

## Language of Legitimization in Political Discourse on Kashmir Issue

Mariyam Aziz<sup>1</sup>

Ahmad Naveed Sharif<sup>2</sup>

Jabir Hussain<sup>3</sup>

Rauf Ahmad<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Management & Technology, Sialkot – Pakistan

<sup>2</sup>University of Otago, Dunedin – New Zealand

<sup>3</sup>University of Education, Lahore – Pakistan

<sup>4</sup>University of Education, Lahore – Pakistan

---

### Abstract

*This study concerns the discursive strategies used in political discourse to legitimize conflicting positions on the Kashmir issue, a major issue between Pakistan and India. More specifically, the study has attempted to address the question of legitimization strategies and their linguistic realizations feature in the Pakistani and the Indian Prime Minister's speeches after the abrogation of Article 370 about the Kashmir issue. The data consists of the speeches the Pakistani Prime Minister Imran Khan and the Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi delivered after the abrogation of Article 370 on Kashmir. The whole research has been framed under the scope of Critical Discourse Analysis and the speeches have been analyzed in terms of Reyes' (2011) strategies of legitimization, and Halliday's (2014) Transitivity Model. The data analysis reveals that both prime ministers use the strategies of emotion, hypothetical future, rationality, voice of expertise, and altruism to justify their respective positions and to attack their opponent, yet they differ on the linguistic realizations of these strategies mainly due to their different mental models of the communicative event rooted in their differing ideological perspectives. The findings establish the significance of language as an analytical tool that can help understand the nature of discursive practices underlying certain ideologies.*

**Keywords:** *Political discourse, critical discourse analysis, language of legitimization, rationality, transitivity*

---

Author's Email: [ahmadns.pk@gmail.com](mailto:ahmadns.pk@gmail.com)

### Introduction

Much of the linguistic research views language as a social construct rather than an innate phenomenon (Evan, 2014), and is

mainly concerned with language use rather than with language per se. One of the research perspectives on the relationship between language and society is Discourse Analysis (DA).

DA research takes language as constructing social reality (Ruiz, 2009), that is, language not only communicates information (saying) but also performs an action (doing) and enacts identities (being) (Gee, 2014). In other words, this research paradigm explores how discourse produces a certain perspective of some phenomenon by excluding other alternatives. This exclusionary dimension of discourse can have social implications as a particular way of representing social phenomena involves a particular way of dealing with it. By assuming a social constructivist view of reality, DA research investigates the role of language in the social practices by which different forms of psychological and social life are created. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) takes a step further in assuming that social phenomena have a discursive dimension due to a close connection between linguistic and social structures, and discourse analytic methods can help understand how asymmetrical power relations are

constructed and maintained (Fairclough, 2010; Richardson, 2006; Van Dijk, 2001; Wodak, 2009). “Critical discourse studies focus on the ways discourse structures enact, confirm, legitimate, reproduce, or challenge relations of power and dominance in society” (Van Dijk, 2001, p.352). This research tradition primarily explicates the ideological function of language to analyze legitimization that is accomplished by discourse, which ultimately helps in the reproduction of power by monopolizing the truth as well as public discourse (Pennycook, 2001). As observed by Fairclough (1996), language is used by social actors to legitimize their authority, hegemony and ideology on a particular issue. The use of certain kinds of lexical choices may help politicians in legitimizing their position on a particular issue. Social actors develop Us vs Them strategy to legitimize their position. (Van Dijk, 1997). The present study explores the nature of the legitimization strategies and their

linguistics realization in political discourse.

### **Literature Review**

The concept of legitimization had been studied in social and political science, law, and philosophy (see Meyer & Rowan, 1997; Parsons, 1960; Suchman, 1995; Weber, 1968), yet its discursive and communicative characteristics are not been much studied. However, some recent studies (see Reyes, 2011; Rojo, 1997; Van Dijk, 1998) foreground the discourse of legitimization for deciphering its discursive and communicative characteristics. They are of the view that it is a speech act in which speaker gives reasons to justify his actions that has been or could be criticized by others. In political discourse, legitimization is very significant as political actors justify their positions or agenda through it. It is the main discourse goal of political actors (Capone, 2008). In addition, it also influences political discourse as they are considered planned (Ochs, 1997) or pre-planned (Capone, 2010).

Legitimization has three main aspects: targets, practices, and consequences. The studies of legitimization see not only the actors as targets that are confronting it but some third parties such as the media or general public as well (Reyes, 2011). Legitimization can be practiced in a number of ways such as through voice of expertise (Thompson, 2004), symbolic power (Chouliaraki, 2005), and emotions and rationality (Reyes, 2011). Recent works on it see discursive and communicative tactics as pivotal in the practice of legitimization. Legitimization always has its consequences either intended or unintended.

The production of legitimization is intertwined with meanings, subjectivities, and discourses. The discourse approach helps in revealing these interrelationships as well as their intended or unintended consequences. To illustrate, Reyes (2011), building on Van Leeuwen's (1996, 2007, 2008) legitimization strategies,

examines the American presidents George W. Bush's (2007) and Barak Obama's (2009) speeches and proposes some new strategies including legitimization through emotions, hypothetical future, rationality, voices of expertise and altruism. For instance, both politicians have used emotive strategy (Bush: *'Killed about 3,000 of our citizens.'*; Obama: *'And therefore, in the long run, your children and grandchildren are more likely to live in peace with the advent of liberty'*), and rational strategy (Bush: *'That's why I made the decision I made. I understand the consequences of failure; they are not acceptable.... for successes.'*; Obama: *'We did not ask for the fight. On September 11, 2001, 19 men hijacked four airplanes and use them to murder nearly 3,000 people.'*). The difference between Bush and Obama is found in their direct and indirect speech respectively as well as in their use of personal pronouns like "I" and colloquial expressions. Neskovska et al. (2019) analyze American Presidential

Speeches (2016) by Donald Trump and Hilary Clinton by employing lexical-semantic analysis, Benoit et al.'s (2003) functional theory of political campaign discourse, and Reyes' (2011) strategies of legitimization. This study also shows how politicians justify social practices through emotions, a hypothetical future, rationality, voice of expertise and altruism. However, in contrast to the above studies, it also conducts pragmatic analysis and finds that the politicians differ on the use of interpersonal meta-discourse markers such as hedges, intensifiers, self-mentions and engagement markers. Abdi and Basarati (2018) analyzes Barak Obama's (2016) speech which was about Muslim identity in America. By using *'half a century'*, Obama tries to legitimize Muslim's position by pointing out their American history of identity. He also legitimizes his position by pointing out the contribution of American Muslims to the well-being of society: *'There's a school where teachers open young minds'*. That Obama

delegitimizes anti-Muslim opinions as well as antagonistic actions against Muslims is quite evident from the text *‘targeting women wearing Hijab, bullying children, vandalizing mosques, and targeting Sikh Americans’*. Obama uses the strategy of analogy and believes that American Muslims should not be considered second-class citizens. Thus, identity construction functions as a discursive legitimization act of power that is used to legitimize certain affairs’ states. Ahmad et al., (2020) find out the emotive and altruistic strategies in the speeches of three politicians: Imran Khan, Narendra Modi, and Donald Trump.

Motivated by the gravity of the Kashmir issue between Pakistan and India, the present study explores the nature of the legitimization strategies the prime political actors use to legitimize their positions on the issue. The Kashmir dispute between Pakistan and India is a root cause of instability in South Asia. This dispute started during the 1947

partition of the Indian subcontinent after the British withdrawal from South Asia and sparked the Indo-Pakistani wars in 1947, 1965, and 1999. Pakistan considers itself ‘incomplete’ as a nation-state without Kashmir and India claims the inclusion of Kashmir as valid to the validation of India's credentials. The imposition of Article 370 on Kashmir by India in 2019 has again escalated the tension between the two countries since this act withdrew the special status of Kashmir valley and brought the state to the ‘curfew’ by the Indian government. Given the fact that both countries are nuclear powers, the issue is often referred to as a nuclear flashpoint. As observed by Nixon (1992) that nuclear powers have never fought each other but because of the disputed Kashmir territory, the clash between Pakistan and India could erupt into the world's first war between the two nuclear powers. The dispute has deep roots in the past and grave

risks for the future, a regional conflict with global impact.

In the context of the Kashmir issue, there have been a number of speeches by the prime ministers of both countries at national as well as international levels in which they use arguments to legitimize their respective positions and to delegitimize their opponents. In political discourse, this act of legitimization, as pointed out by Reyes (2011), deserves special attention because it is from this speech event that political leaders justify their political agenda to obtain or maintain power, to achieve social acceptance, and alter the direction of a whole nation. Against this background, the present study explores the nature of the legitimization strategies Pakistani Prime Minister Imran Khan and the Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi use in their political speeches on the Kashmir issue. The study delineates the research problem into the following question: *What legitimization strategies and their*

*linguistic realizations feature in the Pakistani Prime Minister's and the Indian Prime Minister's speeches after the abrogation of Article 370 about the Kashmir issue?*

To frame the data analysis for addressing the research question, the following section outlines the theoretical assumptions adopted in this study.

### **Theoretical Framework**

To address the research question raised above, the study combines two analytical apparatuses: Reyes' (2011) strategies of legitimization, and Halliday's (2014) Systematic Functional Grammar, more particularly, his transitivity model which approaches grammar through discourse.

#### **Reyes' (2011) strategies for legitimization**

Speakers use different strategies to legitimize themselves and delegitimize their opponents and, in this way, they create so-called binary conceptualizations, us vs them (Van Dijk, 1997). This study assumes Reyes' (2011) strategies of

legitimization as a theoretical framework to analyze the data. Building on Van Leeuwen's (2007) categories (authorization, mythopoesis, moral evaluation, and rationalization), Reyes (2011) proposed five strategies of legitimization: emotions, a hypothetical future, rationality, voice of expertise, and altruism.

- a. The emotive strategy appeals to the emotions (particularly fear) of the audience and speakers constitute the 'them group' by depicting their opponents negatively. By attributing negative qualities to their opponents, they allow their speakers to have two sides of a given story, in which both the audience as well as the speaker is in the 'us-group' and the opponent is in the 'them-group'. Politicians also achieve this with the help of "constructive strategies", that is 'utterances that constitute a "we" group and a "they" group with the

help of certain acts of references (Van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999).

- b. By using a hypothetical future strategy, speakers present a threat in the future which demands immediate action in the present (Dunmire, 2007). They usually legitimize it by highlighting a past mistake, which is the cause of the present problem. Speakers usually do this in two different ways: (a) If we do not do what the speaker is talking in the present, the past will repeat again; (b) If we act according to the speakers' instructions, the future will be bright. Linguistically, they are usually realized with the help of conditional sentences, modals, and mental verbs.
- c. Rational strategy is enacted when political actors present the legitimization process as a process where decisions have been made after a heeded, evaluated and thoughtful

procedure. Decision making is rational if other sources are consulted, and all the opinions are explored. For Van Leeuwen (2007), it is a “theoretical rationalization”.

Linguistically, these arguments would include verbs denoting mental and verbal processes such as ‘explore’ and ‘consult’ (Reyes, 2011).

- d. Voice of expertise strategy is displayed in discourse by speakers when they intend to show their audience that their arguments are supported by experts who also think the same. For Van Leeuwen (2007), this strategy is referred to as “authorization”. Politicians use this strategy as authoritative sources (Rojo & Van Dijk, 1997). By associating one’s speech with authoritative people, speakers try to be more convincing, more persuasive, and more attended to (Philips, 2004).

Linguistically, this strategy is normally expressed with the help of quotation marks or verbs including verbal processes like ‘say’, ‘announce’, and ‘reported’, etc.

- e. Altruistic strategy is displayed by speakers when they want to present themselves as people who care, who serve others and do things for the common good and are not guided by their own personal interests. As it deals with a system of values, so it refers to a type of moral evaluation (Van Leeuwen, 2007).

### **Halliday’s (2014) transitivity model**

The lexicogrammar of a language expresses three metafunctions (ideational, interpersonal, and textual) which operate at the clause level and are present in any clause. The ideational metafunction deals with the way in which the clause represents the world in terms of a process, the participants in that process and, sometimes, the



circumstances in which the process takes place. The interpersonal metafunction concerns the relationships either between the speaker and the addressee, or between the speaker and the message. Finally, the textual metafunction deals with the way in which the message is structured. This metafunction, like the two others, functions at the level of the clause but is also concerned with the ways in which the clauses are linked together to make a text. Systemic Functional Linguistics considers part and parcel the context in which language is created and sees the immediate context in terms of three functions: field, tenor, and mode. The field is the ongoing activity of which the language is a part. Tenor is the relationship between the person who is communicating and those he is communicating with. Mode is the form through which the message is communicated, that is, basically, spoken or written. Thus, the theory focuses on the relationship between

the lexicogrammar, the semantic metafunctions, and the context.

Turning to the ideational metafunction, a simple clause consists of a process (action, event or state) and one or more participants in that process. To this may be added various circumstances. The relationship between a process and its participants and circumstances is known as transitivity, and this constitutes a major part of the ideational metafunction. In Systemic Functional Linguistics, the term 'transitivity' involves a much more complex set of relationships. This study uses a system with five process types: material, mental, relational, verbal, and existential. The following account of process types mainly draws on Bank (2019).

- a. Material processes are actions and events which take place in the physical world.

*The UK's star student hackers **will descend** on Cambridge this weekend, to show off their skills of cyber sabotage. (Cambridge News, 20 April 2016)*

- b. Mental processes are events of a cerebral nature: these can be “cognitive”, dealing with types of thinking, “perception”, dealing with types of sensing (seeing, hearing, etc.), or “affective”, dealing with liking and disliking.

*Why do we **believe** in the unbelievable?* (The Crack, 333, April 2016) *As this gentleman passed along, he **saw** three little girls standing before a shop window.* (Religious tract, 2016) *If, however, you would **like** to stroll through the College’s spacious grounds, a pathway (accorded a national ‘biodiversity’ award) that starts near the vehicle entrance gates on Victoria Avenue will take you through the Grove – where on 10 February 1792 Coleridge composed his poem “In Jesus Wood” – to the rear of North Court.* (Jesus College, Cambridge, tourist guide, 2016)

- c. Relational processes simply state a relationship between two entities, or between an

entity and its characteristics. Here again, there are three types: “attributive”, which gives the characteristics or features of an entity, “identifying”, which refers to the same entity in different words, and “possessive”, which, in addition to possession properly so-called, deals with things like the relationship of inclusion, which can be assimilated to possession. The first of the following examples has two relational attributive processes, the second is an example of identifying relational process, and the third of a possessive relational process.

*The book is a splendid thing, its musical notations and Latin text meticulously inked on the vellum (calfskin) pages which **are** still firm and flexible after nearly half a millennium.* (The Journal Culture, April 2016)

*Sasha Regan is the founder and artistic director of a multiple award-winning theatres in London's Southwark area. (Cambridge Arts Theatre programme, 20–23 April 2016) This well-stocked shop includes brands such as Floris, Cath Kidston, Peony and Dents plus luxury cards and gift wrap. (Ely Cathedral brochure, 2016)*

- d. Verbal processes are processes of communication.

*For the moment, however, he said the most effective way to tackle Ades aegypti is to mobilise the public. (Guardian Weekly, 8–14 April 2016)*

- e. Existential processes simply state the existence of something. The most common way of expressing this in English is the *There is/are* construction.

*There has been a church on this site since the early 12th century, although only a little of the first church building remains. (St. John the Baptist Church, Newcastle, tourist guide)*

In this example, there are two cases of existential process. The verb *has been* is a fairly typical example of an existential process, while *remains* provides a less typical example.

Transitivity, as pointed out by Halliday (1973), is the set of options whereby the speaker encodes his experience, both external as well as internal, in terms of processes, participants in these processes, and their attendant circumstances. Since each individual has his/her own linguistic style, at the same time, s/he will focus on determined aspects to describe his/her own conception of reality. Thus, an individual's semantic and syntactic choices and the resultant discourse organization serve to manifest his/her positioning with respect to how they or perceives a situation (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014).

### Research Methodology

The present study takes much care of the empirical evidence to answer the research question as unambiguously as possible since its findings are bounded by the reliability

of empirical evidence (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2012; Yin, 2003). The focus of the study was to analyze the linguistic strategies in two prime ministers' speeches, its unit of observation and analysis for legitimization strategies in the speeches. However, the unit of analysis for the linguistic realization of these strategies is the clause on which the SFL's Transitivity Model is based. The study consists of two speeches, one by Pakistani Prime Minister Imran Khan and one by Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi. The focus on these speeches was motivated by the view that public opinion was greatly influenced by the discourse of elites in virtue of the fact that "elites are the ones who initiate, monitor, and control the majority and most influential forms of institutional and public text and talk" (Van Dijk, 1990, p.4). Hence, the key factors considered for the choice of speeches are the popularity of the speakers as well as the extent to which their speeches are distributed in print, electronic and social media.

Imran Khan's speech was an address to the nation on 26 August 2019 whereas Narinder Modi's speech was an address to the nation on 8 August 2019. The speeches were taken from YouTube and were subjected to a clean verbatim transcription. Only Kashmir issue-related parts of the speeches were focused on for the analysis.

Considering the purpose of the study, the qualitative approach was used in that it gives an in-depth analysis of the data. For an intensive data analysis, the present study was conducted as a qualitative case study because in it, the particulars were built out of the abstractions, and it also accommodated new linguistic details that emerged during the process of investigation (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Dörnyei, 2007). Furthermore, the deductive reasoning for the present study was considered important as its findings may help in understanding an existing theory. As the research question of the present study was addressed in terms of a

theory, the study follows a theory-to-research-to-theory strategy.

### **Findings and Discussion**

For addressing the research question, the researchers carefully transcribe the speeches, and then find

out the legitimization strategies in the speeches. The next step was to find out the linguistic strategies used to realize legitimization strategies by applying tools from Systemic Functional Linguistics.

## Emotions

Table 1 below shows representative examples of the strategy of emotions used in the speeches of Imran Khan and Narendra Modi.

*Table 1 Emotions in Imran Khan's and Narendra Modi's speeches*

Speakers	Statements	Transitivity Processes
IK-a	<sup>1</sup> jo hiḍūstan hē sīrf hiḍūḍ ka hē ṛ baqī sēb sēkād̃ kēlas sīṭizān hē 'Hindustan is only for Hindus, and all others are only second-class citizens.'	hē = RP hē = RP
IK-b	yīh nāzriyāh rss ka hē... yīh adialoji logō ko pākār pākār ke sārḱō ke opār marti hē 'This is RSS ideology...This ideology kills people on the roads.'	hē = RP marti hē = MatP
IK-c	əssi lak <sup>h</sup> kāḱmiri jo is wāqt kārḱiyu ke nice hē hām sari qom ūn ko pēḱam dē kīh hām ūn ke sat <sup>h</sup> k <sup>h</sup> əre hē 'We, as a whole nation, should give the message to 80-lac Kashmiris who are under curfew right now that we stand by them.'	hē = RP pēḱam dē = VP k <sup>h</sup> əre hē = MatP
NM-a	artikāl 370 and 35A ne jāmmu kāḱmir ko əḷḱavad ətə ḱ vad pārivarvad ṛ vāvəstau mē bəḷ <sup>h</sup> e pemane pār p <sup>h</sup> ele hoe pārəḱṭacar ke ilavəh kuc <sup>h</sup> nāhi diya. In donō ənuḱet ka des ke xīlaf kūch logō ki b <sup>h</sup> avnaē b <sup>h</sup> ərkane ke liye pakīstan dīvara ek sēstər ke tər pār īstəmal kīya ja rəha t <sup>h</sup> a 'Article 370 and 35A have given nothing but secessionism, terrorism, nepotism and widespread corruption on a large scale to Jammu-Kashmir. Both these articles were used as a weapon by Pakistan to flare up the emotions of some people.'	diya = MatP b <sup>h</sup> ərkane = MatP īstəmal kīya = MatP
NM-b	lāg b <sup>h</sup> əg biyalis hāzar nirdoḱ logō ko əpnī jan gēvani pəri 'About 42,000 innocent people were killed.'	gēvani pəri = MatP
NM-c	des ke ənne rajō mē dəlītō pār hətyacar rōkne keliye səxt qanun lagu hē lekən jāmmu kāḱmir mē əsa nāhī hē 'In other states, strict laws were enacted to stop atrocities on Dalits but no such laws could be implemented in Jammu & Kashmir.'	lagu hē = MatP hē = EP

<sup>1</sup>The transcription system used in this study is adapted from Raza (2011).

Note: IK=Imran Khan, NM=Narendra Modi

Table 1 shows that both politicians use the strategy of emotions to legitimize their respective positions. Both speakers evoke emotional mode in their audience by portraying a positive self-representation and a negative other-representation. The difference lies in the source of emotions. IK evokes emotions (fear and sadness) by disparaging the nationalistic ideology of RSS which, as interpreted by IK, divides Hindustan into Hindu and Non-Hindu entities and subjects the former to discrimination and oppression, violating their basic human rights. The analysis of IK's speech shows that he rests self-representation on what he considers an ideology of peace grounded in Islamic sources. For the linguistic expression of such types of emotions and their sources, Ik employs relational and material processes to portray the sad situation

in Kashmir and to identify with Kashmiris.

NM's strategy is to evoke a sense of deprivation, sadness, but with different motivations. This is the reason that NM builds his case on Kashmiris' sense of deprivation owing to Article 370, instead of Kashmiris' demand for freedom, and then passes the buck to Pakistan for its misuse. Such a conception of reality is less likely to help the speaker identify with the target audience. This is also evident in the linguistic resources NM uses: mostly material processes to describe past or future actions, and no relational processes meant for identification. Evasion of a ground reality would be a weak strategy to evoke emotions in an audience without addressing its actual question when the audience itself lives the reality.

## Hypothetical Future

Table 2 shows representative examples of the hypothetical future strategy used in the speeches of Imran Khan and Narendra Modi.

*Table 2 Hypothetical future in Imran Khan's and Narendra Modi's speeches*

Speakers	Statements	Transitivity Processes
IK-a	mẽ kəʃmɪr ka əb əmbəsədər bənu ga. dɒnya mẽ kəʃmɪr ke jo halat hẽ jo pɪyɑm hɛ jo sɪcʊɛʃən hɛ vo mẽ dɒnya mẽ le kər jaũ ga 'I will become the ambassador of Kashmir. I will communicate to the world the situation in Kashmir.'	bənu ga= RP le kər jaũ ga= MatP
IK-b	əgər kəhɪ mʊsəlman həkʊmtɛ ɪs vəqt məjburi ki vəjəh se tɪjərət ki vəjəh se aj əgər nəhɪ b <sup>hi</sup> hẽ age həmare sat <sup>h</sup> ajaẽ gi 'If some Muslim countries are not with us either under compulsion or due to trade, they will come to our outside in future.'	hẽ ... sat <sup>h</sup> = RP ajaẽ gi = MatP
IK-c	hər həfte həm ek ɪvɛɫ kərɛ ge ʃɪdər sari qʊm nɪkle gi ɪs ɪvɛɫ pe...sarɔ ne ek ad <sup>h</sup> e gheɫe ke lie nɪkəlna hɛ 'Every week we will organize an event in which the whole nation will participate. All should come out for half an hour.'	kərɛ ge = MatP nɪkle gi = MatP nɪkəlna hɛ = MatP
NM-a	mujhe pʊra vɪʃvas hɛ kɪh ɪs nəɪi vavasta ke teɦət həm səb mil kər ʔtəŋɡvat, əlvayət se jamʊ kəʃmɪr ko mʊkt kərəɔɫ ge 'I have complete faith that under this new system we all will be able to free Jammu and Kashmir of terrorism and separatism.'	vɪʃvas hɛ = MenP kərəɔɫ ge = MatP
NM-b	əb ʔrtɪkəl t <sup>h</sup> əri sevənti ɔr t <sup>h</sup> arɪ fəɪv e bite hʊə ɪtiɦas ke ho jane ke bəd ɪske nəkarat pərɪb <sup>h</sup> ao se b <sup>hi</sup> jamʊ kəʃmɪr ʃəld bahir nɪkle ga. 'Following the abrogation of Article 370 and 35 A, Jammu and Kashmir would soon come out of its negative effects.'	nɪkle ga = MatP
NM-c		bənana hɛ = MatP



The textual analysis reveals that both political actors regard the determination of the future as the direct aim of their political discourse. It is evident in the above example expressions that the speakers are aware of the socio-political import of the future which is an irreal is, yet consequential space into which they can project, contest, and proclaim their conflicting plans for the future. Both speakers linguistically realize their future representations with the help of modal *ga/gi/ge* ‘will’, a typical marker of future time, and periphrastic modal infinitive + present form of *hona* ‘be’. However, they ground their future reality in different interpretations of the past. IK looks at the past (Kashmiris’ right of self-determination and India’s violation of the right through oppression as interpreted by IK) as a guide to the future and at the future as a natural extension of the present. Such an interpretation of the past and such a construction of future reality necessitates proposing a course of action that calls for freedom from

oppression resulting in self-determination. In contrast, NM’s arguments about the possible future contradict the past, as evident in NM-a and NM-b above. Such a representation of the future cannot be grounded in the actual past (what has actually happened in Kashmir); the only option left with the speaker is to reconstruct/distort the past in order to construct the hypothetical future. NM capitalizes on this option and portrays the future that focuses on what *ought to* be done, employing cover-up arguments that invoke other social problems such as the lack of amenities in different areas. Thus, the different conceptual/semantic choices by these political players motivate their lexical and syntactic choices as evident in the transitivity processes used in their respective speeches. For instance, most of the main clauses by NM contain mental processes such as *vi/vas* ‘I believe/I’m confident’. Such lexical choices expressing epistemic modality are typically used to indicate the level of certainty; however, when the actual past is reconstructed to

create a political discourse with underlying ideology evading the actual issue, frequent use of epistemic and deontic modals ironically reduces the level of certainty because the potency of political language does not stem from its description of the past. Contrary to that, IK never uses mental processes and directly employs

material processes for evocating potentialities in the future. The analysis reveals that hypothetical future strategy gains efficacy when future representation is well-rooted in the actual past, not in the ‘reconstructed’ past, which downplays the significance of the future reality, whatsoever.

## Rationality

Table 3 below shows representative examples of the strategy of rationality used in the speeches of Imran Khan and Narendra Modi.

*Table 3 Rationality in Imran Khan's and Narendra Modi's speeches*

Speakers	Statements	Transitivity Processes
IK-a	pakistan ki yeh jo kəfmir palisi hē is ka ek fəslahkən vəqt a gəya	hē = EP
	hē to is liye yeh zruri hē keh mē ap sari qəm ko itemad mē lu ga ər	a gəya hē = MatP
	ap ko igzəkt səcuefən ka bətau keh hmari qəm kıya kərne ja rəhi	lu ga = MatP
	hē.	bətau = VP
	‘There has come a decisive moment for the Pakistani policy on Kashmir. It is necessary for me to take the whole nation into confidence and tell you exactly what our nation is going to do.’	ja rəhi hē = MatP
IK-b	in <sup>h</sup> ō ne kəfmir ko ənəks ker liya...yeh jo intərnəʃnəl yunaitid	ker liya = MatP
	nəʃənz ki səkyoreti kənsəl ki rəzolyuʃən t <sup>h</sup> i ʊs ke b <sup>h</sup> i xələf gəe,	xələf gəe = MatP
	apnē ain ke b <sup>h</sup> i xələf gəe, apnē səprim kort ər hai kort ke fəslō ke	
	b <sup>h</sup> i xələf gəe. jo vade kiye t <sup>h</sup> e praim mənistər nehru ne kəfmir ke	
	logō se ʊn ke b <sup>h</sup> i xələf gəe	
NM-a	‘They annexed Kashmir... they went against the UNO’s Security Council’s resolution; they went against their own constitution; they went against the decisions of their supreme and high courts; they went against the promises of their Prime Minister Nehru he made with Kashmiris.’	
	deʃ ke ənne rajō mē səfaʃi kərəm cariyō ke liye kərəm cari ekt	lagu hē = MatP
	lagu hē lekin jamō kəfmir ke səfaʃi kərəm cari is se vəncit t <sup>h</sup> e. ʊn	vəncit t <sup>h</sup> e = EP
	ko ye həq nəhi diya geya t <sup>h</sup> a. deʃ ke ənne rajō mē dalitō pər ənne	diya geya t <sup>h</sup> a = MatP
	car rokne ke liye səxt qanon lagu hē lekin jamū kəfmir mē esa	t <sup>h</sup> a = EP
NM-b	nəhi t <sup>h</sup> a. lekin moʃ <sup>h</sup> e pura vifvaf hē ke ab bədlao ae ga.	vifvaf hē = MenP
	‘In different states of the country sanitation workers come under the sanitation worker act, but workers from Jammu and Kashmir were deprived of it. In many states strong laws are there to stop atrocities against Dalits, but this was not the case in Jammu and Kashmir but now I believe the situation will change.’	ae ga = MatP
	deʃ ke ənne rajō mē betiyō ko jo sare həq milte hē voh sare həq	milte hē = RP

Table 3 shows that both politicians use the strategy of emotions to legitimize their respective positions. In IK-1, Imran Khan uses rationality by taking his nation into confidence on the then Pakistani policy on Kashmir. He appeals to social rationality to legitimize his position on the issue. In IK-b, IK delegitimizes NM's abrogation of Article 370 by exposing the contradictions that cannot stand the test of moral values in any democratic system. Again, he appeals to the audience's rationality to acclaim his position and attack the opponent's action. Mostly IK employs material processes with a negative polarity that help him point out contradictions in

the opponent's decision and present Act 370 as a moral choice.

In NM-a and NM-b, NM legitimizes his position through instrumental rationality, that is, by comparing the past and present/future in Kashmir in terms of civic amenities and by ensuring an equitable provision after the abrogation of Article 370. At the very beginning of his speech, he also legitimizes the abrogation by establishing that the change was introduced by a democratic process in the parliament. NM realizes rationality mostly through the use of existential and material processes to ensure a change of state.

## Voice of Expertise

Table 4 below shows representative examples of the strategy of the voice of expertise used in the speeches of Imran Khan and Narendra Modi.

Table 4 Rationality in Imran Khan's and Narendra Modi's speeches

Speakers	Statements	Transitivity Processes
IK-a	yəhi rss t <sup>hi</sup> jis ko hīdūstan ki həkumət ne dehşetgərd qərar de kər do tin dəfə said lain kiya yəni bən kiya ər yəhi audiology t <sup>hi</sup> jo qaid-e-azəm ne dek <sup>h</sup> ke...pakitan muvmint mē şirkə ki ər vo təb musəlmanō ko bətatə rəhe keh ap əgrezō ki yulami se hīdūō ki yulami mē ja rəhe hē. ‘This is the same RSS which the Indian government (previous) banned twice or thrice declaring it terrorist and kept telling the Muslims that they were getting from the English slavery into the Hindu slavery.’	t <sup>hi</sup> = EP qərar de = VP lain kiya = MatP bən kiya = MatP dek <sup>h</sup> ke = MenP şirkə ki = MatP bətatə rəhe = VP ja rəhe hē = MatP
IK-b	jo gərmint t <sup>hi</sup> hīdūstan ki kağris ki ın ke hom mənīstər ne kəha keh rss ke kemp mē dehşetgərd pəda ho rəhe hē ‘They annexed Kashmir... they went against the UNO’s Security The home minister of the Hindustani government of Congress said that the RSS camp is producing terrorists.’	kəha = VP pəda ho rəhe hē = MatP
NM-a	ek xəb jo vala b <sup>h</sup> ai patel ka t <sup>h</sup> a, ek xəb jo babasaheb əmdidker ka t <sup>h</sup> a, voh xəb jo şayama pərsad mək <sup>h</sup> ərji, ətəlji ər kəroğō fəhriō ka t <sup>h</sup> a, əb pura ho cuka hē. ‘A dream which Sardar Vallabh bhai Patel had, a dream which Babasaheb Ambedkar had, the dream shared by Shyama Prasad Mukherjee, Atalji and crores of citizens, has now been fulfilled.’	t <sup>h</sup> a = EP pura ho... = MatP
NM-b	ləddax mē solo nam ka ek poda paya jata hē. jankarō ka kehna hē keh yeh poda bərfili pəhəriō pe təyənt fojiō keliye ziđgi bəcane ka kam kərta hē ‘There is a plant in Ladakh, named solo. Experts say that this plant is like a sanjivini for people living in high altitude...’	paya jata hē = EP kehna hē = VP kam kərta hē = MatP

The representative examples in Table 4 show that IK legitimizes his position on RSS ideology by referring to either an Indian political institution or an Indian political actor; this strategy helps expose the contradiction in the opponent's position and thus, legitimize it. The voice of expertise is appropriately realized through verbal processes and action through material processes. To declare the abrogation of Article 370 as a shared dream, NM also refers to the politicians but only to those who supported BJP ideology. In NM-b, NM refers to experts to establish the

importance of a plant for revenue generation and the resultant material value. This voice of expertise does not contribute to any political positioning. NM too uses verbal and material processes to express the voice of expertise. The difference between the two speakers lies in the nature of functions they use the voice of expertise for: IK employs the strategy to expose the opponent's fascist ideology as he labels it. NM, however, uses it to contextualize the abrogation in terms of BJP's ideology.

## Altruism

Table 5 below shows representative examples of the strategy of altruism used in the speeches of Imran Khan and Narendra Modi.

Table 5 Altruism in Imran Khan and Narendra Modi speeches

Speakers	Statements	Transitivity Processes
IK-a	yeh hər forəm ke upər həm logō ko bətaē ge kīh əssi lak <sup>h</sup> kəʃmiriyō se kis tərəh ka zolm ho rəha hə ‘We will tell this to people at all forms what kind of cruelty 80 lacs Kashmiris are suffering from.’	bətaēge =VP zolm ho rəha hə =MatP
IK-b	həm kəʃmir ke logō ke sat <sup>h</sup> k <sup>h</sup> ərə hē takīh in logō ko pətəh cəle kīh həm on ke sat <sup>h</sup> k <sup>h</sup> ərə hē on ko zorərət hə kəʃmir ke log aj həməri tərəf dek <sup>h</sup> rəhe hē aor həm ne on ko bətana hə kīh jəb tək inʃaallah on ko azadi nəhi mīle gi həm in ke sat <sup>h</sup> k <sup>h</sup> ərə rəhē ge ‘We are with the people of Kashmir so that they know that we are with them. The people of Kashmir are looking towards us and we have to tell them that we are with them until freedom.’	k <sup>h</sup> ərə hē = MatP pətəh cəle = MenP zorərət hə = MenP dek <sup>h</sup> rəhe hē = MenP bətana hə = VP mīle gi = RP
NM-a	deʃ ke ənne rajō mē bəcō ko jīkʃa ka ād <sup>h</sup> īkar hə lekīn jamō kəʃmir ke bəce is se vəncit t <sup>h</sup> e. ‘Other parts of the country have right to education but children in Jammu and Kashmir were deprived of it.’	ād <sup>h</sup> īkar hə = EP vəncit t <sup>h</sup> e = EP
NM-b	deʃ ke ənne rajō mē əl pəsənd k <sup>h</sup> etvō ke hittō ki rənkʃən ke liye məənvriti ekt lagu hē lekīn jamō kəʃmir mē esa nəhi t <sup>h</sup> a ‘To safeguard the rights of minorities, Minorities Act is enacted but not in Jammu and Kashmir.’	lagu hē = MatP t <sup>h</sup> a = EP

As their speeches and the representative examples in Table 5 show, both political actors note that Kashmiris have been denied their basic rights. However, they differ in

the source of deprivation. To IK, the violation of Kashmiris’ right to self-determination is a root cause of their deprivation, whereas NM ascribes Kashmiris’ sense of deprivation to the

370 Article. Both speakers legitimize their respective conceptions of Kashmiris' rights, and to this end, they deploy the strategy of altruism as illustrated in Table 2 above. Just like the use of hypothetical future strategy, the type and linguistic expression of altruism is determined by the speakers' construals of the issue. To illustrate, IK describes the situation in Kashmir as *zōlm* 'suppression', finds the solution in *azadi* 'freedom', and resolves to stand by Kashmiris and communicate to the international community what he thinks is the sheer violation of human rights. He predominantly uses material processes to describe the situation, mental processes to express his empathy for Kashmiris, and verbal processes for internal and external communication. Such lexical and grammatical choices suit his moral evaluation of the situation and the resultant conceptual structure: *zōlm* 'suppression', *azadi* 'freedom' and *bātana* 'communication' (to the international community for support).

Contrary to IK, NM's conceptual structure is composed of *ədikarō se vāncit* 'deprivation of rights' and *hām s̄ab ke p̄aryaso se dur ho ḡai h̄e* '(hurdle: 370 Article) has been eradicated due to our action (abrogation of 370 Article)'. And his lexical and grammatical choices accord with his construal of the situation. NM uses inclusive words such as *hām* 'we' and *hāmare* 'our' to identify with Kashmiris. The transitivity processes he predominantly uses are either existential or material, which suits his comparison between the rights available to the people in other states and those available to Kashmiris, and the change he envisions after the abrogation of the 370 Article. To intensify this sense of deprivation, NM frequently uses contrastive conjunction like *lekin* 'but' in parallel constructions. To sum up, IK's altruism is accompanied by social astuteness, but NM's altruism is based on mere political astuteness. And altruism with social astuteness plays a key role in political



leadership. However, when removed from reality, it becomes self-focused rather than other-focused.

The critical discourse analysis conducted above confirms that both politicians legitimize their positions on Article 370 on the Kashmir issue through emotions, hypothetical future, rationality, the voice of expertise, and altruism. Although both politicians have employed the same strategies, they differ in their conceptual and linguistic choices. The findings of the present study, thus, confirm those of Reyes (2011), Trajkova and Neshkovska (2019), and Ahmad et al. (2020). The study reveals that the use of the discursive strategies detailed above is not subject to any particular ideological perspectives on the issue. Rather, the speakers of conflicting ideologies can use the same set of (de)legitimization strategies but with different mental models of the communicative event and thus, different semantic and linguistic forms, to use Dijk's (2009) terms. Hence, the impact of ideology (a form of social cognition) on the use

of discursive strategies is mediated through cognitive structures speakers construe of any communicative event. As mentioned above, CDA approach assumes a link between social structures (e.g., power, gender, race, etc.) and linguistic structures. That is, relations of power and dominance have a discursive dimension that helps to construct and maintain them. However, the relationship between social structures and linguistic structures is not direct; rather it is mediated through cognition, that is, the way social actors interpret social structures affects the way they use language (Alenazy, 2017; Dijk, 2008). It also means that the context in relation to which a communicative event is analyzed is not a social but a mental construct, i.e., the impact of contextual properties is conditioned by the communicator's unique understanding of these properties: "For instance, age, gender or profession, as well as aims or knowledge of participants often do influence talk and text, but only if and as defined in the context model of the

speaker or writer” (Van Dijk, 2009, p. 209). Such insight necessitates a close look into cognition and its roles in the process of language production and comprehension.

### **Conclusion**

The main aim of the paper was to investigate the linguistic strategies politicians used to legitimize their conflicting positions on the Kashmir issue, a major issue between Pakistan and India. Being still under the influence of Article 370 in Kashmir, we conducted a Critical Discourse Analysis of two speeches of Imran Khan and Narendra Modi which they delivered on different occasions. First, we implemented Reyes (2011) strategies of legitimization to investigate which strategies they used to acclaim themselves. Then, following Halliday’s (2014) Systemic Functional Grammar, more particularly, his transitivity model which approaches grammar through discourse, we carried out a detailed linguistic analysis in order to extract

the arguments in which candidates tried to establish themselves.

Although the present study has tried to utilize the possible resources available, yet the limitations still remain. The findings are limited to the selected speeches only and the diversity in the approaches of CDA may generate different results for this study. Another limitation is that the study was delimited to politicians only. Future studies can also apply these strategies in other speech events and can define culturally bound strategies, as Reyes (2011) pointed out. Finally, although carried out on a relatively small corpus, the analysis gives an insight into the language techniques employed by politicians to legitimize themselves and delegitimize their opponents.

### **References**

- Abdi, R., & Basarati, A. (2018). Legitimation in discourse and communication revisited: A Critical view towards legitimizing identities in communication. *International*

- Mariyam Aziz, Ahmad Naveed Sharif, Jabir Hussain, Rauf Ahmad  
*Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 6(1), 86-100.
- Alenazy, K. (2019). The delegitimation discursive strategies of women's right to drive in Saudi Arabia. Doctoral Dissertation.
- Bank, D. (2019). *A systemic functional grammar of English: A simple introduction*. Oxon Routledge.
- Benoit, W. L., Mchale, J. P., Hansen, G. J., Pier, P. M., & Mcguire, J. P., (2003). *Campaign 2000. A Functional Analysis of Presidential Campaign Discourse*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5<sup>th</sup>ed.). US: Pearson Education.
- Brown, G., Brown, G. D., Brown, G. R., Gillian, B., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge university press.
- Cap, P. (2008). Towards the proximization model of the analysis of legitimization in political discourse. *Journal of pragmatics*, 40(1), 17-41.
- Capone, A. (2010). Barack Obama's South Carolina speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(11), 2964-2977.
- 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.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dunmire, P. L. (2007). Emerging threats and coming dangers. *Discourse, war and terrorism*, 19-43.
- Evans, V. (2014). *The language myth: Why language is not an instinct*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1996). A reply to Henry Widdowson's Discourse analysis: A critical review.

- Language of Legitimization in Political Discourse on Kashmir Issue*
- Language and literature*, 5(1), 49-56.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Harlow: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. L. (1985). Critical and descriptive goals in discourse analysis. *Journal of pragmatics*, 9(6), 739-763.
- Gay, L., Mills, G., & Airasian, P. (2012). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and Applications* (10<sup>th</sup> ed.). US: Pearson Education.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *Unified discourse analysis: Language, reality, virtual worlds, and video games*. Routledge.
- Hafeez, M. R., Shahbaz, M & Ahmad, A. (2020). Altruistic and Emotive Legitimization Strategies in Pakistani, Indian and US Politicians' Discourse. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 4 (1), 16-26.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Oxon Routledge.
- In first speech on Article 370, PM Modi talks development in J &K. (2019, August, 8). *India Today*. Retrieved from <https://www.indiatoday.in/india/story/pm-narendar-modi-speech-article-370-highlights-development-agenda-jammu-kashmir-ladakh-1578882-2019-08-08>.
- Independence Day2020: Full text of Pm Modi's Address to Nation from the Ramparts of Red Fort. (2020 August, 15). *Adplive*. Retrieved from <https://news.abplive.com/news/india/independence-day-2020-full-text-of-pm-modis-speech-to-nation-from-the-ramparts-of-red-fort-1313291>
- Majid, A., & Hussain, M. (2016). *Kashmir: A Conflict between*

- Mariyam Aziz, Ahmad Naveed Sharif, Jabir Hussain, Rauf Ahmad*
- India and Pakistan. *South Asian Studies* (1026-678X), 31(1).
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1997). Institutional organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American journal of sociological*, 83(2), 340-363.
- Nartey, M., & Ernanda. (2020). Formulating emancipatory discourses and reconstructing resistance: a positive discourse analysis of Sukarno's speech at the first Afro-Asian conference. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 17(1), 22-38.
- Nixon, R. (2013). *Seize the moment: America's challenge in a one-superpower world*. Simon & Schuster Books.
- Ochs, E. (1979). Planned and unplanned discourse. In *Discourse and syntax* (51-80).
- Pakistan 'will go to any lengths' to support occupied Kashmir's cause, PM Imran tells nation. (2019 August, 26). *Dawn*. Retrieved from <https://www.dawn.com/news/1501784>
- Parsons, T. (1960). *Structure and process in modern societies*. Free Press.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Routledge.
- Reyes, A. (2011). Strategies of legitimization in political discourse: From words to actions. *Discourse & Society*, 22(6), 781-807.
- Riaz, S., Shah, B. H., & Ahmad, S. Kashmir Issue and Pak-India Press: Content Analysis of Leading Newspapers.
- Richardson, J. (2006). *Analysing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis*. Palgrave.
- 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.
- Ruiz, R. J. (2009). Sociological discourse analysis: Methods

- and logic. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung /Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 10(2).
- Shukry, A. S. M. (2013). A critical discourse analysis of Mahathir Mohamad's speeches on the war on terror. *Intellectual Discourse*, 21(2).
- Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of management review*, 20(3), 571-610.
- Thompson, G. (2004). *Introducing Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Trajkova, Z., & Neshkovska, S. (2019). Strategies of legitimization and delegitimization in selected American Presidential Speeches. *Respectus Philologicus*, 35(40), 11-29.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1990). Social cognition and discourse. *Handbook of language and social psychology*, 163-183.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis. *Belgian journal of linguistics*, 11(1), 11-52.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. *The handbook of discourse analysis*, 349-371.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: a socio-cognitive approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- van Leeuwen, T., & Wodak, R. (1999). Legitimizing immigration control: A discourse-historical analysis. *Discourse studies*1(1), 83-118.
- van Leeuwen, T. (1996). *The grammar of legitimation*. London: School of Media/London School of Printing.
- 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*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and Society: An outline of interpretative sociology (Vol. 1)*. New York: Bedminster Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1998). *The Theory and practice of critical discourse analysis*. *Applied Linguistics*, 19 (1), 136-151.
- Wodak, R. (2009). What CDA is about: A summary of its history, important concepts and its development. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods for critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: design and methods*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.