TREATING DISCLAIMER AS A POWER STRATEGY OF SELF-LEGITIMATION AND OTHER-DE-LEGITIMATION IN NETANYAHU'S UNGA SPEECH

IRHAM

English Language and Letters Department, Faculty of Humanities and Culture, Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University, Malang, Indonesia

irham_aladist@ymail.com

Ribut WAHYUDI

English Language and Letters Department, Faculty of Humanities and Culture,

Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University, Malang, Indonesia

rwah5054@uni.sydney.edu.au

Abstract

The text is produced with its particular purpose. It does not merely function as the information deliverer, but rather as the battle of power (Dijk, 1998). The speaker or the politician could practice his personal or group interest to control the text itself, as well as the audience's mind (Dijk, 1993b, 2006b). It could be designed through the structure of discourse such as the scheme of the text, the headlines of the news, the opening and closing of the speech, and so on (Dijk, 1998). Further, van Dijk (2006a) mentioned that the ideology manifested in the text could be identified from the discursive strategy, the way how discourse is produced. One of the proposed discursive strategies is disclaimer. This strategy defines the way in which the speaker presents something positive at first, and then rejects it by employing a particular term such as *but* (Dijk, 1995, 1998). It serves as a positive representation of self-legitimation and negative representation of other-de-legitimation (Dijk, 1995, 1998, 2006a). This paper then studies the practice of disclaimer by Netanyahu at a peace agreement speech at the United Nations General Assembly (henceforth, UNGA) in 2011. The micro structure of the text, (i.e Syntax, semantics, lexicon, and rhetoric) exercised together with disclaimer to empower the scrutiny of ideological practice, is explored as well. Thus, the political discourse of legitimation, manifested together through the practice of disclaimer, proliferates its power domination.

Keywords: disclaimer, self-legitimation, other-delegitimation, CDA

1. Background of the study

The speech, as another written discourse, is not only a matter of information delivery, but also the practice of interests (Dijk, 1998). People often convey the intended message through the effective use of language. They could modify the choice of a particular topic to perform the order of the speech and word choices in order to attract the audiences. Hence, this is the spectrum of ideological practices, the process of domination, employed within the discourse of the speech (Dijk, 1998, 2000). Additionally, such hidden message could be scrutinized by attempting the linguistics features such as syntax or word choice, which might be practiced together through discursive strategy (Dijk, 1995, 1998, 2006a). One of the discursive strategies (US and THEM of positive/ingroup and negative/ outgroup) is disclaimer, the way how the speaker 'presents something positive and then rejects it in order to maintain his or her main stance (Dijk, 1998, 2006a). Employing the theory, this paper aims to answer the following questions: 1) What are the discourse structures of disclaimer as the strategy of (de)legitimation practiced in Israeli Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu's speech at the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) in 2011?, 2) How are the discourse structures of disclaimer as the strategy of (de)legitimation practiced in Netanyahu's speech at UNGA 2011?

Analyzing the disclaimer strategy as the strategy of (de)legitimation is still worthy of analysis, since it has never been studied before in some journals. Some scholars have discussed discourse construction during the conflict between Israel and Palestine. Amer (2009) studied the '*(de)legitimation strategy of the second Palestinian intifada in Thomas Friedman's discourse*'. He attempted to scrutinize the 'argumentative structure' and 'political representation of self and other' by employing pragmatics, semantics, and sociopolitical approach (Amer, 2009). Afterwards, Richardson & Barkho (2009) analyzed how BBC constructs the discourse of Palestine and Israel. They approach the case through 'discursive and visual rhetoric' and 'argumentative representation' that eventually might result in inequality practice. As it is known, the discursive event does not happen naturally but 'is shaped by situation, institution, and social structure but discursive also shapes them' (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997:258).

In addition, Kamalu (2011) studied the strategy of positive and negative face keeping by employing rhetorical strategy in CDA. His study on '*Jonathan's declaration interest*' shows that political leader might use some strategies in doing the 'self' and 'other' legitimation such as ' personal accomplishment' or 'deployment of pronoun' (Kamalu, 2011). Furthermore, De Olievera (2011) argued that such legitimation might be enacted through 'gender's (woman)

role' or the 'self-achievement' toward the related objective. Her study focused on '*Rousseff's legitmation strategy in promoting Brazil*' to become a permanent member of the UN. She used women and Brazil's political, social, and economic development (see Rouseff's speech in De Olievera's work, 2011) as a 'topicalization' strategy. It eventually could strengthen the 'authorization' as the process of convincing the public that Brazil is qualified enough to be recognized as UN member.

Accordingly, analyzing the disclaimer strategy can enhance the discussion on the (de)legitimation strategy practiced by some politicians or leaders to attract the addressee. Besides, it will also help the society to become more aware of the several manipulations since the language of politician is always politics (Dijk, 1997a; Joseph 2006).

2. Theoretical Framework

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) posits language as the tool of opacities identification. It tries to attempt to the related text understanding beyond the language such as social or political context (Dijk, 1995, 1999, 2001). The CDA analyst is expected to discover the imbalanced power or unequal representation portrayed in discourse (of the speech), which contributes to the maintenance of 'asymmetrical power relation' (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997:258). Additionally, the speech as discourse practice can be scrutinized by analyzing the linguistics features (micro structure), structure of the speech (schematic structure), the main topic of the speech (macro structure), or how the speech is delivered (discursive strategy) (Dijk, 1998, 2006a). As mentioned, the speaker may not only deliver the speech to inform, but also to dominate the audience in order to maintain the main stance or interest. Therefore, an analysis of Netanyahu's speech through the micro structure of disclaimer as a discursive strategy is appropriate.

Disclaimer is a discursive strategy in which the speaker 'presents something positive and then rejects it with a particular term such as *but*' (Dijk, 1998, 2000, 2003). It functions to preserve the face of the speaker, since the speaker also does not expect the recipient to have a negative perception of him/her. Therefore, the disclaimer strategy typically serves as a positive-self representation (Dijk, 1998, 1995). Additionally, it also works to maintain the political stance by maintaining the respect to the audience, and at the same time legitimizes and de-legitimizes the ingroup and the outgroup member (Dijk, 1995, 2002, 2006a, 2006b). The in-

group members represent Israel, Jewish, and its ally meanwhile the outgroup covers Palestinians.

This disclaimer strategy was also practiced in Netanyahu's speech while he was negotiating for a peace agreement at the United Nations General Assembly 2011. He utilized this disclaimer to justify his legitimation and strengthen his political stance, and de-legitmize some propositions of Palestinians' reasons. Importantly, Netanyahu employed micro structure within disclaimer to explicate his legitimation and de-legitmation towards the out-group member**.**

It is salient to highlight that not all uses of *but* is disclaimer (Dijk, 2012b, 2012c). The conjunctions or a connector such as *but* functions as disclaimer whenever 'the attached proposition in the preceding clause reflects positive self-representation and is followed by a negative evaluation of the out-group' member in the latter clause (Dijk, 2012b, 2012c). It functions to keep the face of the speaker since the speaker also does not want the recipient to have a bad perception of him or her.

Compared to previous studies on the similar works, (Richardson & Barkho, 2009; Amer, 2009 ; Kamalu, 2011; De Olieveira, 2011), the distinctive feature is that it makes use of discursive practice of disclaimer as the effort of (de)legitimation. Needless to say, disclaimer strategy has not been studied that much in the current works. Thus, it expects to give a new angle in scrutinizing political legitimation.

2.1 Discourse Structure

One of the main tenets in critical discourse analysis is the notion of ideology. van Dijk (1995,2000) defined ideology as 'social representation shared by social group'. In other words, ideology is 'the fundamental interest shared by particular people', either in individual or group which is represented through 'text and talk' (Dijk, 1993b, 1993c, 1998). Meanwhile, Gramsci (1971) defined ideology as hegemony. Such hegemony could be identified from the process of legitimation and de-legitimation. In relation to ideology, Dijk (1993c, 1993d, 1997, 1998) argues that ideology posits as the power to authorize the (political) interest that eventually might represent Us and Them group.

The text and talk, as in the speech of Netanyahu, reflect his ideology or the interest. To identify the hidden ideology, text analysis or speech analysis can be employed (Dijk, 1998). The first is 'topicalization', how the speaker chooses the main topic to convey (Dijk, 1998, 2007). Netanyahu chooses the peace agreement in which he mentions that the agreement is never settled because of Palestinians' refusal. The second is the scheme of the speech. That is the opening and closing of the speech, or the introduction and conclusion. What is mentioned at

first is something prominent and the latter is less prominent (Dijk, 1998). The last type of text analysis is identification on linguistics features (micro structure) as the smallest element of the speech that is pivotal in that it reflects the holistic view of particular discourse (Dijk, 1993a).

The micro structure of the speech covers three major things. These are syntax, word choice, and rhetoric. Syntax is a dimension which can highlight the semantic aspect (Dijk, 1998). Through the variation of a sentence, for example in active or passive form, the speaker could emphasize or conceal the actor. Presenting the action instead of the event is another way of representing the in-group or out-goup members. Additionally, one of the most familiar and effective use of syntactical strategies is the use of the pronominal pair of US and THEM (Dijk, 1998, 2000). It is the way in which the speaker creates the polarization between in-group and group society (Dijk, 1998). The discourse producer tries to give the identification upon his member and other members by mentioning the pronoun US and THEM. The ingroup (US) society will be represented in a positive way, whereas the outgroup (THEM) society will be represented in a negative way. Such a strategy can effectively create the boundary or distance between those societies (Dijk, 1991, 1993a, 2002, 2006a,).

Further, the idea of word choice is closely related to the semantics aspect. The speaker can portray the audiences (ingroup and outgroup members) or even legitimize and de-legitimize the position through the use of various lexicons because to utter or choose a word is not an accidental event. However, it shows how he or she means the reality by taking the most representative one to the ideology he has (Dijk, 1998). Eventually, Rhetorical Structure, for example by employing the repetition strategy, posits as a means to emphasize or de-emphasize meaning as the function of ideological cognition (Dijk, 1998).

2.2 Disclaimer as Discursive Strategy

Discursive strategy such as disclaimer can highlight the cognitive representation and the process of power exercise since the text is modified by the structure of discourse and even designed though various ways of discourse display (Dijk, 1993a, 1998). Even though there are some discursive strategies (Dijk, 2006a), this paper tries to focus specifically on disclaimer strategy. It is the strategy in producing the discourse by which the speaker 'presents something positive and then rejects it with particular term such as *but'* (Dijk, 1998). Dijk (2012b, 2012c) mentions that not all use of *but* are disclaimers. *But* or other conjunctions functions as disclaimer whenever the proposition or clause that conjunction *but* attached 'is preceded by a positive self-representation and then followed by a negative evaluation' of the outgroup member. It functions to keep the face of the speaker since the speaker also does not want the

recipient negative opinion of him or her. Therefore, disclaimer strategy typically serves as positive-self representation (Dijk, 1995, 1997). It is mostly used to prejudice, mitigate, or to keep the face of the speaker. There are several types of disclaimer strategy. These are ;

• disclaimer apparent denial or negation, the first proposition is directly negated by disclaimer (I have nothing against X, but ….),

• disclaimer apparent concession, the speaker tries to respect the interlocutor's idea in the first clause, but then rejects it (They may be very smart, but …),

• disclaimer apparent empathy, attempting the empathy within the disclaim (They may have had problem, but…),

• disclaimer apparent effort, the speaker portrays the effort (We do everything we can, but….),

• disclaimer apparent apology, the speaker shows his apology to manage the impression, (Excuse me, but…),

• transfer, the speaker puts away particular issue like the term *political hot potato* (I have no problem with them, but my clients…)

• and reversal, blaming the victim (THEY are not discriminated against, but WE are) (Dijk, 1995, 1997b, 1998, 2000, 2006a).

From those disclaimer strategies, disclaimer apparent apology is not found in Netanyahu's speech.

2.3 Interdiscursivity in Discourse

The correlation from one discourse to another discourse, interdiscursivity is examined to enrich the analysis. The term interdicursivity is the extension explanation of 'constitutive intertextuality' (Fairclough, 1992). Further, he defines interdiscurisivity as the contention of 'mixing genres, types, and discourse' which associate with different discourse or text. Bakhtin (1986, cited in WU ,2011 :98) said that interdiscursivity is the composed utterances 'dialogized' in different perspectives. Hence, interdiscursvity is the media that links the text, context, and social phenomenon that concern the implicit relation of the text and its features.

Through interdiscursivity, the authors are able to view the phenomenon from various angles and it will be more objective. WU (2011) said that interdiscursivity plays a significant role because it bridges the gap between text and social practice (WU, 2011). To strengthen the analysis, the authors will also utilize the work on Israel and Palestine peace by Richardson & Barkho (2009), in which they employ discursive and ethnographic approach to examine how the news is constructed (by BBC, as subject in their research).

Discourse analysts posit interdiscursivity as the concept to unveil inter-text relation that consists of discourse formation (WU, 2011). It is more than identifying the relation of one text with another. Though it tries to investigate the deeper elements such as discourse practices. Wodak (2001, cited in in WU 2011) describes interdiscursivity as a 'discourse historical approach', in which the analysis of social problem is done within inter-text relation. On her proposition, interdiscursivity should be tied to historical change and highlight to potential relation of interdiscursive practice (WU, 2011).

2.4 (De)Legitimation Strategy

As mentioned above, disclaimer as a discursive strategy may work as a positive and/or negative representation. When it operates as a positive self-representation, it also works as a strategy of self-legitimation (ingroup legitimation). Conversely, negative representation enacts to other delegitimation (outgroup de-legitimation) (Dijk, 1998, 2006a).

Additionally, some scholars propose legitimation strategy that works on political discourse. Reyes (2011) defines legitimation as the effort to make something legal. Chouliaraki (2005, cited in Reyes, 2011) views the legitimacy as 'symbolic power' to authorize the action. In the case of the Israel and Palestine conflict, the effort of Netanyahu (as well as Abbas) through speech performance to justify the conceived goal is politically legitimate action. Besides, Suchman (1995, cited in Zu and Mc Kenna, 2012:527) delineates legitimation as broad-spectrum propositions about 'appropriateness' of particular social phenomenon within the 'social contract system'.

Further, Reyes (2011) argues that the speaker or politician may justify the (de)legitimation action through fives strategies: 1) Emotional Appealing, how the speaker manifests the emotion within the argumentation portraying the Us-group and Them-group. 2) Hypothetical Future, posing the threat tendency in the future that eventually requires the imminent action. 3) Rationality, the politician rationalizes the action by constituting the common sense (decision making is made through the right procedure) that society will accept it reasonably. van Leeuwen (2007) described it as 'Theoretical Authorization'. 4) Voice of Expertise, the action is backed up by the expert. It might be familiar as 'Authorization' strategy in van Leeuwen's concept (van Leeuwen, 2007). 5) Altruism, the politician tries to ensure that the action is not merely personal interest but it benefits for others (Reyes, 2011:785-787).

In this paper, those strategies will be enacted to sharpen the analysis of disclaimer as the strategy of self-legitimation (ingroup) and other-delegitmation (outgroup). It can portray the holistic argumentation (discourse), intended thought or contention, or political interest that

Netanyahu intends to achieve in peace with Palestine. Such order of analysis is salient since the language produced by the politician is always political in that language itself is constructed out of ideology of the language user (Joseph, 2006).

3. Data and Method

The data are the utterances of Netanyahu's speech from discourse structure (micro structure) and disclaimer. It was taken from Israel's official website, www.haaretz.com, Netanyahu's speech at UNGA, September 23rd, 2011. To gain the valid data, the authors use several steps. Firstly, the authors classify the utterances containing micro structure elements. Second, the writers categorize the utterances covering some terms "but", "however", "though", "yet" into disclaimer and non disclaimer. Those data were finally re-checked and validated by Dijk (2012) through email (personal correspondence from April-Mei 2012) to ensure that the (disclaimer) data are justifiable. Finally, the authors select the disclaimer data to be investigated. Needless to say, the utterances which belong to disclaimer will be typed in bold.

4. Discussion

Maintaining the effective communication is the essence of language. The speaker, then, has liability to respect the audience since they may have different perspectives of a particular case. Accordingly, the speaker in this study, Netanyahu, should deliver his proposition of peace without clearly discriminating others. This is the way disclaimer works in his speech as discursive strategy to legitimize his political stance. Some disclaimers practiced in Netanyahu's speech are discussed below:

Excerpt 1) "The truth is that Israel wants peace with a Palestinian state, **but the Palestinians want a state without peace.** And the truth is you shouldn't let that happen."

In this excerpt, Netanyahu employs syntactical structure, simple present tense, within his disclaimer apparent denial strategy. As the result, it portrays the simultaneous desire of Palestinian toward the refusal of peace agreement (Azzar, 1999; Dijk, 1993b). Palestinians want only a state without negotiating peace. In addition, such structure is strengthened through the use of a transitive verb, by which the verb "want + peace" for Israel in the first clause and "want + without peace" for Palestine in the later clause. It affects Israel' positive portrayal as

the actor who is eager to peace. At the same time, it works as deligitimation strategy and downgrades Palestinians in the sense that they do not intend to work towards a peace agreement.

Thus, disclaimer apparent denial is employed to rationalize Israel's political interest of achieving peace in the Middle East with Palestine by making rationalization. As Reyes (2011) mentions, self-legitimation could be manifested through rational argumentation. Netanyahu argues firstly how the Israel and Palestine conflict could not be mediated through UN resolution but direct negotiation. Though, Palestine always rejects to negotiate. Nevertheless, Israel keeps forward on it for the sake of peace between them. Again, Palestine does not negotiate for peace but a state that eventually peace cannot be reached. The practice of such 'theoretical rationalization' is the manifestation of self-legitmation and other-de-legitimation (van Leeuwen, 2007).

To enhance such a scenario, Netanyahu also practiced the use of the preposition "with" to relate Israel to peace and "without" for Palestinians refusal. The word "with" means there is a willingness from Israel to coexist with Palestine; meanwhile, "without" attached to the Palestinians means have nothing or have no attempt to create peace with Israel (Cambridge dictionary). Accordingly, the positive face of Israel remains protected as the actor of peace keeper.

Excerpt 2) "Leaders must see reality as it is, not as it ought to be**.** We must do our best to shape the future, **but we cannot wish away the dangers of the present.** And the world around Israel is definitely becoming more dangerous. Militant Islam has already taken over Lebanon and Gaza."

In exercising his discourse, Netanyahu practiced micro structure of the text, namely the pronominal pair of "we" (Azar, 1999). Thus, it means that people in that forum, the speaker and the audience are involved together in fighting the raised issue (militant Islam as the danger of the present). Besides, those people are given a shared responsibility for shaping the future that is free from danger since the fact that the word "we" is politically treated is discourse of attraction, involving the interlocutor to the topic (Dijk, 1998). In due course, the contention of such a paradigm, shaping the future and response toward the current danger is not merely the liability of Netanyahu but all people as the representative of United Nation members.

Further, the word choice of "we" is also the practice of group categorization that is so ideological. The word "we" represents the ingroup members, Israel and its allies, that are

accordingly protected. At the same time, it depicts the negative representation of the outgroup members, Palestinians and militant Islam. Thus, both Palestinians and militant Islam are negatively stereotyped to justify ingroup action. Needless to say, the presence of militant Islam represented in the Palestinian movement (Richardson & Barkho, 2009) should be terminated. Such classification of Us-group and Them-group manifested in the use of "we", through emotion, is the spectrum of ideological practice to empower the domination (Reyes, 2011).

On the other hand, Netanyahu employed *disclaimer apparent concession*, that is giving justification upon self defense that all countries should have. Though, he disclaims it through the use of conjunction "but" with another concession (Dijk, 1995,1998). Firstly, he argues about the necessity to set the best future. Secondly, he claims that today's presence of militant Islam is a threat. After all, he utilized disclaimer to attract audience compromise to fight militant Islam/Palestine since the first notion is disclaimed by the latter one that also acts as the main goal.

In justifying his disclaimer strategy, it is clear that Netanyahu employed 'Hypothetical Future' (van Leeuwen, 2007), presenting the danger or threat that requires imminent action, terminating militant Islam (Reyes, 2011). Moreover, Netanyahu tried to trace back to history to illustrate how those militants endanger some nations. In this case, he makes use of interdiscursivity. Furthermore, he puts the emotion of fear to enhance the legitimation. Additionally, the use of modal "must" and the first clause shows the rigid necessity to respond to it (Azar. 1999; Swan, 1995). Conversely, the modal auxiliary "cannot" in the following clause demonstrates the huge urgency of granting the best future that is free from any threat. This is somehow defined as 'cognitive manipulation', turning away a particular perspective (those two concessions of responsibility and threat from Palestine) for the sake domination or (de)legitmation (Dijk, 2006b).

Excerpt 3) "There were things there about the Jewish state that I'm sure the Palestinians didn't like. **But with all my reservations, I was willing to move forward on these American ideas**."

In this excerpt, self-legitmation and otherdelegitmation strategy are enacted through *disclaimer apparent empathy* in which the emotional appealing is involved. Netanyahu utilized the word choice "move forward" that describes the progress of a particular effort that has been planned (the American idea of peace settlement that both sides refuse). It signifies the great intention from Israel to attain the peace for his willingness to follow and accept the American idea as the mediator of peace. Though, the rejection remains there from Palestine. Wanting to

disappoint on that action, Netanyahu practiced empathic words "with all my reservation" that means with all arrangements that he already concerns much (Cambridge dictionary). In that sense, Israelis still listen to other voices and minimize personal interest (discourse of politics) to justify his action and mitigate Palestine's response (Dijk, 1997, 2006; Zu & McKenna, 2012).

In relation to legitimation, he used the personal pronoun "I" that implies in-depth willingness of Netanyahu himself to attain the peace (Azar, 1999). Furthermore, it may also represent the voice of ingroup, Israelis willingness since "I" refers to the speaker personally or the collective voice of the group since the fact that Netanyahu works as Prime Minister (Dijk, 1998). In justifying such action, he practiced the emotion of empathy to persuade the audience to believe in his idea. He involved such empathy due to the consideration and realization of common sense that people will not accept the remaining conflict. The conflict solely results on a human rights violation which the UN intends to fight. Therefore, he justifies his political action through emotional appealing that disclaims the previous notion (Reyes, 2011). Importantly, this discourse depicts Palestinian delegitmation afterwards by giving defensive peace discourse, arguing the positive comment of peace agreement (Gavriely-Nuri, 2010).

Excerpt 4) "In 2000 Israel made a sweeping peace offer that met virtually all of the Palestinian demands. Arafat rejected it. The Palestinians then launched a terror attack that claimed a thousand Israeli lives. Prime Minister Olmert afterwards made an even more sweeping offer, in 2008. President Abbas didn't even respond to it. **But Israel did more than just make sweeping offers**."

In response to international suggestion, Israel abandoned the military operation the territorial line that treats as the core of conflict. Israel left it in a sense that Palestine would also begin the negotiation for peace settlement, although it did not happen. The Palestinian leader did not respond to it. Hence, he practiced *disclaimer apparent effort* to de-legitimize the Palestinian's action that makes peace wishful only. It is employed through comparative sentence signified by the use of the word "more". It functions to compare two things to higher or support the preference that one thing is better that another one (Azar, 1996). In this case, Netanyahu compared the effort to attain the peace between two conflicting parties, Israel and Palestine. Thus, such structure within disclaimer strategy presents the positive portrayal toward Israel (ingroup) and downgrade Palestine's political stance internationally due to its negative representation (Dijk, 1998, 2006a, 2006b).

Gavriely-Nuri (2010) mentions that language peace discourse includes in 'oppressive peace discourse', giving the negative comment. He argues that what has been done by the Palestinian leader is an obstacle toward the peace. Palestinians even seek peace unilaterally (state admittance). Under that scenario, the peace will never happen in that it deals with two countries. Additionally, it enhances the justification of Israeli political action (protecting the territory and building the west bank barrier). No matter how Palestine rejects peace negotiations, Israel and its leader always makes a great effort to end the conflict. The disclaimer apparent effort is negated the notion of international forum to see 'peace' since one side is not eager to. Nevertheless, Israel gained its self-legitimation of peace keeper, the actor that is willing to have peace.

In addition to the above strategies, the 'altruism' strategy of discourse legitimation (Reyes, 2011) is also employed within Netanyahu's strategy of disclaimer. Firstly, accepting international suggestion enables him and Israelis to be portrayed positively. Afterwards, he claims that leaving territory is the hope of both citizens. That is, this action is fundamentally beneficial to both countries, the citizens of Palestine and Israel will not leave under fear due to the simultaneous war. The sweeping offer eventually forces Israel's military to move back, to terminate the attack. Hence, Netanyahu attracts directly social phenomenon, the imminent action to response conflict in justifying his 'altruism' strategy (Reyes, 2011).

Excerpt 5) "The settlements have to be -- it's an issue that has to be addressed and resolved in the course of negotiations. **But the core of the conflict has always been and unfortunately remains the refusal of the Palestinians to recognize a Jewish state in any border.**"

In this context, Netanyahu exercised his *disclaimer apparent transfer* strategy, turning the core of conflict from the negotiation process to refusal, within syntactical structure (perfect tense) and word choice (unfortunately). To negate the previous proposition, he used the following phrase in simple present tense: "has always been and unfortunately remains ...". It implies the sustainable (Azar, 1999) refusal from Palestine to live side by side with Israel. Palestinians do not want to acknowledge the presence of the Jewish state since it firstly proposed in peace agreement settlement even though Israel wants to recognize Palestine state. Further, such action always happens until the current day where the negotiation is working (Azar, 1999). Besides, the practice of lexicon of word peace discourse "unfortunately" means that Netanyahu wishes that the refusal had not happened (Cambridge dictionary). As a result,

negative portrayal is enacted to rationalize his argumentation (Dijk 1998, 2006a; Gavriely-Nuri, 2011). That is, Palestine only offers the hope of peace that is never actualized.

Additionally, such disclaimer is enhanced through the 'altruism' strategy to create self-legitimation and at the same time to de-legitimize others (Reyes, 2011). It is practiced by tracing back to some leaders who had been eager to accept peace agreement and pursued the recognition of a Jewish state. He provided some actors in narrating the justification , such as the President of United States of America. Thus, the presence of support from this actor legitimizes his political stance in drawing the negative representation toward Palestine action. Besides that, this political legitimation is boosted by empowering self-image technique in making news discourse (Richardson & Barkho, 2009).

In sum, the conflict as Netanyahu believed is all about the acknowledgement of Palestine as the state and the refusal of Israel as a Jewish state. To attain the peace, both countries should shake hands. Nonetheless, the dispute from Palestine is exercised as the tool of de-legitimation by practicing disclaimer and further by the discourse of legitimation, that is 'altruism'. Needless to say, the conflict will end whenever both countries openly recognize one another. In this case, the presence of Palestine admittance to a Jewish state is prominent for Israelis for two major factors. Firstly, it is as political empowerment and domination over Palestine since the fact that Palestine's is small country. Secondly, it tends to the existence of ideology-based country to which it may boost Israel's domination in international politics.

Richardson & Barkho (2009) argued in their report that political division between Israel and Palestine is not the matter of religion (purely), but 'between Zionist and anti-Zionist'. In response toward conflicting land, they quote the classical belief of Israelis, "a land without people and people without land"; that means Palestine's land was primarily empty before the imposition of Israelis. Though, it contradicts to the fact that Gaza was one of the most populated land in the world (Richardson & Barkho, 2009: 606). Hence, Netanyahu tried to turn that notion by practicing his disclaimer, arguing that the peace may come upon Palestinian recognition of a Jewish state.

Excerpt 6) They applauded our withdrawal as an act of great statesmanship. It was a bold act of peace. **But ladies and gentlemen, we didn't get peace. We got war.** We got Iran, which through its proxy Hamas promptly kicked out the Palestinian Authority. The Palestinian Authority collapsed in a day -- in one day."

In the above excerpt, the practice of *disclaimer apparent denial* employs the emotional legitimation strategy of the US and THEM categorization (Reyes, 2011), that depicts positive and negative representation (Dijk, 1998). The pronoun "they" in the first clause refers to Palestine and its allies as the marginalized group, and "we" in the second clause represents the speaker, Netanyahu, and his allies, including audiences who agree with him, as the positive group. It gives unequal representation that strengthens his domination over the forum. Addressing the word "we" that attracts people to get involved in the topic (Azar, 1999), Netanyahu strived to increase the emotion of those audiences by stating that Israel and all Jewish people did not get any peace as promised (Reyes, 2011); though the ingroup, Israelis, got war. Additionally, Netanyahu employed the rhetorical structure to explicate the discrimination done by Palestine through terror and attack. He utilized the repetition of the Us-group linguistics feature, that is "we" in his disclaimer. Such rhetorical structure affects the audience's empathy, attention, and the unity of emotion for his legitimation in the following action.

Furthermore, he explicates another threat of the presence that Iran is assumed as the actor behind Hamas' victory in ousting the Palestinian authority. For this reason, Israel has to deal with a new problem beyond Palestinian militant Islam because Iran supports Hamas as the leader of the opposition. Such an obstacle burdens both countries in their efforts to attain peace. Hence, the practice of *disclaimer apparent denial* shows the positive representation of Israelis, since they are depicted as a discriminated group. It negates the idea of a promised peace after the withdrawal of military forces from territory in the preceding clause. On the other hand, Palestine is described as the actor which merely wishes for peace.

In extending his legitimation, Netanyahu puts on the emotion of tragedy, being the victim of Palestine's terror. It reflects the 'positive peace discourse' for Israel and the negative one for Palestine (Gavriely-Nury, 2011). Reyes (2011) says that the speaker might attribute the empathy of being a victim as the strategy of self-legitimation (face-keeping). Accordingly, it also creates a negative impression that Palestine is making the conflict sustainably exist. To sum up, such a disclaimer employed in the rhetorical structure of US and THEM categorization justifies Israel's political action.

5. Concluding Remark

The practice of disclaimer, together with micro structure, could proliferate the interest of the speaker such as politician. Netanyahu employs disclaimer to legitimize his political stance and at the same time de-legitimizes his opposition stance. Further, some discourse legitimation strategies ('emotional appealing', 'hypothetical future', 'rationality') are employed for the sake of self-legitimation and other-de-legitimation (Dijk, 1998, 2000, 2006b, Reyes, 2011). Needless to say, this research is open for question and suggestion in a sense that some angles or perspective might be used see the discourse of peace agreement. Thus, the following research in the similar field will be very worthwhile. This paper views such discourse from the way the speaker (Netanyahu) creates the strategy of (de)legitimation within disclaimer to protect the positive face of the US-group, and at the same time downgrades the Them-group.

References:

Amer, M. Mosheer. (2009): "'Telling-it-like-it-is': De-legitimation Strategy of the Second Palestinians Intifada in Thomas Friedman's Discourse." Discourse and Society 20 (1): 5-31.

Azar, Betty Schrampfer (1999): *Understanding and Using English Grammar Third Edition*. New York: Pearson Education.

Brown, Gillian and Yule, George. (1989): *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cambridge (Digital) Learner's Dictionary 2nd Edition: 2006a. Cambridge University Press.

De Olivera, Sandi.M. (2011): "Promoting Brazil at the UN: Dilma Rousseff's Legitimation Strategy of Authority and Morality." Language Discourse and Society 1 (1): 140-169.

Fairclough, N. (1992): *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Fairclough, N. and Wodak, R. (1997): Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction, in Teun. A. van Dijk (Ed.). *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage Publications.

Gavriely, Dalia-Nuri. (2010): "The Idiosyncratic Language of Israeli 'Peace': A Cultural Approach to Critical Discourse Analysis (CCDA)". Discourse and Society 21(5): 565-585.

Gramsci, A. (1971): *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers.

Joseph, John, E. (2006): *Language and Politics*. Edinburg University Press.

Kamalu, Ikenna. (2011): "A Critical Discourse Analysis of Goodluck Jonathan's Declaration of Interest in the PDP Presidential Primaries". Language, Discourse, and Society 1 (1): 32-54.

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. Pearson Education Limited.

Mills, Sara. (1997). *Discourse*. London and New York: Routledge.

Official website of Israel www.haaretz.com. The Transcript of Benjamin Netanyahu's speech. Retrieved October 10, 2011

Rahimi, Ali. (2006): *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Euphemization and Derogation in The* Late Pop. Linguistics Journal. 1 (2): 29-87. Retrieved October 15, 2011, from http://www.linguistics-journal.com

Reyes, Antonio. (2011): "Strategies of Legitimation in Political Discourse: From Words to Actions". Discourse and Society 22(6): 781-807.

Richardson, John E. & Barkho, Leo. (2009): "Reporting Israel/Palestine". Journalism Studies Journal. 10 (5): 594-622.

Swan, Michael. (1995): *Practical English Usage Second Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van Dijk, T. A. (1991): *Racism and the Press*. London New York: Routledge.

van Dijk, T. A. (1993a): "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis", in Teun A. van Dijk (Eds), Special Issue of Discourse and Society 4 (2): 249-283. Retrieved January 10th, 2012, from http://www.discourse.org

van Dijk, T.A. (1993b): *Elite Discourse and Racism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications

van Dijk, T.A. (1993c): Discourse and Cognition in Society, in D. Crowley & D. Mitchell, *Communication Theory Today* (pp. 107-126). Retrieved February 7th, 2012, from http://www.discourse.org

van Dijk, T. A. (1993d): Critical Discourse Analysis, In Teun A. van Dijk (Eds). Special Issue of *Discourse and Society* 4 (2): 352-371. Retrieved October 13, 2011, from http://www.discourse.org

van Dijk, Teun A. (1995): Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis. In C. Schäffner & A. Wenden (Eds). *Language and Peace (pp. 17-33)*. Aldershot: DarmouthPublishing. Retrieved October 13, 2011 from http://www.discourse.org

van Dijk, T.A. (1997a): "What is Political Discourse Analysis". Keynote address. Congress Political Linguistics. Antwerp, 7-9 -December 1995, in Jan Blommaert & Chris Bulcaen (Eds.), Political linguistics. Amsterdam: Benjamins:11-52

van Dijk, T. A. (1997b): Context Models in Text Processing, in M. Stamenow (Eds). Language

van Dijk, T. A. (1998): *Ideology A multidisciplinary Approach.* London: Sage Publication.

van Dijk, T. A. (2000): *Ideology and Discourse A Multidisciplinary Approach.* Internet Course for the Oberta de Catalunya (UOC). Retrieved October 13, 2011 from http://www.discourse.org

van Dijk, T. A. (2001): Multidisciplinary CDA: A Plea for Diversity, in R. Wodak & M. Meyer (ed), Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. London: Sage Publications. Retrieved December 15th, 2011, from http://www.discourse.org

van Dijk, T. A. (2002): Political Discourse and Political Cognition, in Paul A. Chilton & Christina Schäffner (Eds) Politics as Text and Talk. Analytical Approach to Political Discourse. Amsterdam: Benjamins: 204-236 Retrieved October 13, 2011, from http://www.discourse.org

van Dijk T. A. (2006a): *Politics, Ideology and Discourse*. Retrieved January 10th, 2012, from http://www.discourse.org

van Dijk, Teun A. (2006b): "Discourse and Manipulation." *Discourse and Society 17 (2) 359-*383. Retrieved July 10th, 2012, from http://www.discourse.org

van Dijk, T.A. (2007): "Macro Contexts". Lecture First International Conference on Discourse and Intercultural Relations, University of Murcia, September 2006a, in U. Dagmar

Scheu Lottgen & José Saura Sánchez (Eds.), Discourse and International Relations. Bern: Lang, 2007: 3-26. Retrieved January 17th, 2012, from http://www.discourses.org

 van Dijk. (2012a, 30th, April): *Cognition*. Malang-Barcelona : Personal communication

van Dijk. (2012b, 11th, May): *Disclaimer*. Malang-Barcelona : Personal communication

van Dijk. (2012c, 15th, May). *Disclaimer and Non Disclaimer Data*. Malang-Barcelona : Personal communication

van Leeuwen, T. (2007). Legitimation in Discourse and Communication. *Discourse and Communication 1(1): 91-112. Retrieved from dcm.sagepub.com Oktober, 13th 2012.*

WU, Jianguo. (2011). Understanding Interdiscursivity: A Pragmatic Model. *Journal of Cambridge Studies*

Yule, George. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Zu, Yunxia, & McKenna, Bernard. (2012). Legitimating a Chinese Takeover of an Australian Iconic Firm: Revisiting Model of Media Discourse of Legitimacy. Discourse and

Society 22(5): 525-552. Retrieved from dcm.sagepub.com Oktober, 18th 2012

The authors:

Irham received his Bachelor of Arts degree in Linguistics from Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University, Malang, Indonesia in 2012. He is the former President of the Advanced Debate Community at the university. He has qualified as a Finalist, a Semi-finalist, a Quarter-finalist and an Octo-finalist for several national debate competitions. He can be contacted at: [irham_aladist@ymail.com]

Ribut Wahyudi gained an M.Ed degree in TESOL from The University of Sydney, Australia in 2010. He has taught courses such as one titled, "Introduction to Linguistics, Introduction to Applied Linguistics, and Syntax" and other courses. He is interested in DA, CDA, Intercultural Languages Education, Curriculum and Pedagogy. His articles have appeared in *LiNGUA 2011, Language, Discourse and Society 2012, Theory and Practice in Language Studies 2012, and The State University of Malang Press 2012*. He has actively presented his papers both at national and international Seminars.