

**Legitimization and Delegitimization
Strategies in the Arab Quartet's
Boycott of Qatar: A Cross-
Linguistic Study**

By

Dr. Marwa Mohamed Khamis El-Zouka

**Associate Professor
English Department
Faculty of Arts
Alexandria University**

Abstract

The present study examines the (de) legitimization strategies used in the statements made by diplomats from Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain and Egypt, the four Arab states that severed ties with Qatar on June 5, 2017 for supporting and funding terrorism, in interviews, press conferences, and UN Security Council meetings. It also examines these strategies in the statements made by the U.S. State Department spokesperson in Department press briefings. Employing van Leeuwen's (2007) and Reyes' (2011) (de) legitimization strategies, the study also investigates the linguistic devices used to realize the (de)legitimization strategies as well as the functions that these strategies and their linguistic realizations fulfill. The study shows that diplomats from the Arab quartet use a number of (de)legitimization strategies, such as *authorization*, *moral evaluation*, *a hypothetical future*, and *altruism*, to directly and explicitly legitimize the decision to boycott Qatar and delegitimize its policies. It also reveals that the U.S. indirectly and implicitly delegitimizes boycotting Qatar, and explicitly legitimizes Qatar's efforts to fight terrorism and extremism as well as Kuwait's mediation efforts. The study develops the strategy of *posing unanswered questions* which is used to legitimize some actions and delegitimize others.

Keywords: Qatar crisis – the Arab quartet – U.S. State Department – (de) legitimization strategies – political discourse

المخلص

استراتيجيات الشرعية واللاشرعية في مقاطعة الرباعي العربي لقطر: دراسة لغوية مقارنة

يهدف البحث إلي دراسة استراتيجيات الشرعية واللاشرعية المستخدمة في البيانات التي أدلي بها دبلوماسيون من السعودية والإمارات العربية المتحدة والبحرين ومصر، وهي الدول الأربع التي قطعت علاقتها مع قطر في الخامس من يونيو ٢٠١٧ بسبب دعمها وتمويلها للإرهاب، في اللقاءات التلفزيونية والمؤتمرات الصحفية واجتماعات مجلس الأمن التابع للأمم المتحدة. كما يدرس البحث الاستراتيجيات التي يتم استخدامها في البيانات التي أدلي بها المتحدث باسم وزارة الخارجية الأمريكية في إحاطات صحفية خاصة بالوزارة. ويقوم البحث أيضا بدراسة الأدوات اللغوية المستخدمة لإعمال استراتيجيات الشرعية واللاشرعية، وكذلك وظائف هذه الاستراتيجيات وأدواتها باستخدام الاستراتيجيات التي وضعها كل من فان لوين (٢٠٠٧) ورايس (٢٠١١). وتوضح الدراسة أن الدبلوماسيين من الرباعي العربي يقومون باستخدام عدد من استراتيجيات الشرعية واللاشرعية مثل التفويض والتقييم الأخلاقي والمستقبل الافتراضي والإيثار بشكل مباشر وصريح لإضفاء الشرعية علي قرار مقاطعة قطر ونزع هذه الشرعية عن الجانب القطري بسبب سياساته. كما تظهر الدراسة أن الولايات المتحدة تنزع الشرعية عن مقاطعة قطر بشكل غير مباشر وبصورة ضمنية، وتضفي الشرعية علي جهود قطر في محاربة الإرهاب والتطرف وكذلك علي جهود الوساطة الكويتية بشكل صريح. كما يضيف البحث استراتيجية طرح أسئلة دون أجوبة يتم استخدامها لشرعنة بعض الأفعال ونزع الشرعية عن البعض الآخر.

1. Introduction

Political discourse is an activity that is inherently linguistic in nature as politicians employ language to inform audiences about the decisions made and actions taken with regard to important political issues. The aim is to legitimize these decisions and actions so as to explain, justify and hence convince others that they are right, lawful, desirable and a must since they are for the good not only of certain countries but also of the world community. This act of legitimization, which is a key concept in political discourse, involves an act of delegitimization that serves to present others negatively, and their actions and policies as unlawful and can do harm to the whole world.

One major political issue that has recently received wide attention is the Qatar crisis which started on June 5, 2017. Four countries, namely Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain and Egypt, severed relations with Qatar due to its support of terrorism and extremist Islamist groups classified as terrorist organizations, such as the Muslim Brotherhood. The Arab quartet also cut diplomatic ties with Qatar because it finances and provides safe havens to terrorist groups, incites hatred and violence, and interferes in the internal affairs of these countries as well as in those of other countries. Since the crisis started, diplomats from the four boycotting countries have sought to explain and justify, i.e. legitimize their joint decision and actions against Qatar, and delegitimize its policies that drove them to end relations with it. The U.S. State Department also made statements that reveal whether it legitimizes or delegitimizes the decision and actions of the four countries. The present study examines the (de) legitimization strategies employed by diplomats from the four Arab states and the U.S. State Department spokesperson in statements made on the Qatar crisis as well as the linguistic realizations of these strategies. It also examines the functions fulfilled by the (de) legitimization strategies and their linguistic realizations.

2. Aims of the Study

Because legitimization is considered a type of justification, it is tackled "in connection with courses of action: we ought to do x (or action x is legitimate) because it conforms to certain norms or values that we adhere to" (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012, p. 109). Accordingly, the justification involved in legitimization has "one particularity, namely to invoke *publicly shared and publicly justifiable*, and sometimes even highly formalized, codified, institutional system of beliefs, values and norms, in virtue of which the action proposed is considered legitimate" (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012, p. 109). Moreover, legitimization, which is prototypically political, is employed when politicians seek to justify their decisions, policies or actions when they expect opposition or criticism (van Dijk, 1998). It is especially required in contexts of "controversial actions, accusations, doubts, critique or conflict" (Rojo & van Dijk, 1997, p. 561). Thus, (de) legitimization is essential in managing crises as politicians use this technique to show that "'our' actions and policies were correct and beneficial, and 'their' actions deviant and threatening to the country" (Rojo & van Dijk, 1997, p. 560). In this regard, the present study attempts to answer the following research questions:

- 1- What are the (de) legitimization strategies used in statements made by diplomats from the Arab quartet as well as in the ones made by the U.S. State Department spokesperson to (de) legitimize boycotting Qatar and its policies?
- 2- What are the linguistic devices used to realize the (de) legitimization strategies?
- 3- What functions do the (de) legitimization strategies and their linguistic realizations serve?

3. Data and Methodology

The data of the present study consists of the statements made by diplomats from the Arab quartet that cut off diplomatic relations with Qatar on June 5, 2017. More specifically, the data comprises the interviews conducted with the foreign ministers of the four boycotting countries in which they tackled the issue in question, the joint press conferences held by the foreign ministers of the quartet in Cairo on July 5, 2017 and in Manama (Bahrain) on July 30, 2017 as well as a joint press conference held on July 19, 2017 in Baghdad between Egyptian Foreign Minister, Sameh Shoukry, and Ibrahim Al-Jaafri, his Iraqi counterparty. The statements made by Egypt's representatives in the UN are also analyzed. The representatives are Ihab Moustafe, Egypt's Deputy Ambassador to the UN, and Amr Abdellatif Aboulatta, Egypt's Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the UN since 2014 and Chair of the UN Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee. The statements made by the Arab diplomats are all in Modern Standard Arabic (MSA). Analysis of this authentic Arabic data, rather than its English-translated version, is carried out in this study. The statements issued by the U.S. State Department on the Qatar crisis are also examined as the U.S. has been sending mixed messages on the dispute between the quartet and Qatar since the beginning of the crisis. These statements are made by Hethaer Nauert, spokesperson of the U.S. Department of State, during Department press briefings.

The Arabic data has been obtained from YouTube whereas the English data has been downloaded from the website of the U.S. Department of State. The data collected covers the period from June 2017 to July 2017 as the crisis began on June 5, 2017 and was at its peak during these two months. It was also during this period that important statements were made by the U.S. State Department and diplomats from the four boycotting countries in interviews, joint press conferences and the U.N. Security Council meetings. The total number of statements made by diplomats from the quartet and which are

analyzed in the present study is 15. The number of press briefings in which the U.S. State Department spokesperson made statements about the Qatar crisis from June to July 2017 is 11.

The present study adopts a qualitative methodological approach. To analyze the collected data, van Leuwen's (2007) and Reyes' (2011) (de) legitimization strategies are employed. The qualitative approach as well as van Leeuwen's and Reyes' strategies have been chosen as they are deemed more suitable for the purposes of the current research, and help yield an in-depth analysis of the data. Instances of legitimization and delegitimization strategies and their linguistic realizations are identified in the data. Significant examples that are representative of the strategies, the linguistic devices used to realize them in the data, and the functions fulfilled by the strategies and their linguistic realizations are given and elucidated.

4. Theoretical Background

In political discourse, language and politics are closely related since politics has "a linguistic, discursive and communicative dimension" (Chilton, 2004, p. 4). This entails that any "political activity does not exist without the use of language" (p. 60). Thus, language plays a key role in political discourse analysis whose aim is to seek "the ways in which language choice is manipulated for specific political effect" (Wilson, 2001, p. 410). Indeed, politicians employ language to reconcile differences through persuasion, discussion, bargaining and eliciting support for collective decisions, and thus legitimize political actions, goals and what is presented as right or wrong (Chilton, 2004, p. 5; Hague, Harrop, & Breslin, 1998, pp. 3-4; Reyes, 2011, p. 784). Moreover, some political problems can "be studied more completely and sometimes more adequately when it is realized that the issues have an important discursive dimension" (van Dijk, 1997, p. 12). This is the case in legitimization which is one crucial concept in political discourse that is discursively constructed and is essential for political communication. It is also argumentative in

nature as it involves deliberation and an appeal to reason (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012; Fonseca & Ferreira, 2015).

Legitimization is defined as "the creation of a sense of positive, beneficial, ethical, understandable, necessary or otherwise acceptable action in a specific setting" (Vaara, 2014, p. 503). It is a crucial function of language use and involves "providing good reasons, grounds, or acceptable motivations for past or present action that has been or could be criticized by others" (van Dijk, 1998, p. 255). In legitimization, speakers attempt to win "accreditation for social actions and relations" (Hart, 2014, p. 7). They tend to explain and clarify why they act in a certain way and why this action is reasonable or desirable. In other words, legitimization justifies actions, decisions and policies (van Dijk, 1998, p. 256). Thus, legitimization "is public justification, an argumentative process in which an action is justified in terms of reasons which can themselves, in turn, be justified as (worthy of being) collectively accepted or recognized" (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012, p. 242). There are two levels of justification involved in legitimization. These are "justification of action in virtue of some reason and a justification of that reason in virtue of a publicly recognized system of norms, values, beliefs" (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012, p. 110). In other words, speakers legitimize actions by showing that they conform to certain norms, beliefs and social values (Ross & Rivers, 2017, p. 3).

According to van Leeuwen (2007), legitimization provides "answers to the question 'Why' – 'Why should we do this?' and 'Why should we do this in this way?'" (p. 93). Answering those questions requires providing the type of reasoning of the form "we ought to do *x* because of *y*" so as to persuade hearers that a particular action, stance or viewpoint are right (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012, p. 110; Fonseca & Ferreira, 2015, p. 685). To this end, legitimization techniques include "arguments about voters' wants, general ideological principles, charismatic leadership projection, boasting about performance and positive self-presentation" (Chilton, 2004, p. 46).

The discourse of legitimization goes hand in hand with delegitimization which is seen as "discursively creating and transmitting a negative image of the Other" (Screti, 2013, p. 212). Delegitimization involves challenging the opponents' policies and showing that they are incongruous with values and norms as they lack any positive, beneficial or ethical acts (Ross & Rivers, 2017; Steffek, 2003). Delegitimization techniques involve presenting the other negatively using "ideas of difference and boundaries, and speech acts of blaming, accusing, insulting, etc." (Chilton, 2004, p. 46).

Speakers legitimize their own policies, actions and decisions, and delegitimize those of their opponents using a number of strategies which "can be used in either predetermined or unprompted way" (Ali, Christopher, & Nordin, 2016, p. 78). These strategies are "specific, not always intentional or conscious, ways of employing different discourses or discursive resources to establish legitimacy" (Vaara, Tienari, & Laurila, 2006, p. 794). According to Chilton (2004), legitimization strategies include "positive self-presentation, manifesting itself in acts of self-praise, self-apology, self-explanation, self-justification as a source of authority, reason, vision and sanity..." (p. 47). Strategies of delegitimization involve "acts of negative other-presentation, acts of blaming, scape-goating, marginalizing, excluding, attacking the moral character of some individual or group, attacking the communicative cooperation of the other, attacking the rationality and sanity of the other" (Chilton, 2004, p. 47).

Van Leeuwen (2007) proposes a framework in which he distinguishes four strategies of (de) legitimization and their linguistic realizations. These strategies are: *authorization*, *moral evaluation*, *rationalization* and *mythopoesis*. They are defined as a "way in which language functions and is used for the construction of legitimacy" (Vaara & Tienari, 2008, p. 988). According to van Leeuwen (2007), these strategies "can occur separately or in combination. They can be used to legitimize, but also to de-legitimize, to critique ... And they are all realized by specific linguistic resources and configurations of

linguistic resources" (p. 92).

4.1 Authorization

Van Leeuwen (2008) characterizes legitimization as an answer to the "spoken or unspoken 'why' questions – 'Why should we do this?' or 'Why should we do this in this way?'" (p. 106). *Authorization* provides an answer to those questions by indicating the appropriate personal or impersonal authority held by an individual, government, organization or law. This is indicated by van Leeuwen (2008) who holds that *authorization* refers to "legitimization by reference to the authority of tradition, custom, law, and/or persons in whom institutional authority of some kind is vested" (p. 105). Thus, answers to the above questions can be "because I say so", where the authority is assigned to a person or "because so – and – so says so", where the authority is vested in a government, organization, rule or law (Ali et al., 2016; van Leeuwen, 2007).

Authorization is divided into six categories: *personal authority*, *expert authority*, *role model authority*, *impersonal authority*, the *authority of tradition*, and the *authority of conformity*. In *personal authority*, legitimate authority is assigned to individuals who, due to their status or position, do not have to explain or justify their actions or what they ask others to do except by saying "because I say so". However, they can provide reasons if they wish to do so. *Personal authority* legitimization is linguistically realized using verbal process clauses in which the utterance of the person in authority includes obligation modality (e.g. Magnus sat down. Because the teacher said they had to) (Ali et al., 2016, p. 78; van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 94, 2008, p. 106).

In *expert authority*, expertise, rather than status, provides legitimization. This expertise may be stated explicitly or taken for granted if the expert is a key figure in a given field. *Expert authority* is realized via verbal or mental process clauses. In this case, the expert occupies the subject position (e.g. Some experts say it is best to kiss

the child, not look back and go; Dr. Juan believes it may be a good idea to spend some time with the child in class) (Sadeghi, Hassani, & Jalali, 2014, p. 1583; van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 95, 2008, p. 107).

In *role model authority*, "people follow the example of role models or opinion leaders ... and the mere fact that these role models adopt a certain kind of behavior, or believe certain things, is enough to legitimize the actions of their followers" (van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 95). Examples of *role model authority* are: "The wise teacher finds out the correct way to pronounce the child's name" and "Experienced teachers involve the whole class in supporting the new comer" (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 107).

The answer to the "why" questions in *impersonal authority* is "because the laws (the rules, the policies, the guidelines, etc.) say so" (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 108). Like *personal authority*, *impersonal authority* can be the subject of verbal process clauses (e.g. "The rules state that ...", "The law says that ..."). *Impersonal authority* is also realized by using nouns, such as "policy", "regulation", "rule", "law", etc., or their adjectives or adverbs (e.g. "compulsory", "mandatory", "obligatory"). This kind of legitimization is seen in "It is the policy in her area to admit children termly after their fifth birthday" and "Playtime is usually a compulsory break in the programme" (van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 96).

In the *authority of tradition*, "the implicit or explicit answer to the 'why' question is ... 'because this is what we always do' or 'because this is what we have always done'" (van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 96). The *authority of tradition* can be invoked through words like "tradition", "practice", "custom", "habit", etc. This is seen in "It was the practice for children in infant schools to be given free milk daily" (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 108).

The answer to the "why" question in the *authority of conformity* is "'because that's what everybody else does' or 'because that's what most people do'" (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 109). The *authority of conformity* is legitimizing because of the implicit

messages "'everybody else is doing it, and so should you' or 'most people are doing it, and so should you'" (van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 97). Conformity legitimization is recognized through an explicit comparison, as in "Then she let go of Mummy's hand and skipped along towards the open gate of the playground, just as Uncle Jack and Uncle Ned, Auntie Mary and Mummy had done, when they were children". It is also realized using high frequency modality, as in "The majority of teachers keep records of their progress" and "Many schools now adopt this practice" (Ali et al., 2016, p. 79; van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 97).

4.2 Moral Evaluation

Moral evaluation is based on moral values and is not imposed by an established authority according to which actions are (de) legitimized without any justification. This strategy can be employed indirectly. Therefore, moral evaluations can be recognized using common sense knowledge rather than by means of explicit linguistic methods (Ross & Rivers, 2017, Sadeghi & Jalali, 2013, van Leeuwen, 2007). *Moral evaluation* is subdivided *evaluation*, *abstraction* and *analogies*.

In *evaluation*, evaluative adjectives, such as "good", "bad", "healthy", "normal", "natural", "useful", etc., are essential as they "communicate both concrete qualities of actions or objects and commend them in terms of some domain of values" (van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 98). *Evaluation* is seen in the following examples:

- It is perfectly normal to be anxious about starting school.
- It is only natural that the first days of school are upsetting.
- Showing signs of stress about starting school is a natural and healthy response (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 111)

In *abstraction*, moral evaluations are expressed by "referring to practices (or to one or more of their component actions or reactions) in abstract ways that 'moralize' them by distilling from them a quality that links them to discourses of moral values" (van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 99).

For example, "get on with others" or "cooperate" can be used instead of "the child goes to school for the first time" to legitimize going to school with respect to a discourse of independence (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 111).

The strategy of *analogies* refers to making comparisons that have legitimizing or delegitimizing purposes (Sadeghi et al, 2014; van Leeuwen, 2008). The questions "Why must I do this? and "Why must I do this in this way" are answered by saying "'because it is like another activity which is associated with positive values' (or, in the case of negative comparison, 'because it is not like another activity which is associated with negative values')" (van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 99). The analogy can be expressed implicitly or explicitly. In *implicit analogy*, "an activity that belongs to one social practice is described by a term which ... refers to an activity belonging to another social practice, and the positive or negative values ... which are attached to that other activity, are then transferred to the original activity" (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 112). For example, in "drilling pupils" and "incarcerating pupils", the words "drilling" and "incarcerating" are borrowed from the military and the prison to describe the actions of teachers (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 112). *Explicit analogy* is expressed explicitly by using a similarity conjunction or circumstances of comparison, as in "Like an adult starting in a new job ... the child will be worried" and "It will become as automatic as cleaning your teeth" (van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 100).

4.3 Rationalization

Rationalization refers to legitimization "by reference to the goals and uses of institutionalized social action, and to the knowledge society has constructed to endow them with cognitive validity" (van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 92). It is divided into *instrumental rationality* and *theoretical rationality*. The former "legitimizes practices by reference to their goals, uses, and effects" (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 113). The latter "legitimizes practices by reference to a natural order of things"

(van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 113). *Instrumental rationalization* is divided into three categories: *goal-oriented* instrumentality, *means-oriented* instrumentality and *effect-oriented* instrumentality.

In *goal-orientation*, "purposes are constructed as 'in people', as conscious or unconscious motives, aims, intentions, goals ... the formula is 'I do *x* in order to do (or be, or have) *y*'" (van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 102). It can be realized either explicitly using a purpose clause with "to", "in order to", "so as to", as shown in the first example, or implicitly, as in the second one.

- Jane's teacher used eye contact and facial expression to establish positive bonds with her.

- Your child may respond by spending hours happily entertaining herself drawing while she develops her visual, creative and motor skills (van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 102).

In *means-oriented instrumentality*, "the purpose is constructed as 'in the action', and the action as a means to an end. The formula is then either 'I achieve doing (or being, or having) *y* by *x*-ing', which leaves the agency intact, and uses circumstances of means with 'by', 'by means of', 'through,' etc., or '*x*-ing serves to achieve being (or doing, or having) *y*', which does not" (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 114). *Means-orientation* is seen in the following example:

- The skilful teacher can save the new entrant's face by showing herself to be on his side (van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 102).

The category of *use* is one subcategory of *means-orientation* in which the purposeful action is presented as a means to realize a goal, as in "Registration can also be used to encourage children to respond to their own names and learn each others'" (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 115). Another subcategory of *means-orientation* "focuses on the *potential* of specific actions for serving specific purposes and uses clauses with 'facilitating' processes, such as 'allow', 'promote', 'help', 'teach', 'build', 'facilitate,' etc., in which the purposeful action is subject and the purpose object or complement" (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 115). This is seen in "It helps her to develop her sense of time" (van

Leeuwen, 2008, p. 115).

Effect-oriented instrumentality underscores the outcome of actions. According to van Leeuwen (2007), in *effect-orientation*:

Purposefulness is looked at ... as something that turned to exist in hindsight, rather than as something that was, or could have been, planned beforehand. Those involved might be able to predict the outcome, but they cannot fully bring it about through their own actions. In this case there is no identity between the agent of the action whose purpose is to be constructed, and the agent of the action that constitutes the purpose itself. (van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 103)

Thus, the purpose is the outcome of the action. It is expressed using "so that" or "that way", as in "Your child has to learn to control aggressiveness, so as to be accepted by others" (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 115). The purposeful action can also be the agent of the purpose action, as in "Sending children away from home at an early age builds character". In this example, the purposeful action is the initiator of the action (van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 103).

In *theoretical rationalization*, legitimization "is grounded, not in whether the action is morally justified or not, nor in whether it is purposeful or effective, but in whether it is founded on some kind of truth, on 'the way things are'" (van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 103). There are three forms of theoretical legitimization: *definition*, *explanation* and *predication*. According to van Leeuwen (2008), in *definition* "one activity is defined in terms of another moralized activity. For a definition to be a definition, both activities must be objectivated and generalized, and the link between them must either be attributive ('is', 'constitutes', etc.) or signicative ('means', 'signals', 'symbolizes', etc.) (p.116). This form of *theoretical rationality* is shown in the following examples:

- Transition is a necessary stage in the young child's experience.
- School signals that her children are growing up.

- What we are asking for is not just economic prosperity, but civil rights, equality, freedom, justice and freedom of speech (Sadeghi et al., 2014, p. 1584; van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 116).

In *explanation*, one or more of the actors involved in a practice, rather than the practice itself, who are defined or characterized (Sadeghi & Jalali, 2013; van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 104). Van Leeuwen (2008) holds that in *explanation* "the answer to the 'why' question is: 'because doing things this way is appropriate to the nature of these actors'. Generality is again essential. Explanations describe general attributes or habitual activities of the categories of actors in question" (p. 116).

As for *predictions*, although they "have a ring of authority about them, they are meant to be based, not on authority, but on expertise, and they can therefore be denied by contrary experience" (van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 104). An example of *prediction* is: "Don't worry if you or your child cries. It won't last long" (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 116).

4.4 Mythopoesis

Mythopoesis refers to "legitimation conveyed through narratives whose outcomes reward legitimate actions and punish non-legitimate actions" (van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 92). Mythopoesis is divided into four categories. These are *moral tales*, *cautionary tales*, *single determination* and *overdetermination*. In *moral tales*, "protagonists are rewarded for engaging in legitimate social practices or restoring the legitimate order" (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 117). In other words, legitimization is established by acknowledging or rewarding what is considered a legitimate social practice (Ross & Rivers, 2017). An example of *moral tales* is: "No wonder there had been so many voices cheering her on. The whole family had come with Daddy to see Mary Kate win her first race (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 118). Unlike *moral tales*, *cautionary tales* "convey what will happen if you do not conform to the norms of social practices. Their

protagonists engage in deviant activities that lead to unhappy endings" (van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 106). In other words, *cautionary tales* show what happens when social actors do not abide by norms of social practice. Thus, "the discursive practice of delegitimization is more closely aligned with the consequences of non-legitimate actions, beliefs and practices (Ross & Rivers, 2017, p. 9). A *cautionary tale* is seen in: "The demonstrators will not accept the latest government concessions saying the only way out of the crisis is for President Mubarak to step down and face possible prosecution for his nearly three-decade authoritarian rule" (Sadeghi et al., 2014, p. 1585).

Single determination occurs when events are represented in a straightforward way in a narration so as to be legitimized or delegitimized (Sadeghi & Jalali, 2013, p. 1068; van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 106). An example of *single determination* is "Millions of Egyptians are protesting all over Egypt to demand an end to Mubarak's regime" (Sadeghi et al., 2014, p. 1585)

Overdetermination occurs "when social actors are represented as participating, at the same time, in more than one social practice" (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 47). It is divided into two subcategories, namely *inversion* and *symbolization*. In the former, "the actors and/or actions are inverted in terms of specific semantic features" (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 118). In other words, social actors in *inversion* are represented as being involved in two practices which are opposite each other. A case in point is *The Flintstones*, a comic in which the activities and actions of the Flintstones resemble those of an American family. They are overdetermined as "they do things that twentieth-century families do, but they *look alike*, and are nominated as, prehistoric cave dwellers" (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 48). In the latter, stories may "use symbolic actions, specific actions that can nevertheless represent more than one domain of institutionalized social practice" (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 119).

Reyes (2011) expands on some of van Leeuwen's (2007) (de) legitimization strategies and develops new ones that can be employed

to justify actions. The strategies proposed by Reyes are: (1) *emotions*, (2) *a hypothetical future*, (3) *rationality*, (4) *voices of expertise* and (5) *altruism*. Like van Leeuwen's (2007) strategies, Reyes' (2011) strategies can occur alone or along with other strategies. Reyes also presents how these strategies are linguistically represented in discourse. Two strategies, namely *rationality* and *voices of expertise*, are not explained below since they resemble van Leeuwen's (2007) strategies of *rationalizations* and *authorization*, respectively.

4.5 Legitimization through Emotions

This legitimization strategy "deals with the appeal to emotions" (Reyes, 2011, p.788). Social actors appeal to their interlocutors' feelings to evoke different emotions so as to explain and justify, and hence legitimize, their deeds and thus elicit particular responses from their interlocutors or gain their understanding and approval of their actions.

Because appealing to emotions enables social actors to shape their interlocutors' viewpoints with respect to a certain issue, politicians employ constructive strategies to linguistically establish an "us-group" and a "them-group". These strategies are "utterances which constitute a "we" group and a "they" group through particular acts of reference" (van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999, p. 92). Legitimization by appealing to emotions is realized linguistically by making linguistic choices to represent the "others" negatively by attributing "negative qualities to their personalities or their actions" (Reyes, 2011, p. 785). Thus, they are described and represented using *Referential or Nomination Strategies* to answer the question "How are persons named and referred to linguistically?", *Predicative Strategies* to answer the question "What traits, characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to them?" and *Argumentative Strategies* in answer to the question "By means of what arguments and argumentation schemes do specific persons or social groups try to justify and legitimize the exclusion, discrimination, suppression and exploitation of others?"

(Wodak, 2001, pp. 72-73). *Referential or Nomination Strategies* are used for constructing and representing social actors. *Predicative Strategies* are used to identify social actors via evaluative attributions. They are similar to the category of *evaluation* in van Leeuwen's strategy of *moral evaluation*. *Argumentative Strategies* are used to refer to the actions of social actors (Reyes, 2011, pp. 785-786). The following are examples of legitimization through emotions using *Referential or Nomination Strategies*, *Argumentative Strategies* and *Predicative Strategies*:

- ...clear a neighborhood of extremists and terrorists (Referential or Nomination Strategies).
- They killed innocent people (Argumentative Strategies).
- ... The Taliban – a ruthless, repressive and radical movement (Predicative Strategies) (Reyes, 2011, pp. 791-792).

4.6 Legitimization through a Hypothetical Future

Another strategy employed in political discourse is to pose a possible future threat that entails immediate action in the present (Dunmire, 2007). In legitimization through a hypothetical future, politicians show that present problems and decisions occur due to past deeds and thus require carrying out imminent actions to ensure that these problems do not happen again in the future. In other words, the present is shown as a time that requires making decisions about taking actions against others presented as being guilty. These actions are caused by past events or deeds and can have future consequences (Fonseca & Ferreira, 2015; Reyes, 2011, p. 793). The future is displayed according to the actions taken in the present. Accordingly, "the future displays two alternatives depicted in two different ways: (a) If we do not do what the speaker proposes in the present, the past will repeat itself ... (b) If we do act according to the speaker's suggestion, we will have security at home and we will enjoy a series of familiar values: freedom, liberty, happiness" (Reyes, 2011, p. 793). In option

(A), politicians legitimize their actions by presenting a hypothetically fearful future scenario. In this case, the future represents "an ideologically significant site in which dominant political actors and institutions can exert power and control" (Dunmire, 2007, p. 19). To this end, hypothetical future problems resulting from not acting according to what the speaker proposes are linguistically represented by using conditional structures and the modals "would" and "could", as in :

- Yet, it's important for our fellow citizens to understand that failure in Iraq would be a disaster for our future ... If we were to fail in Iraq, the enemy would follow us here to America.

- It's a different kind of war in which failure in one part of the world could lead to a disaster here at home (Reyes, 2011, p. 794).

Politicians can display the hypothetical consequences of not following their proposals without the use of modality which indicates the degree of the speaker's commitment to the truth of what is being said (Thompson, 2004; Reyes, 2011). Lack of modal adjuncts expresses the speaker's strong commitment to what they are saying as their statements are presented as facts. According to Reyes (2011), this strategy helps "achieve political goals by presenting hypothetical assumptions as factual reality ... A lack of modality adverbs and modal verbs ... calls for imminent action" (p. 796). This is seen in the following example:

- It is from here [Afghanistan] that we were attacked on 9/11, and it is from here that new attacks are being plotted as I speak (Reyes, 2011, p. 796).

In option (B), speakers depict "a future with enduring prosperity and familiar values for the audience" (Reyes, 2011, p. 796). A promising and secure future is appealed to by showing what will happen when the speaker's proposed course of action is accepted, as in:

- And therefore, in the long run, your children and grandchildren are more likely to live in peace with the advent of liberty (Reyes, 2011, p. 796)

4.7 Altruism

This strategy refers to the legitimization of actions by proposing them "as actions beneficial to others. Doing things for others ... presents the action as beneficial for a community and circumvents judgment about the selfishness of the speaker" (Reyes, 2011, p. 801). In other words, politicians legitimize their decisions and actions by showing that they ensure and promote the well-being of other groups or communities, as in: "Troops from Fort Benning are now serving in Iraq right now, helping to protect the troops and the Iraqi citizens, training Iraqi security forces. You're doing something else remarkable here, rebuilding schools and helping improve lives" (Reyes, 2011, p. 802).

In political discourse, previous research on legitimization and delegitimization has mainly examined these notions in newspaper articles (Ali et al., 2016; Rasti & Sahragard, 2012; Yagcioglu & Cem-Deger, 2001), political speeches (Mirhosseini, 2017; Oddo, 2011; Reyes, 2011; Said, 2017, Sulaiman & Jamil, 2014) and the discourse on key events like the Arab Spring, wars and economic crises (Cap, 2006; Chouliaraki, 2005; Dunmire, 2007; Fonseca & Ferreira, 2015; Reyes-Rodriguez, 2008; Sadeghi et al., 2014; Sadeghi & Jalali, 2013; Vaara, 2014; van Dijk, 2005).

The present study adds to the above literature on legitimization and delegitimization by studying them in relation to the Qatar crisis with Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Bahrain and Egypt. To the researcher's knowledge, no earlier studies examined the statements made by diplomats from the Arab quartet and the U.S. State Department spokesperson on this issue. Moreover, unlike the existing research on the two notions in question, which has either applied van Leeuwen's (2007) (de) legitimization strategies only or developed different ones, the current study employs both van Leeuwen's (2007) and Reyes' (2011) strategies and proposes a new one as well.

5. Analysis

This section demonstrates the employment of legitimization and delegitimization strategies in the statements made by diplomats from the Arab quartet and the U.S. State Department spokesperson. The data is analyzed using van Leeuwen's (2007) and Reyes' (2011) (de) legitimization strategies. Van Leeuwen's strategies are analyzed first followed by those of Reyes.

5.1) Authorization

The strategy of *authorization* characterizes the person or party entitled to exercise legitimate authority. In the analyzed data, *impersonal authority* and *authority of conformity* are employed in the statements made by diplomats from the Arab quartet, as seen in the following examples:

Example (1)

من الطبيعي ألا تتفهم دولة قطر، التي تتخذ من دعم الإرهاب والتدخل في الشؤون الداخلية للدول سياسة لها، التزام كافة الدول أعضاء الأمم المتحدة، ومن بينهم مصر، وفقا لأحكام الاتفاقيات الدولية وقرارات مجلس الأمن الملزمة ، بمكافحة الإرهاب بكافة أشكاله.

It's only normal for Qatar, which supports terrorism and interferes in the internal affairs of countries, not to understand the commitment of UN member states, including Egypt, to combat terrorism in all its forms in accordance with the binding provisions of international conventions and Security Council resolutions (All News, 2017).

In example (1), *impersonal authority*, which refers to authority legitimization by reference to laws, rules and regulations, is employed in the statement made by Amr Abdellatif Aboulatta, Egypt's Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the UN and President of the UN Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee. By using the two nouns "أحكام" (provisions) and "قرارات" (resolutions) in "وفا..."

"...in accordance with (لأحكام الاتفاقيات الدولية وقرارات مجلس الأمن الملزمة...) the binding provisions of international conventions and Security Council resolutions), Aboulatta legitimizes Egypt's act of fighting terrorism by showing that it results from its commitment to the provisions of international conventions and Security Council resolutions because they are binding to all UN member states.

Example (2)

معالي الوزير سامح شكري ذكر المبادئ الستة التي يقوم عليها موقفنا كدول أربعة وهي مبادئ واضحة ويتفق عليها ليس فقط الدول الأربعة بل كل دول العالم.

Minister Sameh Shoukry mentioned the six principles upon which the position of the four countries is based. These principles are clear and are agreed upon not only by the four countries but also by all the countries in the world (RT Arabic, 2017).

In this example, Bahraini Foreign Minister, Khaled bin Ahmed Al-Khalifa, seeks to legitimize the position adopted by the Arab quartet with respect to the Qatari crisis as well as the six principles of fighting terrorism and extremism outlined in the joint press conference held in Cairo on July 5, 2017 by employing *conformity* legitimization. He shows that these principles, upon which the position of the four Arab states rests, are legitimate because all countries in the world, and not just the four boycotting countries, agree on them. The *authority of conformity* is realized by using the cognitive verb "يتفق" (agree) and high frequency modality in "كل" (all) to emphasize the legitimacy of the decision taken by the four Arab states to boycott Qatar by conveying the message that all the countries support the quartet in their stance towards it because of the common consensus on the six principles of combating all forms of terrorism.

Only *personal authority* is used in the statements made by the

spokesperson of the U.S. State Department, as shown in example (3):

Example (3)

So the Secretary has said, and continues to say, that he believes that this dispute can be resolved with the parties themselves (U.S. Department of State, 2017f).

Personal authority legitimization is utilized in this example in which Heather Nauert, spokesperson of the U.S. State Department, refers to what Rex Tillerson, U.S. Secretary of State, said with respect to the rift between Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Bahrain and Egypt, on the one hand, and Qatar, on the other hand. Legitimization is vested in Tillerson because of the authority he has due to his position as Secretary of State. Linguistically, *personal authority* legitimization is realized in this example via the verbal process "said" and the modal verb "can". Although van Leeuwen (2007) holds that in *personal authority* legitimization "the authority's utterance contains some form of obligation modality" (p. 94), this is not the case in example (3) in which this kind of legitimization is realized using the epistemic modal "can" which is used to express ability and possibility rather than obligation. This may be done to show that it is possible for the Arab quartet and Qatar to resolve their dispute on their own without interference from the U.S. In other words, avoiding the use of obligation modality reflects the desire of the U.S. not to take part in defusing the Qatari crisis.

5.2 Moral Evaluation

The strategy of *moral evaluation* is employed in the analyzed Arabic and English data. While it occurs through *evaluation* only in the Arabic data, it occurs through *evaluation* and *abstraction* in the English data. *Evaluation* in the statements made by diplomats from the Arab quartet is realized through evaluative adjectives which are used to legitimize the decision taken by the four Arab states to boycott Qatar and delegitimize Qatar's acts and practices. These uses are shown in examples (4) and (5), respectively:

Example (4)

المبادئ التي أعلنت في القاهرة والمطالب الثلاثة عشر المطالب بتنفيذها قطر هي إجراءات غير مسبوقه ولها فاعليتها وضرورية وتأتي في التوقيت الذي تراه الدول الأربع مناسباً ودافع لقطر بأن تغير من مسارها وأن تحيد تماماً عن اعتناق الفكر الأيديولوجي المرتبط بالتطرف.

The principles that were outlined in Cairo and the thirteen demands which Qatar has to meet are unprecedented, effective and necessary measures that are taken at the time that the four countries believe is suitable and drives Qatar to change its path and stop adopting extremist ideologies (Dmc, 2017c).

In this example, Egyptian Foreign Minister, Sameh Shoukry, talks about the six principles and the thirteen demands which are deemed necessary by the quartet to start the negotiation process to resolve the crisis with Qatar. He describes them using the evaluative adjectives "غير مسبوقه" (unprecedented), "لها فاعليتها" (effective), "ضرورية" (necessary) and the adjectival phrase "تأتي في التوقيت... المرتبط... بالتطرف" (...taken at the time ...extremist ideologies). By so doing, Shoukry aims at legitimizing boycotting Qatar by showing that the measures which the four Arab states have taken against Qatar are the result of its practices and promotion of extremist ideologies.

Example (5)

الإجراءات التي تم اتخاذها هي إجراءات سيادية وهذه إجراءات اتخذت بسبب السياسات التي تمارسها الحكومة القطرية ... كان هناك اتفاقين في ٢٠١٣ و٢٠١٤ في الرياض ولكن لم تطبق قطر هذه الاتفاقيات واستمرت في سياستها السلبية والعدوانية تجاه دول المنطقة.

The measures are sovereign and were taken because of the policies followed by the Qatari government ... Two agreements were made in Riyadh in 2013 and 2014 but Qatar did not adhere to them and kept adopting its negative and hostile practices towards the countries of the region (On Live, 2017c).

In example (5), Adel bin Ahmed Al-Jubeir, Saudi Foreign Minister, describes the measures taken by the quartet as "سيادية" (sovereign), thereby legitimizing them as well as the decision to cut ties with Qatar. He also says that Qatar has failed to comply to the agreements signed in Riyadh in 2013 and 2014 which dictated not meddling in the internal affair of Arab countries, not supporting antagonistic media, the Muslim Brotherhood or other groups or organizations that would threaten the security and stability of the region, and not providing refuge to media outlets or Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) citizens who commit encroachments against GCC states. By saying that Qatar persistently pursued policies that the quartet considers "سلبية وعدوانية" (negative and hostile), Al-Jubeir delegitimizes Qatar's policies and practices towards Arab countries.

In the analyzed English data, *evaluation* is used to legitimize Qatar's practices and delegitimize those of the quartet, as shown in examples (6) and (7):

Example (6)

We recognize that Qatar has made some great efforts to try to stop financing of terror groups, including prosecuting suspected financiers, freezing assets, and introducing

stringent controls on its banking system there ... We're grateful to the Qataris for their long-standing support of our presence there in that nation. They have helped to provide us with an enduring commitment to regional security (U.S. Department of State, 2017a).

Heather Nauert, spokesperson of the U.S. Department of State, attempts to give a positive image of Qatar in this example by using the positive evaluative adjectives "great", "long-standing" and "enduring" to describe Qatar's efforts to fight terrorism, support the presence of the U.S. in it, and show commitment to regional security. Thus, these evaluative adjectives serve to legitimize Qatar's acts and practices, thereby implying delegitimization of boycotting Qatar as well as the measures taken against it.

Example (7)

The only thing I can say about the demands ... some of them will be difficult for Qatar to incorporate and to try to adhere to. That's as far as I'm going to go in saying that – some of them will be challenging for that country (U.S. Department of State, 2017g).

In example (7), Nauert talks about the thirteen demands made by the Arab quartet to mend the diplomatic rift with Qatar. She uses the negative evaluative adjectives "difficult" and "challenging" to describe the demands and thus delegitimize them. Thus, Nauert expresses disapproval of these demands and implicitly delegitimizes the tension between the quartet and Qatar.

Expressing *moral evaluation* through *abstraction* is employed in the statements made by the spokesperson of the U.S. Department of State to legitimize Qatar's practices by highlighting a moral and desirable quality. This is shown in example (8):

Example (8)

So we recognize that Qatar continues to make efforts to stop the financing of terror groups ... They have made progress in this arena (U.S. Department of State, 2017a)

In this example, Heather Nauert talks about Qatar's efforts to stop providing financial support to terrorists and says it succeeded in this respect. Nauert legitimizes Qatar's practices in terms of a discourse of combating terrorism by indicating that it managed to improve its record on extremism.

5.3 Rationalization

Legitimization through rationalization is employed in the statements made by diplomats from the quartet and the spokesperson of the U.S. Department of State. In terms of *instrumental rationalization*, *goal-orientation* and *effect-orientation* are found in the Arabic data, as shown in the following example:

Example (9)

ونحن نرصد هذه الظاهرة في اليمن وسوريا وليبيا وعلينا أن نكثف جيعا التعاون لننتصر انتصار شامل ... ومن هنا كان الإصرار علي أن نتخذ موقف حاسم من السياسات القطرية المؤثرة علي استقرارنا وعلي أمننا والتي بذلنا الجهد والدماء من أجل الحفاظ علي الاستقرار وحماية مواطنينا من استهداف المنظمات الإرهابية التي تجد دعم وتجد ملاذ آمن من قبل قطر. هذا جهد لا بد أن يتزامن فيه المجتمع الدولي لمنع هذه التنظيمات من تحقيق أي أغراض سياسية.

We observe this phenomenon in Yemen, Syria and Libya and we all have to increase cooperation in order to achieve all-out victory. That's why we insisted on taking a decisive stand against Qatar's policies that affect our stability and security. Many sacrifices were made so as to maintain stability and protect our citizens from being targeted by terrorist organizations which Qatar supports and provides a safe haven. The international community must partake in those

efforts to prevent these organizations from realizing any political goals (Extra news, 2017b).

In example (9), Egyptian Foreign Minister, Sameh Shoukry, mentions the motives for carrying out some actions. He says "وعلينا أن" (we all have to increase cooperation in order to achieve all-out victory", "بدلنا الجهد والدماء من أجل", "Many sacrifices were made so as to maintain stability ...), and "هذا جهد لا بد أن يتضامن فيه المجتمع الدولي لمنع هذه التنظيمات..." (The international community must partake in these efforts to prevent these organizations ...). In other words, *goal-oriented* rationalization is employed here to legitimize past and future acts that are deemed rational. To this end, clauses of purpose, which are introduced by the adverbs "in order to", "so as to" and "to", are used.

Example (10)

بالنسبة للأزمة مع قطر هي تعود إلى دعم قطر للإرهاب وتمويل قطر للإرهاب واستضافة قطر لعناصر متورطة في الإرهاب ونشر الكراهية والتحريض والتدخل في شئون دول المنطقة، وكان موقف الدول الأربع واضح ، أنه يجب علي قطر أن تكف عن هذه الأعمال وتلتزم باتفاقية الرياض التي وقعتها في عام ٢٠١٣ و ٢٠١٤ لنستطيع أن نتجاوز هذه الأزمة.

As for the crisis with Qatar, it has arisen because Qatar supports and finances terrorism, hosts terrorists, spreads and incites hatred, and interferes in the affairs of Arab countries. The position of the four countries was clear; desisting from such acts and abiding by the agreement signed in Riyadh in 2013 and 2014 are a must to overcome the crisis (DW عربية, 2017).

In this example, Adel bin Ahmed Al-Jubeir, Saudi Foreign Minister, lists the actions carried out by Qatar which caused the Arab quartet to boycott it. He also mentions what Qatar needs to do to solve the problem with the quartet. He says "...يجب علي قطر أن تكف عن هذه الأعمال... لنستطيع أن نتجاوز هذه الأزمة" (...desisting from such acts ... to

overcome the crisis). Al-Jubeir rationalizes desisting from supporting terrorism and extremism and complying with the 2013 and 2014 Riyadh agreements by focusing on the effects of these practices. Thus, *effect-oriented* rationalization, which is realized using the gerund, is employed here to emphasize the outcome and effects of the actions that Qatar is required to carry out to settle the dispute with the Arab boycotting countries.

The three categories of *instrumental rationalization*, namely *goal-orientation*, *means-orientation* and *effect-orientation*, are found in the English data. They are shown in examples (11), (12) and (13):

Example (11)

We believe now that the dispute is at a standstill ... We are urging direct talks between all of the parties in order for the situation to be resolved – and it does need to be resolved – but they have to sit down together and have some direct dialogue about it (U.S. Department of State, 2017k).

In this example, Heather Nauert talks about the stance of the U.S. towards the tension between the four Arab states and Qatar. She says that the U.S. encourages talks between the two camps and mentions the aim of this position, namely "in order for the situation to be resolved." *Goal-orientation* is used here to highlight the reason for the concern of the U.S. about urging the Arab quartet and Qatar to hold talks to solve the crisis. This legitimization strategy is realized using the adverb of purpose "in order for".

Example (12)

The Secretary is excellent at that. He is good at bringing parties together and speaking with them. I think the President provided that as an opportunity that helps facilitate and bring all parties together on this matter ... (U.S. Department of State, 2017b).

Example (12) demonstrates the use of *means-orientation* rationalization by focusing on the potential of an action to serve a certain purpose. Nauert here talks about an offer made by U.S. President Donald Trump to mediate to resolve the crisis between Qatar and the Arab quartet. She says that the purpose of providing mediation is to serve as a chance which "helps facilitate and bring all parties together on this matter".

Example (13)

The President had offered Secretary Tillerson weeks ago to do that ... We believe through the Secretary talks – talking with those nations and hearing what they have to say, they'll be able to work this out (U.S. Department of State, 2017e).

In example (13), Heather Nauert again talks about the mediation offered by U.S. President in the Qatar crisis. She says that the U.S. believes that the parties concerned will manage to solve the problem "through the Secretary talks" and by "talking with those nations and hearing what they have to say". In other words, *effect-orientation* is used to show the effects or results of holding talks with all the parties in the Qatar dispute. This strategy is linguistically realized using the gerund in "talking" and "hearing".

As for *theoretical rationalization*, it occurs in the form of *definition* and *explanation* in the statements made by diplomats from the boycotting countries, and in the form of *explanation* and *prediction* in the ones made by the spokesperson of the U.S. State Department. Examples (14) and (15) demonstrate the occurrence of *theoretical rationalization* in the Arabic data.

Example (14)

المطالب ليست بشروط وإنما هي مجموعة من الإجراءات الدالة علي ابتعاد السلطات القطرية عن الممارسات السابقة في دعم الإرهاب ... ومن تحتضنهم من شخصيات متورطة في أعمال إرهابية .

The demands are not conditions but a set of measures that signal the departure of the Qatari authorities from past practices of supporting terrorism and hosting people involved in terrorist acts (France 24 Arabic, 2017).

Theoretical rationalization in the form of *definition* is used in this example in which Sameh Shoukry talks about the thirteen demands which Qatar is required to meet to resolve the crisis with the Arab quartet. He talks about the nature of the demands by defining them in terms of the moralized activity of Qatar's abandonment of the policy of supporting and financing terrorism and extremism. Using this strategy helps legitimize the demands and the quartet's position towards Qatar, and delegitimize Qatar's policies and practices towards Arab countries.

Example (15)

ليس من المعقول أو المقبول أنه في الوقت الذي يقوم فيه مجلس الأمن باعتماد قرارات تبني الإطار القانوني لمكافحة الإرهاب أننا نجد أن الأنظمة الحاكمة لحفنة من الدول تضرب هذا الإطار بمعاول الهدم وذلك بانتهاكتها المستمرة لقرارات المجلس بشكل علني يصل إلي حد الوقاحة ودون أية خشية من المحاسبة ... وذلك باستمرارها في تمويل الإرهاب وإمداده بالسلاح وتوفير الملاذ الآمن له، وهو الأمر الذي يتجسد علي سبيل المثال في تبني النظام الحاكم في قطر لسياسة دعم الإرهاب بتمويله وإمداده بالسلاح وتوفير الملاذ الآمن وبالتحريض سواء كان ذلك في ليبيا أو في سوريا أو في العراق أو في دول أخرى.

It's not possible or acceptable that at the time the Security Council passes resolutions to authorize combating terrorism, we find the regimes governing a handful of countries defy these resolutions by violating them openly, rudely and

without fear of accountability by constantly funding terrorism, supplying arms and providing safe havens. For instance, the ruling regime in Qatar adopts a policy of supporting terrorism by financing it, supplying weapons, providing safe havens, and incitement whether in Libya, Syria, Iraq or in other countries (On Live, 2017b).

Example (15) demonstrates the use of *theoretical rationalization* in the form of *explanation* to characterize the actors involved in a practice. In this example, Ihab Moustafa, Egypt's Deputy Ambassador to the UN, characterizes regimes that do not abide by the Security Council resolutions "by violating them ... safe havens." He also talks about the ruling regime in Qatar and describes it by referring to its terror-related activities. He says that it "adopts a policy ... incitement ..." By so doing, Moustafa delegitimizes Qatar's activities as well as those of other countries whose ruling regimes adopt similar policies.

Examples (16) and (17) show the occurrence of *theoretical rationalization* in the form of *explanation* and *prediction* in the English data.

Example (16)

The Secretary is determined to remain engaged as we monitor the situation ... We are encouraging all sides to de-escalate tensions and engage in constructive dialogue. We, once again, call on parties to focus on the core regional and international goal of fighting terrorism, to meet the commitments that were made in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, and to constructively resolve this dispute (U.S. Department of State, 2017e).

Legitimization via *explanation* occurs in this example in which

Heather Nauert talks about the role of the U.S. in the Qatari crisis. She describes the position of the U.S. as an actor in the crisis, saying that "the Secretary is determined to remain engaged...resolve this dispute". By using *explanation*, Nauert implicitly delegitimizes the quartet's boycott of Qatar by saying that Qatar and the Arab quartet should focus on combating terrorism, meeting the commitments that were made in Riyadh, and resolving the dispute. The implication is that all parties, and not only Qatar, have to work on alleviating the tension to end the problem.

Example (17)

I think to highlight that the United States and Qatar have this agreement on terror financing sends a really good message to all of the nations that we can get to an agreement that terror financing is a major issue and a major concern. So I think that helps set a good example for the other nations that we hope that they will come to the table with us as well (U.S. Department of State, 2017i).

In example (17), *theoretical rationalization* via *prediction* is employed as Heather Nauert sheds light on the possibility that an agreement between the U.S. and Qatar on financing terrorism can be useful in bringing the parties in the Qatari crisis to the negotiating table since this agreement sends a message that "we can get to an agreement that terror financing is a major issue and a major concern." Nauert bases her prediction on experience and expertise and can thus be proven wrong by contrary experience and expertise. The use of this strategy indicates that the U.S. implicitly delegitimizes the stance of Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Bahrain and Egypt towards Qatar by showing that it – Qatar – already takes part in fighting terrorism. Therefore, the quartet's position towards it needs to be reconsidered.

5.4 Mythopoesis

In *mythopoesis*, narratives are used to legitimize and delegitimize actions. This strategy is employed in the analyzed data by using *cautionary tales* and *single determination* in the Arabic data, and *single determination* only in the English data. The use of *cautionary tales* and *single determination* in the Arabic data is shown in examples (18) and (19), respectively.

Example (18)

فيما يتعلق بتقارب قطر مع إيران كما ذكرت في الماضي أي دولة تتعامل مع إيران النتيجة ستكون سلبية علي الدولة نفسها.

In terms of the close relation between Qatar and Iran, as I mentioned before, any country that deals with Iran will face negative consequences (On Live, 2017c).

In this example, Adel bin Ahmed Al-Jubeir, Saudi Foreign Minister, talks about the results of dealing with Iran. He says that countries that establish diplomatic relations with Iran will face unfortunate outcomes. The use of the strategy of *cautionary tales* serves to delegitimize developing a relation with Iran and legitimize the actions that could be taken by Saudi Arabia against any country that deals with it.

Example (19)

هذه ليست أول خطوة في التعامل مع قطر فقد سبق وأن سحبت ثلاث من دول مجلس التعاون الخليجي سفراءها، اللي هي البحرين والمملكة العربية السعودية والإمارات العربية المتحدة، سفراءها من الدوحة، وكانت تتعلق بمسألة دعم الإرهاب وإبواء الإرهابيين ومسألة التأمير ضد الدول العربية ومسائل أخرى كثيرة. وفي ذلك الوقت كان هناك خطوة أن تم سحب السفراء وبعد سحب السفراء تم معالجة الموضوع في اتفاق الرياض في ٢٠١٣ واتفاق الرياض التكميلي في ٢٠١٤ ... وتم التوقيع علي الاتفاق من قبل قادتنا وكذلك من قبل قطر التي تم إعطاءها الفرصة لتصلح من سياستها تجاه دولنا لكنها لم تصلح واستمر الشئ فجاءت خطوة قرار المقاطعة.

This is not the first step in dealing with Qatar; three GCC states, namely Bahrain, Saudi Arabia and the UAE, had withdrawn their ambassadors from Doha for reasons related to many issues including supporting terrorism, hosting terrorists and conspiring against Arab countries. At that time, ambassadors were withdrawn and then the issue was dealt with in the 2013 Riyadh agreement and the 2014 supplementary Riyadh agreement. The agreements were signed by our leaders as well as by Qatar which was given the chance to change its policies towards our countries. However, this did not happen, hence the decision to boycott Qatar (Dmc, 2017a).

Single determination is employed in example (19) in which Khaled bin Ahmed Al-Khalifa, Bahraini Foreign Minister, talks about the acts taken by Saudi Arabia, the UAE and Bahrain against Qatar because of its support for terrorism. He presents in a straightforward way the steps taken by these GCC states in this respect. He also makes it clear that the decision to boycott Qatar was taken due to its failure to adhere to the 2013 and 2014 Riyadh agreements which it signed. The use of *single determination* in this example legitimizes the quartet's decision to boycott Qatar by delegitimizing its actions and policies.

The use of *single determination* in the English data is shown in example (20).

Example (20)

... we ask all countries involved to look again at the top issue. And the top issue, as we see it and as we all agreed to from Riyadh, was defeating terrorism. Each of these nations, including Qatar, has confronted terrorism in one way, shape or form. That continues to be the main issue. We call on

those countries to resolve their differences, to work together, and speed this along (U.S. Department of State, 2017e).

In example (20), Heather Nauert emphasizes the realization that defeating terrorism is a top issue that has been agreed upon by GCC countries in Riyadh. Saying that gulf countries, including Qatar, have fought terrorism, and that these countries have to "resolve their differences" indicates that the strategy of *single determination* is used to implicitly delegitimize boycotting Qatar since it has already worked on defeating terrorism, as maintained by the spokesperson of the U.S. Department of State.

Examples that demonstrate the use of Reyes' (2011) (de) legitimization strategies are given below.

5.5 Emotions

In the analyzed data, politicians seek to legitimize certain actions and delegitimize others by appealing to emotions and manipulating them. In the Arabic data, (de) legitimization through *emotions* is accomplished by using *Referential* or *Nomination Strategies*, *Argumentative Strategies* and *Predicative Strategies*, as shown in the following examples.

Example (21)

... علينا أن نبذل كل جهد ممكن لإخلاء هذه المنطقة من كل ما يؤدي نحو منطقة تعاني من التدمير والفوضى. نحن في المنطقة العربية لدينا العديد من الامال نحن مستقبل أفضل لنا ولأبنائنا ولأحفادنا ولكننا أضعنا هذا الوقت والجهد بسبب هذا الوحش المتهور في المنطقة، ولذلك الجميع اتفق مع الرئيس ترامب أن هذه فرصة تاريخية لنا جميعا أن نعمل معا لكي ننتهي من هذا الوباء المأساوي.

We have to make every possible effort to empty the region from everything that has made it suffer from destruction and chaos. We, in the Arab region, have many hopes for a better future for us, our children and grandchildren, but we wasted

this time and effort because of the reckless beast in the region. For this reason, everybody agreed with President Trump that this is a historic opportunity for all of us to work together to end this tragic epidemic (RT Arabic, 2017).

In example (21), Abdullah bin Zayed Al-Nahyan, Minister of Foreign Affairs the UAE, talks about the role played by Qatar in destroying the Arab region by supporting and funding terrorism. He employs the appeal to emotions to delegitimize Qatar's acts and thus legitimize its boycott. To this end, Qatar is linguistically represented by using the referential or nomination strategies "الوحش" (beast) and "الوباء" (epidemic). Qatar is also negatively evaluated and represented through the predicative strategies "المتهور" (reckless) and "المأساوي" (tragic) to further delegitimize its terror-related acts and policies.

Example (22)

لا يمكن لنا أن نكون في مجتمع دولي يريد أن يصل إلي القضاء علي صوت التطرف وأعمال الإرهاب التي نراها اليوم دون اجتناب هذا العمل بشكل واضح ومشارك. نحن في هذه المنطقة نري مع الأسف أن قطر سمحت وحرضت هذا كله ... نأمل في إيصال صوت العقل للقيادة في قطر لأنها تدعم الإرهاب وتحتضن المحرضين وكارهي خطاب المحبة والتسامح .

We cannot be in an international community that wants to put an end to the voice of extremism and acts of terrorism that we see today without uprooting these acts clearly and jointly ... In this region, we unfortunately see that Qatar allowed these acts and incited them ... We hope to communicate the voice of reason to the leadership in Qatar because it supports terrorism and incubates instigators and haters of the discourse of love and forgiveness (Extra news, 2017a)

In example (22), legitimization is displayed through the appeal to emotions by referring to what Qatar does. The Foreign Minister of the UAE presents the acts carried out by Qatar through the use of

argumentative strategies by saying that it "سمحت وحرضت" (allowed...and incited), "تدعم" (supports) and "تحتضن" (incubates). These argumentative strategies are represented through the use of material processes to show Qatar's actions that motivated the Arab quartet to boycott it. In other words, the argumentative strategies are used to delegitimize Qatar's actions and thus legitimize the quartet's decision.

Example (23)

يجب منع الإرهابيين من الاستفادة بشكل مباشر أو غير مباشر من الأموال التي يحصلون عليها علي سبيل الفدية، علي سبيل المثال دولة قطر قامت بسداد ما يقارب مليار دولار لتنظيم إرهابي يعمل في العراق للإفراج عن عدد من أفراد الأسرة الأميرية المختطفين والمحتجزين لدي هذا التنظيم عندما كانوا في رحلة صيد بالعراق. إن مثل هذا الانتهاك الخطير لقرارات مجلس الامن ... ستكون له انعكاسات هامة علي جهود مكافحة الإرهاب ...

Terrorists must be prevented from benefiting, whether directly or indirectly, from ransom payments. For example, Qatar paid almost one billion dollars to a terrorist group that works in Iraq to free members of the royal family who were kidnapped and detained while they were on a hunting trip. This serious violation of Security Council resolutions ... would have a negative bearing on counterterrorism efforts (On Live, 2017a).

In this example, Ihab Moustafa, Egypt's Deputy Ambassador to the UN, presents Qatar negatively by showing that it does not respect Security Council resolutions because it deals with terrorist organizations. This negative presentation of Qatar is realized through predicative strategies by using the evaluative attributions "إرهابي" (terrorist) and "الخطير" (serious) to underscore Qatar's relation with terrorist groups and violation of Security Council resolutions, and thus delegitimize its actions.

In the English data, (de) legitimization through emotions is realized through *Argumentative* and *Predicative Strategies*, as shown in examples (24) and (25), respectively.

Example (24)

An important piece of news to announce is that we worked out an arrangement with the Qataris ... And this is something we're pretty proud of, and this is something that the President has made a major initiative of his that was worked out at the Riyadh conference. And that is the Qataris and the United States have signed a memo of understanding between the United States and Qatar on counterterrorism financing (U.S. Department of State, 2017i).

In example (24), the U.S. State Department spokesperson, Heather Nauert, declares that the U.S. and Qatar have reached an agreement on counterterrorism financing. *Argumentative Strategies* are employed through the material process verbs "worked out" and "signed" to indicate that Qatar is serious in combating all sorts of terrorism and extremism, thereby implying that the reasons stated by the Arab quartet to boycott Qatar could be false claims. Thus, the use of *Argumentative Strategies* serves to indirectly delegitimize boycotting Qatar by showing that it is keen on fighting terrorism or else it would not have signed an agreement on counterterrorism financing with the U.S.

Example (25)

Kuwait has really done a lot of hard work in terms of trying to bring the nations together so that they can come to some sort of agreement ... These nations are going to have to work out their disagreements ... a lot of these are long-simmering tensions (U.S. Department of State, 2017g).

Predicative Strategies are employed in this example through the evaluative attributes "hard" and "long-simmering". The former is used to positively evaluate the Kuwaiti mediation efforts to resolve the crisis between the quartet and Qatar. The latter is used to negatively describe the tension between the quartet and Qatar. These evaluative attributes clearly legitimize the role played by Kuwait to mend the rift in question, and indirectly delegitimize the position taken by the four Arab states towards Qatar.

5.6 Hypothetical Future

Politicians employ this strategy to show that decisions taken in the present are caused by undesired actions committed by others in the past, and can thus trigger future decisions and actions. (De) legitimization through a *hypothetical future* occurs in the Arabic data only in which the consequences of not acting according to what the speaker proposes are sometimes stated explicitly, as shown in example (26), and sometimes implicitly, as in example (27).

Example (26)

قطر أثبتت في العقدين الماضيين أن هوايتها هو رسم الحزن في وجوه الناس وأن تري الدم وأن تري الخراب. إن لم تقرر قطر تغيير هذا المسار من مسار الدمار إلي مسار الإعمار سنبقى في حالة انفصال عن قطر.

In the last two decades, Qatar proved that it enjoys making people sad and seeing blood and destruction. If Qatar does not decide to change this course from the path of destruction to that of construction, our relations will remain severed (Sada El-Balad, 2017b).

In this example, Abdullah bin Zayed Al-Nahyan, Foreign Minister of the UAE, says that Qatar is fond of "رسم الحزن ... الخراب" (making people ... destruction). Legitimization through a hypothetical future is employed in the speaker's utterance "إن لم تقرر قطر ... سنبقى في حالة انفصال" (If Qatar does not decide ... our relations will remain

severed) by explicitly stating the consequences of not doing what the speaker proposes. Al-Nahyan legitimizes future acts carried out by the quartet by showing that the ball is in Qatar's court as the ties with the four boycotting countries will remain cut off if it does not deviate from the path it currently pursues. Explicit legitimization through a hypothetical future is linguistically constructed by using the conditional structure: If + present [protasis] → will+infinitive without to [apodosis].

Example (27)

أكدت الدول الأربعة بدء الحوار مع قطر إذا أعلنت عن رغبتها الصادقة والعملية في وقف دعمها وتمويلها للإرهاب والتطرف ونشر خطاب الكراهية والتحرير وعدم التدخل في شؤون الدول الأخرى وتنفيذ المطالب الثلاثة عشر التي تضمن السلم والاستقرار في المنطقة والعالم.

The four countries have asserted that they would start a dialogue with Qatar if it declared its sincere and practical desire to stop supporting and financing terrorism and extremism, disseminating hate speech and incitement, and interfering in the affairs of other countries. It also has to meet the thirteen demands that ensure peace and stability in the region and the world (On Live, 2017c).

In example (27), Khaled bin Ahmed Al-Khalifa, Bahrain's Minister of Foreign Affairs, declares the conditions that Qatar has to comply with in order for the four Arab countries, namely Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Bahrain and Egypt, to start a dialogue with it. He makes it clear that the quartet will hold a dialogue with Qatar only if it carries out certain actions. These are "وقف دعمها وتمويلها للإرهاب ... تنفيذ" (stop supporting and financing terrorism ... meet the thirteen demands). The implication is that if Qatar does not act as desired by the quartet, the boycott will be sustained. Thus, Bahraini Foreign Minister legitimizes the decision to boycott Qatar as well as any possible actions that the quartet can take in the future against Qatar by delegitimizing the possibility of its non-commitment or non-

compliance with the requests of the four boycotting countries. In other words, the hypothetical future scenario is only alluded to and is not stated directly. Linguistically, the strategy in question is realized by using the conditional structure: If + past [protasis] → would+infinitive without to [apodosis] and inverting the order of protasis and apodosis by saying "بدء الحوار ... إذا أعلنت..." (would start a dialogue ... if it declared...).

5.7 Altruism

Legitimization through *altruism* occurs in the Arabic data only in which it is used to legitimize decisions and actions by projecting them as important and favorable for others. The use of this strategy is shown in example (28).

Example (28)

البيانات التي صدرت عن الدول الأربعة أكدت فيها علي ضرورة حماية المواطنين وحماية الدول الأربعة من التدخلات القطرية ومن الدعم القطري للتنظيمات الإرهابية ... كل الإجراءات التي اتخذت هي من أجل حماية الشعب المصري ومن أجل حماية شعوب الدول الأربعة ومن أجل حماية الإطار العربي بل العالم أجمع.

The statements issued by the four countries stressed the need to protect the citizens and the quartet from Qatar's interference and support for terrorist organizations ... All the measures that have been taken protect the Egyptian people, and the peoples of the four countries. They also protect the Arab framework and the whole world (Dmc, 2017c).

In this example, Sameh Shoukry, Egyptian Foreign Minister, talks about the statements issued by Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Bahrain and Egypt concerning the measures taken against Qatar. He legitimizes the actions and measures taken by showing that they are beneficial not only to the peoples of the Arab quartet but also to the Arab world and the whole world. Thus, he legitimizes the decision to boycott by

proposing an altruistic motivation, namely protecting the peoples of the world and making their lives better.

In addition to van Leeuwen's (2007) and Reyes' (2011) (de) legitimization strategies, the analyzed data reveals that political actors employ another strategy to legitimize certain actions and delegitimize others. This strategy is: posing unanswered questions. The use of this strategy is shown in examples (29) and (30).

Example (29)

لم نجد إلي اليوم أي بوادر حقيقية من دولة قطر أنها مهتمة بأشياءها ومهتمة بمحيطها كما هي مهتمة بالتطرف والتخريب والتخريب والإرهاب. السؤال الذي علي قطر أن تجاوب عليه هو لماذا؟ لماذا تريد قطر هذه الفوضى؟ لماذا تريد قطر التخريب والتدمير؟ لماذا لا تسعى قطر لرسم الابتسامة علي أوجه الناس؟

Until today, we haven't seen any real initiative from Qatar to show that it cares about its brothers and the region as much as it cares about extremism, incitement, vandalism and terrorism. The question that Qatar has to answer is: Why? Why does Qatar want this chaos? Why does Qatar want vandalism and destruction? Why doesn't Qatar seek to put a smile on people's faces? (Sade El-Balad, 2017b)

In example (29), Abdullah bin Zayed Al-Nahyan, Foreign Minister of the UAE, says that Qatar only cares about terrorism, destruction, extremism, incitement and vandalism. To delegitimize Qatar's concern with terrorism, he asks "...لماذا؟ ... أوجه الناس؟" (...Why? ...people's faces?) Thus, using the wh-question "why?" is not intended to request information or invite an answer. Rather, it is meant to blame Qatar for indulging in terror-related practices that result in chaos and destabilization not only in the four boycotting countries but also in the Arab region and the world.

Example (30)

Now that it's been more than two weeks since the embargo started, we are mystified that the Gulf States have not released to the public, nor to the Qataris, the details about the claims that they are making toward Qatar. The more that time goes by, the more doubt is raised about the actions taken by Saudi Arabia and the UAE. At this point, we are left with one simple question: Were the actions really about their concerns regarding Qatar's alleged support for terrorism or were they about the long simmering grievances between and among the GCC countries? (U.S. Department of State, 2017e).

In this example, Heather Nauert seeks to delegitimize the quartet's decision to cut ties with Qatar for supporting and funding terrorist groups by asking "Were the actions ... GCC countries?" She holds that no details have been provided to prove the truth of "the claims that they are making toward Qatar." She implies that the four Arab countries are merely making unsubstantiated allegations about Qatar's policies. The use of yes-no questions aims at negatively evaluating the quartet's decision to boycott Qatar, and encouraging critical thinking about whether the embargo is motivated by "the long simmering grievances between and among the GCC countries? Thus, the purpose of Nauert's yes-no questions is to delegitimize the decision to sever relations with Qatar by questioning the real motivation behind this decision.

6. Conclusion

Employing van Leeuwen's (2007) and Reyes' (2011) (de) legitimization strategies, the present study has examined the (de) legitimization strategies used in the statements made by diplomats from Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Bahrain and Egypt and by the spokesperson of the U.S. State Department concerning Qatar's policies and terror-related practices as well as the quartet's decision to boycott

it. It has also investigated the linguistic devices used to realize the (de) legitimization strategies used in the data and the functions that these strategies and their linguistic realizations perform.

The data reveals that van Leeuwen's (2007) (de) legitimization strategies, the linguistic devices used to realize them, and the functions of the strategies and their realizations are as follows. In terms of *authorization*, two subcategories of this strategy, namely *impersonal authority* and *authority of conformity*, are used in the statements made by diplomats from the four boycotting countries. *Impersonal authority* is used to legitimize the measures taken by Egypt to combat terrorism by showing that they result from Egypt's commitment to the Security Council resolutions and provisions of international conventions. Linguistically, it is realized using nouns like "أحكام" (provisions) and "قرارات" (resolutions). *Authority of conformity* is used to legitimize the quartet's stance towards Qatar as well as the six principles which Qatar is required to accept and adhere to in order to end the crisis. This strategy is realized by using high frequency modality, such as "كل" (all), and cognitive verbs like "يتفق" (agree). Only one category of *authorization*, namely *personal authority*, occurs in the statements made by the spokesperson of the U.S. State Department. It is used to refer to the statements made by Rex Tillerson, U.S. Secretary of State, concerning the dispute between the quartet and Qatar. It is linguistically realized using the verbal process "said". Although in van Leeuwen's (2007) framework, the authority's utterance, in *personal authority* legitimization, has a form of obligation modality, in the analyzed data, this legitimization strategy is realized using the epistemic modal "can" which expresses ability and possibility rather than some form of obligation modality.

Moral evaluation occurs in the analyzed Arabic and English data. In the former, it occurs through the subcategory of *evaluation* and is linguistically realized using evaluative adjectives like "غير" (unprecedented) and "عدوانية" (hostile) to legitimize boycotting Qatar and delegitimize its acts and practices. In the latter, *moral*

evaluation occurs through *evaluation* and *abstraction*. *Evaluation* in the English data is used to legitimize Qatar's policies and delegitimize the quartet's actions against it. It is linguistically realized using evaluative adjectives like "stringent" and "difficult". *Abstraction* is used in the English data to legitimize Qatar's practices by highlighting moral and desirable qualities.

Rationalization is employed in the Arabic and English data. In *instrumental rationalization*, two categories occur in the Arabic data. These are: *goal-orientation* and *effect-orientation*. *Goal-oriented rationalization* is used to legitimize past and future acts taken by the Arab quartet which are considered rational. This strategy is linguistically realized using clauses of purpose which are introduced by the adverbs "in order to", "so as to" and "to". *Effect-oriented rationalization* is realized using the gerund, and is used to underscore the effect of the policies that Qatar has to adopt to resolve the crisis with the quartet. In the English data, the three categories of *instrumental rationalization*, namely *goal-orientation*, *means-orientation* and *effect-orientation*, are employed. *Goal-orientation* is mainly used to show why the U.S. is concerned about making the four boycotting countries and Qatar hold talks to ease the tension. It is realized using the adverb of purpose "in order to". *Means-orientation* is used to highlight the potential of certain actions to serve particular purposes. *Effect-orientation* is constructed using the gerund, and is employed to shed light on the results of holding talks with the parties involved in the Qatari crisis. With respect to *theoretical rationalization*, it occurs in the form of *definition* and *explanation* in the Arabic data. *Definition* is used to legitimize the demands made by the four Arab countries and the stance taken against Qatar. It is also used to delegitimize Qatar's terror-related practices. *Explanation*, which is used to describe the actors involved in a practice, serves not only to delegitimize Qatar's support for terrorism but also the policies adopted by other countries that support terrorist groups and actions. *Theoretical rationalization* in the English data occurs in the form of

explanation and *prediction*. *Explanation* is used to delegitimize boycotting Qatar and implying that all the parties involved in the dispute have to work together to settle it. *Prediction* is used to delegitimize the quartet's position towards Qatar by showing that it has already taken measures to combat terrorism.

Mythopoesis occurs in the Arabic data by using two categories: *cautionary tales* and *single determination*. The former is used to delegitimize establishing relations with Iran and legitimize subsequent actions that could be carried out against countries that deal with this country. The latter is used to legitimize the decision to sever relations with Qatar and delegitimize its policies and the acts it performs to support terrorist organizations. Only one category of *mythopoesis*, namely *single determination*, occurs in the English data in which it serves to implicitly delegitimize cutting ties with Qatar since it had already worked on fighting all forms of terrorism.

The data also shows important results concerning Reyes' (2011) (de) legitimization strategies, their linguistic realizations as well as the functions of these strategies and their realizations. In the Arabic data, *Referential* or *Nomination Strategies*, *Argumentative Strategies* and *Predicative Strategies* are used to realize (de) legitimization through *emotions*. Diplomats from the boycotting quartet use *Referential* or *Nomination Strategies*, such as "الوحش" (beast) and "الوباء" (epidemic), to negatively evaluate Qatar and its acts so as to delegitimize its policies and thus legitimize the measures taken against it. The *Argumentative* strategies employed in the Arabic data also serve to legitimize the decision to boycott Qatar and delegitimize its terror-related practices. The *Argumentative Strategies* are realized using material processes such as "حرضت" (incited) and "تحتضن" (incubates). Qatar is also negatively represented using *Predicative Strategies* which are realized using evaluative attributions like "تنظيم" (terrorist group) and "انتهاك خطير" (serious violation) to highlight the close relation between Qatar and terrorist groups and show its disrespect for Security Council resolutions. This helps legitimize the

quartet's boycott of Qatar by delegitimizing its acts. In the English data, *Argumentative* and *Predicative Strategies* are used to realize (de) legitimization through *emotions*. The *Argumentative Strategies*, which are accomplished through material processes such as "worked out" and "signed", are used to indirectly delegitimize boycotting Qatar by shedding light on the effort it has put in to combat all forms of terrorism and extremism. *Predicative Strategies* are realized through evaluative attributes such as "hard" and "long-simmering". They are used to positively evaluate, and thus legitimize, the mediation role played by Kuwait to handle the dispute between the quartet and Qatar. They are also used to negatively evaluate, and thus delegitimize, the rift between the two parties.

(De) legitimization through a *hypothetical future* is employed in the Arabic data only to highlight the results of not acting according to what the speaker proposes. This strategy sometimes occurs explicitly and sometimes implicitly. When it is used explicitly, it is linguistically realized using the conditional structure: If + present [protasis] → will + infinitive without to [apodosis] and is used to legitimize the possible future acts of the four Arab countries by explicitly showing the consequences of not doing what they ask for. Implicit (de) legitimization through a *hypothetical future* is linguistically realized through the conditional structure: If + past [protasis] → would + infinitive without to [apodosis] and inverting the order of protasis and apodosis. It is used to implicitly delegitimize the possibility that Qatar might not comply with the demands made by the four boycotting countries, and thus legitimize future measures that could be taken to force Qatar to change its policies and stop supporting terrorism.

Legitimization through *altruism* is employed in the Arabic data only and it is used to legitimize the quartet's decision to cut ties with Qatar as well as possible future actions that they could carry out by projecting an altruistic motivation. It is used to show that the quartet's decisions and acts are crucial and beneficial not only to the citizens of these four boycotting countries but also to the peoples of the Arab

region as well as the whole world.

Besides van Leeuwen's (2007) and Reyes' (2011) (de) legitimization strategies that have been examined, it has been found that another (de) legitimization strategy, namely posing unanswered questions, is employed in the Arabic and English data. In the former, it is realized using the wh-question "why" not to seek information but to delegitimize Qatar's concern with terrorism, incitement and vandalism, and unconcern about peace and stability in the region and the world. In the latter, it is realized using yes-no questions and is employed to delegitimize boycotting Qatar by casting doubt on the motivation behind cutting ties by implying that the claims made about Qatar's support for terrorists are unfounded.

The study reveals some differences in the stance taken by the Arab quartet and the U.S. towards Qatar. Diplomats from Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Bahrain and Egypt delegitimize Qatar's policies and terror-related actions and legitimize the decision to break relations with it. They justify the boycott by saying that relations were broken because Qatar harbors terrorists, supports terrorist groups designated as terrorist organizations, including the Muslim Brotherhood, Hamas, Al-Qaida and IS, incites hatred, spreads violence and chaos, and interferes in the internal affairs of other countries. By adopting these policies, Qatar is deemed to be destabilizing and undermining the Arab countries in the region. Therefore, the four Arab states stress that all measures taken are in line with international law and thus insist that Qatar meets the list of demands they set out as a requirement to come to the negotiating table to resolve the rift. The U.S., on the other hand, directly legitimizes Kuwait's mediation efforts in the Qatari crisis and indirectly, as well as implicitly, delegitimizes the quartet's boycott of Qatar by commending its – Qatar's – efforts to combat terrorism and extremism. This indicates that while the State Department does not back the boycott, it seeks to seem neutral with respect to the dispute by trying not to show a clear, direct or coherent stance towards it. However, the U.S. wants the crisis to end because Qatar is the linchpin

of U.S. military interests in the region as it hosts Al-Udeid, the largest U.S. military overseas airbase.

Results of the study indicate that legitimization and delegitimization are employed to generate a positive-self presentation and negative-other presentation. This "Us vs. Them" dichotomy reflects a desire to justify "our" actions and policies by showing that they are correct, beneficial and are carried out in accordance with international law, while "their" actions and policies are not in line with the normative order because they are perverse, deviant and pose a threat to other people's lives. This is shown in the direct and explicit use of (de) legitimization strategies in the statements made by diplomats from the Arab quartet as opposed to the indirect and implicit use of these strategies in the ones made by the State Department spokesperson.

Unlike the State Department, U.S. President Donald Trump has taken a tougher and more direct stance against Qatar by assailing it for financing terrorism and providing safe havens to terrorists. He has also voiced support for boycotting Qatar, saying that it marks "the beginning of the end to the horror of terrorism" (Trump, 2017). Therefore, future research can compare and contrast the (de) legitimization strategies used by Trump and the State Department with regard to the dispute between the Arab quartet and Qatar. Future studies can also examine the strategies used by Qatari diplomats to legitimize Qatar's policies and delegitimize the boycott which Qatar views as a blockade that violates international law. Since the present study examines data from political discourse, future research can investigate the (de) legitimization strategies utilized in non-political discourse so as to compare the strategies used by politicians and non-politicians and the reasons for using them.

Transcription Conventions

... omitted speech

References

- Ali, M. K., Christopher, A. A., & Nordin, M. Z. (2016). Linguistic Legitimation of Political Events in Newspaper Discourse. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(4), 76-83.
- Cap, P. (2006). *Legitimation in Political Discourse: A Cross-disciplinary Perspective on the Modern US war Rhetoric*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Chouliaraki, L. (2005). Introduction: The Soft Power of War: Legitimacy and Community in Iraq War Discourses. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 4(1): 1-10.
- Dunmire, P. (2007). 'Emerging threats' and 'coming dangers': Claiming the Future for Preventive War. In A. Hodges & C. Nilep (Eds.), *Discourse, War and Terrorism* (pp. 19-44). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. London: Routledge.
- Fonseca, P., & Ferreira, M. (2015). Through 'seas never before sailed': Portuguese Government Discursive Legitimation Strategies in a Context of Financial Crisis. *Discourse & Society*, 26(6), 682-711.
- Hague, R., Harrop, M., & Breslin, S. (1998). *Comparative Government and Politics: An Introduction* (4th ed.). Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Hart, C. (2014). *Discourse Grammar and Ideology: Functional and Cognitive Perspectives*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Mirhosseini, S. A. (2017). Discursive Double Legitimation of (Avoiding) Another War in Obama's 2013 Address on Syria. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 16(15), 706-730.
- Oddo, J. (2011). War Legitimation Discourse: Representing 'Us' and 'Them' in Four US Presidential Addresses. *Discourse & Society*, 22(3), 287-314.

- Rasti, A., & Sahragard, R. (2012). Actor Analysis and Action Delegitimation of the Participants Involved in Iran's Nuclear Power Contention: A Case Study of *The Economist*. *Discourse & Society*, 23(6), 729-748.
- Reyes, A. (2011). Strategies of Legitimization in Political Discourse: From Words to Actions. *Discourse & Society*, 22(6), 781-807.
- Reyes-Rodriguez, A. (2008). Hot and Cold War: The Linguistic Representation of a Rhetorical Decision Filter. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*, 2(2), 31-47.
- Rojo, L. M., & van Dijk, T. A. (1997). "There was a problem, and it was solved!": Legitimizing the Expulsion of 'Illegal' Migrants in Spanish Parliamentary Discourse. *Discourse Society*, 8(4), 523-566.
- Ross, A. S., & Rivers, D. J. (2017). Digital Cultures of Political Participation: Internet Memes and the Discursive Delegitimation of the 2016 U.S. Presidential Candidates. *Discourse, Context and Media*, 16, 1-11.
- Sadeghi, B., Hassani, M., & Jalali, V. (2014). Towards (De-) Legitimation Discursive Strategies in News Coverage of Egyptian Protest: VOA & Fars News in Focus. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1580-1589.
- Sadeghi, B., & Jalali, V. (2013). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Discursive (De-) Legitimation Construction of Egyptian Revolution in Persian Media. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(5), 1063-1071.
- Said, H. M., (2017). Legitimation Strategies in Egyptian Political Discourse: The Case of Presidential Speeches (unpublished master's thesis). AUC, Cairo.
- Screti, F. (2013). Defending Joy against the Popular Revolution: Legitimation and Delegitimation through Songs. *Discourse Studies*, 10(2), 205-222.
- Steffek, J. (2003). The Legitimation of International Governance: A

- Discourse Approach. *European Journal of International Relations*, 9(2), 249-275.
- Sulaiman, A., & Jamil, N. (2014). Demonising Demonstartion: (De) Legitimization Strategies through Emotions in the Speeches of Hosni Mubarak and Ben Ali. *Middle East Journal of Scientific Research*, 20, 1-10.
- Thompson, G. (2004). *Introducing Functional Grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Arnold.
- Trump, D. [realDonaldTrump]. (2017, June 6). ...extremism, and all reference was pointing to Qatar. Perhaps this will be the beginning of the end to the horror of terrorism! [Tweet]. Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/872086906804240384?lang=en>
- Vaara, E. (2014). Struggles over Legitimacy in the European Crisis: Discursive Legitimation Strategies and their Ideological Underpinnings. *Discourse & Society*, 25(4), 500-518.
- Vaara, E., & Tienari, J. (2008). A Discursive Perspective on Legitimation Strategies in Multinational Corporations. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(4), 985-993.
- Vaara, E., Tienari, J., & Laurila, J. (2006). Pulp and Paper Fiction: On the Discursive Legitimation of Global Industrial Restructuring. *Organization Studies*, 27(6), 789-810.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is Political Discourse Analysis? In J. Blommaert & C. Bulcaen (Eds.), *Political Linguistics* (pp. 11-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: SAGE.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2005). War Rhetoric of a Little Ally: Political Implicatures and Aznar's Legitimization of the War in Iraq. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 4(1), 65-92.
- van Leeuwen, T. (2007). Legitimation in Discourse and Communication. *Discourse & Communication*, 1(1), 91-112.

- van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press..
- van Leeuwen, T., & Wodak, R. (1999). Legitimizing Immigration Control: A Discourse-Historical Analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 1(1), 83-118.
- Wilson, J. (2001). Political Discourse. In H. Hamilton, D. Schiffrin, & D. Tannen (Eds.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 398-415). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wodak, R. (2001). The Discourse Historical Approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 63-94). London: SAGE.
- Yagcioglu, S. A., & Cem-Deger, A. (2001). Logos or Mythos: (De) Legitimation Strategies in Confrontational Discourses of Sociocultural Ethos. *Discourse Society*, 12(6), 817-852.

Internet Resources

- Alghad TV. (2017, June 7). *الجبير يكشف الأسباب الحقيقية لمقاطعة قطر* (Al-Jubeir reveals the real reasons for boycotting Qatar) [video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n3AsSNfuR-0>
- All News. (2017, August 5). *مصر ترد علي شكوي قطر أمام مجلس الأمن* (Egypt responses to Qatar's complaint before the Security Council) [video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BbPW7R6Xnfw>
- Dmc. (2017a, July 26). *مساء dmc - وزير خارجية البحرين: "تم إعطاء الفرصة للأمير تميم لإصلاح سياساته تجاه الدول العربية"*. (Dmc night – Bahraini Foreign Minister: "Emir Tamim was given the chance to reform his policies towards the Arab countries") [video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ssbjq048fQ>

- Dmc. (2017b, July 26). مساء dmc - وزير خارجية البحرين: "لو لم نواجه قطر بكل حسم فنحن لم نلتزم بمسئوليتنا أمام العالم"
(Dmc night – Bahraini Foreign Minister: "If we don't confront Qatar firmly, we will have abdicated our responsibility in front of the world") [video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Hp52IO>
- Dmc. (2017c, July 30). وزير الخارجية سامح شكري لـ dmc: أي إجراءات بشأن قطر تتخذ بالتوافق بين الدول الأربعة.
(Sameh Shoukry to DMC: The four countries are in agreement about the sanctions imposed on Qatar) [video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qcRJBsHVwrh>
- DW عربية (DW Arabic). (2017, July 8). وزير الخارجية السعودي لـ DW: على قطر التوقف عن دعم الإرهاب.
(Saudi Foreign Minister to DW: Qatar has to stop supporting Terrorism) [video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NaTXiV>
- Extra news. (2017a, July 4). عبد الله بن زايد: كفي يا قطر دعما للإرهاب.
(Abdullah bin Zayed: Stop supporting terrorism, Qatar) [video file]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com.com/watch?i0_cqTjwdDg
- Extra news. (2017b, July 19). مؤتمر صحفي بين وزير الخارجية سامح شكري ونظيره العراقي إبراهيم الجعفري (A press conference between Foreign Minister Sameh Shoukry and his Iraqi counterpart) [video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WmnDDcqauXI>
- France 24 Arabic. (2017, July 26). سامح شكري وزير الخارجية المصري: "الديننا" (Egyptian Foreign Minister Sameh Shoukry: "We have evidence that Qatar supports terrorism") [video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vkyle5yUBa8>
- On Live. (2017a, June 8). مصر تدعو مجلس الأمن للتحقيق في اتهام قطر بتمويل جماعات إرهابية في العراق (Egypt calls Security Council to investigate accusations that Qatar funds terrorist groups in Iraq) [video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oQnDY6Yf17I>

- On Live. (2017b, July 21). مصر تؤكد أمام مجلس الأمن أن النظام الحاكم في قطر يتبنى سياسة دعم الإرهاب (Egypt assures Security Council that the ruling regime in Qatar supports terrorism) [video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oNaQp1Y6bmy>
- On Live. (2017c, July 30). مؤتمر صحفي لوزراء خارجية الدول الأربعة الداعية لمكافحة الإرهاب (A press conference held by the Foreign Ministers of the four countries calling for combating terrorism) [video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xoo54XO3Os>
- RT Arabic. (2017, July 5). مؤتمر صحفي لوزراء خارجية مصر والسعودية والإمارات والبحرين بشأن الأزمة مع قطر (The Foreign Ministers of Egypt, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and Bahrain hold a press conference on the crisis with Qatar) [video file]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s_YiMy39UVM
- Sada El-balad. (2017a, July 5). سامح شكري: لا تراجع عن أي قرارات ضد قطر (Sameh Shoukry: Decisions taken against Qatar will not be changed unless it stops supporting terrorism) [video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vOiiicclEKZE>
- Sada El-balad. (2017b, July 5). وزير خارجية الإمارات: قطر تهتم بالتطرف والتخريب والعنف والإرهاب (UAE Foreign Minister: Qatar is concerned with extremism, vandalism, violence and terrorism) [video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ktfeuAaLAcQ>
- U.S. Department of State. (2017a, June 6). *Department Press Briefing* [Interview transcript]. Retrieved from <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/06/271605.htm#QATAR2>
- U.S. Department of State. (2017b, June 8). *Department Press Briefing* [Interview transcript]. Retrieved from <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/06/271653.htm#QAT>

AR

U.S. Department of State. (2017c, June 13). *Department Press Briefing* [Interview transcript]. Retrieved from <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/06/271723.htm#QAT>

AR

U.S. Department of State. (2017d, June 15). *Department Press Briefing* [Interview transcript]. Retrieved from <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/06/271956.htm>

U.S. Department of State. (2017e, June 20). *Department Press Briefing* [Interview transcript]. Retrieved from <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/06/272056.htm#QAT>

AR2

U.S. Department of State. (2017f, June 22). *Department Press Briefing* [Interview transcript]. Retrieved from <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/06/272114.htm#QAT>

AR

U.S. Department of State. (2017g, June 27). *Department Press Briefing* [Interview transcript]. Retrieved from <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/06/272215.htm#QAT>

AR

U.S. Department of State. (2017h, July 6). *Department Press Briefing* [Interview transcript]. Retrieved from <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/07/272393.htm#QAT>

AR

U.S. Department of State. (2017i, July 11). *Department Press Briefing* [Interview transcript]. Retrieved from <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/07/272535.htm>

U.S. Department of State. (2017j, July 13). *Department Press Briefing* [Interview transcript]. Retrieved from <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/07/272575.htm>

U.S. Department of State. (2017k, July 27). *Department Press Briefing* [Interview transcript]. Retrieved from <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/07/272879.htm#QAT>

AR

