

Political Apologia: Image Repair Strategies in Nasser's  
Resignation Speech (1967) and Morsi's Final Speech  
(2013)

الخطاب السياسى الاعتذارى: استراتيجيات تصحيح الصورة فى خطاب  
التنحى لجمال عبد الناصر (١٩٦٧) والخطاب الأخير لمحمد مرسى  
(٢٠١٣)

Dr. Fayrouz Fouad I. Hassan  
Assistant Professor of Linguistics, Dept. of English  
Faculty of Al-Alsun (Languages), Ain Shams University

د. فيروز فؤاد إبراهيم حسن  
مدرس بقسم اللغة الإنجليزية  
كلية الألسن – جامعة عين شمس



## **Political Apologia: Image Repair Strategies in Nasser's Resignation Speech (1967) and Morsi's Final Speech (2013)**

### **Abstract**

This paper investigates the linguistic devices and rhetorical strategies employed by President Gamal Abdel Nasser in his Resignation Speech (June 9<sup>th</sup>, 1967), which was delivered following the June 5<sup>th</sup> military defeat, and President Mohammed Morsi in his June 26<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Final Speech, which was delivered three days before the June 30<sup>th</sup> mass protests. The analysis of data is based on Benoit's Image Repair Theory (1995, 2000). The study attempts to demonstrate how language can be manipulated by political figures in repairing the speaker's damaged public image, constructing a positive self-image, and winning the support and sympathy of the audience. The analysis reveals that Nasser primarily employs four strategies: bolstering, minimization, and compensation. His apologetic discourse lacks overt mortification, though. Morsi, on the other hand, relies on evasion of responsibility and reduction of offensiveness through: defeasibility, bolstering, attacking accusers, and compensation. Unlike President Nasser, President Morsi resorts to the strategy of corrective action.

**Keywords:** political apologia – image repair strategies – person deixis – euphemism - overlexicalization

## الخطاب السياسى الاعترارى: استراتيجيات تصحيح الصورة فى خطاب التنحى لجمال عبد الناصر (١٩٦٧) والخطاب الأخير لمحمد مرسى (٢٠١٣)

### ملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تحليل التراكيب اللغوية والاستراتيجيات البلاغية التى استخدمها كل من الرئيس جمال عبد الناصر فى خطاب التنحى الذى ألقاه فى أعقاب هزيمة الخامس من يونيو عام ١٩٦٧، والرئيس محمد مرسى فى خطابه الأخير الذى ألقاه قبيل تظاهرات الثلاثين من يونيو عام ٢٠١٣. وتتخذ الدراسة من نظرية بينويت فى تصحيح الصورة (١٩٩٥، ٢٠٠٠) اطاراً نظرياً لها، وتهدف إلى توضيح إلى أى مدى يمكن للساسة استخدام اللغة فى تصحيح صورتهم الشخصية وبناء صورة ايجابية وكسب تأييد الجماهير. ويظهر التحليل اعتماد الرئيس جمال عبد الناصر على عدة استراتيجيات منها الدعم والتقليص والتعويض كما يوضح خلو الخطاب من الاعتذار بشكل علنى. ومن ناحية أخرى، فقد اعتمد الرئيس محمد مرسى بشكل أساسى على استراتيجيات تفادى المسؤولية وتقليل درجة الأذى وذلك من خلال استخدام الدعم ومهاجمة الخصوم والتعويض، اضافة إلى استراتيجية اصلاح الأخطاء.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** الخطاب السياسى الاعترارى – استراتيجيات تصحيح الصورة – الضمائر الشخصية – التلطيف اللغوى - التكرار اللفظى

## **Political Apologia: Image Repair Strategies in Nasser's Resignation Speech (1967) and Morsi's Final Speech (2013)**

### **Introduction**

There are critical moments in the history of nations when the country's well-being and prospects are largely determined by the extent to which a speaker manages to influence his audience. The present study investigates two presidential speeches that were given at crucial moments in the history of Egypt, when each of the speakers was suffering from a hugely damaged image: President Gamal Abdel Nasser's Resignation speech (**June 9th, 1967**) and President Mohammed Morsi's Final Speech (June 26th, **2013**). It is significant that the two speeches were followed by massive protest marches all over the country, in which, ironically, Egyptians pleaded the former to 'stay' and demanded the latter to 'leave'. Thus, while Nasser's speech was successful and inspiring, Morsi's was a drastic failure.

### **Aim of the Study**

The present study aims to analyze the image repair strategies employed by President Nasser in his television resignation speech and President Morsi in his final speech, as two examples of political apologia. The study is based on Benoit's (1995, 2000) theory of image repair, which provides the method of rhetorical analysis of image repair discourse. The significance of the present study lies in the fact that it attempts to combine Benoit's theoretical framework with a micro-linguistic analysis of the dominant lexical and pragmatic features correlated with image repair discourse. It is also an attempt to test the applicability of Benoit's theory on Arabic political discourse, which has not received much attention.

### **Data and Context**

#### **Nasser's Resignation Speech**

On the morning of June 5<sup>th</sup>, 1967, Israel struck Egyptian air fields, destroying much of the Egyptian Air Force. By June 10<sup>th</sup>, 1967, Israel had captured the entire Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip from Egypt, the West Bank from Jordan, and the Golan Heights from Syria. On the 9<sup>th</sup> of June, Nasser appeared on television to inform the Egyptian citizens of

their country's defeat. He announced his resignation, ceding all presidential powers to his vice-president Zakaria Mohieddin (Encyclopedia Britannica). The Arabic text (1638 words) is derived from [www.nasser.org/Speeches](http://www.nasser.org/Speeches). The English translation is retrieved from <http://nasser.bibalex.org/Speeches>.

### **Morsi's Final Speech**

Morsi gave this televised speech on the 26<sup>th</sup> of June 2013, three days before planned mass demonstrations by his opponents who were demanding that the president resign and call for an early election. Almost a year on from Morsi's election, Egypt was dangerously divided between his Islamist supporters and a secular opposition that saw his rule as incompetent and autocratic. Millions of Egyptians signed a petition issued by 'tamarrud' (Rebellion) calling for the President's departure. The speech was delivered at the Cairo International Conference Hall in front of a friendly audience chiefly composed of cabinet ministers and senior officials of Muslim Brotherhood and the Freedom and Justice party, along with several hundred supporters. The Arabic text (5327 words) is derived from <http://www.aswatmasriya.com/news/details/24028> and the English translation of the speech is provided by MENASource, and retrieved from <http://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/menasource/translation-president-mohamed-morsi-s-address-to-the-nation>.

### **Theoretical Framework**

The Image Repair Theory, established by William L. Benoit (1995, 2000), provides an integrative perspective on individual image management, grounded in communication studies, rhetorical criticism, and social psychology. What makes Benoit's theory particularly effective as a model of analysis is that, unlike most psychological theories of image management, Benoit's model takes a speech-oriented view of image restoration, examining prolonged discourse and relating image restoration specifically to human communication patterns.

Initially called "image restoration", Benoit later changed the term to "repair" because restoration implies that the image of the accused has been totally restored to its prior pre-damage state, while in fact on many occasions "one has to settle for repair" (Benoit, 2000, p.40). Benoit

defines “image” as the perception of a person, group, or organization held by the audience, shaped by the words and actions of that person, as well as by the discourse and behavior of other relevant actors (1997, p.251). People generally feel the need to maintain a positive image. And when this positive image is threatened, through objections, blame, criticism, complaints, reproach, or censure, people often defend themselves by offering “explanations, defenses, justifications, rationalizations, apologies or excuses” (Benoit, 1994, p.418) to restore their reputation. The discourse of image repair is, therefore, a form ethical self-defense generated in response to accusations.

Benoit divides image repair strategies into five categories: denial, evasion of responsibility, reduction of offensiveness, corrective action, and mortification.

### **1. Denial**

The accused can engage in simple denial by either denying that the act occurred or denying any involvement or responsibility for the wrongful act. The accused can also use denial by shifting the blame. This is done by implying that someone or something else is responsible for the wrongdoing and, thus, the accused shifts the audience’s anger onto another target.

### **2. Evasion of Responsibility**

The accused can evade responsibility by arguing that s/he did not willingly or intentionally commit the undesirable act. There are four sub-categories for evasion of responsibility: one can suggest provocation, defeasibility, accident, or good intentions.

#### **2.1. Provocation**

In provocation, the accused says that the wrongful act occurred in response to another offensive act. Susie Epp (2010, p.14) points out that provocation was originally referred to as scapegoating by Scott and Lyman (1968), who described it as one of the ways by which individuals account for undesirable acts by making excuses. The classic quarreling children's defense of "s/he started it!" is an application of provocation.

## **2.2. Defeasibility**

In defeasibility, the argument is that there was insufficient information or control over the situation. According to Benoit & Henson (2009, p.41), the rhetor attempts to “claim that lack of information, volition, or ability means that he or she should not be held completely responsible for the offensive act”.

## **2.3. Accident**

The accused can evade responsibility by claiming that an undesirable act happened *accidentally* or due to unforeseeable circumstances.

## **2.4. Good Intentions**

In this sub-category, the accused can suggest that the offensive action was done with *good intentions* and that s/he was doing what was believed to be the best course of action at the time (Benoit, 1995).

## **3. Reduction of Offensiveness**

This strategy allows the accused to reduce the offensiveness of the wrongful act. In reducing the offensiveness of an act, the accused attempts to “distract audiences or weaken the significance of the wrongdoing” (Davis, 2009 p.22). This strategy has six sub-categories: bolstering, minimization, differentiation, transcendence, attacking the accuser, or compensation.

### **3.1. Bolstering**

According to Benoit & Hanczor, *bolstering* “attempts to strengthen the audience’s positive affect for the rhetor, hoping to offset the negative feelings associated with the wrongful act” (1994, p.420).

### **3.2. Minimization**

In this strategy, the rhetor attempts to reduce the offensiveness of the act by arguing that the act is not as severe as initially thought.

### **3.3. Differentiation**

In differentiation, the accused attempts to redefine the alleged wrongdoing as something acceptable. This is done through discriminating between a negative action and a closely linked but more offensive action. One manifestation of differentiation is to change the wording to lessen the negative connotation of an event (Davis, 2009, p.22). In the present study,

euphemism, a strategy whereby events or participants are relexicalized in terms that invoke a positive image, and at the same time diminish negative connotations, will be investigated as a manifestation of the strategy of differentiation.

### **3.4. Transcendence**

In this strategy, a negative act is placed in a broader context, or simply in “a different frame of reference” (Benoit & Hanczor, 1994, p.420). A negative action is seen to be less significant when compared to more superior goals. "It was done for the greater good" or "the needs of the many outweigh the needs of the few" are examples of applications of transcendence (Davis, 2009, p.22).

### **3.5. Attacking Accusers**

In this strategy, the rhetor attempts to reduce the offensiveness of the act by drawing attention to the negative qualities or actions of the accuser. In so doing, the accused turns the tables on the accuser and, in a way, shifts the audience’s anger. In the literature on persuasion and argumentative discourse, this strategy is also known as *kategoria*, or *argumentum ad hominem*. *Kategoria*, or “counter-charge”, is a type of apologia that contests the validity of a charge of wrongdoing by attacking the credibility of the accuser (Epp, 2010, p.24). In the *argumentum ad hominem*, the arguer distracts the audience’s attention by insulting the accuser and, consequently, dismissing the argument instead of responding to it. By making the opponent appear suspicious, ridiculous, or inconsistent, people's attention will be diverted from the argument to the opponent (van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 1994, p.64).

### **3.6. Compensation**

The last strategy in reduction of offensiveness is *compensation*. In this strategy, the accused offers “a concession meant to wholly or partially make up for damage inflicted by the accused” (Davis, 2009, p.23).

## **4. Corrective Action**

In this strategy, the accused pledges to correct the problem, restore the action to its originality, or prevent the act from ever occurring again. Although this may seem like an apology, it does not actually contain an apology (Epp, 2010, p.16).

## 5. Mortification

It is an admission of guilt and a request for forgiveness (Benoit, 1995). It involves the acceptance of guilt or responsibility and is usually accompanied by an apology and a request for forgiveness. Mortification can be more effective when combined with corrective action.

## Review of Literature

The following is a review of selected related studies in the field of political apologia. It should be noted that other discourse genres, such as celebrity apologia, organizational apologia, and religious apologia have also received the attention of scholars. However, a review of the literature on such discourse genres is irrelevant to the type of texts analyzed in the present study and, therefore, falls beyond the scope of this review. The review shows that research in image repair within the context of political apologia has noticeably focused on American presidential discourse, with Richard Nixon as the most recurrent subject of study, followed by Bill Clinton and George W. Bush. Image repair strategies employed by Arab politicians have not received adequate research attention; the present study is hopefully an attempt to fill this gap.

Applying Ware and Linkugel's model, Katula (1975) explores the strategies of apology in Nixon's resignation address (August 8, 1974) following the Watergate scandal. Katula argues that Nixon combined denial and transcendence by claiming that he was innocent of crimes and that he was resigning because it was the country's best interests that mattered most. This strategy of putting the nation first was, according to Katula, a form of victimization since Nixon had "presented himself as a victim of the national interest" (p.3). Moreover, Nixon subordinated the whole Watergate affair and his resignation to the larger victories of his administration. Watergate is, thus, considered as simply one loss amidst a greater number of wins.

Blair (1984) studies the strategies of post-Watergate *apologia* in articles written by Nixon and other members of his administration. She finds that the strategies of denial, bolstering, differentiation, and transcendence were the most favored by the authors. According to Blair, the post-scandal authors had failed in their defenses because the e inconsistent

accounts and contradictory versions provided by the various authors further called into question the credibility of the former administration members.

Henry (1988) studies the rhetorical strategies employed by John F. Kennedy in his 1960's presidential campaign, in which Kennedy had to soothe the uneasiness of Protestant voters over sending a Catholic to the White House for the first time. Unlike other instances of presidential *apologia*, Kennedy is defending an aspect of his character rather than a past action. One strategy that Kennedy used was to declare that his religion was of minimum importance in comparison to other campaign issues. Kennedy was also able to establish a differentiation between religious/private affairs and national/public affairs.

A taxonomy of the strategies used by Reagan in defending his actions connected to the Iran-Contra affair is offered by Benoit, Gullifor, and Panici (1991). According to Benoit et al. (1991), the strategies of denial, evasion of responsibility, and mortification are the most pervasive in Reagan's defensive discourse, which they divide into three phases: "First, he denies that arms had been traded for hostages. Second, he attempts to justify his actions on the basis of his good intentions. Finally—and most effectively—he admits wrongdoing and announces action to correct the causes of the problem" (Benoit et al, 1991, p.290).

Blaney and Benoit (2001) examine Clinton's image restoration discourse in various scandals including the subject of his draft record, questions about his marijuana use, and the Lewinsky affair. The authors find that Clinton employed the strategies of denial, bolstering, defeasibility, differentiation, minimization, in addition to attacking his accusers in his response to accusations that he had evaded the Vietnam draft. Clinton's assertion that he had smoked but not inhaled marijuana is identified as an instance of minimization and simple denial. The authors conclude that the discourse of image restoration in these instances proved effective, and cite as evidence the fact that Clinton was reelected. In the issue of the Monica Lewinsky scandal, Clinton mostly denied but also used bolstering and transcendence. This was followed by Clinton's address to the American citizens on August 17, 1998 in which he made use of the strategies of

mortification, minimization, attacking the accuser, transcendence, corrective action, and denial. The authors conclude that Clinton's most successful defense was the combination of corrective action, mortification, and "victimization" (p.136), a variation of attacking the accuser.

In Koesten and Rowland's (2004) point of view, Clinton's image repair discourse can be classified as a case of atonement rhetoric, a subgenre of *apologia*. The authors distinguish between atonement rhetoric and other *apologia* discourse in five main characteristics: first, recognition of wrongdoing and a request for forgiveness; second, "a thorough examination of the sinful act and... a changed attitude or policy to prevent future wrong-doing"; third, efforts to change "the present and future"; fourth, mortification; and fifth, a public confession (p.73). These features are clearly identified in Clinton's September 11<sup>th</sup> Prayer Breakfast address, which they describe as Clinton's "first complete use of the rhetoric of atonement" (p.80).

Benoit (2006) analyzes George W. Bush's use of image repair strategies in his February 8<sup>th</sup> 2004 television appearance on *Meet the Press* to respond to two fundamental accusations: namely, that the invasion of Iraq was unjustified and that Bush's policies had been detrimental to the U.S. economy. In response to accusations about Iraq, Bush denied that he had deceived Americans about pre-war intelligence supporting Iraq's possession of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Further, his argument that removing the 'dangerous' Saddam Hussein was far more important than the presence of WMD is an instance of transcendence. In response to charges that his policies had damaged the U.S. economy, Bush argued that the economic problems had started before his term began, thus resorting to shifting the blame as a device for image repair.

Using Benoit's Image Repair Theory, Liu (2007) analyzes Bush's image repair discourse in the nine speeches he delivered between August 31, 2006 and January 12, 2007 in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. Bush was criticized for the delayed and inadequate response to the devastation left by the storm. Liu maintains that Bush evaded responsibility by using the strategy of defeasibility and stressing the fact that Katrina was such an

extraordinary natural disaster that his administration was not able to deal with. Bush also used bolstering to frame his government's response and compensation to point at the financial incentives promised for the areas affected by the storm. On the other hand, Bush used mortification, by admitting that his government had failed the victims of Katrina, and employed corrective action, by promising an evaluation of the country's emergency response plans (Liu, 2007).

Kofi Annan's image repair discourse in his address before the Rwandan parliament (May 1998) is explored by Edwards (2008) as an example of international apology for historical injustice. Edwards claims that Annan's effort to heal U.N.-Rwandan relations was a failure due to his inability to admit personal culpability, his democratization of the blame "where a rhetor spreads the blame equally among parties for any wrongdoing that has been committed" (p.100), and the appearance of personal arrogance created by his language choices. Edwards recommends that rhetors, who are faced with a situation such as Annan's, "should apologize fully for their specific actions or for those actions committed by their ancestors", arguing that naming a specific culprit facilitates the process of reconciliation between communities that have been hurt by historical injustice (p.101).

Davies (2009) investigates Barack Obama's image repair discourse during his presidential campaign in response to attacks relating to his religion, citizenship, and patriotism. Davies argues that although Obama failed in using simple denial, provocation, defeasibility, and transcendence; "Obama's success with bolstering, minimization, differentiation, and corrective action allowed him to rebuild his image sufficiently enough to overcome Hillary Clinton for the Democratic nomination" (p.251). Obama's *apologia* in response to attacks for his associations with accused domestic terrorist William Ayers relied on denial, evading responsibility, and reducing offensiveness. Davies concludes that Obama not only wisely chose his strategies, but he also "achieved *kairos* with his *apologia*, delivering his messages at the opportune time with respect to the exigencies, constraints, and audience in the various rhetorical situations" (p.281).

Nasser's resignation speech after the 1967 defeat is analyzed by Abdel Latif (2010) from a rhetorical perspective. He contends that the rhetorical construction of the speech has played an essential role in producing subsequent reactions, and resulted in mass anti-resignation demonstrations. Combining a formal analysis of language and rhetoric with an analysis of the socio-textual context, the article examines such features as euphemism, personal pronouns, conceptual metaphors, as well as non-verbal signs (vocal performance, body language, etc.).

Brian (2011) analyzes the political rhetoric of the 2004 and 2008 Democratic presidential candidates and the strategies they used to repair the Democratic Party's image as the irreligious or anti-religion party. Democratic candidates managed to repair their image by reducing the offensiveness of the charge through transcendence, attacking the accuser, and the use of corrective action appeals. Brian argues that in 2004, Democrats selected John Kerry who was "a religiously quiet Northeastern Catholic who made excuses for Democrats' irreligious image while struggling to infuse religion into his campaign rhetoric", whereas in 2008, Democrats picked Obama "a religiously eloquent and fluent African-American who quoted scriptures and preached about God" (p.254).

The techniques of image repair employed by First Lady Hillary Clinton in the 1990s are explored by Oles-Acevedo (2012), who highlights Mrs. Clinton's management of the multiple image-damaging incidents she faced including the Whitewater Land Investigations and the Monica Lewinsky infidelity affair. The study points out that Benoit's typology is most effective when multiple strategies are used in combination. The analysis demonstrates that Clinton relied heavily on the combination of denial and reducing offensiveness in her approach to repair her image.

Joseph Biden, Chris Dodd and John Edwards, three Democratic contenders of the 2008 U.S. presidential elections, were accused of dishonesty, poor judgment, and reversing positions, as they had voted in 2002 to authorize the use of the U.S. Armed Forces against Iraq. This accusation has tarnished their image in the eyes of the voters. Davis and Glanz (2014) explore the various means used by the three senators in their attempt to repair their public image. The authors argue that Biden's use of

transcendence and Edwards' use of mortification were effective, while Dodd's failure to combine mortification with corrective action made his attempt less successful.

Herrero and Marfil (2016) analyze the forgiveness speech given by King Juan Carlos I in an interview following the accident he had in Botswana in 2012 while he was in an elephant hunt, and that had raised negative repercussions in Spanish public opinion towards the Monarchy. The authors argue that the King's speech, as an example of apologetic discourse, was effective in repairing his damaged public image, coming as it is within a context where people were not used to listening to politicians apologizing. The King combines mortification with corrective action to deliver his message.

## **Analysis**

Building upon Benoit's model for the analysis of Image Repair (1995, 2000), the following sections examine the various linguistic and rhetorical strategies employed by President Nasser and President Morsi in their efforts to discursively repair their damaged public images. The analysis begins by discussing Nasser's apologetic discourse, and then moves to exploring Morsi's speech. In addition to the rhetorical strategies of image repair, these sections investigate some of the dominant lexical and pragmatic constructions correlated with apologetic discourse in both political speeches. These include: euphemism, pronominalization, loaded language, labeling, and overlexicalization.

## **Strategies of Image Repair in Nasser's Speech**

### **1. Evasion of Responsibility**

#### **1.1. Defeasibility**

Rather than accepting the full liability for the defeat of the Egyptian army in its battle against Israel, Nasser attempts in several parts of his speech to evade responsibility by suggesting that the timeline of events that concluded with the defeat was entirely out of his control, and that he, therefore, should not be blamed. It should be noted that the strategy of defeasibility is usually combined with the strategy of shifting the blame. There is always a scapegoat to blame for the defeat rather than Nasser himself. The rhetorical card of scapegoat comprises a wide range of

influential political figures as well as international entities: the American President Lyndon Johnson, the Russian government, the Security Council, the French pressure, and the international public opinion.

Moreover, in order for the strategy of defeasibility to work most effectively, it is usually blended with a maximization of the opponent's power. The more daunting, formidable, and elusive the antagonist is, the less likely that the protagonist would be in control of the situation, and, hence, the more plausible the protagonist's argument that he/she is not to blame. This is encoded lexically in over-lexicalization, which is defined by Fowler (1991) as the use and repetition of an excess of quasi-synonymous lexical items to refer to the same entity with the ideological aim of changing attitudes. The terms relexicalized, which differ only slightly in meaning, are categorizations embedded in, and expressing, a particular system of discourse (pp. 15- 45). Trew (1979, p.136) argues that such lexical items - "coming all at once in one short text" - "are almost like an incantation and have a kind of axiomatic, tautological effect that forecloses all discussions". This is manifest in the following excerpts: "***other powers behind the enemy . . . came to settle their accounts with the Arab national movement***", "***The enemy . . . showed that facilities exceeding his own capacity and his calculated strength had been made available to him***", "***The enemy . . . was relying on some force other than his own normal strength***", "***There is clear evidence of imperialist collusion with the enemy***", "***American and British aircraft carriers were off the shores of the enemy helping his war effort . . . our land forces, fighting most violent and brave battles in the open desert, found themselves at the difficult time without adequate air cover in face of the decisive superiority of the enemy air forces. Indeed it can be said without emotion or exaggeration, that the enemy was operating with an air force three times stronger than his normal force***".

The abovementioned examples illustrate that defeasibility and shifting the blame are supported by the existence of a conspiracy theory against Nasser's Egypt. Conspiracy theory is defined by Barkun (2003) as "the belief that an organization made up of individuals or groups was or is acting covertly to achieve a malevolent end" (p.3). This term is used to explain an event as the result of a secret plot by exceptionally powerful

and cunning conspirators. It is a “form of scapegoating that frames demonized enemies as part of a vast insidious plot against the common good, while it valorizes the scapegoater as a hero for sounding the alarm” (Berlet and Lyons, 2000, p.9 ). According to Barkun, conspiracism is appealing as it is often presented as secret knowledge unknown or unappreciated by the masses who are a brainwashed herd.

Maximization of the opponent’s power is also constructed on the morphological level through the recurrent use of the relevant nouns in their pluralized form. Hence, we notice in the examples above the use of *powers, facilities, aids, British and American plane carriers, and aircrafts*.

## **2. Reduction of Offensiveness**

### **2.1. Bolstering**

In an attempt to reduce the offensiveness of the defeat, Nasser employs the strategy of bolstering on multiple occasions to portray a positive image for himself, his armed forces, his Arab allies, and his audience/his citizens.

Along with his constant emphasis on the superseding power of the opponent, Nasser insists that the Egyptian armed forces have fought bravely and heroically in an inequitable battle: “*Accurate calculations were made of the enemy’s strength and showed us that our armed forces, at the level of equipment and training which they had reached, were capable of repelling the enemy and deterring him. We realized that the possibility of an armed clash existed and accepted the risk*”.

Nasser uses emotive language to describe his armed forces as role models who set legendary examples for bravery, sacrifice, and heroism, instances of positively-loaded lexical items.

Nasser also attempts to bolster his image by constructing a positive picture for his Arab allies and elaborating on their heroic stances and valiant positions. It is noted, nevertheless, that no concrete evidence is given as to what kind of assistance was particularly extended to Egypt on the part of her Arab allies. The language used by President Nasser here tends to be rather abstract and figurative than specific or tangible. The Algerian and the Iraqi peoples, whose ‘leaders’ are described using

positively-charged modifiers – “*the great*” and “*the faithful*” respectively - are said to have given “*infinite and boundless*” support. The peoples and governments of the Sudan, Kuwait, Yemen, Lebanon, Tunisia, and Morocco have likewise “*taken honorable stances*”. Lastly, the people of the Arab nation have “*collectively displayed gallantry, dignity, and determination*”.

Nasser goes on to enumerate the contribution of his government, or his generation of revolutionaries, to the advancement of Egypt in all fields, in an effort to positively present himself, and to indirectly reduce the offensiveness of the military defeat. Nasser mentions the evacuation of the British occupation, the realization of Egypt’s independence, the reclamation of the Suez Canal, the industrialization of Egypt, the construction of the High Dam, the discovery of oil resources, and the adoption of socialism, among others. Nasser, thus, foregrounds the whole issue of the war and the subsequent collapse against the larger canvas of the victories of his presidency. It is here that the “setback” is linguistically and rhetorically constructed as just one relapse in the glorious history of Nasser’s fifteen-year-long reign. It is simply one loss amidst a greater number of wins.

On the pragmatic level, rather than blatantly employing the first person pronoun in its singular or plural forms as Agent in the previously-mentioned series of positive self-glorifying actions, Nasser constructs the noun phrase “*this generation of revolutionaries*” of which he undoubtedly stands as leader.

Furthermore, Nasser commends the unity and harmony of the Egyptian people; “*farmers, laborers, soldiers, intelligentsia, and patriotic entrepreneurs*”. He also praises the nation’s sacrifices, heroism, and faith. By flattering his audience, President Nasser is indirectly presenting himself in a positive light, as we tend to look more favorably upon those who look favorably toward us. Such a rhetorical device is known as apple polishing or sucking up.

## **2.2. Minimization**

Nasser employs the strategy of minimization by arguing that the nation has suffered from a ‘*naksah*’ (setback). The military confrontation

between Egypt and Israel has resulted in the Israelis capturing the entire Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip from Egypt, the West Bank from Jordan, and the Golan Heights from Syria by 10 June, and destroying much of the Egyptian Air Force. Rather than using the label ‘*hazi:mah*’ (defeat)- completely absent from the speech - to describe the outcome of the battle, Nasser constructs the event using the euphemism ‘*naksah*’ (setback) (four occurrences), as in the following examples: “*We cannot hide from ourselves the fact that we have met with a grave setback in the last few days, but I am confident that we all can and, in a short time, will overcome our difficult situation*”, and “[*Our*] task is to learn the lesson of the *setback*”.

It is worth mentioning that Heikal, who was asked by Nasser to help craft his resignation speech, came up with the word ‘*naksah*’ (setback) after the two men went down the list of words ‘*hazi:mah*’ (defeat), ‘*šadmah*’ (shock), and ‘*ka:riəah*’ (catastrophe) as well as ‘*nakbah*’ (debacle). The skillful choice of a specific lexical item to label a catastrophic military condition of the Egyptian arms following the 1967 War was a matter of great importance. According to Heikal, Nasser believed that to describe the Six Day War as a ‘*hazi:mah*’ (defeat) would leave no room for reconstruction and would upset the Soviets who provided the bulk of the military hardware that Syria and Egypt incompetently deployed (Aboul-Enein 2005, p. 3). Thus, ‘defeat’, a lexical item that is associated with failure, loss, and collapse, is replaced with the mitigated ‘setback’, which is less painful from the psychological and emotional aspects. This is an example of euphemism, which is the use of a word or phrase as a synonym for another word that is avoided because of its taboo status or its negative political or ideological connotations (Trask, 2007, p. 89). As a lexical strategy, euphemism reconstructs events, participants, and objects in terms that invoke a positive valuation, or image, and at the same time diminish negative connotations.

As a euphemistic term, ‘setback’ carries out a number of rhetorical functions which help establish the strategy of minimization on the lexical level. First, such a euphemism, which unlike victory and defeat has no equivalent in English in the semantic field of war, blurs the actual reality

of the battlefield. This mystification seems to be in accordance with the misleading representation of the war in the official mass media. Despite the extent of Israel's quick military gains, for the first four days the general population in the Arab states believed the fabrications of Arab radio stations which claimed an Arab victory was near. Second, 'setback' carries the positive connotations of a forthcoming victory, albeit delayed for some time or hindered by some conspiring enemies. Third, according to Abdel-Latif (2010, p.153), 'setback', a lexical item that is usually employed to denote a relapse in a person's recovery from an illness, invites sympathy from the audience with the speaker rather than assuming his accountability for a certain action.

Another example of minimization through euphemization is the use of the label 'oudwan' (aggression) to designate the war.

□ *We now have several urgent tasks before us. The first is to remove the traces of this aggression against us.*

□ *[T]he Arab nation, with all its potential and resources, is in a position to insist on the removal of the traces of aggression.*

Rather than using any of the lexical items 'war', or 'invasion', or 'occupation', Nasser resorts to the word 'aggression'. This lexical choice is significant. Firstly, it relates the 1967 event to the audience's positive collective memory of the 1956 Suez Crisis, in which the Egyptians, despite being defeated militarily, made important political gains. Secondly, 'aggression', according to Oxford Dictionary, is defined as the "hostile or violent behavior" or "the action of attacking without provocation". Thus, as an abrupt offensive, it carries the negative connotations of belligerence, deceitfulness, and, malice. In contrast, war, "a state of armed conflict between different countries", denotes a battle between two equal sides, and is, therefore, associated with mutual animosity and antagonism.

### **2.3. Compensation**

In his attempt to reduce the offensives of his wrongful act, and hence to repair his image, Nasser resorts to the strategy of compensation. Ceding all presidential powers to his then-vice president Zakaria Mohieddin, he declares in the famous excerpt: "*I have taken a decision with which I need*

*your help. I have decided to **step down** totally and for good from any official post or political role, and to return to the ranks of the masses, performing my duty in their midst, like any other citizen”.*

Using the lexical item ‘to step down’ rather than ‘to resign’ portrays the action as a concession made on the part of the individual for the welfare of the people. In this sense, the speaker manages to repair his image through compensating for the wrongful act.

### **3. Mortification**

In the most well-known and oft-quoted excerpt in the speech, Nasser proclaims his readiness “to bear the whole responsibility” for the ‘setback’:

- [D]oes this mean that we do not bear responsibility for the consequences of the setback? I tell you truthfully and despite any factors on which I might have based my attitude during the crisis, that I am ready to bear the whole responsibility.

It should be noted here that Nasser neither admits guilt nor requests forgiveness for the military defeat. Besides, he does not fully assert his responsibility for bringing about ‘the setback’. Rather, he is only willing to shoulder the full responsibility for its ‘consequences’. The difference is, undeniably, substantial. On the pragmatic level, the interplay between the pronouns ‘I’ and ‘we’ is adept: while ‘we’ is the subject of the predicate “bear responsibility” in the question, ‘I’ comes as the subject in the answer. Through the explicit presence of ‘I’, Nasser presents himself as a *trustworthy, volitional, and causative* leader. Pronominalization, or person deixis, is persuasively significant as it indicates the speaker’s involvement or distance from the actions concerned and, hence is employed to emphasize, blur, or deny responsibility for specific actions.

The recurrence of ‘I’ as a separate pronoun suggests self-assertiveness, “authenticity, subjectivity, distinctiveness and involvement” (Fowler and Kress, 1979, p. 199). In a speech whose main goal is to repair Nasser’s image by evading the responsibility for the defeat, it is not surprising that the first person pronoun in its plural form appears twice as much as the first person singular pronoun (60 vs. 29 occurrences). It is a collective

responsibility, *we* are all to blame; however, *I* am willing to take responsibility. Thus, the speaker manages to present his decision to cede his presidential powers as a form of individual concession to compensate for a collective damage.

## Strategies of Image Repair in Morsi's Speech

### 1. Evasion of Responsibility

#### 1.1. Defeasibility

Throughout his final presidential speech, Morsi attempts to evade the responsibility for the deterioration of the economic and security conditions in Egypt during his first year of presidency by suggesting that the nationwide resentment that concluded with the anticipated June 30<sup>th</sup> mass protests was largely out of his control, and that he, therefore, should not be solely blamed. He argues that the deteriorated economic condition was a legacy of his predecessor, President Mubarak. The strategy of defeasibility is illustrated in the following excerpt: *“Under the previous regime, Egypt’s foreign debt increased to 50 and 77 billion USD. The size of the internal and external debt on Egypt in July 2012 reached 212 billion USD as a result of the budget deficit transferred from a ruler to another. Is it logical for the problems of this budget to be solved in one year? . . . We received public business sector companies in 2012 with 48 billion EGP loss and debts of 70 billion EGP”*.

Morsi adds that when he assumed presidency, there were “20 million under the poverty line, 3.5 million unemployed citizens, and huge income disparity”. Morsi also accuses “ongoing protests and violence” of hindering “development”: *“There are 1,770 sit-ins and thirty-seven protests every day, with some of them involving violence, roadblocks and loss of life”*. He wonders, *“How is it possible to work in this environment?”* Finally, Morsi points to “remnants of the old regime” who *“sold everything in the country while they were in power”* and holds them responsible for the turmoil.

The strategy of defeasibility is enhanced by the discursive tactic of shifting the blame. Although Morsi affirms in the opening lines of the speech that it is not *“just or wise to hurl blame at others”*, he, nevertheless, constructs a rhetorical scapegoat to which he attributes the

worsened conditions. He points to “*some abroad who are overtly hostile to this revolution*”, to “*those who crave the ability to . . . revert to the state of corruption, oppression, monopolization and injustice*”. He accuses “*Egypt’s enemies*” of “*attempting to sabotage the democratic experiment*” leading the country to “*a state of violence, defamation, incitement, and corrupt financing*” He adds that there are “*intrusion from external powers to force decisions and halt policies*”. He covertly and rather vaguely accuses “*invisible fingers*” of working to “*hinder good relations*”.

Thus, by shifting the blame to unspecified ‘enemies’ of Egypt, inside the country and abroad, Morsi maximizes the power of the opponent and renders himself helpless. This is lexically accentuated through the choice of such lexical items as ‘war’ and ‘fail’, and the repetition of the word ‘challenges’: “*I have faced a war attempting to make me fail since I assumed my responsibility*”, “*we are still faced with challenges*”, “*We still have challenges ahead of us*”, and “*Egypt is facing several challenges*”.

## 2. Reduction of Offensiveness

### 2.1. Bolstering

In an attempt to repair his image, President Morsi employs in several parts of his speech the strategy of bolstering with a view to portraying a positive image for himself, by listing his achievements on the economic, political, and social levels. Along with his constant emphasis on the superseding power of those conspiring against him, Morsi insists that, as President of Egypt, he has done his best. This is manifested in the following excerpts:

*What we have achieved:*

*We have increased the salaries and incomes of around 1.9 million employees . . . In two years from 2011 to 2013, increases in wages have equalled the increases in the sixty years before that. . . . We have also improved the system of ration cards used by 67 million citizens. . . 490,000 women have benefited from the medical insurance for female breadwinners . . . 13 million children have benefited from pre-school medical insurance. 593,000 part time workers have become full time. And*

*we have **instituted** total debt forgiveness for 52,000 small farmers with debts under 10,000 EGP . . . We have **provided** 74 billion EGP to provide petroleum products . . . We have **succeeded** in writing a modern constitution we can be proud of”.*

It is noted that Morsi relies heavily on positively-loaded lexical items (highlighted in the excerpt) combined with argumentation by numbers to deliver his message and repair his image in the eyes of his resentful citizens.

In addition to listing his achievements, Morsi employs another tactic to positively present himself. He frequently uses revolutionary slogans, thus, constructing himself as representative of the 25<sup>th</sup> of January values of freedom, dignity, and social justice. He does not fail to deploy the enchanting term “Tahrir Square” in an attempt to summon in the minds of his audience that glorious moment at the onset of his presidency. This is encoded in the overlexicalization of positively-charged words, which are highlighted in the following excerpt:

*A high price was paid in the **revolution**. We must not forget it and remember those who **sacrificed** for stability, **freedom, dignity and social justice**.*

*A year has passed since I stood among you in **Tahrir Square** and took my oath of office to assume the great responsibility in this crucial period, with hope uniting us to build the new Egypt that we have been dreaming of.*

In his continuous effort to win the sympathy of his people, Morsi constructs himself as a simple, humble man: “*I stand before you today as Mohamed Morsi, an Egyptian citizen before I am a president responsible for the fate of a country and the future of a people*”. To further enhance this image, Morsi habitually uses the language of the common man in the street, thus he frequently switches codes between standard Arabic and colloquial Egyptian throughout the speech. The following excerpt illustrates this rhetorical strategy (the colloquial Egyptian variety is printed in bold):

*I stand before you today to transparently make an account of my first year. . . We spent ten years in Egypt dreaming: when, O Lord, when...How can we change the unjust, criminal regime...without Egypt losing blood, without our sons in the future suffering from any sort of division...When our Lord granted permission for the revolution, it was only by the grace of God. We were all hand in hand, in order, by God, to do away with the adversity, injustice, forgery, corruption, and theft. We removed the regime and followed the path together as we see in detail. It is no secret from anyone of us that we are still faced with challenges.*

Moreover, Morsi resorts to the rhetorical strategy of appealing to the emotions of his audience/citizens in an attempt to win their support. He commends the unity and harmony of the Egyptian people; ““O glorious people of Egypt”, “We Egyptians are capable, with God’s will, of overcoming this phase and standing up to challenges”, “Young people of Egypt, you are the pride of this nation. Young people of Egypt, you are the pride of this nation”. The rhetorical device of apple polishing or sucking up is employed by President Morsi in his attempt to present himself in a positive light by flattering his audience.

It is particularly remarkable that Morsi pointedly praises the army, whom many opposition members hoped would lay a paramount role in facilitating a transition of power. At pains to win over the military, Morsi portrays a positive image of the armed forces elaborating on their heroic stances and valiant positions. “I voice my appreciation and gratitude to all members of the armed forces for what they did during the revolution”. Using the adjective “brave” and the metaphor “the protecting shield”, he accentuates the idea that the Armed Forces “have been and will always be” protecting not only Egypt’s borders but also its “institutions and the revolution’s achievements”. Highlighting the facts that “the president is the supreme commander of the armed forces” and that “the country’s institutions, including the armed forces, are working in complete harmony as long as each plays its assigned role according to the constitution”, Morsi denies the existence of any disagreement between the president and the army saying that these are merely “rumours” disseminated by those “aiming to drive a wedge between the institutions of the country”.

## 2.2. Attacking Accusers

Morsi's speech is for the most part a fierce attack on many segments of society whom he considers as obstacles hindering the path to progress and reform. The long list includes the administrative state, the media, the Judiciary, the opposition, among others. He attacks the previous regime, for which Morsi and the Muslim Brotherhood repeatedly use the lexical label 'addawlah al'amiqa' (the deep state). He addresses corruption in the system, enemies of the state, and the new democracy. While many hoped he would strike a conciliatory tone, Morsi instead criticizes opposition politicians for failing to engage in what he perceives to be constructive dialogue. Employing a series of rhetorical questions, Morsi, who is on the defensive, deflects blame for his failure onto his predecessors:

*I was surprised to see the opposition quickly give up at the first difference in opinion and resorting to insults, stubbornness and degrading adjectives instead of dialogue. Is democracy the imposition of one opinion? . . . Is it the destruction of elected institutions; the imposition of conditions for any dialogue; the refusal to participate in any political positions; or throwing accusations of take-over, domination and Brotherhoodization?*

Morsi also opens fire at prominent public figures in the media, and the judiciary: "Was Makram Mohamed Ahmed a revolutionary? The press syndicate overthrew him, and he comes back to claim being a revolutionary." He adds that the officers of Mubarak's National Democratic Party, naming Safwat El-Sherif and Zakareya Azmi, might now also have become revolutionaries, "since everyone on trial is being acquitted." The sarcastic tone in his comment is not to be understated and applause comes instantly from his audience which is mostly made up of his cabinet ministers and senior officials of his Muslim Brotherhood and its political arm, the Freedom and Justice Party, along with several hundred supporters. Morsi further accuses Ahmed Bahgat, owner of Dream Cable Channels, and Mohamed al-Amin, owner of CBC Cable Channels, of stirring up trouble on their TV channels instead of paying "the debts and back taxes they owe the state". He warns them, "No one should think that they are able to escape justice".

Morsi continues to launch his uncorroborated attacks by referring to his competitor in the runoffs of the presidential elections: "*Ahmed Shafiq. Is he a revolutionary? He lives abroad inciting a coup while being on trial, yet people approach him as an icon of the revolution.*" Morsi then takes aim at the judiciary: "*I respect the judiciary, but a member of the judicial panel looking into Ahmed Shafiq's case, Ahmed al-Nemr, is known for rigging. He is among 22 people who should be prosecuted for rigging elections, I personally filed legal action against him.*"

Morsi rounds up his speech by reprimanding those he labels "foloul" (the Remnants of the Old Regime) and scolding them unwaveringly and unequivocally deploying the second person pronoun: "*You hired people to terrorize citizens in the streets and you collaborated with foreign enemies*"; "*The revolution started to get rid of the dictatorship and corruption that you once played a big part in*". According to Fowler and Kress (1979: 203), the occurrence of the pronoun "you" measures "the speaker's consciousness of, care for, or most often, desire to manipulate, the addressees". In an effort to repair his image, Morsi diverts attention to the negative attributes of his opponents, thus launching a counter-attack and shifting people's anger to the accusers.

### **2.3. Compensation**

In his attempt to repair his image, Morsi resorts to the strategy of compensation. As a concession, he accepts the proposal of setting up a committee to make the necessary constitutional amendments and a higher committee for national reconciliation. Towards the end of his speech, he announces his decision to "*[e]stablish an independent committee for receiving constitutional amendments from all political parties and powers,*" adding that "*[a]ll of them are invited for a meeting with me after choosing a representative*".

### **3. Mortification and Corrective Action**

The speech opens with the statement, "*I stand before you today to transparently make an account of my first year*". The choice of the word 'account' is subtle. It portrays the president as someone who stands liable in front of his citizens or those who elected him and brought him to presidency. This is echoed throughout the speech on several other occasions: "*I take on my share as well of the responsibility for the current*

*circumstances and to move toward correcting them insightfully and responsibly.”* In a frantic attempt to repair his image, Morsi archetypically admits having made mistakes and even apologizes. *“I have struggled along . . . to appraise matters. I have been right at times and been wrong at others. Of course I have made many mistakes and been right as much as possible. Mistakes are to be expected, but correcting them is a duty.”*

It is worth noting that the Arabic lexical items chosen by Morsi to construct his apologetic discourse all lie within the semantic field of *‘ijtihād’* (a term that means ‘independent reasoning’ in Islamic jurisprudence): *‘ijtahadtū’* (have struggled), *‘aṣabtu’* (have been right), *‘aḫṭā’* (have been wrong, made mistakes). Thus, although he repeatedly admits his many mistakes and shortcomings, he gives religious explanations for them. This is seriously misleading. The problem here is incommensurability of concepts; while error as a result of *Ijtihad* is acceptable in Islamic thought and rather rewarded, erroneous judgment is not acceptable in the bureaucratic state. Rather, there is accountability for one’s actions and the resulting consequences before the people or their representatives.

Morsi does not only admit having made many mistakes and apologizes for them, he also combines mortification with corrective action in an attempt to make his apologetic discourse more effective. *“[T]he youth possess a revolutionary state and energy for change that they are not finding an outlet for in political life. We must fix this.”* In order to conciliate young protesters, Morsi announces *“creating one million three hundred thousand employment opportunities for youth through large projects”* with a view to *“empowering the youth to open new horizons”*. He also pledges to introduce *“radical and quick”* reforms in state institutions and assigns all ministers and governors to have assistants younger than forty years old.

## **Discussion**

In his television address to the nation on June 9<sup>th</sup>, 1967, Nasser found himself on the defensive; yet his rhetorical devices can be generally described as consistent and persuasive. The analysis of the speech reveals that he primarily employs four of the strategies identified in Benoit’s image repair theory. Nasser most dominantly uses defeasibility, but he

also makes use of bolstering, minimization, and compensation. He minimizes the seriousness of the defeat by calling it merely 'a setback' on Egypt's pathway towards victory over its enemy, just like a person who is suffering from an illness may have a setback or a delay in his guaranteed recovery which will happen in due course. This is combined with Nasser's effort to bolster his resolve to win the war against Israel and his satisfaction with the bravery of the Egyptian troops. Nasser's use of bolstering through his compassion for Egyptian soldiers was likely to be well received by his audience, who must have known a family member, a friend, a colleague, or a neighbor in the armed forces. Nasser largely employs the strategy of defeasibility more than any other image repair strategy and attempts to shift the blame to various international political entities. This is followed by the strategy of compensation through which Nasser constructs his resignation as a sacrifice he is willing to take for the sake of the nation.

However, Nasser should be criticized for his failure to admit any mistakes, or to apologize. Even his compensatory strategy is not combined with corrective action, and hence is questionable, since the action he suggests - namely, stepping down and ceding his presidential authority to his vice-president, is merely a proposal and not an act that has already been taken. Furthermore, Nasser does not openly apologize to his citizens; nowhere can we hear mortification among Nasser's various image repair strategies. This has to do partly with the fact that Nasser belonged to an era when the Arab-Islamic-Middle-eastern culture appreciated high self-esteem and assertiveness, and where leaders were neither used to nor expected to apologize to their citizens. Despite the lack of overt mortification, no sooner was Nasser's televised speech broadcast than tens of thousands of Arabs poured into the streets in mass demonstrations throughout Egypt and across the Arab countries rejecting his resignation and pleading him to stay in office. Upon these reactions, Nasser retracted his decision the next day (Encyclopedia Britannica). This shows that his image repair strategies were well chosen, well-suited, and, hence, successful.

While Nasser unambiguously declares his resignation, ceding his presidential powers to his vice president Zakaria Mohieddin, Morsi

demonstrates his deep resolve to keep his power and position at all cost. In his efforts to discursively repair his deformed image, President Morsi in his final speech relies heavily on the two strategies of evasion of responsibility and reduction of offensiveness. The most dominant discursive strategies are defeasibility, bolstering, attacking accusers, and compensation. Morsi constructs along list of opponents whom he holds responsible for the deteriorating conditions: President Mubarak, *'folu:l'* (remnants), Egypt's enemies, and even what he labeled "the invisible fingers". By shifting the blame and maximizing the power of the opponents, Morsi attempts to evade responsibility.

Unlike President Nasser, President Morsi resorts to the strategy of corrective action, in a desperate attempt to repair his image. He frequently admits having made mistakes and openly apologizes. Though denial has not been explicitly deployed, it is, undoubtedly, prevailing throughout the speech. Morsi's repeated reference to the 'legitimacy' of his rule and his claim that Egypt's new constitution is a democratic draft whose sovereignty should be honoured, is an indirect form of denial as it reveals his disregard to the real grievances and needs of his people at a critical moment in the nation's history. Although the majority of the audience inside the covered, air-conditioned conference hall, stood up cheering and applauding for Morsi with supporting slogans, the thousands who gathered to watch the speech on screens in Tahrir Square and many parts throughout Egypt, reacted furiously, many holding shoes as a sign of disrespect.

### **Conclusive Remarks**

The application of Benoit's model of analysis to the selected data has revealed the various strategies of image repair in the two political speeches. It is believed that Benoit's image repair typology is most effective when multiple categories join to portray a repaired image. The strategy of evasion of responsibility, for instance, is shown to be mostly effective when the speaker combines the discursive tactic of defeasibility with those of shifting the blame and maximizing the opponent's power. To end with, the linguistic analysis carried out in the present study has demonstrated the aptness of Benoit's theory in analyzing Arabic political apologia.

## References

- Abdel-Latif, E. (2010). Nasser's resignation speech and the memory of defeat: a rhetorical introduction to political discourse analysis. *Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics*, 30, 146-175.
- Aboul-Enein, Y. (2005). The Heikal papers: A discourse on politics and the 1967 Arab-Israeli war with Egyptian president Gamal Abdel Nasser. *Strategic Insights*, 4(4), 1-7.
- Barkun, M. (2003). *A culture of conspiracy: Apocalyptic visions in contemporary America*. University of California Press.
- Benoit, W. L. (1995). *Accounts, excuses, apologies: A theory of image restoration strategies*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Benoit, W. L. (1997). Hugh Grant's image restoration discourse: An actor apologizes. *Communication Quarterly*, 45, 251-267.
- Benoit, W. (2000). Another visit to the theory of image restoration strategies. *Communication Quarterly*, 48(1), 40-43.
- Benoit, W. L. (2006). President Bush's image repair effort on *Meet the Press*: The complexities of defeasibility. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 34(3), 285-306.
- Benoit, W. L., & Brinson, S. L. (1994). AT&T: "Apologies are not enough". *Communication Quarterly*, 42, 75-88.
- Benoit, W. L., & Hanczor, R. (1994). The Tonya Harding controversy: An analysis of image restoration strategies. *Communication Quarterly*, 42(4), 416-433.
- Benoit, W. L., & Drew, S. (1997). Appropriateness and effectiveness of image repair strategies. *Communication Reports*, 10, 153-163.
- Benoit, W., & Henson, J. (2009). President Bush's image repair discourse on Hurricane Katrina. *Public Relations Review*, 35(1), 40-46.
- Benoit, W. L., Gullifor, P., & Panici, D. (1991) President Reagan's defensive discourse on the Iran-Contra affair. *Communication Studies*, 42(3), 272-294.
- Berlet, C., & Lyons, M. N. (2000). *Right-wing populism in America: Too close for comfort*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Blair, C. (1984). From "All the president's men" to every man for himself: The strategies of post-Watergate *apologia*. *Central States Speech Journal*, 35, 250- 260.
- Blaney, J. R., & Benoit, W. L. (2001) *The Clinton scandals and the politics of image restoration*. Westport, CT Praeger Publishers.
- Brian, K. T. (2011). Altar call: The Democratic Party's religious rhetoric as image repair discourse. *Public Relations Review* 37, 250- 256.
- Davis, C. B. (2009). The reverend, the terrorist, and a web of rumors: The image repair discourse of Barack Obama. University of Missouri. Doctor of Philosophy.
- Davis, C. B., & Glantz, M. J. (2014). Resurrecting the Also-Rans: Image repair debate strategies of democrats who voted to authorize the war in Iraq. *Iowa Journal of Communication*, 46 (2), 159-178.
- Edwards, J. A. (2008). The mission of healing: Kofi Annan's failed apology. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 16, 88-104, Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.
- Epp, S. (2010). *The image repair strategies of Mark McGwire, Alex Rodriguez and Barry Bonds*. University of Kansas Master's of Science.

- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and Ideology in the press*. London: Routledge.
- Fowler, R., & Kress, G. (1979). Critical linguistics. In R. Fowler, R. Hodge, G. Kress, & T. Trew, *Language and control*. London: Routledge.
- Garcia, C. (2011) Sex scandals: A cross-cultural analysis of image repair strategies in the cases of Bill Clinton and Silvio Berlusconi. *Public Relations Review* 37, 292– 296. Elsevier Inc.
- Harrell, J., Ware, B. L., & Linkugel, W. A. (1975). Failure of apology in American politics: Nixon on Watergate. *Speech Monographs*, 42(4), 245-261.
- Heisey, D. R. (1988). President Ronald Reagan's apologia on the Iran-Contra affair. In H. R. Ryan (Ed.) *Oratorical encounters: Selected studies and sources of twentieth-century political accusations and apologies* (pp. 281-305). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Henry, D. (1988). Senator John F. Kennedy encounters the religious question: "I am not the Catholic candidate for president." In H. R. Ryan (Ed.) *Oratorical encounters: Selected studies and sources of twentieth-century political accusations and apologies* (pp. 153-173). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Herrero, J.C., & Marfil, P. (2016). Forgiveness speech as a image restoration strategy: Accounts of King Juan Carlos I. *Zer*, 21(40), 51-65.
- Katula, R. A. (1975). The apology of Richard M. Nixon. *Today's Speech*, 23, 1-5.
- Koesten, J., & Rowland, R. C. (2004). The rhetoric of atonement. *Communication Studies*, 55(1), 68-87.
- Kramer, M. R., & Olson, K. M. (2002). The strategic potential of sequencing *apologia* stases: President Clinton's self-defense in the Monica Lewinsky scandal. *Western Journal of Communication*, 66(3), 347-368.
- Len-R'ios, M. E. & Benoit, W. L. (2004). Gary Condit's image repair strategies: determined denial and differentiation. *Public Relations Review* 30, 95–106.
- Liu, B. F. (2007). President Bush's major post-Katrina speeches: Enhancing image repair discourse theory applied to the public sector. *Public Relations Review*, 33, 40-48.
- Oles-Acevedo, D. (2012). Fixing the Hillary factor: Examining the trajectory of Hillary Clinton's image repair from political bumbler to political powerhouse. *American Communication Journal*, 14(1), 33-46.
- Six-Day War (2018). In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved July 11, 2018, from <https://www.britannica.com/event/Six-Day-War>.
- Smith, C. A. (1988). President Richard M. Nixon and the Watergate scandal. In H. R. Stein, K. A. (2005). *Apologia, Antapologia, and the 1960 Soviet U2 incident*. *Communication Studies*, 59, 19-34.
- Trask, R. L. (2007). *Language and linguistics: The key concepts*. 2nd Edition. New York: Routledge.
- Trew, T. (1979). Theory and language at work. In R. Fowler, R. Hodge, G. Kress, & T. Trew, *Language and control*. London: Routledge.
- van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1994). Relevance reviewed: the case of 'argumentum ad hominum'. In F.H. van Eemeren, & R. Grootendorst (Eds.), *Studies in pragma-dialectics* (pp. 51-68). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.