvious violation of law.'

Photograph: Morteza Nikoubazl/REUTERS

Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad is locked in confrontation with MPs after being warned he acted illegally by declaring himself caretaker oil minister in what his critics called an unconstitutional power grab. Iranian media reported that the majlis (parliament), which has repeatedly clashed with the president over key policy issues in recent weeks, voted 165-1 to approve a report by its energy committee, which declared Ahmadinejad's move an 'obvious violation of law'.

The vote was triggered by the president's sacking of the oil minister, Massoud Mirkazemi, which was part of a plan to merge eight ministries into four to cut their overall number to 17. Observers said it was unclear whether there was now a real threat that Ahmadinejad could be impeached. But it was the latest spat in an increasingly ugly struggle between the president and his onetime mentor, the supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei.

Aides to Khamenei have castigated Ahmadinejad's controversial chief-of-staff Esfandiar Rahim-Mashaie as representing a 'deviant current' moving Iran away from Islamic principles.

Accusations of 'perversion', witchcraft and exorcism have been bandied around – as well as more conventional complaints of corruption.

The majlis vote was spearheaded by the speaker, Ali Larijani, who was sacked by Ahmadinejad as Iran's national security chief in 2007 but is seen as a prospective candidate for the presidency in 2013.

Ahmadinejad's original bid to streamline his cabinet was blocked by Khamenei. Ahmadinejad fought back by dismissing three ministers and temporarily taking over the oil ministry, but drew furious criticism from Khamenei's camp.

The move by MPs reflects mounting alarm by Ahmadinejad's rivals in the country's conservative ruling elite, including hardline clerics and the elite Revolutionary Guards, especially since it involves the hugely important energy sector – the source of 80% of Iranian state revenue – and because Ahmadinejad is famous for his populist economic policies. Late last month parliament voted to investigate allegations that the president had misused state funds as effective bribes by giving $80 (£48.80) each to 9 million voters before the 2009 presidential election.

To complicate matters further, Iran is also the current chairman of Opec, although Ahmadinejad has said he will not attend its summit in Vienna next week.

'This illegal and hasty action will undermine the Islamic Republic of Iran's interests on the international level,' the conservative-dominated parliament said in its report. 'Mr Ahmadinejad as oil minister has issued some orders and will continue to issue orders which are obvious examples of illegal interference with governmental financial resources.'

Ahmadinejad has the power to remove ministers and put caretakers in place for up to three months before having to consult parliament and insists that no-one should have been surprised by the reshuffle.

Iran's constitutional watchdog, the guardian council, has already called his takeover of the oil ministry illegal. The final say on the ministry lies with Khamenei – whose wholehearted backing for Ahmadinejad since his disputed re-election two years ago can clearly no longer be taken for granted.
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Thesis to be opposed

Table 5.3.1: Data analysis

When Barack Obama became president, he announced an end to the enhanced interrogations of al-Qaeda leaders at secret detention facilities that his predecessor, George W. Bush, said were essential to breaking up terror networks in the long-term. Obama instead ramped up the targeted killing of terrorists with drone strikes, taking out many more than under Bush.

But the revelation that tips prodded from captured al-Qaeda members subjected to ‘enhanced interrogations’ led to the capture of Osama bin Laden has ignited a debate over whether Obama should revisit the policies he cast aside.

John Yoo, the Bush White House lawyer who ruled that terror suspects were ‘enemy combatants’ could be handled outside the criminal justice system said the United States is ‘losing vital intelligence opportunities if we are killing bin Laden and other al Qaeda leaders when we have the opportunity to capture them.’

Michael Mukasey, U.S. attorney general from November 2007 to January 2009, says the interrogations by the CIA were ‘enormously valuable’ to finding how al-Qaeda worked, who its members were and what it was plotting. In spinning the techniques, Obama directed a multidepartment team to use less coercive techniques contained in the U.S. Army Field Manual for questioning prisoners.

Mukasey said that because the manual is public, al-Qaeda members can train for it.

‘There ought to be a classified program that goes beyond the Army Field Manual,’ Mukasey said.

Glenn Carle, a former CIA operations officer who interrogated a suspected al-Qaeda leader, said the Bush detainee program was ‘a hugely labor-intensive operation’ that’s ‘not sustainable for a large number of people over an extended period of time.’ Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, the leader of al Qaeda in Iraq, was eventually found and killed without enhanced interrogation techniques, said Matthew Alexander, a retired Air Force officer and interrogator.

‘Outside of Afghanistan and Iraq, where they’re doing tactical interrogations, there has been no high-level capture since Obama became president,’ said former Bush adviser Marc Thiessen. ‘There is an incredible loss of intelligence because of this.’

‘I think it’s immoral to kill 3,000 people in a day,’ Mukasey said. ‘The morality of doing that or preventing it, and the morality of depriving people of sleep, I know which way I fall.’

Table 5.3.2: Data analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic features</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessity Modals</td>
<td>Enormously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicative Modals</td>
<td>ought to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility Modals</td>
<td>Could– can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional clauses</td>
<td>the is ‘the United States is losing vital intelligence opportunities if we are killing bin Laden and other al Qaeda leaders when we have the opportunity to capture them.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Questions</td>
<td>Announced– said– told– agree– believed–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive verbs</td>
<td>‘losing vital intelligence opportunities if we are killing bin Laden and other al Qaeda leaders when we have the opportunity to capture them.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘It’s impossible to know whether information obtained by EITs (enhanced interrogation techniques*) could have been obtained by other forms of interrogation,’ Vietor said. ‘There’s no way that information obtained by EITs was the decisive intelligence * that led us directly to bin Laden.’

‘in a way that did not create the problems of putting U.S. troops on the ground on the Pakistan side of the border.’ ‘We (can) do it a lot more than we (could) by putting special forces on the ground,’ he said.

Tommy Vietor, spokesman for Obama’s National Security Council, said the value of the enhanced interrogation techniques *has been overblown.

‘enhanced interrogations’– ‘enemy combatants’– ‘black sites,’ ‘enormously valuable’’a hugely labor–intensive operation’ that’s ‘not sustainable for a large number of people over an extended period of time.’‘in a way that did not create the problems of putting U.S. troops on the ground on the Pakistan side of the border.’
its members were and what it was plotting. In
spurning the techniques*, Obama directed a
multidepartmental team to use less coercive
techniques *contained in the U.S. Army Field
Manual for questioning* prisoners*.
Mukasey said that because the manual is
public, al-Qaeda members (can) train for it.
'There (ought to) be a classified program that
goes beyond the Army Field Manual,' Mukasey
said.

Former Bush adviser Richard Perle agrees
that an aggressive interrogation* program is
critical.
'The thing that worries all of us is that they will
get their hands on weapons that (will) enable
them to kill* hundreds of thousands of us in a
single blow,' he said.

Clues on bin Laden's couriers came from
detainees who had been held by the CIA in
other countries, said former CIA director
Michael Hayden.

Jose Rodriguez, who ran the CIA's
Counterterrorism Center from 2002 to 2005, told
Time magazine that information provided by 9/11
mastermind Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and his
alleged replacement, Abu Faraj al-Libbi, 'was the
lead *information that eventually led* to’ bin Laden's
courier and his compound. The two were among
hundreds of suspects* the U.S. intelligence
*officials apprehended with the help of Pakistan and
other countries, some of whom were held at CIA
'black sites,' Rodriguez said.

'Many of these people were not so
cooperative. Some had been trained in counter
interrogation* and tactics* to undo what we
were trying to do,' said John Radsan, assistant
general counsel at the CIA from 2002 to 2004.
Other CIA operatives say the program was
ineffective in the long-term.

Glenn Carle, a former CIA operations
officer who interrogated *a suspected* al-
Qaeda leader, said the Bush detainee program
was 'a hugely labor-intensiveoperation' that's
'not sustainable for a large number of people
over an extended period of time.' Abu Musab
al-Zarqawi, the leader *of al Qaeda in Iraq, was
eventually found and killed *without enhanced
interrogation techniques*, said Matthew
Alexander, a retired Air Force officer and
interrogator.

'Outside of Afghanistan and Iraq, where
they're doing (tactical)* interrogations*, there
has been no high-level capture* since Obama
became president,' said former Bush adviser
Marc Thiessen. 'There is an (incredible) loss of
intelligence* because of this.'

Ken Gude, a national security expert at the
Center for America Progress, a liberal
Washington think tank, said Obama believed the
drones expanded the reach of the U.S.
government 'in a way that did not create the
problems of putting U.S. troops on the ground
on the Pakistan side of the border.'

'We (can) do it a lot more than we (could)
by putting special forces on the ground,' he
said. 'I think it's (immoral) to kill* 3,000 people
in a day,' Mukasey said. 'The morality of doing
that or preventing it, and the morality of
depriving people of sleep, I know which way I
fall.'
expressing necessity in Arabic is mainly conveyed

(2) Predictive modals, which are ‘used to refer to the future, to consider events that will or will not occur’ (Biber, 1988:150) such as: will, would, will not etc.

(3) Possibility modals such as can, may, might and could.

B. Persuasive verbs that mark the writer’s attempt to persuade the reader that certain events are desirable or probable (McDonald, 1989). Verbs such as agree, arrange, ask, beg, command, decide, insist and propose, etc.

C. Conditional clauses that specify ‘the conditions that are required in order for certain events to occur’ (Biber, 1988:111).

D. Repetition and intensifiers.

E. Concessive adverbials

F. Rhetorical questions

The frequent occurrence of each linguistic feature used by the English native speakers and Arabs in argumentative journalistic texts will be represented in the form of tables. The findings will then indicate the extent to which English and Arabic tend to prefer the employment of these linguistic features in argumentative journalistic texts.

Bin Laden raid renews debate on interrogations
By Oren Dorell, USA TODAY
Posted 05/11/2011 02:10:59 PM |

When Barack Obama became president, he announced an end to the enhanced interrogations* of al-Qaeda leaders at secret detention facilities that his predecessor, George W. Bush, said were essential to breaking up terror networks in the long-term.

Obama instead ramped up the targeted killing of terrorists with drone strikes, taking out many more than under Bush. But the revelation that tips prodded from captured* al-Qaeda members subjected to ‘enhanced interrogations’

*led to the capture* of Osama bin Laden has ignited a debate over whether Obama should revisit the policies he cast aside.

John Yoo, the Bush White House lawyer who ruled* that terror*suspects *were ‘enemy combatants’*could be handled outside the criminal justice system said the United States is ‘losing vital intelligence opportunities *if we are killing bin Laden and other al Qaeda leaders *when we have the opportunity* to capture *them.’

Tommy Vietor, spokesman for Obama's National Security Council, said the value of the enhanced interrogation techniques *has been overblown.

"It's impossible to know whether information obtained by EITs (enhanced interrogation techniques*) could have been obtained by other forms of interrogation,’ Vietor said. "There's no way that information obtained by EITs was the decisive intelligence * that led us directly to bin Laden."

Obama shuttered the CIA's secret prisons in countries such as Poland, where al-Qaeda suspects *grabbed elsewhere were questioned as illegal enemy combatants*. Some were subjected to sleep deprivation and loud noises to get them to talk, and three top leaders *were water-boarded, a technique* that simulates drowning.

Michael Mukasey, U.S. attorney general from November 2007 to January 2009, says the interrogations by the CIA were "enormously valuable" to finding how al-Qaeda worked, who
4. The objective of this study:

The aim of this study is to investigate the linguistic argumentative strategies that the native English speakers and Arab journalists tend to employ in English journalistic discourse. Argumentation in the context of this study is the form of discourse that attempts to persuade and influence readers through the use of a connected series of conceptual relations, violation, value, significance and opposition in order to establish opposition or claim (Toulmin 1958, Beaugrande and Dressler 1981, Andrews 1989, Teeffelen 1991, Rottenberg 2000).

5. Methodology:

5.1 The study's approach

Hatim’s approach (1991) to text type theory is adapted as an approach for the investigation and analysis of the data of this study. He (1991) perceives argumentative texts as texts that evaluate through persuasion and he divides them into two subtypes:

a) Through-argumentation, which is initiated by a statement of a point of view, that is to be argued through. In through- argumentative text, there is no explicit reference to some opposite view. He represents format or structure of through-argumentative text as follows:

↓ Thesis to be argued through
↓ Substantiation
↓ Conclusion


In Counter- argumentative text, which is initiated by a thesis citing the position of an opponent followed by an opposition, substantiation and finally a conclusion. He represents the format of counter-argumentative texts as follows:

↓ Thesis cited to be opposed
↓ Opposition
↓ Substantiation

↓ Conclusion


Furthermore, Hatim (1991, 1997:193) distinguishes between two subtypes within counter-argumentation: First, the balance argument where an author or writer has the option of signaling the contrastive shift between what may be viewed as a claim and a counter-claim either explicitly or implicitly. Second, the lopsided argument in which the counter-claim is anticipated by introducing an explicit concessive (e.g. although).

5.2 Data collection

The data for this study were collected from forty journalistic articles written in English in four newspapers: USA Today and The Guardian written by native English speakers, and Arab News and Egyptian Gazette by Arabs. Ten articles are taken from each newspaper in 2011.

5.3 Data analysis

The data analysis consists of two stages. The first stage of analysis is concerned with the argument structure of the discourse, in other words the textual organization of argument in the journalistic discourse. At this stage of analysis, the discourse is analyzed according to Hatim’s(1989a, 1991, and 1997) approach of argument structure. The second stage of analysis will investigate the linguistic strategies employed in each argumentative text. These linguistic strategies to be examined are syntactic and lexical. According to Biber(1988:150), there are linguistic features, which are highly persuasive and highly employed in the journalistic discourse. Thus, the linguistic features which, according to Biber(1988), characterize the argumentative texts and which will be investigated and analyzed in the Data are the following:

A. Modals

(1) Necessity modals, which are directly persuasive such as: must and ought to in English. Similarly,
2. Review of literature:

Argumentation as a text type has been acknowledged and defined by famous English and Arab rhetoricians and logicians such as Toulmin (1958) and Ibn Qudama in the fourteenth century. Ibn Qudama discussed the different argumentative texts and recommended them to be taught to students of rhetoric. According to many authors an argumentative text is defined as a form of discourse that attempts to persuade readers to accept a claim, whether that acceptance is based on logical or emotional appeals or both. The argument itself, Toulmin explained, must be set out and presented in ‘a sequence of steps’ that are based on certain procedural rules. In addition, this structure falls into three categories – claim, support and warrant. Classifications of text types have been put forward on a different basis. Werlich (1976) classified five idealized text types or modes based on cognitive and rhetorical properties. The text types, which he identified, were description, narration, exposition, argumentation and instruction. These text types were adapted by Biber (1989) based on linguistic criteria. However, he (1988, 1989) captures the prominent linguistic differences among texts in English. He classifies texts according to the linguistic features they employ into eight types. More specifically, he (1988, 1989) classifies texts according to the sets of syntactic and lexical features that co-occur frequently in them. He also adds that the journalistic language, the data used in this research study, have a primary argumentative and persuasive purpose and style. In his empirical study (1988), he illustrates the linguistic features that characterize each text type. In particular, he explains that argumentative texts, which are of our interest here, tend to frequently employ modals of prediction, necessity and possibility, conditional clauses and persuasive verbs. According to him, these linguistic features have a persuasive impact on the reader.

Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) defined three text types: descriptive, narrative and argumentative. According to them, argumentative texts are defined as those utilized to promote the acceptance or evaluation of certain beliefs or ideas as true vs. false, or positive vs. negative. Conceptual relations such as reason, significance, violation, value, and opposition should be frequent. The surface texts will often show cohesive devices for emphasis and insistence, e.g. recurrence, parallelism, paraphrase. Hatim and Mason (1990) also adapted the text types identified by Werlich (1976) and argued that common textual classifications as such fail to capture the social function of form and content. They classified (Hatim 1989a, 1989b, 1991, 1997, Hatim and Mason 1991) argumentative texts into two types, through-argumentative and counter-argumentative.

3. Argumentative texts across cultures:

Languages differ in their orientation to the reader and in the manner in which ideas are presented and organized and vary in the social functions they serve (Connor 1996). More specifically, written texts have different conventions across cultures. The conventions of discourse within each culture provide a framework in which ideas are arranged. These conventions may express cultural preferences in organizing thought and attitudes towards different points of views. Such tendency to prefer an argumentative style or format to another does not mean that the language lacks that style but it means that, reasons, language users (speakers and writers) tend to favor a certain style. Researchers, such as Hatim (1989a, 1991), see such preferences to be bound to solidarity, politeness, face saving and other pragmatic phenomena.
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1. Introduction
Argumentation is a verbal and social activity of reason aimed at increasing (or decreasing) the acceptability of a controversial standpoint for the listener or reader, by putting forward a constellation of propositions intended to justify (or refute) the standpoint before a rational judge’ (Van Eemeren et al, 1996). The version of Van Eemeren and Grootendorst of the argumentation theory, the pragma–dialectical theory, is currently most popular. They began to study argumentation as a means of resolving differences of opinion. Argumentation starts with four principles.

1) Externalization: Argumentation needs a standpoint and an opposition to the standpoint. Therefore, argumentation research concentrates on the externalizable commitments rather than the psychological elements of people.

2) Socialization: arguments are seen as an expression of people’s processes. Crucial is to validate the arguer’s position by arguments in a certain way. Two people try to obtain an agreement in argumentation; therefore argumentation is part of a social context rather than an individual context.

3) Functionalization: Argumentation has the general function of managing the resolution of disagreement. Studying of argumentation should concentrate on the function of argumentation in the verbal management of disagreement.

4) Dialectification: Argumentation is appropriate only when you are able to use arguments that are able to help you arguing against another person. For resolving differences a theory on argumentation should have a set of standards. The term dialectical procedure is mentioned as a depending element on efficient arguing for solving differences.