DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF ARGUMENTATION FROM

AN ENGLISH/ARABIC TRANSLATION PERSPECTIVE

Presented to the faculty of the American University of Sharjah

College of Arts and Science

in partial fulfilment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

by

SUMAYA ADAM EISA

B.Sc. 1983

Sharjah, UAE

June 2008

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF ARGUMENTATION FROM

AN ENGLISH/ARABIC PERSPECTIVE

Sumaya Adam Eisa, Candidate for the Master of Arts Degree

American University of Sharjah, 2008

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores whether Arab translators translate argumentative discourse adequately. The study examines the degree of awareness among translators of the genre conventions embedded in the argumentative English source texts. As a persuasive genre, counter-argumentation contains certain conventions used by the media to persuade an ever more sophisticated readership. Untrained practitioners are probably unaware of the determinant semiotics. As a result, most translated editorials and opinion columns often tend to lose their persuasive vigour. For its framework for analysis, the study draws on rhetoric genre studies, critical discourse analysis and discussions of the translation of editorials/opinion columns from some serious western press publications, namely the *Economist*, *Financial Times*, Project Syndicate website and other sites, together with their translations in *Majalat Al Majala, Al Khaleej* newspaper, and Project Syndicate translations respectively. The study reveals that Arab translators often literally replace or transfer the equivalent meaning of argumentative texts from the English into Arabic. They seem to concentrate mostly on aesthetic, rhetorical, semantic and eloquent aspects of the target language writing rather than the underlying notions of argumentation of the source language. These textual and intertextual practices are closely related to the other existing practices in mass media. The study thus, aims to uncover gaps in the translation of argumentation genre. In doing so, it seeks to add to the contrastive linguistic research that is moving beyond the text and into the context of the production and publication industry. Therefore, the study calls for specialized media translation to revolutionize, not only the translation of persuasive genres but writing tradition as a whole. Arab commentators, translators, writers, and publishers therefore need to be genre aware for their messages to get through.

CONTENTS

6

TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

DEDICATION

I love my family . This thesis is dedicated to them.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Argumentation which is defined variably as a systematic way of persuading and convincing an audience using the force of logic, is a well-established tradition in Western writings, seen for example in the editorials and opinion columns of newspapers and magazines. It is nowadays closely linked to the art of persuasion. Arguments according to Aristotle must derive their validity from logic, evidence, or appeal to reason. Still arguments may also include appeals to emotion and aesthetics. Other forms of genre, including narration, description, analysis, etc also include argument. In reality, most writing contains argumentation in some way or other. Increasingly nowadays, a speaker with 'right' on their side may lose an argument to a more argumentative and persuasive speaker. Hence it is no longer enough to be an expert in your field, if you do not know the art of persuasion - how to present your arguments convincingly and how to refute your opponent's criticisms. Thinkers defend themselves with reason.

1â¸ Importance of the Research Area

Argumentation has always been important, for example, in the rigorous world of science to defend cases and articulate proposals. Sustained argumentation is still a strong tool used by politicians, lawyers and researchers. Law courts and legislative bodies exploit debate as a means of making decisions.

Nowadays there is considerable focus on professional, administrative, economic, legal and technical fields, all of which rely heavily on argumentation in different respects. Today, mass media which includes print, radio, television, internet and other communication technologies, has emerged as the most influential tool in shaping perceptions, decision-making, and persuasion in the age of infinite access to information. Advertisements for example are persuasive tools that give reasons for consumers to buy certain products, voters to elect certain candidates, or people to alter their behaviour. Editorials and opinion columns (ed/ops) are an example of manipulative tools used by written media to reflect, affect and persuade. Persuasion is changing to a changing audience. Increasingly nowadays speakers and writers have to bear in mind that in order to convince the public, they have to educate, and to raise awareness by arguing with evidence-based justifications and clarifications. Writers

and speakers do not restrict themselves to the statement of facts though; instead, they aim to make the reading or listening process a challenging adventure.

Reading involves thinking about and evaluating what we read. Readers negotiate what they read with the writer to reach conclusions and make inferences. The reader, while reading, is carefully evaluating the ideas and knowledge of the author and the significance of their ideas. Argumentation aims not just to present 'facts' but to persuade the reader/listener to accept a point of view. When the language user utters their opinions as if they are stated facts, the reader is denied the right to reflect, scrutinize, discover, and learn in the process. Similarly, excessive assertion or reiteration of one central point makes reading a boring experience, while unsupported ideas reflect shallow knowledge and thinking. Dictating and stating the obvious are unlikely to attract recruits to your cause, especially in a free society.

Rather than dividing, it is argued that argumentation seeks to build bridges, mend fences and clarify opinions and beliefs. It is argued that argumentation is an important component of free speech, which is a prerequisite for a civil society. In a free, democratic society, decisions are reached through debate. Proper argument is of paramount importance to fostering democracy. The aim should not to win but to enable understanding and give respect to the other's points of view. These are important fundamentals to setting the ground for resolving any misunderstanding or conflict.

Some, however, accuse western democracy and its much-trumpeted free speech of being coercive to people's thinking. Democracy and free speech are blamed for introducing unnecessary jargon that distracts and alienates readers. Secondly, although western argumentative writing promotes the freedom of expression and press, it is clear that there are certain limits on those freedoms. This is evident nowadays with the rise of the Islamist, Jehadist argument and the fact that Islamist media now faces restrictions including censorship in many democracies. In addition, there are many legal limitations to argument under different names, like copyright, defamation, human rights, and justification of the war on terrorism, etc.

Non-democratic countries are not short of noted writings and writers. Some are even Nobel Prize laureates. Arab writing, for example, has a long history of stylistics and literary-aesthetic heritage. It is the language of poetry and rhetoric. Argumentation is well enshrined in the holy book, the Quraan. The authorized voice in writing is a social tradition that respects the reader and saves him/her the offense of abhorrent

terms. Terms that disdain the reader are never allowed in respected writing circles. After all, it is a tradition that goes hand by hand with our social and political systems.

In fact, critical discussion based on sound, thoughtful argument supported by evidence is more likely to foster reflection, toleration, and understanding among different people and is more likely to assist in gradual change of perceptions. Can translators play a role in the reconciliation between the two Arabic and non-Arabic speaking worlds? Can translation subtly help promote tolerance and sensitivity?

1.2. Conventions of Argumentation

Argumentation is not without rules. There are certain genre conventions to be followed. Usually, in an argumentative discussion, a central claim, which is the main idea, is advanced. The claim, which can also be called a proposition, standpoint, thesis or point of view, is presented in such a way that it calls for debate, argument, or proof. It is then supported by secondary propositions or reasons, followed by concluding statement. This is the simplest or basic form of argumentation. While arguing, writers have to be careful not to rely heavily on basic emotions such as, caring, sympathy, rejection, pity, fear, intimidation, or appeal to loyalty, freedom, democratic norms, etc. Valid support is necessary for the success of persuasion. Opinions have to be adequately supported by solid evidence. You cannot drop a potentially enflaming sentence and simply go away waiting for the audience to agree with you!

Research refers to two general types of argumentation: "Counter Argumentation" and "Through Argumentation". Generally, counterargument takes the form of; argument, followed by counterargument, response to counterargument, and conclusion (sometimes). In the *counter-argumentative* discussion, two voices are actively engaged to resolve a point of view. In *through-argumentation* on the other hand, a thesis is stated, extensively supported, mostly positively, before a conclusion is reached. Throughout the *Through-argumentative process*, only one voice is predominant, and that is the voice of the writer.

Depending on the context, argumentation could be single argumentation (where only one explicit reason for or against a standpoint is expressed), or multiple (where several alternative defences are given as support).

A variety of strategies can be used, just as in games or battles. Sarcasm, irony, lampooning, mockery, ridicule, cynicism, harshness, bitterness, criticism, rebuffing, metaphor, comeback, concession, conditions, reproach, enquiry, answer, idioms may

all be used in varying degrees. The aim is to facilitate dialogue by challenging the other party. The writer may also show friendliness, good humour, kindness, sweetness, compliment, and praise. All these can be used, but according to certain rules and conventions.

My study aims to investigate how different argumentation strategies used in western commentaries are handled in translation from English to Arabic. How translators deal with the argumentation genre in general. By genre, I mean a conventionalized way of using language, which must include a purpose and participants, for a specialized social event. There are many genres, for example; promotional genre, academic genre, business genre.

In my study, I critically assess extracts from different English editorials/opinion columns. My claim is that lack of genre awareness may frequently result in distorted translated editorial/opinion texts that could mislead or marginalize the receptor audience and disturb communication between English and Arabic writing genres.

The study aims to evaluate whether translators of editorial/opinion columns are aware of explicit and implicit argumentation rules and whether these rules are well represented in their Arabic translations. My goal is to attempt to measure the success of the translator in enhancing the communication process between ever diverging worlds.

I have chosen to evaluate editorials and opinion columns because they are considered one of the tools used by written media to reflect and affect opinions. The skill and knowledge of how to preserve and convey the right message in translation are vital in any intellectual communication.

My source data are taken from editorial/opinion columns from serious Western press publications, namely the *Economist*, *Financial Times,* Media Lens, Project Syndicate, and other sites, together with their translations in *Majalat Al Majala*, *Al Khaleej newspaper*, and Project Syndicate website respectively. As texts are the unit of genre being studied here, I use English and translated Arabic texts for my study. The internet facilitated retrieval of most data, in this case, texts, for the study. Most ed -ops are retrieved from the respective newspaper websites through the AUS library website. However, all the Arabic newspapers and magazines are procured in hard copy by regular subscription.

I studied the argumentation philosophy of various English ed/op genres, which usually reflect the paper's views and the patronizing institution behind it. The persuasiveness of different ed-op genres is evaluated and their translations are criticized. Problems are identified and texts with identified problems were thoroughly analysed. However, I only included specific paragraphs from each of the analysed texts. Different indicators of argumentation are identified in the English texts, including respective stages of argumentation and speech acts. The translations of these indicators are traced to see how appropriately the translator dealt with the different stages. Although time was the greatest constraint, the study was nevertheless interesting.

Having identified certain problems, I want to raise the question of; to what extent adoption of argumentation in Arabic writing may reduce miscommunication in translated work?. I tentatively propose specialized media translation to revolutionize, not only the translation of the argumentation/persuasion genre, but the writing tradition in Arabic as a whole.

1.3. Significance of the Study

I believe this study has significance because it is an area of study that is greatly deficient in Arabic literature. Books on how to write critically in Arabic are scarce if any. There are scattered research studies on critical writing on Arabic literature, but to my knowledge, no systematic analyses of persuasion in media writing have been carried out.

Furthermore, there is great discrepancy between teaching practices in our schools and the way academics recommend research to be written. The very fact that a literature review is a part of any research project indicates the importance of teaching critical writing/argumentation in Arabic from early school days.

This research may be of use to those working in public relations, media communication, publishing and information campaigns striving to improve images. The translator-awareness notion can be of value to translation and interpretation programs. Contrastive and comparative linguistics can help to identify other aspects of this field that need more research.

In this Chapter, I have reviewed the broad definitions of the notion of argumentation, its importance and types. These are further discussed in the analysis section. The introduction has also discussed different conventions implied in the argumentation process together with the significance of the study. Chapter 2 tracks

translation studies and theories, highlights their relevance to the current study and discusses their chronological aspects and insights into semiotics, genre, discourse and media. Special consideration is given to theories related to the Argumentation Theory. Chapter 3 provides the theoretical framework for this study. It presents an overview of previous models of argumentation, specifies different types, in addition to explaining argumentation tools and strategies. This section indicates the stages that should be distinguished in *resolving a difference of opinion* in an argument. It then looks closer at *speech acts* and the *linguistic clues* that serve as tools in tracing and analysing various moves in argumentation. Chapter 4 focuses on the analysis. Here I sketch a tentative model for assessing the argumentativeness of a commentary. This model, called the Transparent Model assists in the comparison process of the original source text with the translated one. Then I analyse the translation process of argumentation indicators, standpoints, starting points, arguments, supporting points and concluding stages. Chapter 4 discusses the findings of the study. Chapter 5 is dedicated to the conclusion, recommendations, and practical implications. Finally, I translate the main insights contained in the study discussion into a critical writing guidelines model (appendix B). The model is probably to assist trained writers write sound editorials/opinions in Arabic. It would probably help in future standardization and comparative evaluation. I suggest further research to assess the acceptability and influence of different Arabic editorials and their efficiency in persuasion and shifting certain stereotypes perceptions. Though quite challenging, information yielded by this study is expected to help in evaluating the degree of success in media persuasion in general. The thesis ends with a series of questions, which relate to concepts of persuasion, translation, and factors contributing to the process of argumentation, all of which continue to be central to the discipline of contemporary Translation Studies.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Literature

More and more researchers call for Arab translators to be genre aware to reflect the embedded pragmatics. In translation, neither formal, nor semantic or functional correspondence can adequately convey the right message as indicated by the American-Dutch translation theorist (James Holmes 1978: 101). This study evaluates whether tactics adopted, if any, while translating conform with a specific genre in this case, argumentation. In particular, the study discusses how different English editorials and opinion columns are translated into Arabic. As a background, this chapter discusses the vast amount of past research on translation with particular emphasis on the subject of the study.

The definition of Argumentation as the "verbal, social, and rational activity that attempt at convincing a reasonable critic of the acceptability of a standpoint by putting forward a series of propositions justifying or refuting the preposition expressed in the standpoint" (Van Eemeren & Grootendorst 2004: 1) reflects the common ground shared between argumentation, language and social-cultural communication.

By further defining argumentation as a complex speech act, Van Eemerern and Grootendorst suggest that, this link is established. Translation as a linguistic activity on one hand and a cultural communicative function on the other hand accommodates argumentation as well. Albercht Neubert and Gregory Shreve (1992) believe that translation is diversified as to include different *discourses* and *perspectives*. Mary Snell-Hornby (1988) suggests that translation is mainly seen as a process of cultural communication. The translated text is part of ongoing cultural communication, and that makes translation *interdisciplinary*. However translation today, has become a global discipline rather than *interdisciplinary*. It covers almost all aspects of discourse including argumentation.

A background survey of previous research on translation studies and their approach to Argumentation is presented below. The current research is in line with the call by Christopher Candlin (1991) that translators as applied linguists should constantly uncover, through research obstacles they encounter during their work. In his book "Teaching and researching translation" Basil Hatim (2001), Professor of

translation and linguistics adds that practitioners are tasked with pinpointing researchable issues encountered in the field of translation. Research and practice should complement each other to produce what was called *Action Research*. Thus *comparative data* obtained will assist in *standardization* and amending the detachment between theory and practice (p: 7).

2.1. Source Oriented Translation Studies

Initially, translation studies concentrated on the purely structuralistic notions that focus only on morphology and syntax (Bloomfield 1933: 14). The focus was then on the *behavior* of interrelated elements of language according to their number. Despite its limitations, the structuralism has nevertheless paved the way for investigating more translation problems that lead ultimately to incorporating translation as a branch of contrastive linguistics (Hatim 1990: 25).

Gradually the link between language and cogitation starts to emerge. At the time, the notion was limited to only one kind of language (e.g. Edward Sapir 1921 & Whorf 1956). However, research continues to produce new insights as those introduced by Chomsky and others (Hatim 1990: 31).

Consequently, the British linguist and translation theorist, J. C. Catford (1965), distinguished between two kinds of translation equivalence. *Formal Equivalence* (FE), which is the close adherence to the linguistic form of the source text (ST), and *Textual Equivalence* (TE) when *replacement* is not dependant on the syntactic and other differences. Equivalence has been defined as replacement between two language texts. While relevance to the communicative function whether situational or functional can be distinguished, the notion of Equivalence as replacement between two language texts deals with equivalence in quantitative terms. These shortages have been attributed to the intellectual climate predominant at the time (Hatim 2001: 16).

Increasingly the communicative role of translation is stressed. Hymes (1972) introduced the concept of *communicative competence*. Newmark (1981) described the communicative nature of translation as " a mode which seeks to produce the same effect on the TL readers as was produced by the original on the SL readers" (p: 22). The Austrian text linguist and translation scholar Robert de Beaugrande (1978), noted while developing an approach for poetic translation, the potentiality of *contextual information*. Equivalence relation occurs when the translation takes into account the *communicative act in question*. Equivalence in this manner is governed by rules and

factors affecting language use in a text at a given time. Translations may be evaluated based on their appropriateness to the context (cited in Hatim 1990).

Beaugrande (1978: 13) argued that, in the *context of communication,* "the attention should be focused on the underlying strategies of language use as can be seen from text signs. Translation was envisaged as a process of interaction between author, translator, and reader". Importantly, translation is guided now by many strategies including the type of language use i. e. register, genre .etc, the notions of *informativity* and *markedness.* A negotiation process has been called for to give the exact meaning of culturally sensitive source texts (Hatim 2001).

Eugene Nida, the American scholar and Bible translator (1979) added some dynamism to the definition of Translation Equivalence. Cognitive and emotive responses, together with the relation between language, culture and society were acknowledged. Gradually the role of the audience started to attract attention. Nida's Dynamic Equivalence (DE) was defined as. "a set of procedures by means of which the message of the original text ….is transferred into the receptor language to produce the same response in the receptor as the original".

However, for Werner Koller the German linguist and translation theorist (1979) "Translation has come to share significant features with a range of other text processing activities and a line started to be drawn between *translation* and *non-translation"*. The Skopos notion was introduced. Skopos is a term used by Reiss and Verneer to mean the purpose of the translation (Hatim 2004).

> …As a translator, I am also in a position to judge when a source text is unsuitable as a model for a target culture, and to propose to the client the production of a new text for the target culture. (Koller 1995: 194)

The translator has come to be seen as an expert by Hans Vermeer (1989: 174) who defined the purpose or the Skopos as the function of the source text. The target text has to be produced with a given communicative purpose in mind (as cited in Nord 1997: 29). "Content coherence and intention are important factors to ensure the success of the text" (Reiss & Vermeer 1984: 113, cited in Shultleworth & Cowie 1997, 1976). The Skopos theory also refers to the fact that, the text is likely to generate meanings not physically present in it.

Translation according to Kollar (1979) is the outcome of text processing activity. The relation between the new product to the ST and TT has come to be known as the *equivalence relation*. Translation equivalence could thus be achieved through *formal equivalence*, *denotative equivalence*, *connotative equivalence*, *text-normative equivalence and pragmatic or dynamic equivalence*. "The growing tendency to view translator as cultural interpreter-cum PR consultant" as seen by Hatim (2001: 28) was a further step towards liberating the translation equivalence from the source text. Indeed, James Homes (1978b: 100, cited in Hatim, 2001), has claimed that unless scholars detach themselves from the sentence level to explore the realisms of text "no adequate general theory of translation can be developed".

However, the revolutionary breakthrough for dealing with genres such as argumentation comes with the notion of relevance. According to the Bible translator and relevance theoretician Ernst-August Gutt (1991, 1998), there should be direct relationship between effort and extracted meaning in translation. Maximization of effort must be warranted by sound justification. *Inferences* in the translation process as related to cause-and-effect .etc were important in grasping the intended meaning. "Translation as a communicative component tends to address deeper associations such as decision-making and evaluation". Two modes of language use were identified as expressing *thoughts in the same language or across languages*: Descriptive vs. Interpretive use. Descriptive utterance is when the words are translated literally, while an interpretive utterance is when the genre conventions are preserved.

2â¸ Target Oriented Translation Studies

The 1990s witnessed a gradual shift towards target-oriented translation studies. The cultural theorist and translation scholar Lawrence Venuti (1995) who was working at the time on the American translation tradition observed that Culture was the overriding factor in target-oriented studies. The new research trend according to Venuti questions the West translation traditions, and how "values, ideologies, and institutions shape practices differently in different historical periods". *Invisibility* of the translator was a widespread trend in the Anglo-American tradition. That tradition, for political reasons, favors *fluency* and *readability* at the cost of certain semantics. The new trend has increasingly focused on thematic and styles. "Texts are being modified to appeal to the Western culture, removing in the process cultural features that show the differences between different worlds".

10

Most prominently, Venuti claimed that foreign texts translated into English were being largely ignored if they fail the *"fluency test"*. This means that, to get acceptability in the West, translated texts have to conform to the West's modes and norms. "There is also scarcity of other languages translated into English. An entire translation tradition has evolved in the West to serve the imperialistic goals abroad and xenophobic values at home". Notions such as foreignization vs. domestication were predominant. This further alienates other cultures. Certain translation strategies were adopted to prevent the infiltration of certain cultural and ideological differences (Venuti 1995 cited in Hatim 2001: 45).

The inability of the Western reader to decode complex cultural messages was also hinted to by the Czech writer, Milan Kundera (1988) in his book *the Joke*. However, this is also evident in other cultures. The researcher has observed that the religion and ideology of Albert Einstein (1955) the German-born theoretical physicist who is best known for his theory of relativity, are greatly ignored in translations from English into Arabic. More research may indicate such trends. For further reading: Lawrence Venuti (1998) *Scandals of translation*. New York: Routledge.

The Deconstructionists on the other hand, called for illuminating all the hidden ideology and culture. The translation process was described as *transformation*. The translator has been considered as a specialist. James Holmes (1985) differentiated between Deconstructionism and other *interpretive methods* like the *New Criticism* and *Hermeneutics*. Deconstructionists purposely uncover all underlying paradoxes and contradictions (Hatim 2001).

In tandem, the Feminist Translation Theory urged for more scrutiny of the concealed meaning, albeit to disgrace what has been called the *patriarchal language*. Language was used as a political tool to uncover what Lobiniere-Harwood (1995: 64) has called *depressing meaning*. The translator was urged to expose deliberately the underlying stigmas. This trend was meant to encourage the translator to become politically, ideologically, aesthetically active to combat alleged dualism (Gillian Lane Mercier 1997: 63). Furthermore, the movement recommended the manipulation of certain conceptions (Barbara Johnstone 1981, cited in Flow, 1991: 81). Levine (1991) even asserted that her *intentions* were to *subvert* the text. That was a movement with a common cause.

As cultural and social norms exhibited more change, the culturist and translation theorist Mary Snell-Hornby (1988) called for adoption of culture rather

than text as the unit of translation. Translation was mainly seen as a process of cultural communication and the translated text as part of an ongoing cultural communication .

Corollary, Susan Bssnett and Andre Lefevere (1990b) advocate the notion of *going beyond the text*. Translation studies were viewed as capable of challenging the complexities of ideology, change, and power in literature and society, giving translation in the process the upper hand of change and reconstruction (1990). Texts are *re-worked* in translation according to their context, history of source, target text and production in relation to the *literary system.* The "*image*", which is the fingerprint the author has in a given culture, should exert more influence than the original has had in its own culture (Lefevere 1992: 110).

Notably, Lefevere's translation model was influenced by, inter alia, the status of the original text, image of the target culture of itself, types of translatable texts, intended audience, cultural *scripts* that arouse the interest of the audience, and the translator's ideology. In addition, the translator's drive to keep up to date the prestigious position of the work by using respectful genre, the popular motif and the culture semiotics favored at a particular time and by particular culture are among the stimulants (1992: 26). Although applicable to poetics, the need to keep a prestigious work and the cultural conflicts may probably interfere with the adequate effect a translation of some provocative verbs in argumentation discourse needs to convey (Snell-Hornby 1988).

Institution of prestige and power can have influence on translation as can be seen from the work lead by the Tel Aviv scholars Itimar Even-Zohar and Gideon Toury on *literary polysystems and translation norms.* In contrast to Lefevere's translation model, the Polysystem Theory calls for consideration to be given to *low forms* as well as *high forms* in dealing with literature. Inspired by the intellectual activity, which Eastern Europe has witnessed in the 1960s and early 1970s, the theory attributes the interaction between literary systems to the natural friction between genre and culture to get prominence. "Even-Zohar, the Israeli architect of the polysystem approach stresses that translated literature operates as a system of other systems and co-systems (http://www.anukriti.net/translation3.asp March 08). There is always a struggle between superior forms and less important ones, which try to top off. Translation serves as an important source of innovation (para. 5).

Announcing the death of the Equivalence notion, the Descriptive Translation Studies addressed such issues as the translator's individual styles, translation policy,

ideological considerations and political decisions. Socio-cultural norms, textual-literary conventions in the target language and culture, together with decisions regarding the end product, model of translation and relevant presupposition are the main inducers of the translation.

In 1995, Gideon Toury introduced the notion of Norms that calls for a systematic approach to replace the prevalent single approaches of translation studies. Associations should be made in relation to the decision-making in future translation works. Corpus can be expanded and descriptive translation profile should be built to identify Norms and standardize each kind of translation.

Toury observed, while working for more than 15 years on the sizable translations into modern Hebrew from English, Russian, German, French and Yiddish, the tendency to "upgrade the language to avoid sounding less prestigious".

3â¸   Metatext/ Metadiscourse in Translation

While working in poetry and poetic translation, James Holmes (1969) pointed out to the notion of metatext. Translation is perceived as portraying a different reality, which is meta compared to the original. Metatext is translating what is already a description of reality as in literature. Translation in this sense is applied to imaginary situations without ignoring the linguistic, literary and socio-cultural concepts. Modernizing vs. historicizing were the notions driving this movement (1972a).

Metatext refers to discourse about discourse (Palteidge & Starfield 2007). Metatext is a notion that can best be thought of in terms of argumentation. "Argumentation goes beyond the reader to incorporate third parties who can be the audience, observers, translators or arbitrators". The other party in the process of argumentative discussion is mostly implicit (Van Eemeren & Grootendorst 2004). The translator also plays the dual role of translator and observer.

4â¸   The Notions of Text, Register, Discourse and Genre in the Translation Strategy

According to Muna Baker (1998), there are more discoursal factors that contribute to the meaning. Texts are classified according to many criteria such as discourse, subject matter, domain, and functions. The latter has paved the way for the recognition of the text as a *hybrid that can account only for predominant tendencies*. Consequently, many contextual *foci* were distinguished, including a

focus on the evaluation of concepts (basic to the text-type argumentation). Text analysis treats the text as a linguistic unit that displays special patterns of cohesion. (pp: 262-264).

Texts are also classified in terms of their structure (Zydatiss *et al*. 1983 cited in Baker, 1998: 264). "A text is an element of structure, whatever a particular function the analytic model is ultimately trying to fulfill; *event or argument*. This combines both *mapping and negotiation*. Text structure have been usefully studied from the standpoint of cross-cultural differences in the utilization of persuasive strategy (Hatim 1991).

The register analysis by Firth (1951) is seen as a significant contribution to the meaning in the context of function. Translatability lies somewhere between *phonological, grammatical, collocational* and *situational* levels.

From the studies conducted by Halliday, Mclntosh and Strevens (1964) two notions come forth. The *dialects* of the user (speaker/writer) and the *registers* related to the use (grammar and lexis). The use is further divided into; field of discourse (field of activity), mode of discourse (medium of the language activity) and tenor (level of formality). Registers theories have given way to the notions of pragmatics and semiotics. Pragmatic is the "study of the purposes for which sentences are used....." (Stalnaker 1972: 380). Discourse is defined as "the modes of speaking and writing which involve participants in adopting a particular attitude towards areas of socio-cultural activity (e. g. racist discourse, bureaucratese, etc" (Hatim 2004: 338).

The Oxford philosopher J. Austin (1962) highlighted the significance of sentences in assuming certain communicative function. Three kinds of actions were identified: The *locutionary act* (the effect of complete sentence meaning), the *illocutionary* act (the communicative force of the utterance, e. g. promising, denying .etc) and the p*relocutionary* act (the effect on the hearer/reader). It is the illocutionary act, which should lend communicative credence to the utterance. The three notions *Locutionary, Illocutionary* and *Prelocutionary* form what are referred to as the speech acts. With studies increasingly focusing on the text and the register of the text, argumentation is projected as a field that needs particular attention. The three notions *Locutionary, Illocutionary* and *Prelocutionary* that form the speech acts have become the theme of argumentation studies (Hatim 1990: 60).

In summary, the translation activity can then be defined as:

> A process not a product and the meaning of the text as something that is negotiated between producer and receiver and not a static entity... (1990: 65)

Consequently, the relation between communicative, pragmatics, semiotic and genre notions is established. Pragmatics as defined above is the study of the relations between language and its context of utterance (p: 59). Semiotics according to Daniel Chandler (1980) is the study of signs that can take the form of words, images, sounds, odours, flavours, acts or objects. Peirce (1931: 58) suggested that such signs become significant when they are surrounded by meaning. Far from the quantitative approach to language, Semiotics often incorporates the significance of the signs. Genres on the other hand are defined as:

> Recognizable communicative events characterized by a set of communicative purposes identified and mutually understood by members of a professional or academic community in which they frequently occur (Bhatia 2004: 11).

Thus, argumentation as a conventionalized language use constitutes a genre that has a communicative purpose, which is the goal of the community, a product, i. e. the textual effects, the practices, procedures or processes, and finally the players, who are the discourse and professional community membership "in this case the media" (1999a). Other examples of genres are scientific genre, sports genre .etc.

The above is an outline of the previous research works in linguistics and translation. The survey traced the relevance of past theories to the area of study in argumentation. It is clear from this Literature Review that argumentation in translation is gradually enhanced with the appearance of such notions as discourse, genre, semiotic and pragmatics. The next chapter will attempt to shed more light on argumentation studies, definitions, types of and processes of its translation.

CHAPTER THREE

ArgumentationStudies

3.1. Overview

This section will focus on the definition of argumentation, types and subtypes, processes and models. Argumentative indicators and Argumentation in the Arabic language will also be assessed. The aim is to provide the theoretical background for the analysis of the Arabic translation of Argumentation in English. To begin with, Argumentation is broadly defined as "a logical reasoning that embraces the arts and sciences of civil debate, dialogue, conversation, and persuasion (Wikipedia, 2008).

Aristotle, the famous Greek philosopher, and Marcus Tullius Cicero, the Roman statesman, lawyer, political theorist, and philosopher (106 BC –43 BC), are the classical authors of Argumentation (Van Eemeren & Grootendorst 2004). According to Aristotle in his *Rhetoric* (1939/1994: 15-23) arguments must contain logical *logos*, emotional *pathos*, and ethical *ethos* appeals. Aristotle's model of argumentation is Syllogistic reasoning, where a major premise is followed by a minor premise, then a conclusion. This method is also called Deduction (Gilbert 2005: 7-8). Cicero was especially influential in introducing the art of refined letter writing to the European culture.

The Model of Argumentation devised by the British philosopher, author, and educator Stephen Edelston Toulmin (1922), which set out an analysis of moral reasoning, was considered his most influential work. The Toulmin Model of Argumentation outlines six inter-related components used for analyzing arguments. "Facts (data) are adduced in support of a standpoint (claim). Data are then linked with the claim by means of a usually implicit justification (warrant)" (Van Eemeren & Grootendorst 2004: 46; Wikipedia, 2008).

As a genre, Argumentation is defined as:

> The verbal, social, and rational activity that attempt at convincing a reasonable critic of the acceptability of a standpoint, by putting forward an orderly propositions justifying or refuting certain standpoint (2004: 1).

Argumentation is shown to affect all aspects of discourse. "Argumentation and rhetoric are not the components of legal and political discourse alone, rather

Discourse Analysis of Argumentation

Argumentation is a part of many writings, even in natural sciences and economics, where observation objectivity is the dominant norm. The case for the presence of Argumentation in science is that information, knowledge and ideas are just as argumentative, and arguable, as beliefs and hopes" (Malcolm Williams 2004: 335)

Referred to as critical discussion, Argumentation is further described by (Van Eemeren, Houtlosser, & Snoeck 2007) as "a regulated exchange of views by which parties try to resolve their differences in order to reach agreement on the acceptability or unacceptability of a standpoint under discussion" (p: 9).

As text structure has been most usefully studied from the standpoint of cross-cultural differences in the utilization of persuasive strategy (Hatim 1991 cited in Baker, 1998: 264), argumentative texts have been defined by Beaugrande and Dressler (1981: 184) 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, volition, value and opposition should be frequent. The surface texts will often show cohesive devices for emphasis and insistence, e.g. recurrence, parallelism and paraphrase (Hatim 1990: 154).

The persuasive nature of the argumentative text is further highlighted by (Biber 1988 & Hatim 1989)

    as:

The text type genre used in editorials and opinion columns to persuade and influence readers through the use of a concerted series of conceptual relations, in order to settle a difference in opinion (cited in Renad Abbadi, 2006, 1) available on line at http://www.ling.mq.edu.au/translation/ctir_working_papers/

Therefore, an argument is a process of reasoning that presents reasons or proofs to support a position, belief, or conclusion (Muller & Wiener 2005). It is also the performance of complex speech acts to provide a reasoned critique from a certain standpoint (Van Eemeren *et al*. 2007). Argumentation can be used to justify a positive standpoint or refute a negative standpoint (2004).

There are two general types of Argumentative texts (Hatim 1989a, 1989b, 1991, 1997, Hatim and Mason 1991); "through-argumentative" and "counter-argumentative". In through-argumentation, a thesis is sited, extensively supported, mostly positively, before a conclusion is reached. Throughout the "through-

17

argumentative process", only one voice is predominant, which is the voice of the writer. In short, the opposite voice is absent. Counter-argumentation, on the other hand, is formed in its simplest forms of a thesis to be opposed or rebutted followed by support of the rebuttal and conclusion (Hatim 1989a, 1989b, 1997: 40).

Hatim further identifies two subtypes of counter-argument (1) *The Balance*, where the counter claim can be explicit or implicit. (2) The *Explicit Concessive,* where the counterargument is anticipated by explicit concessive (e. g. while, although, despite ..etc).

Table 1. Example of "through-argumentative text", and its translation into English.

The US and Israel Who is the real Enemy of the Palestinians?	الوليات المتحدة و إسرائيل من هو العدو الحقيقي للفلسطينيين ؟
If there is a slightest glimpse of hope that the Bush administration's bias to Israel is less than Clinton's, then this hope must have been shattered by now, as this administration has shown that in the peace talks, it is not only adopting the Israeli position (1), but also supporting the barbaric Israeli acts (2), and calling the victims to refrain from violence (3). At a time, when the White House has invited the war criminal Arial Sharon to Washington talks (4), it denied that to the Palestinian president Yasir Arafat (5). By this, it clearly declares that its adoption of the Israeli stand has become so brazen that it exceeds all diplomatic considerations (6).	1 إذا كان لدى البعض أي أمل في أن تكون إدارة الرئيس جورج دبليو بوش أقل انحيازاً لإسرائيل من الرئيس السابق بيل كلينتون 2فان هذا الأمل تبدد 3 عندما أظهرت هذه الإدارة أنها لا تكتفي بتبني الموقف الإسرائيلي من مفاوضات السلام فحسب 4 ولكنها تدعم الأعمال الوحشية الإسرائيلية 5 وتطالب الضحايا بوقف أعمال العنف ، 6 وفي حين وجه البيت الأبيض الدعوة لمجرم الحرب اريبل شارون 7 للإجراء محادثات مع الرئيس بوش ، 8فقد امتنعت الإدارة الأمريكية عن توجيه دعوة مماثلة للرئيس الفلسطيني ياسر عرفات ، 9 لتعلن بهذا الموقف أن

	انحيازها لإسرائيل بلغ من الصفاقة حدا يتجاوز حتى الاعتبارات الشكلية 10 التي يتعين أن يظهرها الوسيط.11 وإذا كان هناك من يظن أن المصالح الأمريكية في المنطقة يمكن أن تتأثر12 عندما تواصل واشنطن دعمها لأعمال القتل اليومية للأبرياء 13فقد أثبتت الحكومات العربية التي اكتفت بتقديم الدعم الكلامي للقضية الفلسطينية (مع حفنة دولارات لا تغني ولا تسمن) أنها أعجز من أن تشكّل قوى الضغط 14 وأنها لا تجرؤ على رفع أصوات الاحتجاج ضد السياسة الأمريكية الراهنة 15 ولم يكن صعباً على واشنطن أن تستوعب الحقيقة. Adapted from the Internet. See also the Appendix:

For an example of *counterargument,* see the Analysis Section

Preference for any of the above types is shown to be shaped by cultural context. Cultures tend to prefer certain conventions of written texts at different times (Connor 1996 cited in Renad Abbadi, 2006). Furthermore Hatim notes that the dominance of counter argument or through argument vary across and within cultures and languages. While counterargument is found at varying degrees in the Arabic texts, Arabic writers are inclined mostly to the "through argumentation" structure in their writings (1997: 41).

In her study (*Construction of Arguments in English and Arabic: A Comparison of the Linguistic Strategies Employed in Editorials*), Renad Abbadi (2006) concludes that Arabic editorials opt for through-argumentation. Abdulrahman M Alhudhaif (2005), claims in his study *A Speech Act Approach to Persuasion in American and Arabic Editorials* (Doctoral dissertation Abstract), that persuasiveness can be accomplished using different ways of manipulation of speech in different cultures. Both American and Arabic editorials prefer the use of strong assertions, but they seem to differ with regard to the speech acts of directives and expressives (explained below). American directives and expressives are stronger, and more direct and explicit than their Arabic counterparts. Persuasion in American editorials is accomplished via

19

powerful and explicit claims; Arabic editorials favour the use of implied propositions to persuade their readers. Arabic editorials approach their readers differently and hence try to accomplish persuasiveness while at the same time save their readers' face. In fact, the trend of cultural variation is not restricted to the Arabic writings. Pointing to the *striking differences* between styles of argumentation in Western and oriental cultures, Van Eemeren and Grootendorst (2004), observe that in Japan, the risk of loss of face seems to make it often inappropriate to express a difference of opinion explicitly and directly (p: 98). "Looking doubtful is also contrary to the preference for agreement that predominates in ordinary exchange" (p: 98). In addition, Paltridge and Starfield (2007) assert that "the notion of critical thinking is a culture-specific Western idea". Examples of Russian, Indonesian or Korean students not familiar with the critical discussion-kind of argumentation are cited. The paradox is that in research, critical discussion is universal (p. 113).

In general, "factors affecting types of argumentation range from politeness to ideology and power and sometimes aspects of social life as political system or the nature and role of family" (Hatim 1997 p: 41). "This may be what affects an Arabic speaker /writer's preference!"

Van Eemeren and Grootendorst (2004) agree and draw the attention to the circumstances needed for a critical discussion to flourish. These include individual freedom, the right of free exchange of information and criticism, non-violence, and intellectual *pluralism* as precursors (p: 38). Inevitably, this calls for further research to determine reasons behind a preference for certain types of argumentation in different cultures.

Evidence of counterarguments in Arabic can be traced back to the Arab rhetoricians; Ibn Rushd, Al Ghazali, Ibn Seena, Al Shahrstani, Al Razi, Ibn Khaldoon and many others including (Ibn Rushd, 1180/1998) and Ibn Qudama, who worked in the fourteenth century (Renad Abbadi, 2006). At the time, those philosophers were engaged in a systematic philosophical argumentation with each other. Ibrahim, Aydelott, and Kassabgy (2000) also hint at the text by the Arab historian, mathematician, and geographer Abu al Fida Isma'l Ali (1273-1331 CE), in which he describes his observations following Aristotelian linear logic (p: 129). Hatim (1997) refers to *Nagd al-Nathr* by the rhetorician Qudaama b. Ja'far, as one of the more remarkable contributions to argumentation (p: 49). Qudaama b. Ja'far based most of his studies on the Quraan. Certainly, the contribution of Arab philosophers to

20

argumentation can not be covered in this study. More research is thus needed to assess their contribution to Arabic argumentation and counter-argumentation is needed. However, "through-argumentation" is found in English and counter-augmentation is found in Arabic but at different levels. (Hatim 1991, 1997, Hatim and Mason 1997: 133).

Ibrahim *et al*. (2000) indicate that writers of argumentative texts use meta-discourse expressions to demonstrate their assessment of, and attitude toward, the information and views they present about the subject matter. For the purposes of this research, meta-discourse as adapted from the website of Peabody Institute, of the Johns Hopkins University (Liberal Arts) is:

The language we use when, writing about some subject matter, we incidentally refer to the act and to the context of writing about it. We use metadiscourse verbs to announce that in what follows we will *explain, show, argue, claim, deny, describe, suggest, contrast, add, expand, summarize*. We use metadiscourse to list the parts or steps in our presentation: *first, second, third, finally,* to express our logical connections: *infer, support, prove, illustrate, therefore, in conclusion, however, on the other hand*. We hedge how certain we are by writing *it seems that, perhaps, I believe, probably*, etc. http://www.peabody.jhu.edu/1696

As explained by Van de Kopple (1985 cited in Ibrahim *et al., 2000*), metadiscourse devices do not add anything to the propositional content. They indicate only the writer's involvement in the text. The use of metadiscourse allows writers to *project themselves into the text to explain their attitude toward the content and the readers* (p: 111).

Meta-discourse can be divided into validity markers and attitude markers. These two markers indicate the writer's credibility and attitude to the propositions submitted. Validity markers are used to indicate how writers assess the probability or truth of the propositions expressed and to show their commitment. Validity markers include hedges and emphatics (p: 111). Calling them presentation indicators, Van Eemeren *et al*. (2007) describes propositional attitude indicators and force modifying expressions (p: 9) as argumentative indicators.

2â¸   Argumentation in Arabic

21

Discourse Analysis of Argumentation

Hassan (1995) classifies the Arabic emphatic devices as *inna* (indeed), *bi-la shakkin* (no doubt), *bi-al-tabi* (of course), and *min al mu'akadi* (certainly)". It is rhetorically wrong to use emphatics unless the predicate (*khabar*) is subject to doubt or denial (cited in Ibrahim, 2000). Arabic rhetoricians identify two instances for the *Khabar* (predicate) Arabic sentence (Ghazwini 1993).

â 1â¤Sentence without emphatics: (this is a primitive form like "I went to the mosque". This is said when the receiver has no idea (*khali dhihn*) and may not be interested. The assumption is that he or she will accept it anyway. Although referred to as open-minded in Hatim (1997: 48) *khali dhihn* is exactly the opposite. To put it simply *khali dhihn* means disinterested in the subject being discussed or at best indifferent.

â 2â¤Sentences said when the receiver is in doubt and the speaker or writer is anxious to persuade:

aâ¤ If a reader or listener is uncertain (*mutaradid*), only one emphatic indicator is used (usually *inna*)

bâ¤ If the reader or listener is in total denial (*Munkir*), in this case more than one emphatic indicator is used (many examples from the Quraan show this (http://egyig.com/Public/articles/literature/9/56418531.shtml); (Hatim 1997).

The use of emphatics in Arabic is for persuasion, drawing attention and stressing the importance of the subject matter. It is also to prepare the reader to take the matter seriously. It reflects the sophistication and knowledge of the author.

Examples of Some Arabic Emphatics:

. Affirmative tools; *inna, anna, lam* (لمحمد), *lam + inna* (إن العالمين على فضل لذو الله), *noon.*

. Stress indicators, *Haqan, La raibin, La shakin, la Jidalin* (حقاً – لا ريب – لا شك – لا جدال – لابد)

. Exceptions (القصر)

. Superfluous prepositions

. Self-same assertions (like itself ..etc)

. Verbal emphatics (repetition)

. Oath; *Wa Alassar* (والعصر), *Wa Al Fajer* (والفجر)..etc

22

.   Conjunctions (*ba'l, lakin, la*, بل ، لكن ، لا)

.   Advancing the predicate (*khabar*) over the subject (*mubtadaá*)

.   Cataphora i.e. advancing the object *mafaol bihi* (iyaka naábudo,

زرت   محمد ، نعبد إياك   )

.   Advancing the preposition and word governed by the proposition.

.   *Qad, laqad* (لقد ، قد   )

.   The use of antithesis and opposites which exhibits contrast

أضحك   وأنه   المنتهى   ربك   إلى   وأنه
وأنه خلق   وأحيى*   أمات   وأنه   وأبكى
إذا   والأنثى *من نطفة   الذكر   الزوجين
أغنى   وأنه هو   الأخرى *   النشأة   وأن عليه   * تمنى
الشعرى   رب   وأنه هو   * وأقنى

.   The use of definite article (the, *al*) for the subject and predicate

.   Others

(أساسيات   البلاغة   ،   الجزء   الثاني)

http://www.aklaam.net/forum/archive/index.php?t-4025.html Feb. 2008

See full list of Arabic emphatics in the Appendix.

Barbara Johnstone (1991) also referred to repetition and *parallelism* in Arabic discourse as a means of persuasion. Lexical couplets are seen as parallelisms on the level of semantics. Johnstone believes that Arabic lexical couplets and repetitions reflect the process by which Arabic argumentative discourse is structured. For further reading: Johnstone, Barbara (1991) *Repetition in Arabic discourse: Paradigms, syntagms, and the ecology of language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Given the plethora of argumentative rhetoric in Arabic, and the fact that critical thinking and reading is a prerequisite for research, the question that begs itself is: could it be just a matter of time before the practice of fully fledged argumentation develops in Arabic rhetoric, notwithstanding the seemingly absence of this vital science in our schools?. Could the socio-cultural norms, for example repetition or the use of superfluous prepositions in Arabic mean that the language has its own counter-argumentative system or a system in-between *through* and *counter argumentation*?

Examining native English vs. native Arabic texts, Ibrahim *et al.* (2000: 114) conclude that the frequency of validity markers (hedges and emphatics) and attitude markers is higher in Arabic essays compared to English ones. Emphatics, in particular,

23

constitute the majority of indicators due to the excessive use of *inna* by native Arabic writers. Hedges on the other hand were found to be more predominant in the English texts. The study concludes that "*inna*" is mostly used by the most proficient writers in that group.

Could this coupled with the stylistic and idiomatic usage, reveal that Arabic is a more authoritarian language?. Could this be attributed to the prevalence of certain social norms that emphasize the superiority of the author/writer/speaker over the reader or listener? Could this authoritarian trend be translated as an overarching assertion to persuade an uncertain or denying reader? By showing, that he or she is the master of the text, and worthy of respect, the writer may feel that this is the best way to achieve persuasion given the mindset of his or her audience, who, if addressed differently, might not pay the same degree of attention. These could well be interesting areas for future research.

Again, the use of these emphatics in Arabic to assure the "uncertain" or "denying" reader is not always without restrictions. Exceptions Tools *Alistithn*a in Arabic are restrictors or concessive tools that should be used after the *khabar* sentence which targets the doubting reader. This probably indicates that Arabic argumentative indicators work exactly as the way certain emphatics work in English. They do not express the writer's absolute conviction, but rather the argumentative nature of the context. However it is probably rhetorically wrong to use emphatics without these exceptions or concessive as explained by Arab rhetoricians in most Arabic Rhetoric Books. Examples of exception tools are *ela, ghair, siwa, ada, khala, hasha, laisa, la yakoon* for لا يكون ، ليس ، حاشا ، خلا ، عدا ، سوى ، غير ، إلا respectively (Ghazwini 1993).

The antagonist is also present in the writings of many Arabs. Expressions such as كما ، دعونا ، الشاهد ، وللمرء ، المرء ، على ، يقول أن قائل ورب indicate صاح يا ، صاحبي يا ، فالبعض ، عذرا استميحكم ، دعوني ، تعلموذ that the writer is using another voice in the text. One could assume here that the lack of systematic approach may have probably prevented the adoption of Arabic specific counterargument. Consequently each writer adopts their own style. The researcher also noticed the predominence of certain emphatics in particular discourses. For example, the use of the Islamists of *yaghinan, hasbi, ahsabu* أحسب ، حسبي، يقينا underlines an ideological component. Are emphatics probably been used as an ideological battlefront? Naturally, these observations need to be consolidated through

further research to explore whether the use of different argumentation patterns in Arab writings is related to certain factors or related to certain groups.

3â¸   Counter-argumentation

In Argumentation, as said, a specific point of view, standpoint, proposition or claim is advanced. The writer defends this standpoint to a reader who has doubts or a different point of view. Standpoint according to Muller and Wiener (2005) is the main idea or conclusion in an argument. "It is the statement that needs to be justified or proved". Minor propositions are the reasons offered to support the major proposition or standpoint". "Evidence" on the other hand, supports the claim and the minor propositions of argument. "Evidence refers to the facts, statistics, accepted opinions, expert testimony, examples, or personal experience. Argumentation has 'a warrant', defined as the connection, typically implicit, between a claim and the supporting reasons. It is the general belief, or principle, underlying the argument, the assumption that makes the claim appears to be acceptable. A backing is defined as a broader principle that serves as the foundation for a warrant (p: 5).

According to (Van Eemeren *et al.* 2007), whose work has direct relevance to the field of this research in argumentation, two parties are presumed to have conducted the dialogue. The other party could be, implicit. Usually, argumentation is centred around implicit or unexpressed premises. The protagonist makes an attempt to counter the (potential) doubts or criticism of a specific or non-specific audience or readership who can be called the antagonist.

Searle (1969) characterised standpoints as assertive speech acts. Speech acts are defined as" making statements, giving commands, asking questions, making promises ...etc" (p:16). Searle categorised speech acts into five types which he related to critical discussion.

According to Van Eemeren *et al* (2007): the different verbal moves or speech acts made in the various stages of an argumentation to resolve a difference of opinion are as follows:

.   Assertives

These are the standpoints advanced by the writer to assert a proposition. "Many *Assertives* do not pronounce the truth but express a judgement on its acceptability in a wider sense". Examples *in my opinion, I think that*…..

However, *Assertives* are not used only to express standpoint, but may also be part of the argumentation that is advanced to defend the standpoint or to conclude discussion.

.   **Directives**

These are requests and prohibition speech acts. They also include; orders, questions, definition, recommending, begging, and challenging an explanation.

.   **Commissives**

These are implicit phases, where the two parties (writer and reader) undertake to do something or to refrain from doing something.

.   **Expressivess**

These are expressions of feelings such as: congratulating, thanking, regretting, etc.

.   **Declaratives or Declarations**

These expressions are related to institutionalized contexts such as official meetings and religious ceremonies. Declaratives do not play any role in the argumentation process because of the authorized nature of the writer in a particular institutionalized context. Consequently, they do not directly contribute to the process of resolving the difference of opinion

.   **Usage declaratives**

These are speech acts, such as definitions, specifications, amplifications, and explanations. The role of usage declaratives is to enhance a reader's understanding of other speech acts (p: 13-14).

Four stages in the process of argumentation are further identified (p: 11):

.   **The confrontation stage**

.   **The opening stage**: Two camps are distinguished (protagonist and the antagonist). In this stage, which is mostly implicit there is "*commitment to a common point of departure.*"

.   **The argumentation stage:** Here a number of supports or counterarguments are advanced.

.   **The concluding stage**: The end of the argumentation process.

"These stages should not necessarily come in sequential order. The Argumentative practice usually does not require the explicit completion of all four stages". (pp: 10-11)

Argumentative indicators, as adapted from Van Eemeren *et al.* (2007), are of direct relevance to the analysis in this study. Different indicators of the Argumentation process are grouped as Appendix A.

4â¸   Mass Media

Mass media is a term used for the media specifically envisioned and designed to reach a very large audience such as the population of a country (wikepedia, 2008). According to Robert Sylwester, an Emeritus Professor of Education at the University of Oregon, mass media plays an important role in democratic societies and competitive markets that function through the efficient persuasion of large widespread audiences".

At the end of this Literature Review, I need to say that the current Arabic studies of argumentation are clearly deficient in the field of contrastive linguistics particularly, studies on critical writing and translations. Systematic research in the field that builds on the ancestors' traditions needs to be in place (Hatim 1997: 49). The few studies available differ considerably in their focus and objectives. So far, none of these approaches has studied systematically the Arabic argumentative language and its development. I shall make clear that there are many gaps in the existing studies on our persuasive discourse. In the next chapter, I intend to show how translators overlook Argumentation's genre and how they could deal with it. I will do so by exposing the various problem areas with respect to critical discourse.

CHAPTER FOUR

Theoretical Framework and Methodology

In this Chapter, the research strategy used to study the way different Arab translators deal with the argumentative genre of English editorials and opinion columns is described. Building on the theoretical basis set out in the Literature Review chapters, this Chapter presents a more detailed consideration of the work undertaken to collect data to analyse the research practical problems.

The genre of argumentation discourse involves certain semiotics. Genres, as conventionalized use of language contain a set of rules. These rules are set by certain professional members and have different purposes, use certain language and often play a particular social role (Bhatia 2004; Hatim 2004). The translation of an argumentation genre thus, should not merely be replacement, substitution (Catford 1965) or transferral of the equivalent meaning from one language to another (Nida 1979). Rather it should adhere strictly to the respective genre conventions. The relevance of speech acts that are part of the argumentative genre should be preserved (Hatim 1990; Beaugrande 1978; Van Eemeren 2004).

1â¸   The Analytical Methodology

Primary data including newspaper editorials and opinion columns, representing the genre in question, are compiled through regular subscriptions to *Al Khaleej* newspaper (UAE) and *Majalat Al Majala* (KSA). These two publications have regular opinion pieces translated from the *Financial Times*, the *Economist* and other noted websites, including Project Syndicate (http://www.project-syndicate.org/) and Medialens (http://www.medialens.org/). The original English material (i.e. the *Economist* and *Financial Times* articles) is retrieved through the AUS Library website. Many others are retrieved free from the world wide web.

Data are analyzed via text analysis method. Information relating to the problem area is subjected to thorough Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). CDA is important as a tool used in research for "describing, interpreting, analyzing, and critiquing social life reflected in text" (Brown & Yule 1983: 1). "Unmasking certain practices, CDA allows for the systematic exploration of often nuanced relationships

and practices, texts, events and the wider social and cultural settings" (Fairclough 1993 cited in McGregor, 2004). A large body of linguistic research uses text as a unit of CDA analysis. Following in this tradition allows the results of this study to be compared to the broader body of research (Paltridge & Starfield, 2007). However, the discourse analyst, according to Brown and Yule (1983), is not in the apparently secure position of the formal linguist who has the *rules* of the language, which are or are not satisfied, but rather, is in the position of the hearer who has interpretations of the discourse which do, or do not, make sense.

2â¸   Identification of the Argumentative Text

Argumentative texts have certain indicators, speech acts and standards that assist in determining whether a text is argumentative or another kind of writing, such as prose, exposition, narration, informative, etc. Different indicators and speech acts, as described in the previous chapter are signs that particular argumentative moves might be in progress.

Prior to the translation analysis, an original English article was analysed to show the different stages, indicators and speech acts of the argumentation process.

Inspired by the pragma-dialectical model of van Eemeren and Grootendorst (2004), I devised a simple analysis model (described below as the Transparent Model (TM) for analysing translated argumentative text. This model runs the risk of overgeneralization as it is the only sample analysed. However, argumentation analysis is outside the scope of this study.

The pragma-dialectical approach is based on the premise that two parties are conducting a critical discussion, even when it is by way of a monologue, to resolve a difference of opinion. A reconstruction process is carried out in which deletion of irrelevant parts, addition of relevant implicit premises, substitution, rearrangement takes place (p: 103). My points of departure for the said model are as follows:

.   The Transparent Model (TM), makes visible the Antagonist and their standpoint. The Antagonist, referred to variably in different settings as the audience, analyst, observer, those concerned, hearer, reader, listener or addressee is factual. To identify the Antagonist's standpoint, the Protagonist's standpoint is simply negated.

.   TM deals only with the explicit arguments advanced with the exception of the Antagonist point of view.

.   Resolving the difference of opinion is not the underlying purpose. The aim of the TM is to assist in determining whether a text is argumentative and/or to assist in the analysis.

.   The Transparent Model (TM) considers all verbal moves as part of the discussion. There are no specific stages. The discussion is considered as an ongoing and continuous process.

.   No reconstruction is carried out.

.   The two parties are considered to be conducting an argument in the wider domain of an attempt to persuade.

This model is designed and adopted only for this study. In this context, it is relevant only to written texts.

In the table below the Protagonist occupies one side and the Antagonist the other side. Different speech acts are then divided respectively. The concessions of one to the other are made clear.

The Arabic translation of different English argumentative indicators, speech acts and techniques as included in the appendix is then evaluated. Problems related to the proper identification of stages, indicators and significance are also identified and the cohesion and coherence of translated texts are assessed.

Sample (1): *A lot for one man to do….IT IS hard to overstate the hopes being vested in Paddy Ashdown. The former British marine, politician and international pro-consul in Bosnia is on the point of being appointed as the new United Nations representative in Afghanistan, charged with steadying nerves and giving direction to the West's faltering stabilisation effort……..* See full documents in the appendixes:

Table 2. The TM

The Protagonist	The Antagonist
It is hard to overstate the hopes being vested in Paddy Ashdown. **Standpoint**	(Implicit, not in the text) It is not difficult to overstate the hopes being vested in Paddy Ashdown. **Standpoint**

The Taliban insurgency has spread from the wild frontier region to engulf much of Afghanistan's southern Pushtun belt, with some exceptions, as well as parts of Pakistan. **Macro -support+ concession**	The former British marine, politician and international proconsul in Bosnia is on the point of being appointed as the new United Nations representative in Afghanistan, charged with steadying nerves and giving direction to the West's faltering stabilisation effort **Macro support+ definition + concession**
The traditional winter lull in fighting did not stop a Taliban suicide squad from brazenly blasting and shooting its way into Kabul's posthest hotel on January 14th, killing eight staff and guests **Macro -support+Concession**	
There is general consensus among Western diplomats and soldiers that, bad as it is, Afghanistan could get a lot worse. **Support (Fallacy, overgeneralization)**	
	Tired of demanding that its European allies send more men and equipment to Afghanistan, America has decided to reinforce its contingent, announcing plans to deploy 3,200 more marines in April. **Concession+ Macro-support**
	Robert Gates, the Defense Secretary, also upset the Europeans by suggesting they had yet to master counter-insurgency tactics. **Mini-support + Concession**
The problem in Afghanistan, however, is more serious than just a shortage of troops. **Counter-arguing**	
Many of the 39 allies are conducting their own mini -campaigns, frequently in disjointed six-month bursts as fresh units are rotated through a region. **Mini-support**	
They are also pursuing different aid policies. **Mini-support (new argument)**	
America, Britain, Canada, Poland and the Netherlands are among those waging the fight in the south, while many others want to stay out of it. **Clarification (support +Concession)**	

America channels its aid through private contractors in the name of avoiding corruption, but Britain gives the bulk of its aid directly to the government to encourage "capacity building". **Restricted clarification+ Mini-support (adding to the Macro- support)+ (restricted Concession**	..in the name of avoiding corruption **Restricted support**
A recent report by the European Council on Foreign Relations, a think-tank, castigated members of the European Union in scathing terms: "EU countries have treated the common effort in Afghanistan like a pot-luck dinner where every guest is free to bring his own dish." **Mini -support + Definition (Macro-support)**	
In other post-conflict rebuilding efforts, the UN has been given primacy. But in Afghanistan it adopted a low profile as sovereignty was handed over to an Afghan government led by President Hamid Karzai. As security has worsened, the UN and aid charities have found themselves unable to work in many provinces. **Restricted concession + Clarification (new starting point)**	**Restricted support**
For years commanders have looked wistfully at Bosnia, thinking that a "Paddy Ashdown figure" is just what Afghanistan needs. **Restricted concession**	**Restricted support**
Now, it seems, they will get the genuine article. **Sarcastic micro conclusion**	
Lord Ashdown has given warning that "we are losing in Afghanistan" and that defeat here would be worse than in Iraq. **Implicit micro- counter argument** (Macro-support)	
But can he turn things around? **Challenging question+Restricted concession**	**Implicit restricted support**
but it is clear he will not have the powers he enjoyed in Bosnia, where he could sack local officials and rescind laws. **Implicit counterargument + Restricted**	His appointment is still under negotiation,

concession + Clarification)	
	On current plans, Lord Ashdown will replace a German politician, Tom Koenigs, as UN envoy. **Clarification (Potential argument)**
He will not be, as once mooted, a "triple-hatted" super-envoy who would also represent the EU and the civilian side of NATO. **Counterargument**	
	Still, the job that needs to be done is as much a matter of personal dynamism as of formal authority. **Counterargument+ concession**
	NATO commanders say they want political direction. **Micro-support**
	As a former member of the special forces, who took part in a successful counter-insurgency campaign in Borneo in the 1960s, Lord Ashdown should have little difficulty in straight-talking with military commanders. **Micro-support**
	Mr Karzai has often complained that he gets contradictory advice from his Western backers. **Micro-support (new argument)**
But he is balking at the prospect of a powerful new figure arriving in Kabul, not least because many would like Lord Ashdown to focus on reducing the government's corruption and inefficiency, in a country where opium accounts for about one-third of GDP. **Counterargument**	
Mr Karzai has demanded clarification of Lord Ashdown's mandate. **Micro-support**	
"We will not be dictated to by anyone," says his spokesman. **Micro-support**	

Another tricky matter has been America. **New argument (Micro-support)**	
It provides most of the foreign soldiers, training for Afghan forces and aid. It may not want "co-ordination" by a Briton. **Support (gradual deduction)**	Restricted support
For now, though, it seems to accept that the alternative is failure. **Macro conclusion (Counterargument +Concession +irony)**	Confronted by either the appointment of Mr Ashdown or failure, the Antagonist is forced to suspend discussion preferring the latter.
The Protagonist wins while not ruling out future turn of events.	

The above Transparent Table shows the different moves taken during the argumentation process. The analysis of the translation of the above speech acts and indicators is explained below.

3â¸ Analysis of the translation

Table 3. Differentiation between the Protagonist and the Antagonist

ST (source text)	TT (target text)
It is hard to overstate the hopes being vested in Paddy Ashdow. The former British marine, politician and international proconsul in Bosnia is on the point of being appointed as the new United Nations representative in Afghanistan, charged with steadying nerves and giving direction to the West's faltering stabilisation effort	من **الصعب** المبالغة في الآمال المعلقة على بادي آشدواذ ، **فجندي** البحرية والسياسي والمبعوث الدولي السابق في البوسنة على وشك أن يتم تعيينه الممثل الجديد للأمم المتحدة في أفغانستان المكلف بتهدئة التوتر ومنح التوجيه لجهود الغرب المتعثرة لإقامة الاستقرار ،

. This is what is called, the *confrontation stage* (Van Eemeren & Grootendorst 2004).

34

. *It is hard to overstate the hopes being vested in Paddy Ashdow...* This is the standpoint of the first party referred to here as the Protagonist. *It is hard* is a concessive speech act (p: 28). It expresses uncertainty, as it is not a firm assertion. The concessive use gives the other party the chance to respond and probably try to state a stronger position.

. The writer's expression *it is hard..* tries not to violate the second Maxim of Quality in the Cooperation Principle (p: 32-34). [1] By saying *it is hard* the writer is pre-empting being accused of making a fallacious move. The writer is trying to prevent the reader from thinking that what is said is founded on strong evidence. The sentence is uttered only to challenge and provoke further discussion, while guarding against any expected attack (Van Eemeren *et al*. 2007).

. *Overstate* is an instigating word that challenge the other party and stir doubts. This indicator also implies that the reader will not embrace the standpoint at face value.

. The Formal Equivalence translation of the standpoint gives the same connotation in the Target Language (من الصعب المبالغة في الآمال المعلقة على بادي آشدوان .)

. The ensuing arguments indicate that the Antagonist is provoked to usher in the argumentation process.

. The translation of *overstate* as مبالغة is correct in raising more doubts and expectations.

. The word *vested*, which is usually used to imply power or authority is translated as المعلقة . The Arabic word has not got the same connotation as the English one. بـ المنوطة implies more authority. However the translator was compelled to use المعلقة , and heed to the collocation rhyming and rhetoric fluency الآمال المعلقة , as بـ المنوطة will unnecessarily disturb the MinMax cohesion of the sentence.

. The translation of the whole sentence *It is hard to overstate the hopes being vested in Paddy Ashdow* raises the intended doubts, though, on the ability of Paddy Ashdow to deal with the situation in Afghanistan.

. The rest of the paragraph, *the former British marine, politician ….effort*, is actually a clarification. Clarifications are an intrinsic part of the argumentation process (Van Eemeren *et al*, 2007). According to the TM, the

clarification here is the Antagonist support of their implicit claim that *Paddy Ashdow* is qualified to deal with the difficult situation in Afghanistan. However, the Antagonist made some concession too.

.   The translator opts to use a conjunction tool *fa* فجندي البحرية.. .... لإقامة الاستقرار to join this sentence to the preceding Protagonist standpoint. While this gives artificial coherence to the paragraph, it does not assist to understand that this is in fact the Antagonist point, or to draw attention to the second implicit camp. Although the presumption of the presence of the Antagonist at this instance is based on the above tentative model, nevertheless, in the argumentation process, its presence must be announced sooner or later (2004: 57). The *fa* in Arabic indicates continuous timely succession without any break. " The linear progression of elements within a text may obscure the nonlinear interrelationship of rhetorical functions" Candlin and Saedi (1982: 107)

.   For more information about the work of conjunction tools in Arabic visit: (http://www.geocities.com/mosad_ziyad/index63.htm).

.   However, as a supporting clarification to the Antagonist's standpoint, the use of *fa* could be justified. It does not connect the sentence *It is hard*.., to the sentence *the former British* .., rather it connects the implicit Antagonist's standpoint to the supporting clarification .

.   Suggested amendment :

من **الصعب** المبالغة في الآمال المعلقة على بادي آشدواز ، **فالبعض** يرى **أن** جندي البحرية والسياسي والمبعوث الدولي السابق في البوسنة المزمع تعيينه الممثل الجديد للأمم المتحدة في أفغانستان قادر على تهدئة التوتر ومنح التوجيه لجهود الغرب المتعثرة لإقامة الاستقرار ، **إلا** **أن**

.   Note the (Nominization of the sentence). The emergence of *however, Ila anna*. The Arabic sentence becomes active rather than passive. This restores the MiniMax of the editorial discourse.

Table 4. The use of emphatics as conjunctions

The Taliban insurgency has spread from the wild frontier region to engulf much of ...., There is general consensus among Western diplomats and soldiers that, bad as it is, Afghanistan could get a lot worse.	**وقد** انتشر تمرد طالبان ... مع بعض الاستثناءات ، وكذلك أجزاء من باكستان ، و هدوء القتال المعتاد في الشتاء ، لم يمنع فرقة انتحارية ... وهنالك إجماع عام بين ...على الرغم من سوئها حاليا قد تزداد سوءا.

. The above are supporting arguments of the Protagonist's standpoint.

. By using conjunctions here, the Arabic translator expressed excellent sentence cohesion which conforms to the Arabic rhetorical coherence rules.

. "Arabic must have an explicit connecter unless there is a good reason to do without" (Hatim 1997 p: 8). Some Arabic connectors include *bal, fahasab, kazalika, Aydhan, fadhlan, laisa zalika fahasab*

ف... وكذلك... وأيضا...فضلا عن...ناهيك...ليس ذلك فحسب بل

. The implicit concession tool in English is made explicit by the translator الرغم على, or *although*.

. As seen above, the paragraphs' separation does not conform to the argumentation stages in both Arabic and English.

. In Arabic, supports require the use of a special substantiation signal (the particle *fa*) but not necessarily the start of a new orthographic paragraph (p: 61). However more than one particle could be used to give progressive strengths to the sentences like *fa, wa* and *bal* successively.

. Suggested amendment:

إلا **أن** تمرد طالبان انتشر من المنطقة الحدودية المتطرفة ليشمل معظم مناطق حزام البوشتان الجنوبي في أفغانستان ، مع بعض الاستثناءات ، وكذلك أجزاء من باكستان ، **فهدوء** القتال المعتاد في الشتاء ، لم يمنع فرقة انتحارية من طالبان من تنفيذ التفجيرات وشق طريقها

الرابع عشر   في كابول   في   فندق   أفخم   في النار   بإطلاق

أن هنالك   بل ،   موظفين   بمقتل ثمانية متسببة   الثاني   كانون   من

والجنود   الدبلوماسيين   بين   عاما   إجماعا

سوئها   الرغم من   على   سوئها   الأمور   على   أن   الغربيين

سوءا.   تزداد   قد   حاليا

.   *Qad* as emphatic tool should not be at the beginning of a supporting argument. Thus with the introduction of *illa anna*, the sentence will be:

انتشر من   طالبان   تمرد   أن   إلا

Table 5. The use of successive emphatics

Tired of demanding that its European allies send …… America has decided to reinforce its contingent, announcing plans to deploy 3,200 more marines in April. Robert Gates, the Defense Secretary, also upset the Europeans by …master counter-insurgency tactics.	**وقد** قررت أمريكا التي سئمت من …… في نيسان. **وقد** أزعج روبرت غيتس وزير الدفاع ، أيضا الأوربيين عن طريق الإيحاء بأنهم لم يتقنوا بعد تكتيكات مكافحة التمرد

.   *Tired of demanding that its European allies….* This is a new claim advanced by the Antagonist. The claim contains some sort of concession *tired*. The emphatic is implicit in English. The use of the translator of *qad,* قد at the beginning is a successful choice. As *qad* is an emphatic tool, it indicates assertion and expectation.

دخل على   إذا   وتأكيد   توقع   حرف   قد)   .

دخل على فعل   وإذا   التحقيق   أفاد معنى   ماض   فعل

، التحقيقة   أحيانا   قد وتفيد   التقليل   أفاد   مضارع

مضارع)   فعل تلاها إذا   والتكثير

.   The accompanying use of the conjunction *wa qad* should not necessarily change the meaning as the use of connectors in Arabic is mostly superfluous.

. However, by using another emphatic *qad* in the second sentence the translator fails to differentiate the supporting argument from the starting claim in the argumentation process.

. This is seen in many samples (attached in the appendix).

. Suggested amendment:

أن **بل** ...... التي سئمت أمريكا قررت **وقد**

أزعج الدفاع وزير ، روبرت غيتس

أيضا الأوربيين عن طريق الإيحاء بأنهم لم يتقنوا تكتيكات

مكافحة التمرد بعد.

. *Bal* is a conjunction tool used for retraction and negation.

. The use of *bal* differentiates the support and gives it more strength.

. *Similar indicators in Arabic include* أن في حين ، أذ حتى

. By translating *Tired…*as سئمت, the sentence becomes highly evaluative. This selection adds to the overall sense of suspension and thrill.

Table 6. Identification of successive mini-supports

The problem in Afghanistan, however, is more serious than just a shortage of troops. Many of the 39 allies are conducting their own mini-campaigns, frequently in disjointed six-month bursts as fresh units are rotated through a region. They are also pursuing different aid policies.	في المشكلة أن إلا أفغانستان أكثر خطورة من مجرد نقص في عدد الجنود ، **فالكثير** من الحلفاء البالغ عدد هم 39 يشنون حملات مصغرة خاصة بهم غالبا في تراشق ناري لمدة ستة أشهر متقطعة أثناء تناوب الوحدات الجديدة في المنطقة **كما** أنهم يتبنون سياسة معونة مختلفة. و أمريكا وبريطانيا وكندا ، ... وتنقل أمريكا ، ... وقد انتقد تقرير

. This is a counter-argumentative sentence by the Protagonist to the Antagonist's above claim and support.

. *However* is an adversative tool. *However* opposes what is said by the Antagonist.

39

. The translator properly translates *however* into إلا أن .

. *fa* lends more support to the above counterclaim .

. *They are also pursuing different aid policies* can be considered a new micro-claim . It opens the door for more arguments. However the use of *Also* also indicates that the sentence is a support to the preceding counterclaim *The problem in Afghanistan, however, is more serious..* i.e. indicating the intermittent efforts.

. Again *kama* in Arabic is a good choice, but it is not clear whether it refers to the *Also* in the original source text, or a normal Arabic conjunction particle to connect sentences. The use of *ayaidhan* restores the sentence to mark it as another mini-support acting at the same time as a new argument .

. Suggested amendment :

أيضا سياسة يتبنون أنهم ،كما تراشق .... بهم غالبا في

معونة مختلفة...

. Had the translator been aware of the succession nature of the (mini supports), the translation could have proceeded as follows:

مصغرة يشنونحملات عددهم 39 البالغ الحلفاء **فالكثير** من

أثناء اشهر متقطعة لمدة ستة ناري تراشق خاصة بهم غالبا في

في الجديدة الوحدات تناوب

معونة **أيضا** سياسة يتبنون أنهم **كما** ، المنطقة

أن **كما** ،... وكندا وبريطانيا **فأمريكا** ، مختلفة

،... أمريكا تنقل

. The use of *fa* indicates that the sentence *Many of the 39 allies are conducting…* is in fact a mini-support to the above mini-claim *They are also pursuing different aid policies* .

Table 7. Highlighting Markedness

| وتنقل أمريكا | America channels its aid through private |
| مساعدتها من خلال متعاقدين خاصين من | contractors in the name of avoiding corruption, but |

Britain gives the bulk of its aid directly to the government to encourage "capacity building".	أجل تجنب الفساد ، إلا أن بريطانيا تعطي معظم مساعداتها مباشرة إلى الحكومة لتشجيع بناء القدرات.

.   The connotative use of brackets in "capacity building" is lost in the Arabic example.

.   Many other examples have been shown to ignore parentheses. Suggested amendment:

An exclamation mark can be used to indicate potential significance of the expression for the reader to build on through the coming arguments.

Table 8. *Explicating assertive tools*

In other post-conflict rebuilding efforts, the UN has been given primacy. But in Afghanistan it adopted a low profile as sovereignty was handed over to an Afghan government led by President Hamid Karzai. As security has worsened, the UN and aid charities have found themselves unable to work in many provinces.	وفيما يتعلق بجهود أخرى لإعادة البناء لفترة ما بعد الصراع ، منحت الأمم المتحدة الأولوية ولكنها أقل أهمية في أفغانستان فمع تفاقم الوضع الأمني وجدت الأمم المتحدة والجمعيات الخيرية نفسها غير قادرة على العمل في الكثير من المقاطعات

.   *In other ...primacy*. This sentence is a new claim by the Protagonist. It is a restricted concession to the Antagonist as shown in the Transparent Model and will be shown below.

.   The use of *but* in the second sentence restricts the concession that comes with the above claim.

.   The assertive tool of the first sentence restricted by *but* is implicit in English.

.   In English "A series of sentences without cohesive devices can give the impression of conveying completely new information in each sentence

41

..often however implicature is drawn from background knowledge or clues from the context" (Raphae 1995:94).

. Here the translator seems unaware of the implicit assertive tool and the concession restricted by *but,* uses the conjunction connector *wafeema.*

. The use of *wafeima,* وفيما , which is a compound conjunction instead of the implicit *certainly,* makes the above sentence a support to the previous sentence.

. However the word *other,* أخرى gives the sense of a new standpoint.

. Removal of the conjunction would change the sentence into a nominal and restores the markedness e. g إن الأولوية في جهود ما بعد الصراع تمنح عادة للأمم المتحدة

. If according to the Arabic translation, the sentence is considered a support, then where is the claim?

. With a conjunction, the sentence remains mostly verbal instead of nominal.

. This mistake is probably attributed to the fact that the translator treated the claim as an ensuing support.

Suggested amendment:

إن الأولوية في جهود ما بعد الصراع تمنح
عادة للأمم المتحدة. أو

كثيرا ما تُمنح الأولوية لجهود إعادة البناء
لفترة ما بعد الصراع إلى الأمم
المتحدة ، ولكن دورها تقلص في أفغانستان
لتسليم الحكومة الأفغانية بقيادة حامد كرازي مقاليد
السلطة. كما أنه ومع تفاقم الوضع الأمني وجدت
الأمم المتحدة والجمعيات الخيرية نفسها غير
قادرة على العمل في الكثير من المقاطعات.

. The introduction of an assertive tool كثيرا or *inna* which is restricted by *lakinha,* لكنها restores the sentence.

.   *As security has….many province*. This provides mini-support to the above sentence, thereby preventing the Antagonist from making use of the concession in the first claim.

Table 9. Implicit counterargument

For years, commanders have looked wistfully at Bosnia, thinking that a "Paddy Ashdown figure" is just what Afghanistan needs. Now, it seems, they will get the genuine article. Lord Ashdown has given warning that "we are losing in Afghanistan" and that defeat here would be worse than in Iraq. But can he turn things around? His appointment is still under negotiation, but it is clear he will not have the powers he enjoyed in Bosnia, where he could sack local officials and rescind laws.	وينظر القادة العسكريون منذ سنوات إلى البوسنة **بتوق** ، معتقدين أن شخصية بادي آشداون ، هي بالضبط ما تحتاجه أفغانستان. ويبدو أنهم سيحصلون الآن على صفقة حقيقية. فاللورد آشداون حذر قائلا " إننا نخسر في أفغانستان" ، وأن الخسارة هنا ستكون أسوأ منها في العراق. ولكن هل بإمكانه تغيير الأمور ؟ لا يزال تعيينه قيد التفاوض ولكن من الواضح أنه لن يحصل على الصلاحيات التي كان يتمتع بها في البوسنة ، حيث كان بإمكانه طرد المسئولين المحليين وإبطال القوانين.

.   This paragraph displays contrasting emotive expressions that convey some sort of *Informativity*. These expressions reflect expectation, cynicism, warning and questioning.

.   Informativity is the degree of unexpectedness which an item or an utterance displays in some context (Hatim and Munday, 2004) i. e المباغتة   الأسلوبية

.   The use of words such as بتوق ، حذر gives the Arabic sentence the same connotation displayed by the English *Informativity*.

.   The use of superordinate* (can he, بإمكانه) adds to the cohesion of both English and Arabic texts.

43

. There is a shift in the functional tenor of the register in this part, varying from the persuasiveness style *writer/reader* to the official informative language *Paddy Ashdown/his audience*.

. *For years, commanders have looked wistfully....* This is a new starting point. The adverbial *for year*s and the catch word *wistfully* indicate that the writer senses the doubts of the reader.

. The word *thinking that…*, also implies that things may not be as expected.

. This sentence entails a concession.

. The implied irony in the sentence *Now it seems..* counters the above claim, however the adversative tool is implicit. This sentence explains that there is an argumentative restriction attached to the preceding concession (Van Eemeren *et al.* 123).

. *Lord Ashdown has given warning that ... worse than in Iraq.* Now this is what the Protagonist has been preparing to say. These sentences are intended to be ironic, as the use of parenthesis indicates.

. The conjunction tool *waw* واو العطف at the beginning of this paragraph is, arguably, superfluous.

. The words *wistfully*, *thinking* are *trap* or *catch* words that serve to raise expectations prior countering them. The translation of these words into معتقدين ، توّق did justice to the argumentative translation and compensate for the lost adversative indicator.

. The translator fails to understand the nature of the concession provided in the claim and does not explicate the adversative tool of the cynicism, opting instead for a normal verbal sentence.

. The sarcasm is neutralized and the meaning is blurred. Still, the irony is felt due to the contrast in *wistfully*, and *warning, genuine article, defeat, losing* which has more or less contributed to the sense of counter-arguing.

. Suggested amendment:

. وينظر القادة العسكريون منذ سنوات إلى البوسنة **بتوّق** ، **معتقدين** أن شخصية بادي آشداون ، هي بالضبط ما تحتاجه

أفغانستان ، **إلا** **أنهم** سيحصلون الآن على ما يبدو
على صفقة حقيقية. فاللورد آشدون حذر قائلا...

.   *But can he turn things around?*. It is obvious that this question is not merely an informative question, but intended specifically to challenge the Antagonist. By challenging the Antagonist, it acts also as a new micro claim. The Protagonist advances the question as a new point to carry forward the argumentation. This is evident by the response of the Antagonist, which implies counterargument and concession *His appointment is **still** under negotiation...* The interrogative question's *but* acts to prevent the Antagonist from answering the above question positively by saying *Yes he can change matters. But* is a weak counterargument tool, it indicates the writer is ready to reconcile (2007).

.   However, the second *but* in **but** *it is clear he will* …, is a counterargument by the Protagonist to the preceding claim.

.   That means *although the process of his appointment is not yet complete, but he may not get the powers to act properly*. However, the translator overlooks the implicit concessive *although* and this confuses the meaning.

.   Adding a word such as *perhaps,* ربما , which means that something is possible, can add further ambiguity to the meaning.

.   The use of *still* indicates a restricted concession.

.   Suggested amendment:

وينظر القادة العسكريون منذ سنوات
إلى البوسنة **بتوق** ، **معتقدين** أن شخصية بادي
آشداون ، هي بالضبط ما تحتاجه أفغانستان ، **إلا**
أنهم سيحصلون الآن على ما يبدو على صفقة حقيقية. فاللورد
آشدون حذر قائلا....... ولكن هل بإمكانه تغيير
الأمور ؟. **ربما** ،**على** **الرغم من** أن
تعيينه ما زال قيد التفاوض ، **إلا** **أنه** من
الواضح أنه لن يحصل على الصلاحيات التي كان يتمتع بها في
البوسنة ، حيث كان بإمكانه طرد المسئولين المحليين
وإبطال القوانين

Discourse Analysis of Argumentation

Table 10. Implicit adversative and concessive tools

| On current plans, Lord Ashdown will replace a German politician, Tom Koenigs, as UN envoy. He will not be, as once mooted, a "triple-hatted" super-envoy who would also represent the EU and the civilian side of NATO. **Still**, the job that needs to be done is as much a matter of personal dynamism as of formal authority. NATO commanders say they want political direction. | ووفقا للخطط الحالية سيحل اللورد آشدون محل السياسي الألماني توم كونيغس كمبعوث للأمم المتحدة. ولن يكون كما نوقش سابقا مبعوثا أعلى "بثلاثة مناصب" ، يمثل أيضا الاتحاد الأوروبي والجانب المدني من الناتو. ومع ذلك ، فإن المهمة الواجب القيام بها تتعلق بالنشاط الشخصي بقدر ما تتعلق بالسلطة الرسمية. ويقول القادة العسكريون للناتو انهم يريدون توجيها سياسيا. |

Table 11.

| The Democratic surge
The Democrats will **almost certainly** strengthen their hold on Capitol Hill in this year's election. In a USA Today/Gallup poll last December, 53% of Americans preferred Democratic control of Congress. …..

The Democrats … important role in shaping foreign policy. The Republicans are defending more seats … | **ولا شك** أن الديمقراطيين سيعززون قبضتهم على الكونغرس في انتخابات هذا العام. وفي استطلاع لصحيفة يو اس توداي وغالوب في كانون الأول (ديسمبر) الماضي تبين أن 53 في المائة من الأمريكيين يفضلون أن.....
والديمقراطيون في وضع أفضل في مجلس الشيوخ ، وهي مؤسسة لها دور مهم بصورة خاصة في تشكيل السياسة الخارجية. **ويدافع** الجمهوريون عن عدد أكبر من المقاعد من الجمهوريين (23 مقابل 12) وعدد أكبر من المقاعد المفتوحة التي لم يرشح أصحابها أنفسهم (خمسة ....

مجلة المجلة 6-12/2008 |

46

. In table 10, the register functional tenor of the English text exhibits some change fluctuating between an informative clarification dominated by military terms to evaluative language.

. *On current plans…*, this is new claim or starting point advanced by the Antagonist.

. *He will not be, as once mooted, a "triple-hatted"* … is the Protagonist's counterargument signalled by the use of *not*.

. **Still**, *the job that needs to be done is* …, this is another counterargument by the Antagonist. *still* here means despite. The sentence could have read *but still the job that needs to be done…...* This means that the adversative tool is implicit in the original counterargument. *still*.., here also serves to maintain the doubt and express some concession by the Antagonist.

. The translator use of لن يكون gives negation but it would be more emphasized if *illa anhu* .. إلا أنه لن يكون is used to prepare the reader for the concessive use of (still) in the following sentence.

. ووفقا للخطط الحالية سيحل اللورد آشدون محل السياسي الألماني توم كونيغس كمبعوث للأمم المتحدة. **لكنه لن يكون** كما نوقش سابقا مبعوثا أعلى "بثلاثة مناصب" ، يمثل أيضا الإتحاد الأوروبي والجانب المدني من الناتو. **غير** أن المهمة الواجب القيام بها تتعلق بالنشاط الشخصي بقدر ما تتعلق

. Although مع ذلك, for *still* is correct, the translator could also opt for على الرغم من or رغم/ برغم /مع أنّ to reflect the Antagonist's concession, and maintain the doubts.

. *mooted* as a *trap word* could have been successfully translated as روج, which is more evaluative than نوقش.

. *NATO commanders say* … is a supporting argument to the Antagonist point of view. Therefore the use of حيث as a connector is correct.

. *Triple-hatted*, intertexuallity lost in the translation.

47

Discourse Analysis of Argumentation

. In table 11 there should be *however* before يدافع . The amended sentence will be:

إلا أن الجمهوريين يدافعون عن عدد أكبر ....

Table 12. Translation of Expressivess

Another **tricky** matter has been America. It provides most of the foreign soldiers, training for Afghan forces and aid. It may not want "co-ordination" by a Briton. For now, though, it seems to accept that the alternative is failure. Continuation from table 10	والمسألة الأخرى الصعبة هي أمريكا فهي تزود معظم الجنود الأجانب ، وتدرب القوات الأفغانية ، وتمنح معظم المساعدات وقد لا ترغب أن يقوم بريطاني بالتنسيق. ولكن في الوقت الراهن يبدو أنها تتقبل فكرة أن البديل لذلك هو الفشل.

. There is a (cause and effect relationship) in the above concluding claim and supports.

. In the concluding stage, by using *For now, though, it seems…*, the Protagonist maintains their standpoint.

. The translation explicates the counterargument tools ولكن .

. The use of *though* in English, and لكن in Arabic in the above paragraph are intended to amend or reduce or limit the harm done by the concession in the first sentence *that America provides…,* so the Antagonist could not misjudge the meaning of *tricky*.

. To reflect the displeasure, concession, and time factor the translator could opt for ولكن في الوقت الراهن على instead of ولكن في الوقت الراهن ، يبدو أنها ... ، يبدو أنها أي حال

. *It seems* is a hedging tool. Hedges indicate the probable truth of some generic statement. By using hedges the writer signals a tentative or cautious assessment of referential information" (Crismore and Vande Kopple, 1988: 185, cited in Ibrahim *et al*, 2000: 110).

48

.   Although the Protagonist's viewpoint concludes the discussion using strong sarcastic conclusion *...the alternative is failure*, this does not mean that the Antagonist withdraws their opinion.

.   The Protagonist maintains their standpoint, albeit in a pessimistic tone, while the Antagonist also maintains their doubts in the Protagonist's point of view.

.   Both the pessimistic tone and the continuation of doubts are not well represented in the translation.

.   As a lazy English word, it seems that the word *tricky* has no synonymous in Arabic. Usually, Arabic does not prefer such expressions in serious writings.

.   The Arabic translator could in this case make use of many other strategies, e. g. the use of idioms… to express these feelings.

.   The parenthetical connotation in "cooperation" should be marked in Arabic

.   Suggested amendment:

عفريت ، تزال **على كف** الأمور لا ولكن
ترغب في الجنود و..و..قد لا تزود معظم فأمريكا ولأنها
بدأت تتقبل في **يبدو** **وفيما** **لكنها،،** قيادة بريطاني
البديل أن **الراهن على** **أي حال** الوقت
الفشل. لذلك هو

Table 13. The literal translation of emphatics

The Greening of China	تخضير الصين
Pollution from Hong Kong's own power generation plants, growing number of vehicles, and burgeoning shipping industry can **certainly** be reduced. But, the lion's share of this industrial haze – like the growing pollution of its coastal waters – is a direct result of the rapid industrialization of the Pearl River Delta across the border in China's Guangdong Province. China is exporting not **only**	معدلات **مما لا شك فيه** أن تقليص التلوث الناتج عن محطات توليد الطاقة والأعداد المتزايدة من السيارات وصناعة الشحن المزدهرة في هونج كونج ممكن وممكن. أمر إلا وارد وممكن. **أن** نصيب الأسد في هذا الضباب

more and more goods, but also its environmental degradation.	الصناعي ، مثل التلوث المتزايد لمياه هونج كونج الساحلية ، يأتي كنتيجة مباشرة للتحول الصناعي السريع الذي تشهده دلتا نهر بيرل عبر الحدود في منطقة جوانجدونج الصينية. إن الصين لا تصدر المزيد والمزيد من السلع فحسب ، بل أنها تصدر أيضا تدهورها البيئي.
August 2007	
	نقلا عن بروجيكت سنديكيت

. The standpoint/claim *Pollution from…*, is asserted by *certainly*. The use of *certainly* is mostly to allow for judging the acceptability of the proposition in a broader sense (2007: 12). The writer gives her view in a form of a proposition.

. Strong assertives express a certain degree of certainty or likelihood (p: 2).

. *Certainly* in argumentation is a request to accept a proposition as a starting point for discussion. It implicitly indicates that this starting point or standpoint is advanced for further argumentation and is not intended to be a conclusive statement; otherwise it would have contradicted the two Maxims of the Cooperative Principle.

. Also the use of *certainly* indicates that the writer is ready to defend her standpoint in an argumentative way, which become clear by the concessive/restricting tool (*but*).

. *but* in the second sentence *But, the lion's share of …..* as a counter-arguing adversative tool places restrictions on the *certainty* of the above proposition.

. So *certainly* is actually an indication of what is to come and not an end in itself. The use of strong or weak assertive tools tells us about the amount and intensity of the coming argumentation and the anticipated doubts. That is why in serious writings we find words such as *certainly, of course, no*

doubt, it is clear that, while *I believe, and I think ..,* are mostly used with more interpersonal evaluative dialogues (p: 35).

.   In Arabic, emphatics are widely used to stress the meaning and win the confidence of others. The writer is so keen to get the confidence of audience he or she is addressing. The writer/speaker is well aware that his audience, *the elite* (Alhudhaif 2005), will not accept what is said at face value. Moreover, high Arabic writing styles, particularly persuasion writings, are characterised by the use of strong emphatics and assertives.

.   الكلمات من نمط "لا شك   أنّ   ، و "يقيناً" و "لا   ريب فيّ"، لا   مرية   ، من   المعلوم   ، مما ليس فيه شكا   ، يقينا ، لا   مرية كلمات   متقاربة في   المعنى تفيد   اليقين والتأكد (المعنى من   المعجم).

.   According to Hassan, (1995) it is rhetorically wrong to use emphatics unless the predicate is subject to doubt or denial. Consequently the translator should have expected to reflect such doubt when using them.

.   By translating *certainly* as   أن   مما لا شك فيه the translator, while conforming with Arabic rhetorical rules, is trying to make the translation as sophisticated as possible. The translator too is aware of the kind of audience the writer is addressing. Ibrahim *et al* (2000) noted that expressions like *"bi-la shakkin, min almoakad..*المؤكد   من ، شك بلا.. are mostly noticed in texts written by non-native Arabic speakers. This study also confirms the tendency of translators to translate them literally from the English. In free writing Arabic texts on the other hand, writers opt for the use of *inna* and *anna* (114).

.   In Arabic Emphatics are necessary for the coherence. The use of مما لا شك فيه, is argumentatively correct, since it is restricted later by a concussive tool (http://www.islamguiden.com/arabi/m_a_r_39.htm).

.   *Bi-la shakkin, mima la shak fiehi, bidon shak, min almouakad,* ....بلا شك   ، مما لا شك فيه   ، بدون شك   ، من   المؤكد act the same way as *certainly* ..etc in English.

.   The restriction in the form of استثناء   حرف   أو   لكن إلا   أن in the second sentence, indicates that the emphasis was not absolute. لكن ، بالرغم من ذلك ، على أي حال ، ومهما يكن من   أمر   حروف استدراك   والاستدراك   غالبا   ما

يكون   دفعا لمظنة   توهم   أشياء غير   مقصودة   أو تأكيد
حقيقة يخشى   أن   تكون منسية(قواعد   اللغة   العربية)

Table 14. More examples of emphatics' literal translation

The evidence that the rich have done best is **certainly** compelling. ..... equal incomes. **But** it is not so	**ولا شك** **أن** .....الدليل على مع الدخول المتساوية نسبيا **ولكن** ليس من الواضح جدا إن كان اللوم يقع على العولمة بمعنى .... المجلة 3-2008/02/9 ، في مكان ما فوق قوس قزح

Table 15. The translation of *of course*

The war in Iraq is not, **of course**, about oil. Coalition troops are there to advance democracy and to protect the innocent. **But** the consequences for the world's energy markets of .... Financial Times	الحرب في العراق لا تتعلق بالنفط **بالطبع** ، وقوات التحالف موجودة هناك لتعزيز الديمقراطية وحماية الأبرياء. **ولكن** لا يمكن تجاهل العواقب التي تترتب على أسواق الطاقة العالمية ، ... الخليج

Table 16.

The Globalization of Ethics
 	
         Of course, Asia does not yet have a cohesive core culture comparable to that of Europe, which is founded on the Judeo-Christian tradition and the Enlightenment. But Europeans ought not to be too arrogant,
 	
         project-syndicate.org
	من **المؤكد** أن آسيا لا تتمتع
	بعد بثقافة أساسية متماسكة مقارنة بالثقافة
	الأوروبية... ولكن لا ينبغي...

of course, is described as one of the semi-assertive *propositional attitude indicator*s, however *of course* is not primarily used to introduce a standpoint as in the above example, rather it introduces new claims in the different parts of the discussion (Van Eemeren *et al*, 2007).

. The primary function of *of course* is to indicate that there is a shared understanding between the two parties *writer and reader*.

. Therefore *of course* is most suitable in concession situations.

. "Although, *of course, naturally, obviously, and it goes without saying that…*etc are used to indicate some sort of concession or an approvingly nod more than to a standpoint, they nevertheless can be used to introduce a standpoint. "Since *of course* implies that the writer agrees with the reader's opinion, its use has the effect of presenting the adopted standpoint as self-evident *of course* is suited both for making a concession and for presenting a standpoint as self-evident (p: 45).

. The second sentence started with *but*, which means that an argumentative restrictions is attached to the previous concession made by the use of *of course*.

. The researcher could not find the words طبعا ، بالطبع in classical Arabic Dictionaries like Al Munijid or Al Waseet.

. Most probably, these words are derivative of طبعي ، طبيعي ، طبع which mean *naturally*.

. بالطبع ، طبعا are not common as standpoints assertive tools in serious Arabic writings. Further analysis may be needed.

. Therefore the translator translation as *bi-al-tab* بالطبع is correct, as long as the restriction, which is translated as لكن. However معلوم هو كما, which indicate also some sort of shared opinion can be used, if بالطبع sounds too informal.

. In table 16., the translation of *of course* as من المؤكد denied the Antagonist a shared point of view.

Note

(¹) **The Cooperative Principle:** Called the *Gricean maxims*. The philosopher Paul Grice proposed four conversational maxims that arise from the pragmatics of natural language. (1) Maxim of Quality: Truth (do not say what you believe to be false. Do not say that for which you lack adequate

evidence). (2) Maxim of Quantity: Information (make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required). (3) Maxim of Relevance. (4) Maxim of Manner: Clarity (Wikipedia, 2008).

CHAPTER FIVE

Findings and Discussion

Chapter Four identified the methodology for investigating the research propositions. This chapter describes the outcomes of the data-analysis phase. Texts selected were analysed in relation to the overarching research question posed in this thesis: How do Arab translators translate the argumentation genre of editorials and opinion columns (ed/op) at a time when others (Hatim 1997) indicate that the Arabic writing culture of persuasive language is mostly dominated by "through argumentation", a process Hatim identifies as the excessive support of one point of view in the absence of the other voice?

Inherent in the question is the assumption that Arab translators, unaware of the genre conventions of the counterargument as a strong persuasive semiotic taking place in ed/op, tend to distort their translations, overlooking in the process implicit and explicit assertive and adversative tools and indicators of the opposing point of view, thereby neutralizing the text and disturbing the overall coherence of the genre. If this is true, it suggests that the notion of argumentation genre needs to be better understood by translators to help communicate messages with less distortion.

Various ed/op texts were analysed to investigate these issues. CDA was conducted to help the researcher identify errors created as a result of lack of awareness of the different stages of the critical discussion taking place.

1â¸ Pre-supposition of the Transparent Model

The above mentioned model (see the analysis chapter) was designed by the researcher based on the pragma-dialectical approach of Van Eemeren and Grootendorst (2004). The model was used to support the analysis of the translation of argumentation. The model proved useful in revealing different Antagonist and Protagonist tactics and speech acts in the process of argumentation. In the Model, the implicit Antagonist's standpoint is explicated. Then, the different speech acts are distributed respectively between the Antagonist and Protagonist. The Antagonist's standpoint is constructed by negating the Protagonist's standpoint. The model is

55

tentative and is used only for the purpose of this study. Further research is called for to establish its validity for analysing translated argumentative articles.

The model helped the researcher to identify eight key findings concerning features of English and Arabic argumentation that appear to result in problems of translation from English to Arabic.

Finding 1: Arabic and English use different ways of differentiating between the Protagonist's and Antagonist's viewpoints and this causes problems when translating from English to Arabic

It is observed that Arab translators often overlook the distinction between the Protagonist and the Antagonist at the confrontation stage of the argumentative discussion. In most of the texts sampled, the Antagonist implicit standpoint was not evident. Instead, translators opted for conjunction tools to connect the Protagonist's standpoint with the Antagonist's supporting claims. While the use of conjunctions in itself is superfluous, non-differentiation of the Antagonist disturbed the coherence of the counterargument at this stage in the discussion. It is found that by making the Antagonist visible at this stage in the discussion, the coherence is restored. Table (3) including the suggested amendments indicates this point.

Arabic has its own system of differentiation between the Antagonist and Protagonist's points of view. Using such phrases when appropriate as e. g. ورب قائل أن يقول ، على ، المرء ، وللمرء ، الشاهد ، البعض ، كما تعلم ، تعلموذ ، دعونا ، دعوني ، استميحكم ، عذرا ، يا صاح can indicate that there is another voice in the text. These expressions help to set two different camps in the process of negotiation. The emergence of the Antagonist brings with it almost compulsorily the adversative tools as can be seen from the suggested amendment in table (3).

Finding 2: Arabic translators tend to translate English emphatics literally

Both original English texts and Arabic translations employ propositional attitude indicators and force modifying expressions in the confrontation phase to convey their assessment of and mental attitude towards the communicated

informational content (Van Eemeren *et al.* 2007; Ibrahim 2000). English and Arabic use the same categories and largely the same sub-categories of meta-discourse in mostly the same contexts (2000: 122).

In both languages, and following rhetorical rules, it is observed that meta-discourse indicators are generally used concessively in the argumentative discussion. Some expressions that indicate that a writer is making a concession to which restrictions are attached include *that is true, I admit that, certainly, of course…*etc (2007). Expressions that indicate there is some sort of opposition or restriction include; *but, however* etc, although other expressions such as *(al)though, even though, yes, still, but still, in spite of, nevertheless, nonetheless, notwithstanding,* and *that does not mean that* etc. These expressions impose certain restrictions on the acceptance of a proposition. In Arabic, these meta-discourse indicators are followed by what are called *alistithna,* حروف الاستثناء .

Arabic meta-discourse tools *bi-la shakkin, mima la shak fiehi, bidon shak, min almouakad* المؤكد من ، بدون شك ، مما لا شك فيه ، بلا شك , work the way English *"certainly, of course, no doubt, it is clear, which all means* work, and when that happens they are used concessively most often.

The above rhetorical rules are exhibited to varying degrees in Arabic and English argumentative texts. It is the frequent use of such structures that differentiates counterargument from other kinds of writings, see (Hatim 1997).

High Arabic writing styles particularly persuasion writing are characterised by the use of strong emphatic and assertive structures. Indeed an Ed/op is an important channel of media via which the writer communicates their ideas and opinions with the general public as well as with the elite (Alhudhaif 2005). Emphatic-less writing on the other hand is considered primitive as it addresses those who has no doubts, interest, or are indifferent. (http://www.aklaam.net/forum/archive/index.php?t-4025.html), (Ghazwini 1993) (http://www.islamguiden.com/arabi/m_a_r_39.htm).

According to Ibrahem *et al.* (2000) Arabic writers use more emphatics than their English counterparts. Arabic emphatics are dominated by *inna* and *anna.* Expressions like *bi-la shakkin, min almoakad..*المؤكد من ، بلا شك.. are mostly noticed in the writings of non native Arabic writers. The texts that I have analysed confirm that translated texts also exhibits high rate of these expressions, see tables (11, 13, 14, 15 and 16). This finding naturally needs to be consolidated by

57

further research focusing on the correlation between translated and non-translated works.

In conclusion, it can be argued that non-abidance with the above rhetorical rules in translation is not only a violation of genre rules but also of the rules of Arabic rhetorical system. By following the proper Arabic rhetoric rules translators should not restrict themselves to the literal translation of emphatics. The use of *inna* as can be observed from this analysis assists in nominalization of the argumentative sentence and restoring the coherence. The translator should observe the assertive and concessive use of emphatics in Arabic even if they are implicit in the English text.

Finding 3: By using the superfluous conjunctions, Arabic translators may unwittingly mask the work of assertive and adversative tools in the argumentation discussion

In English "A series of sentences without cohesive devices can give the impression of conveying completely new information in each sentence ... often however implicature is drawn from background knowledge or clues from the context" (Raphae 1995: 94). By comparison, Arabic coherence depends on the use of cohesive devices or connectors. Arabic must have an explicit connector unless there is a good reason to do without it (Hatim 1997). This has led translators to use connectors even when it is clear that an adversative tool or assertive tool should be used in a particular argumentative step. These connectors are mostly superfluous and should not interfere with the meaning. The problem arises when there is a need to differentiate between the Protagonist and Antagonist's claims in the counter-argumentation process.

However, the use of Arabic conjunction tools الواو ، الفاء ، ثم ، حتى ، حيث ، فضلا ، ناهيك عن ، أَم ، أو ، لا ، بل as can be seen in table no. (4), adds more coherence to the supporting prepositions in the argumentation process. The use of different conjunctions gives sentences varying strengths according to their importance. Explicating an assertive tool where necessary restores the sentence markedness as can be seen in table (8, 9 and 11).

Sometimes, the use of connectors in Arabic renders *also* when it is originally part of the English sentence unnecessary, *see* table (6).

Finding 4: Arabic translators normally employ successive emphatics as connectors, which can cause distortion in the translation of argumentative texts

Table (5) shows that translators use successive emphatics as connectors. This does not allow for a distinction to be made between a claim and its supporting arguments. For such cases, the use of the Arabic conjunction *bal,* بل in place of the second assertive tool can restore the coherence.

Finding 5: Arabic and English texts normally require the use of paragraphing as a means of achieving coherence. However, this may disrupt the coherence of an argument structure

Following Hatim and Munday (2004) this study has also noted the use of paragraphs in Arabic translations of English texts as a cohesion device, instead of performing a separation based on the units of the argumentation process. Although not restricted to Arabic, in a translation of a text originally written in English, the way paragraphing is used may break the coherence of the *critical discussion*. "The physical break can irreparably distort text comprehension and lead to some misguided conclusions about text meaning"(p: 11). "The rhetorical purposes should constitute a text in persuasion (1990: 145). Rhetorical purpose is the intension behind the production of a text (2004).

Finding 6: Translators find it difficult to translate implicit adversative tools fluently

From the attached samples, it has been found that translators translate argumentative indicators more successfully when they are explicit, while implicit counterargument indicators pose some challenges. Hatim has shown in extended research how confused the meaning can become if adversative tools are not used. However, it is recognised that Arabic's rigorous aesthetic requirements do not normally allow the repetition of adversative tools at the expense of coherence. A contrast in meaning can acceptably be reflected by semantic context, the kind of words used, irony, suspension or the way the sentence is presented, e.g. as a question, exclamation, etc. From the evidence of the samples I have studied, it can be argued

that translators need not to abide by formal equivalence translation, nor explicate every implicit tool, but should rather attempt to convey the relevant meaning of a counterarguage using idiomatic language, collocations, informativity and intertextuality . Making adversative tools explicit throughout an Arabic text interfere with the Minimax and the aesthetic value of the text. Minimax in the process of translation, is the decision that yield maximal effect for minimal effort (Hatim 2004: 344). Excessive use of adversative tools such as *illa anna, lakin, ghair, baid anna, hasha, khala…* ....أن ، بيد ، غير ، لكن ، أذ ، إلا renders the text incoherent (Ghzwini 1993: 185).

The point made by Venuti (1998) that foreign texts translated into English are being largely ignored if they fail the *fluency test* is relevant here. Different cultures have their own *fluency tests*. A text translated into Arabic may fail the fluency test in Arabic if it adheres strictly to the genre conventions of English. Style is important in Arabic as well as the socio-cultural aspects of writing such as, repetition, paying due obeisance…etc (Hatim 1990: 68). Style is a close reading which correlated historical and linguistic information and sought connection between aesthetic responses and specific stimuli in the text (1997: 15).The amount of the translationese signs noted in the sampled texts together with the broken coherence may well render many translated texts unpalatable to the Arabic reader.

Finding 7: Translators find it problematic to capture the connotative significance of Markedness and Implicture in original English texts

It is interesting that by using the proper assertive argumentation tools such as *inna*, the Arabic sentence becomes Cataphoric as in English i.e. marked. Conjunctions tend to leave the sentence verbal, thus loses its markedness. "Counter-argumentation structures favour the Nominal Subject Verb Complement, which is highly evaluative " (1997: 9). It has also been found from the samples analysed that in Arabic, coherence and cohesion are given priority over the use of catchy words or phrases of argumentation. Thus, many words were familiarized to cope with the rhetoric setting.

To highlight English expressions used parenthetically , such techniques as exclamation marks may prove useful. This would transfer the connotative meaning to the readers and prepare them for the coming counter argument. The use of brackets

entails significance on which ensuing arguments are built. Non-adherence breaks the coherence between argumentation structures.

As seen in table (9) and examples in the appendix, interrogative questions in the argumentation process usually indicate a new claim or start-point. To highlight such a move in Arabic, while conforming with the rhetorical rules, questions should be followed by some sort of response such as *perhaps,* ربما   to increase expectation and set the scene for the counterargument. Affirmative tools like *yes*, or *no* put an end to the discussion.

From the samples I have analysed, I would suggest that making use of the overwhelming resources of idioms, collocations and other forms of elaboration available in Arabic would assist a translator in capturing the connotative significance of marked words i. e. English catch words, which have no synonyms in Arabic.

Finding 8: Register functional tenor's fluctuations in the translated texts may not necessarily correspond to fluctuations occurring in the original texts

It is observed that efforts to restore the Minimax of the sentence vary throughout the translated text depending on the coherence requirement. This can be seen in table (3) where words conveying authority are translated idiomatically and in table (9), where the mockery is masked by the informative reporting. Hence, the overriding factor in the translations is coherence, cohesion and fluency.

CHAPTER SIX

Conclusion

In this study I have argued that Arab translators, particularly those practitioners who do not have the required academic training in translation may be unaware of many of the subtle codes and regularities of organization embedded in the argumentation genre in general.

Firstly, I have suggested that, based on the data investigated in this present study, both English and Arabic share the same communicative values that semiotics of lexico-grammar in conventionalized texts represent. Thus, I have found that both English and Arabic writers use *propositional attitude indicators* and *force modifying expressions* or meta-discourse indicators in argumentation. Indeed they are considered universal rhetorical devices (Crimore *et al*., 1993, cited in Ibrahim, 2000: 123). It has been shown that both English and Arabic use the above mentioned tools to advance claims, to stress meaning, to get the confidence and remove doubts from the mind of the reader. In this sense, these tools reflect a degree of certainty or likelihood of the complementing proposition (Van Eemeren, 2004, 2007). Furthermore, in both languages it has been shown that, sometimes there are certain restrictions imposed on the certainty and truth of these statements (2007: 125). A broad similarity in the use of these indicators was indicated by the comparative translations of some argumentative texts pieces. The translations of English indicators that assert claims and standpoints, while, literal, conformed with the Arabic rhetorical rules.

While the assertive indicators *inna* and *anna* are the preferred assertion tools for professional Arab writers (Ibrahim. 2001: 123), this study has confirmed that translators use of *bi-la shakkin, mima la shak fiehi, bidon shak, min almouakad*, بلا شكـ.... ، مما لا شك فيه ، بدون شك ، من المؤكد is usually due to the literal translation of the same equivalents in English. However their use is quite acceptable and does not interfere with the rhetorical or aesthetical fluency of the text provided that they are not over repeated.

The study has further revealed that translators who were able to translate explicit argumentation tools that announce standpoints, startpoints, supporting arguments and concluding claims, failed in certain instances to deal properly with

implicit indicators and their implications. However explicating implicit indicators might interfere with the coherence and fluency of the text, so it is not necessarily recommended. Instead a degree of contexual rendering to give the same connotation of contrast or opposition is required.

It has been further shown that markedness in English, as may be represented by parenthetical use, capital letters, etc., is often ignored by translators. This removes important implicatures from the translation of the argumentative discussion. To resolve this, the use of exclamation marks and other tools is suggested.

Arabic and English use different ways of differentiating between the Protagonist's and Antagonist's viewpoints. To differentiate between the Protagonist and the Antagonist in the argumentative discussion in Arabic, the study recommended the use of certain Arabic rhetorical expressions such as رب قائل أن يقول ، على المرء ، وللمرء ، الشاهد ، دعونا ، دعوني ، استميحكم عذرا ،كما تعلمون instead of conjunctions.

1â¸ Recommendations

As a result of this study two main recommendations can be made.

First, the research has exposed the need for greater rigour in Arab writing, particularly in translations from English, and greater focus on constructed argumentation, particularly in the media. It has called for a revolution in media writing through translation to enable the Arab world to compete successfully in the international intellectual arena. To achieve this revolution will require building on the heritage of our ancestors as well as drawing from current practices within our own culture and also elsewhere in the world. As a step forward, I recommend the adoption of counter-argumentative tactics in the writing of editorials and opinion columns. The present study has proposed a simple tentative counter-argumentative model that harnesses the aesthetical and fluency requirements of Arabic to assist different ed/op writers to improve their writings (appendix B). This may assist in bridging the gap between different cultures by helping to combat *xenophobic values*. Counterargument increases the persuasiveness of editorials by supporting and refuting different points of view. This makes reading a more interesting experience, allowing the reader to interact with the text.

To develop such writing, we need to ensure that critical writing and reading become part of our educational system and are promoted and encouraged from the early years of study. This will require new directions in educational curricula and

teacher training, so that critical thinking, counter-argumentation and critical writing become normal practices for future generations. It will also require systematic and rigorous training for the next generations of translators, training in how to bridge the gap between traditional practices and new ones based on critical thinking and writing.

Second, this research has exposed not only certain weaknesses in current translation practices, but also the lack of systematic research in the field of Arabic writing and contrastive linguistics. Further research is needed to improve our ways of writing and to transfer our voice to the larger world. While there are many Arabic norms that cater for argumentation, lack of research and associations to defend and organize Arab writings has contributed to the current deficiencies. This study has showed that our language is not devoid of the argumentative tools needed for critical discussion, nor is our heritage, but we need systematic research to improve this part of our writing culture.

What the present research does not make clear is the extent of agreement on the need for such a kind of writing culture, the level of acceptability such ideas would have, the hindrances that might be put in the way of change. Continuous research is needed to assess the acceptability of different approaches to editorial writing and their efficiency in persuading and shifting certain stereotypical perceptions. Information yielded by such studies would greatly help us to evaluate our success in persuasion in general. Areas for future research could also cover argumentation in Quraan, argumentation in Arab history ..etc. This is just a preliminary study. There is still more work that needs to be done in this fast-growing field. Owing to the limitation of space, not all references, books, journals and web material consulted on the topic are covered, and suggestions for further research are therefore made in the recommendation section for future consideration.

To end, argumentation is a form of cooperative communication where two parties are trying to reach agreement in a civilized way; it is a beautiful imaginary process enhancing contemplation and thinking. By building gradually on our arguments, and by actively listening to the views of others, we can reach rational judgements. Our aim must be that confrontational one-sided presentations of disputes should disappear and give their place to constructive argumentation, where different parties build and develop their thinking in order to resolve their problems

REFERENCES

Al Afghani, Saed (2003) *AlMujaz in Arabic*: *Emphatics in Arabic*. Dar Al Fiker. Available online at: http://www.islamguiden.com/arabi/m_a_r_39.htm (accessed on 15 March 2008)

Alhudhaif, A. M. (2005) *A speech act approach to persuasion in American and Arabic editorials*. (Doctoral dissertation), Purdue University, 2005) *Dissertation Abstracts, 12,* AAT 3191415. Available online at (http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink), (accessed 12 March 2008)

Amin, Ebrahim (2006) *Basics of Arabic rhetoric:* Emphatics in Arabic: Available online at: http://www.aklaam.net/forum/archive/index.php?t-4025.html (accessed on 12 Feb 2008).

Aristotle (1994) *The art of rhetoric*. *(*J. H. Freeae, trans.). London: Harvard University Press. (original work published 1939) (pp. 3-31).

Baker, M. (1998). *Encyclopaedia of translation studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bassnett, Susan and Lefevere (1998) *Constructing cultures: Essays on literary translation*. Philadelphia: Multilingual matters

Bhatia, V. K. (2004) *World of written discourse: A genre-based view*. London. Continuum.

Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983) *Discourse analysis*. UK: Cambridge university press.

Butler, Nick (2007, September 12). Iraq needs an oil for peace deal. *Financial Times*, Available online at: http://us.ft.com/ftgateway/superpage.ft?news_id=fto091120071359262757

Chandler, Daniel (2007) *Semiotics: The basics* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge

Even-Zohar, Itamar (2006.) *About translation: Translating India*, volume 3 (no. 1 & 2). Retrieved March 31st, 2008, from: Anukriti.net http://www.anukriti.net/translation3.asp

Freeley A. J. and Steinberg D. L. (2005) *Argumentation and debate*. UK: Thomson Wadsworth.

Gutt, Ernst-August (2000) *Translation and relevance: Cognition and context* (2nd ed.) Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing

Hatim, B. (1997) *Communication across cultures: Translation theory and contrastive text linguistics*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

Hatim, B. (2001) *Teaching and researching translation*. London. Pearson Education

Hatim, B. and Mason, I. (1990) *Discourse and the translator*. London: Longman.

Hatim, B. and Munday (2004) *Translation: an advanced resource book*. London: Routledge

Ibrahim, Z. M., Aydelott, S., and Kassabgy, N. (2000) *Diversity in language, contrastive studies in Arabic and English theoretical and applied linguistics*. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press

Johnstone, Barbara (1991) *Repetition in Arabic discourse: Paradigms, syntagms, and the ecology of language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Kennedy, G. A. (1994) *New history of classical rhetoric.* Princeton University Press (e-book). Available via AUS library at http://site.ebrary.com.ezproxy.aus.edu/lib/aus/Doc?id=10035918 (original work published 1928)

Kung, Hans (2007) The globalization of ethics. Project Syndicate: www.project-syndicate.org

Loh, Christine (2007) The *greening of China.* Project Syndicate : www.project-syndicate.org

Mary Snell-Hornby (1988) *Translation Studies: An Integrated approach*. John Benjamin

McGregor S. (2004) *Critical discourse analysis- A primer.* Available on line at (http://www.kon.org/archives/forum/15-1/mcgregorcda.html) accessed on 2nd April 2008

Medialens (http://www.medialens.org/).

Muller, G. H., Wiener, H. (2005) *To the point : Reading and writing short arguments*. London: Longman

Paddy re-enlists; Afghanistan: A lot for one man to do (2008, January 26). *The Economist*, vol. 386, iss. 8564; 67: http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.aus.edu/pqdweb?RQT=318&pmid=28390

Paltridge, B. and Starfield, S. (2007) *Thesis and dissertation writing in a second language*. London : Routldge.

Peabody Institute, of the Johns Hopkins University (Liberal Arts), http://www.peabody.jhu.edu/1696

Project Syndicate (http://www.project-syndicate.org/)

Renad A. (2006) *Construction of arguments in English and Arabic : A comparison of the linguistic strategies employed in editorials*. Available online at: http://www.ling.mq.edu.au/translation/ctir_working_papers) (accessed on 15 March 2008).

Rhetoric in Quraan (http://egyig.com/Public/articles/literature/9/56418531.shtml) (البلاغة في القرآن) (accessed on 12 Feb 2008).

Rules for teaching Arabic : http://64.233.183.104/search?q=cache:9QGs4ar08K4J:www.moe.gov.sa/ishraf /MOE/Shaqra/ 10 March 2008

67

Salkie, R. (1995) *Text and discourse analysis*. Routledge (e-book). Available online via AUS Library (website at http://site.ebrary.com.ezproxy.aus.edu/lib/aus/Doc?id=10017744) accessed on 2nd April 2008.

Searle, John R. (1999) *Mind, language and society: Philosophy in the real world*. New York: Basic Books

Somewhere over the rainbow - The world's silver lining (2008, January 26) *The Economist*, vol. 386, iss. 8564; 28: London. http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.aus.edu/pqdweb?RQT=318&pmid=28390

The Democratic surge (2008, March 29) *The Economist*, vol. 386, iss. 8573; 7: London. http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.aus.edu/pqdweb?RQT=318&pmid=28390

Through Argumentation (http://docs.ksu.edu.sa/DOC/Articles19/Article190559.doc) (accessed on 1 April 2008)

Van Eemeren, F. H & Grootendorst (2004) *A systematic theory of argumentation, the pragma-dialectical approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Eemeren, F. H., Houtlosser. A. F., and Snoeck H. (2007) *Argumentative indicators in discourse, A pragma-dialectical study*. Springer. Dordrecht

Venuti, Lawrence (1998) *The scandals of translation: Towards an ethics of difference*. New York: Routledge

Wikipedia (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/) Main_Page, April 2008

Williams, M. (2001) The *application of argumentation theory to translation quality assessment*. Ottawa, Canada. Available online at http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/2001/v46/n2/004605ar.pdf accessed on 15 Feb. 2008.

Wood, L. A. and Kroger, R. O. (2000) *Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text*. London: Sage Publications.

Ziyad, M. M. (n.d.) *Arabic language: Conjunction tools in Arabic*: Available online at: http://www.geocities.com/mosad_ziyad/index63.htm (accessed on 2 April 2008).

Ziyad, M. M. (n.d.) *Arabic language: Emphatics in Arabic* (chap 5): Available online at: http://www.drmosad.com/index58.htm (accessed on 2 April 2008).

ابن رشد (1998)تهافت التهافت ، انتصارا للروح العلمية وتأسيسا لأخلاقيات الحوار (محمد عابد الجابري). بيروت مركز دراسات الوحدة العربية (صدر الكتاب الأصلي في 1180)ص 56-1

إعادة تجنيد بادي: مهام كثيرة لرجل واحد (03-09 فبراير 2008). العدد 1460

صعود الديمقراطيين في أمريكا (12-06 أبريل 2008) العدد 1469

العراق بحاجة إلى برامج " النفط مقابل السلام" (2007) ، الخليج- مترجم عن فاينانشيال تايمز في مكان ما فوق قوس قزح (03-09 فبراير 2008). العدد 1460

قزويني جلال الدين محمد بن عبد الرحمن (1993) ، كتاب الإيضاح للبلاغة بيروت ، دار الجيل

Appendix A
Argumentative Indicators

According to Van Eemeren *et al* (2007): Argumentative indicators are defined as: "words and expressions that refer to any of the moves that are significant to the Argumentative process". Depending on the context, Argumentative Indicators often announce that a particular move is taking place. (p:1). Argumentative Indicators are grouped according to different phases (pp: 1-7).

Indicators of the confrontation stage:

These are *assertives* that advance a standpoint e. g. **(***I really believe that .., I believe that …, I think that you, I'm sure that , In my view, It is quite certain that, certainly,…, Of course, ..etc***)**. These indicators are to assuage the reader's doubts. They also signify that the writer/ speaker anticipate doubt on the reader's side". "Expressions like (*I admit that, I must admit that, of course, certainly ..etc*) indicate that the writer makes a concession to which sooner rather than later restrictions are attached to prevent the other party from drawing all kinds of conclusions from the statement" (p: 122).

Indicators that accompany supports, or minor propositions:

Because…, For…., Therefore…, Since…, After all…, Thus…, So…., As…etc. These indicators are usually distributed over different clauses. Sometimes two can occur for the same clause as follows: *Since because…, For because ..,After all because ..etc*.

Indicators of multiple argumentation or (supports):

These expressions make clear that the preceding argument should be sufficient, but if it is not so, an indicator can be used to provide sufficient support. Example; *Anyway…,Anyhow…, Even if this is not true/not the case, then…, Even then…, Whatever the case may be…,In any case.*

Indicators to introduce an argument as superfluous:

Leaving aside (the fact) that…., (-quite) apart from (the fact that)…, I won't even mention…, Not to mention the fact that…, Needless to say…, For more.. Also; *But that is not the only reason.., But there is another reason…..,Also because….., At least as important ..*etc are the type of clues used with multiple argumentation.

70

Indicators of enumeration:

In the first place (because)...., In the second place (because)..., Firstly..., secondly...,To begin with...., Next..., Lastly....., Last but not least..., Finally..., Further....,Furthermore..., Moreover.

Indicators of induction:

When arguments are organized in a descending nature according to their importance: The most important first: this is called induction, "which is a way of reasoning in which a general statement is reached on the basis of specific propositions. Induction moves from the particular to the general (Gilbert, 2005)*.*

Standpoint

↓

An additional reason is

↓

A secondary reason is

↓

An added reason

↓

Less importantly

↓

Of secondary importance (Adapted from Van Eemeren *et al*, 2007)

Indicators of Deduction

"Deduction is a process of reasoning that seeks valid conclusions. In Deduction, a conclusion must be true because the premise, or statements on which it is based, are also true. Deduction proceeds from the general to the most important*.* (Gilbert, 2005):

And all the more since/because..,

↓

the more so since

↓

especially/particularly (too) because

↓

above all because

↓

more importantly

↓

to top that (off)

↓

Even (Adapted from Van Eemeren *et al*, 2007 p: 213)

Indicators to add another argument to a previous one:

(But) this is only part of the reason.., *On top of that…, (And) also…..., Besides…, In addition to this…, Together with…, Plus…, Moreover…., And what is more..., As well as*

Specific indicators:

While: While indicates a contrast. The speaker is trying to refute a possible objection to one of his/her arguments. Hatim (1997) classified *while* as an explicit concessive together with (*although, despite*, ..etc) when the counter-claim is anticipated. For more information on while read (p: 216). *While normally/otherwise/ as a rule…, whereas…., whereas normally/otherwise/as a rule….., not even…, and yet…, X was not an option/was impossible* have the same function (p: 218). (*While*) could be used in the beginning, in the middle or at the conclusion (Hatim, 1997 p: 41).

(*Then*): (then) expresses impatience or displeasure. It could also be used to indicate a conclusion (p:94). In the latter case, it could represent the standpoint.

After all: "rhetorical questions in which "after all" or a tag questions are used generally indicate a starting point".

(*Rather*) "is a word that usually indicates a starting point if it is used in a rhetorical question specially if the question is introduced by the conjunction "or".

(*But*): When (but) precedes *besides, chiefly, first of all, now, later, sometimes, also* …etc, it means there is a restriction. *But* is used to amend or reduce the *harm* done by concession in the preceding paragraph. Sometimes (*however*) is used. But could also imply rejection of a standpoint.

Still: Still indicates that the writer is maintaining a standpoint e. g. *I still think that…., I'm still right…., I still stand by/stick to my opinion that……, I still insist/maintain that….*

Adverbs like *indeed, really, truly* are sisters of *certainly* (p: 35).

Unconditional concession Indicators

These are indicators, which make possible the acceptance of "a particular proposition as a staring point for the discussion without automatically invoking a follow-up, which expresses special restrictions with regard to the argumentative use". These are:

"*yes*", and "*that is true*" which are an tools to accepting a proposition.

Argumentative rhetorical questions

A question could be an implicit offer to accept a proposition as a starting point, or to get concessions to allow for certain point of view. These questions often include adverbs and expressions like "*then, now, well, surely, rather, after all, also, eventually, just* and *tag-questions* such as "*isn't it*" and "*is it*?. They indicate both a claim at the beginning of the discussion or a starting point at the middle of the discussion (p: 94).

Expressions that express an opinion

Generally, expressions that express an opinion (*in my opinion/belief/judgement/view, to my mind, I find that, it seems to me..*) are weak assertives that introduce a standpoint in addition to their concessive use (p:41).

Expressions that represents conjecture:

Expressions like *I believe that, I assume that, it is likely that, I'm under the impression that, probably, I suspect that, I expect that, I suppose that ..* are used usually to express a standpoint (p: 41).

Indicators of the concluding stage:

Here the two parties have to announce the result of their argumentation. In this stage it would become clear whether the protagonist has actually defended his/her position or the antagonist has successfully attacked the standpoint. Different indicators

73

used for this purpose are: (so…, thus…, hence….., therefore,…., consequently…., in short..

Indicators announce maintaining of a standpoint:

I maintain that.., I stand by my opinion/standpoint/point of view that.., I stick to my opinion…., I contend that….

Indicators that announce withdrawal or defeat:

(If that is the case, then…, if that is true, (then)…. You are right/I agree…., then that is indeed the case

Indicators announce refusal of surrender

Expressions that indicate the antagonist is refusing to *give in* are:

I still disagree with you there…, I still don't agree…,You have not convinced me.

Fallacies

According to Van Eemeren and Grootendorst, a fallacy is a wrong discussion move (2004: 5). For more information on logic fallacies: van Eemeren & Grootendorst (2004). *A systematic theory of argumentation, The pragma-dialectical approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix B

A Model for Writing Editorials/Opinions

1- Get the main idea of the topic.

2- Negate this idea.

Table 17.

The Protagonist	The Antagonist
The main idea (one sentence using propositional attitude indicators and force modifying expressions)	Negation (implicit and should not appear in the text). To help in building the opposite point of view
Built your supports	
Support while giving concessions to the other party	Try to clarify, identify, introduce an informative information, like definition, background history, cultural reference (talk positively)
	Support it
	Give some concession
Continue your support of the main point giving concessions	
	New point (but related to the topic)
	Support it giving concession
Counter argument	
support	
	counterargument
	Support +concession
	Micro-conclusion
New point	
Support +concession	
Clarification + definition	
Micro conclusion	
	counterargument
	Restricted support

counterargument	
Restricted support	
Question	
Answer	
Restricted support	
	counterargument
Macro conclusion (Counterargument +Concession +irony)	

.   Make sure that one or more of these strategies is used. Sarcasm, irony, lampooning, mockery, ridicule, cynicism, harshness, bitterness, criticism, rebuffing, metaphor, comeback, concession, conditions, reproach, enquiry, answer, idioms. You can also show friendliness, good humour, kindness, sweetness, compliment, and praise.

.   Avoid fallacies (see: Appendix A, last para.)

.   Be careful not to rely heavily on basic emotions such as, caring, sympathy, rejection, pity, fear, intimidation, or appeal to loyalty, freedom, democratic norms.

Appendix C
Through Argumentation

ا لولايات المتحدة و إسرائيل
من هو العدو الحقيقي للفلسطينيين ؟

1 إذا كان لدى البعض أي أمل في أن تكون إدارة الرئيس جورج دبليو بوش أقل انحيازاً لإسرائيل من إدارة الرئيس السابق بيل كلينتون **2** فإن هذا الأمل تبدد **3** عندما أظهرت هذه الإدارة أنها لا تكتفي بتبني الموقف الإسرائيلي من مفاوضات السلام فحسب **4** ولكنها تدعم الأعمال الوحشية الإسرائيلية **5** وتطالب الضحايا بوقف أعمال العنف ، **6** وفي حين وجه البيت الأبيض الدعوة لمجرم الحرب اريیل شارون **7** لإجراء محادثات مع الرئيس بوش ، **8** فقد امتنعت الإدارة الأمريكية عن توجيه دعوة مماثلة للرئيس الفلسطيني ياسر عرفات ، **9** لتعلن بهذا الموقف أن انحيازها لإسرائيل بلغ من الصفاقة حدا يتجاوز حتى الاعتبارات الشكلية **10** التي يتعين أن يظهرها الوسيط.

11 وإذا كان هناك من يظن أن المصالح الأمريكية في المنطقة يمكن أن تتأثّر **12** عندما تواصل واشنطن دعمها لأعمال القتل اليومية للأبرياء **13** فقد أثبتت الحكومات العربية التي اكتفت بتقديم الدعم الكلامي للقضية الفلسطينية (مع حفنة دولارات لا تغني ولا تسمن) أنها أعجز من أن تشكّل قوى الضغط **14** وأنها لا تجرؤ على رفع أصوات الاحتجاج ضد السياسة الأمريكية الراهنة **15** ولم يكن صعباً على واشنطن أن تستوعب الحقيقة القائلة أن الدول العربية لا تتبنى استراتيجية واحدة حيال القضية الفلسطينية **16** ولا تتحدث بصوت واحد **17** ولم تخطط للقيام بعمل احتجاجي واحد **18** ولا تنوي اتخاذ إجراء عملي واحد ضد المصالح الأمريكية **19** وبالتالي فإن الشيء الطبيعي هو أن تمسك الولايات المتحدة الحبل من طرفه السائب **20** لتنحاز فقط إلى الطرف الذي اعتادت إلى الانحياز إليه.

21 وبالرغم من بعض الجوانب الإيجابية التي أسفرت عن انعقاد القمة العربية **22** فقد صار من الجلي الآن أنّ الموقف من الانحياز الأمريكي الأعمى لإسرائيل كان هو الغائب الأكبر. **23** لا شيء أهم اليوم من وضع هذا الانحياز على جدول أعمال اللقاءات العربية القادمة.

24 إسرائيل ليست هي العدو الوحيد للفلسطينيين ، **25** الولايات المتحدة هي العدو الآخر إن لم تكن هي العدو الأهم ، **26** فمن دون دعم الولايات المتحدة ما كانت إسرائيل لتجرؤ على التصل من كل التزاماتها المتعلقة بعملية السلام ، **27** ومن دون تواطؤ الولايات المتحدة ما كانت إسرائيل لتجرؤ على ارتكاب كل هذا القدر من الجرائم اليومية ، **28** ومن دون مساندة الولايات المتحدة ما كان بوسع إسرائيل أن تنتهك كل ما تشاء من القوانين والأعراف والمقررات الدولية.

29 في الحقيقة الولايات المتحدة هي المسئول الأول والمباشر عن كل ما يجري في المنطقة ، **30** وليست إسرائيل سوى أداة.

31 إسرائيل هي البندقية **32** ولكن الولايات المتحدة هي اليد **33** التي تضغط على الزناد **34** لقتل الأطفال الفلسطينيين.

35 إسرائيل هي البلدوزر **36** ولكن الولايات المتحدة هي اليد **37** التي تهدم منازل الفلسطينيين.

38 إسرائيل هي الدبابة **39** ولكن الولايات المتحدة هي قوة الاحتلال.

40 ومن الواجب حمل العلاقة مع الولايات المتحدة على محمل العلاقة مع عدو ... **41** لأنها ببساطة هي العدو الحقيقي.

الولايات المتحدة و إسرائيل من هو العدو الحقيقي للفلسطينيين ؟
(http//docs ksuedu sa/DOC/Articles l 9/Articlel 90559 doc

Appendix D
Arabic Emphatics

<div dir="rtl">

أساليب التوكيد

– يأتي الكلم خالياً من التوكيد إذا كان المتلقي متقبلاً له غير شاكٍ فيه، مثل: الحمد لله – ذهبت للقاهرة أمس (أسلوب ابتدائي).

– يؤكد الكلم بمؤكد واحد ، إذا كان المتلقي متردداً ، أو شاكاً، مثل: إنني أحترمك (أسلوب طلبي).

– يُؤكد الكلم بأكثر من مؤكد ، إذا كان المتلقي منكراً له، مثل: والله لقد سددت ديوني (أسلوب إنكاري)

من أدوات التوكيد:

1/ إنّ – أنّ: " إن الله مع الصابرين" – " أعلمُ أن الله على كل شيء قدير"

2/ لم الابتداء: لَمحمدُ خير الخلق كلهم

** وقد تأتي "لم" مع " إنّ": " إن الله لذو فضل على العالمين"

3/ نونا التوكيد: (الخفيفة – الثقيلة): "كلا لنسفعنْ بالناصية" – "هل يُ ذهبنّ كيده ما يغيظ".

4/ المصدر المؤكد لفعله: (المفعول المطلق): " وسلموا تسليماً" - " وكلم الله موسى تكليماً".

5 – أحرف الجر الزائدة: (من – الباء – الكاف): "ليس كمثله شيء" – "كفى بالله وكيلاً" – "هل من خالق غير الله".

6/ التوكيد المعنوي: (النفس – العين – كل – جميع – كلا – كلتا – كافة – عامة): رأيت المصلين كافتهم – جاء الطالبان كلاهما

07/ التوكيد اللفظي: ويكون بتكرار نفس اللفظ المراد توكيده: الله أكبر الله الله أكبر الله الله أكبر

8/ الألفاظ الدالة على التوكيد: مثل: (حقاً – لا ريب – لا شك – لا جدال – لابد): " ذلك الكتاب لا ريب فيه هدى للمتقين" – " أولئك المؤمنون حقاً"

9/ القسم: والله ما فعلت شراً – " والفجر وليال عشر".

10/ العطف: باستخدام (لكن – بل – لا) مثل: أنت مجتهدٌ لا كسول – لا تقرب الشر لكن الخير – ما جئت ذاماً بل مادحاً

11/ أسلوب القصر: بـ (إنما): " إنما المؤمنون إخوة" أو بالنفي والاستثناء: – "ما أنت إلا نذير".

</div>

12/ التقديم: * تقديم الخبر على المبتدأ: "لله الأمر من قبل ومن بعد"0

* تقديم المفعول به: " إياك نعبد"0- محمداً زرتُ0

* تقديم الجار والمجرور: بك أستعين0 – اللهم لك أسلمت ، وبك آمنت ، وعليك توكلت

13/ قد – لقد: وبعدهم الفعل الماضي: "قد أفلح المؤمنون"0 – " ولقد خلقنا الإنسان من سلالة من طين".

14/ الطباق ، والمقابلة: " وأنه هو أضحك وأبكى ، وأنه هو أمات وأحيى ، وأنه خلق الزوجين الذكر والأُنثى".

15 – تعريف المبتدأ والخبر: الدين المعاملة0 – أنت الطالب0

ويحقق التوكيد هدفه ، إذا كان نابعاً من إحساس الأديب ، ومستخدماً بقدر الحاجة إليه ، ولا تكلف فيه ولا إكثار0

Emphatics in Arabic (http://www.aklaam.net/forum/archive/index.php?t-4025.html) accessed on March 2008

Appendix E
Additional examples of flawed translation

TL	SL
من الصعب أن يصاب **المرء** بخيبة أمل من شيء ما إلا إذا كان جيدا بصورة غير عادية ، أو على الأقل يبشر بذلك. ويعتبر توني بلير ، الذي أعلن في العاشر من أيار (مايو) تاريخ استقالته من منصب رئيس الوزراء ، سياسيا موهوبا بصورة استثنائية ، بل ربما أكثر شخصية تمتلك موهبة الإقناع من ضمن الشخصيات التي شغلت المنصب الأعلى في الدولة منذ أن تم إدخال حق الانتخاب العام عام 1928. ومستويات تأييده المنخفضة التي هبطت إلى أقل من 40% ، بعد بلوغها أكثر من 65% ، خلال العشر سنوات التي قضاها في السلطة تعكس خيبة الأمل التي يشعر بها فقط أولئك الذين انبهروا به بصور كبيرة..	Tony Blair, The Economist, May 10th 2007 It is hard to be really disappointed by something unless it is unusually good, or at least promises to be so. Tony Blair, who announced on May 10th the date on which he was stepping down as Britain's prime minister, is an exceptionally gifted politician, perhaps the most natural persuader to have occupied the country's highest office since universal suffrage was introduced in 1928. His tumbling approval ratings, which have travelled from plus 65 to minus 40 in the ten years he has been in power (see chart), reflect a scale of disenchantment that afflicts only those who were once truly smitten.

.   Arabic translation turns the passive English sentence into active (من الصعب أن يصاب المرء بخيبة أمل ....), which adds to the cohesion of the Arabic sentence.

.   (…*is an exceptionally gifted politician, perhaps the most natural persuader*..), this part increases the suspense. The reader expects something extraordinary. In the same vein, the translation (.... سياسيا موهوبا بصورة استثنائية ، بل ربما أكثر شخصية تمتلك موهبة الإقناع ....) was successful.

.   (*His tumbling approval ratings, which have traveled from plus 65 to minuss*…). This is a counterargument with implicit (*however*). The words (*tumbling, minus, disenchantment*, ..) come in sharp contrast with (excep*tionally gifted politician, perhaps the*

most natural persuader..) in the preceding sentence. This adds to the counter-argumentation structure effect.

. The above part can be divided as claim followed by support and counterargument, the natural steps in an argumentative discussion.

. Was the translator aware of the argumentative stages?

. It seems no. because the translator failed to explicate the implicit genre micro elements (*however*) or any article that has the same role, leaving the sentence with the superfluous Arabic connectors.

. **Suggested amendment:**

(شغلت المنصب الأعلى في الدولة منذ أن تم إدخال حق الانتخاب العام عام 1928 ، إلا أن مستويات تأييده التي هبطت إلى أقل من 40% ، بعد بلوغها أكثر من 65...) المنخفضة

. This kind of translation does not assist to differentiate between the two points of view in the argumentation process.

There is no doubt that this is a frightening moment. But the narrow economic rationale ……considerably. **But** the central bankers' next scheduled meeting begins on January 29th. **Since** lower interest ….. rate cuts by a few days will not much affect the outcome. **Yes**, share prices had been falling sharply across the globe, **but** the ….. The Fed seems to have been spooked, and wanted to stop the markets' fall	**لا** شك **أن** الأوقات الراهنة مخيفة. **إلا أن** الأساس الاقتصادي المنطقي ضيق…… السياسة النقدية إلى حد بعيد. **إلا أن** الاجتماع المقرر المقبل **إن** للمصرفيين المركزيين سيبدأ في التاسع والعشرين من كانون الثاني (يناير). **وبما أن** أسعار الفائدة ….. على النتيجة. **صحيح أن** أسعار الفائدة تنخفض بصورة حادة في جميع أنحاء العالم ، **إلا** أن الهبوط منظم والنظام لم يتوقف بعد. ويبدو أن مجلس … هبوط الأسواق.

Globalization implies that America's mortgage problem has worldwide repercussions The first run on a bank occurred against the British mortgage lender Northern Rock.	**إن** العولمة تعني ضمنا أن مشكلة الرهن العقاري في أمريكا لابد وأن تكون

America managed to pass off bad mortgages worth hundreds of billions of dollars to investors (including banks) around the world. They buried the bad mortgages in complicated instruments, buried them so deep that no one knew exactly how badly they were impaired, and no one could calculate how to re-price them quickly. In the face of such uncertainty, markets froze.	ذات أصداء عالمية. وتلقى بنك الإقراض العقاري البريطاني " نورثرن روك" أول ضربة. وتمكنت أمريكا من تمرير مشكلات الرهن العقاري التي تجاوز حجمها مئات المليارات من الدولارات إلى المستثمرين (بما في ذلك البنوك وخبأ الأمريكيون رهنهم العقاري الردئ داخل أدوات مالية معقدة ، على نحو كان من الصعب معه أن يتكهن أحد على وجه التحديد بمدى فساد تلك الأدوات ، ولم يكن بوسع أحد ان يتوصل إلى الكيفية التي يستطيع بها أن يعيد تسعير هذه الأدوات بسرعة. وفي ظل هذه الحالة من عدم اليقين تجمدت الأسواق الخليج الاقتصادي ، 24 أكتوبر 2007

.   The translator managed to add *inna* but there is no adversative tool.

Appendix F
Arabic and English Articles Cited in the Thesis

Asia: Paddy re-enlists; Afghanistan
The Economist. London: Jan 26, 2008. Vol. 386, Iss. 8564; pg. 67

A lot for one man to do

IT IS hard to overstate the hopes being vested in Paddy Ashdown. The former British marine, politician and international proconsul in Bosnia is on the point of being appointed as the new United Nations representative in Afghanistan, charged with steadying nerves and giving direction to the West's faltering stabilisation effort.

The Taliban insurgency has spread from the wild frontier region to engulf much of Afghanistan's southern Pushtun belt, with some exceptions, as well as parts of Pakistan. The traditional winter lull in fighting did not stop a Taliban suicide squad from brazenly blasting and shooting its way into Kabul's poshest hotel on January 14th, killing eight staff and guests

There is general consensus among Western diplomats and soldiers that, bad as it is, Afghanistan could get a lot worse. Tired of demanding that its European allies send more men and equipment to Afghanistan, America has decided to reinforce its contingent, announcing plans to deploy 3,200 more marines in April. Robert Gates, the defence secretary, also upset the Europeans by suggesting they had yet to master counter-insurgency tactics.

The problem in Afghanistan, however, is more serious than just a shortage of troops. Many of the 39 allies are conducting their own mini-campaigns, frequently in disjointed six-month bursts as fresh units are rotated through a region. They are also pursuing different aid policies.

America, Britain, Canada, Poland and the Netherlands are among those waging the fight in the south, while many others want to stay out of it. America channels its aid through private contractors in the name of avoiding corruption, **but** Britain gives the bulk of its aid directly to the government to encourage "capacity building". A recent report by the European Council on Foreign Relations, a think-tank, castigated members of the European Union in scathing terms: "EU countries have treated the common effort in Afghanistan like a pot-luck dinner where every guest is free to bring his own dish."

In other post-conflict rebuilding efforts, the UN has been given primacy. But in Afghanistan it adopted a low profile as sovereignty was handed over to an Afghan government led by President Hamid Karzai. As security has worsened, the UN and aid charities have found themselves unable to work in many provinces.

For years commanders have looked wistfully at Bosnia, thinking that a "Paddy Ashdown figure" is just what Afghanistan needs. Now, it seems, they will get the genuine article. Lord Ashdown has given warning that "we are losing in Afghanistan" and that defeat here would be worse than in Iraq. But can he turn things around? His appointment is still under negotiation, but it is clear he will not have the powers he enjoyed in Bosnia, where he could sack local officials and rescind laws. On current plans, Lord Ashdown will replace a German politician, Tom Koenigs, as UN envoy. He will not be, as once mooted, a "triple-hatted" super-envoy who would also represent the EU and the civilian side of NATO. Still, the job that needs to be done is as much a matter of personal dynamism as of formal authority. NATO commanders say they want political direction. As a former member of the special forces, who took part in a successful counter-insurgency campaign in Borneo in the 1960s, Lord Ashdown should have little difficulty in straight-talking with military commanders. Mr Karzai has often complained that he gets too much contradictory advice from his Western backers. But he is balking at the prospect of a powerful new figure arriving in Kabul, not least because many would like Lord Ashdown to focus on reducing the government's corruption and inefficiency, in a country where opium accounts for about one-third of GDP.

The Democratic surge
Anonymous. *The Economist*. London: Mar 29, 2008. Vol. 386, Iss. 8573; pg. 7.
The relentless rise of the Democrats will make a big difference to foreign policy.

ON THE morning after the 2004 presidential election it looked as if the age of an enduring Republican majority had dawned. Mr Bush had not only won re-election with more votes than any previous president; he had become the first president in 70 years to win re-election while increasing his party's majorities in both houses. Two years later he received what he called a "thumpin" in the mid-term

elections, with the Democrats winning control of both houses of Congress along with six governorships and 321 state legislative seats. The Democrats defeated six incumbent senators and picked up 30 House seats. There were lots of reasons for the Republicans' dismal performance: the inept handling of Hurricane Katrina, the out-of-control federal spending, a spate of ethics scandals, the pandering to the Christian right. But at the heart of it was Mr Bush's foreign policy. The war in Iraq undermined the Republican Party's strongest electoral claim: that it was best equipped to keep America safe. In a CBS News/New York Times poll, only 29% of those questioned approved of Mr Bush's handling of Iraq. The Iraq war also set public opinion against the Bush presidency in general. In a Newsweek poll, 58% thought that the administration had deliberately misled the American people about Saddam's WMD. The anti-Republican tide remains as strong as it was in 2006. Five years ago support for the two big parties was evenly divided, with 43% each. Today the Democrats lead by 50% to 36% (see chart 3). Americans at present regard Democrats as more competent by a margin of five to three and as more ethical by a margin of two to one. The generation of Americans who came of age in 2000-05 identifies itself with the Democrats by the largest majority recorded for any age group since polling began. The Democrats will almost certainly strengthen their hold on Capitol Hill in this year's election. In a USA Today/Gallup poll last December, 53% of Americans preferred Democratic control of Congress. Twenty-one House Republicans plan to retire from politics at the end of this Congress. The figure for the Democrats is two. The Democrats are even better placed in the Senate, an institution that has a particularly important role in shaping foreign policy. The Republicans are defending more seats than the Democrats (23 against 12), and more "open" seats where the incumbent is not running (five against none). They are also defending seven seats in Democratic-leaning states. This may allow the Democrats to increase their majority from one now to perhaps seven or eight. So the Senate will either strengthen the hand of a Democratic president or frustrate a Republican one. The presidential race is much more difficult to predict because of the importance of personality and chance. A gaffe in the presidential debates or the discovery of a personal indiscretion could turn everything upside down. But the Democrats are well placed to take the White House. Recent polls have shown a 24-point preference for a Democratic president--a lead unheard of since Watergate. Mr Obama and Mrs Clinton have been drawing monster crowds. Mr McCain often finds himself addressing the local rotary club.

A different view of the world

Democratic voters view foreign policy very differently from Republican ones. Iraq is a prime example. Only 27% of Democrats support keeping troops in Iraq, according to a recent poll by the Pew Research Centre, compared with 81% of Republicans. A mere 36% of Democrats think that America is making progress in Iraq with defeating the insurgency, compared with 80% of Republicans. Only 39% of Democrats reckon that America has not gone far enough in protecting itself from terrorist threats, against 56% of Republicans. Only about half as many Democrats as Republicans (39% against 74%) believe that it is right to conduct surveillance of suspected terrorists without a court order. And a similar proportion (39% against 73%) believe that the government's treatment of the inmates at Guantanamo Bay is fair. Hostility to the Iraq war, and wider worries about the excesses of the "war on terror", are particularly strong among the Democratic base: the people who vote in primaries and do much of the legwork in the general election. The Bush years have seen the rise of a Democratic counter-establishment set up largely in opposition to Mr Bush's assertive foreign policy. Groups such as MoveOn.org (which opposed the invasion of Afghanistan as well as Iraq) and internet sites such as DailyKos and the Huffington Post are becoming an increasingly important source of funding and opinion and can make life difficult for Democratic politicians who are seen to "betray" the party. Both Mr Obama and Mrs Clinton have been careful to preserve as much wiggle room as possible, particularly on what "withdrawal" of American troops from Iraq actually means. But the resurgence of the Democrats will nevertheless have a profound influence on the direction of American foreign policy, given the party's strong disagreements with the Bush doctrine. Congressional Democrats have been working hard to bring American troops home from Iraq: in a debate on Mr Bush's surge last year, 229 Democrats but only 17 Republicans voted to condemn it. So an incoming Republican president would be constrained by powerful Democratic majorities on Capitol Hill, and an incoming Democratic president would be under strong pressure from his or her core supporters to put much more emphasis on negotiation than on force. Presidents enjoy a great deal of freedom in policymaking, but they ignore the views of their most reliable supporters at their peril.

Somewhere over the rainbow - The world's silver lining

In a week of financial uncertainty we look behind the headlines to a world that is unexpectedly prosperous and peaceful

POLITICIANS seem drawn to danger--as a rhetorical device, that is. George Bush justified last year's troop surge in Iraq by saying that otherwise the world would become "a more dangerous place". Gordon Brown, Britain's prime minister, said this would be "a dangerous year" for his country. Vladimir Putin told a NATO meeting that the world had become "more dangerous" because of the Bush administration.

This sense of impending doom is not confined to politicians. Public attitudes generally seem to have become more pessimistic and inward-looking. The proportion of Americans who think their country should be active in the world (42%) is the lowest it has been since the early 1990s. Support for international trade and multinational companies is falling. Opposition to immigration is growing. Large minorities in most countries say globalization is bad for them personally. Although the main perceived threat varies by time and place--from climate change to economic recession--the general mood is a bit despondent. And the outside world tends to be viewed as a source of trouble.

Indeed, for a great many people the way things are is pretty rotten: Burmese monks, for instance, or the Luo in Kenya. Life is not too bright for investors at the moment, either. But is the broader proposition true? Is the world really becoming worse for the majority of mankind? We argue that it is not.

To some extent, our qualified optimism is borne out by impartial data. In this article we look at three pieces of evidence: the underlying social conditions in poor countries; poverty alleviation over the past decade; and the incidence of wars and political violence. By those measures the world seems to be in rather better shape than most people realise.

Miracles behind the turmoil

In China 25 years ago, over 600m people--two-thirds of the population--were living in extreme poverty (on $1 a day or less). Now, the number on $1 a day is below 180m. In the world as a whole, a stunning 135m people escaped dire poverty between 1999 and 2004. This is more than the population of Japan or Russia--and more people, more quickly than at any other time in history.

Poverty alleviation has gone hand in hand with improvements in basic services. Digging canals and building water-treatment plants has increased the number of people with access to safe water: in South Asia, for instance, the number of those without clean water has been nearly halved since 1990. Thanks to this, and to better public-health provision, the rate at which people die from infectious diseases such as malaria and tuberculosis is falling in most poor countries, Africa excepted.

That in turn has cut child mortality. In 2007 UNICEF, the United Nations child-welfare body, said that for the first time in modern history fewer than 10m children were dying each year before the age of five. That is still an awful lot but it represents a fall of a quarter since 1990. Life expectancy has increased a bit in low- and middle-income countries. The long march to literacy is nearing an end: three-quarters of people aged 15-25 were literate in 1975; now the rate is nearly nine-tenths.

All these things are the results of patient work over many years. But perhaps the biggest change affecting people's lives has little to do, at least directly, with development policy or public spending. People in poor countries are now able to exert more control over their own fertility, and hence over the size of their families.

A generation ago the biggest worry about poor countries was over-population. Books such as "The Population Bomb" (1968) and "The Limits to Growth" (1972) predicted Malthusian crises in countries where women were having five children or more. Since then the fertility rate (the average number of children a woman can expect during her lifetime) in low- and middle-income countries has crashed. In East Asia and the Pacific, the rate was 5.4 in 1970. Now it is 2.1. In South Asia, the fertility rate halved (from 6.0 to 3.1). In the world as a whole, fertility has fallen from 4.8 to 2.6 in a generation (25 years).

The biggest decline is in those countries that are most involved with globalisation (especially in East Asia, though China is a special case because of its one-child policy). The most important exception to the rule of declining fertility is sub-Saharan Africa. All the countries with fertility rates over 5.0 are in Africa (with the one exception of Yemen).

Globalisation, it seems, leads to a shift in the direction of "replacement fertility": the rate at which the size of a population eventually stabilises. This is a remarkable development. In closed agrarian societies, families need a lot of children as insurance against disaster. But in countries that have opened themselves up, families can rely on other sorts of protection, such as urban jobs or trade.

These demographic changes help to create a virtuous circle of growth. When fertility rises then falls, you get a bulge of people at and just after the inflection point. The baby boomers were one such bulge. Between 1960 and 1990 Europe and America had relatively few old people (because mortality rates had earlier been high), relatively few children (because fertility had fallen) and a disproportionately big number of economically active adults.

These 30 boom years were (to borrow the French phrase) "les trente glorieuses". Developing countries are seeing a similar confluence now. Eventually, of course, the demographic bonus turns into a demographic onus, as is happening in parts of Europe. But that is a difficult story for a later generation. In the next one, low- and middle-income countries will have a demographic advantage to reinforce their economic gains.

Up and up and up

These social achievements have not come about by accident. They are, at least in part, attributable to growth. A World Bank study of 19 poor countries concluded that every 1% increase in national income per head translates into a 1.3 point fall in extreme poverty. Hence the importance of the second broad indicator: the state of the world economy.

Last year the global economy entered its fifth year of over 4% annual growth--the longest period of such strong expansion since the early 1970s. Despite financial turmoil and soaring oil and commodity prices, world growth barely dipped in 2007 and trade grew at 9%, even though trade talks fell apart. Unlike previous expansions, inflation remained more or less under control.

Moreover, growth was spread around fairly evenly. According to the World Bank, national income in the European Union rose slightly more than in America for the first time in a decade. Growth in East Asia was 10%, in South Asia over 8%, in eastern Europe almost 7% and in Africa, thanks to the commodity boom, over 6%. This was unprecedented. In earlier booms, fast growth seemed to have been the preserve of a few miracle countries, such as the Asian tigers. No longer. Almost half of humanity, spread over more than 40 nations, lives in countries growing at 7% a year or more, a rate that doubles the size of an economy in a decade. This is twice the number of fast growers that existed in the years between 1980 and 2000.

As a result, the world's economic balance is tilting from rich industrialised countries to emerging markets. Their share of world output in 2006 was just below half, and rising. The International Monetary Fund reckons that in 2008 China and India will be the largest contributors to worldwide growth for the first time.

This does not mean that the world will be able to make light of a slowdown in industrialised countries. Nor will developing countries be unaffected by problems hitting America and Europe. Nevertheless, so far they have been hit less hard by the credit crunch than rich nations were.

Yields on high-risk corporate bonds rose over 300 basis points after August 2007, an indication of the scale of damage to companies in rich nations. By contrast, emerging-market bond yields rose less than 100 points, peanuts compared with what happened after the Asian and Russian crises of 1995 and 1998. Equity markets in emerging markets, unlike those in America and Japan, shrugged off their losses last August. The view from the bond and equity markets seems to be that emerging markets are in a better position to cope with a credit crunch than rich countries are--and have grown better than they were at coping (see page 84).

There is a problem, however. Many people argue that the pattern of world growth over the past 20 years has not been beneficial. They point out that globalisation-driven growth has gone hand in hand with a growth in inequality. This inequality is a worry in its own right (communities get broken up; the poor get left behind) and also a missed opportunity (emerging markets might have done better still if only their extra wealth had been distributed more fairly). Is this charge against globalisation true? And, if it is, does it follow that globalisation has been a failure because its benefits have been pinched by the rich?

The evidence that the rich have done best is certainly compelling. Inequality has risen in both rich and poor countries. It is thus a sharp break from the pattern established between 1950 and 1990, when there was a general decline in inequality, notably in East Asia, where the tigers managed to combine fast growth with relatively equal incomes.

But it is not so clear that globalisation--in the sense of opening up to trade and foreign investment--is to blame. Ukraine and Poland both opened themselves in the 1990s. Yet inequality rose in Poland and fell in Ukraine. Globalisation, it seems, sometimes increases inequality, sometimes reduces it.

The educational ladder

A more plausible culprit for rising inequality seems to be technological progress (see chart below). This is associated with inequality in poor countries because in emerging markets the people best able to take advantage of new technology are those who already have an education and who are usually among the richest in society. The more technological progress, therefore, the better the well-off do.

But to limit technology to reduce inequality would be a cure worse than the disease. Technology in its broadest sense--the flow of new ideas--is the only way of getting growth rates up to 5-10% a year, the rate which enables poor countries to catch up with the West. Without it, growth would be dependent on labour and capital inputs, and growth would be just a few percent. To reduce technological progress--even supposing one could do it--would be to condemn poor countries to stay poor.

In fact, since the mid-1990s, the incomes of the poorest fifth have risen everywhere except, marginally, in Latin America, where they have been affected by the after-shocks of debt crises. In Asia, the real incomes of the poorest fifth rose 4% a year; in Africa, by 2% a year, faster than the rise for other income groups.

The result is that the number of very poor people in the world is falling fast--even though many critics continue to believe that the poor have not really benefited from growth. In 1990 those on $1 a day accounted for more than a quarter of the population of developing countries. By 2015, on current rates, the proportion of very poor people should have shrunk to 10%. Moreover, these monetary measures probably understate the real gains from things such as lower child mortality, safer water, literacy and other social achievements. A rich man appreciates his extra cash but this does not compare with what a poor family gains from seeing an infant survive childhood or learn to write.

The general reduction in the numbers of the very poor weakens the perceived link between globalisation and inequality. Across the world, if not within nations, globalisation can be claimed to be making people more equal, not less. This is mainly because China and India, with their 2.5 billion people, are growing fast and narrowing the gap with rich countries.

Fading trumpets of war

Economic growth improves lives unobtrusively. The more dramatic explanation for improved living standards is the decline in the number of wars, and in deaths from violence and genocide.

The Greening of China
Christine Loh

Two countries – the United States and China – remain aloof from global efforts to create a new post-Kyoto framework on climate change. Fifty years ago, the rest of the world might have carried on with remedying the problem of conventional and greenhouse gas emissions and let China and the US stew in their own waste. But the world is now so interdependent that what happens in one place affects all others. For example, visitors and residents alike have long thought of Hong Kong as a beautiful city clinging to the South China coast. But, for at least five years, Hong Kong's citizens have found themselves starting to cough and wheeze from the city's increasingly degraded air. Corporate employers are even complaining about not being able to attract overseas talent. Pollution from Hong Kong's own power generation plants, growing number of vehicles, and burgeoning shipping industry can certainly be reduced. But the lion's share of this industrial haze – like the growing pollution of its coastal waters – is a direct result of the rapid industrialization of the Pearl River Delta across the border in China's Guangdong Province. China is exporting not only more and more goods, but also its environmental degradation. The inescapable truth is that the futures of Hong Kong and China are integrally linked. There are roughly 58,000 factories in the Pearl River Delta with Hong Kong connections, and together they employ more than 10 million workers. Guangdong accounts for about 30% of China's total foreign trade, while Hong Kong is China's international finance center. Officials in both Hong Kong and Guangdong are powerless to clean up their environmental problems on their own. In fact, development plans in China may be heading in the opposite direction. Political heavyweights in Guangdong still favor a form of development that relies on speed and quantity while ignoring overall environmental quality. And Hong Kong's economic blueprint also focuses on accelerating large infrastructure projects whose environmental impact has not been rigorously examined. It will not be easy for leaders on either side of the border to reverse gears, but there is still chance that people and companies can make a difference. Increasingly loud complaints about deteriorating air quality have goaded Hong Kong and Guangdong into embarking on a joint program in which a series of monitoring stations now provides emissions data. Hong Kong's data have been released regularly, and in 2006, Guangdong's data were made publicly available for the first time. There is now also talk about monitoring water quality. These are laudable steps for China, given its poor record on transparency. Indeed, the joint air-monitoring network provides a foundation for the region to develop a sophisticated regional air management program. Furthermore, new coal-fired power plants may no longer be allowed on either side of the border, necessitating greater use of natural gas and renewable energy sources. The first challenge for authorities is to regulate power generation very differently. People are used to paying for the electricity that they actually use. But, to optimize efficiency, utilities need to be rewarded for what they help consumers save. In other words, utilities must be given incentives to help consumers use less power. This idea is clearly feasible. Amory Lovins of the Rocky Mountain Institute has proposed what he calls the "negawatt," or energy that is never used. All that is needed are the right financial incentives to induce utility companies to produce less electricity (and still be more profitable) and consumers to reduce their use (and gain savings without sacrificing comfort). This can be done by refitting households with high-efficiency light bulbs and other technological improvements, and by retrofitting industrial plants with energy-saving technologies. Another innovative idea that Hong Kong and Guangdong are exploring is the "P2E2" scheme. To help industries in the region upgrade environmentally, firms can now obtain special loans for which the Asian Development Bank assumes the risk – a program made possible by Hong Kong's sound banking practices. Another initiative worth watching is the Hong Kong stock exchange's exploratory project to offer a trading platform for emissions derivatives, which will most likely include conventional pollutants as well as carbon. The exchange will undertake a study this summer, with trading to begin as early as 2008. If these reforms are not trumped by efforts to maintain high growth at all costs, the region could not only clean itself up while continuing to prosper, but could also establish a model for all of China. Nothing is more necessary in a country that, according to the United Nations Development Program, contains 16 of the world's 20 most polluted cities. Hong Kong's leaders to do not want to end up on that infamous list. By saving themselves, they may also be able to play an instrumental role in saving China.

The China and other Asian countries. The Asian economies seem to make much better use of the resources that women have to

2007: www.project-syndicate.org

Iraq needs an 'oil for peace' deal- By Nick Butler, Financial Times
Published Sep 12, 2007

The war in Iraq is not, of course, about oil. Coalition troops are there to advance democracy and to protect the innocent. But the consequences for the world's energy markets of an unresolved conflict in a country that holds the

world's third largest accumulation of oil reserves cannot be ignored General David Petraeus's report on the progress of the war could usefully be accompanied by an audit of what regime change has done for the oil sector within Iraq and for global energy security and by some creative thinking on how the country's economic strength can be used in the cause of stability In 2002, before the shooting war began, the consensus in the international oil industry was that Iraq - free of sanctions and with only limited judiciously applied investment - could produce more than 3m barrels a day from existing fields within a matter of months after a transfer of power. The infrastructure was in place and the Iraqi state company was highly competent Its leadership may have been Ba'athist in name but its skill owed more to the pre-revolutionary Iraq Petroleum Company than to any political ideology The engineers who ran the company were pragmatists who had kept oil flowing through the 1980s and 1990s in spite of wars and sanctions A change of regime, it was assumed, would bring increased oil output funding reconstruction and even, on optimistic assumptions repaying the costs of the war. Within a matter of years with the help of international capital and technology Iraq could be producing 4m or 5m b/d - or even more. The reality has been rather different Production in recent months has fallen to less than 2m b/d, of which a good deal is stolen With domestic demand boosted by prices at a fraction of world levels, exports have slipped below 1.5m b/d - well down on pre-war levels The oilfields appear largely undamaged but the infrastructure, including pipelines is ageing, investment since the collapse of the old regime has been minimal and, most important, there has been an exodus of skilled professionals In the short to medium term even sustaining the current level of production looks challenging If the conflict continues, production and exports could well fall sharply. The result of all this is that events in Iraq are contributing to the escalation of oil prices Spare capacity across the world is limited and Iraq is a downside risk in a tight market. Of course, civil wars are about religion and personal enmities, but economic factors can usually be found somewhere in most such conflicts In Iraq, where 60 per cent of gross domestic product and 89 per cent of government revenue comes from one sector, that factor is not hard to find The oilfields in the north around Kirkuk and the fields in the south, outside Basra, will be the prizes in the continuing conflict involving the Madhi army of Moqtada al-Sadr, the peshmerga guerrillas who provide the security for the Kurdish enclave and the residual, if splintered, Sunni forces. If the short-term consequence is increased oil prices, the longer-term impact of what has happened in Iraq is greater insecurity in the world's energy system With about 50m new vehicles on the world's roads each year and no obvious substitute for the oil-driven internal combustion engine in sight, demand for oil is set to increase to more than 100m b/d in the next decade. Sources of supply are becoming dangerously concentrated Output from the North Sea is falling by 10 per cent a year. Alaskan oil production is almost 75 per cent below its 1987 peak. The Caspian and Angola provide some new supplies but the volumes are limited when measured against the growth in consumption especially in Asia. The winners in terms of market share will be Russia and the states around the Persian Gulf - Abu Dhabi, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Iraq. By 2020, on the latest forecasts, Saudi will need to export 17m b/d to meet growing global demand - almost double today's level The dependence on Saudi supplies will be even higher if all the other producers are not delivering at full capacity, which for Iraq means close to 5m b/d. The reserves to achieve this are available, not least from undeveloped giant fields such as Rumaylah, but the institutional structure is not. Perhaps the most useful parting gift that the coalition could leave for future Iraqi governments is a practical model for renewal of the oil sector One way forward would be the creation of an international Iraqi company that recognised Iraqi ownership of resources, the need for global skills and manpower and the value of giving Iraqi citizens a stake in economic renewal. Seventy five per cent of this company would be held by the government in Baghdad, the remainder, after an auction, by a consortium of international companies, perhaps on a fixed-term basis The company would be managed transparently to the highest international standards with a simple strategy designed to increase production from existing and new fields on a progressive basis The foreign companies would receive a fair return on their investment of people and technology leaving part of the Iraqi company's annual surplus after investment to be distributed to Iraqis - a growth dividend which would spread wealth and capital across the country and provide the seed for the economic renewal which is essential if Iraq is to return to stability The creation of a collective interest in peace is of paramount importance. As a slogan "oil for peace" carries some dark ironies. But we have surely learnt over the past five years that a sustainable solution to a complex conflict cannot be won by military means alone.

The Globalization of Ethics
by Hans Kung

2007: www.project-syndicate.org
Many Europeans doubt that Asia can catch up with Europe in terms of regional integration. But Asia not only has the type of stable common ethical foundations that were so important to European integration; it also has a well developed set of moral principles, some of which were an established part of Asian culture long before similar principles were adopted in Europe. Indeed, these Asian principles can serve as a part of an emerging common global ethic.

Of course, Asia does not yet have a cohesive core culture comparable to that of Europe, which is founded on the Judeo-Christian tradition and the Enlightenment. But Europeans ought not to be too arrogant, because, in recent years, that common European culture has itself proven to be fragile, particularly in light of the Bush administration's divide-and-rule strategy pitting "Old Europe" against "New Europe." And, just as the inhuman terror attacks of September 11, 2001 severely damaged Islam's credibility in many people's eyes, the invasion of Iraq, which was based on lies, has damaged both Christianity and the Western community of values.

Although Asia seems to lack Europe's cultural core, there are core ethical constants that have long governed Asian societies and indicate common ethical foundations. Indeed, in some respect, Asia has more experience with intercultural relations than Europe. As early as the third century B.C., Buddhism spread peacefully from India to Sri Lanka and to large parts of Southeast Asia. In the first century C.E., it continued its advance, spreading along the Silk Road to Central Asia and China, and finally made its way to Korea and Japan centuries later.

Ethnically homogeneous Japan is an example of how three different religions – Shinto, Confucianism, and Buddhism – can coexist peacefully and, in many cases, intermingle. Even Islam – which mostly spread in the wake of military conquests in the Middle East, India, and North Africa – expanded rather peacefully into Southeast Asia in the footsteps of merchants, scholars and mystics.

Moreover, there was a historically important and ethically oriented humanism in China as early as the fifth century B.C. The concept of "ren," which corresponds to our "humanum" is a central term in the Chinese tradition.

Likewise, Confucius was the first to formulate the Golden Rule of Reciprocity: "Never impose on others what you would not choose for yourself." Through the spread of Chinese characters, the concept of ren and the Golden Rule spread throughout the vast Chinese-influenced area that reaches from Central Asia to Taiwan and from Korea to Singapore.

This Golden Rule, however, also appears in the Indian tradition. In Jainism, it is stated as: "A man should wander about treating all creatures as he himself would be treated." In Buddhism: "A state that is not pleasant or delightful to me must also be so to him; and a state that is not pleasing or delightful to me, how could I inflict that upon another?" In Hinduism: "One should not behave towards others in a way which is disagreeable to oneself. This is the essence of morality. This "Golden Rule" can also, of course, be found in the Abrahamic religions. Rabbi Hillel (60 B.C.) said: "What is hurtful to yourself do not do to your fellow man." Jesus worded it positively: "So in everything, do to others what you would have them do to you." Islam, too, has a similar concept: "None of you believes until he wishes for his brother what he wishes for himself." Moreover, such commonalities go beyond the principle of humanity and the Golden Rule of Reciprocity. Four concrete ethical rules were laid down in the Buddhist canon by Patanjali, the founder of Yoga, in the Chinese tradition and, of course, in the three prophetic religions: "Do not kill," "do not steal," "do not bear false witness," and "do not abuse sexuality." These trans-cultural ethical rules form structural elements of a common human ethic, whatever we call it, and make almost irrelevant the idea of a deep antagonism between "Asian" and "Western" values. If Asia focuses on its trans-cultural ethical core, an entirely new spirit of unity can be developed that uses soft power instead of military force and does not know enemies, but only partners and competitors. In this way, Asia could catch up with the West in terms of its cultural integration while contributing to the establishment of a genuinely peaceful new world order.

This project differs from the West's human rights movement, which is based on natural law thinking. The point is rather to integrate values, standards, and attitudes of ethical-religious traditions that, while appearing in each culture in a specific form, are common to all, and that can be supported by non-religious people as wel

عولمة الأخلاق

هانز كنغ

بيدي العديد من الأوروبيين الشكوك في قدرة آسيا على اللحاق بأوروبا من حيث التكامل الإقليمي. بيد أن آسيا تتمتع بذلك النوع من الأسس الأخلاقية المشتركة الثابتة، التي شكلت قدراً عظيماً من الأهمية بالنسبة للتكامل الأوروبي؛ هذا فضلاً عن تركيبة ناضجة من المبادئ الأخلاقية، التي شكل بعضها جزءاً راسخاً من الثقافة الآسيوية قبل أن تتبني أوروبا لمبادئ مماثلة بوقت طويل والحقيقة أن هذه المبادئ الآسيوية من الممكن أن تخدم كجزء من النظام الأخلاقي العالمي المشترك الناشئ.

من المؤكد أن آسيا لا تتمتع بعد بثقافة أساسية متماسكة مقارنة بالثقافة الأوروبية، التي قامت على التقاليد المسيحية اليهودية والتنوير. ولكن لا ينبغي للأوروبيين أن يبالغوا في غطرستهم، وذلك لأن هذه الثقافة الأوروبية المشتركة أثبتت هشاشتها أثناء الأعوام الأخيرة، وخاصة في ضوء إستراتيجية "فرّق تَسُدْ" التي تبنتها أوروبا القديمة" في إدارة بوش، والتي وضَعت " مواجهة " أوروبا الجديدة". وتماماً كما تسبب الهجمات الإرهابية غير الإنسانية التي شهدتها أميركا في الحادي عشر من سبتمبر/ أيلول 2001 في إلحاق الضرر الشديد بسمعة الإسلام في نظر العديد من الناس، فقد تسبب غزو العراق، الذي استند إلى أكاذيب واضحة، في إلحاق الضرر بالمسيحية ومجتمع القيم الغربية.

رغم أن آسيا تفتقر إلى الأساس الثقافي الذي تتمتع به أوروبا كما يبدو، إلا أنها تتمتع بثوابت أخلاقية أساسية ظلت تحكم المجتمعات الآسيوية لمدة طويلة من الزمن، وهي ثوابت تشير إلى أسس أخلاقية مشتركة. بل إن آسيا، من بعض الجوانب، تتمتع بقدر أعظم من الخبرة، مقارنة بأوروبا، فيما يتصل بالعلاقات بين الثقافات. ففي القرن الثالث قبل الميلاد انتشرت البوذية بصورة سلمية من الهند إلى سريلانكا ثم إلى أجزاء ضخمة من جنوب شرق آسيا. وفي القرن الأول الميلادي استمرت البوذية في تقدمها، فانتشرت على طول " طريق الحرير" إلى وسط آسيا والصين، وأخيراً وصلت إلى كوريا واليابان بعد قرون.

تشكل اليابان، المتجانسة عرقياً، مثالاً على التعايش السلمي بين الديانات المختلفة - الشنتو، والكونفوشيوسية، والبوذية - بل والاختلاط بين الأديان في العديد من الحالات. وحتى الإسلام - الذي انتشر غالباً في أعقاب غزوات عسكرية للشرق الأوسط، والهند، وشمال أفريقيا - توسع على نحو سلمي إلى جنوب شرق آسيا على إثر خطوات التجار، والعلماء، والصوفيين.

فضلاً عن ذلك، فقد نشأت في الصين في القرن الخامس قبل الميلاد حركة فلسفية إنسانية تبنت توجهات أخلاقية، وكانت على قدر عظيم من الأهمية التاريخية. ومفهوم الـ" رين"، الذي يضاهي مفهوم " هيومنيوم" لدينا، يشكل المصطلح المركزي في التقاليد الصينية.

وعلى نفس المنوال، كان كونفوشيوس أول من صاغ القاعدة الذهبية للتعامل المتبادل: "لا تفرض على الآخرين ما لا يمكنك أن تختاره لنفسك". ومع انتشار حروف الأبجدية الصينية، انتشر مفهوم الـ" رين" و" القاعدة الذهبية" عبر الأراضي الشاسعة التي كانت تحت السيطرة الصينية والتي امتدت من وسط آسيا إلى تايوان ومن كوريا إلى سنغافورة.

91

وتظهر هذه القاعدة الذهبية أيضاً في التقاليد الهندية. ففي العقيدة "الجاينية" جاء نص هذه القاعدة على النحو التالي: "ينبغي للمرء أن يتعامل مع كل المخلوقات على نفس النحو الذي يريده لنفسه". وتقول البوذية: "إن الحالة التي لا تسرني ولا تبهجني لابد وأن تكون كذلك بالنسبة للآخر؛ فكيف لي إذاً أن أفرض على الآخر نفس الحالة التي لا تسرني ولا تبهجني؟". وفي الهندوسية: "يتعين على المرء ألا يتصرف مع الآخرين على النحو الذي لا يريده لنفسه. وهذا هو جوهر الأخلاق".

وبالطبع، نستطيع أن نجد هذه "القاعدة الذهبية" في الديانات المنحدرة عن إبراهيم عليه السلام. فيقول الحبر اليهودي هلال (في العام ستين قبل الميلاد): "ما يضيرك شخصياً لا ينبغي لك أن تفعله مع أخيك الإنسان". ولقد عبر المسيح عليه السلام عن ذلك بطريقة إيجابية في قوله: "في كل ما تفعل، تصرف مع الآخرين كما تود لو يتصرف الآخرون معك". والإسلام أيضاً يقدم نفس المفهوم: "لا يؤمن أحدكم حتى يحب لأخيه ما يحب لنفسه".

فضلاً عن ذلك، فقد ذهبت هذه القواسم المشتركة إلى ما هو أبعد من المبادئ الإنسانية أو القاعدة الذهبية للتعامل المتبادل. فقد أرسى باتانجالي، مؤسس اليوغا، أربعة قواعد أخلاقية راسخة في الشريعة البوذية، وفي التقاليد الصينية. وبالطبع أكدت الديانات السماوية الثلاث على نفس القواعد: "لا تقتل"، و" لا تسرق"، و"لا تشهد زورا"، و"لا تزنِ".

هذه القواعد الأخلاقية التي اشتملت عليها جميع الثقافات والحضارات المشتركة تشكل العناصر البنيوية للأخلاق الإنسانية، أياً كان المسمى الذي قد نطلقه عليها، وهي في نفس الوقت تهدم فكرة الخصومة أو التضاد العميق بين القيم "الآسيوية" و"القيم الغربية". وإذا ما ركزت آسيا على روح جديدة تماماً من جوهرها الأخلاقي العابر للثقافة، فمن الممكن أن تنمو الوحدة. إنها تلك الروح التي تستخدم القوة الناعمة بدلاً من القوة العسكرية، وهي الروح التي لا تعرف الأعداء، بل الشركاء والمنافسين فحسب. وعلى هذا النحو، تستطيع آسيا أن تلحق بالغرب فيما يتصل بتكاملها الثقافي، بينما تساهم في تأسيس نظام عالمي جديد سلمي أصيل.

إن هذا المشروع يختلف عن حركة حقوق الإنسان الغربية، والتي تقوم على أسلوب قانوني في الفكر. فالهدف الأساسي هنا يتلخص في توحيد ودمج القيم، والمعايير والمواقف من التقاليد الدينية الأخلاقية، التي على الرغم من ظهورها في كل ثقافة إنسانية بصورة مختلفة، إلا أنها مشتركة بين الجميع، حتى أن غير المتدينين يؤيدونها ويدعمونها.

VITA

Sumaya Adam Eisa was born in Darfore, Sudan. She graduated from Faculty of Agriculture, University of Khartoum. Since her graduation, she worked as a translator in many research institutions including; Marine Science and Fisheries Centre, Sultanate of Oman and Dubai Consultancy Research & Media Centre, UAE. She an author of Marine Science and Fisheries Dictionary. A dictionary widely used in fisheries and marine centres. She completed her Masters of Arts degree in Arabic/English translation and interpretation at the American University of Sharjah, United Arab Emirates.