

Critical Discourse Analysis and Political Discourse: Assessing Political Legitimacy in English to Arabic Translation of the UNPE Reports' Summaries (2020-2021) on Yemen

NABIL MOHSEN A. AL-BAHRI

2021

School of Language and Culture

A dissertation submitted to
Auckland University of Technology
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Language and Culture

Primary Supervisor: Prof. INEKE CREZEE

Abstract

Political legitimacy is the main factor of the Yemeni civil war since September 2014 and the UN is mediating to solve that conflict starting with the UN Security Council resolution 2216. Since then, the UN has appointed the Panel of Experts (PE) to evaluate the situation in Yemen and to provide the UN Security Council with an annual report issued in English as the original (ST) and in Arabic as the translated (TT). The Arabic translations of the UNPE final reports' summaries are also published by the UN office and are aimed at Arab addressees, especially, people of Yemen as they are the intended target readership. The present study aims to investigate how the concept of political legitimacy was reflected in the Arabic translation of the UN Panel of Experts' (UNPE) final reports' summaries (2020, 2021) on Yemen in compare with the English text as the original. Then, the study explores how such translating strategies influence the Yemeni addressees' perspective about the political legitimacy issue in Yemen. To evaluate whether or not the TT delivered the same message to the target audience as the ST, the study adopted both van Dijk's (1997) and Schäffner's (2004) approaches of critical discourse analysis (CDA) to assess political discourse translation. The data analysis explores the linguistic structures, including word choices, syntactic organization, textual cohesion, and textual structure. The data which the study used for the investigation are two summaries of the UNPE annual reports namely the Final Reports of the Panel of Experts on Yemen (2020, 2021). Findings from the study reveal that the translation of the UNPE reports' summaries manipulated the TT to redistribute political legitimacy between the legitimate government and illegitimate political rivals. The TT has used several strategies such as lexical choice, foregrounding and backgrounding, deliberate ambiguity, analogic frame, nominalization, and passivation. Interestingly, the text translators used translator agency to convey less neutrality in transferring the ST message by following a strategy of literal translation. By applying CDA, this study aims to uncover the intended message of the source text and whether or not it was accurately and impartially transferred into the target text considering the Yemeni sociocultural and socio-political context. The TT addressees, as the Yemeni people in this case, view the reports of the UNPE as a testimony that evaluates the local political parties competing over political legitimacy. So, it is important to consider the TT context in translating these UNPE documents. The study recommends further research on the UNPE whole documents and their Arabic translation with consideration to the sociocultural and socio-political context in conflict zones.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
List of Appendices	iv
Attestation of Authorship.....	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Chapter One: Introduction	7
1.1 Aim of this study	7
1.2 Significance of the study	8
1.3 Rationale of the study	8
1.4 Structure of the study	9
Chapter 2 : Literature Review	11
2.1 Introduction and Background	11
2.2 The Yemeni contextual environment.....	13
2.3 The contextual and political discursive practice	13
2.4 Political legitimization in political discourse	15
2.5 Analysing political discourse using CDA	16
2.6 Political discourse translation and CDA.....	19
2.7 Evaluating political discourse translation using CDA.....	21
2.8 Framing in translating political discourse	23
2.9 CDA and political legitimization in political discourse translation.....	26
2.10 The functional and ethical aspect in translating political discourse.....	28
2.11 Summary	30
Chapter 3 : Research Method	31
3.1 Introduction	31
3.2 Data	32
3.3 Method	33
3.4 Ethical concerns	35
3.5 Summary	35
Chapter 4 : Findings and Discussion.....	36
4.1 Introduction	36
4.2 Findings	37
4.2.1 Lexical choices	37
4.2.2 Grammatical organization.....	43
4.2.3 Textual Cohesion.....	48
4.2.4 Text Structure	49
4.3 Discussion of the Findings	51
4.3.1 The legitimate government and other political rivals treated as equals	51
4.3.2 Political legitimacy moved from the Government to political rivals	54
4.3.3 Political legitimacy appears undervalued	59
4.3.4 Potential social-political consequences resulting from the TT	61

4.4	Summary	62
Chapter 5 : Concluding Remarks		63
5.1	Introduction	63
5.2	Concluding remarks	63
5.3	Study alignment with previous research	64
5.4	Limitation of this study and recommendations for future research	65
References.....		67
Appendices.....		72

List of Appendices

Appendix A : The report summary of the Final report of the Panel of Experts on Yemen no. (S/2021/79), the English version.....	72
Appendix B: The report summary of the Final report of the Panel of Experts on Yemen no. (S/2021/79), the Arabic translation.	75
Appendix C: The report summary of the Final report of the Panel of Experts on Yemen no. (S/2020/326), the English version.....	78
Appendix D: The report summary of the Final report of the Panel of Experts on Yemen no. (S/2020/70), the Arabic version.	80

Attestation of Authorship

I hereby declare that this submission is my own work and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person (except where explicitly defined in the acknowledgements), nor material which to a substantial extent has been submitted for the award of any other degree or diploma of a university or other institution of higher learning.

Signature _____

18/06/2021 _____
Date

Acknowledgements

I dedicate this dissertation to my family, who sacrificed much to assist me to pursue learning in a very difficult time.

Also, I dedicate this dissertation to my primary supervisor, Prof. Ineke Crezee who patiently guided me through the steps of my writing. Prof. Ineke Crezee has provided me with professional knowledge to research translation as well. I would like to show my gratitude to her for her positive attitude and caring support all the times. I appreciate all her insightful suggestions and kind recommendations because without those, I would not be able to finish my dissertation in such a limited time.

I would like to express my appreciation to Mrs. Annette Sachtleben for her assistance in proofreading and editing.

Finally, I would like to thank all staff of School of Language and Culture of AUT for their support and assistance.

Chapter One: Introduction

This study explored the English to Arabic translations of the 2020 and 2021 summaries of the United Nations Panel of Experts' (UNPE) reports on the situation in Yemen. In particular, the study will analyse the UNPE reports' summaries titled the *Final Report of the Panel of Experts on Yemen*¹ (henceforth, the UNPE reports' summaries). The seven-year civil war in Yemen is all about gaining and maintaining political legitimacy. All the political parties involved in the conflict have been pursuing a foundation for establishing political legitimacy for their authority and for their political decisions. Political legitimacy is defined by (Peter, 2020) as "people's beliefs about political authority" (p. 1), i.e., it is about the justification of political power. The United Nations Panel of Experts' (UNPE) reports' summaries involve political discourse i.e., political documents which either negate or provide political legitimacy. The Arab audience, especially the Yemeni people, as the Arabic language readership, are the addressees of the Arabic version (the Target Text or TT) of the UNPE reports' summaries. Hence, they view such reports as a UN political document i.e., as a record that evaluates the local political parties' competition for political legitimacy.

Translating UNPE reports' summaries ought to be precise and consider the socio-cultural and political norms of the target language (TL). Given the parameters of this study, both (Reyes, 2011) and (Van Leeuwen, 2007) introduced conceptual basis of legitimizing strategies in political discourse which will be considered. In their studies, (Schäffner, 2004), (Fairclough, 2013) and (Van Dijk, 1997) advocated Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) for both the analysis of political discourse and its translation.

1.1 Aim of this study

The primary purpose of this study is to investigate how the concept and perspective of political legitimacy was conveyed in the Arabic translation of the UNPE reports' summaries on Yemen. The study also aims to explore how the translation can be interpreted in the Yemeni context, and how such political documents can be used by political actors to acquire legitimacy to hold power and authority, or to delegitimize the legitimately recognized Government of Yemen.

¹ UN panel of experts' reports are on the UN online website,
<https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/sanctions/2140/panel-of-experts/work-and-mandate/reports>

1.2 Significance of the study

In Yemen, people are relying mainly on the translated version of the UNPE reports' summaries, as well as all the documents of the UN, rather than the original English version. This study investigates how the Arabic version (as the TT) has approached the critical issue of political legitimacy, and how such translations might be capitalized on to gain political legitimacy for one party and to delegitimize other parties. There is a dearth of studies employing critical discourse analysis (CDA) to investigate UNPE reports' summaries, especially to examine the potential influence of such documents on the perspective of political legitimacy in Yemen. This present study fills a gap in the literature, provides a CDA approach as a meta-discursive tool of uncovering, and resisting social and political hegemony, and thus to investigate political discourse translation of the critical issues underpinning the civil conflict in Yemen.

1.3 Rationale of the study

This study has chosen to assess the Arabic translation of the UNPE Reports' Summaries for three main reasons. First, the UNPE reports' summaries are the documents submitted annually by the Panel of Experts to the UN Security Council followed by UN resolutions on the conflict in Yemen. Second, the people of Yemen, as the TT addressees, rely on the Arabic translation in reflecting the UN's stand and the international community's support to the political solutions in Yemen. The UNPE reports' summaries have only one official translation processed by the UNPE translating staff. So, those documents are critical to reflect the UN Security Council's political orientation, i.e., they provide political legitimacy to the party they prefer as the future legitimate regime of Yemen. This stand determines the future of the country and bears a pressure on the conflicting parties to stop the seven-year civil war.

The target text (TT), as the product, is an attestation which reflects the UNPE political stand. The ST and the TT are produced by the same institution, as the UN itself. The TT is seen as an institutional translation which creates a challenge to the translators either to stand with the institution's stand or to commit to the professional ethics. Third, The Arabic translation is also received by other Middle Eastern readerships who speak Arabic too. The UNPE reports' summaries on Yemen are seen as (resumes) for the UNPE annual complete reports on Yemen. The complete reports contain data from the fields handled by teams of experts, and hence are seen as the reference of the reports' summaries. Therefore, I decided to carry out this study to illustrate the important role

the UNPE reports' summaries play in the local politics in conflict zones. This study makes two main contributions to the field of political discourse translation outlined below:

- a. It contributes to the development of applying CDA to assess political discourse translation between English and Arabic by exemplifying the role of lexical choices, grammatical organizations, and textual structure in translation as they are subject to linguistic and cultural norms of the TT socio-cultural and socio-political practices.
- b. It contributes to political discourse translation assessment by analysing some of the strategies in transferring the ST into the TT to serve a certain political agenda, i.e., either to stand with a particular political party or to re-distribute an institutional recognition between the conflicting parties. CDA should be used to manifest and reflect "...how power abuse is enacted, reproduced or legitimised by the text and talk of dominant groups or institutions" (Van Dijk, p. 84). The study also, presents some linguistic and grammatical alternatives in the TT to avoid mistranslating.

1.4 Structure of the study

This dissertation consists of five chapters. This chapter introduces the aim, the rationale, and the significance of the study. Chapter Two presents and discusses a range of literature as the theoretical and the conceptual basis underpinning the methodology of the study. Chapter Two also presents the concept of political legitimacy and provides a background of the contextual issue of the civil war in Yemen and the political parties which are fighting for power and for political legitimacy. The second part of the literature review addresses interdisciplinary critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a method to analyse political discourse and to evaluate political discourse translation. The third part of Chapter Two explains how CDA is used to manifest political legitimization/delegitimization in political discourse translation. The last section presents the gap that this study intends to address.

Chapter Three presents the nature of the data (the UN Panel of Experts reports' summaries on Yemen, issued in 2020 and in 2021), as well as the methodological framework and methods of analysis. Schäffner's (2004) CDA has been utilized as a method to investigate political discourse translation, in addition to van Dijk's (1997-2009-2010) linguistic markers being used as part of the socio-cognitive approach to explore the relationship between discourse structure and its political context.

Chapters Four presents the data analysis and the discussion of the findings. The first section analyses and expands on examples taken from the January 2020 and January 2021 UNPE reports' summaries (both the original text and the translation). The second section of chapter four presents the discussion of the findings. Chapter Five is dedicated to the conclusion remarks. It illustrates how this study is aligned with the previous studies. Also, it is discussing the limitations of this study and suggesting some recommendations for further research.

Chapter 2 : Literature Review

2.1 Introduction and Background

This study will introduce critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a method to investigate political discourse translation. The UNPE final reports on Yemen are documents prepared, edited, and translated by the UN Panel of Experts and submitted to the UN Security Council. The reports are to endorse the mediation and peacekeeping efforts to resolve the political conflict over power and to end the civil conflict in Yemen that started in September 2014. UNPE reports are part of the UN documents for peacekeeping efforts in Yemen that have been issued by the United Nations committee of expertise called Panel of Experts since 2015. The reports for this dissertation's data are the latest two reports' summaries. The first was issued on 27 January 2020 titled *Final Report of Panel of Experts on Yemen*, with reference no. (S/2020/70). The second one was issued on 22 January 2021 titled *Final Report of Panel of Experts on Yemen*, with reference no. (S/2021/79). The UNPE reports are issued in the UN official languages: English, as the authentic source, and in addition the language of the situational context, such as Arabic as the target language. Arabic, as the language of the target text (TT), is the language of the contextual and the situational subjects of the UNPE reports' summaries because they are about the socio-political conflict in Yemen. The UNPE reports' summaries were issued and translated by the UN organization itself. The translated text, the Arabic version, will be examined in comparison with the English version to assess translation strategies and to clarify the potential socio-political effects and problematic consequences of such translation on the social and political situation in Yemen.

The study will look at the UNPE reports' summaries as they represent a mediation of power relations between the Yemeni legitimate government or *الحكومة الشرعية* / the Legitimate Government) as *the Legitimate Government* and the non-legitimate socio-political powers namely, the Houthis movement, the Southern Transitional Council (STC), and other minor armed groups which have been involved in the conflict in order to share political legitimacy as part of the recognized government. All the parties, whether the legitimate government or the non-legitimate entities have been involved in civil conflict and have been striving for political legitimacy or *الشرعية السياسية* / *the*

political legitimacy) to become the legitimized/authorized power to rule the country, which has been devastated during seven years of conflict.

Translating political discourse, and political documents in particular, is a very serious task because of the potential socio-economic and socio-political consequences and effects. UNPE political documents are no exception. To the best of my knowledge, there have not been any previous studies exploring the aforementioned issues using CDA as a lens to focus on the English to Arabic translations of UNPE reports on Yemen, and this study aims to address this gap in the literature. By employing CDA as a methodology for exploring strategies and policies of translating political discourse, the focal point of this study is to determine the socio-economic and socio-political consequences that might occur as a result of the target text linguistic choices. Also, utilizing CDA as a method for a comparative investigation of the target text (TT) and the source text (ST) will reveal the political ideology and stance of the UNPE on the Yemeni socio-political conflict. Another issue that will be discussed is exploring how such translation strategies influence the translation process and alter the linguistic construction of the TT (the Arabic version) as the product of the translation process. This dissertation will explore the following research questions:

1. To what extent is the concept of political legitimacy conveyed in both, the Arabic version as the target text and the English version as the source text in the UNPE reports' summaries on Yemen?
2. What are the socio-political issues affected by the translation of the UNPE reports' summaries on Yemen and what political consequences might conceivably result from these issues?

In this chapter, there is first a short background on the conflict over political legitimacy in Yemen. Next, aspects of political legitimacy embedded in political discourse will be examined. After that, follows a discussion of how translation strategies are crucial in transferring political documents from one language/culture to another with the concept of political legitimization as the focal point. That is followed by an evaluation of CDA as an efficient tool to analyse political discourse with some relevant examples. The last two sections illustrate the ways political discourse translation is evaluated by CDA to reveal concepts like political legitimization or/and de-legitimization.

2.2 The Yemeni contextual environment

In this section, the Yemeni contextual environment, i.e., the local politics, social dynamics, and the role of regional powers (mainly Saudi Arabia and UAE) will be briefly described. The former government, under-President Saleh, succumbed after the Arab Spring uprisings in 2011 (Knights, 2018). After that, the legitimate government of Yemen, or the current President *Hadi* Government, became the elected transitional government as the legitimate government of Yemen. Between March 2013 and January 2014, the Yemeni Government with help from regional powers (Gulf Co-operation countries), global powers and the UN Security Council, conducted a transitional so-called National Dialogue Conference (NDC) as part of the efforts to reconcile the socio-economic and socio-political crisis of the country. The NDC aimed to offer all local powers and groups the opportunity for a peaceful agreement to ‘distribute power’ after the end of the current legitimate government so-called *Hadi* transitional government. In September 2014, the Houthis movement (the Houthis) invaded the northern part of the country, captured the capital of Yemen, Sana’a, overran the Yemeni legitimate government and proceeded with a takeover of the armament of the state. The Houthis have been accused of acting as an Iranian proxy, which became a real fact after they were provided with direct support from Iran (Knight, 2018). Then, in March 2015, a Saudi-led coalition started a military intervention against the Houthis with what was called *Operation Decisive Storm*. The aim and reason behind that campaign was in response to calls from the *Hadi* transitional government, as the legitimate government, to bring back, support and enforce the UN recognized government of Yemen as *الحكومة الشرعية* / the Legitimate Government) as *the Legitimate Government*. The civil conflict in Yemen has still not ended and is having a disastrous effect on the humanitarian situation of the people of the country.

2.3 The contextual and political discursive practice

Nida (1964) drew links between authoritative and serious translation and the issue of ethics, which has to be considered by the translators to “ensure that mis-statements, prejudiced language, illogical conclusions and irrelevancies are clearly shown up” and that “the pursuit of the truth is the translator’s supreme obligation” (p.29). Schäffner (2004) introduced CDA and translation studies including political discourse analysis to investigate how linguistic choices (as lexical choices and

conceptual metaphor) have serious political consequences between text production and reception in different contextual and situational environment. Schäffner (2004) discussed the concept of “*recontextualization across cultures*” as a *transformation process* that undergoes four major translation strategies: a.) implicitation, b.) explicitation, c.) domestication and d.) foreignization. Other researchers, (Fairclough, 2013) and (Wodak, 2000) probed the issue of recontextualization considering its effect on socio-political decision making and the local interpretation of language. Valdeón (2007) applied contrastive CDA to investigate problematic lexical choices and concluded that text producers exercise “altering a communicative and informative event to make it conform to their own political stance” (p. 115). Venuti (2010) considered foreignization as a translation strategy that is close to literal translation and postulated that foreignization might emphasise the resistance of “ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism” (p.78). He explained that “foreignizing strategy attempts to bring out the foreign in the TT itself sometimes through calquing of ST syntax and lexis or through lexical borrowings that preserve SL items in the TT” (P.20).

Utilizing lexical and syntactic tools of CDA and translation studies, Al-Hejin (2012) conducted a comparative analysis on BBC news translation practices between English and Arabic to provide a “good example of selective appropriation which sometimes went beyond that to include content that was basically invented” (p.330). Ayyad (2012) discussed the issue of *deliberate ambiguity* to investigate the *level* of deliberateness, intention, and ideology in translation. Daghigh et al. (2018) conducted a study that investigated the idea of manipulating the ST in translating to the TT to meet the ‘socio-political needs of the target society’ by applying Van Dijk's (2017) socio-cognitive notion of *Ideological Square* in translation in situations of conflict. His study concluded that the translated text betrayed the ST to serve the local authorities’ ideological purposes. In translation from one different culture into another, focusing on the linguistic form, as a translating solution, can create greater ambiguity to the TT’s readership. Bassnet (2011) viewed translation as “a re-writing of an original” and that “...the translator is involved in complex power negotiations (mediating between cultures...)” (p.14). So, in the translation process, “...focus of attention needed to be on broader issues of context, history and convention not just on debating the meaning of faithfulness in translation or what the term ‘equivalence’ might mean” (p.13).

2.4 Political legitimization in political discourse

In terms of political and philosophical theories, Peter (2020) defined political legitimacy as comprising two aspects, descriptive and normative. He pointed out that, “if legitimacy is interpreted descriptively, it refers to people’s beliefs about political authority and, sometimes, political obligations” (p.1). As to the normative aspect, “...political legitimacy concept refers to some benchmark of acceptability or justification of political power or authority and-possibly-obligation”, so, legitimacy as a political norm is about the “justification of coercive political power ” (Peter, 2020, p. 2). It is the authority’s justification of a political entity, mainly the state, and not only the exercise of power. Political legitimacy is very important for any political entity, i.e., government, movement or party, because it has a function which is to justify political authority and political obligation. Consent, acting for the public, and utility are the main resources of political legitimacy. If a political authority had not succeeded in guaranteeing those elements, then it ceases to be legitimate (Peter, 2020). Reyes (2011) explored different linguistic paths in political discourse regarding legitimization strategies applied by social actors, i.e., political leaders, naming rationality, hypothetical future planning, and voice of experts as three of such legitimization strategies. Regarding the voice of experts as a strategy of legitimizing decision makers’ deeds, he concluded that quoting the voice of experts is a strategy to “support or give validity to the information we are presenting” (Reyes, 2011, p.804). This study will shed light on how deliberate ambiguity used by the TT might be viewed and utilized by the *parties* fighting over political legitimacy in Yemen to make their words serve their political agenda. This study will investigate the UNPE reports’ summaries on Yemen and how inadequate knowledge of the target culture (Arabic language) could affect the case as well as the UNPE political stance and integrity. This would be the case if evidence that the translation process followed the course of *think-aloud protocol* was provided. To find out, this study will follow some translating process strategies such as substitution, addition, deletion, and rearrangement, which are applied in the process of recontextualization of the TT *to make it work* in the Yemeni Middle Eastern language and culture.

2.5 Analysing political discourse using CDA

This study adopts CDA as a model of the discourse analytic approach of political discourse translation. The goal is to reveal the strategies and the manipulation tools of translation between the original text (ST) and the translated one (TT). The translation of any text does not exist randomly, i.e., questions should be asked such as “what gets translated, who is it translated for, and how is the material translated?” (Nord, 1991, p. 36). Both the discourse and the context have an interrelationship that cannot be dismantled, i.e., the process of translation is considered both as a discourse and socio-cultural practice. Fairclough (1992) considered CDA to be a practical approach because it sheds light on the interrelationship that governs any language and its socio-cultural practices and context. Also, it is a tool to explore how discourse plays a critical function in handling social conflicts and constructing power relations. This approach is beneficial in analysing discourse particularly political discourse, as it reveals the relationship between the linguistic content and social power. From this perspective, CDA was applied by some researchers to investigate the lexical choices of some translated texts. For example, (Malkawi, 2012) used CDA to investigate the ‘implicit ideology’ of chosen newspapers between the English language and the Arabic language.

On the other hand, CDA as a methodology was used by many researchers who investigated translations within two different socio-political contexts to explore the cultural load and the bias behind the manipulation in the translation process toward certain political issues and attitudes (Elewa, 2019; Faiq, 2007). As part of the CDA functioning aspect, it discloses how powerful social agents capitalize on the manipulative strategies not only to justify political dominance, but also to “institutionalize social discrimination” (Elewa, 2019, p. 397). Political discourse comprises texts or documents for political institutions such as conventions, political agreements, and political constitutions. Schäffner (2004) pointed out that legitimization and de-legitimization are part of the functions of political discourse. Translating political discourse requires recognising the main textual issues such as the linguistic structure as well as the socio-cultural context. For the latter issue, utilizing CDA through political discourse is a convenient method to uncover how political stances and ideologies are imbedded in the TT. Van Dijk (2010) confirmed that to explore the relationship between discourse structure and its political context structure, CDA is used

to uncover the role of language usage in the production or reproduction of dominance and inequality.

In terms of the cultural aspect, (Faiq, 2004) pointed out that dealing with translation as a process entitles combining sociocultural and political acts that are “attached to global and local relations of power and dominance” (p.178). Following that approach, the process of TT production functions to reflect the speaker’s social and political perception and values too. Schäffner (1996) pointed out that political discourse should be analysed with consideration of its socio-political context to reveal the relevant ideological and political embodiments and frameworks. Discourse has interconnected relations with CDA as they both deal with socio-cultural problems such as power relations. Studying the relationship between discourses and their contexts i.e., the social practices, is a socio-cognitive approach. As a method, CDA can be used to treat discourse analysis from two angles, i.e., textual analysis and social theory. The function of discourse is more than merely constituting society and culture or performing an ideological job (Wodak, 1997). Hardy et al. (2004) ascertained that “discourse analysis involves the systematic study of texts to find evidence of their meaning and how this meaning translates into a social reality” (p. 20).

Contemporary researchers view CDA as a corresponding approach with the translation process as they both conceptualize and rewrite a text. For example, (Moradi Joz, 2017) argued that translation research using the CDA approach is “more compatible with constructivism and advocacy / liberatory paradigms” regarding the major concern “at uncovering discursive reproduction of the abuse of power”. This is because they both deal with a structure, i.e., a text, loaded with the socio-cultural, and socio-political contexts with the intention to detect linguistic and manipulation strategies (Moradi, Joz, et al, 2014, p.1-4). Other researchers considered ‘content’ and ‘meaning’ relative and subjective on the one hand, because their meanings are dependent on the author’s perspective and position. On the other hand, translation is an approach that is both subjective and interpretive and requires attention to the other aspects such as the social, contextual and the interpretative nature of the process of translation through critical language awareness (Steiner, 1975/1992).

The first stage of CDA consists in addressing the linguistic relationships such as semantics and pragmatics. Next it examines the text in advanced aspects such as what and why the author has missed something, overlooked, or manipulated a concept

through the writing of that discourse (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). CDA is not just an analytical approach for socio-political contexts, but it is a tool for initiating social and political transformation too. Van Dijk (2001) brought a function to CDA as a primary concern in examining, understanding, and uncovering “the way social power abuse, dominance”, and inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context’, and then resisting inequality problems in a society (p.352). Paltridge (2013) defined the function of CDA as examining “the use of discourses in relation to the social and cultural issues of the race, politics, gender and identity” because discourses are loaded with socio-political values and perspectives (p.186). For Paltridge (2013), CDA “explores the connections between the use of language and the social and political contexts in which it occurs” (p. 186).

Moreover, CDA functions also as a tool to reveal how “..language constructs and is constructed by social relationships” (Paltridge, 2013, p.186). Hence, CDA uncovers different issues such as identity, ideology and cultural differences that have been embedded and constructed within the text, either explicitly or implicitly. CDA is an interdisciplinary approach that is concerned with the usage of language as a function to reflect and interpret the social reality because language chosen is never arbitrary. One of the main tasks of CDA is revealing the relationship between a certain discourse and social power. Van Dijk (2013) proposed that CDA should be used to manifest and reflect “...how power abuse is enacted, reproduced or legitimised by the text and talk of dominant groups or institutions” (p. 84). CDA studies aim to analyse and deconstruct the attachment between social and cultural practices with the beliefs and assumptions of the discourse. This mechanism is obtained by unpacking what an individual says or does when talking or writing about their own opinions and perspectives of any social or political matter.

CDA as a methodology, provides useful instruments for analysis because it enables us to reveal logical fallacies. Also, it provides a warrant to recognize the strategies that individuals apply unconsciously, or deliberately to conceal their biases. Some of these strategies include omitting facts, foregrounding, positioning the information and opinions that support the individuals’ perspectives and views, as well as relying upon presuppositions and suggestions (Huckin, 2002). By doing that, i.e., by linking together and by conducting an analysis of texts, discursive practices and the larger social context, researchers can give special attention and analysis to any certain contemporary social or political issue. Language and social structure influence,

formulate and shape each other. Also, they cannot be separated because they are interrelated and interconnected as part of their nature. This linguistic nature enables us to discover the ideologies behind the use of language. To illustrate that point, CDA is viewed as “politically involved research with an emancipatory requirement: it seeks to have an effect on social practice and social relationships” (Titscher et al., 2000, p. 147).

2.6 Political discourse translation and CDA

Translation and politics influence each other in different ways. Valdeón & Calafat (2020) pointed out that using translation as a political statement is a manifestation of how translation is a political act and how manipulation of an original text is practiced to serve political purposes and agendas. They argue that translation as a political act “does not only imply the exertion of power, or, conversely, some degree of resistance against it: it is also present in the choices made by scholars themselves” (Valdeón & Calafat, 2020, p.2). They also, indicated that the process of research selection in any topic to be analysed is considered an engagement in a “political act that does not necessarily contribute to the creation of objective knowledge but can in fact add a layer of sectarianism” (Valdeón & Calafat, 2020, p. 2-3).

Political discourse is “a complex form of human activity”, while political discourse analysis is the process of relating certain linguistic behaviour to political behaviour (Chilton & Schäffner, 1997, p. 207). The role of CDA is to uncover the power relations that underlie those processes of analysing the process of text production for ‘transcultural interaction’ whereas translation is a process of socio-cultural and socio-political practice. In terms of strategies of translating political discourse, Schäffner’s (1997) study proposed that there are four salient strategic functions (i) coercion, (ii) resistance, (iii) opposition/ protest/ dissimulation, and (iv) legitimization and/or de-legitimization. Legitimization or de-legitimization is a process of presenting one’s own actions or traits in a positive way and other’s actions or traits in a negative way, either explicitly or implicitly. Schäffner (2004) presented different examples of translations of political discourse between German and English to manifest the political impact of certain translation strategies as “the processes by which information is transferred via translation to another culture; and the structure and function of equally valid texts in their respective cultures” (p.117). By applying CDA to evaluate political discourse translation, it is possible to uncover the ‘ideological loading’ through analysing the ways the language has been structured and the “underlying relations of power” too (Schäffner, 2004, p. 132). Another point discussed by Schäffner (2004) is that the

notion of equivalence as a strategy for remaining faithful to the ST. That notion has been surpassed by the focus on contextual factors such as socio-cultural, socio-political, and communicative practices as the new scope of translation politics. Hence, the issue of political legitimacy in political discourse is crucial because the concept has political consequences such as decision-making and justification for political authority.

In their discussion about how translation brings about a ‘perlocutionary effect’ between the author and the audience, (Obeng & Hartford, 2008) confirmed the importance of explanation of the Source Text (ST) as “one strategy a translator uses to render such equivalence” to assist the audience to gain mastery over linguistic, socio-cultural, and situational difficulties of the ST (p. 222). Van Dijk (2009) argued that to investigate how authors have exercised social power by means of discourses, we search ‘linguistic markers’ such as lexical style and topic choice. Dijk concluded that word order, coherence, schematic organization, and syntactic structures are also significant linguistic markers to be examined. As well as discussing contextual analysis, (Van Dijk, 2009) provided other areas for analysis such as semantic structures, local meanings such as implications, presuppositions, allusions, vagueness, omissions, and polarizations. Investigating discursive strategies includes argumentation on a particular theme to justify political purpose, the use of referential terms or nomination, the strategy of predication (positive or negative, implicit or explicit), framing, perspectivation (as in reporting or narration), and strategies of intensification versus mitigation (Van Dijk, 2009).

Transferring a text from one culture to another requires recontextualization across cultures. For Al-Hejin (2012), recontextualization is the process accompanying the transformation of discourse from one language to another. However, when using the term with CDA, recontextualization refers to the process of re-arrangement, deletion, addition, and substitution in the TT to reconcile with the novel cultural context of the TT (Van Leeuwen, 1993, p. 294). In terms of translating strategies, Venuti (2012, p.19-20) used the term ‘domestication’ for borrowing equivalent elements from the target culture’s conventions to make the readers of the TT more familiar with ST elements, and the term ‘foreignization’ for retaining of the ST ‘cultural conventions’ without consideration to the issue of familiarity to the TT audience. However, translating UN documents such as resolutions, treaties, and conventions from English to Arabic raises the issue of localization. Localization is the process of addressing the cultural and non-textual components, because every language has its own socio-political and socio-

cultural loads and connotations. So, even though the Arabic language is one of the UN official languages, translating from English to Arabic involves many linguistic problems, including inherent ambiguity, and culture-specific issues. In this case, we realize the importance of applying CDA as a tool to expose such problems through revealing political ideologies and agenda structured within the linguistic formulations of both ST and TT. Schäffner (2004) explained that both political discourse analysis and CDA have a common goal as they uncover “the mediated connection between properties of text on the one hand, and socio-political or socio-cultural structures and processes on the other hand” (p. 142).

Al-Hejin (2012) suggested three methodological models to analyse the TT to connect the discursive practice with social practice. These models have three different angles as (a) a perspective which views translation as a **re-writing** where the translator imposes the TT’s recontextualization; (b) a perspective which views translation as an **intertextual chain** which both the ST and the TT undergo a ‘comparative CDA’ including the rationale behind linguistic choices as well as the socio-cultural context’s impact; and (c) a perspective which views translation as a **multiple versions** in which comparative CDA is used on more than two translations of the same ST.

2.7 Evaluating political discourse translation using CDA

One of the basic functions of CDA is to explore how power relations in a society are structured through language use. Wodak and Meyer (2015) indicated that CDA is rationalized upon essential assumptions such as the belief that “not only individuals, but also institutions and social groupings have specific meanings and values, that are expressed in language in systematic ways” (p.6). Ayyad (2012) examined different translations of the ‘*Roadmap Plan*’² document, originally drafted in English, into both Arabic and Hebrew languages in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. His study found that the “Roadmap Plan” was translated with different translation strategies which resulted in different TT versions serving different institutions’ political stand. Every institution attempted to foreground its respective political interests and “construct narratives that resonate with their constituencies” (p.19). Daghigh et al. (2018) applied the ‘ideological square’ of (Van Dijk, 2011) as a part of CDA method to examine the cognitive factor in translation. They explained the manipulation in the process of

² The ‘Roadmap Plan’ is a peace plan that has been launched in 2003 by the Quartet (comprises of UN, USA, EU, and Russia) to resolve the Palestinian-Israeli conflict based on the idea of establishing two states. The document was issued in English and translated into both Arabic and Hebrew.

translation at the textual level, to meet the socio-political needs of the target society. In their conclusion, the authors confirmed that political discourse translation is broadly produced with many manipulating techniques to meet the socio-political needs of the target society. Bazzi (2019) applied CDA and the functional structure of the text to reveal how translation plays a significant role in “reproducing the dominant political beliefs” or by “resisting counter-ideologies” of the ST (p. 584). His study found that media sources used linguistic structures to justify their ideological stance with or against conflict situations. Owaida (2018) conducted a study on three different Arabic language translations (as the TT) of the Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s speech (in English as ST) in the UN General Assembly in the UN 66th session in September 2011. The study situated the TTs using their historical, socio-political, and institutional contexts as a frame. The study concluded that conditions of TT production/reproduction are embedded in the texts’ features and narratives which are intended to serve the producers’ political goals that resulted in different versions of translations of the same political speech (or the same ST). Malkawi (2012) explored the ‘ideological stamp’ through investigating political discourse translation using semantics as a linguistic approach to examine the translated text’s style on three operational levels: lexical usage, syntactic structure and the conveyed message that is imposed on the text’s structure compared with the source text.

This linguistic approach is concise and practical because it focuses on translation strategies in two aspects: direct and oblique strategies in translation (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995). Another CDA model used by Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) as a way to comprehend the technique and strategies of translation. They argued that the target discourse is manipulated as a strategy of the translator for “specific purposes” (p. 5) as well as how some translators dealt with the stylistic approaches between the authentic text and the target context through detecting the ‘ideological marker’ and ‘mistranslations’ (Malkawi, 2012, p.16). Another example of this combination is by Daghigh et al. (2018), who investigated the idea of manipulating the ST in translating to the TT to meet the ‘socio-political needs of the target society’ (p.1) by applying van Dijk’s (2011) socio-cognitive notion of ‘Ideological Square’ in translation in situations of conflict. The study concluded that the translated text betrayed the ST to serve the local authorities’ ideological purposes. In other variant ways, practising translation involves ‘framing’ through reconstructing the source message to respond to the target text’s contextual or institutional necessities (Darwish, 2006). The conclusions made by

both Darwish's (2006) and Daghigh et al. (2018) about manipulating the TT message to create certain effects on the target readership are relevant to this study which will involve comparing the ST with the TT on the one hand, and comparing the TT with the socio-political reality, i.e., the context of the TT to uncover the deliberate manipulation of the TT to serve the political agenda of the author/translator.

2.8 Framing in translating political discourse

Frames are defined as “semi-structured elements of discourse which people use to make sense of information they encounter” (Fisher, 1997, p.1). Framing is used to “provide patterns for understanding social relations” in different realms such as linguistics, policy studies and social science. Also, it is utilized as a method of encompassing ideas, concepts or beliefs. Framing is considered an extra-linguistic form of discourse and its focal point is how individuals, members of a society, for example, represent meaning. Frame analysis has been utilized to investigate strategies of activists of social movements when producing and introducing ideas or perspectives, i.e., “to explore the processes by which social movements come to understand problems and to sell their perspectives to a wider audience” (Gamson, et al., 1992, p. 1). In the process of framing, (Goffman, 1974) introduced the term of “keying” or staging to “organize information drawn from real experiences and about people and objects” (p.47). Keys might be capitalized on to deceive, as Goffman (1974) contended, in two ways; a) in fabricating naïve audiences by suspending their ability to notice the reality, or b) in creating an illusion or self-deluding process. Applying the concept of framing (or keying) as a methodology, to separate political contests and their arguments has four aspects, a) illusions, b) fabrications, c) social frameworks, and d) natural frameworks (Goffman, 1974, p.22).

Snow's et al. (1986) approach was about “how social problems being framed” or “how activists assign meaning to events”, which, in turn, affects shaping public policy (p. 466). This approach is crucial in discussing the methods used in this study of understanding the strategy of framing, frame deployment in political discourse, as well as manipulating frames, in the UNPE reports' summaries (see data). For Snow (2013), framing has three main tasks, a) “diagnostic framing” used to outline a problem and assign blame to a specific agent, b) “prognostic framing”, used to offer solutions, or propose strategy and objectives to be achieved with its implementation, and c) “motivational framing” used to appeal to the supporters of the cause, such as using narratives and storytelling. Johnston & Klandermans (1995) introduced “text-dependant

micro-discourse” for analysing textual materials and the linguistic patterns, i.e., to analyse words and phrases to locate frames. (p. 237).

Van Dijk (1977-1980) developed framing levels as discursive at a deep structural level asserting that, in a given text, the discursive level of discourse is more than the sum of words, phrases, and sentences. Van Dijk (1980) elaborated the concept of cognitive processes as how individuals perceive, interpret, organize, and represent knowledge of the world, i.e., “the way people construct social reality” (p.99). He also, introduced the concept of ‘schematic forms’, which are the extra-linguistic elements like narratives, arguments and reports as strategies to serve communicative purposes. Van Dijk (1980, p. 46) introduced four tasks for discursive structures regarding receiving of the discourse message as a) enabling the receiver to select or/and delete some elements of the message regarding the meaning of that message, b) enabling the receiver to organize elements of the message according to the strong or weak aspects, c) to allow the receiver to build/infer meaning from the message, and d) to equip the receiver to extract general fact from the message. So, in locating and analysing frames, investigating the process of select-delete, strong/weak selection and deletion, meaning generalization, and universal facts is crucial because such processes affect meaning creation and social reality representation. In this study, the issue of clustering as a process applied by UNPE reports’ summaries as a strategy to gather different agents under one category, is added and discussed. These agents include human rights violation which reduces legitimacy capital from all parties even though some of the political parties have more activities, qualitatively and quantitatively, that violate human rights in Yemen.

In political discourse translation studies, framing and reframing have been applied in order to explore the mechanisms of altering and modifying the target text for specific purposes (Al-Hejin, 2012; Baker, 2006; Daghigh et al., 2018; Darwish, 2006; Dijk, 1988; Spiessens & Van Poucke, 2016; Valdeón, 2007). Both of (Daghigh et al., 2018; Spiessens & Van Poucke, 2016) applied framing to investigate van Dijk’s pattern of ideological square to manipulate translation through selective appropriation, i.e., bringing particular information to the fore (as foregrounding certain elements of information), shifts in translation, or to draw attention and focus to certain details while excluding others. Spiessens and Van Poucke (2016) examined emissions, additions, and “lexical shifts”, which is as they explained, “the replacement of a specific term or concept in the source text by a lexical non-equivalent item in the target text” (p. 326).

This process results in losing that level of effect on the TT reader. Baker, (2018b) had elaborated Goffman's (1974, p.302) frame ambiguity and ascertained that it results from competing narratives or the definition of the situation. Also, it "is often experienced by different parties to a conflict as a by-product of competing attempts to legitimize different versions of the relevant narrative" (p.108).

Baker (2018b) indicated the ethical issue, that translators dissociate themselves from reproducing ideologies is "how translators elaborate of particular narratives", when "they translate texts and utterances that participate in creating, negotiating and contesting social reality" (p. 105). That is because she put the concept frame and framing in conjunction with 'schema' and 'schemata', which refer to what an individual's expectations are about social reality. Drawing on examples from the Al-Jazeera Channel translation strategy, Baker suggested that it is important to treat frame as "an active and conscious strategy" because frame "can be exploited in translation" through "numerous linguistic devices such as tense shifts, deixis, code switching, use of euphemism" as well as paralinguistic devices such as typography (p. 108-111). As part of the strategy of framing, Baker (2018b) extended the concept of framing by introducing tools such as "selective appropriation" of textual material in forms of "patterns of omission and addition designed to surpass, accentuate or elaborate particular aspects of a narrative encoded in the source text" (p.114).

Al-Sharafi and Al-Shehari (2020) utilized a combination of Baker's (2006, p.19) narrative framework and Peirce's (1974) semiotic model of triadic signification to investigate "legitimacy narratives" in the briefings' translation of UN special envoy for Yemen with concentration on the issue of "translator agency". Their study identified one main strategy, metonymization, to construct and/or to frame legitimacy narratives. They also extracted three other additional sub-strategies: labelling, naming and selective appropriation. In their discussion of the translator agency issue, the researchers pointed out that the "struggle between the translator's freedom and the UN institutional norms" and how "institutional pressure" might result in a "literal target text" (p.211-213). However, by using neutral back-translation, the researchers concluded that sometimes the translator did not "exercise agency" which is "the willing and ability to act" (Koskinen, 2010, p.60 as cited by Al-Sharafi & Al-Shehari, 2020) because the "translator's subordination to institutional pressure is not a given" (p.214). This approach is relevant to this study because one of the analytic indicators the study methods is *detecting the frame* i.e., to examine how certain words, phrases and

sentences have been located or transplanted into the TT compared to the ST. Also, this study illustrates how such process is affecting both the textual grid (the UNPE reports' summaries), and the consequences of the contextual situation (the Yemeni state socio-political future and the peoples' socio-economic situation). For that, language-neutral awareness, as Crezee (2016) pointed out, matters in exercising intercultural translation to reflect the TT audience's cultural viewpoint, particularly when the translator plays as an intercultural mediator. When the translator realizes how culture-specific items can create varied reactions on the TT receptors depending on their linguistic and cultural backgrounds, then he/she can reflect 'how to put it' in the target language (p.34). This awareness enables the translator to show "appropriate reflection on both the nature of the text, the culture specific issues identified, and the need to take into account the perceived target audience when producing a culturally appropriate translation" (Crezee, 2016, p. 35).

2.9 CDA and political legitimization in political discourse translation

Uncovering how values and ideas have been perpetuated within discourses' structures requires an analytical tool such as CDA because there is a relationship between translation behaviour and socio-cultural factors. When analysing a translation, linguistically and textually, embedded ideologies and power structures are sought. Al-Hejin (2012) pointed out that the "analyst needs to step outside the text to consider the social practices surrounding the translation" (p. 325) because translation is a human activity that transfers the message in between different socio-cultural contexts. However, (Kiersey & Hayes, 2010) mentioned that the application of CDA on official documents "can expose the political agenda, the hegemony behind the text, the inclusion of particular voices versus the exclusion of others" (p. 332). Luke (1997) detailed three salient linguistic characteristics that CDA reveals when analysing a discourse (either spoken or written): firstly, lexical choices, how dialogue was structured, secondly, how clauses were combined and sentences were linked, and thirdly how grammar and semantics were organized e.g., action verbs and modality.

CDA and the translation process have similar functions toward the discourse, i.e., it cannot be translated without scrutinizing the socio-political beliefs, conventions, and values of both the ST and the TT (Daghigh et al., 2018). CDA is a method that researchers utilize to analyse the relationship between the discourse structure and the constitution of the power relations and domination in a society. It explores how

dominant groups use linguistic structures to reproduce and legitimate power and position (Van Dijk, 2001).

Political legitimization or de-legitimization as a strategy in translating political discourse can be capitalized on or even manipulated to serve certain political ideology or a political agenda. For example, a political document might present one party positively and/or present the other party negatively, explicitly or implicitly in the translation (the TT). So, translation as a process can be manipulated to create political effect through specific strategies such as lexical choices, information selection or transfer to another culture, and developing identity. Reyes (2011) introduced an explanation to the question of strategies of legitimization in political discourse. To understand how political figures or institutions resort to specific discursive structures and strategies, even of different ideologies, linguistic analysis of five major legitimizing strategies is needed: emotions, hypothetical future, rationality, voice of experts, and altruism. By applying CDA to investigate the linguistic ways in which legitimization is constructed in the discourse of political officials, Reyes (2011) concluded that social actors such as politicians exercise a process of legitimization through the use of language in society to gain, manifest and maintain authority for justifying their social practices.

The United Nations is the global political organization that represents most nations and countries. It has been playing a crucial political role as a mediation institution during political conflicts either between two countries or between two or more local parties fighting over political power. When translating UN documents, the question that arises is how such documents can be translated into the local language of a country in civil conflict, as in this case Yemen. The UN, as a global political institution, has both the authority and the use of the ST and the TT at the same time as English and Arabic are two of the UN's seven official languages. The use of CDA to evaluate UNPE reports' summaries has several advantages. First, CDA views the text-context relation as being constructed upon three layers: society where the reality of power relationships, cognition which is the 'mediating layer' and then the discourse itself. That is because the discourse comprises the meaning of the text (Fairclough, 2001; Van Dijk, 1998, 2005). Second, CDA and the translation process have similar functions toward the discourse as it cannot be translated without scrutinizing the socio-cultural and socio-political beliefs, conventions, and values. Third, CDA is a method that researchers utilize to analyse the relationship between the discourse structure and the constitution of

the power relations and domination in a society. Finally, CDA explores how dominant groups use such linguistic structures to reproduce and legitimate power and position (Van Dijk, 2001). The study reported on here is using CDA to explore the concepts of political legitimization and de-legitimization in the English to Arabic translations of the UNPE reports' summaries, which were published and translated in January 2020 and January 2021 (see Appendices A and C).

2.10 The functional and ethical aspect in translating political discourse

UN documents such as the UNPE annual reports about the conflict in Yemen are significant, consequential and authoritative political documents that has major socio-political consequences on peoples' welfare and the future of the country of Yemen. Such documents require authoritative and earnest translation. Any mistranslation, misstatements, or prejudicial language usage in the process of the translation could result in grave political, social, and individual consequences and effects. Newmark (1988) considered documentary texts to be serious literary works that entail ethical and aesthetic concerns. He confirmed:

I have endeavoured to establish that translation is a noble, truth-seeking profession and that a translation must not mislead readers factually nor deceive them with false ideas; if such occur in the original, they must be corrected or glossed extra-textually, depending as their ethical benchmark on the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) plus amendments, and not on the translator's personal ideology; in my view, the UN Declaration is the keystone of social and individual ethics today. (Newmark, 1988, p. 21)

The institutional control (or patronage) of the process of translation is one of the principal issues that affect the TT as a product realised for the goals of that institution. The concept of patronage in analysing the interpretation of political discourse was considered as a factor that controls the process of translation toward the target language. For example, (Shojaei & Laheghi, 2012) investigated news translation to detect political ideology and controlling factors through CDA analysis using Lefevere's (1992) concept of patronage as a 'control factor'. This idea can be adopted by researchers of political discourse translation to explore other controlling factors of transferring the message of the ST discourse to the TT discourse, because every text is a mixture of the socio-cultural and socio-political practices. This study adopts that notion to examine how the translated text achieved or failed to achieve the process of transferring the perception of political legitimacy as one of the key points of the original text's message.

In terms of the role of the translator, (Baker, 2018b) discussed translator's ethical and political judgements as a critical issue beyond equivalence ascertaining that "to become a point of contact can involve becoming a point of conflict" (p.307). The critical issue outlined by Baker (2018a) extends to the role of translated UNPE documents, as it is an ethical and moral mediating committee in the Yemeni conflict. The classic question of the ethical issue is 'what kind of translator should I be?', however, for the UNPE documents and role, the question would be 'who we are and what role do we play?'. Therefore, for UN panel of experts' documents translation, it is critical to show the UN institution as an independent mediating institution not as a mediating agency involved in the Yemeni conflict on behalf of a global or regional political agenda. Baker (2018a) synthesized the ethical and moral judgement of the translator as an individual, but she did not include an institutions' ideological or political agenda. In the case of the UNPE reports' summaries about Yemen, both the original text and the target text were processed by the UN translation office itself. This case raises several questions about UN Panel of Experts authority: whether it is an independent mediating institution or just another indirect agency to confirm an agenda of major hegemonic and imperial global powers. This agenda affects, and even determines peoples' rights, freedom, and survival. This study explores the question of language as socio-political power, as it analyses translation, and political documents in applying CDA to investigate the translation of the UNPE documents which might perpetuate linguistic, political, and cultural dominance. Understanding the strategies of the TT as the product of the translation process will enable understanding of the issue of transplantation in translation. This transplantation views translation as an instrument of change to construct a new socio-political reality.

This study applies CDA to investigate the issue of political legitimization and de-legitimization of the Yemeni conflicting parties, mainly, the current legitimate government, the Houthis, and the Southern Transitional Council (STC), by examining the UN Panel of Experts reports' summaries on Yemen. The study compares both the English version as the source text and the Arabic one as the target text. The UNPE reports' summaries on Yemen are political and semi-legislative documents, and hence, translating such documents has the same seriousness and consequences as the original, because the translation is an institutional and "authoritative" document. In other words, it could determine the present and the future of the socio-economic and socio-political situation of the whole country. This study endeavours to direct attention to the

overwhelming hegemony of English as a global political lingua franca, as it is the UN lingua franca as well as most of the global political discussions, treaties, conventions, and agreements. This is relevant to the study reported on here as that involves a translation of UNPE reports on Yemen from English into Arabic, which shows that the Arabic translation of the English document source text was almost a replica of the English version that did not consider the Yemeni local culture, conventions, and language, nor the social reality as the context of the TT.

2.11 Summary

This chapter has offered a literature review of the up-to-date studies which discussed, political discourse translation, legitimation and political legitimization in political discourse and political discourse translation. The chapter also presented a brief discussion of how political discourse translation is analysed by using CDA as well as how CDA is utilized to manifest the process of legitimization/de-legitimization in political discourse translation. The next chapter will outline the research methodological approach for the study.

Chapter 3 : Research Method

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the method applied to investigate the strategies of political legitimization used in the translation of the UNPE reports' summaries will be introduced and explained. To do this, the UNPE, as an institutional committee, responsible for both the ST and the TT versions of the text will be considered. In other words, the textual features of these reports' summaries will be explored and analysed as political documents used to provide legitimacy for or abolish legitimacy from particular institutions or entities such as the Yemeni President *Hadi* Government as *الحكومة الشرعية* / the Legitimate Government, the Houthis movement, the STC and the other political or militia groups which enjoy no political legitimacy. The research questions were:

1. To what extent is the concept of political legitimacy conveyed in both the Arabic version as the target text and the English version as the source text in the UNPE reports' summaries on Yemen?
2. What are the socio-political issues affected by the translation of the UNPE reports' summaries on Yemen and what political consequences might conceivably result from these issues?

The premise will be based on the fact that the Yemeni President *Hadi* Government is the UN recognized legitimate government which already holds the political legitimacy while both the Houthis movement, the STC and others do not possess political legitimacy in the status quo. In fact, the Houthis, among other political actors, are under the sanction of the UN Security Council resolution S/RES/2214 (2015)³, which considers them illegitimate political groups. Therefore, there are four parties in conflict and fighting for political legitimacy. However, only one institution already possesses political legitimacy, and that is the recognized legitimate government or the current President *Hadi* Government. The other two parties are fighting to gain the UN recognition, and hence political legitimacy, even though they do not have any thus far. In this study, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) will be applied to explore how global political institutions (as the UNPE in this case) utilize their authority, such as voice of experts, to justify their legitimization/de-legitimization of legitimate institutions from

³ https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/s_res_2214.pdf

one hand. From the other hand, to explore how they justify their legitimization/de-legitimization of other illegitimate political actors such as to construct an institutional a recognition of an armed militia. In the preceding chapter the features of and rationale for using CDA were illustrated as they provided a review of the literature and will be reflected below as the process of legitimization or de-legitimization in the TT. In the following sections, the three main parts of this chapter, that is data collection, methodology and ethical considerations will each be discussed.

3.2 Data

Data were extracted from the reports' summaries of the UN Security Council's documents on Yemen namely, **Final Report of the Panel of Experts on Yemen**. The English version, which is the original or the source text (ST) addresses the UN General Assembly, and the international community. The Arabic version, which is the translation, or the target text (TT) addresses the Arabic language audience especially the Yemeni addresses because those reports including their summaries are discussing the Yemeni civil war. Those documents may be seen to represent the genre of political discourse, including the assessments by the Panel of Experts (as explained below), and legislative documents. The UNPE reports' summaries are part of the UN documents for peacekeeping efforts in Yemen that have been issued by the United Nations committee of expertise called the **Panel of Experts** since 2015. This study has chosen the latest reports' summaries to be its subject of investigation. The first one was issued on January 2020 with reference No. (S/2020/70), the second one was issued on January 2021 with reference No. (S/2021/79) (see Appendices A and C). All documents of the UN, including the Panel of Experts' annual reports, are found on the UN online website⁴. The texts that this study examines contain two summaries, each two pages long as part of the larger document corpus of the Panel of Experts of the UN Security Council. The Panel of Experts organizes, edits and translates the reports annually, thus named *Final Report of the Panel of Experts on Yemen*, and they are addressed to the President of the UN Security Council.

The UNPE reports have been issued in January of every year since the beginning of the conflict in Yemen in September 2014, both in English as the original document or source text and in Arabic as the translation or target text. Both reports are signed by the members and the coordinator of the UN Panel of Experts on Yemen. The two late

⁴ <https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/sanctions/2140/panel-of-experts/work-and-mandate/reports>

reports' summary number (S/2020/70) contains nine paragraphs, while the one numbered (S/2021/79) contains fifteen paragraphs. These paragraphs comprise between two and fifteen lines both in the English version as the ST or the Arabic translated version as the TT.

3.3 Method

This study attempts to answer the question of political legitimacy in political discourse translation. The main goal of investigating and analysing the data, as the UNPE reports' summaries on Yemen, is to uncover the message of the ST and whether or not it was translated/transferred into the TT with neutral connotations, i.e., transferring the ST message to the TT with informative language/words which bears no positive or negative implications regarding the cultural notions of the target language. To do so, this study will follow two main tracks in analysing the TT compared with the ST. The first track will involve an analysis of four linguistic features concerning: a) lexical choices, mainly the use of verbs, adjectives, and modality (modals and adverbs; b) syntactic style and structure, mainly the use of sentence structure and patterns, nominalization, use of the passive voice and agency; c) semantic issues, mainly the lexical non-equivalence, image constructing, information choice (the topic), and rhetoric figures of speech; and, d) text cohesion and coherence, i.e., "textual schemata" (Van Dijk, 1997), mainly, topic sentence, topic paragraph, concluding sentence, concluding paragraph and expression structures.

In order to strengthen the reliability of this study, some concepts of previous researchers who analysed political discourse translation were included. Schäffner (2004) pointed out that translation strategies include implicitation, explicitation, domestication, and foreignization in "recontextualization across cultures" (p.143). Her study investigated lexical choices and conceptual metaphors and how they result in text production and reception, as well as their serious political consequences. She also suggested that political discourse needs to be analysed from three aspects: a) how lexical choices like keywords and political concepts are applied to serve political goals, b) how information is selected in the way political ideas and decisions are introduced, and c) how illusion of identity is manipulated where "texts and discourses are framed by social and political structures and practices" (Schäffner, 2004, p. 16). Van Leeuwen (1993) elaborated on recontextualization tools such as substitution, addition, deletion, and rearrangement which make texts "work" in the target context. Van Leeuwen's (2007-2008) introduced a framework to handle the issue of legitimation in discourse

ensuring that “legitimation is always the legitimation of the practices of specific institutional orders” (2007, p.92). Leeuwen (2007) examined four categories of legitimation, as a framework, to investigate “ways discourses construct legitimation for social practices in public communication” (p. 91). Reyes (2011) traced the “linguistic choices employed in the message” to analyse the “linguistic representation of legitimization” employed by social actors to justify courses of action in discursive structures (p.785). These strategies of investigation will be applied in the second track.

The second track will include an assessment of the translated text applying CDA to reveal power relations within the TT (as the product). Through the analysis, the concept of political legitimacy in the TT is examined, specifically, the ways the UNPE reports’ summaries distributed political legitimacy among the different Yemeni political partis. The Yemeni political rivals involved in the political conflict can use such recognition as a symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 2001). For the second track, this study is going to modify and expand the approaches of (Van Leeuwen, 2007) and (Reyes, 2011) who introduced categories of legitimization and strategies of legitimization in political discourse for several reasons. The second layer of the contextual analysis involves comparing the textual grid with the contextual/situational reality. The goal is to investigate “language use as a social practice” (Fairclough, 1995, p. 135), i.e., how such type of translation could result in altering the present and the future of the socio-political reality as in the Yemeni case. Fairclough (2013) pointed out that analysts view language use as a social practice that implies a) “a mode of action”, and b) as *“a socially and historically situated mode of action, in a dialectical relationship with other facets of ‘the social’ (its ‘social context’) – it is socially shaped, but it is also socially shaping, or constitutive”* (Fairclough, 2013, p. 92).

The UNPE report summary issued in January 2020 with reference number S/2020/70) be hereafter referred to as Number I (Report summary I). The second UNPE report summary was issued in January 2021 with reference number (S/2021/79) and will hereafter be referred to as Number II (report summary II). Every example will be numbered as well, for example, **Example 1** will refer to the first example excerpted from the report summary number one and so on. This study will use a qualitative method for data analysis by applying CDA as a method of investigation to both the ST and the TT.

The process of data analysing will involve the micro-level as a “thorough check of the words” (Cap, 2008, p.21) against the political actors in the Yemeni political scene. In other words, the linguistic enactment of the UNPE reports’ summaries will be used to uncover strategies that have been suggested by (Cap, 2008) as legitimization and/or delegitimization strategies of rhetoric-linguistic patterns. These patterns take a form of presenting the other in a negative way, “blaming, scape-goating, marginalizing, excluding, attacking the moral character of the adversary, attacking the rationality of the adversary”, and similar linguistic features (2008, p.22). Cap (2008) introduced three main cross-cultural strategies of legitimization occurring in discourses, with examples from the US political rhetoric toward the US intervention in the Iraq war as; 1) *assertion*, to “establish axiological groundwork” with the addressee’s predispositions by novel messages or claims (p.23), 2) *implicature*, to invite or direct a response of the audience toward the asserted information by justification, or denial of criticism and similar methods, and 3) *common ground*, as a process of construction of “enactment of credibility, imposition of common course goal or attracting the addressee to a particular course of action” (p. 27). Cap’s (2008) suggestions are very important tools in explaining the UNPE reports on Yemen, as they constitute political discourse which addresses both the UN General Secretary Council to suggest global political decisions, as the UN resolution, and the Yemeni local readership, persuading it to embrace the UN General Secretary’s future decision. Therefore, this study will apply Cap’s analysis lenses to the UNPE reports’ summaries to reveal linguistic patterns. Such patterns include lexical items, semantic inferences, phraseology, sentences’ organization and systematic rhetorical arrangement that have been transplanted in the TT, as *markers* of assertion, implicature and common ground as strategies of legitimization or delegitimization.

3.4 Ethical concerns

This study analysed the UNPE documents (the UNPE Reports’ Summaries) which are available in the public domain, and hence did not require ethics approval.

3.5 Summary

This chapter has provided a more detailed overview of the data, and the method of analysis. The next chapter will present the details of the analysis of the UNPE documents (both report summary-I and report summary-II).

Chapter 4 : Findings and Discussion

4.1 Introduction

This study explores how the UNPE reports' summaries translation has addressed the issue of the political legitimacy regarding the socio-political conflict in Yemen, and the social and political consequences that may affect the situation in Yemen. The questions explored in this study are:

1. To what extent is the concept of political legitimacy conveyed in both, the Arabic version as the target text and the English version as the source text in the UNPE reports' summaries on Yemen?
2. What are the socio-political issues affected by the translation of the UNPE reports' summaries on Yemen and what political consequences might conceivably result from these issues?

This chapter will present the findings of the analysis conducted in an attempt to answer the research questions. The second section will present the discussion of the findings. To find answers to the abovementioned questions, two main stages of analysis were applied. The first one is a linguistic analysis to answer the first question. The aim of the linguistic analysis approach is to unveil 'what is said?' or how the TT was produced? To answer the second question, the CDA approach was applied to explain 'why is it said?' so as to explore the political ideology behind the linguistic construction of the TT. The first question of this study aimed to see how the concept of political legitimacy was conveyed in the UNPE reports' summaries, in both the Arabic as TT and in the English version as the original or ST. So, the procedure in the first phase of the analysis aimed to uncover how the concept of political legitimacy was represented and referred to, either by denotation or by connotation in each text. In other words, the linguistic analysis of the data was to understand how both the TT and the ST handled the language to produce 'meanings' of political legitimacy of the Yemeni local parties i.e., the political actors involved in the conflict over power in Yemen.

The first stage of the analysis examined the linguistic choices including word choice, word order, intentional changes of phrases order and sentence order resulting in meaning alteration. Van Dijk (1998) confirmed that "opinions may be conventionalized and codified in lexicon" (p.205). To evaluate the linguistic problems that cause departure from the lexical and the grammatical level between the ST and the TT, it was necessary to analyse the text on four levels: lexical choices including the semantic level,

the grammatical order including the syntactic process, text cohesion, and how the text was organized, or the textual structure. To do that, Fairclough's (1992, p. 75) framework of textual analysis through linguistic analysis and intertextual analysis was followed. This framework has four parts: a) lexical choices, b) grammar, c) cohesion, and d) text structure (or text organization). The analysis yielded rich data. Unfortunately, due to the word limit constraints of this brief dissertation, all of these findings cannot be presented in detail.

4.2 Findings

4.2.1 Lexical choices

This section explains the process of arriving at lexical choices by the translator in the TT regarding the concept of political legitimacy. The data analysis shows that the TT used different references to the UN recognized legitimate Government of Yemen namely الحكومة اليمنية pronounced as /əl- 'hukūmā əl- 'ye-mānēə/ as *the Yemeni Government*. In Yemen, it is also called as الحكومة الشرعية أو حكومة الشرعية pronounced as /əl- 'hukūmā əsh-shə- 'rāē-ə/ or /'hukūmā-t əsh-shə- 'rāē-ə/ meaning: the Legitimate Government or the Government of the Legitimacy. The latter phrase is a reference only for the current UN recognized President *Hadi* Government.

Example 1:

- a. ST: the Coalition to Support Legitimacy in Yemen
TT: تحالف دعم الشرعية في اليمن
Back Translation (BT): [coalition of *supporting* legitimacy in Yemen]
- b. ST: the Coalition to Restore Legitimacy in Yemen
TT: تحالف إعادة الشرعية في اليمن
Back Translation (BT): [coalition of *restoring* legitimacy in Yemen]
- c. ST: The Government of Yemen
TT: حكومة اليمن
BT: [ø/government /of Yemen]
- d. ST: There is opacity in the relationships between **non -State armed groups** and the Government of Yemen
TT: ويسود العلاقات بين الجماعات المسلحة غير التابعة للدولة وحكومة اليمن غموض
BT: [the relationships between **non -State armed groups** and the Government of Yemen is **predominated** by opacity]
Suggested Translation (SGT): هناك غموض في العلاقة بين الجماعات المسلحة غير النظامية وبين الحكومة اليمنية

In Example 1, the translation employed different terminology and did not commit to the one-basic form, in using the proper noun. In Example 1-a, the name was written in different forms as 'Coalition to Support Legitimacy in Yemen' تحالف دعم الشرعية, in Example 1-b, it was written and translated as 'coalition to restore

legitimacy 'تحالف إعادة الشرعية' which implicates that legitimacy has gone, so the coalition is working to 'restore' it. In the ST, the name of the 'Coalition' was written with a Title Capital (as in Example 1 meaning that it is a proper noun, however, in Example 1-b, the translation did not use the well-known proper noun as التحالف دعم الشرعية في اليمن, instead, the ST proper noun was translated into a noun phrase (see 1b). In Example 1-c, the phrase "the Government of Yemen" was translated as [Ø]Government of Yemen pronounced as /'hukūmā-t əl-'ye-mən/, the definite article ال [al] as [al-'hukūmā/] , (where *al* stands for *the*), is omitted where it should be used to refer to the specific Government of Yemen, the currently UN recognized legitimate Government of Yemen, namely President *Hadi* Government, known as الحكومة اليمنية /al-'hukūmā əl-'ye-mənē/. In fact, the TT did not use the definite article ال *al* to refer to the (Government of Yemen) anywhere at all in the whole text.

It is not common in the Yemeni local discourse to say or write حكومة اليمن without the article ال because this expression is ambiguous as if it is referring to a non-current or to another government rather than the current local Yemeni recognized Government. The non-use of the definite article may show that the TT is excluding the Yemeni local audience and addressing other Middle Eastern readers. In Example 1-d, there is opacity between the noun الجماعات المسلحة غير النظامية meaning 'non-state armed groups' and الحكومة / the Government of Yemen. The translation creates an ambiguity of the relationship between 'the state', and the Government of Yemen as if they are different entities, whereas, in reality, they are related, as the Government of Yemen is the representative of the State of Yemen. The alternative (the suggested translation) – as in Example 1-d – is to disambiguate the relationship between 'the state' and 'the Government of Yemen', we re-write the TT as هناك غموض في العلاقة بين الجماعات المسلحة غير النظامية وبين الحكومة اليمنية.

Example 2:

- a. **ST:** Houthi forces also engaged in the brutal suppression of tribal **opposition** and political **dissent**.
TT: وشرعت قوات الحوثيين أيضا في قمع وحشي للمعارضة القبلية والمعارضة السياسية.
BT: [Houthi forces also engaged in the brutal suppression of tribal **opposition** and political **opposition**]
- b. **ST:** to starve **opponents** of funds
TT: وصول الأموال أو المواد إلى **المعارضين**

In Example 2, the lexemes 'opposition', 'dissent', and 'opponents' were all translated by one single lexeme as المعارضة / 'opposition', even though there exist

different linguistic equivalents in Arabic. The other problem is that المعارضين / 'opponents' creates an impression on the reader that it is a 'political opposition' in an institutional way which is not true in reality. The term 'dissent' was also translated into المعارضين whereas the closest Arabic equivalent is المخالفين which has less opposing potency as it refers to those individuals who just have different opinions on public policies. The term 'opponent' was translated to المعارضين / 'opponents' too, which is different of what the original text alludes to, when it refers to war adversaries. Opponents in the original text refers to the الخصوم / 'adversaries' more than political opposers or competitors. The translated text is a departure from the exact meaning and/or excludes the audience from critical contextual information, i.e., the contextual facts that the parties, as the social and political actors, are already in the middle of a seven-year civil war. In Arabic, the term المعارضين is used to define the political opposition actors to the recognized government only.

Example 3:

- a. ST: The Panel **found** indications of illicit enrichment
 TT: وجد الفريق مؤشرات تدل على الإثراء غير المشروع
 BT: [the panel **found** indications of illicit enrichment]
 b. ST: The Panel **found** that the Houthis were involved
 TT: لاحظ الفريق أن الحوثيين تورطوا
 BT: [the panel **noticed** that the Houthis were involved]

In Example 3-a, there is a lexical coherence problem because verb choices have different levels of potency. The verb 'found' was translated to different terms in Arabic as **وجد** / '**found**' which has the same semantic load of 'finding'. However, in Example 3-b, it was translated as **لاحظ** / '**noticed**' which has a lower level of the semantic load of 'finding'. In Arabic, when we use the verb يجد / 'find' referring to something as a deed or action, it means we have the evidence for that, whereas, when we say we لاحظ / '**noticed**', it has less potency and implies that we have no actual evidence. Also, the verb يلاحظ / '**notice**' does not cohere, semantically, with the verb تورط / '**involved**' because the latter is loaded with the implication of the continuity, and the availability of evidence of the action.

Example 4:

- a. ST: Houthi forces also **engaged** in the brutal suppression
 TT: وشرعت قوات الحوثيين
 BT: [Houthi forces **started**]
 b. ST: they are **engaged** in discussions
 TT: يقومون بإجراء مناقشات
 BT: [they are **making procedures** of discussions]

- c. **ST:** The Government of Yemen is, in some cases, **engaging** in..
TT: وتنخرط حكومة اليمن
BT: [*government of Yemen is becoming **involved**..*]
- d. **ST:** the Houthis were **involved** in cases of violations
TT: أن الحوثيين **تورطوا** في حالات انتهاك
BT: [*the Houthis were **involved** in cases of violations*]
- e. **ST:** Houthi network **involved** in the repression of women who oppose..
TT: شبكة حوثية **تشارك** في قمع النساء اللاتي يعارضن الحوثيين
BT: [*Houthi network **participating** in the repression of women who oppose..*]
- f. **ST:** Houthis were **involved** in cases of violations of asset freeze measures
TT: ولاحظ الفريق أن الحوثيين **تورطوا** في حالات انتهاك لتدابير تجميد الأصول
BT: [*Houthis were **involved** in cases of violations of asset freeze measures*]

In Example 4, the term ‘engage’ has different translations in the TT as, a. **شرع** / ‘started or began’, b. **يقوم بإجراء** / ‘making procedures’, c. **ينخرط** / ‘involved’ which reflects three different attitudes of the translator toward the core of the messages of the original text. When transferring the original message as ‘the Houthis are ‘**engaged**’, the translator used the term **شرع** / ‘started or began’ which has the implication of ‘starting’ which is not exact if we refer to either the other texts of the UNPE reports or to the factual reality in terms of the situation in Yemen. In Example 4- b, the phrase ‘engaged in discussion’ was translated as **يقوم بإجراء مناقشات** / ‘makings procedure of discussions’. The Arabic phrase conveys continuity of time, as we are describing a long procedure of discussions which is not exact in the factual reality or in the rest of the UNPE documents.

Also, the word **مناقشات** has the semantic connotation of going into details which is not happening in reality, maybe **مباحثات** as general negotiations to arrive to an agreement, but the two parties did not yet get into details as the Arabic term implies. In sentence (d-e-f), the word ‘involve’ was translated into two different meanings as, a) **تورط** / ‘involved’ and b) **شارك** / ‘participated’. The Arabic word **شارك** has a different semantic load from **تورط**, as the latter has a connotation to social wrongs as in the saying ‘involved in a crime’, whereas the word **شارك** has more neutral connotation as participating or sharing in a deed, action or process, whether it is a good or a bad deed. Here, the TT is meliorating the action verbs that are connected to the Houthis.

Example 5:

- a. The **lack** of a coherent strategy among anti-Houthi forces
TT: وأدى **غياب** استراتيجية متماسكة في صفوف القوى المناهضة للحوثيين
BT: [*The **absence** of a coherent strategy among anti-Houthi forces*]
- e. **ST:** The **lack** of capacity of the Yemeni Coast Guard
TT: ويشكل **نقص** قدرات خفر السواحل اليمني
BT: [*The **lack** of capacity of the Yemeni Coast Guard*]

In Example 5, the word ‘lack’ was translated into two different lexemes, namely as **غياب** / ‘absence’ in sentence (a) and **نقص** / ‘shortage’ in sentence (b). Semantically, the term **غياب** has the connotation of a total absence, whereas **نقص** refers to just ‘shortage’. The term **غياب استراتيجية** as ‘the absence of strategy’ is a metaphor of chaos, and if used

with military force, implicates imminent defeat. There is a process of hyperbole in using the adjective words to refer the situation of the Government of Yemen.

Example 6:

- a. **ST:** national wealth and external aid are increasingly either **diverted** or lost = **divert public money illegally**
TT: الثروة الوطنية والمعونة الخارجية تتعرض بشكل متزايد إما **للتحويل** أو للضياع
BT: [national wealth and external aid are increasingly either **transferred** or lost] = **transfer**
- b. **ST:** allowing the **diversion** of frozen assets and public funds = **appropriate public funds**
TT: **بتحويل** أصول مجمدة وأموال عامة = transfer
BT: [allowing the **transfer** of frozen assets and public funds] = **transfer**
- c. **ST:** in the **diversion** of funds unlawfully appropriated = **confiscate people's properties or money**
TT: في **تحويل** الأموال التي يتم نزعها بطريقة غير قانونية
BT: [in the **transfer** of funds unlawfully appropriated] = **transfer**

In Example 6, the terms ‘divert, diversion, diverted’ occurred in three different positions with three different contextual references and meanings. However, in the TT, it was translated into just one single lexeme as **حول، تحويل، يحول** meaning ‘to transfer, transferred, transfer’. The equivalent to the Arabic term **تحويل** is ‘transfer’, in English, which has a pure neutral connotation meaning ‘to move from one place to another; to move something/somebody from one place to another’ (Oxford Dictionary), whereas the term ‘divert’ is ‘to make somebody/something change direction’ (Oxford Dictionary), which is not the exact reference of the three sentences in Example 6. Also, the target context of the TT has three different contextual situations or actions. The message in the TT became different from the ST message as in example 6-a which the meaning became ‘to divert public money illegally’. In the example 6-b, the meaning became ‘to appropriate public funds illegally’, and 6-c as ‘to confiscate people’s properties or money illegally’. These terms have nothing to do with **تحويل / to transfer** in the TT. This is a process of normalization or neutralization of the action verbs that refer to the Houthis’ illegal actions.

Example 7: translating the term ‘undermine’

- a. **ST:** which **undermine** the objectives of Security Council resolution 2216
TT: **فقوضا** بذلك أهداف قرار مجلس الأمن 2216
BT: [which **subverts/demolishes** the objectives of Security Council resolution 2216].
Alternative term: (يبطل/يعطل) [put out of action/invalidate]
- b. **ST:** unilateral actions that **undermine** the political transition
TT: إجراءات انفرادية **تقوض** عملية الانتقال السياسي
BT: [unilateral actions that **subvert/demolishe** the political transition]
Alternative term: (يعرقل)[obstruct]
- c. **ST:** its support to the Southern Transitional Council **undermines** the Government of Yemen.
TT: دعمها للمجلس الانتقالي الجنوبي **يقوض** حكومة اليمن.
BT: [its support to the Southern Transitional Council **subverts/demolishes** the Government of Yemen].
Alternative term: **يعيق أداء** meaning ‘constrain’

In Example 7, the verb ‘undermine’ was translated to the TT as **يقوض** / ‘to subvert or to demolish’ even though the three sentences have different contextual situations and references as well as different connotative loads. When an individual or a party breach that law (or as in this situation, the UN resolution), it means that the doer or the lawbreaker should go through the law procedure, which is to be brought to court, or sentenced. Instead, the implication of the Arabic translation is reversing the principle, as, if the law is breached, then that law is null **مقوض** as ‘subverted or demolished’. In Example 7, the deeds, or actions does not **يقوض** or ‘subvert’ the political transition or the Government of Yemen, instead, such deeds or actions are accusations against the doer (as the STC here) to be held accountable. The repetition of the same lexeme **قوض** as ‘to subvert or to demolish’ to refer to the three principles that have established and caused the conflict in Yemen has significant ideological stance which will be explained more in the discussion chapter.

Example 8:

- a. **ST:** launch from Houthi-controlled **territory**.
TT: إطلاق من **أراض** خاضعة لسيطرة الحوثيين.
BT: [launch from Houthi-controlled **lands**]
- b. **ST:** through **territory** controlled by the Government of Yemen
TT: عبر **الأراضي** التي تسيطر عليها حكومة اليمن
BT: [through **the lands** which controlled by government of Yemen]
- c. **ST:** The Government of Yemen lost strategic **territory** to both the Houthis and the Southern Transitional Council
TT: واستولى الحوثيون والمجلس الانتقالي الجنوبي على **أراض** استراتيجية كانت بحوزة حكومة اليمن،
BT: [The Houthis and the STC had appropriated strategic **lands** that were under government of Yemen's possession]
- d. **ST:** In **territory** controlled by the Government of Yemen, there is a risk of the disintegration of power into a patchwork of competing factions
TT: ويتهدد **الإقليم** الذي تسيطر عليه حكومة اليمن خطر تفكك السلطة إلى خليط من الفصائل المتنافسة
BT: [**the territory/federal state** which is controlled by government of Yemen is **threatened** by the risk of the disintegration of power into a patchwork of competing factions]

In Example 8, the word ‘territory’ was translated by means of different terms such as **أراض**, **الإقليم**, **الأراضي** meaning ‘lands- the lands, lands, territory’ which creates different geographic references resulting in different ambiguous interpretations. The word **أراض** means ‘terrains or lands’, **الأراضي** and also, ‘the lands or the terrains’, while **الإقليم** means ‘territory, district or federal’ while also referring to ‘province or state’ which has a political reference in Yemen. The term **إقليم** has a special reference or implementation in the Yemeni socio-political environment after the outcomes of the Yemeni National Dialogue Conference (NDC) and the announcement of the first draft of the Yemeni constitution in 2015. The term **الإقليم** meaning ‘territory or federal’ is one of the biggest issues that might have led to the conflict in Yemen over power because some of the political actors (especially the Houthis and the STC) did not agree with the proposed

Federal Regions of Yemen. In other words, the Yemeni NDC introduced proposals to change the central system of the country into federal system/regions or نظام الأقاليم meaning ‘states or territory system’. The use of singular form, as إقليم in the TT, has the implication to the Arab audience that the Government of Yemen is controlling only one ‘territory’, while in reality, it is still controlling more than just one. The implicit message in this expression is that the party which controls and dominates more land and has more power is the party which is (implicitly) granted recognition to exercise authority and, hence, to be granted political legitimacy.

4.2.2 Grammatical organization

In this section, the analysis of the TT translation will aim to uncover how words were ordered and combined to construct clauses and then sentences. For (Baker, 2018a), word order in a text is a textual strategy as, “the linear arrangement of linguistic elements plays a role in organizing messages at text level” (Baker, 2018a, p. 134). In Arabic, the organization of the names, as the agents, in any discourse, is a discourse strategy to illustrate the agent’s importance, respect, and also to refer to who the most active or main agent is, and who/which contributes more in an event or action. In other words, major or main agents always occur in sentence initial position in Arab discourse. This style, as a linear arrangement, is constructed to drive the addressee to conclude that the first names are the major participants, or the more significant contributors to an activity (either good deeds such as donations to community events or bad deeds such as breaking the law). Arab discourse considers sequence of elements as a syntactic device to signal major factors, important agents, and essential ingredients, it is a fixed norm. In the following examples (9 and 10), data analysis illustrates that word order created ambiguity of the meaning in the TT departing from the meaning and the intended message of the ST. Here are two excerpts from the original (2020, 2021) UNPE reports’ summaries:

Example 9:

*Arbitrary arrest and detention, enforced disappearances, ill-treatment and the torture of detainees continue to be conducted **by the Government of Yemen, Saudi Arabia, the Houthis and the forces affiliated with the United Arab Emirates**. UNPE report summary (S/2020/70)*

Example 10:

*The Panel documented an alarming pattern of the repression of journalists and human rights defenders **by the Government of Yemen, the Southern Transitional Council and the Houthis** ... UNPE report summary (S/2021/79)*

The excerpts in Examples 9 and 10 present how the organization of the agents (actors) is serving a certain political stance. The TT was a literal translation of the ST, as in placing the Government of Yemen in the initial positions of sentences which mentioned the violators, which implicates that the Government of Yemen is the political actor that has done most of the acts of violation. This is not exact, if the UN reports of human rights and the international humanitarian law violations are examined. Hatim and Mason (2014), indicated that neither lexicogrammatical choice, nor “theme-rheme organization is [not] random”, so, any change of thematic progression is intentional. Hence, “if thematic progression is to be altered in translation, it should not compromise in any way the rhetoric purpose of the ST text” (p. 234). The following examples illustrate how the TT employed a different word order to create a biased perspective either pro the Houthis and the STC or against the legitimate Government.

Example 11:

- a. **ST:** The Government of Yemen lost strategic **territory** to both the Houthis and the Southern Transitional Council
TT: واستولى الحوثيون والمجلس الانتقالي الجنوبي على أراض استراتيجية كانت بحوزة حكومة اليمن،
BT: [*The Houthis and the STC had appropriated strategic lands that were under government of Yemen's possession*]
- b. **ST:** In **territory** controlled by the Government of Yemen, there is a risk of the disintegration of power into a patchwork of competing factions
TT: ويهدد الإقليم الذي تسيطر عليه حكومة اليمن خطر تفكك السلطة إلى خليط من الفصائل المتنافسة
BT: [*the territory which is controlled by government of Yemen is **threatened** by the risk of the disintegration of power into a patchwork of competing factions*]
- c. **ST:** In the south, the Government of Yemen confronted the military challenges posed by the forces affiliated with the southern transitional council.
TT: وفي الجنوب، واجهت حكومة اليمن التحديات العسكرية التي تطرحها القوات التابعة للمجلس الانتقالي الجنوبي.
BT: [*In the south, the Government of Yemen **confronted** (or may be faced with) **the** military challenges posed by the forces affiliated with the southern transitional council*]
- d. **ST:** Houthis diverted at least **\$1.8 billion** in 2019, originally destined to fill the coffers of the Government of Yemen, pay salaries and provide basic services to citizens, to fund their operations.
TT: الحوثيين حولوا مبلغا لا يقل عن 1.8 بليون دولار من دولارات الولايات المتحدة في عام 2019، كان من المفروض في الأصل أن يملا خزائن حكومة اليمن وينفق في دفع المرتبات وتوفير الخدمات الأساسية للمواطنين، من أجل تمويل عملياتهم
BT: [*The Houthis/ transferred/ an amount no less than 1.8 Billion dollar/ from the United States dollars/ in 2019/ was supposed, originally, to fill the coffers of the Government of Yemen/ and to be spent for paying salaries and providing basic services/ to citizens to fund their operations/*]
Suggested Translation (SGT): [الحوثيين حولوا مبلغا لا يقل عن 1.8 بليون دولار أمريكي في عام 2019، من أجل تمويل عملياتهم تمويل عملياتهم، كان من المفروض في الأصل أن تملأ خزائن الحكومة اليمنية وينفق في دفع المرتبات وتوفير الخدمات الأساسية للمواطنين.]
- e. **ST:** Conflicts in Yemen are overshadowed by tensions between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the United States of America.
TT: فالتوترات القائمة بين جمهورية إيران الإسلامية والولايات المتحدة الأمريكية تلقي بظلالها على النزاعات في اليمن.
BT: The tensions between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the United States of America are overshadowing on the disputes in Yemen. = **extra-position**

In Example 11, the phrase واجهت التحديات has double meanings as either ‘confronted the challenges’ or ‘has encountered challenges’. Also, it would carry a different meaning when saying واجهت تحديات without the definite article, because the latter phrase means that the legitimate government is encountering difficulties, while the first phrase means that the legitimate government has confronted (and defeated) the challenge. In Example 11-d, the clause ‘to fund their operations’ was moved to the end of the sentence just after the word ‘citizens’ as وتوفير الخدمات الأساسية للمواطنين، من أجل تمويل عملياتهم, so the Arabic language reader will be confused about ‘whom?’ the citizens or the Houthis, though the original text was referring to the Houthis. So, the clause من أجل تمويل عملياتهم / ‘to citizens to fund their operations’ should be moved after the verb phrase ‘divert’. The translation of that sentence was an exact mimical transliteration of the original sentence which creates grammatical ambiguity of action as *who is doing what* because the clause was moved after the second agent which is ‘citizens’. The other problem is the redundancy in Example 11-d, where the use of the expression من دولارات الولايات المتحدة / ‘from the United States dollars’ is not a necessary addition because it is already written 1.8 بليون دولار or ‘an amount no less than 1.8 billion dollars’.

That redundancy creates an ambiguity to the Arabic audience as the amount has been sent or received **from** the US treasury to Yemen and the Houthis ‘transfer’, i.e., they just transfer it, but **do** not appropriate it. In Example 11-e, the TT turned ‘the conflict in Yemen’ into the rheme of the sentence as it is seen an effect or a shadow of the tension between the USA and Iran, whereas, in the ST, the clause ‘the Conflicts in Yemen’ took the theme position of the sentence, which positioned the conflict in Yemen as the focal point.

In the following examples, the analysis shows different problems of extra-position. For (Baker, 2018a), extra-position is to “change the position of the entire clause in the sentence by embedding a simple clause in a complex sentence” (p.183). This process changes the “thematic organization” of the ST which causes a change of the nature of the phraseology of the target language. The aim of this process is to foreground particular information through manipulating the syntax of the TT. This extra-position was another phenomenon of how the TT was designed or re-written to serve the author’s/translator’s ideological stance.

Example 12: addition, ellipsis, redundancy

- a. **ST:** /the Houthis/ made a public offer/ **to establish/** a ceasefire/.
TT: قدم الحوثيون عرضاً علنياً لوقف إطلاق النار.
BT: [*the Houthis/ made a public offer/ ϕ / to ceasefire/*] = **ellipsis**
- b. **ST:** Confrontations in Shabwah between the Government of Yemen, the Southern Transitional Council and affiliated **forces..**
TT: ولا تزال المواجهات في شبوة بين قوات حكومة اليمن وقوات المجلس الانتقالي الجنوبي والقوات التابعة لها..
BT: [*Confrontations in Shabwah between the Government of Yemen, and **the forces** of the Southern Transitional Council and affiliated **forces..***] **addition**
- c. **ST:** The country's many conflicts are interconnected and can no longer be separated
TT: ويشهد البلد نزاعات كثيرة مترابطة فيما بينها ولم يعد ممكناً الفصل بينها
BT: [*the country **is witnessing** many conflicts that are interconnected and can no longer be separated*] = **addition**
- d. **ST:** In territory controlled by the Government of Yemen, there is a risk of the disintegration of power
TT: ويتهدد الإقليم الذي تسيطر عليه حكومة اليمن خطر تفكك السلطة
BT: [*the territory controlled by the Government of Yemen, **is threatened** by a risk of the disintegration of power*] = **addition**
- e. **ST:** **There is opacity** in the relationships between non-State armed groups and the Government of Yemen
TT: ويسود العلاقات بين الجماعات المسلحة غير التابعة للدولة وحكومة اليمن غموض
BT: [*the relationships between non-State armed groups and the Government of Yemen **is predominated by opacity***] = **addition**
Suggested Translation (SGT): هناك غموض في العلاقة بين الجماعات المسلحة التي لا تملك صفة رسمية وبين الحكومة اليمنية
- f. **ST:** There was limited progress regarding peace negotiations
TT: ولم يحرز سوى تقدم محدود فيما يتعلق بمفاوضات السلام
BT: [***there was no achievement, except limited progress regarding peace negotiations***] = **addition**

In Example 12, the TT has ellipsis, additions and redundancy in comparison with the ST style or level of information. In Example 12-a, the word ‘to establish’ in the ST was passed in the TT which creates a different contextual meaning, and hence inference, as the clause ‘to establish a ceasefire’ is different from the expression ‘to ceasefire’. The first expression has a possibility of negotiating whereas the second has the meaning of a direct action of ceasing the war. In Example 12-b, the word قوات / ‘forces’ was added which gives the impression that the legitimate government is facing two different forces while, in reality, there is only one force which is ‘the Southern Transitional Council and affiliated **forces**’. In Example 12 (c, d, e), the terms, يشهد / ‘witnessing’, يتهدد / ‘threatened’ and يسود / ‘predominated or prevailed’, were added to the TT which gives the effect of intensifiers into the scene or the situation. Such terms are part of the Arabic political rhetoric that creates a dramatic victorious scenario against the ‘others’ as the about-to-be defeated opponents. Such terms occur also, in media propaganda to impact opponents in war times. These terms were presented in the present continuous tense in Arabic, which gives the impression and inference of an ongoing state or situation – just as it does in English. The three terms have been modified to intensify the action in the Arabic writing style. They describe three parties,

the whole country, the territory controlled by the legitimate government and its relationship with the non-state armed groups. In Example 12-f, the TT started with a negative attitude toward the peace negotiation processes between the Government of Yemen and the Houthis as ‘**there was no achievement, except** limited progress’, unlike the ST expression that started with positive attitude ‘there was limited progression’ which created the impression that there is a hope, even if it is limited. We also notice here that there is a linguistic construction which takes a stand against the legitimate government. Furthermore, the implication appears to be that ‘there was no achievement’ was also the fault of the legitimate government.

Foregrounding and Backgrounding

Example 13:

- a. **ST: In the south**, the Government of Yemen confronted the military challenges posed by the forces affiliated with the southern transitional council.
TT: وفي الجنوب، واجهت حكومة اليمن التحديات العسكرية التي تطرحها القوات التابعة للمجلس الانتقالي الجنوبي.
- b. **ST: In the north**, the Houthis continued to consolidate their political and military control
TT: وفي الشمال، واصل الحوثيون توطيد سيطرتهم السياسية والعسكرية
- c. **ST:** The Government of Yemen lost strategic **territory** to both the Houthis and the Southern Transitional Council
TT: واستولى الحوثيون والمجلس الانتقالي الجنوبي على أراض استراتيجية كانت بحوزة حكومة اليمن،
BT: [*The Houthis and the STC had appropriated strategic lands that were under government of Yemen's possession*] = extra-position
- d. The **lack** of a coherent strategy among **anti-Houthi forces**
TT: وأدى غياب استراتيجية متماسكة في صفوف القوى المناهضة للحوثيين
BT: [*The absence of a coherent strategy among anti-Houthi forces*]
- e. **ST: the Houthis** and the Government of Yemen made **little headway** towards **either a political settlement or a conclusive military victory**
TT: لم يحرز الحوثيون وحكومة اليمن سوى تقدم ضئيل نحو التوصل إلى تسوية سياسية أو تحقيق انتصار عسكري حاسم.
- f. **ST: Conflicts in Yemen are overshadowed** by tensions between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the United States of America.
TT: فالتوترات القائمة بين جمهورية إيران الإسلامية والولايات المتحدة الأمريكية تلقي بظلالها على النزاعات في اليمن.
BT: **The tensions between the Islamic Republic of Iran** and the United States of America are overshadowing the quarrels in Yemen. = extra-position

In Example 13, the TT established a process of foregrounding and backgrounding to serve a certain ideological or political stance. In Example 13 (a&b), the terms ‘in the south’ and ‘in the north’ were used which creates an impression that there are two parts (as two states or two federal states) of the country. The inference here is that the country has already been becoming two main geographical territories, North and South, which brings to the fore the chronical case of separation of the country into two states, one in the north and the other in the south. The Example 13 (c, d & f) are examples of how the TT manipulated the translation, i.e., it changed the order of the words or clauses to foreground the idea that non-legitimate political actors are progressing while the legitimate government is regressing and

losing. This point will be discussed in detail in the second section of this chapter. In Example 13-e, the word order has been used to infer that there is much encouraging for the Houthis to achieve ‘either a political settlement or a conclusive military victory’.

4.2.3 Textual Cohesion

In this section, the cohesive progression of the text is examined. Fairclough (2013) defined the analytic methodology of paratactic-sentence relations as “the relations between sentences, clauses or phrases which are grammatically equal, and are coordinated; they contrast with hypotactic relations, where there is one main sentence, clause or phrase, and others are subordinated” (p. 254). Data analysis shows that, in the TT, there was no consideration of how the Arabic discourse uses linguistic devices for establishing cohesive links such as the use of conjunction. The TT style presents the first paragraph as the main one, while the remaining paragraphs are presented as subordinated, due to the use of the conjunctive device in Arabic as (و) meaning ‘and’. Here are the first paragraphs of the reports’ summaries:

Example 14:

- a. **(RS-I) ST:** After more than five years of conflict...The country’s many conflicts are interconnected and can no longer be separated by clear divisions between external and internal actors and events.
TT: بعد مرور أكثر من خمس سنوات على اندلاع النزاع، ... ويشهد البلد نزاعات كثيرة تترايط فيما بينها ولم يعد ممكناً الفصل بينها بتقسيم واضح يميز بين الجهات الفاعلة الخارجية والداخلية والأحداث.
- b. **(RS-II) ST:** The situation in Yemen has continued to deteriorate, with devastating consequences for the civilian population. Three main factors are contributing to the catastrophe..
TT: ما فتى الوضع يتدهور في اليمن، مع ما يترتب على ذلك من آثار مدمرة على السكان المدنيين. وتساهم ثلاثة عوامل رئيسية في هذه الكارثة

In Example 14 (a & b), the TT used the first (lead) paragraphs as a disclaimer, to show objectivity toward the situation overall. However, the remaining paragraphs, in both documents, start with the Arabic conjunction /wə/ (و) meaning ‘and’. In Arabic, this style carries the syntactic function of the principal information or the theme and the subordinate one or rheme. For van Dijk (2004, p. 17-19), semantic disclaimers are tools used by the writer to show objectivity, yet also manifests his/her ideology. In the TT, there is an overuse of the conjunction (و), i.e., the repetition of the meaning and function is the same of the additive conjunction *and* in English. All and every paragraph, except the first paragraph, started with the conjunction (و), which

creates several cohesive issues such as the subordination of the rest of the paragraphs to the first one.

The problem of the overuse of the Arabic cohesive device (وَ) is that it confuses the reader about the intent of the penultimate paragraph of the text. The reader may wonder whether these paragraphs are providing examples of the introductory paragraph (the lead), or whether they initiate or present new statements so as to bring more information or different evaluations. Even the closing paragraphs of the TT are initiated by the conjunction (وَ), where other conjunctive devices such as وبناء عليه meaning 'therefore' or similar, for example, should be the starting word of the closing paragraph. Most of the paragraphs are built in such a way as to maintain more rhetoric rather than provide evaluative information as a report summary. There is much analogic framing between the legitimate government and the rival political actors, mainly the Houthis and the STC which have no political legitimacy. The closing paragraphs are constructed as a compilation of evaluations which introduce an implicit semi-counter argument or, at minimum, displacement to the UN resolutions which determined and defined the legitimate government and defined the illegitimate parties and individuals under sanction. Repetition of the phrase of 'international humanitarian law' is another feature that occurs in the TT, following the ST design. The word 'Saudi Arabia' is repeated ten times, whereas the word 'the Government of Yemen' is repeated eighteen times which has a remarkable implication that will be explained in detail in the discussion section.

4.2.4 Text Structure

In this section, the analysis of the UNPE reports' summaries translation will explore the organization and structure of both the ST and the TT using van Dijk's, (1993) mode to examine the text organization and the course of the text narration. Van Dijk (1993) handled the issue of thematic structure of text, i.e., theme/rheme relationship, to explain how the main events of the story are manifested in the discourse. As discussed in previous sections, CDA is the tool that helps reveal models of dominance, power, and power abuse in a discourse. The UNPE report belongs to the political document genre that has a "pragmatic dimension" as coined by Hatim and Mason (2004, p. 60), i.e., it has a more evaluative than merely a political report. Hence, the UNPE reports' summaries become a very important document which might

determine the future of the society and politics of Yemen. Also, CDA has been shown to include a prescriptive dimension as if the text sought to influence the receiver's attitude and behaviour toward both the situation and the political actors. The first paragraph of the UNPE reports' summaries were designed to manifest the authors' disclaimer, or at minimum neutrality, of the whole situation. However, the paragraphs that follow in the translation all start with the Arabic conjunction (و) / *and*, creating the impression that the second to last paragraphs are illustrating the outlined introduction of the first paragraph. Grammatical structure can be used, as (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997) pointed out, to "show ideologies in discourse" (p.263) which will be discussed in more detail in the discussion chapter.

However, the Arabic Middle Eastern readership already know the background of the situation in Yemen, including the historical sequence of events since September 2014. Data analysis shows that the text organization was meant to bring together both the legitimate government and the other political rivals that have no political legitimacy for an ideological purpose. The majority of the paragraphs bring together both the legitimate Government of Yemen and the non-legitimate political actors and blame both for the situation. However, that organization does not manifest neutrality, but it reflects the attitude that the UNPE reports' summaries put the legitimate government in the same position with the illegitimate political rivals. It treats them as equals, mainly by referring to the violations of the international humanitarian law and the international human rights law, which is a serious crime that affects any regime's political legitimacy. An examination of the text organization shows that, even though it was designed to show objectivity and neutrality toward the situation, it reflects the Panel of Experts' ideology and political stance through paragraph organization, beginning with the lead paragraph choice and foregrounding strategies for the rest of the paragraphs (van Dijk, 2004, p. 17-19). The TT, following the ST style, did not follow Crombie's (1985) macro-pattern of "basic text design" (sited in Hatim and Mason, 2014, 182). Crombie's basic text design follows these steps:

[situation -> problem -> solution -> evaluation]

However, the design of the UNPE reports' summaries took the following steps as:

[situation -> problem -> ∅ -> problem/evaluation]

This textual grid shows how the reports' summaries were designed to compile a description of the situation and actors with the problems and the evaluations. However, there is no explicit conclusion to state the UNPE opinion of the solutions to the situation. Nevertheless, the whole text is outlined, organized, and structured to implicitly schematize a suggestive solution. Those suggestive solutions were imbedded through lexical choices such as the geographical references 'in the south' and 'in the north', or through grammatical order such as replacing the legitimate government, as the theme, into the background, as the rheme or the passive actor, or through foregrounding and backgrounding. Dissemination appears to be a strategy used to impede the audience from connecting the actions, with negative connotation such as human rights violations, with the doers (the agents). The whole texts, the TT as well as the ST, have been organized to narrate how the Government of Yemen, the Houthis, and the STC have been involving in violating the international humanitarian law and the international human rights law, how the country became divided into South and North, how the Government of Yemen is losing land and power and control, and how the Houthis movement and the STC are appropriating more lands and much more power and control.

4.3 Discussion of the Findings

In this section, the most salient findings as analysed in the findings section will be summarised. This leads to a discussion of how the UNPE reports' summaries translation utilized linguistic and textual strategies to make the TT serve certain political ideological and political stances regarding political legitimacy in Yemen. Three major findings will be discussed in detail namely a) how the legitimate Government of Yemen and the illegitimate political rivals were treated and viewed as equals, b) how political legitimacy has been moved from the legitimate Government of Yemen to the illegitimate political rivals, and finally, c) how political legitimacy was underestimated in the translated text.

4.3.1 The legitimate government and other political rivals treated as equals

The findings of this study show that the translation of the UNPE reports' summaries created an equalling process between the legitimate Government of Yemen and their illegitimate political rivals. Two linguistic strategies were used to pursue that, namely: deliberate ambiguity, and nominalization and passivation.

Deliberate ambiguity

The findings show that, the TT translation used deliberate ambiguity to create an opacity of the connection between الحكومة اليمنية / the Government of Yemen pronounced /əl- 'hukumə əl- 'ye-mənēə/ as the current UN recognized and legitimate Government of Yemeni which is also called as حكومة الشرعية أو الحكومة الشرعية pronounced as /əl- 'hukumə əsh-shə- 'rəē-ə/ or /'hukumə-t əsh-shə- 'rəē-ə/ meaning: the Legitimate Government or the Government of the Legitimacy. The latter phrase is a reference only for the current UN recognized President *Hadi* Government. Instead, the translation changed the proper noun into an abstract noun as حكومة اليمن /'hukumə-t əl- 'ye-mən/ meaning ‘a government of Yemen’ which is a phrase that refers to any government of Yemen at any time. Also, that phrase is used by other Arab people, but not the Yemeni ones because of the missing Arabic definite article [ـ] as the definite article *the* in English.

Nominalization and passivation

Nominalization is an organizational tool involving the process of using agent-less sentences or clauses, or the use of passives with deleted-agent structure. Fairclough (2013, p. 360 quoting Iedema 2003: 73) explained that

Nominalisation is associated with a shift from the representation of actions and processes situated in the ‘here and now’, involving specific persons in specific places at specific times, a disembedding, dedifferentiation and time–space distantiation of actions and processes from concrete and particular situations to an abstract representation of them as applicable ‘wherever, whenever and involving whoever’ (Iedema 2003: 73).

The translation manipulated the TT to create a departure between the illegitimate political rivals and the illegal actions in Yemen using two linguistic strategies: nominalization and passivation. The aim of these strategies is to equalize the legitimate Government of Yemen with the illegitimate political rivals. Nominalization changes the theme-rheme function in the sentence because it “transforms processes and actions into a type of pseudo-entities” which “at the same time has potentially (re)constructive effects on organisational identities and social relations” (Fairclough, 2013, p.360). In Arabic linguistic structure, nominalization is an evasive way to avoid identifying the accused (person or party) as there is no direct verb-subject in the Arabic version. One example is the expression, ‘تزداد في المناطق الخاضعة لسيطرة الحوثيين التهديدات’ as the translation of the expression, ‘Threats and acts of violence... are increasing in Houthi-controlled

areas'. This organization of the sentence is used in Arabic to create general and agentless sentences that do not aim to hold any party accountable for the action.

In the following examples, the TT, following the linguistic order of the ST, introduces the events of 'violations of the targeted arms embargo' while backgrounding the role of the Houthis, as the agent of the sentences. The following examples illustrate how nominalization works to impede the TT audience from connecting the UN resolutions and the party who/which violate that resolution.

Example 15:

- a. ST: With regard to potential **violations of the targeted arms embargo**, the Panel observes **two major trends**: the first is the **transfer of...** the second is the continued **reception** by Houthi forces
 TT: وفيما يتعلق بالانتهاكات المحتملة لحظر الأسلحة المحدد الأهداف، يلاحظ الفريق اتجاهين رئيسيين: الاتجاه الأول هو نقل الأجزاء... والاتجاه الثاني هو استمرار تلقي قوات الحوثيين
- b. ST: sea transport continues to play a role in potential violations of the targeted arms embargo.
 TT: لا يزال النقل البحري يؤدي دورا في الانتهاكات المحتملة لحظر الأسلحة المحدد الأهداف

In Example 15-a, verbs were altered to be used as nouns, hence verbs were in the agent position to the process of violations like, 'transfer' / نقل, 'reception by Houthis' / تلقي الحوثيين. The whole paragraph that follows Example 15 discusses the process of embargo with many unnecessary details of weapons and parts without accentuating or mentioning who is the agent. Words of probability such as 'seem' / يبدو were used. The words, 'seem' / يبدو or 'indicate' / تشير are used in Arabic to show less confirmation, less certainty about the information or the source of information. Even the use of the word 'possibility' / المحتملة gives less certainty about the likelihood of the action happening. Modality, as (Holmes, 1982) indicated, "signals a higher or lower degree of certainty about the validity of the proposition" (p. 69). In Example 15-b, 'the sea transport' / النقل البحري was used as the agent instead of the human agent that is doing the violation, forming a pseudo-entity to disguise the real agent/doer. Such linguistic techniques create opacity and are meant to mitigate the actions related to the violations of the targeted arms embargo that are mentioned in the UN resolutions. In the TT, significant effort was undertaken to separate the doer, as an agent of the verb, from the direct verbs that referred to violations of the targeted arms embargo. However, the confirmation that the embargo was passing 'through territory controlled by the Government of Yemen' implies that the Government of Yemen is either involved in the process, by allowing that action to happen, or cannot control its 'territory' / أراض, but regardless, the Government is blamed.

Passivation is the syntactic process in which the agent is deleted from the sentence. For (Baker, 2018a), “the form of the verb changes in a passive structure to indicate that its subject is the affected entity rather than the agent” (p.115). In active clauses, as Baker (2018a) reflected, “the subject is the agent responsible for performing the action”, whereas in passive clauses, “the subject is the affected entity, and the agent may or may not be specified” (p. 114). Words and phrases such as نقل / ‘the transfer’, or تلقي / ‘reception by Houthis forces’, طريق التهريب يمتد / ‘smuggling route seems to run’, عملية الحجز البارزة / ‘high-profile seizure’ are examples showing how the doer was deleted and separated from the embargo activity. This is all the more interesting if additionally, the process of fronting themes is considered. Fronting an object or complement involves the process of an object or complement: “in order to make it prominent, a speaker places it in theme position” (Baker, 2018a, p. 132). In the translation, the Arabic sentence shows Subject-Verb-Object order (SVO), however, in fact, Arabic tends to be ordered as a verb-subject-object (VSO). In other words, Arabic is a verb prominent language, especially when a clear-cut statement is needed to present who is doing what, as in writing legal and legislative documents. The translations examined here are a clear departure from that convention.

4.3.2 Political legitimacy moved from the Government to other political rivals

The analysis of the findings shows that the translation of the UNPE reports’ summaries has moved political legitimacy from the legitimate Government of Yemen to the illegitimate political rivals. To attain that, the TT applied two main strategies: the process of analogic frame and the process of foregrounding and backgrounding.

Analogic frame

The TT manipulated to frame the legitimate government as losing lands, exercising corruption, and involvement in international humanitarian laws violations, whereas illegitimate political rivals as the Houthis and STC are reframed as appropriating more lands and authority, making progress, corruption, and involvement in international humanitarian laws violations. However, the illegitimate rivals’ action verbs and adjectives were manipulated to have either neutralized or heroic connotations. For example, the words used to describe the illegitimate rivals were تحقيق انتصار عسكري / ‘conclusive military victory’; لإزالة ما لحكومة اليمن من سلطة ضئيلة / ‘to remove what little

authority the Government of Yemen’; / توطيد سيطرتهم السياسية والعسكرية / ‘consolidate their political and military control’, which lends them a state-like profile rather than that of armed militia. These examples illustrate *the motivated choices* of words which connote either neutral or heroic attitude to the Houthis and the STC’s actions and deeds even though they are breaking laws and violating the international humanitarian laws. In contrast, the legitimate President *Hadi* Government’s action verbs and adjectives have been loaded with negative connotations. Examples are: واجهت التحديات / ‘confronted the military challenges’; سلطة ضئيلة / ‘little authority’; الممارسات الفاسدة / ‘corrupt practices by officials of the Government of Yemen’; تلاعب / ‘the manipulation of foreign exchange rates by the Central Bank of Yemen’; and خارج نطاق سيطرة حكومة اليمن / ‘operate outside the control of the Government of Yemen’. These examples construct an image of the Government of Yemen as a gang of outlaws, exercising illegitimate authority over the people of Yemen, even though, in some of the abovementioned examples, both the Houthis and the STC were added to the accusative statements. This is what (Van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999) called ‘contrastive strategy’ (p. 92), used to constitute a ‘we’ group and a ‘they’ group through particular acts of references. The aim of this ‘discursive strategy’ is to position one party on the positive side and the other party on the negative side (Wodak, 2000).

In the current socio-political situation in Yemen, a new attitude has become a phenomenon as a result of the chaotic political situation of the country. People want to end the civil war in any way possible, so they have started to believe that a strong control over the land or territories is a cause for political legitimacy. So, if the report in Arabic evaluates the Houthis insurgents by stating ‘the Houthis continued to consolidate their political and military control’, this provides them with more political legitimacy. This study labels this as “(plus) political legitimacy”. From another aspect, to put all the social and political actors together in a practice is a ‘pragmatic scheme’ (Leeuwen, 2007, p. 104). In this case, the Government of Yemen, the Houthis, the STC and the other political rivals were all gathered in one sentence with one verb or verb clause, even though this involves an imbalance of the actions. The audience will have the strong impression that all of the parties are involved or participate to the same degree (both in terms of quantity and quality⁵) in those violations, which, is not factually correct or equal. The TT audience will conclude that the UNPE is taking the

⁵ <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/Pages/NewsDetail.aspx?NewsID=26800&LangID=E>

Government of Yemen to task for all political wrongs, whether it is actually involved or not. Hence, the political legitimacy of the recognized Government of Yemen is starting to be at stake. The message of this portrayal appears to present the illegitimate political rivals as progressing, gaining more lands and becoming much effective. The words used to describe them reflect masterful and heroic images. The next paragraph will present some of the strategies used to build that ‘balance’ between the legitimate Government of Yemen and the illegitimate political rivals by giving “(minus) political legitimacy” to the legitimate Government of Yemen and “(plus) political legitimacy” to the illegitimate political rivals.

Plus political legitimacy versus minus political legitimacy

By examining the choice of words in a text to manifest lexical cohesion, “patterns of lexical chains” (Baker, 2018a) such as repetition, synonyms, superordinate, were used (p. 216). For example, in Arabic language, it is not common to use the collocation سلطة ضئيلة because the term ضئيل is a more quantitative term which refers to something that has a more physical nature than an abstract one. Instead, the more common collocation with authority or سلطة is ضعيفة / ‘weak/ineffective’. Another example is the use of the word إزالة / ‘to remove’, with the word سلطة / ‘authority’. The collocation of ‘remove’ and ‘authority’ is ‘a drastic removal of the former regime’ in Arabic socio-political discourse because the word إزالة is used to refer to more material than to abstract things, such as إزالة مبان / ‘to remove a building’. Instead, the word يقضي/ينهي / ‘to eliminate or to end authority’ is much more appropriate and common. The word إزالة / ‘elimination’ has a very strong connotation in the Middle Eastern socio-political culture of governments and states. It has a historical connotation of the bloody coups that eliminated former regimes, including the brutal killings of the ex-regime members by new ones. Such usage of lexical items reflects the author’s/translator’s preferences or ideological stance. Another example is of how the term ضئيل was preferred to describe ‘little headway’ as تقدم ضئيل / ‘little headway’, when in fact the term محدود / ‘limited’ is more common in Arabic. As a result of certain lexical choices, the TT receptor will envisage the legitimate government as controlling only one province and even that province as being ‘threatened’ by the risk of the ‘disintegration’ of power into a patchwork of competing factions that ‘lack coherent strategy’ and ‘lack capacity’. On the other hand, the Arab receptor will envisage the illegitimate political rivals as having ‘appropriated strategic lands’, as capable of ‘removing’ the legitimate Government’s ‘little authority’,

‘consolidating their political and military control’, and as being able to ‘undermine the objectives of the Security Council resolution 2216’, ‘undermine the political transition’, and ‘undermine the Government of Yemen’. The TT processed such lexical choices as a pragmatic scheme to provide the illegitimate political rivals of “plus political legitimacy”. Furthermore, there are two explanations for the aforementioned series of lexical choices and comparative references to the legitimate government of Yemen, the Houthis and the STC. The first one is that the TT aims to evoke feelings of anger and disappointment against the Government of Yemen as /əl- 'hukūmə əsh-shə- 'rəē-ə/ the legitimate government. The Yemeni audience’s experience of local politics and socio-political practices of the state, government, or state authority is that of strong autocratic and decisive rather than democratic and consultative. In Yemen, the socio-historic concept and practices of the state, authority and socio-political leaders were based on power and ability to (conquer) other political rivals rather than democracy. In their approach about translating texts as signs, (Hatim & Mason, 2014) mentioned that the semiotic dimension of contexts plays a crucial role so “lexical and syntactic choices made within the field of a given discourse ultimately [are] determined by pragmatic considerations” (p. 101). Most of the terms employed in the target text have denotative meanings which act as ‘signs’ that “give [or fabricate] portions of reality” (p. 114). The next paragraph will present how foregrounding and backgrounding were used to serve the same purpose of weighing the balance between the legitimate Government of Yemen with the illegitimate political rivals.

Foregrounding and backgrounding

In the TT, the illegitimate political rivals were first introduced to the scene while the legitimate Government of Yemen was backgrounded. In Example 13-d, the legitimate government was not even mentioned, instead, it was referred to as القوي المناهضة للحوثيين / ‘anti-Houthi forces’. In Example 13-e as لم يحرز الحوثيون وحكومة اليمن / ‘the Houthis and the Government of Yemen made little headway’, the sentence began with the Houthis, as they are the main agent (power) that are allowed or even encouraged to make ‘headway towards either a political settlement or a conclusive military victory’. This process of replacement in language use is, as Fairclough (2013, p. 273) indicated, a deviation from description to prescription, and from presenting information to propaganda. Such organization has what Hatim and Mason (2004, p.77) referred to as “the illocutionary

structure of a text” in their question of whether the “illocutionary force of the source text been presented in the translation” with consideration of target language cultural norms. So, it is important to reveal how the Yemeni local readership will receive the TT’s intended message. It is reality that there are humanitarian violations in Yemen by all parties, both the legitimate Government of Yemen, the Houthis, the STC, other political rivals, however, there are two problems in presenting them. First, the reference to the violations combined all parties and started with the Government of Yemen, which breaches the maxim of quality and even quantity.⁶ Also, the reports’ summaries contained unnecessary details of the process and parts of weapons embargo instead of reporting who/which party is violating the targeted arms embargo mentioned in the UN resolutions.

However, the TT attributes the violation of the international humanitarian laws to all parties, as seen in Example 13 ‘the Houthis and the Government of Yemen made little headway towards either a political settlement or a conclusive military victory’. We conclude that the Government of Yemen was foregrounded if the activity was negative, such as violation of human rights or the international humanitarian law, whereas the illegitimate political rivals were backgrounded. There is a misuse or even a manipulation of international humanitarian law and international human rights law, as a supreme concern to the international politics, in relation to providing with or depriving of political legitimacy to a particular political actor. The expression *واصل الحوثيون توطيد سيطرتهم السياسية والعسكرية* is appropriate and the equivalent expression in Arabic, however, it has a problem on the level of the pragmatic equivalence because of the choice of the verb *توطيد* used to describe the Houthis’ authoritative control of their territories. The verb *توطيد* / ‘stabilization’ in the ST, which has positive connotations in terms of a legitimate government while the Houthis are not a recognized authority as they are still exercising an armed ‘militia’ control. In fact, it seems that the TT translator is in alignment with the ST author, and that both share the same political stance toward the situation in Yemen. However, further research about the procedures of translation of the UNPE documents may reveal its mechanisms and level of patronage of the UNPE, as a committee represents an institution, on its translators.

⁶ Human Rights Watch reports, <https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2021/country-chapters/yemen>

4.3.3 Political legitimacy appears undervalued

The seven-year catastrophic civil war in Yemen had one main reason: political legitimacy. However, the TT did not conceptualize this as crucial issue⁷. The analysis of the findings shows that the issue of political legitimacy and the conflict in Yemen, in general, has not been reflected as an important issue. On one hand, the conflict in Yemen is portrayed as a Saudi issue and on the other hand, it is seen as a *shadow* of the US-Iranian tensions. For the translator, the influence of the ideological stance was manifested in the TT toward the legitimate government or the illegitimate political rivals. There is evidence of the influence of the ideological stance of the UNPE, as the institution that owns both the ST and the TT too⁸. The unexpected and more interesting finding, in this study, is that the translators did not use their level of agency to promote a neutral/ethical approach to translation, so as to eliminate the ideological content. Instead, they have promoted a certain political stance against the legitimate Government of Yemen and pro-illegitimate political rivals. This occurred, for example, by using certain TT equivalence which awards negative implications to the legitimate government, or by choosing neutral wordings to describe illegal actions of the illegitimate political rivals. However, it may be the factor behind that intervention is the institutional patronage, i.e., the UNPE itself is approving and/or even encouraging such manipulation of translation to serve the main political ideology and norms of the UNPE.

The lexeme ‘conflict’ was translated into نزاع / ‘quarrel or struggle’, and the lexeme ‘tension’ was also translated into نزاع. For (Hatim, 1997), translation, as an activity, is never be perceived as neutral. In Example 7, the translator/s could have chosen a more appropriate Arabic equivalent to transfer the lexeme ‘undermine’ into يقوض / ‘to subvert or to demolish’. In fact, the use of the Arabic term يقوض / ‘to subvert or to demolish’ manifests the translator’s ideology and political stance against the three main principles that outline the Yemeni political conflict over political legitimacy. These are 1) the objectives of the UN Security Council resolution 2216, 2) the political transition in Yemen after the results of the Yemeni National Dialogue Conference (NDC), and 3.) the UN recognized legitimate Government of Yemen. This finding confirms the findings of (Al-Sharafi & Al-Shehari, 2020) about the ‘translator agency’ issue between the UN as an institution and its translators. This is because the institutional patronage of documents translation has resulted in ‘literal’ translation. In this study, the findings

⁷ <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2015/09/yemen-the-forgotten-war/>

⁸ The UN panel of experts’ report summary is issued and published in English, as the original language (the ST) as well as in Arabic, as the translated language (the TT) by the UN office and available on the UN security council report online: <https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/un-documents/yemen/>

show that this issue leads to a type of mimical duplicate of the English version (as the original language of the UN documents).

Narrative

The narrative of the UNPE reports' summaries was organized as follows: a) the situation in Yemen is chaotic, b) there is massive human rights violation and profiting from the war by all the parties (the Government of Yemen, the Houthis, the Southern Transitional Council STC) and other political rivals; c) the Government of Yemen is inactive, corrupt and inefficient; and d) the legitimate Government of Yemen is losing power and land in the south to the STC and losing authority and land in the north to the Houthis. The question that remains is the resolution of the crisis. For (Hatim & Munday, 2019), the "cognitive linguistics analysis of the translation process has shifted the focus from texts to mental process" (p. 58). Then, the legitimate Government of Yemen would not be needed anymore because it would be replaced by other 'effective' rivals, i.e., the Houthis in the north and the STC in the south as a solution to end the conflict and bring peace to a country in turmoil as the end result. However, this proposed illusionary solution might not achieve such an end for many reasons because other causes behind the civil war are not considered. Another semiotic interpretation of the lexical choices in Example 7(a -d), is that the Houthis are 'consolidating their military and political control'. Such lexical choices create an impression to the Yemeni local reader that the TT (the Arabic version of the reports' summaries) is presenting foreign knowledge of the Yemeni situation and context. Deliberate ambiguity creates a breach of what Baker (2018a) called the "co-operative principle" as it breaches one of the maxims, (quality, quantity, relevance, and manner) (p. 242). It might be concluded that the translators' attempt to evade or distort the factual reality by using ambiguous expressions or lexical choices conveys through signals or implicatures the UNPE's presuppositions, ideology and political stance toward the conflict in Yemen. On the other hand, it may of course also reflect the translators' lack of knowledge of the target language linguistic and cultural maxims and inferences.

4.3.4 Potential social-political consequences resulting from the TT as a product

The UN panel of experts' reports on Yemen have significant consequences for the situation in Yemen. This study argues that the UNPE reports are considered as a 'voice of experts' which justifies legitimizing or de-legitimizing a political figure or party. This finding is consistent with that of Reyes' (2011), who introduced the 'voice of experts' as a political strategy to legitimize political decision-making as "legitimization is a justification of a behaviour" (p.782). Lexical choices may be involved here. The TT maintained the same lexemes of the geographic reference as 'in the south' and 'in the north'. In other words, the phrases 'in the south' and 'in the north' refer to Yemen's North and South. To disambiguate the reference, there is a need to specify where exactly in the south or in the north, i.e., in which territory or province. The use of the term 'in the south' and 'in the north' in the Arabic version of the UNPE document creates a sensitive issue to the majority of the Yemeni people because such phrases are used in political discourse to refer to the situation of Yemen before the unification in May 1990. The local TT receivers' knowledge of such phrases is associated with the pre-1990 situation as there were two countries namely, the Arab Republic of Yemen in the north, and the People Democratic Republic of Yemen in the south. It might be seen as if the UNPE are already schematizing deliberately with some global powers and regional regimes to prepare the socio-political situation in Yemen to be re-separated into two countries, as a solution for peace and an end to the civil war. The TT version does not directly transfer the ST message, but rather heralds the new socio-political reality of the country as two states: South Yemen and North Yemen. The conflict in Yemen is presented as a regional issue more than a humanitarian disaster. For example, the text mentions the Yemeni government eighteen times, and Saudi Arabia ten times, which reflects the idea that the Yemeni issue is depicted and seen to be a Saudi interest more than as a tragic civil conflict resulting in more than 233,000 deaths and a massive infrastructure destruction, with around four million Yemeni people displaced from their houses into the desert living in tents.

By examining text structure and text lexical choices, the findings show that the text did not introduce explicit solutions to the situation as a conclusion. The TT linguistic construction of the UNPE reports' summaries transplants lexemes which create a prescriptive rather than a descriptive tendency. It manifests how the UNPE may pursue to reconstruct social reality in areas of conflict around the world, which could

result, as in the conflict in Yemen, in new scales and standards of political legitimacy and in new relationship scales between power and authority. It might create new measures of how political legitimacy is achieved. Hence, the UNPE may construct or reverse new courses of global attitudes toward democratic procedures and its channels such as elections. In the Yemeni situation, the question which will be raised will be about the consequences of such political discourse after the era of the Arab Spring. Such political discourse is a discursive initiation to reconstruct a social reality for the people in the Middle East. It does not show that they are going to achieve democracy but rather moving from military regimes to theocratic ones. The UNPE reports' summaries translation plays a role by restructuring a discourse that might encourage militia movements in conflict zones to gain political legitimacy.

4.4 Summary

This chapter has introduced and developed the key research findings and the discussion. The first section detailed the analysis of the main findings. The second section was dedicated to the discussion which enhanced the potential social and political consequences that might result from the translation strategies used in the target text.

Chapter 5 : Concluding Remarks

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will present the study conclusions, illustrate how the study aligned with the previous research regarding the use of CDA in investigating political discourse translation. It will look at the limitations of this study and suggest relevant future research in this area.

5.2 Concluding remarks

This study provides some conclusions regarding the translation of the UNPE reports' summaries from English to Arabic. The legitimate Government of Yemen was introduced and evaluated as diminishing whereas the illegitimate political rivals were introduced and evaluated in a positive portrayal. Also, the study concludes that the issue of political legitimacy was undervalued in the translated text. The TT has chosen words which trigger the Arab receptors' minds to flash back to the Yemeni local traditional solutions for political conflicts situation as: *من تزوج امنا صار عمنا* meaning 'whoever married our mother became our stepfather' ⁹. The political interpretation of that slogan is that the party/group that controls Sana'a, the capital city of Yemen, will be politically recognized as the legitimate ruler/government of the whole country.

The TT has chosen lexico-grammatical structure that overlaps between political legitimacy with armed authority. It provokes another local Yemeni socio-political proverb as: *الدولة الظالمة باليوم ألف حسنة* meaning 'the oppressive state/regime has one thousand merits a day', i.e., the oppressive regime is a thousand-times better than social and political chaos. With regard to the Yemeni socio-political slogans, as socio-cultural codes of local politics, the use of strong, oppressive and vivid words to describe the illegitimate political rivals such as the Houthis and the STC provides them with plus political legitimacy. Likewise, the use of vanishing, hesitating, and deficient words to frame and to describe the legitimate Government of Yemen is a linguistic strategy to

⁹ It is a social proverb drawn on from an Arabic classic story of a lady who married another man after her first husband's death. Her boys from her first husband did not accept their stepfather's orders because they did not admit his authority as a master of their house. After a time with troubles at the house, the boys decided to accept his authority because he had been already 'married to their mother'. The proverb became a socio-political slogan meaning the party which has control in the capital of the country will be accepted as the legitimate government.

give the latter minus political legitimacy. This way of balancing political power versus political legitimacy will likely serve the powerful political rivals over the UN recognized as the legitimate Government of Yemen.

Referring to such political slogans, many people believe that because the Houthis have invaded, captured and now control the capital of Yemen, then the people of Yemen should recognize them as the legitimate government, whether they like it or not. The term إزالة / 'removing' of the سلطة ضئيلة / 'little authority' of the legitimate Government of Yemen is an option/solution to separate the country into two states and to facilitate the Houthis, 'in the north', and the STC 'in the south' as alternative regimes as a de facto authority without democratic procedures. The Yemeni socio-political slogans are socio-cultural codes of local politics. Word choice is a powerful tool for establishing an ideological stance, as (Reah, 2002) pointed out, "the use of belittling, demeaning or derogatory terms toward a disadvantaged group can help to promote the benefits that the group itself is to blame for its advantage" (p. 71). This discursive practice has set in motion a process in which the political legitimacy of the recognized legitimate Government of Yemen may be about to be **removed** (literally) in the future.

5.3 Study alignment with previous research

The concept and perspective of political legitimacy in this study was based on Peter's (2020, p. 2) benchmark of political legitimacy as "acceptability or justification of political power or authority and-possibly-obligation". Peter's (2020) standard is a core dialectic notion of the UN orientation of providing or depriving political legitimacy in international political norms and practices. With regard to recontextualizing the TT to work in the new target language, (Schaffner, 1996) pointed out that political discourse should be analysed with consideration of its socio-political context to reveal the relevant ideological and political embodiments and frameworks. Schäffner (2004) introduced the issues of implicitation and explicitation in political discourse analysis by investigating how linguistic choices have been made through comparing the TT with the ST. Studies that used CDA to investigate this include Al-Hejin's (2012) selective appropriation, Al-Sharafi and Al-Shehari's (2020) legitimacy narratives and translator agency, Ayyad's (2012) ideological square, Daghigh's et al. (2018) deliberate ambiguity, Faiq's (2004) combination of socio-cultural and political acts, translation process and the cultural load and the bias behind the manipulation. Mockli's, (2014) study on implicit ideology, and (Valdeón, 2007) study on manipulating the TT and problematic lexical choices, concluded that text producers have manipulated the TT, resulting in alteration of the

communicative and informative events to conform to or meet their ideological purposes, socio-political needs and political stances. Although, few studies have addressed the issue of political legitimacy, the abovementioned studies focused on discourses of a socio-political genre toward certain socio-political issues and attitudes.

With regard to linguistic strategies of legitimization and de-legitimization in political discourse, Reyes (2011) considered the voice of experts as a strategy of legitimizing decision makers' deeds and concluded that quoting the voice of experts is a strategy to "support or give validity to the information we are presenting" (p.804). In their discussion of the translator agency issue Al-Sharafi and Al-Shehari (2020) pointed out critical issues regarding the "struggle between the translator's freedom and the UN institutional norms" and how "institutional pressure" might result in a "literal target text" (p.211-213). Van Leeuwen (2007) introduced a framework to handle the issue of legitimation in discourse and communication ensuring that "legitimation is always the legitimation of the practices of specific institutional orders" (p.92). As discussed previously, Leeuwen (2007) introduced categories of legitimation, as a framework and analysis tools to investigate "ways discourses construct legitimation for social practices in public communication" (p. 91). This present study is an extension to the previous studies regarding how political discourse translation of the UN documents might affect the future of the political decision-making process in situations of civil wars, especially for crucial issues like political legitimacy.

The findings of this study apply to the UN documents as the data (the latest two reports' summaries of the UN Panel of Experts on Yemen) which identify, discuss and summarize the conflict in Yemen since September 2014. The current study shows how using CDA to investigate political discourse translation can lead to understanding the political stance, and hence, the political agenda of the UNPE as to bypass the UN Security Council's resolutions on Yemen to establish a political reality based on the de facto authority. Another significant outcome of the current study findings is that it confirms the high level of the institutional dominance of (the UNPE) over its translation staffs, and the consequences of that as the absence of the 'translator agency'.

5.4 Limitation of this study and recommendations for future research

This research introduced worth investigating findings for future research, however there are some limitations regarding time and data. The analysis provided rich data; however, the researcher was not able to present all data, due to the word limit

constraints of this dissertation. The researcher aims to undertake further research to explore the topic in more detail. This study set out to examine political discourse translation of the UNPE reports' summaries applying CDA, and how such translation might affect the status of the competing political parties. Also, this study explores how such translation can influence the political decision-making process in situations of civil wars. In section 3.3 I stated that I pursued to explore whether the ST had been translated with neutral connotations. My analysis has shown that the answer to this question has to be no, and the question remains why this has not been the case. My most salient findings have added to the literature on applying CDA to investigate how some strategies in translation like deliberate ambiguity, foregrounding and backgrounding, analogic frame, nominalization, and passivation can alter the ST message to serve the translator's political ideology and political stance.

Recommendations for further research could involve a comparison of the full UNPE reports and the reports summaries as well as other UN documents such as UN General Assembly resolutions, and UN Envoys' briefings to the General Assembly, which comprise some 'cherry-picked' elements of the full report, lacking the subtle details of the full report.

References

- Al-Hejin, B. (2012). Linking critical discourse analysis with translation studies: An example from BBC News. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 11(3), 311-335.
- Al-Sharafi, A. G., & Al-Shehari, K. (2020, 07//). Translation and the narratives of legitimacy: A semiotic analysis of the UN Special Envoy for Yemen's legitimacy-constructing strategies and their Arabic translations. *Translation Spaces*, 9(2), 202-223.
<https://ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&site=eds-live&db=edb&AN=148517368>
- Baker, M. (2006). Translation and activism: Emerging patterns of narrative community. *The Massachusetts Review*, 47(3), 462-484.
- Baker, M. (2018a). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. Routledge.
- Baker, M. (2018b). *Translation and Conflict : A Narrative Account*. Routledge.
<https://ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edebk&AN=1892530&site=eds-live>
- Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Masculine domination*. Stanford University Press.
- Cap, P. (2008). Towards the proximization model of the analysis of legitimization in political discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(1), 17-41.
- Crombie, W. (1985). *Process and relation in discourse and language learning*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Daghigh, A. J., Sanatifar, M. S., & Awang, R. (2018, 01//). Modeling van Dijk's Ideological Square in Translation Studies: Investigating Manipulation in Political Discourse Translation. *InTRAlinea: Online Translation Journal*, 20, 1.
<https://ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=134194221&site=eds-live>
- Darwish, A. (2006). Translating the news reframing constructed realities. *Translation Watch Quarterly*, 2(1), 52-77.
- Dijk, T. A. v. (1988). *News as discourse*. University of Groningen.

- Elewa, A. (2019). A critical discourse analysis of ideological translations of Arabic quotations in English language newspapers. *Language and Intercultural Communication*.
- Faiq, S. (2004). *Cultural encounters in translation from Arabic* (Vol. 26). Multilingual Matters.
- Faiq, S. (2007). *Trans-lated: Translation and cultural manipulation*. University Press of America.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, 5(11), 121-138.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. *Discourse as social interaction*, 2, 258-284.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Harvard University Press.
- Hatim, B. (1997). *Communication across cultures*. Exeter: Exeter University Press.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (2014). *Discourse and the Translator*. Routledge.
- Hatim, B., & Munday, J. (2019). *Translation: An advanced resource book for students*. Routledge.
- Holmes, J. (1982). Expressing doubt and certainty in English. *RELC journal*, 13(2), 9-28.
- Huckin, T. (2002). Textual silence and the discourse of homelessness. *Discourse & Society*, 13(3), 347-372.
- Crezee, I. H. (2016). The benefits of reflective blogs in language-neutral translator education. *FITISPos International Journal*, 3, 28-41.
- Johnston, H., & Klandermans, B. (1995). The cultural analysis of social movements. *Social movements and culture*, 4, 3-24.

- Kiersey, R. A., & Hayes, N. (2010). Reporting the rhetoric, implementation of the United Nations convention on the rights of the child as represented in Ireland's second report to the UN committee on the rights of the child: A critical discourse analysis. *Child Care in Practice*, 16(4), 327-346.
- Knights, M. (2018). The Houthi war machine: from Guerrilla war to state capture. *CTC Sentinel*, 11(8), 15-23.
- Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translating literature: Practice and theory in a comparative literature context*. Modern Language Association of America New York.
- Malkawi, R. (2012). *The ideological stamp: Translation of political discourse in news media*. Writescop Publishers.
- Moradi Joz, R. (2017). Translation Studies Research Paradigms. *Modern Language Studies Journal*, 4(1), 1-8.
- Obeng, S. G., & Hartford, B. (2008). *Political discourse analysis*. Nova Publishers.
- Paltridge, B. (2013). Critical discourse analysis. *Discourse studies reader: essential excerpts*, 89.
- Peirce, C. S. (1974). *Collected papers of charles sanders peirce* (Vol. 2). Harvard University Press.
- Peter, F. (2020). The Grounds of Political Legitimacy. *Journal of the American Philosophical Association*, 6(3), 372-390.
- Reah, D. (2002). *The language of newspapers*. Psychology Press.
- Reyes, A. (2011). Strategies of legitimization in political discourse: From words to actions. *Discourse & Society*, 22(6), 781-807.
- Schaffner, C. (1996). Political speeches and discourse analysis. *Current issues in language & society*, 3(3), 201-204.
- Schäffner, C. (2004). Political discourse analysis from the point of view of translation studies. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 3(1), 117-150.

- Shojaei, A., & Laheghi, F. (2012). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Political Ideology and Control Factors in News Translation. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 2(12).
- Snow, D. A. (2013). Framing and social movements. *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements*.
- Spiessens, A., & Van Poucke, P. (2016). Translating news discourse on the Crimean crisis: patterns of reframing on the Russian website InoSMI. *The Translator*, 22(3), 319-339.
- Valdeón, R. A. (2007). Political and sexist bias in news translation: Two case studies. *Trans. Revista de Traductología*(11), 231-243.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Stories and racism. *Narrative and social control: Critical perspectives*, 21, 121-142.
- 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). Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, 1, 95-120.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2005). War rhetoric of a little ally: Political implicatures and Aznar's legitimatization of the war in Iraq. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 4(1), 65-91.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2009). *Society and discourse: How social contexts influence text and talk*. Cambridge University Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2011). Discourse and ideology. *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*, 379, 407.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2017). *Socio-cognitive discourse studies*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2007). Legitimation in discourse and communication. *Discourse & communication*, 1(1), 91-112.

- Van Leeuwen, T., & Wodak, R. (1999). Legitimizing immigration control: A discourse-historical analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 1(1), 83-118.
- Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation* (Vol. 11). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis and the study of doctor-patient interaction. *The construction of professional discourse*, 19(6), 173-200.
- Wodak, R. (2000). Recontextualization and the transformation of meanings: A critical discourse analysis of decision making in EU-meetings about employment policies. *Discourse and social life*, 185-206.

Appendices

Appendix A : The report summary of the **Final report of the Panel of Experts on Yemen** no. (S/2021/79), the English version.

United Nations

S/2021/79



Security Council

Distr.: General
25 January 2021
English
Original: French

**Letter dated 22 January 2021 from the Panel of Experts on Yemen
addressed to the President of the Security Council**

The members of the Panel of Experts on Yemen have the honour to transmit herewith the final report of the Panel, prepared in accordance with paragraph 8 of resolution [2511 \(2020\)](#).

The report was provided to the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution [2140 \(2014\)](#) on 22 December 2020 and was considered by the Committee on 22 January 2021.

We would appreciate it if the present letter and the report were brought to the attention of the members of the Security Council and issued as a document of the Council.

(Signed) **Dakshinie Ruwanthika Gunaratne**
Coordinator
Panel of Experts on Yemen

(Signed) **Mourad Sami Baly**
Expert

(Signed) **Henry Thompson**
Expert

(Signed) **Marie-Louise Tougas**
Expert

(Signed) **Wolf-Christian Paes**
Expert

20-17310 (E) 270121 280121



Please recycle



Final report of the Panel of Experts on Yemen

Summary

The situation in Yemen has continued to deteriorate, with devastating consequences for the civilian population. Three main factors are contributing to the catastrophe: (a) economic profiteering by all Yemeni parties, affecting human security; (b) continuous and widespread human rights and international humanitarian law violations, with impunity; and (c) escalations in fighting and its impact on civilians, including displacement.

The Government of Yemen lost strategic territory to both the Houthis and the Southern Transitional Council, both of which undermine the objectives of Security Council resolution 2216 (2015). Therefore, the Houthis are not the only force to which paragraph 1 of the resolution applies.

The activities of the Southern Transitional Council, under the leadership of Aydarus al-Zubaydi and Hani Bin Brik, constituted a violation of paragraphs 1 and 6 of resolution 2216 (2015), which demand that all Yemeni parties refrain from unilateral actions that undermine the political transition. The Southern Transitional Council's unilateral declaration of self-administration in April 2020 led to significant destabilization in Abyan, Aden, Shabwah and Socotra.

The lack of a coherent strategy among anti-Houthi forces, demonstrated by infighting within them, and disagreements between their regional backers, has served to strengthen the Houthis. However, within the Houthi leadership, competing power brokers emerged, notably Mohammed Ali al-Houthi, Ahmed Hamid and Abdulkarim al-Houthi.

In territory controlled by the Government of Yemen, there is a risk of the disintegration of power into a patchwork of competing factions, as observed in Ta'izz. There is opacity in the relationships between non-State armed groups and the Government of Yemen, as demonstrated by the illegal recruitment of fighters by Hamoud Saeed al-Mikhlaifi. Confrontations in Shabwah between the Government of Yemen, the Southern Transitional Council and affiliated forces continues to pose a threat to stability.

There was limited progress regarding peace negotiations, with the exception of an exchange of 1,056 prisoners under the Stockholm Agreement. Developing national peace initiatives while working under the influence of wider regional struggles remains highly challenging. Conflicts in Yemen are overshadowed by tensions between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the United States of America.

The extent of external support for the parties to the conflict in Yemen remains unclear. The United Arab Emirates is a member of the Coalition to Restore Legitimacy in Yemen, yet its support to the Southern Transitional Council undermines the Government of Yemen. An increasing body of evidence suggests that individuals or entities in the Islamic Republic of Iran supply significant volumes of weapons and components to the Houthis. The Panel is also investigating a group of individuals who travelled to Oman on "mercy flights" in 2015 and onwards to the Islamic Republic of Iran. One later publicly stated that he had received naval training in Bandar Abbas and went on to facilitate maritime smuggling for the Houthis.

The Houthis continue to attack civilian targets in the Saudi Arabia, using a combination of missiles and uncrewed aerial vehicles, while waterborne improvised explosive devices are regularly launched into the Red Sea. While most attacks are foiled by the Saudi military, the group's ability to project power beyond Yemen remains a threat to regional stability and a challenge for future peace negotiations. There was an escalation of attacks on civilian vessels in the waters around Yemen in 2020; thus far, the identity of the attackers remains unclear.

The Panel documented several supply routes to the Houthis involving traditional vessels (dhows) in the Arabian Sea. Arms and equipment are trans-shipped in Omani and Somali waters to smaller boats, with the cargo being delivered to ports on the south coast of Yemen and smuggled overland to the Houthis or, in some cases, through the Bab-el-Mandab directly to Houthi-held areas. The lack of capacity of the Yemeni Coast Guard and prevailing corruption in areas held by the Government of Yemen are contributing factors that allow smuggling to flourish despite a number of high-profile seizures.

The economy of Yemen continued to contract, weighed down by double-digit inflation and a collapsing currency, which has a devastating impact on the population. Parties to the conflict appear to be indifferent to these developments, both remaining unaffected by the plight of Yemenis and continuing to divert the country's economic and financial resources. The Houthis perform functions that are exclusively within the authority of the Government of Yemen, collecting taxes and other State revenue, a large portion of which is used to fund their war effort. The Panel estimates that the Houthis diverted at least \$1.8 billion in 2019, originally destined to fill the coffers of the Government of Yemen, pay salaries and provide basic services to citizens, to fund their operations.

The Government of Yemen is, in some cases, engaging in money-laundering and corruption practices that adversely affect access to adequate food supplies for Yemenis, in violation of the right to food. The Government of Yemen implemented a scheme to divert funds from the Saudi deposit, in which \$423 million of public money was illegally transferred to traders. A total of 48 per cent of this amount was received by the Hayel Saeed Anam Group.

All parties continue to commit egregious violations of international humanitarian law and international human rights law, including indiscriminate attacks against civilians, enforced disappearances and torture. The widespread use of landmines by Houthis poses a constant threat to civilians and contributes to displacement. Houthis continue to recruit children. Migrants are regularly victims of serious human rights abuses.

The Panel documented an alarming pattern of the repression of journalists and human rights defenders by the Government of Yemen, the Southern Transitional Council and the Houthis, comprising a blatant violation of the freedom of expression and impeding their capacity to identify and report on violations of international humanitarian law and international human rights law, which can contribute to the protection of civilians.

Since the beginning of the conflict, there has been no significant initiative to hold perpetrators of violations to account. The absence of the rule of law and the dysfunction of the judicial system give leeway to impunity and contribute to the recurrence of violations.

Despite some progress made in the past few months, substantial hurdles to principled humanitarian action remain in Houthi-controlled areas. The Panel also documented obstruction to humanitarian assistance in Aden.

Appendix B: The report summary of the Final report of the Panel of Experts on Yemen no. (S/2021/79), the Arabic translation.

S/2021/79

الأمم المتحدة

Distr.: General
25 January 2021
Arabic
Original: French



رسالة مؤرخة 22 كانون الثاني/يناير 2021 موجهة إلى رئيس مجلس الأمن من فريق الخبراء المعني باليمن

يتشرف أعضاء فريق الخبراء المعني باليمن بأن يحيلوا طيه التقرير النهائي للفريق، الذي أُعد وفقاً للفقرة 8 من القرار 2511 (2020).

وقد قُدم التقرير إلى لجنة مجلس الأمن المنشأة عملاً بالقرار 2140 (2014) في 22 كانون الأول/ديسمبر 2020، ونظرت فيه اللجنة في 22 كانون الثاني/يناير 2021.

وسنكون ممتنين لو تفضلتم بإطلاع أعضاء مجلس الأمن على هذه الرسالة والتقرير وإصدارهما بوصفهما وثيقة من وثائق المجلس.

(توقيع) داكشيني روانتيكا غوناراتني
المنسقة

فريق الخبراء المعني باليمن

(توقيع) مراد سامي بالي
خبير

(توقيع) هنري تومسون
خبير

(توقيع) ماري - لويز توغاس
خبيرة

(توقيع) وولف - كريستيان بايس
خبير



الرجاء إعادة استعمال الورق

280121 270121 20-17310 (A)



[الأصل: بالإنكليزية]

التقرير النهائي لفريق الخبراء المعني باليمن

موجز

ما فتئ الوضع يتدهور في اليمن، مع ما يترتب على ذلك من آثار مدمرة على السكان المدنيين. وتساهم ثلاثة عوامل رئيسية في هذه الكارثة: (أ) التزيع الاقتصادي من قبل جميع الأطراف اليمنية، مما يؤثر على الأمن البشري، (ب) والانتهاكات المستمرة والواسعة النطاق لحقوق الإنسان والقانون الدولي الإنساني، في ظل الإفلات من العقاب، (ج) والتصعيد في القتال وتأثيره على المدنيين، بما في ذلك النزوح.

واستولى الحوثيون والمجلس الانتقالي الجنوبي على أراض استراتيجية كانت بحوزة حكومة اليمن، ففوضا بذلك أهداف قرار مجلس الأمن 2216 (2015). وبناء عليه، فإن الحوثيين ليسوا القوة الوحيدة التي تنطبق عليها الفقرة 1 من القرار.

وشكلت أنشطة المجلس الانتقالي الجنوبي، الذي يقوده عيروس الزبيدي وهاني بن بريك، انتهاكاً للفقرتين 1 و 6 من القرار 2216 (2015)، اللتين تطالبان جميع الأطراف اليمنية بالامتناع عن اتخاذ إجراءات انفرادية تقوض عملية الانتقال السياسي. وأدى إعلان المجلس الانتقالي الجنوبي من جانب واحد عن الإدارة الذاتية في نيسان/أبريل 2020 إلى زعزعة شديدة للاستقرار في أبين وعدن وشبوة وسقطرى.

وأدى غياب استراتيجية متماسكة في صفوف القوى المناهضة للحوثيين بتجلى في الاقتتال داخلها والخلافات بين الجهات الداعمة لها إقليمياً إلى تعزيز الحوثيين. غير أنه برزت ضمن قيادة الحوثيين شخصيات نافذة متنافسة على رأسها محمد علي الحوثي وأحمد حامد وعبد الكريم الحوثي.

ويهدد الإقليم الذي تسيطر عليه حكومة اليمن خطر تفكك السلطة إلى خليط من الفصائل المتنافسة، على نحو ما لوحظ في تعز. ويسود العلاقات بين الجماعات المسلحة غير التابعة للدولة وحكومة اليمن غموض يتضح من تجنيد حمود سعيد المخلافي للمقاتلين بصفة غير قانونية. ولا تزال المواجهات في شبوة بين قوات حكومة اليمن وقوات المجلس الانتقالي الجنوبي والقوات التابعة لها تشكل تهديداً للاستقرار.

ولم يحرز سوى تقدم محدود فيما يتعلق بمفاوضات السلام، باستثناء تبادل 1 056 أسيراً بموجب اتفاق ستوكهولم. ويظل وضع مبادرات سلام وطنية في وقت يجري العمل فيه تحت وطأة نزاعات إقليمية أوسع نطاقاً أمراً بالغ الصعوبة. فالتوترات القائمة بين جمهورية إيران الإسلامية والولايات المتحدة الأمريكية تلقي بظلالها على النزاعات في اليمن.

ولا يزال مدى الدعم الخارجي لأطراف النزاع في اليمن غير واضح. فالإمارات العربية المتحدة عضو في تحالف إعادة الشرعية في اليمن، ومع ذلك فإن دعمها للمجلس الانتقالي الجنوبي يقوض حكومة اليمن. وتشير مجموعة متزايدة من الأدلة إلى أن أفراداً أو كيانات في جمهورية إيران الإسلامية يزودون الحوثيين بكميات كبيرة من الأسلحة والمكونات. ويحقق الفريق أيضاً مع مجموعة من الأفراد الذين سافروا إلى عُمان ضمن "رحلات الرحمة" في عام 2015 ثم إلى جمهورية إيران الإسلامية. وأفاد أحدهم علناً في وقت لاحق بأنه تلقى تدريباً بحرياً في بندر عباس، ثم قام بتيسير التهريب بحراً لفائدة الحوثيين.

ويواصل الحوثيون مهاجمة الأهداف المدنية في المملكة العربية السعودية باستخدام مجموعة من القذائف والطائرات المسيرة من دون طيار، في حين يجري إطلاق الأجهزة المتفجرة اليدوية الصنع المنقولة بالماء بانتظام في البحر الأحمر. وعلى الرغم من أن الجيش السعودي يحبط معظم الهجمات، فإن قدرة

الجماعة على الظهور بمظهر القوة خارج اليمن لا تزال تشكل تهديداً للاستقرار الإقليمي وتحدياً لمفاوضات السلام المقبلة. وتصاعدت الهجمات على السفن المدنية في المياه المحيطة باليمن في عام 2020؛ وحتى الآن، لا تزال هوية المهاجمين غير محددة.

ووثق الفريق عدة طرق إمداد للحوثيين تشمل المراكب التقليدية (مراكب الدهو الشراعية) في بحر العرب. وتُثقل الأسلحة والمعدات في المياه العمانية والصومالية من السفن إلى قوارب أصغر، ويتم تسليم الشحنة إلى موانئ تطل على الساحل الجنوبي لليمن وتهريبها برّاً إلى الحوثيين، أو في بعض الحالات، عبر باب المندب مباشرة إلى المناطق التي يسيطر عليها الحوثيون. ويشكل نقص قدرات خفر السواحل اليمني والفساد السائد في المناطق التي تسيطر عليها حكومة اليمن عاملين يساهمان في تنامي التهريب على الرغم من وقوع عدد من عمليات الحجز الهامة.

وواصل الاقتصاد اليمني انكماشه، متأثراً بالتضخم الذي بلغ رقمين والعملية المنهارة، وهو ما له أثر مدمر على السكان. ويبدو أن طرفي النزاع غير مباشرين بهذه التطورات، إذ يظان غير متأثرين بمحنة اليمنيين وما انفكا يحولان موارد البلد الاقتصادية والمالية عن وجهتها الأصلية. ويؤدي الحوثيون وظائف تدخل في نطاق السلطة الحصرية لحكومة اليمن، إذ يجمعون الضرائب وغيرها من إيرادات الدولة، التي يستخدم جزء كبير منها لتمويل مجهودهم الحربي. وتشير تقديرات الفريق إلى أن الحوثيين حولوا مبلغاً لا يقل عن 1,8 بليون دولار من دولارات الولايات المتحدة في عام 2019، كان من المفروض في الأصل أن يملأ خزائن حكومة اليمن وينفق في دفع المرتبات وتوفير الخدمات الأساسية للمواطنين، من أجل تمويل عملياتهم.

وتتخبط حكومة اليمن، في بعض الحالات، في ممارسات لغسل الأموال والفساد تؤثر سلباً في إمكانية حصول اليمنيين على الإمدادات الغذائية الكافية، مما يشكل انتهاكاً للحق في الغذاء. ونفذت حكومة اليمن خطة لتحويل أموال من الوديعة السعودية، حوّل فيها مبلغ قدره 423 مليون دولار من الأموال العامة بصورة غير قانونية إلى تجار. وتلقت مجموعة هائل سعيد أنعم نسبة 48 في المائة من هذا المبلغ.

ولا تزال جميع الأطراف ترتكب انتهاكات صارخة للقانون الدولي الإنساني والقانون الدولي لحقوق الإنسان، بما في ذلك شن هجمات عشوائية ضد المدنيين، وحالات اختفاء قسري وتعذيب. ويشكل استخدام الحوثيين للأغمار الأرضية على نطاق واسع تهديداً مستمراً للمدنيين ويسهم في النزوح. ويستمر الحوثيون في تجنيد الأطفال. ويتعرض المهاجرون بانتظام لانتهاكات جسيمة لحقوق الإنسان.

ووثق الفريق نمطاً متثراً للجزع لقمع الصحفيين والمدافعين عن حقوق الإنسان من جانب حكومة اليمن والمجلس الانتقالي الجنوبي والحوثيين، يشمل انتهاكاً صارخاً لحرية التعبير وإعاقة قدرتهم على تبين انتهاكات القانون الدولي الإنساني والقانون الدولي لحقوق الإنسان والإبلاغ عنها، وهو ما من شأنه أن يسهم في حماية المدنيين.

ومنذ بداية النزاع، لم تكن هناك أي مبادرة ذات شأن لمحاسبة مرتكبي الانتهاكات. فانهدام سيادة القانون واختلال النظام القضائي يتيحان مجالاً للإفلات من العقاب ويسهمان في تكرار الانتهاكات.

وعلى الرغم من إحراز بعض التقدم في الأشهر القليلة الماضية، لا تزال هناك عقبات كبيرة أمام العمل الإنساني المبني في المناطق التي يسيطر عليها الحوثيون. ووثق الفريق أيضاً حالات لعرقلّة المساعدة الإنسانية في عدن.

Appendix C: The report summary of the Final report of the Panel of Experts on Yemen no. (S/2020/326), the English version.

S/2020/326

Final report of the Panel of Experts on Yemen

Summary

After more than five years of conflict, the humanitarian crisis in Yemen continues. The country's many conflicts are interconnected and can no longer be separated by clear divisions between external and internal actors and events. Throughout 2019, the Houthis and the Government of Yemen made little headway towards either a political settlement or a conclusive military victory. In a continuation from 2018, the belligerents continued to practice economic warfare: using economic obstruction and financial tools as weapons to starve opponents of funds or materials. Profiteering from the conflict is endemic.

In the south, the Government of Yemen confronted the military challenges posed by the forces affiliated with the southern transitional council. The vice-president of the council, Hani Ali Salem Binbrek, initiated a conflict when he used force to remove what little authority the Government of Yemen held in Aden. Ongoing clashes on the Abyan and Shabwah borders and the limited progress in the implementation of the Riyadh Agreement indicate that the situation in the south remains volatile.

In the north, the Houthis continued to consolidate their political and military control, in particular through their pervasive intelligence services, which include both the preventative security and a new security and intelligence bureau. Houthi forces also engaged in the brutal suppression of tribal opposition and political dissent. The Panel of Experts on Yemen has identified a Houthi network involved in the repression of women who oppose the Houthis, including through the use of sexual violence, headed by the director of the Sana'a-based criminal investigation department, Sultan Zabin.

Throughout most of 2019, the Houthi forces continued and intensified their aerial attacks on Saudi Arabia. In addition to the previously known weapon systems, they used a new type of Delta-design uncrewed aerial vehicle and a new model of land attack cruise missile. The Panel has investigated the high-profile attack on 14 September 2019 on the Saudi Aramco facilities in Abqaiq and Khurays and finds that, despite claims to the contrary, the Houthi forces are unlikely to be responsible for the attack, as the estimated range of the weapon systems used does not allow for a launch from Houthi-controlled territory. Nevertheless, a number of other attacks on Saudi Arabia can clearly be attributed to the Houthi forces.

Following the attack in September, the Houthis made a public offer to establish a ceasefire. The ceasefire has been broadly complied with. Both Saudi Arabia and the Houthis now publicly state that they are engaged in discussions, while the launching of longer-range uncrewed aerial vehicles and missile strikes by Houthi forces against Saudi Arabia has abated.

With regard to potential violations of the targeted arms embargo, the Panel observes two major trends: the first is the transfer of commercially available parts, such as uncrewed aerial vehicle engines, servo actuators and electronics, which are exported from industrialized countries through a network of intermediaries to the Houthi-controlled areas of Yemen, where they are integrated into locally assembled uncrewed aerial vehicles and waterborne improvised explosive devices; the second is the continued reception by Houthi forces of military support in the form of assault rifles, rocket-propelled grenade launchers, anti-tank guided missiles and more sophisticated cruise missile systems. Some of those weapons have technical characteristics similar to arms manufactured in the Islamic Republic of Iran. For both commercial parts and weapons, the main smuggling route seems to run overland from Oman and the southern coast of Yemen, through territory controlled by the

Government of Yemen, towards Sana'a. The high-profile seizure on 25 November 2019 of a dhow carrying anti-tank guided missiles and other missile parts in the Arabian Sea indicates that, as in previous years, sea transport continues to play a role in potential violations of the targeted arms embargo.

The absence of the rule of law and oversight in Yemen allows for the illicit enrichment of a small number of predatory entrepreneurs, some of whom hold official posts in public institutions. Within this context, and with the lack of any accountability, national wealth and external aid are increasingly either diverted or lost owing to corrupt practices by officials of the Government of Yemen and the Houthis. As tools of economic warfare, the parties have created obstacles to block the financing of the importation of goods and caused delays for the vessels carrying them to Yemen.

The Panel found indications of illicit enrichment through the manipulation of foreign exchange rates by the Central Bank of Yemen in Aden. The Panel found that the Houthis were involved in cases of violations of asset freeze measures by allowing the diversion of frozen assets and public funds through false contracts for the benefit of individuals acting on behalf of Abdulmalik al-Houthi (YEi.004). Saleh Mesfer Alshaer, a Houthi general in charge of logistics, was also instrumental in the diversion of funds unlawfully appropriated from Houthi opponents.

Violations of international humanitarian law and international human rights law continued to be widely committed by all parties in Yemen with impunity. The air strikes conducted by the Coalition to Support Legitimacy in Yemen, led by Saudi Arabia, and the indiscriminate use of explosive ordnance, including landmines, by Houthi forces continue to disproportionately affect civilians and civilian infrastructures. Arbitrary arrest and detention, enforced disappearances, ill-treatment and the torture of detainees continue to be conducted by the Government of Yemen, Saudi Arabia, the Houthis and the forces affiliated with the United Arab Emirates. In Aden, the absence of the rule of law allows armed groups affiliated with the United Arab Emirates to conduct such violations and to operate outside the control of the Government of Yemen. Threats and acts of violence against humanitarians, as well as administrative hurdles to the delivery of assistance, are increasing in Houthi-controlled areas.

Appendix D: The report summary of the Final report of the Panel of Experts on Yemen no. (S/2020/70), the Arabic version.

S/2020/70

التقرير النهائي لفريق الخبراء المعني باليمن

موجز

بعد مرور أكثر من خمس سنوات على اندلاع النزاع، لا تزال الأزمة الإنسانية مستمرة في اليمن. ويشهد البلد نزاعات كثيرة تترابط فيما بينها ولم يعد ممكناً الفصل بينها بتقسيم واضح يميز بين الجهات الفاعلة الخارجية والداخلية والأحداث. وطوال عام 2019، لم يجرز الحوثيون وحكومة اليمن سوى تقدم ضئيل نحو التوصل إلى تسوية سياسية أو تحقيق انتصار عسكري حاسم. وعلى غرار عام 2018، ظلت الأطراف المتحاربة تمارس الحرب الاقتصادية المتمثلة في: استخدام العراقيل الاقتصادية والأدوات المالية كأسلحة للحيلولة دون وصول الأموال أو المواد إلى المعارضين. ويعد التبرع من النزاع أمراً مستحكماً.

وفي الجنوب، واجهت حكومة اليمن التحديات العسكرية التي تطرحها القوات التابعة للمجلس الانتقالي الجنوبي. فقد بدأ نائب رئيس المجلس، هاني علي سالم بن بريك، نزاعاً عندما استخدم القوة لإزالة ما لحكومة اليمن من سلطة ضئيلة في عدن. ويشير استمرار الاشتباكات على حدود أبين وشبوة ومحدودية التقدم المحرز في تنفيذ اتفاق الرياض إلى أن الوضع في الجنوب لا يزال متقلباً.

وفي الشمال، واصل الحوثيون توطيد سيطرتهم السياسية والعسكرية، لا سيما من خلال أجهزةهم الاستخباراتية المنتشرة، التي تشمل جهاز الأمن الوقائي ومكتباً جديداً للأمن والاستخبارات. وشرعت قوات الحوثيين أيضاً في قمع وحشي للمعارضة القليلة والمعارضة السياسية. وكشف فريق الخبراء المعني باليمن شبكة حوثية تشارك في قمع النساء اللائي يعارضن الحوثيين، بطرق منها استخدام العنف الجنسي، ويرأس هذه الشبكة مدير إدارة البحث الجنائي في صنعاء، سلطان زابن.

وخلال معظم عام 2019، استمرت قوات الحوثيين في شن الهجمات الجوية على المملكة العربية السعودية وكثفتها. فإضافة إلى منظومات الأسلحة المعروفة سابقاً، استخدمت نوعاً جديداً من الطائرات المسيّرة من دون طيار من طراز دلتا ونموذجاً جديداً للقذيفة الانسيابية للهجوم البري. وحقق الفريق في الهجوم البارز الذي شن في 14 أيلول/سبتمبر 2019 على منشأتين تابعتين لشركة أرامكو السعودية في بقيق وحرّض، ويستنتج الفريق أنه، على الرغم من الادعاءات بالعكس، من غير المحتمل أن تكون قوات الحوثيين مسؤولة عن الهجوم، إذ إن المدى المقدر لمنظومات الأسلحة المستخدمة لا يسمح بعملية إطلاق من أراض خاضعة لسيطرة الحوثيين. غير أن عدداً من الهجمات الأخرى على المملكة العربية السعودية يمكن أن تنسب بلا شك إلى قوات الحوثيين.

وفي أعقاب الهجوم الذي وقع في أيلول/سبتمبر، قدم الحوثيون عرضاً علنياً لوقف إطلاق النار. وتم الامتنثال لوقف إطلاق النار على نطاق واسع. فالمملكة العربية السعودية والحوثيون ينفدان علناً الآن بأتهما يقومان بإجراء مناقشات، وخفت في الوقت نفسه عمليات قوات الحوثيين لإطلاق الطائرات المسيّرة ذات المدى الأطول وشن الهجمات الصاروخية على المملكة العربية السعودية.

وفيما يتعلق بالانتهاكات المحتملة لحظر الأسلحة المحدد الأهداف، يلاحظ الفريق اتجاهين رئيسيين: الاتجاه الأول هو نقل الأجزاء المتاحة تجارياً، مثل محركات الطائرات المسيّرة من دون طيار (الطائرات المسيّرة)، والمشغلات المعززة، والإلكترونيات، التي تصدر من البلدان الصناعية عن طريق شبكة من الوسطاء إلى مناطق اليمن الخاضعة لسيطرة الحوثيين، حيث يتم إدماجها في الطائرات المسيّرة المجمعة

مخليا والأجهزة المتفجرة اليدوية الصنع المنقولة بحرا. والاتجاه الثاني هو استمرار تلقي قوات الحوثيين للدعم العسكري في شكل بنادق هجومية، وقاذفات قنابل صاروخية (آر بي جي)، وقذائف موجهة مضادة للدبابات، ومنظومات قذائف انسيابية أكثر تطورا. وبعض تلك الأسلحة لها خواص تقنية مماثلة لأسلحة مصنوعة في جمهورية إيران الإسلامية. ويبدو أن طريق التهريب الرئيسية لكل من القطار التجارية والأسلحة تمتد برا من عُمان والساحل الجنوبي لليمن عبر الأراضي التي تسيطر عليها حكومة اليمن لتصل إلى صنعاء. وتشير عملية الحجز البارزة لمركب شرعي يحمل قذائف موجهة مضادة للدبابات وأجزاء صاروخية أخرى في 25 تشرين الثاني/نوفمبر 2019 في بحر العرب إلى أنه، على غرار السنوات السابقة، لا يزال النقل البحري يؤدي دورا في الانتهاكات المحتملة لحظر الأسلحة المحدد الأهداف.

ويتيح انعدام سيادة القانون والرقابة في اليمن الإثراء غير المشروع لعدد صغير من المقاتلين الانتهازيين، الذين يشغل بعضهم مناصب رسمية في المؤسسات العامة. وفي هذا السياق، وفي ظل عدم وجود أي مساءلة، فإن الثروة الوطنية والمعونة الخارجية تتعرض بشكل متزايد إما للتحويل أو للضياع بسبب الممارسات الفاسدة للمسؤولين في حكومة اليمن والمسؤولين الحوثيين. وفي إطار أدوات الحرب الاقتصادية، استحدثت الأطراف عراقيل لمنع تمويل استيراد السلع وتسببت في حالات تأخير للسفن التي تنقلها إلى اليمن.

ووجد الفريق مؤشرات تدل على الإثراء غير المشروع من خلال تلاعب البنك المركزي اليمني في عدن بأسعار الصرف الأجنبي. ولاحظ الفريق أن الحوثيين تورطوا في حالات انتهاك لتدابير تجميد الأصول بسماحهم بتحويل أصول مجمدة وأموال عامة باستخدام عقود مزورة لصالح أفراد يتصرفون باسم عبد الملك الحوثي (YEI.004). وكان لصالح مسافر الشاعر، وهو لواء حوثي مسؤول عن اللوجستيات، دور أساسي أيضا في تحويل الأموال التي يتم نزعها بطريقة غير قانونية من معارضين للحوثيين.

وما برحت انتهاكات القانون الدولي الإنساني والقانون الدولي لحقوق الإنسان ترتكب على نطاق واسع من جانب جميع الأطراف في اليمن دون عقاب. ويستمر تعرض المدنيين والبنى التحتية المدنية لأثر جائر نتيجة الغارات الجوية التي يقوم بها تحالف دعم الشرعية في اليمن، بقيادة المملكة العربية السعودية، وإقدام قوات الحوثيين على الاستخدام العشوائي للذخائر المتفجرة، بما فيها الألغام الأرضية. وتستمر عمليات الاعتقال والاحتجاز التعسفية، وحالات الاختفاء القسري، وحالات سوء المعاملة، وتعذيب المحتجزين من جانب حكومة اليمن، والمملكة العربية السعودية، والحوثيين، والقوات الموالية للإمارات العربية المتحدة. وفي عدن، يتيح انعدام سيادة القانون للجماعات المسلحة الموالية للإمارات العربية المتحدة ارتكاب هذه الانتهاكات والعمل خارج نطاق سيطرة حكومة اليمن. وتزداد في المناطق الخاضعة لسيطرة الحوثيين التهديدات وأعمال العنف الموجهة ضد العاملين في المجال الإنساني، وفضلا عن وضع العقوبات الإدارية أمام إيصال المساعدات.