

A Pragma-Dialectical Study of David Hare's 'Stuff Happens

Lect. Abdullah Najim Abd Al Khanaif sawy
The General Directorate of Education at Diwaniyah,
Ministry of Education, Iraq
abdullah.najim1980@gmail.com.

Abstract: This study analyzes David Hare's play "Stuff Happens" from pragma-dialectical perspective. The study tries to approach the characters in the light of van Eemeren's pragma-dialectical Model. The study is put to determine the most frequency fallacy committed by the characters of the plays and to show the most utilized speech acts and how these acts highlight the characters' own personalities. The study concludes that the speech acts used in the play are an efficient tool in approaching the characters and the model of analysis used is workable on the data under analysis.

Keywords: pragma-dialectical, speech acts and fallacies

1. Introduction

In Pragma-dialectics account, argumentation is regarded as using language for the sake of convincing other discussions of the (un)acceptability of a certain expressed opinion. This determines that argumentation has communicative and interactive functions that are interrelated. Two of the pragma-dialectical approach features are focusing on regarding argumentation as verbal communication and purposive activity. Argumentation discourse has been studied by focusing descriptively on a verbal use of language communicatively and interactively, with normative standers of reasonableness. Joining the study of communication and interaction descriptively is referred to as pragmatics, discourse analysts concerned with this type of study, with studying argumentation normatively, is resulting in constructing argumentation theory as a branch of "normative pragmatics". Thus, argumentation is studied by focusing on set rules of a critical discussion within the use of speech acts (henceforth SAs).

2. Research Methodology

2.1. Research Problem

The main problem which this study tries to tackle is to show the implementation of pragma-dialectics in literature. The present study tries to analyze David Hare's play, *Stuff Happens*, (henceforth, SH) pragma-dialectically in order to approach the characters by using this notion.

2.2. Research Objectives

The objectives of this study are:

- 1- Determining the committed fallacies by the characters of the play and how is the first in making fallacies.
- 2- Finding out the use of the SAs by the main characters and their role in highlighting the characters' characteristics.

2.3. Research Questions

The study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What is the most frequency fallacy committed by the characters?
2. How are the SAs are efficient in approaching the characters?

2.4. Research Limits

The present research is limited to :

1. The paly '*Stuff Happens*' written by David Hare.
2. Implementing a pragma-dialectical analysis on David Hare's 'Stuff Happens'.
3. Utilizing van Eemeren's pragma-dialectical Model of analysis.

2.5. Data Selection

The choice of the data is based on some reasons:

- (1) To the researcher's best knowledge, no study has been carried out to investigate David Hare's selected plays from pragma-dialectical perspective.
- (2) The play constitutes the data of the study.
- (3) Most of the data is dialogic in nature. The dialogues are built upon arguments.

It is worth mentioning that the arguments under analysis are selected according to their structures, that is, the arguments pass through the four stages of a critical discussion. Thus, the researcher surveys the whole texts of the play and picks out all the arguments that have such stages. In the arguments, only the relevant parts are taken into account, the irrelevant parts are left out. This study consists of 15 arguments from 'Stuff Happens' (2006). The data will be analyzed by using van Eemeren's Model of analysis which consists of four stages with the use of speech acts.

2.6. Research Significance

Linguistics is a wide field and linguists always need to be in touch with every theory, approach or concept. The study is put to be a new trend in analyzing new data. It is supposed that the study will enrich not only linguistic fields, but the literary field of study. In linguistics, it is expected that the students in BS or MA do not have good deal of information about pragma-dialectics, therefore, this study attempts to highlight and widen its scope to cover the literary works.

In literature, the study is expected to be helpful in giving more details about the characters, topics, plots, and the themes in the selected literary work. It explains the way by which the characters in the two plays try to convince their parties to agree with their views by being reasonable, in other words, pragma-dialectically.

3. Theoretical Background

3.1. Pragma- Dialectical Approach of Argumentation

The pragma- dialectical approach (henceforth, PDA) is his key contribution to argumentation theory (henceforth, AT). It is developed to deal with argumentation from a practical stand. It was proposed in a systematic and philosophical structure between the 1970s and the 1990s by van Eemeren and Rob Grootendorst in Amsterdam (van Eemeren et al.,2014:38). Etymologically, the term pragma-dialectic consists of pragma and dialectic. Whereas 'pragma' emanates from the Greek word (πράγμα) which means 'deed, act, enterprise, doing, acting and so forth' (Stydom, 2014: 1), 'dialectic' is derived from the Greek verb 'διαλέγεσθαι' that implies 'discuss' (Kneale and Kneale, 1962: 7). Together, the meaning of pragma-dialectics is *doing discuss*. (Italics added)

In terms of PDA, argumentation is analyzed practically from two perspectives: communicative perspective and critical perspective. Whereas the first is created by pragmatic perceptions from discourse analysis, SAT and ordinary language philosophy, the second is created by dialectical perceptions from dialogic, logic and critical rationalism (van Eemeren et al.,2014:518). The pragmatic aspect is denoted by using SAs in argumentative moves. The dialectical aspect involves two arguers who try to put an end to their arguments by exchanging moves in a discussion (van Eemeren and Grootendorst,1992:9). This integration between pragmatics and dialectics that named the PDA puts the approach in practical stand and differentiates it from AT and puts PDA as the final outcome of AT. Thus, AT is the main source for PDA.

PDA is basically a theory of argumentative discourse which enables the argumentative discourse analysts to create adequate instruments that methodically analyze, evaluate and produce oral and written argumentative discourse (van Eemeren,2018:33).

The PDA has two phases which are the study of verbal communication 'discourse analysis', and the study of the communicative and the interactive aspects of language use, i.e., 'pragmatics' (van Eemeren ,2018:33). The use of SAT in discourse activity together with the critical rationalism and the formal dialectic gives the term PDA its shape. Thus, the PDA results from integrating a communicative angle with a critical angle.

3.2. Stages of a Critical Discussion

The pragma-dialectical program manifests itself in four stages of what is called a critical discussion. A critical discussion, according to van Eemeren et al. (1996:280; 2002:23), is an ideal of an argumentative discourse through which parties aim at finding an end to their difference in views by specifying whether the standpoint(s) have to be accepted or not. Accordingly, the aim of this model is to resolve the difference in opinion. This model consists of four stages: the confrontation, the opining, the argumentation, also the

concluding stage, each of them is featured by specific SAs and rules that have a crucial role in the resolution process of difference in opinion. The model stands up on the foundation that when agreement on whether the standpoint is acceptable or not is reached, a difference in opinion is resolved (van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2004:57). van Eemeren sees that an argument is expected to go through these four stages respectively to resolve the difference of opinion. Resolving process does not mean only agreement with other party but even the disagreement is regarded as a kind of a resolution. In this sense, a settlement is different from resolution, which cannot end up the difference as in a dispute because argumentation needs to be resolved by agreeing with the other party's standpoint or rejecting it (ibid.:58). Reaching a resolution requires a well-ordered and sounded exchange of arguments and criticism between the discussants meanwhile passing through the four stages of a critical discussion.

3.2.1 The Confrontation Stage

In a critical discussion, the confrontation stage is mostly required because a standpoint put under a discussion to resolve the difference of opinion is discussed in this stage. This is the stage of standpoint where the parties express their views, beliefs, thoughts or doubts that need to be resolved through the next three stages. (van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2004: 60).

It is not an essential condition for a person to have completed opposite standpoint, maybe he or she is only not certain about the decrease or increase of the acceptability of a standpoint. Whenever there is an externalized standpoint that shows a real or an objected view, idea, uncertainty or contradiction (s), an alteration in opinion is initiated or supposed to initiate (van Eemeren, 2018:36). This stage starts with one standpoint (or more), and if there is none, there will be no discussion. It is regarded as a spark that initiates the argument.

3.2.2. The Opening Stage

In this stage, the technical and the suitable related argument(s) are specified, in addition to identify the roles of the participants concerning the standpoint(s) either a protagonist or an antagonist (van Eemeren, 2018:36). One or more participants can be the party that takes the position of the protagonist to defend his own standpoint(s), whereas the other participant(s) take(s) the position of the antagonist in order to attack critically the proposed point of view and face the protagonist's defense (van Eemeren and Grootendorst,2004:60).

If there are more than one standpoint is concerned at, one of the parties can act as a protagonist for some standpoints and react as an antagonist for the others. A standpoint (s) need(s) to determine the common starting points that the protagonist and the antagonist are relayed in their exchange. The points of departure can be expressed either implicitly or explicitly. These points are accepted by the parties in order to start their way towards resolving the difference in opinion (van Eemeren,2018:37). Due to the important role of this stage, van Eemeren et al. (1996:282) point out that without the opening stage, there would not be an argumentation. It is worthy to mention that this stage is corresponded with the socialization principle of pragma-dialectical program.

3.2.3. The Argumentation Stage

Significantly, this stage is called so due to the fact that it is the essence of the critical discourse. It is the center of any argument. At this level, the set standpoints concerning an issue are covered with resistances from any criticisms that are attached to them in the opening stage (van Eemeren et al., 2014:38). The antagonist provides further reactions if he /she feels that the other party has not yet accepted of the standpoint. As a result, more defense for the standpoint leads to further argumentations and more complicated structures (van Eemeren and Grootendorst,2004:61).

3.2.4. The Concluding Stage

In this stage, the difference of opinion is resolved and the arguments end up in favour of one of the participants by determining the result. One of the parties, the protagonist or the antagonist, is the winner. In this respect, van Eemeren summarizes this stage by describing it as the win or loss stage, either the protagonist or the antagonist. In the same token, new points of view can lie down and a new argument is started again (Touria DridKasd, 2016).

These four mentioned stages denote the ideal model. Correspondingly, the model has two functions: a heuristic (or analytic) and a critical function. The 'heuristic' function is the tool that the analyst depends on

to explain and interpret certain elements in addition to aspects which are essential in the process of evaluating the argument.

Furthermore, it has a critical function in sense it provides a dependent set of standers which are used to show the extent to which the vary contributions created in the argumentative discourse emerges from a course conductive so that to find a proper end to a difference of view on the merits (van Eemeren, 2018 :35). The model integrates both the rules which control the reasonable aspect and the SAs that have a direct role in deciding the end of a critical discussion.

3.3. Fallacies in Pragma-dialectical Approach

van Eemeren (2010:29) points out that the term 'reasonableness' as a reason that is used in such a way to be suitable in view of the situation regarded. Reasonableness involves ten critical rules that arrange the discussion in a proper way and the relevant SAs that have a vital role in the resolution process.

Additionally, these dialectical rules are considered as a process for showing the acceptability of the standpoint(s). They do not only deal with the relation between the standpoint and its conclusion(s), but also overcome the SAs that are used to present the discussion (van Eemeren et al., 2015: 135-6). Nevertheless, van Eemeren et al. (2002:132-3) state the rules as follows:

Rule 1 (the Freedom Rule): It quotes that parties are obliged not to prevent each other from advancing standpoints or casting doubt on standpoints.

Rule 2 (the Burden of Proof Rule): According to this rule, parties who advance a standpoint are obliged to defend it if the other party asks him/her to do so.

Rule 3 (the Standpoint Rule): A party's attack on a standpoint must relate to the standpoint that has indeed been advanced by the other party.

Rule 4 (the Relevance Rule): A party may defend his standpoint only by advancing argumentation relating to that standpoint.

Rule 5 (the Unexpressed Premise Rule): A party may not falsely present something as a premise that has been left unexpressed by the other party or any premise that he himself has left implicit.

Rule 6 (the Starting Point Rule): A party may not falsely present a premise as an accepted starting point nor deny a premise representing an accepted starting point.

Rule 7: A party may not regard a standpoint as conclusively defended if the defense does not take place by means of an appropriate argumentation scheme that is correctly applied (**the Argument Scheme Rule**).

Rule 8 (the Validity Rule): In an argumentation, a party may only use arguments that are logically valid or capable of being validated by making explicit one or more unexpressed premises.

Rule 9 (the Closure Rule): A failed defense of a standpoint must result in the party that put forward the standpoint retracting it and a conclusive defense in the other party retracting his doubt about the standpoint.

Rule 10 (the Usage Rule): A party must not use formulations that are insufficiently clear or confusingly ambiguous and he must interpret the other party's formulations as carefully and accurately as possible.

van Eemeren et al. (2002:110) affirm that if one follows these rules, he/she certainly resolves a difference of opinion reasonably. Moreover, any violation of these rules will lead to impede the resolution and results in a fallacy. Weigand (2008: 136) defines fallacies are "*arguments that seem valid but are in fact not valid*". The PDA presents a new treatment to fallacies instead of looking at them in boundaries of valid and invalid arguments. For van Eemeren and Grootendorst (1984: 182), a fallacy is "*every violation which may result in the resolving of the dispute being made more difficult or even impossible*". Likewise, Cummings (2010: 165) defines fallacies as violations of dialogical rules. He adds that fallacies must be distinguished from mechanical errors and what linguists call performance errors, that is, errors that arise from inattention, fatigue, drunkenness and the like (ibid.).

Moreover, committing the fallacies results in damaging the value which builds the argumentative discourse. A pragmatic approach is used to show what is fallacious about the fallacies by making allowances for the communicative and interactional situation in which fallacies happen. Unless taking the pragmatic knowledge into account, many fallacies cannot be satisfactorily analyzed (van Eemeren,2001:21). In other words, van Eemeren uses SAs as well as their illocutionary and prelocutionary forces to determine the violations in rules of reasonableness. Thus, fallacies are connected with the critical rules and defined as the SAs that prejudice or frustrate efforts to resolve a difference in opinion on the merits (van Eemeren,2010:193). To

sum up, an argumentative step is considered as a fallacy only if it makes a kind of obstacle in the way of resolving a difference of opinion reasonably.

These rules are in corresponding with the four stages of a critical discussion. Each stage has a number of rules. One rule may belong to more than one stage. van Eemeren (2018:66-7) mentions the destruction of the ten rules of a critical discussion among the four sages and assigns the role of the party who commits the violation, either the protagonist or antagonist or both. Table (1) displays the distribution of the rules of among the four stages a critical discussion.

Violations of the **Freedom Rule** in the confrontation stage by the protagonist or the antagonist.

Violations of the **Obligation to Defend Rule** in the opening stage by the protagonist.

Violations of the **Standpoint Rule** in all stages by the protagonist or the antagonist.

Violations of the **Relevance Rule** in the argumentation stage by the protagonist.

Violations of the **Unexpressed Premise Rule** in the argumentation stage by the protagonist or the antagonist.

Violations of the **Starting Point Rule** in the argumentation stage by the protagonist or the antagonist.

Violations of the **Validity Rule** in the argumentation stage by the protagonist.

Violations of the **Argument Scheme Rule** in the argumentation stage by the protagonist.

Violations of the **Concluding Rule** in the concluding stage by the protagonist or the antagonist.

Violations of the **Language Use Rule** in all discussion stages by the protagonist or the antagonist(ibid.).

Table (1): Rules of Reasonableness among Stages of a Critical Discussion

The Confrontation Stage	The Opening Stage	The Argumentation Stage	The Concluding Stage
Freedom Rule	Obligation to Defend Rule	Standpoint Rule	Standpoint Rule
Standpoint Rule	Standpoint Rule	Relevance Rule	Concluding Rule
Language Use Rule	Language Use Rule	Unexpressed Premise Rule	Language Use Rule
		Starting Point Rule	
		Validity Rule	
		Argument Scheme Rule	
		Language Use Rule	

Thus, reasonableness is achieved by observing the rules that determine the notion of being reasonable in each stage of a critical discussion together with pragma-dialectical SAs that identify whether the argumentative moves are reasonable or unreasonable.

3.4. Speech Act Theory in a Pragma-dialectical Approach

The pragma-dialecticians have proposed an analysis of argumentation through the application of SAT along the four stages of a critical discussion. This can be achieved by regarding the relevant argumentative exchanges as those acts which occupy a vital position in proposing a decision on a difference in viewpoints.

For van Eemeren et al. (2014:5), argumentation is '*complex speech act*'. This definition to argumentation denotes the relationship between SAT and argumentation since argumentation is regarded as a part of the SA activity. van Eemeren and Grootendorst (1987:151) mention that two advantages can be taken from selecting SAT: (i) this theory has the ability to introduce a large coverage to most phases concerning argumentation studies; (ii) the theory has the ability to give regarding to the fact that argumentation is a natural activity used in everyday language.

Likewise, argumentation is verbal activity that aims at approaching a resolution to the different views between or among the parties. This needs the interlocutors to utter sentences, i.e., to make SAs since the basis of SAs theory is uttering utterances. In this concern, Yule (1996:47) defines SAs as "*actions performed via utterances*". He sees apology, compliment and invitation as actions. Pragmatically, argumentation is viewed as a communicative activity used to propose a resolution to difference in

views(ibid.). This activity is expressed in an oral or written forms aiming at creating interaction which is in its turn denotes that argumentation is a part of the study of verbal communication, i.e., discourse analysis. That is, pragma-dialectics concerns with studying argumentation as a discourse activity (van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2004:52).

As have mentioned that argumentation is a performance of complex verbal actions, i.e., SAs. In pragma-dialectical perspective, Searle's (1969) typology of SAs is used. van Eemeren and Grootendorst amend Searle's (1969) original theory of illocutionary acts to be closer to the SAs that are used in argumentation and to establish conditions that are needed to be fulfilled (van Eemeren ,2015:470).

There are points of differences between the original SAs and the van Eemeren's SAs. The basic theory of SA is concerned with the utterance as a unit of language and the explicit illocutionary act, while SAs of argumentation deals with units larger than an utterance (argumentation) and with the explicit and implicit illocutionary acts (van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 1983:23).Moreover, Searle states that there is only one single preposition for each SA such as requesting, as opposite to that in argumentative discourse which may consist of more than one preposition (van Eemeren , 2015:470).

In addition, van Eemeren and Grootendorst (1983:23-4) note that SA of argumentation must be examined from two aspects which are the communicative aspect, i.e. the illocutionary act, and the interactional aspect, i.e., the prelocutionary act. By performing an illocutionary act, the speaker aims to get his listener understood his purpose and doing so whereas by a prelocutionary act, the listener tries to elicit a verbal or otherwise respond or to effect his listener. Performing SA of argumentation intends to elicit understanding and acceptance explicitly or implicitly, verbally or non-verbally. The lines above display that van Eemeren modifies the SAT to go with his approach.

In PDA, the ideal model of critical discussion specifies argumentation moves that used to put a final decision to differences of views as well as the appropriate SAs that is used to make the argumentative moves. van Eemeren (2018:39) describes these SAs pragma-dialectically as follows:

1. Assertive SAs are used to state a standpoint, advance argumentation, retrace a standpoint, and to establish the result of the discussion.
2. Directive SAs are used to set an end to the difference of opinion critically, directives are used to call for a declarative usage and argumentation.
3. Commissive SAs are used to determine the (un)acceptability of standpoint, accepting to, attack a standpoint, start a discussion, determine the participant's roles, agree to obey the discussion rules and premises, (un)accept argumentation, acknowledge or reject the standpoint, and to start a new argumentation (van Eemeren and Grootendorst,2004:63-5).
4. Declarative SAs have no proper function. Instead, usage declarative SAs are subtypes of declaratives used to 'regulate the linguistic usage' and to have vital position in ending up the discussion in a reasonable way (van Eemeren,2018:41). Their main purpose is to decrease or increase the reader/listener's understanding of other SAs via identifying the way by which these acts are understood, i.e., they need the authority of the addresser and they do not help straightly in resolution process. These usage declaratives are definition, precization, explication, and amplification (van Eemeren, 2004:66).
5. Expressive SAs: Pragma-dialectically, these acts do not have a direct effect on the resolution process (van Eemeren, 2018: 41).

In order to use the SAT in a way that is appropriate in pragma-dilaectical perspective, van Eemeren and Grootendorst use both Searlean (1969) and Gricean (1975) insights. Concerning Searle's view (1969), he sees that every SAs have a communicative function which can be identified by the interaction of the speaker(s)/ the writer(s) and the rules that govern the performance of a certain SA, i.e., 'felicity conditions. Otherwise, Grice (1975) views that there are reasonable rules that the speaker(s) /the writer(s) have to follow them in order to interact properly. For Grice (1975), the use of language is governed with a Cooperative Principle and a set of maxims. Therefore, van Eemeren and Grootendorst take these two insights and modify them to go with their new approach, i.e., PDA as these insights correspond with each other (van Eemeren and Grootendorst,2004:75-6).

The combination of Searlean (1969) insight that reflects the communicative side of language use as well as Gricean (1975) insight that shows the interactional side are regarded as a basis for analyzing the

argumentative discourse from pragma-dialectical perspective. To combine these two insights, van Eemeren and Grootendorst reform the Gricean Cooperation Principle (1975) into Communication Principles (1969) which are: clarity, honesty, efficiency and relevance (van Eemeren and Grootendorst,2004:76). It is not common to observe all the principles because most times there is a violation of one or more of these principles. Taking these principles as a starting point result in specifying five specific and practical rules of language use that can work as alternative SAs to that of Gricean maxims (1975). According to van Eemeren and Grootendorst (2004 :75-77), these rules are:

- 1.You must not perform any speech acts that are incomprehensible.
- 2.You must not perform any speech acts that is insincere (or for which you cannot admit responsibility).
- 3.You must not perform any speech acts that is redundant.
- 4.You must not perform any speech acts that is meaningless.
- 5.You must not perform any speech acts that is not in an appropriate way connected with the previous speech act (by the same speaker or writer or by the interlocutor) or the communicative situation.

The first rule meets both the clarity principle and the propositional content in addition to the identity conditions. The second one integrates both the honesty principle and sincerity conditions and correctness conditions. Third and fourth rules have the criteria of efficiency principle and preparatory conditions. The fifth one is concerned with the relevance principle. This rule is not corresponded with any SA conditions and it is not used to perform any SAs, but it bears the relationship between them (van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2004 :7-78). It is a support rule that is used to link the performance of the SAs.

However, the standards of reasonableness allow the achievement of particular SAs in the stages of a critical discussion. These standards established in a set of dialectical rules which start from the Freedom Rule that is placed in the confrontation stage to the Concluding Rule in the concluding stage.

4. Material and Method

4.1. Pragma-dialectical Analysis of Stuff Happens

4.1.1. Argument one between a Journalist and Rumsfeld

The argument holds between a journalist and Rumsfeld, the American Secretary of Defense, when the former asks for a comment on the events in Baghdad after the American invasion.

After invading Iraq in 2003 and changing the regime, Rumsfeld is asked by a journalist (whose gender is unknown) to comment on widespread looting and pillaging that followed the American conquest of Baghdad - Friday April 11th, 2003. It is important to mention that the journalist has no proper name in order to be a model to the whole people that asking the same questions as his/hers. Here presents a journalist character for the purpose of finding out the truth. However, the argument initiates with the journalist's question "*What's your response, sir? Mr. Secretary, how do you respond to the news of looting and pillaging in Baghdad?*" (SH, 1.2.p.3). In this argument, the journalist uses a directive SA to motivate Rumsfeld to be clear during the description of the situation (Requesting for argumentation).

For the rules of a critical discussion, the journalist accurately adopts these rules as he puts his standpoint freely and clearly which is the question about the reason behind the chaos after the war against Iraq.

The opening starts with Rumsfeld's response. By asking the question, the journalist takes the role of antagonist whereas Rumsfeld takes the opposite role. By using assertive SAs "*I've seen the pictures. I've seen those pictures. I could take pictures in any city in America. Think what's happened in our cities when we've had riots, and problems, and looting*" (SH, 1.2.p.3) Rumsfeld explicates the matters of news of looting and pillaging in Iraq.

Regarding rules of a critical discussion, Rumsfeld does not follow the rules since he breaks the tenth rule, i.e., the Usage Rule through opening his argument which lacks transparency. He does not answer the question directly; instead, he refers to the pictures of looting and pillaging.

In the argumentation stage, Rumsfeld advances his argument that is related to commenting on looting and pillaging events that occur in Iraq after invasion by using an assertive SA to reject the protest "*Stuff happens! But in terms of what's going on in that country, it is a fundamental misunderstanding to see those images over and over and over again of some boy walking out with a vase and say, 'Oh, my goodness, you didn't have a plan.'*" (SH, 1.2. p.3). He follows that with other assertive SAs "*...freedom's untidy and free*

people are free to make mistakes and commit crimes and do bad things. They're also free to live their lives and do wonderful things" (SH, 1.2.p.4). He also claims that what is happening in Iraq is freedom.

As far as rules of a critical discussion are concerned, Rumsfeld does not mind the rules because of violating the Validity Rule. That is to say, he does not provide sufficient reasons for widespread looting and pillaging that followed the American invasion of Iraq; instead, he says that "*Stuff happens!*" (SH, 1.2.p.3).

The argument finishes with Rumsfeld's comment on the events of looting and pillaging in Iraq. He presents an assertive SA to state "*and that's what's going to happen here*" (SH, 1.2.p.4) and to denote that looting and pillaging deeds are expected to take place due to the freedom that people enjoy after long years of dictatorship and oppression under the previous regime. The argument ends up in favor to Rumsfeld as he completes his argument totally and the journalist does not ask more questions.

As far as the of rules of a critical discussion are concerned, Rumsfeld accurately adopts them, that is to say, he ends up the argument with clear depending on the advanced standpoint "*and that's what's going to happen here*" (SH, 1.2.p.4).

4.1.2. Argument ten between Bush and Cheney

Bush, Powell, Rice, Tenet, Rumsfeld and Cheney meet to discuss the UN support with US war on Iraq. Cheney holds his argument to propose a way to put UN under pressure as long as UN wants reliable evidence against Iraq to support the war.

The main point of the whole argument can be considered as an attempt to suggest a reasonable to change for Bush's decision to go into war against Iraq since the UN may reject such decision. The standpoint is put by Cheney as "*The decisions been made and I'm going to offer a notion of how it should be presented. I mean, to the world.*" (SH,1.13. p.59). Cheney makes use of an assertive SA to present his intention offering a way to tell the world about the decision which is purely an American decision.

From rules of a critical discussion concern, Cheney presents his standpoint freely and clearly. Besides, he effectively shows the listeners how bad the situation is "*I don't think anyone in this room begins to understand what we've let ourselves in for.*" (SH ,1.13. p. 59). He tells Bush administration that he has an idea about presenting the decision which is established by Bush to the public "*The decisions been made and I'm going to offer a notion of how it should be presented. I mean, to the world.*" (SH ,1.13. p. 59). Thus, Cheney minds the rules of this stage which portray his reasonableness.

The opining starts with performing an assertive SA by Cheney. As opposite to Bush's role, Cheney is the protagonist of this argument "*The way we do this is: Crisis at the UN.*" (SH,1.13. p.59). With reference to rules of a critical discussion, he logically and clearly presents his way "*The way we do this is: Crisis at the UN.*" (SH,1.13. p.59). Thus, he follows the rules of a critical discussion.

As the argumentation stage initiates, Cheney goes ahead in presenting his way to "*Crisis at the UN.*" (SH,1.13. p.59). He uses directive SAs in the sense that he asks some questions for attacking the role of the UN from Saddam Hussein's bad actions "*Does the UN still have a role? That's the question. Is the UN an East River chattering factory? Is it an expensive irrelevance? Is this or is this not an organization which still has the authority to enforce its own resolutions? Does it have the chops?*" (SH,1.13. p.59). He follows that by using assertive SAs to sustain his questions "*we'll go through the UN. We go to the UN. We walk right in that glass door. Yes, we're supporting the UN.*" (SH,1.13. p.59). Consequently, he argues that America supports the UN "*Sure, we support the UN.*" (SH,1.13. p.59). Finally, he uses a directive SA to ask "*Can the UN deliver?*" (SH,1.13. p.59). In this way, he wants to assert that there is a crisis at UN.

Furthermore, Cheney maintains the rules of rules of a critical discussion in the sense that he puts his argumentation forward in relation to his plan to "*Crisis at the UN.*" (SH,1.13. p.59) by asking certain questions with no answers.

In the concluding stage, Cheney's idea gets accepted from Bush as he says "*I think it's good. This way it's not about us. It's about them. That's good. We put the monkey on Kofi Annan's back.*" (SH,1.13. p.59). Thus, he performs an assertive SA to express his agreement with what Cheney presents. With reference to the rules of a critical discussion, Bush is convinced by Cheney when he agrees with the standpoint mentioning "*I think it's good.*" (SH,1.13. p.59).

4.2. Results and Discussion of Stuff Happens

Starting from the fallacies, the characters show variations in committing the fallacies. In this way, they violate the rules of being reasonable. Table (2) shows the frequency of committing fallacies by the characters.

Table (2) The frequency of committing Fallacies by the Characters.

The character's Name	The Violated Rule		
		No.	Per.
Bush	Starting Point	1	9,09 %
Blair	Usage Rule, Burden-of-proof Rule, Relevance Rule, Usage Rule , Unexpressed Premises Rule	5	45,46 %
Rumsfeld	Usage Rule + Validity Rule	2	18,18%
Wolfowitz	Usage Rule +Usage Rule	2	18,18%
Rice	Usage Rule	1	9,09%
Total		11	100%

The results show that Bush's staff commit more fallacies than the other characters as there are eleven fallacies and the Usage Rule is committed five times. Blair is the first in violating the rules of a critical discussion in a percentage of (45,46%). Both Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz commit two fallacies. Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz's percentage is (18.18%). Rice has the lowest percentage in (9,09%).

Concerning the use of SAs by the characters, the results of four SAs, *assertive, directive, commissive and usage declarative* SAs, each character uses more percentage of certain SAs than the others. Table (3) displays the use of these speech acts by the characters.

Table (3) The use of these speech acts by the characters.

The character's Name	Assertive		Directive		Commissive		Usage Declarative	
	No.	Per.	No.	Per.	No.	Per.	No.	Per.
Bush	21	10,76%	9	4,61%	6	3,07%	0	0%
Powell	13	6,66%	9	4,61%	1	0,51%	0	0%
Blair	20	10,25%	1	0,51%	0	0%	0	0%
Rumsfeld	11	5,64%	2	1,02%	0	0%	0	0%
Blix	5	2,56%	3	1,53%	2	1,02%	0	0%
Wolfowitz	16	8,20%	7	3,58%	0	0%	0	0%
Cheney	16	8,20%	7	3,58%	0	0%	0	0%
Tenet	8	4,10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Rice	3	1,53%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
An Iraqi Exile	13	6,66%	2	1,03%	0	0%	0	0%
A Journalist	12	6,15%	2	1,03%	0	0%	0	0%
A Palestinian Academic	1	0,51%	4	2,06%	0	0%	6	3,08%
Total	134	68,71	46	23,60	9	4,61	6	3,08%

Bush is the first in using assertive and commissive SAs as he does (10,76 %) assertive SAs as well as he does (3,07%) commissive SAs and (0%) usage declarative SAs. Using assertive SAs denote that Bush uses his sanctified beliefs. Using commissive SAs clarifies that he does not find difficulty in revealing his convincingness. By using directive SAs, Bush has the upper hand over his arguers due to his position as a president. He never uses usage declarative SAs and this shows that Buh does not care about expressing himself to the arguers. Thus, Bush is not a solid character as he shows assentation and domination and then gives up at the end of his arguments. Powell uses more assertive SAs than the other SAs. This denotes that Powell trusts his opinions. He uses directive SAs equally to Bush's use of the same SAs to show that Powell has a position and he is as effective as a president. He uses a low percentage of commissive SAs and this reflects that Powell is indirect in showing his convince. There is no use of usage declarative SAs and this reveals that he does not concern with his arguers' understanding as he does not give explanations. Accordingly, Powell is a firm character with high self-esteem.

Blair uses a high percentage of assertive SAs (10,25%), while he uses a low percentage of directive SAs. By using assertive SAs, Blair trusts his views. His use directive SAs reveals that Blair has no power on his arguers. The difference in using assertive and directive SAs shows that Blair is pretending confidence. He never uses commissives and usage declarative SAs and this denotes that he does not care about neither showing acceptance nor refusal besides giving explanations.

Wolfowitz and Cheney use an equal percentage of SAs, i.e. (8,20%) assertive SAs and (3,58%) directive SAs with no use of both commissive and usage declarative SAs. That is to say, Wolfowitz and Cheney argue with their strong trust in their opinions. They have low degree of domination over their arguers.

Rumsfeld uses more assertive acts than directive ones. He uses (5,64%) percentage of assertive and this reveals that he is interested in giving his opinion assertively. He almost has no power on his arguers as he does not direct others to what he wants. Concerning the other SAs, i.e., commissive and usage declarative SAs, Rumsfeld never uses these two acts to indicate that he is careless about putting things clearly and showing his attitudes from the ongoing arguments.

Blix uses a relatively similar percentage of both assertive and directive SAs. This indicates that he is a stable character and makes balance between asserting his opinions and directing others in his arguments. Concerning usage declarative SAs, Blix shows that he does not need to give others any explanations. He uses a very low percentage of commissive SAs (1,02%) and this exposes that Blix can admit when he likes or dislikes certain arguments.

Rice and Tenet are not interested in performing directive SAs as they do not use any of these acts. This tells us that these two characters have no power on any other arguers and they are not effective in making the decision of war with Iraq. Concerning commissive SAs, both Rice and Tenet do not use any of these two acts. This is back to the reality that these characters have less ability to admit themselves directly by using the commissive SAs. Additionally, they never use any usage declarative SAs. This shows that they do not care about their arguers' understanding.

The Journalist and the Iraqi exile have similar characters as they use almost the same percentages of SAs. They use more assertive SAs than directive SAs. This points out that they depend on the trust in their views in arguing more than on showing dominance. As far as commissive and usage declarative SAs are concerned, the Journalist and the Iraqi exile show that they are not interested in giving details or showing clear position from the arguments. That is to say, they are angry concerning the war against Iraq.

The Palestinian Academic is the last one who uses assertive SAs (0,51%). This reveals that this character does not argue with her opinions, but with directing others to support her opinion by using (2,06%) directive SAs. She is the first who uses usage declarative SA (3,09%) to indicate that she prefers to give clarifications because she wants to get more clarifications.

5 Conclusions

The study ends up with a number of conclusions:

- 1.The most committed fallacy is the Usage Rule and Blair is the first in committing fallacies.
- 2.Bush is the first in using assertive and commissive SAs.
- 3.The use of SAs reveals the characters' personality
- 4.The model is applicable on such literary discourse.

References

1. Cummings, L. (2010). *The pragmatics encyclopedia*. New York: Routledge.
2. Dridkasd, T. (2016). "A Pragma-Dialectical Approach to Argumentative Discourse". *Khazar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 19 (4), 20-35.
3. Kneale, W., and Kneale, M. (1962). *The development of logic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
4. Stydom, P. (2014). "Cross-Currents of Pragmatism and Pragmatics: A Sociological Perspective on Practices and Forms". *IBA Journal of Management & Leadership* 5(2), pp. 20-36.
5. van Eemeren, F. (2004). *A systematic theory of argumentation: the pragma-dialectical approach*. Cambridge: CUP.
6. van Eemeren, F. (2018). *Argumentation Theory: A Pragma-Dialectical Perspective*. Springer International Publishing AG.

7. van Eemeren, F. (2001). *Crucial concepts in argumentation theory*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
8. van Eemeren, F. (2010). *Strategic maneuvering in argumentative discourse*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
9. van Eemeren, F. (2015). *Reasonableness and effectiveness in argumentative discourse: Fifty Contributions to the Development of Pragma-Dialectics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
10. van Eemeren, F. and Grootendorst, R. (1987). "Fallacies in pragma-dialectical perspective". In Walton, D. (1995). *A Pragmatic Theory of Fallacy Studies in Rhetoric and Communication*. Alabama: University of Alabama Press. 283-301.
11. van Eemeren, F. and Grootendorst, R. (1992). *Argumentation, communication, and Fallacies: a pragma-dialectical perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
12. van Eemeren, F. and Grootendorst, R. (1983). *Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussion*. Dordrecht-Holland/Cinnaminson-U.S. :Foris Publications.
13. van Eemeren, F. and Grootendorst, R. (1984). *Speech acts in argumentative discussions*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
14. van Eemeren, F. and Grootendorst, R. and Henkemans, F. (2002). *Argumentation analysis, evaluation, presentation*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
15. van Eemeren, F. and Grootendorst, R. and Henkemans, F., Blair, J.A., Johnson, R. H., Krabbe, E. C.W. (1996). *Fundamentals of argumentation theory: A handbook of historical backgrounds and contemporary developments*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
16. van Eemeren, F. and Houlosser, P. (2002). *Dialectic and rhetoric: The warp and woof of argumentation analysis*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
17. van Eemeren, F., Garssen, B., Krabbe, E., Henkemans, F., Verheij, B. and Wagemans, J. (2014). *Handbook of argumentation theory*. Dordrecht: Springer.
18. Weigand, E. (2008). *Dialogue and Rhetoric*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
19. Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.