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ABSTRACT


This study aims to analyse the hedges usage as mitigating word in politeness strategy within the language in online newspaper of New York Times and Al Jazeera regarding the topic of the movement of U.S Embassy in Israel and the issue of Jerusalem as the capital city of Israel published on December 2017. This study applied a synthesized classification by several linguists on hedging devices, Vold’s test consisting of substitution, reformulation and syntactic test to test linguistic expressions which act as hedges. Furthermore, it is analysed how the word, phrases or clauses takes part in the strategies of politeness.

The result of this study indicates that the hedges are determined by the lexical categories, phrases or clauses depending on the surrounding words, and what is being delivered within the sentence. Most of the hedges are determined by the use of lexical categories which weakens the author commitment and marks the epistemic sense related to the degree of possibility. The most common lexical category used as hedges is modal auxiliary verbs. Moreover, this study presents that Vold’s test helps to determine which lexical categories that takes role as hedges; however it also shows that this test is not applicable to determine some phrases and clauses taking role as hedges. The situational and linguistic contexts of the sentence are considered to be a helpful guide to determine the phrases or clauses which act as the hedges. Furthermore, this study found that the use of hedges does correlate with the politeness strategies that mitigate the face threat towards the participant conveyed in the sentence.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

Language has been essential need in mass media to deliver its content and construct perception in the reader understanding. Various words, phrases and clauses are used to aid the writer to deliver a proposition and how he takes a position towards the proposed matter. As the ethics also has standard of how to presenting idea without being impolite or inappropriate, writers tend to use a strategy that allow them to convey undesirable matters in polite way. Writers commonly use this strategy to prevent conflict or manage appropriate situation (Hamuddin & Noor, 2015, p. 52). As mass media reports some events that might be sensitive issues, writers would likely use strategy such as hedges that represent uncertainty of the propose matters. The writers would likely to put certain hedges in order to avoid direct and full commitment to the truth of propositions particularly on intense issues (Murphy, 2010, p. 67). Particularly in newspaper, the writers tend to avoid tendentious stance and conflict through their text in order to maintain a polite, objective and proper atmosphere within the proposition presented in their writings. In order to take this action, writers might use what is called hedges. When speakers or writers do not hedge properly, they might be labeled as impolite, offensive or inappropriate (Fraser, 2010, p. 15).

Hedges is an open category in which words, phrases and clause can act as hedging device when it mitigates the responsibility and certainty of the proposition, as there is not yet restriction of the categorization of hedges, however
several linguists in Laurinaitytė (2011) proposed the classification of hedges based on certain lexical categories and several syntactic forms. In short, words or phrases are included as hedges when they are applied in certain syntactic form in the sentence, the details of the syntactic form when the words or phrases act as hedges are explained on the second chapter. Within the study of politeness, hedges is included as one of negative politeness strategy and it is also found that using hedges to maintain politeness in written communication has been gradually conducted, particularly the usage of hedges in the research articles by several linguists (Hamuddin & Noor, 2015, p. 52). Several papers focused on the concept of politeness strategies in written discourse particularly on the use of hedges in research articles, business letters, scientific texts, and etc. (Hamuddin & Noor, 2015, p. 52). This research leads other to examine further analysis regarding the use of politeness in written discourse, particularly in newspaper. As it is found that the use of hedges in politeness strategy probably is applied in newspaper, the writer aims to analyze this matter.

This research intends to analyze qualitatively the use of hedges in two different newspapers specifically the politeness strategy that use hedges as its mitigating word (Myers, 1989). Flores-ferrán and Lovejoy (2015, p. 69) stated that mitigation is “extra propositional; it does not add any new information but instead modifies what has been said” which functions to minimize what has been said by softening, reducing illocutionary force repairing, or masking the real intention of the speaker in order to maintain equilibrium in the interaction allowing for a sociable exchange.
It is essential to comprehend hedges usage and determine which words, phrases or clauses function as hedge in politeness strategy in the newspaper to allow readers grasp what the writers try to convey beyond the text which covering the same topics by using certain types of hedges. As this study analyses textual corpus, newspaper, this study is included as a discourse analysis with pragmatic approach.

B. Focus of the Study

This study focuses on the use of hedges in politeness strategy on sixteen online articles taken from New York Times and Al Jazeera on December 2017 which mainly concerns on U.S President, Donald Trump’s interference in Israeli-Palestinian conflict by declaring Jerusalem as the capital city of Israel. In this thesis, it would be analyzed how and what hedges types act as mitigating word in politeness strategy in sixteen articles which were taken from New York Times and Al Jazeera published on December 2017.

C. Research Questions

As it has been explained in the previous section, the discussion will analyze the hedges functions. Therefore, the research questions in this study are:

1. How do hedges function as mitigating word in politeness strategy?
2. What are the hedges types found in the data?

D. Significance of the Study

As a theoretical merit, it is aspired that the thesis will provide a contribution in the field of pragmatics particularly focusing on the use of hedges as one of politeness strategy and the use of hedges without resulting on more polite
sentences. Practically, the thesis is aimed to explain how hedges are used in media discourse particularly newspaper in order to present tentative commitment and politeness.

E. Research Methodology

1. The Objective of the Research
   a. To understand how the hedges are used as mitigating word in politeness strategy
   b. To identify the hedges types used in the data

2. The Method of the Research
   As this study analyses textual corpus, newspaper, this study is included as a discourse analysis with pragmatic approach. This research is included as descriptive research using the qualitative method which entails collecting primarily textual data and examining it using interpretive analysis (Heigham & Croker, 2009, p. 5). Hedges will be analyzed based on the synthesized hedges classification by several linguists and Vold’s testing system to identify the linguistics features which function as a hedge in politeness strategy and Brown and Levinson’s politeness concept will be used to identify the politeness strategy as well the face-threatening act in the data. The data of this research were taken from textual source, sixteen online articles published by New York Times and Al Jazeera.

3. The Technique of Data Collecting and Data Analysis
   Documentary technique is used to analyze the data in this research that are related to written sources. The idea of documentary sources was
mainly focusing on textual sources however the technologies nowadays does not limit other sources to be includes as documentary source such as radio, film and etc (Sapsford & Jupp, 2006, p. 139).

A. Data collection process consists of certain steps as follows

1. Choosing ten related articles with the same topic
2. Reading ten related articles
3. Marking the hedges in ten related articles
4. Writing and classifying the data on the data card

B. The collected data will be analyzed with several steps as follows

1. Classifying the hedges based on the synthesized classification of hedges.
2. Testing the linguistics expression which may acts as hedges using Vold’s testing system.
3. Analyzing how hedges are used as politeness strategy and mitigating devices.
4. Concluding the entire data analysis.

4. The Instrument of the Research

Data card is used to help the writer in collecting, comparing, classifying, and analyzing the data taken from English online articles published by New York Times and Al Jazeera. Moreover, the related theories of hedges, politeness and Vold test are applied to analyze the data. As the qualitative method is employed in this study therefore it is
suggested to use his own methodologist (Taylor, Bogdan & DeVault, 2015, p 13).

5. The Unit of data analysis

The unit of data analysis of this study is hedges in politeness strategy of sixteen English articles in New York Times and Al Jazeera, eight online articles were taken from New York Times and the other eight were taken from Al Jazeera published on December 2017 focusing on U.S President, Donald Trump’s interference in Israeli-Palestinian conflict by declaring Jerusalem as the capital city of Israel. New York Times and Al Jazeera are chosen due to the possible different stance of both media towards the issue.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter will focus on the structure of knowledge used to analyse the scope of hedges in pragmatics field and how hedges plays role in politeness strategy. Hedges will be determined through the analysis of its pragmatics context by synthesized concept of hedges in written discourse and identifying its usage as mitigating word in politeness strategy and how it is used to mitigate the face threatening act that might be performed.

A. Previous Research

There have been several researches concerning the use of hedges in politeness strategy. The first was A Closer Look on Politeness Strategies in Malaysian Economic Journal by Budianto Hamuddin and Faridah Noor Mohd Noor in 2015. It is focused on the use of tactics in politeness strategies in economic journals. The research combined both qualitative and quantitative method to investigate the strategies used in its corpus, economic journals, and to measure the frequency of the strategies used in the economic journals. The research put certain comparable articles of Malaysian Journal of Economic Studies with the same criteria such as published in the year of 2004 to 2009 and to be very least consisting of 4500 words each journal. The study as stated by Hamuddin and Noor (2015, p. 52) is aimed “to identify the politeness strategies and to analyze the most used tactics used to maintain friendliness…” The result shows that most used tactics in positive politeness strategy is informing readers about the research that occur 48 times out of 195 tactics used or 24.61%, showing humility is the least preferred
tactics which only occur 7 times or 3.58%. Tactics used in negative politeness strategies are hedging as the mostly used, 121 times out of 214 of tactics in negative politeness strategies or 56.54% while the least tactics used in negative politeness is by using comparison, 7 times or 3.27%. Direct criticism is mostly used to mark bald-on-record tactics, 27 times out of 48 or 56.25% while rhetorical question is mostly used to mark off-record tactics, 16 times out of 27 or 59.3%.

The researchers also analyze most used tactics qualitatively by explaining what functions they take on each politeness strategy and the effect of its usage for both journal writers and the readers. The researchers conclude that the journal writers are required to build or maintain proper atmosphere in the text in order “to mitigate the impact of imposition in their action…” so that the objectivity and formality of scientific language is fulfilled by using politeness strategy (Hamuddin & Noor, 2015, p. 62). Furthermore, it is hoped that the study takes role on developing better understanding that economist use the strategy to present the polite manner in delivering the texts and to help readers to understand the language strategies in the academic papers.

Another research related to politeness strategy and hedges is Politeness and the communication of uncertainty by Thomas Holtgraves and Audrey Perdew in 2016. The research focused on the impact of speaker’s linguistics choices in face management and how the receivers interpret them. The experiments conducted by the researchers were divided into two experiments; the first experiment was aimed to examine whether event severity would affect the terms used by the speakers and whether the chosen terms would affect the estimation of even likelihood by
the receiver (Holtgraves & Perdew, 2016, p. 3). The participants of the research were students of introductory psychology of Midwestern University, they are divided into two groups for each experiment. At the first experiment, participants were presented with two practice scenario and one of six scenario booklet, they are assigned to imagine themselves as the scenario said and convey the news to the other group who need to provide an estimate of the probability conveyed by the first group in the range 0-100. As a result, when the participant is conveying severe event with 80% of probability, they would choose expression with greater certainty. The second experiment was identical to the first one, however the second experiment focused on conveying opinion regarding something negative and face-threatening. The result shows that on the second experiments, when the scenario was face-threatening, the speaker would be more indirect rather than non-face-threatening one, this indirectness was marked by using politeness hedge or conveying meaning indirectly by phrasing a question which occur more frequent (19.6%) than politeness hedge (2.2%) in face-threatening situation. The researchers concludes that the higher concern of face management by lower power speaker results in more indirectness and more uncertain probability terms while speaker with higher power will tend to use less for both and when a threat is identified as a potential motive the participants would alter uncertainty expression.

The other related research is *Hedging to save face: a linguistics analysis od written comments on in-training evaluation report* by Saphira Ginsburg, Cees van der Vleuten, Kevin W. Eva and Lorelei Lingard. The research focused on the use of hedging in the in-training evaluation reports in order to save face both the
residents and the assessors. It is started by coding the hedging devices used in both positive politeness and negative politeness in two groups of resident evaluation reports, low rated and high rated group. In the strategy to address positive face, it is found two strategies that are exaggerating interest, in-group identity markers and give gifts or compliments while in addressing negative face by using conventional indirectness. Hedges found in the data occur more frequent in low-performing students, 94%, while in high-performing student it is only found 71%. Each hedges subset, shield and approximators, served higher occurrence in low performing students. It is concluded that the use of the hedges help the writers to save not only the resident face but also their own face, furthermore it helps to build and maintain relationship between the residents and the assessors and obscure the intended message conveyed in the comment without being impolite or misunderstood.

B. Discourse Analysis

Jorgensen and Phillips (2002, p. 3) that discourse is formed by several interdisciplinary approach that can be took to explore many different social domains in various type of studies. They define the terms discourse itself as “a particular way of talking about and understanding the world (or an aspect of the world)” (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002, p.3). Garner (2007, p. 41) conveyed that in order to understand language as way to communicate which expressed beliefs, values, and assumption of speaker’s individual reality and social, taking discourse concept into consideration is necessary. It is also emphasized by Jorgensen and Phillip (2002, p. 3) that many discourse analysis work across disciplinary border
so that many theoretical points and methodological tools are not possible to use one specific approach exclusively.

Discourse shares features with pragmatics as both discourse analysis and pragmatics concerns on the use of language as Cook in Cutting (2008, p. 2) stated that discourse analysis and pragmatics look at spoken and written discourse on how language become meaningful and unified their users. To be specific, both pragmatics and discourse analysis focuses on the function of the language use. Cutting (2008, p. 2-3) added that the pragmatics and discourse analysis differs in how language beyond the sentence level is organized, the structure of the text while pragmatics provide the importance of social principles.

Cutting also explained that one of the shared aspects between discourse analysis study and pragmatics is context (2008, p.2). Context represent two sides of world knowledge: one that is in our mind (prior context) and the other (actual situational context) that is out the in the world (Kecskes, 2014, p. 12). The present studies of pragmatic theories also believe that meaning is constructed both socially and context dependent. Widdowson viewed context as the aspects of certain circumstances of actual language use taken as relevant to meaning and the achievement of pragmatic meaning is a matter of matching up the linguistic elements of the code with the schematic elements of the context (Widdowson, 2000, p. 126). Song (2010, p. 876) classified context into three dimensions that are linguistic context, situational context, and cultural context. Linguistic context is related to the context within the discourse, the connection between words, phrases, sentences and even paragraph. It is possible to be analyzed through the
three aspects; deictic, co-text and collocation. Situational context, or context of situation, refers to the environment, time and place, etc. in which the discourse occurs, and also the relationship between the participants, the key concept of situational context are field that refers to the ongoing activity, tenor referring to the social relationship in the discourse and mode as the medium or the channel whether direct or indirect contact and written or spoken. (Song, 2010, p. 877).

Cultural context focuses on how language cannot avoid being influenced by all these factors like social role, social status, sex and age, etc.

C. Politeness

Politeness concept have been discussed throughout the years in sociolinguistics and pragmatics field, it happens as the speaker try to make utterance more polite by flouting the Maxims in Cooperative Principle suggested by Paul Grice (Kádár, 2017). Theory of politeness by Brown and Levinson (1978) as stated by Hamuddin and Noor (2015, p. 54) was first used as model for politeness strategies in which they conveyed that particular act might threaten someone’s face, referred as face threatening strategy (FTA) while as Ariel mentioned (2010, p. 213) “… how to express ourselves in view of our interlocutors’ needs” which means negative and positive face of the interlocutors need to be considered. Kádár (2017) stated that Brown and Levinson’s concept is known as ‘first wave’ of politeness research however it faces many criticisms for its ability to be applied in various culture. The following concepts that are suggested are called ‘second wave’ and ‘third wave’ have not served a complete theoretical concept which covers what has been suggested by ‘first wave’ concept,
as Ginsburg et al. (2015) stated that it persists influential despite the recent suggested modification.

Brown and Levinson’s concept mainly points on face strategies that are the extension of Leech’s politeness concept (Teng, 2015, p.1691). Leech introduced the politeness concept through presenting the maxims in politeness principle as follows:

a. Tact-maxim: Minimize the cost to other; maximize the benefit to other.
b. Generosity maxim: Minimize benefit to self, maximize cost to self.
c. Approbation maxim: Minimize dispraise of other, maximize praise of other.
d. Modesty maxim: Minimize praise of self, maximize dispraise of self.
e. Agreement maxim: Minimize disagreement between self and other; maximize agreement between self and other.
f. Sympathy maxim: Minimize antipathy between self and other; maximize sympathy between self and other

Jingwei (2013, p. 157)

Thomas in Teng (2015, P. 1691) synthesized Leech’s maxims into a) minimizing the expression of impolite beliefs and b) maximizing the expression of polite beliefs. Some distinction in the concepts of politeness also arises as mentioned in Leech (2014, p. 13-18), one of them is seeing politeness as pragmalinguistic or sociopragmatics phenomenon.
1. **Face threatening act**

   As mentioned before Brown and Levinson’s concept concerning of politeness is related to what is called face, negative and positive one. Negative face are needs that not to be imposed upon while positive face revolves around the wish to be approved of (Ariel, 2010, p. 213). Brown and Levinson (1978, p. 26) defined face threatening acts as the acts which naturally damage the addressee or speaker’s face by opposing to the other’s desire. The model of face in FTAs consists of two aspects of face, positive and negative, that is distinguished from the speaker and the addressee’s face. As negative face threatening acts happened, it results on the submission of will to the other and the freedom of choice and action is limited which might cause the damage to the hearer through the form of orders, requests, suggestion, advice and threats, while causing the damage to the speaker when he is inferior to the hearer through the act of complementing, thanking and etc.

   Positive face threatening acts happens as the other does not consider the other’s needs or feeling. It might damage the addressee’s face through the speaker’s criticism, complaint, accusation, contradiction or disagreements. Meanwhile, as the speaker apologises, makes confession, regrets the act, it might damage the speaker’s face (Redmond, 2015).

2. **Politeness strategy**

   Hamuddin and Noor (2015, p. 56-58) stated that a speaker might adopt certain strategies in order to reduce the damage of the speaker or or addressee’s face
using what is called politeness strategy in order to avoid uncomfortable feeling and save the hearer’s face some strategies are proposed

i. Bald on record

It is used when the damage to the addressee’s face is not particularly modest so that the speaker might do the act baldly by being straightforward, clear and unambiguous. This strategy happened as in offering, requesting or suggesting (Brown and Levinson, 1978, p. 69).

ii. Off record

This strategy includes indirect request by using metaphor, rhetorical question, connotations and tautologies. Some utterances would imply the addressee to take an action without being directly asked (Brown and Levinson, 1978, p. 69). As noted in Adel, Davoudi and Ramezanzadeh (2016, p. 51), the off record strategy mainly flouting some maxims of cooperative principles since the indirectness tend to force use to give less or more information than needed and being ambiguous and vague.

iii. Positive politeness strategy

Mainly concern on reducing a threat to the addressee’s positive face and maintain the comfort of the addressee. This strategy usually takes action to prevent opposition by being optimistic, making promises, listening and fulfilling the addressee’s need. Brown and Levinson, 1978, p. 70). As stated in Adel, Davoudi and Ramezanzadeh (2016, p. 50) fifteen strategies conveyed by Brown and Levinson are noticing and attending to the hearer, exaggerating
by giving different intonation, tone and other prosodic features or exaggerating by using intensifying modifiers, intensifying interest to hearer, using in-group identity markers, seeking agreement by the addressee’s statements through using specific statements or repetition, avoiding disagreement by using hedge or by making white lies, showing common ground, joking, showing the speaker’s concern for the hearer’s wants, offering and promising, being optimistic, including both the speaker and the hearer in the activity, telling or asking the reason, assuming reciprocity, giving gift to the hearer in the form of sympathy, understanding and cooperation in the conversation

iv. Negative politeness strategy

Negative politeness strategies refer to the avoidance of imposition on the hearer and can be considered as is the desire to remain autonomous using distancing styles like using modal verbs or hesitation, apologizing for imposition, asking questions or asking for permission to ask a question. Koike in Adel Davoudi and Ramezanzadeh (2016, p. 50) explained negative politeness as “consideration of the listener’s wish to be unimpeded in taking action and having attention”. There are strategies that can be used according to Brown and Levinson to show negative politeness including the use of questions and hedges (Adel, Davoudi and Ramezanzadeh, 2016, p. 50). The strategies of negative politeness that are commonly used are being conventionally indirect, not assuming willingness to comply by using question and hedges, being pessimistic about willingness and ability to comply,
minimizing the imposition, giving deference, apologizing, impersonalizing, stating the FTA as an instance of general rule, nominalizing to distance actors and add formality, and going on record as incurring a debt or as not indebting hearer/reader.

D. Hedges

The term *hedge* was introduced by Lakoff in 1972 (Crompton, 1997, p. 271) which functions to make things more or less fuzzy however some confusions arise in defining hedges and hedging, according to Schroder and Zimmer in Florea (2017, p. 183) a hedge can be one or more lexico-syntactical category or a strategy to modify a proposition and ‘hedging’ is used to refer to the textual strategy of using linguistic features as hedges in certain context for specific communicative purpose. While as a rhetorical strategy (Hyland, 1998, p. 1) states that hedging determines speaker’s commitment of truth towards a proposition he delivered. Looking at its literal meaning as stated in a literature (Crompton, 1997, p. 272), hedge means “to go aside from the straightway; to shift, shuffle, dodge; to trim; to avoid committing oneself irrevocably; to leave open a way of retreat or escape. In Hyland (1998, p. 1), he explains that hedge in the literature he presented was not a strategy to confuse the reader but mainly a convention of academic style. Prince et.al in Crompton (1997, p. 273) mentions *approximator* and *shield* in empirical study of spoken medical discourse, *approximators* functions as fuzzines in the “propositional content proper” and *shield* as fuzziness between the propositions and the speaker.
Surface structure of hedges can be identified from its lexical categories, however it does not determine either certain lexical categories act as hedging or not. Therefore the function of certain words or phrase might be included as hedges when it plays role as hedging. Several linguists in (Laurinaitytė, 2011), concludes that words and phrases are included as hedges when they are put in certain syntactic form, for instance, *to suggest* would be hedge when it followed by a clause instead of followed by noun or noun phrase. The example below (a) shows the role of *to suggest* as hedge while (b) does not take function as hedge.

a. Whilst the beginnings of international flows of human capital can be traced to the decades of the sixties and the seventies, recent data *suggests* that emigration of skilled people from developing countries continues unabated. (Hamoodin and Noor, 2015, p. 58)

b. The researchers *suggest* new approach to the problem.

1. **Hedges as hedging strategies in pragmatics perspective**

Several analysts have marked various scopes of hedges taking role as rhetorical strategies as distinguished by the evolution of its concept conveyed by some experts

a. **Propositional hedging**

This strategy affects the truth value of the proposition. Originally introduced by Lakoff, who was only concerns of the hedges in declarative sentence that are predicate adjective or nominal which also possibly not act as hedging. However, Fraser (2010, p. 17) stated that Lakoff did realize that the interpretation of hedges is dependent on context and the effect of hedging...
is pragmatic phenomenon instead of semantics. The propositional hedging which was conveyed by Lakoff below needs the knowledge of the hearer.

That is **technically** a book case.

A penguin is **sort of** bird.

Lakoff’s concept of hedges was limited in propositional hedging which affect the truth value of the proposition he offered. However, this concept leads to further analysis of hedges by several analysts.

b. **Hedged performative**

Some performative verbs might be hedged when it is preceded by certain modals. This type of hedges would reduce the act of illocutionary force performed by the performative verb and produce less strong sentence of utterance. Hedged performative or speech act hedging is commonly used to reduce the illocutionary force, this type of hedges usage was fully developed by Brown and Levinson. Some examples of hedged performative as follows.

The bold words mark a hedge which turn the illocutionary force less than if the modal which functions as hedges were not present.

- I **must** insist that you close the door.
- I **should** apologize for making this mess.

c. **Prince et al.’s classification of hedges**

**Approximators and shields**, conveyed by Prince *et al.* in Fraser (2010, p.19) and Jingwei (2013, p. 155), **approximators** can change the true value of discourse, or make a certain degree of amendments based on the given facts, or provide certain range of variation to the original discourse.
consisting of adaptors which relate to class membership (Fraser, 2010, p. 19) and reveal the degree of truth of the original proposition (Jingwei, 2013, p. 156) and rounders which convey a range. Shield implicated the writer’s uncertainty towards the propositional content (Fraser, 2010, p. 19). It consists of plausibility shield that are speakers’ direct speculation of a certain subject or attitudes they hold and consist of expressions related to doubt (Fraser, 2010, p. 19; Jingwei, 2013, p. 156) and attribution shield that are expression which put the responsibility of the proposition to someone other than the speaker. To be specific, the classification of hedges according to E. F. Prince, J. Frader & C. Bosk in Jingwei (2013, p. 156) is describe in the following diagram.

![Diagram 2.1 The Organization of Hedges by Prince, Fraser and Bosk](image)

Fraser conveyed some relation of hedging to other discourse effect such as vagueness, evasion, equivocation and politeness (2010, p. 25-29). In the case of
politeness, hedges are commonly used to weaken the negative face, it was mentioned before as hedged performatice. Brown and Levinson in Fraser (2010, p. 29) mentioned that hedges are use to hedge (i) the illocutionary force, (ii) the felicity condition on the speech act and (iii) the four of Gricean Maxims.

d. Ken Hyland’s concept of hedges and hedging

As most of the expertise analyze hedges trough the range of conversation, Hyland proposes the uses of hedges as hedging strategies in written discourse mainly in research articles. He stated in Hyland (1995, p. 34-35) that hedges would allow the writers to shape better precision of the delivered proposition, they are also used to protect writers position if there might be wrong proposition conveyed by the writers and hedges also build the relationship between the writer and the reader to engage in order to grasp the intended meaning delivered by the writers.

Having been mentioned in the previous concepts that what is called hedges might not serve function of hedge or they do not give an act of hedging. As stated in Hyland (1995) some surface forms of hedges can be identified based on lexical categories; however it does not guarantee that it would be functioning as a hedge in the sentence. Hyland (1996, p. 256) presents two wide scope of hedges, first, content-motivated functioning to mitigate the relationship between what is written about one thing and what it thought to be like, it consist of accuracy-based hedges which helps the writer to express certain degree of precision and caution towards the delivered propositions and writer-based hedges that indicates the writer’s
desire to avoid the unwelcome response or being proved wrong concerning the propositions he delivers. Second, reader-motivated hedges functions to engage the relation with readers through addressing them or use a pronoun to present the writer’s appearance in the text so that the engagement would be achieved, although the scope of use is different depending what follows after the hedges, both shares some similar elements.

1. Epistemic lexical verb

Crompton’s classification (Yagiz and Demir, 2014, p. 262) name this as _epistemic lexical verbs_, consists of words that represent an evaluation, assumption or doubt. Hyland (1998, p. 119) explained that epistemic verbs shows transparent means to signal subjectivity of the epistemic source and put in use to do a hedging either in the commitment or assertiveness. It consist of verbs such as _to seem, to appear, to believe, to indicate, to assume, to suggest, to speculate_... However, he also divides its types as _epistemic judgement verb_ and _epistemic evidential verb_. Epistemic judgement verbs generally are recognized by conventional “performative verbs” as stated by Perkins (1983) and Brown (1992) in Hyland (1998, p. 120-121) which consist such as _to suggest, to speculate, to propose, and_ etc. meanwhile epistemic evidential verbs are mostly occurred in a phrase which consist of the epistemic evidential verb and particularly to refer an evidence of the proposition. For instance, _this idea seems..., as the prime minister have suggested...,_ these are used to present evidences for the propositions someone intends to convey.
2. Modal auxiliaries

Crompton’s classification (Yagiz and Demir, 2014, p. 262) name this as *epistemic modality verbs* functioning as indirect way of the writer to convey their intended propositions and to avoid face threatening act, while Hyland (1998, p. 105) stated, which needs to be underlined, that the use of modal auxiliaries as a hedge takes its functional meaning instead of its primary meaning. Lyons (1997) and Perkins (1983) in Hyland (1998, p. 105) also mentioned that the meaning of modality as a hedge relies on the utterance which contains them. Modal auxiliaries consists of *may, will, would, should, could, need to, ought, might…* The use of modal auxiliaries as a hedge, for instance *the government should have noticed the condition*, the *should* showing the tentative assumption which is the epistemic function meaning, while in *the government should take an action*, showing a weak obligation that is the primary meaning of *should*.

3. Epistemic adjective

Boncea (2013, p. 10) stated that modal adjective functions as device to reduce the strength of the noun such as *likely, possible, probable*. However, Hyland (1998, p. 133) added that the epistemic meaning of an adjective would attribute to an interpretation if only the result is “imaginable rather than likely”.

4. Epistemic nouns

Boncea (2013, p. 10) conveys that modal nouns are used to render certainty, it consist of words such as *tendency, possibility, assumption*
5. Epistemic adverb

Hyland (1998, p. 135-136) explained that adverbial forms function to reduce the force caused by the verb acting as downtoners and he also stated that it might act as disjunct that conveys comment about the truth-value of the proposition. He also added that when the epistemic adverb is put in initial, it would mark what follows as hypothetical and subjective. It consist of slightly, presumably, almost, usually, relatively, probably, practically...

6. Strategic discourse-based hedges

This type of hedges presents phrases or clause conveying the limited knowledge of the writer or reference of the evident, probably, without using epistemic evidential verb. In order to convey this condition, some would use comment on the existing knowledge, stating the knowledge limitation, refer to another source, using conditional sentence, or comment on the doubt regarding the truth guarantee of the precision, in Hyland (1998, p. 271-274) these concern on scientific papers, however, it is also found in other forms of texts.

E. Word Mitigation

Fraser underlined that mitigation is not a certain type of speech act but the modification or reduction of particular unwanted impact result from the speech act on the addressee (1980, p. 341). Holmes (1984, p. 346) defined mitigation as strategy used to anticipate negative effect of speech act. Fraser in his paper (1980) emphasized that mitigation is not the same with politeness or hedging, however
mitigation entails a politeness and it only occurs when the speaker is being polite. Caffi (1999, p. 882) widen the notion of mitigation in functional perspective as a way to “smooth interactional management by reduce the risk of self-contradiction, refusal, losing face, conflict and etc.”. Hernández-Flores in (Flores-ferrán and Lovjoy, 2015, p. 69) also posits that mitigation can provide “a way of reaching a friendly and pleasant interaction”, bringing the relationship between speakers into line “with the cultural rules for social contact in the particular group”.

Flores-ferrán and Lovejoy (2015, p. 69) stated that mitigation is “extra propositional; it does not add any new information but instead modifies what has been said” which functions to minimize what has been said by softening, reducing illocutionary force repairing, or masking the real intention of the speaker in order to maintain equilibrium in the interaction allowing for a sociable exchange.

1. **Mitigating mechanism by Caffi**

Mitigating mechanism as Caffi offered (1999, p. 883) work within the proposition, illocution and the utterance resource. Caffi’s concept on mitigation mainly made use of what has been introduce as hedges, however the term she delivered as the mitigating devices was known as bushes, hedges, and shield. In bushes, it focused on the mitigating devices on the propositional content. As an example she provided is the utterance produced by a doctor to his patient

*Le do uno sciroppino de prendere*

I’ll **give** you a cough syrup

(Caffi, 1999, p. 881)
As the speaker use to give rather than to prescribe has been a mitigated lexical choice to convey what he is going to do in order to downgrade the possible worries that might be faced by the addressee.

Hedges focused on mitigating the illocutionary force or the speaker’s epistemic commitments to the propositional content. Probability terms are often used to mark the mitigation in illocutionary force.

*Probabilmente è una conseguenza di un problema intestinale: che è cominciato con l’influenza*

It is **probably** the consequence of an intestinal problem: that began with the flu.

The use of probability here has downgrade the diagnosis to a hypothesis (Caffi, 1999, p. 881). It also weakens the speaker degree of certainty.

While shields, mitigation scope is the utterance source so that it turns the utterance more authoritative and unquestionable by shifting the responsibility to another source in order to weaken the speaker’s personal commitment, as in the following example

*c’è un’i: perplasia estrogenica – c’è scritto qui*

there is an estrogenic hyperplasia – **it is written here** (by….)

The speaker refers the responsibility of the statement to someone other than him and the addressee. This also functions to weaken his commitment towards the proposition he has presented.
Caffi’s concept looks at the mitigating words as how they function in the whole sentences. Hedges and bushes are frequently lexicalized expression while shield might occur at the syntactic level. Shield might happen in the shift of passive voice or in the shift pronouns. Caffi’s (2007, p. 96) also stated that hedges and bushes in the dimension of ‘epistemic certainty’ while shield works as a total mitigation of the responsibility by stating the different utterer.

2. Mitigating devices by Blum-Kulka

While Caffi proposed the mitigating mechanism based on the function of the mitigation affects, Blum-Kulka in Bella (2011, p.1720) conveyed that mitigation strategies may take part of “external or internal modification”. The difference between the two modifications lay on the ‘device’ used to create mitigation. The external modification focuses on the devices which precede the head act, such as reasons, so that it modifies its illocutionary force (Bella, 2011, p. 1720). Meanwhile, the internal modifiers as Blum-Kulka suggesten in Bela (2011) are those element present within the illocutionary force but take functions to downgrade the its possibility of negative impact, the threatening nature of speech act. The internal modifiers are marked by syntactic or lexical linguistic devices such as politeness markers, modal adverbs, mental state predicate, adjective or degree modifiers. However these devices may not accomplish the function of mitigating some statement into polite manner since both external and internal modifiers depends on the certain situations.
Bella (2011, p. 1718-1740) mainly focused on the mitigating devices in refusal utterance. The use of external modifiers which focused on the devices following the head act takes the same frequent occurrence as the internal modifiers. Some examples of external modifiers used to downgrade the head act are presented as follows:

………..I have promised to go and pick him up from the airport [excuse]

………..maybe some other time we can arrange something together [alternative]

(Bella, 2011, p. 1721-1722)

May I have the book you recommended me yesterday? I went to the library, but unfortunately it was closed.

(Abdolrezapour and Eslami-Rasekh, 2012, p.151)

The utterance above shows indirect refusal which uses external modifiers to downgrade the head act and mitigating the possible threatening impact of the statement conveyed before. The two examples above are some ‘reasons’ given to reduce the possible negative effect received by the addressee.

While there are some devices functioning within the sentence as mitigating devices in order to reduce the possible threatening act cause by the illocutionary force. Some examples are presented as follows.

I wonder if you could possibly give me your pen
Can you **perhaps** give your lecture tomorrow?

Do you mind if I sit there and you **kind of** sit there.


The sentences which are conveyed above contain the internal modifiers explained before. Some experts might name the type of the linguistic devices differently, in the example above, the first and second are called downtoners which is also included as mental state predicates and modal adjective while later on some are called as hedges, the third is what was called as hedge or degree modifiers, in later term it is called as approximators which also included as hedges.

3. **Hedges and the mitigation scopes**

As we have seen that hedges, mitigation and politeness strategies share connection in some ways, all of them function to create a sense that lessens the commitment, force and arrogance. The term ‘hedges’ can be seen as how certain lexical categories are used to mark uncertainty or less commitment in written text and the larger scope it affects as the mitigating devices in pragmatic view especially when it used to signal politeness strategies. Both Hyland and Caffi conveyed intertwined concepts of hedges will be used to identify how the hedges are used in the written sources, particularly as pragmatic case.
F. Procedure of Analysis

Hedges are identified as Hyland, Clemen, Salager-Meyer, Hinkel and Vold in Laurinaitytė (2011) who convey that linguistic expressions classified as hedges are based on their part of speech. In order to identify the linguistic expressions used as a hedge a test by Vold (2006) will be taken to prove them as a hedge. The following step as the hedges has been identified is analyzing the hedges that are used in politeness strategy. The indicators below will be used to analyze the hedges and the how hedges might be used in politeness strategy.

A. Hedges Classifications

Several hedges types are proposed to classify hedges by some linguists, it is divided into two main types, conventional and conversational hedges. The synthesized classification will be presented as follows.

1. Hedges formed by using certain lexical categories called as conventional hedges (Laurinaitytė, 2011) conveyed as follows:
   i. Hedges are formed by using the epistemic meaning of the modal auxiliary verbs such as may, might, can, could, will, would, should. According to Keck and Biber (2004) Hall and Folley (1998) and Alexander (2003) in Laurinaitytė (2011) modal auxiliaries would only act as hedges when they are presented in certain construction as conveyed

   a. could would express possibility when it is constructed as could + be + adjective/noun and could + perfect infinitive
b. *should* only expresses probability when it is constructed in *should +be*
   and *should+ perfect infinitive*

c. *can* would express possibility if it is served in the construction of
   
   *inanimate noun+ can + linking verb/verb*

d. *will* would express prediction if it is used in the construction of *will+*
   
   *be+ adjective/ noun*

ii. Hedges are formed by using **epistemic lexical verbs** which express doubt
   and evaluation as well conveying attitude towards the proposition such as *to*
   
   *seem, to appear, to believe, to assume, to suggest, to estimate, to tend, to*
   
   *think, to argue, to indicate, to claim, to propose, to speculate, to predict, to*
   
   *calculate, to infer.*

As an example, the use of epistemic lexical verb is found in Hamuddin and
Noor (2015, p. 58)

   a. Comparing the SRM and CRM, it *appears* that aggregation bias
   
   does exist.

   b. Whilst the beginnings of international flows of human capital can
   
   be traced to the decades of the sixties and the seventies, recent data
   
   *suggests* that emigration of skilled people from developing
   
   countries continues unabated.

Hamuddin and Noor (2015, p. 58) also conveyed that the use of these
lexical items brings about the mitigation effects and a degree of probability
that aids to save the negative face of both readers and JWs.
iii. Hedges are formed by using **adjectives**, **adverbs** or **nouns** which conveys a probability such as *possible, likely/unlikely, perhaps, partly, apparently, presumably, almost, nearly, assumption, suggestion* and etc.

2. Hedges are formed by using **passive voice** as the passive voice represents a turning the precision of argument down (Sigel, 2009, p. 479). Hyland also conveyed that taking passive constructions avoids an overstated assertion (2005, p. 80)

   Throughout the paper, a multisine approach for trajectory optimization *has been developed and applied* to a nonholonomic WMR. (Robotics)

   The example is conveyed by Gil-Salom and Soler-Monreal (2009, p. 184) that the use of passive form, on of non-personal construction, allows writer’s self-protection and permits reader to feel free interpreting writer claims.

3. Hedges are formed by using **modal-adverb** expressions, some called this as **multiple hedges** such as *could possibly*. Moreover, Laurinaitytė (2011, p. 25) added that modal-adverb hedges also act as negative politeness strategy.

4. Hedges are formed by adding the **introductory phrase** conveying personal doubts as in *to our knowledge...and we believe...*. 

5. Conjunction as a hedge, however, only **concessive conjuncts** such as *although, despite, whereas, notwithstanding*, and etc, included as hedges as it allows the writer to lessen the strength of statement by providing “equivocal supports” (Laurinaitytė, 2011, p. 25).
6. **Conditional clause** forms a hedge as it presents a hypothetical situations and providing a possibility as conveyed by Hyland and Clemen in Laurinaitytė (2011, p. 25)

The situation becomes worse if the privileged groups acquire more control and influence over the economy

Hamuddin and Noor (2015, p. 60) explained that the use of conditional ‘if’ express the uncertainty as the condition results depend on other condition and see this as negative politeness as JWs distanced themselves from assumption.

7. Hedges are able to be attained from the combination of modal auxiliary and lexical verb as well the combination of lexical verbs with the hedging adverb or adjectives, this type of hedges are called **compound hedges**

8. Hedges are also realized by using **approximators** of degree, indefinite quantifiers and indefinite frequency and time. Approximators signals the precision that is used in the proposition, therefore it represent the certainty as hedges should be.

9. Hedges are also can be formed by using the **reference**. Reference is used as the alternate responsibility and mark as personal opinion (Hyland, 1996). It presents evidential statement to avoid full commitment of the proposition.

**B. Hedging Test**

Some problems arise as it comes to determine the lexical categories that play roles as hedges but also overlap with the other linguistics concepts such as vagueness and modality. Several tests were proposed by some linguists. Vold
(2006) recommend having other mitigatory lexical expression to be added or taking several test such as substitution, reformulation and syntactic test. These tests are used to determine the epistemic meaning of the linguistic expressions. Vold (2006, p. 12) stated if adding an ‘uncertainty phrase’ felt natural, the occurrence was classified as epistemically modal.

i. We therefore assume that these default preferences for the null complements in (19a), (20a) and (21a) have been established as part of the conventional meanings of the relevant verbs, but we are not sure.

ii. I assume Hornstein’s approach, but I’m not sure.

The uncertainty phrase but I’m not sure that is added in the examples above have shown that assume in the (a) is used in the epistemic sense while in (b) is not. The next test that might be taken is substituting polysemic marker, such as may into one expression with epistemic meaning, e.g perhaps, if this substitution keeps the meaning in the same sense, may is used in the epistemic sense within the related sentence.

Reformulation test might also be used when the proposition can be changed into more ‘certain’ way by changing the polysemic marker as in we assume that…. into the non-hedged expression we know that…. The other way that is proposed by Vold is syntactic criteria. Vold (2006, p. 12) took assume(ing) that and be assumed to are included in epistemically modal sense meanwhile assume+ NOUN for instance assume an approach does not contain epistemic sense.

However, not every linguist agreed upon the proposed test as Salager-Meyer in Heiniluoma (2008, p. 30) conveyed that there is no definite, error-free way to
identify a hedge. Laurinaityté (2011, p. 34) stated that although these tests are not applicable in all the cases, they might be used as the guideline to recognize hedges.
CHAPTER III
DATA FINDINGS

1. Data Description
The data are collected from 16 articles of New York Times and Al Jazeera published in December 2017 within the same topic concerning on Trump’s decision on Jerusalem as the capital city of Israel. New York Times and Al Jazeera were taken as the source of the data despite the possibility of different tendency of view between the two online newspapers. The articles were chosen based on their similarities on the topic and not included in opinion section of the news. It is found that there are 249 data which fulfill the indicators of synthesized classification of the hedges and Vold’s test.

2. Data Analysis
There are 22 hedges in Article 1 (A1) consisting of 7 modal auxiliaries, 7 references, 5 concessive conjuncts, 1 conditional clause, 1 passive voice and 1 multiple hedges. On the second article, Article 2 (A2), it is found that there are 5 hedges used in the article consisting of 3 references 1 epistemic lexical verb and 1 modal auxiliary. While in Article 3 (A3), there are 20 hedges used consisting of 7 forms of passive voice, 6 references, 2 concessive conjuncts, 1 epistemic lexical verb, 2 epistemic adjective, 1 multiple hedges, and 1 modal auxiliary. In Article 4 (A4), it is found that 36 hedges are applied and they are 4 references, 10 modal auxiliaries, 9 adverbs, 5 adjectives, 3 epistemic lexical verbs, 2 approximators, 2 passive voices, and 1 multiple hedges. In Article 5 (A5), 9 hedges are found consisting of 3 references, 3 modal auxiliaries, 2 adjectives, and 1 adverb. In
Article 6 (A6), 26 hedges are used consisting of 17 references, 8 modal auxiliaries, and 1 passive voice. The same numbers of hedges, 26 hedges, are found in Article 7 (A7) as well, they are 11 references, 9 modal auxiliaries, 2 approximators, 2 adverbs, and 1 epistemic lexical verb. In Article 8 (A8), it is found that 15 hedges are applied which consist of 11 modal auxiliaries and 4 references. The first eight articles were taken from New York Times, in total it is found that there are 159 hedges applied in 8 New York Times articles.

The other eight articles were taken from Al Jazeera referred as Article 9 to Article 16. In the Article 9 (A9), 13 hedges are found that consist of 7 references, 4 modals, 1 conditional clause, and 1 passive voice. Article 10 (A10) applied 26 hedges consisting of 8 modal auxiliaries, 9 references, 4 adjective, and 2 passive voices. While Article 11 (A11) made use of 7 hedges, it consists of 3 references, 1 conditional clause, 1 adjective, and 1 passive voice. In the Article 12 (A12), there are 14 hedges found formed by using 7 references and 7 passive voices. Article 13 (A13) uses 4 hedges which consist of 3 references and 1 modal auxiliary. In Article 14 makes use of 14 hedges that are 5 modal auxiliaries, 4 references, 2 passive voices, 1 conditional clause, 1 adjective and 1 concessive conjunct. Article 14 (A14) applies 13 hedges consisting of 5 modal auxiliaries, 4 references, 2 passive voices, 1 adjective, and 1 concessive conjuncts. Article 15 (A15) applies 6 hedges in the article, consisting of 4 references, 1 conditional clause and 1 modal auxiliary. The last, Article 16 (A16) makes use of 7 hedges consisting of 3 passive voice, 3 modal auxiliary, 1 approximator, and 1 concessive conjunct. The last
eight articles were taken from Al Jazeera, in total it is found that there are 90 hedges applied in 8 Al Jazeera articles.

As the 249 data were found, there are 16 representative data selected through random sampling process.

A1-14

On Monday, the United States used a rare veto to block a resolution in the Security Council calling for the administration to reverse its decision on Jerusalem. The vote on the resolution, which was drafted by Egypt, was 14 to 1, suggesting there could be a similarly wide margin against the United States in the 193-member General Assembly.

(A1-14) Canada, the Czech Republic and Hungary might abstain from the vote, according to diplomats. (New York Times, Trump Threatens to End American Aid: ‘We’re Watching Those Votes’ at the U.N., December 20, 2017)

Hedges: Modal auxiliary verb (might) and a reference (according to)

The use of might in the datum above is recognized as one of the hedges. It is proved by using substitution test proposed by Vold. In order to provide an evidence, if might is possible to be replaced with other linguistic expression which convey epistemic meaning, it means that might in the datum is within its epistemic sense. Might will be substituted with probably to test the epistemic sense difference, therefore, the sentence would result in the following sense Canada, the Czech Republic and Hungary perhaps abstain from the vote, according to
diplomats. It can be inferred that might and perhaps results in the same notion of possibility. Moreover, it also proved that might does not refer to sense of permission instead of possibility, this factor support the use of might as hedges in the datum. The other hedges found in the datum is that a reference is being used to hedge the responsibility of the whole proposition to the external source by using the phrase according to in order to refer the supporting source diplomats, in this case the hedge act as the external mitigation as it takes external support. The reference of according to diplomats also shows the strong standing of the writer towards the truth-value of the proposition he delivered that he serves a credible source of the statement (Měchura, 2005).

Looking at the situational context in the datum, it is known that the vote regarding Jerusalem issue is held between United States and 193 member of General Assembly. The event is delivered to the reader indirectly by using textual medium, newspaper. To form a proper atmosphere in the text, the writer applied politeness strategy in this article. The politeness strategy that is formed in the data is negative politeness with hedging strategies and minimizing the imposition in order to reduce the FTA that might happen to the negative face of the reader. The writer of the article avoids imposing the reader by using hedges to allow personal doubt and alternative perspective on the reader conveyed through the use of hedges might. By using negative politeness strategy the writer is aware of the social distance between him and the reader who might be more superior to him as the Canada, the Czech Republic and Hungary representative that might also be the reader.
Mr. Trump has threatened to hold up aid to Pakistan if it does not cooperate more with the United States on counterterrorism operations. (New York Times, Trump Threatens to End American Aid: ‘We’re Watching Those Votes’ at the U.N., December 20, 2017)

During the 2016 presidential election, he warned that the United States might pull out of NATO because it shouldered an unfair burden in paying for the alliance.

Hedges: conditional clause

The conditional sentence type 1 is used to mark the hedge in the datum. The attempt to examine conditional clause as a hedge is not covered by Vold’s test. The only supporting argument to mark conditional clause as hedges is that it serves condition in which something likely happen depending on the certain condition. To put it in another words, the conditional clause is included as the hedges due to its hypothetical nature (Laurinaitytė, 2011). In this case, if only certain condition happen “if Pakistan does not cooperate” is committed, the aid will be held up.

The context that describes the tense relationship between U.S and other countries that support Palestine is explained by using conditional form to weaken the force done by the U.S. In the statement, it is clearly seen that the condition described threatens the participant and the reader, Pakistan, negative face. The use of conditional clause that conveys one condition will only happen if another is fulfilled is used to mitigate the negative face threat to the participant. However,
the writer also put the hedge as negative politeness in order to address the respective readers that might also related to the participants mentioned in the statements. This conditional clause as one of the hedges will allow them to consider some degrees of other possible outcome regarding to the statement.

A2-24

*The Taliban, Hamas and Shia extremist leaders also railed against the move.*

(A2-24) But the outlier was the Islamic State, which waited until Friday to publish an editorial in its weekly newsletter — one that *appeared to be* mainly concerned with critiquing what it saw as hypocritical and self-serving statements by other jihadist groups and Arab leaders. (New York Times - Terrorist Groups Vow Bloodshed over Jerusalem Decision. ISIS? Less So, December 8, 2017)

Hedges: epistemic lexical verb (*to appear*)

The datum above takes *to appear* to act as hedges. In order to distinguish *to appear* as a hedge, it is attempted to make use of the syntactic text that is proposed by Vold to determine the sense of hedges. Vold (2006, p. 12) proposed the comparison of two different syntactic forms in using one linguistic expression. Despite *to appear* is proceeded by *to be* instead of *preposition* as in “*The light appears from inside the room*” which serves meaning of being visible while in the datum *to appear* share the meaning of *to seem* describing the impression of being concerned with critiquing what it saw as hypocritical and self-serving statements
by other jihadist groups and Arab leaders. To appear is used to emphasize the speculative nature of the statement (Salager-Meyer, 1997) and also avoids the accusation towards the participant. The following construction of passive voice proceeding the epistemic lexical verb adds the hedging sense to weaken the proposition delivered in the datum, besides weakening the proposition, the passive forms is used to remains objective (Sigel, 2009).

The context that is described in the datum is that the contradiction between Islamic State and the Arab leaders on taking action towards the issue. As the Arab leaders are against Trump’s statement, Islamic State seems to focus in accusing Arab leader of be hypocrites. Within the range of politeness strategy, the datum serves criticism towards the participant that threatens the positive face of the participant, Islamic State, however negative politeness strategy is applied, hedging, strategy to avoid direct accusation to the participant and avoid imposition to the readers as well as giving freedom to the readers to have personal judgement. “one that appeared to be mainly concerned with critiquing what it saw as hypocritical and self-serving statements”. The writer puts epistemic lexical verb, to appear, as the hedge so that the readers are allowed to have personal judgement towards the indirect accusation conveyed by the writer towards the participants in the statement. The negative politeness strategy allows the writer to avoid presuming something as well as to give chance for the readers to be freely interpret the truth of the statement. As the writer is not familiar with the readers personally, there is possibly social distance that exists, this also becomes the motive to use negative politeness strategy.
“How did ISIS respond to US announcement on #JerusalemEmbassy move? Outrage? Nope. Call to jihad? Not really,” the independent researcher Raphael Gluck wrote on Twitter. He added, “ISIS takes a stab at rival terror and Islamist groups accusing them of politicizing Palestinian cause to suit their own agendas.”

The article published by the Islamic State began: “Sixty years and Jerusalem has been in the hands of the Jews, and it is only now that people cry when the Crusaders announced today as their capital,” according to a translation provided by the Washington-based SITE Intelligence Group, which monitors the group’s propaganda.

(A2-25) The Islamic State, also known as ISIS, argued that the focus should instead be on working to defeat the Arab countries ringing Israel, which they say “surround it the same way a bracelet surrounds the wrist, protecting the Jews from the strikes of the mujahideen.”

Hedges: reference (The Islamic State, also known as ISIS, argued), modal auxiliary (should)

The datum applies two types of hedges, reference and modal auxiliary. The use of reference “The Islamic State, also known as ISIS, argued...” allows the writer to not only directly shift the responsibility of the intended proposition but also provide the evidence for the following statements. This also shows the strong standing of the writer towards the truth-value of the proposition he delivered that he serves a credible source of the statement (Měchura, 2005). The other hedges
type applied in the datum is, modal auxiliary should. Looking at the syntactic form used in the datum, should, was used in the syntactic form which conveys probability as supported by Laurinaitytė (2011) that should only expresses probability and personal judgements when it is constructed in should +be and should+ perfect infinitive. Therefore, the datum meets the required syntactic form of should which functions as hedge since it applies the syntactic form of should+be.

The context that is described in the datum is the situation where ISIS accusing Arab leaders of being a hypocrite and politicizing Palestine to benefit themselves. Looking at the condition described, the intense atmosphere is obviously presented therefore hedge is applied as one of tactic of politeness strategy. Within the politeness perspective, the use of hedges mitigates the face threat to the reader and participant’s negative face. By using should as a hedge, the intended reader would have a choice not to do what is suggested in the statement, as the threat to the negative face can happen due to a suggestion or advice that is as well found in the datum “The Islamic State, also known as ISIS, argued that the focus should instead be on working to defeat the Arab countries ringing Israel”, instead of using stronger modal auxiliary as must the writer puts should to modify the suggestion.

A3-29

In the century since, Jerusalem has been fought over in varying ways, not only by Jews, Christians and Muslims but also by external powers and, of course,
modern-day Israelis and Palestinians.

(A3-29) It is perhaps fitting that President Trump appears to have chosen this week to announce that the United States will recognize Jerusalem as Israel’s capital, despite concerns from leaders of Arab countries, Turkey and even close allies like France. (New York Times, The Conflict in Jerusalem Is Distinctly Modern. Here’s the History, December 5, 2017)

Hedges: Adverbs (perhaps), epistemic lexical verb (appears to), concessive conjuncts (despite)

Three hedges are used in the datum, the first two hedges, adverb (perhaps) and epistemic lexical verb (appears to), has similar patterns as the previous data. Perhaps indeed acts as the hedge since it definitely possesses the epistemic meaning (Laurinaitė, 2011) and appears to is also constructed in the similar forms as Datum 3 proving that they take roles as hedges, however in this case it is served in the active form. Perhaps mitigates the whole proposition of the datum while appears to hedge the clause in which it is used have chosen this week to announce that the United States will recognize Jerusalem as Israel’s capital and represent the impression of being and a prediction as well. The other hedges used in the datum is despite, a concessive conjunct, the use of despite weaken the strength by providing the evidential support of concerns from leaders of Arab countries, Turkey and even close allies like France. This maintains the objectivity of the proposition even though the author hedges the proposition. The objectivity is also supported by the absence of personalization, recognized by the presence of “anticipatory it” which create the objective atmosphere and free of personal bias
However, in order to prove *despite* as hedges, Vold’s test seems incompatible to be applied, therefore the only supporting factor to include the concessive conjuncts as hedges is the classification stated by Clemen (2002) and Hinkel (2004) that it provide different point of view and balancing the main clause and supporting clause.

The context that is described in the datum is the short history of the city of Jerusalem being fought over in years and this can be dangerous for a powerful country like U.S to meddle with the conflict. The politeness strategy which overlaps with the use of hedges in the datum is the use of negative politeness with hedging strategies and the impersonalization as the author avoids using the pronouns and replacing them with the anticipatory *it*. The strategy is applied in order to mitigate the face-threatening towards the positive face to the participant President Trump due to indirect criticism conveyed by supporting evidence “.....despite concerns from leaders of Arab countries, Turkey and even close allies like France.” The politeness strategy of using hedges also allows the writer to mitigate the threat to the reader’s negative face, as it allows them to have other perspective and freedom as the imposition is minimized by hedging strategy.

A3-37

*The early Israeli state was hesitant to focus too much on Jerusalem, given pressure from the United Nations and from the European powers, according to Issam Nassar, a historian at Illinois State University.*

(A3-37) Having accepted the idea of international control of Jerusalem, the early Israeli leadership sought alternatives for a capital, perhaps Herzliya or
somewhere in the south. They also realized that not having control of Jerusalem’s holy sites might have some advantages, according to Dr. Ramon.

While Israel moved many government functions to Jerusalem during the country’s first two decades, foreign governments largely avoided Jerusalem and opened embassies in Tel Aviv, in recognition of the United Nations resolution.

Hedges: modal auxiliary (might) and reference (according to)

The use of might in the datum above is recognized as one of the hedges. It is proved by using substitution test proposed by Vold. In order to provide an evidence, if might is possible to be replaced with other linguistic expression which convey epistemic meaning, it means that might in the datum is within its epistemic sense. Might will be substituted with perhaps to test the epistemic sense difference, therefore, the sentence would result in the following statement They also realized that not having control of Jerusalem’s holy sites perhaps have some advantages, according to Dr. Ramon. The other hedge type that is used is reference that provides evidence of the statement and allows the shift of responsibility of the delivered proposition so that it protects the writer. The reference of according to Dr. Ramon also shows the strong standing of the writer towards the truth-value of the proposition he delivered that he serves a credible source of the statement (Měchura, 2005).

The context that is described in the statement is that Israel had never put much interest to put its capital in Jerusalem and being not having control towards
Jerusalem might be more advantageous. However, in conveying this matter, the writer puts hedge in order to avoid imposing his opinion to the readers. The hedge therefore plays role as the negative politeness strategy. The strategy gives room to reader’s freedom in receiving the presented statement.

A4-52

The United States, in order to present itself as a dispassionate broker, long considered Jerusalem’s status to be a conflict issue that was up to Israelis and Palestinians to decide. Mr. Trump is breaking with that traditional neutrality. Maybe more important, Israel’s position on Jerusalem isn’t just that its capital should be somewhere in the city.

(A4-52) A 1980 law declared Jerusalem to be Israel’s “undivided” capital, which was widely understood as a de facto annexation of the city’s eastern half.

Mr. Trump, in endorsing Jerusalem as Israel’s capital, did not explicitly endorse this idea. But he didn’t reject it, either. Nor did he say that Jerusalem should also become the Palestinian capital.

Hedges: reference (A 1980 law) and passive form (was widely understood)

To support the intended argument, the reference is used. This shifts the responsibility of the truth or false value of the statement so that it allows the writer to be free from false judgement. Moreover, the use of a reference A 1980 law maintains the objectivity of the proposition by serving a credible source of statement. The other hedge type applied in the datum is passive form also used to
remain objective. By using a passive form, “was widely understood” the writer also impersonalize who conveyed and understood the statement. The context behind the statement is described in the previous sentence that the contradiction of how the neutrality should be maintained by US had been broken by Trump although he did not show his tendency towards Israel explicitly. Considering this grey context, unclear stance, so that the reader could receive the other probability of the statement, the writer uses a politeness strategy. Hedge as one of negative politeness strategy allows the reader to grasp other possibility that the law might not be accepted generally by the people of Palestine and Israel.

A4-54

Mr. Trump, in endorsing Jerusalem as Israel’s capital, did not explicitly endorse this idea.

But he didn’t reject it, either. Nor did he say that Jerusalem should also become the Palestinian capital.

(A4-54) This implies that the United States is increasingly supportive of Israel’s position — full annexation — though this would almost certainly kill any viable peace deal. (New York Times, The Jerusalem Issue Explained, December 9, 2017)

Hedges: Epistemic lexical verb (implies), concessive conjuncts (though), modal-adverb hedges; modal auxiliary verb (would) + adverb (almost, certainly)
Several types of hedges are used in the datum above consisting of epistemic lexical verb (implies), concessive conjuncts (though), and the compound hedges formed by the use of modal auxiliary verb (would) and adverb (almost and certainly). In order to prove them as hedges, Vold’s test will be applied to the possible hedges since some types of hedges are not compatible to be examined using Vold’s test or has already possessed the epistemic sense. The use of to imply in the datum, mark the hedge as to imply is substituted with another epistemic possible hedges to indicate, the sense would result on “This indicates that the United States is increasingly supportive of Israel’s position…” It does not significantly change the epistemic sense conveyed by to imply. While no test needs to be applied on would despite its nature sense of probability based on the hypothetical condition (Mèchura, 2005, p. 9). The use of adverbs almost and certainly portray contradictory sense, almost weaken the following proposition yet certainly conveys something without doubt while hedges function to avoid full commitment of the proposition truth-values. In this case, the adverb of certainly does not present as hedges instead boosters which functions contrastly with hedges. To prove that certainly does not act as hedges, the writer will attempt to substitute it with the adverbs with higher chance for having the epistemic sense as in probably, the significantly different sense when both are used in the same sentence. If probably is put to replace the certainly in the datum “this would almost probably kill any viable peace deal.” it has sense that is weaker and less committed rather than using certainly, therefore certainly is not included as hedges. The same problem arises on testing the concessive conjuncts that acts as
hedges, the test proposed by Vold (2006) does not cover the suitable way to test a conjunction.

The context in the datum is described that Trump tends to back Israel increasingly and starts to lose the neutrality to build two states solution. By stating such accusation, politeness strategy is used. Although conveying the accusation towards the participant in the statement threatens the positive face of the participant, hedging as one of the negative politeness strategies is applied. The politeness strategy that is built in this datum is the hedging strategies which mitigate the accusation to the participant, United States, as well as allow readers to have freedom on perceiving the statement conveyed by the writer. The accusation conveyed as follows “This implies that the United States is increasingly supportive of Israel’s position...” the hedging strategies to imply attenuate the accusation conveyed in the datum. By using to implies as a hedge, one of the negative politeness strategy, the statement is weakened and imposition to the reader freedom is avoided.

A5- 84

Saeb Erekat, the secretary general of the Palestine Liberation Organization and a steadfast advocate for a Palestinian state, said in an interview on Thursday that Mr. Trump and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel “have managed to destroy that hope.” He embraced a radical shift in the P.L.O.’s goals — to a single state, but with Palestinians enjoying the same civil rights as Israelis, including the vote.
(A5-84) Israel would be unlikely to accede to equal rights, because granting a vote to millions of Palestinians would eventually lead to the end of Israel as a Jewish state. (New York Times, Did Trump Kill Off a Two-State Solution? He Says No, Palestinians Say Yes, December 7, 2017)

Hedges: modal auxiliary verb (would), adjective (unlikely), modal-adverb (would+eventually)

As conveyed that would always serves as weak commitment to possibility which means that it is put as the epistemic sense that serve as hedges in the proposition, moreover the adjective of unlikely also emphasize this weakness. They convey the author low confidence on acceding to equal rights. Unlikely itself hedge the sense of impossibility as the author choose to take unlikely rather than impossible. If a reformulation test applied in this case by applying less-hedged or non-hedged as in “Israel is impossible to accede to equal rights...” it can be seen that both hedges in “Israel would be unlikely to accede to equal rights...” attenuate the full commitment of possibility in the proposition. Another type of hedges used in the datum is modal-adverb combination of hedges would eventually which hedge to the following proposition of lead to the end of Israel as a Jewish state. All of the hedges act as the internal mitigation within all propositional content, however, the whole dependent clause “because granting a vote to millions of Palestinians would eventually lead to the end of Israel as a Jewish state” acts as the external mitigation of the head act.
The context is described within the beginning of the article conveying the present condition between United States, Israel and Palestine and the following supporting sentences which describe the impossibility to achieve equal rights for the Israelis and Palestinians such as Trump and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel “have managed to destroy that hope.” To present this sensitive issue, the writer takes negative politeness strategy in conveying the possible condition in the datum in order to weaken his claim and allowing readers to have doubts but also presenting the condition without imposing reader freedom to assume other possible outcome of the Israeli and Palestinian condition. In the datum, it can be seen that the use of modal auxiliaries would allow the reader to perceive that the statement conveyed by the writer might not be fully true. The writer possibly chose to apply the negative politeness strategy, as he might be aware the higher social distance and avoid the imposition by weakening the statement. He applies negative politeness in order to address respectively the higher social distance of Israeli and Palestinian leaders who might also act as the reader of the article.

A6-94

A chorus of international leaders criticized the Trump administration’s decision on Wednesday to officially recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, calling it a dangerous disruption that contravenes United Nations resolutions and could inflame one of the world’s thorniest conflicts.

(A6-94) Secretary General António Guterres and Pope Francis both expressed alarm that the announcement would provoke new tensions in the Holy City, which is revered by Jews, Christians and Muslims. (New York

Hedges: reference (Secretary General António Guterres and Pope Francis), modal auxiliary (would)

The direct shift of responsibility by using reference is one of the hedges used in the datum. By mentioning two figures Secretary General António Guterres and Pope Francis who conveyed a concern towards the tension that might happen, the author provides evidence as the hedges, reference, and it also functions as the external mitigating device in the sentence. Another hedges found in the datum is the modal auxiliary verbs which hedge the illocutionary force instead of a proposition. The illocutionary force is marked by the assertive prediction of what is believed by the author is going to happen in the future, that it will provoke new tensions in one condition caused by the announcement as stated by the reference, and the other supportive argument within preceding the statement, that Trump’s announcement is a dangerous disruption that contravenes United Nations resolutions and could inflame one of the world’s thorniest conflicts. Would therefore manage to hedge the possibility of overstating the prediction since it would be far different if the author prefers using stronger modal to convey the possibility, will. If we reformulate the use of the hedges into less-hedged sentence by using will, it will results in higher force of the assertive prediction.

The context that is presented in the datum, is that the world leaders warn the possibility of chaos and deeper conflict because of Trump’s statement as it is started by “A chorus of international leaders criticized the Trump administration’s
...” As in the politeness matter, the hedges that are used in delivering the news convey the negative politeness strategy. By using both would and applies the reference in the statement, the writer allows the possibility of what he delivers being false. Therefore, the negative politeness strategy in the datum minimizes the imposition of the statement towards the reader as the hedge weakens the statement.

**A7-127**

He will also not take a position on a disputed area of the Old City, known as the Temple Mount to Jews and the Haram al-Sharif to Muslims, which has been a flash point for tensions.

(A7-127) **But even with those caveats**, Mr. Trump’s decision **seems likely** to disrupt, if not dissolve, the peace effort. (New York Times, U.S. to Recognize Jerusalem as Israel’s Capital, Trump Says, Alarming Middle East Leaders, December 5, 2017)

Hedges: reference: (1) **But even with those caveats**, (2) compound hedges (seems likely)

Hedges that are applied in this datum are the compound hedges that are formed by using an epistemic lexical verb and an adjective, besides having the compound hedges, there is an external mitigation which is also included as hedges of reference. The substitution test will be applied to the compound hedges by replacing the possible hedges, likely, with an adverb which conveys epistemic meaning of possibility, probably. This would result in Mr. Trump’s decision
seems probably to disrupt, if not dissolve, the peace effort, to seem is not reformulated as the previous datum (Datum 3) has proved that it present epistemic meaning as it does in to appear + to be. The other hedges in the datum is the external mitigation “But even with those caveats.” the caveats refers to the previous conditions in the sentence before the datum. However, the test proposed by Vold does not cover the ability to examine the reference as hedges, the only supporting evidence is that the external mitigation that it covers.

The context that is described in the statement is that although Trump has tried to stay away from center of the conflict, the disruption to the effort towards the peace is unavoidable. To convey the probability how it will disrupt the peace effort, hedges are applied. The use of hedges in the datum within the politeness matter is used to mitigate the face threat towards the participant’s positive face as the author conveys the statement by using hedges to avoid this threat. The datum threats the Mr. Trump’s positive face as it conveys criticism and the warning by stating what Mr Trump decided would disrupt, if not dissolve, the peace effort. Yet, the negative politeness strategy is used, as it is intended to keep the freedom of the reader perspective. The use of hedges strategies allows some doubts towards the news as the compound hedges “seems likely” is applied. Thus, the reader’s freedom is not imposed.

William Caldwell Harrop, who was the ambassador from 1992 to 1993, called Mr. Trump’s decision “slightly reckless” and even “kind of a masochistic move”
that might “undermine his own, repeatedly discussed, ‘great deal’ of bringing peace to the Israelis and Palestinians.”

(A8-152) Having decided to make his announcement, Mr. Trump could have been explicit that he would place the embassy in West Jerusalem, Mr. Harrop said. (New York Times - Nearly Every Former U.S. Ambassador to Israel Disagrees With Trump’s Jerusalem Decision, December 7, 2017)

Hedges: Modal auxiliary verb of could and would

The construction of could as a hedge can be noticed by the construction of could+perfect infinitive as conveyed by Keck and Biber in Laurinaitytė, (2011) as it is seen in the sentence that could is followed by the perfect infinitive. Within the epistemic sense, could presents a weak possibility of the following proposition explicit that he would place the embassy in West Jerusalem which determines the sense of could as expression of possibility. Furthermore, the author added would to hedge a stronger prediction statement of he would place the embassy in West Jerusalem. Two different hedges are used to hedge two different clauses. To support the argument, Vold’s test would be used as an attempt to prove them as hedges, a substitution test will be applied. Moreover, the absence of personalization such as personal pronouns referring to both author and audience also “create feeling of objectivity, of being free of personal bias”(Měchura, 2005, p 7). As the mitigating devices, the hedges work as the internal mitigation as it mainly makes use of the epistemic modality, and it mitigate the propositions instead of the illocutionary force.
The context described in the datum portrays that Trump is being criticized of being reckless and inconsiderate towards the peace for Palestinians and Israelis and by having decided making the announcement, it is clear that US recognize Jerusalem as Israel’s capital and tends to side with Israel. However, to present such possibility of Trump’s explicit move, the writer applied hedge as the politeness strategy. The politeness strategy that is built automatically along with the use of hedges is being indirect by using the hedging strategy. The strategy takes conventionally indirect and hedges to perform FTA to attenuate the participant, Mr. Trump positive face caused by the accusation conveyed by the author. Moreover, the use of the hedge that is originally a negative politeness strategy allows the reader to have different alternate perspective and opinion as the statement conveys possibility instead of absolute truth signaled by the use of passive form and modal auxiliary Mr. Trump could have been explicit that he would place the embassy in West Jerusalem.

A9-164

Senior Trump administration said Trump will continue to sign the waiver until the process of moving the embassy, which could "take years", is completed.

(A9-164) The controversial move, if implemented, would make the US the first country to have its embassy in Jerusalem - currently, all such diplomatic missions are located in Tel Aviv. (Al Jazeera, What a US Embassy in Jerusalem means to Palestinians, December 7, 2017)
Hedges: conditional clause, approximators (currently)

The use of conditional clause and approximators as hedges are combined to avoid several commitments in the datum. Firstly, conditional clause type 2 is used to convey hypothetical prediction if one action will determine what will happen in the future if only the condition is fulfilled, in the datum if implemented refers to the controversial move if it is implemented, the condition will be the one that is predicted in the datum it would make US the first country to have its embassy in Jerusalem. As the conditional type 2 is applied in the datum, the following hedges used to mark the prediction used by the author is would which also presents the probability based on the hypothetical condition that is also included as one of epistemic meaning of modality (Měchura, 2005). If the reformulation test is applied in this datum, it will result in the replacement of the conditional clause with non-heded form by omitting the conditional clause and put a certainty modal that shows a strong epistemic modality, will. The sentence will be “The controversial move will make the US the first country to have its embassy in Jerusalem - currently, all such diplomatic missions are located in Tel Aviv.” The delivered sense is different compared to the datum as it shows strong certainty rather than a prediction of particular condition. The other hedges used in the sentence is the approximator of time, which is stated by using currently which refers to the time range of the present. This conveys function as hedges as it limits the proposition that only happening at the present time. As the mitigating strategy, the hedges are used as the external mitigating device, the related external information is conveyed by the conditional condition and the supporting evidence
from the next clause, that if the move is implemented, it would also *overturn decades of international consensus*.

The context described in the datum shows the certainty of U.S Embassy movement to Jerusalem, although it is possible that the process may take years. This will make US the first country to take such decision. The statement shows how the writer avoids imposing the reader’s understanding as he made use of conditional clause. In order to allow reader’s perspective to stay open, a negative politeness strategy is applied by using hedge that is a conditional clause type that conveying a possibility that will happen if another condition is fulfilled.

**A10-175**

*Predictions have included the threat of renewed violence - even an uprising - from Palestinians; the possible collapse of the Palestinian Authority, the Palestinians' government-in-waiting, and its diplomatic strategy for two states; and the demise of Washington's claim to be serving as a credible peacemaker.*

**(A10-175)But according to analysts**, more far-reaching - and disruptive - undercurrents will likely be set in motion by Trump's decision.

Hedges: reference *(But according to analyst)* and multiple hedges *(will likely)*

The use of reference shifts the argument of possible disruption that will happen on the contrary to the Washington’s claims as a credible peace maker. The writer puts the credible reference to convey a sensitive criticism towards
Washington's claim. The other hedge type used in the datum is the modal auxiliary and an adverb. To deliver the probability that worse disruption to the peace will happen, multiple hedges are applied in the datum, however the writer chose will instead of would which shows stronger probability of something is going to happen and provides the supporting argument by serving a reference. Likely itself does play role as hedge as it conveys the same notion as probably, if the substitution test is applied the sentence will result in the same notion of meaning, conveying a probability.

The context described that the datum is the supporting argument of the previous sentence. It supports not only the likeliness of the possible violence that might happen and the failure of Washington as credible peace maker. In order to convey this matter, the use of hedge as negative politeness strategy is applied. By using the strategy, the threat to the readers which might related to the Washington authority is being mitigated so that they can have freedom to alter different perspective.

A10-181

Last week, Gabbay backed Trump's announcement, saying that recognition of Jerusalem was more important than a peace deal with the Palestinians.

(A10-181) The possible effects of Trump's announcement on Israelis have been largely overlooked, even though previous turning points in the conflict have consistently resulted in dramatic lurches rightwards by the Israeli
public. (Al Jazeera, How will US Jerusalem move affect Israel's far right?, December 10, 2017)

*Given Israel's power over the Palestinians, these changes have played a decisive role in leading to the current impasse between Israel and the Palestinians, analysts note.*

Hedges: adjective (*possible*), concessive conjuncts (*even though*)

Two types of hedges are used in the datum, the first hedges used is the conventional hedge using the use of an adjective *possible*. The adjective marks the possibility of *effects of Trump’s announcement*. By using this type of hedges, the author attenuate the possible commitment that the *effects* will happen, as in its natural sense, *possible* has already having the epistemic meaning which convey possibility. The other hedge within the datum is concessive conjuncts presenting a different view by stating a supporting statement towards the contradiction in the sentence “…*even though previous turning points in the conflict have consistently resulted in dramatic lurches rightwards by the Israeli public.*” This clause also acts as the external mitigation as it is connected to the proceeding sentence which provides evidence for the main argument in the datum “*The possible effects of Trump’s announcement on Israelis have been largely overlooked…*”

The US stance towards the conflict becomes clearer that it increasingly support Israel to one state solution that will lead to trigger more conflict between Israel and Palestine. In order to convey a tense situation, the politeness strategy is
applied. Within the politeness strategy, the hedging strategy is used to avoid the FTA towards the positive face due to the criticism delivered by the author in the datum to the *Trump’s announcement*. However, the use of hedges is one of negative politeness strategy used to protect the reader’s negative face. This strategy allows the readers to doubts the presented statement in the news. By allowing readers to grasp more options regarding the statement, this avoids the imposition of reader’s freedom.

**A11-207**

*Trump’s move has triggered widespread protests across the occupied West Bank, East Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip.*

(A11-207) **At least** two Palestinians **have been killed** and hundreds more **injured** by Israeli forces during the protests. (Al Jazeera, Trump’s Jerusalem move: ‘A blunder with consequences’, December 13, 2017)

In order to lessen the confidence of the precision, the datum is hedged by using an approximator, moreover the datum is formed in passive voice instead of using an active form. An indefinite quantifier also called as rounders, *at least*, is used to show uncertainty of the quantity or range that follows, *two Palestinian*. By using this type of hedges in the datum, it opens the possibility that there might be more people who are killed so that it does not give a negative impact to the credibility of the proposition. The other hedges type used in the datum is passive form. In this case the passive form is also used as the strategy to avoid the accusation to the participant, *Israeli forces*. The accusation to the *Israeli forces* by
stating that the Palestinians were killed and injured by Israeli forces creates a face threat to the participant and the reader, *Israeli forces*, positive face as they are blamed for having done something badly. The reader who are anonymous might have emotional relation towards the participant, by using passive form, this will attenuate the imposition of their freedom to make a judgement regarding the

Therefore, in order to avoid doing the face threat to the participant, the author hedge the sentence by using the approximator *At least two Palestinians* to convey uncertain range in the datum and taking passive *have been killed and hundreds more injured by Israeli forces* form to convey the news. In order to provide evidences that both categories are included as hedges, the reformulation test will be applied to presents the different sense when the sentence is non-hedged, as the datum is presented in passive form the non-hedged version would be provided in active form. The non-hedged sentence would be *Israeli forces has killed two Palestinians and injured hundreds more*, it is seen that the threat is stronger than the hedged sentence.

3. Research Findings

In the data that has been analyzed, Vold’s test can only be applied to test conventional hedges and passive form while it does not cover the need to prove the hedges which use concessive conjuncts, conditional clauses and reference. However, it does function to prove the epistemic sense of the hedges formed by using conventional hedges and the passive form. Within the politeness analysis, most of the data mitigate the face threat towards the positive face of the
participants as the accusation and criticism are conveyed in the data. This contradicts with the politeness strategies which conveyed that hedges are used to mitigate negative face or in other words it is used as one of negative politeness strategy instead of the positive politeness strategy. This results prove that the hedging strategies is not only used within the negative politeness strategies as they are also likely mitigating the threat to the positive face of the participant.

Based on the data that has been found and examined the only hedges type that is not available is hedges using the introductory phrase. The hedges usage frequency also different between the New York Times and Al Jazeera, NYT conveys more statement using hedges rather than non-hedges forms while AJ choose non-hedged from more frequently than hedged form or it choose to directly quote the reference, the interviewees. This fact also present indirect evidence that New York Time tend to be more “careful” in conveying the news in order to avoid full assertiveness in the news they conveyed to mark the most possible neutral position.
CHAPTER IV
CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

A. Conclusions
Analyzing the hedges by using the synthesized classification and Vold’s test helps the writer to determine if the linguistic expression is used as hedges or not as it helps the writer to recognize the possible epistemic meaning in the expressions. Meanwhile the application of mitigation and politeness theory give further insight on the use of the hedges itself. Within the mitigation strategy conveyed by Caffi, most external mitigation is related to the previous or next sentence which gives more evidential support to the data. The application of the politeness strategy also raises a new evidence that hedges is not only able to be applied as the negative politeness strategies. These findings would trigger further analysis towards the coverage of the politeness strategy.

The correlation between hedges and politeness strategy is the main aim in this analysis. Hedges do mitigate the face threat because of their nature to weaken the strength of the statement. It is advantageous to the mass media field in order to keep the objective atmosphere in their writings. As the criticism and accusation as common things conveyed in the mass media the hedging strategies help the author in the newspaper to sound neutral and objective also avoid damaging the face of the participants mentioned in their data.

B. Suggestions
As hedges are not included as part of speech and they are included as open category depending how it is used, more analysis on determining hedges needs to
be taken. In this case, the writer suggests that hedges analysis might be done within the syntactic analysis as the syntactic forms of the hedges also determine either certain linguistics expressions act as hedges or not. Moreover, the written discourse on hedges usage is still suggested in order to provide deeper analysis within the pragmatic areas in the written discourse, some of the source that might provide many cases on hedges is legal document and scientific articles.
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APPENDICES

1. New York Times Articles

A. Trump Threatens to End American Aid: ‘We’re Watching Those Votes’ at the U.N.

By MARK LANDLER DEC. 20, 2017

WASHINGTON — President Trump issued a threat on Wednesday to cut off American aid to any country that votes for a resolution at the United Nations condemning his recent decision to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.

Mr. Trump’s statement, delivered at a cabinet meeting in which he exulted over the passage of a tax overhaul, followed a letter to General Assembly members from the American ambassador to the United Nations, Nikki R. Haley, in which she warned that the United States would take note of countries that voted in favor of the measure. (Negative Pol Showing deference)

“All of these nations that take our money and then they vote against us at the Security Council or they vote against us, potentially, at the Assembly, they take hundreds of millions of dollars and even billions of dollars and then they vote against us,” Mr. Trump said.

“Well, we’re watching those votes,” he added. “Let them vote against us; we’ll save a lot. We don’t care.”

It is difficult to see how Mr. Trump can make good on that threat because it could involve cutting off financial assistance to the country’s most strategic allies in the Middle East. Some of those programs, like Egypt’s, are congressionally mandated. While the president can hold up aid unilaterally as a form of leverage, canceling it would require new legislation.

Still, the bitter confrontation at the United Nations shows the lingering repercussions of Mr. Trump’s decision to recognize Jerusalem, which defied world opinion and upended decades of American policy. While the decision has not unleashed the violence in the Arab capitals that some had feared, it has left the United States diplomatically isolated.

The General Assembly is scheduled to vote Thursday on a resolution that would express “deep regret at recent decisions concerning the status of Jerusalem,” according to a draft text. It would urge other countries not to move their embassies there from Tel Aviv.

Mr. Trump announced this month that the United States would relocate its embassy to Jerusalem, though State Department officials said a move was several years away because of the logistics of constructing a new embassy complex.

In Ms. Haley’s letter, a copy of which was seen by The New York Times, she said, “As you consider your vote, I want you to know that the president and U.S. take this vote personally.”

“To be clear,” she wrote, “we are not asking that other countries move their embassies to Jerusalem, though we think it would be appropriate. We are simply asking that you acknowledge the historical friendship, partnership and support we have extended and respect our decision about our own embassy.”

In a Twitter post on Tuesday, Ms. Haley said of the vote in the General Assembly, “the US will be taking names.”
On Monday, the United States used a rare veto to block a resolution in the Security Council calling for the administration to reverse its decision on Jerusalem. The vote on the resolution, which was drafted by Egypt, was 14 to 1, suggesting there could be a similarly wide margin against the United States in the 193-member General Assembly. Canada, the Czech Republic and Hungary might abstain from the vote, according to diplomats. Days after the United States, the Czech Republic recognized West Jerusalem as the Israeli capital, though it said it would not move its embassy before negotiating with countries in the region.

Egypt received $77.4 billion in foreign aid from the United States from 1948 to 2016, according to the Congressional Research Service, including about $1.3 billion in annual military aid.

Yemen and Turkey are sponsoring the General Assembly resolution, which underlines the problem Mr. Trump would face in retaliating for an anti-American vote. Yemen, which is torn by civil war, receives humanitarian aid from the United States, while Turkey is a North Atlantic Treaty Organization ally.

On Wednesday, Mr. Trump struck a familiar tone, declaring that “people are tired of the United States — people that live here, our great citizens that love this country — they’re tired of this country being taken advantage of, and we’re not going to be taken advantage of any longer.”

Derek H. Chollet, who served in the Obama administration, said: “This is an empty threat. Some of the countries Trump professes to be most admiring of would be caught in the cross-hairs of this.”

President Barack Obama withheld Harpoon missiles and F-16 fighter jets from Egypt in 2013 after the country’s army ousted President Mohamed Morsi. But Mr. Obama did not try to kill the overall aid program, even though some officials argued that the army’s action constituted a coup, grounds for cutting off the aid. In 2015, he reinstated the aid.

“The idea that you can use foreign assistance as a lever to influence the behavior of countries is not a new one,” Mr. Chollet said. “But this is bluster that other countries will see right through.”

Mr. Trump has threatened to hold up aid to Pakistan if it does not cooperate more with the United States on counterterrorism operations. During the 2016 presidential election, he warned that the United States might pull out of NATO because it shouldered an unfair burden in paying for the alliance.

It was also not the first time that Ms. Haley has used this language at the United Nations. Soon after taking her post, she said, “You’re going to see a change in the way we do business.” The United States, she said, would back its allies and expected their backing in return. “For those who don’t have our back,” she added, “we’re taking names.” At the cabinet meeting on Wednesday, Mr. Trump praised Ms. Haley, saying, “That was the right message that you and I agreed to be sent yesterday.”

But the deepening dispute over Jerusalem casts an even longer shadow over Mr. Trump’s hopes to broker a peace accord between Israel and the Palestinians. Vice President Mike Pence postponed a trip to Israel this week that some officials hoped would be a victory lap for the administration.

White House officials said Mr. Pence stayed in Washington as an insurance policy because of the vote in the Senate on the tax bill. But the trip was shaping up as divisive: the vice president was not going to meet with Palestinian leaders, who are still seething
over Mr. Trump’s decision on Jerusalem, which they regard as the capital of a future Palestinian state.

“They thought they were taking Jerusalem off the table,” said Aaron David Miller, a longtime Middle East negotiator, said of the Trump administration. “They now have guaranteed it will be there for breakfast, lunch and dinner.”

Rick Gladstone and Michael Schwirtz contributed reporting from the United Nations.

B. Terrorist Groups Vow Bloodshed over Jerusalem Decision. ISIS? Less So.

By RUKMINI CALLIMACHI
December 8, 2017

Osama bin Laden was just 14 when his mother noticed that he had stopped watching his favourite Westerns. She found him fixated instead on news reports about Palestinians, tears streaming down his face as he watched TV in their home in Saudi Arabia.

“In his teenage years, he was the same nice kid,” his mother related. “But he was more concerned, sad and frustrated by the situation in Palestine,” she said, according to Lawrence Wright’s account of bin Laden’s trajectory and Al Qaeda’s rise in his book, “The Looming Tower.”

The Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza has long been one of the themes invoked by jihadists to push a narrative of Muslim victimhood and to fan an us-versus-them framework. So it’s of little surprise that Qaeda affiliates across the world reacted with venom after President Trump this week recognized Jerusalem as Israel’s capital, a decision that was also denounced by Arab leaders.

The Taliban, Hamas and Shia extremist leaders also railed against the move.

But the outlier was the Islamic State, which waited until Friday to publish an editorial in its weekly newsletter — one that appeared to be mainly concerned with critiquing what it saw as hypocritical and self-serving statements by other jihadist groups and Arab leaders.

“How did ISIS respond to US announcement on #JerusalemEmbassy move? Outrage? Nope, Call to jihad? Not really,” the independent researcher Raphael Gluck wrote on Twitter. He added, “ISIS takes a stab at rival terror and Islamist groups accusing them of politicizing Palestinian cause to suit their own agendas.”

The article published by the Islamic State began: “Sixty years and Jerusalem has been in the hands of the Jews, and it is only now that people cry when the Crusaders announced today as their capital,” according to a translation provided by the Washington-based SITE Intelligence Group, which monitors the group’s propaganda.

“Are these cries over an issue to which they are accustomed to crying every time it is mentioned?” it added. “Or is it a new opportunity for the traders of faith and the fraudulent ones to raise their voices again?”

The Islamic State, also known as ISIS, argued that the focus should instead be on working to defeat the Arab countries ringing Israel, which they say “surround it the same way a bracelet surrounds the wrist, protecting the Jews from the strikes of the mujahideen.”
Even as the Islamic State’s official line played down the White House move, the group’s followers in chat rooms on the messaging app Telegram have busied themselves making revenge posters.

One shows Israeli and American flags burning in a pyre, with the signature dome of the Old City’s Al Aqsa Mosque pictured in the background. Images of Al Aqsa — one of the holiest sites in Islam, which is also revered by Jews as the Temple Mount — have been used in generations of jihadist propaganda.

“Wait for violent attacks on American and Jewish embassies by the wolves of the Islamic State,” the text alongside the images said.

That message was more in line with that of other terrorist groups, especially Al Qaeda. The world’s perceived indifference to the plight of the Palestinians is proof, jihadists say, of the second-class status of Muslims, and evidence that only through violence will Muslims regain their dignity.

The spokesman for the Shabab, Al Qaeda’s branch in East Africa, called Mr. Trump’s decision on Jerusalem “an aggression against Islam.” He urged its followers to pick up arms in revenge, according to SITE Intelligence.

“The Jews do not have the right to a grain of sand of Palestine and Jerusalem,” Qaeda’s affiliate in Yemen railed. Qaeda’s largest branch, in Syria, said, “We emphasize that whatever was taken by force can only be retrieved by force.”

And from Mali to Yemen to Afghanistan, jihadist groups ridiculed Mr. Trump. On his Telegram channel, Abu Muhammad al-Maqdisi, an influential Qaeda ideologue, posted a YouTube clip from a campaign rally last year, when Mr. Trump appeared startled after hearing a commotion behind him. He called Mr. Trump a “coward” and an easy mark, urging future terrorists to do their best to “surprise” him.

C. The Conflict in Jerusalem Is Distinctly Modern. Here’s the History.

By MONA BOSHNAQ, SEWELL CHAN, IRIT PAZNER GARSHOWITZ and GAIA TRIPOLI

In December 1917 — 100 years ago this month — the British general Edmund Allenby seized control of Jerusalem from its Ottoman Turkish defenders. Dismounting his horse, he entered the Old City on foot, through Jaffa Gate, out of respect for its holy status.

In the century since, Jerusalem has been fought over in varying ways, not only by Jews, Christians and Muslims but also by external powers and, of course, modern-day Israelis and Palestinians.

It is perhaps fitting that President Trump appears to have chosen this week to announce that the United States will recognize Jerusalem as Israel’s capital, despite concerns from leaders of Arab countries, Turkey and even close allies like France.

Conflicts over Jerusalem go back thousands of years — including biblical times, the Roman Empire and the Crusades — but the current one is a distinctly 20th-century story.
with roots in colonialism, nationalism and anti-Semitism. The New York Times asked several experts to walk readers through pivotal moments of the past century.

**1917-48: British Mandate**
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British soldiers awaiting the arrival of Gen. Edmund Allenby at Jaffa Gate in 1917. Credit: Culture Club/Getty Images
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Palestinian prisoners in the Old City of Jerusalem during the British Mandate. Credit: Fox Photos, via Getty Images
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The British authorities deported Jewish immigrants from Haifa in 1947. Credit: Pinn Hans/Agence France-Presse - Getty Images
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“It was for the British that Jerusalem was so important — they are the ones who established Jerusalem as a capital,” said Prof. Yehoshua Ben-Arieh, a historical geographer at Hebrew University. “Before, it was not anyone’s capital since the times of the First and Second Temples.”

The three decades of British rule that followed Allenby’s march on Jerusalem saw an influx of Jewish settlers drawn by the Zionist vision of a Jewish homeland, while the
local Arab population adjusted to the reality of the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, which had ruled the city since 1517.

“Paradoxically, Zionism recoiled from Jerusalem, particularly the Old City,” said Amnon Ramon, senior researcher at the Jerusalem Institute for Policy Research. “First because Jerusalem was regarded as a symbol of the diaspora, and second because the holy sites to Christianity and Islam were seen as complications that would not enable the creation of a Jewish state with Jerusalem as its capital.”

Many early Zionists were secular European socialists, motivated more by concerns about nationalism, self-determination and escape from persecution than by religious visions.

“Jerusalem was something of a backwater, a regression to a conservative culture that they were trying to move away from,” according to Michael Dumper, professor in Middle East politics at the University of Exeter in England. “Tel Aviv was the bright new city on a hill, the encapsulation of modernity.”

For Arabs, he said: “There was still something of the shock at not being in the Ottoman Empire. There was a reordering of their society. The local Palestinian aristocracy, the big families of Jerusalem, emerged as leaders of the Palestinian national movement, which was suddenly being confronted by Jewish migration.”

Opposition to that migration fueled several deadly riots by Palestinians, while Jews chafed at British rule and at immigration restrictions imposed in 1939 — restrictions that blocked many Jews fleeing the Holocaust from entering. After the war, in 1947, the United Nations approved a partition plan that provided for two states — one Jewish, one Arab — with Jerusalem governed by a “special international regime” owing to its unique status.

1948-67: A Divided City
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Damaged buildings in Ben Yehuda Street in central Jerusalem after car bombs in February 1948. Credit: Hugo H. Mendelsohn/Agence France-Presse — Getty Images
Palestinians in Jerusalem leaving the Jewish sector to go to Arab territory around 1948. Credit: Three Lions/Getty Images

Jews leaving a section of Jerusalem’s Old City in 1948. Credit: John Phillips/The LIFE Picture Collection, via Getty Images

The Arabs rejected the partition plan, and a day after Israel proclaimed its independence in 1948, the Arab countries attacked the new state. They were defeated. Amid violence by militias and mobs on both sides, huge numbers of Jews and Arabs were displaced. Jerusalem was divided: The western half became part of the new state of Israel (and its capital, under an Israeli law passed in 1950), while the eastern half, including the Old City, was occupied by Jordan. “For the Palestinians, it was seen as a rallying point,” Professor Dumper said.

Israel and Jordan, he said, were largely focused elsewhere. Israel built up its prosperous coastal areas — including Haifa, Tel Aviv and Ashkelon — into a thriving commercial zone, while the Jordanian king, Abdullah I, focused on the development of Amman, Jordan’s capital.

The early Israeli state was hesitant to focus too much on Jerusalem, given pressure from the United Nations and from the European powers, according to Issam Nassar, a historian at Illinois State University.

Having accepted the idea of international control of Jerusalem, the early Israeli leadership sought alternatives for a capital, perhaps Herzliya or somewhere in the south. They also realized that not having control of Jerusalem’s holy sites might have some advantages, according to Dr. Ramon.

While Israel moved many government functions to Jerusalem during the country’s first two decades, foreign governments largely avoided Jerusalem and opened embassies in Tel Aviv, in recognition of the United Nations resolution.

1967-93: Two Wars and an Intifada

Credit: John Phillips/The LIFE Picture Collection, via Getty Images
No event has shaped the modern contest over Jerusalem as much as the Arab-Israeli War of 1967, in which Israel not only defeated invading Arab armies but also seized control of the Gaza Strip and the Sinai Peninsula from Egypt; the West Bank and East Jerusalem from Jordan; and the Golan Heights from Syria.

“The turning points in 1967 were two: the great victory, including the fast shift from fears of defeat before the war to euphoria and the feeling that everything was possible, and the emotional impact of occupying the Old City,” said Menachem Klein, a political scientist at Bar-Ilan University in Israel.

Images of Israeli soldiers praying at the Western Wall, to which they had been denied access during Jordanian rule, became seared into Israel’s national consciousness. “Jerusalem became the center of a cultlike devotion that had not really existed previously,” said Rashid Khalidi, a professor of modern Arab studies at Columbia University. “This has now been fetishized to an extraordinary degree as hard-line religious nationalism has come to predominate in Israeli politics, with the Western Wall as its focus.”
The victory of the right-leaning party Likud in 1977, under the leadership of Menachem Begin, helped solidify this new emphasis on Jerusalem as integral to Israel’s identity. Religious settlers became more prominent in political life in Israel, beginning a long ascendance that has never really halted. Old-line socialists with roots in Russia and Eastern Europe gave way to a more diverse — and also more religious — population of Israelis with origins in the Middle East, North Africa and other regions.

As part of this shift, Jerusalem’s symbolic importance intensified. Its role in Jewish history was emphasized in military parades and curriculums, and students from across Israel were taken there on school visits. This process culminated in 1980, when lawmakers passed a bill declaring that “Jerusalem, complete and united, is the capital of Israel” — although Israel stopped short of annexing East Jerusalem, a move that would most likely have drawn international outrage.

1993-present: Oslo and Beyond
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Israeli soldiers refusing Palestinians entry into Jerusalem from the West Bank in 2016. Credit: Daniel Berehulak for The New York Times
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Palestinians hurling shoes at the Israeli police at the Aqsa Mosque in 2001, during the second intifada. Credit: Getty Images
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The scene after a Palestinian suicide bomber blew himself up in West Jerusalem in 2001. Credit: Getty Images
Construction work in a Jewish settlement in the mainly Palestinian eastern sector of Jerusalem in November. Credit: Ahmad Gharabli/Agence France-Presse — Getty Images

The 1993 Oslo accord provided for the creation of a Palestinian Authority to govern the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, while deferring a resolution on core issues: borders, refugees and Jerusalem’s status. In the nearly quarter-century since, the prospects for a lasting peace deal have seemed ever more elusive.

A visit by the right-wing politician Ariel Sharon in 2000 to the sacred complex known to Jews as the Temple Mount and to Muslims as the Noble Sanctuary — which contains Al Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock — set off violent clashes and led to a second Palestinian uprising that claimed the lives of about 3,000 Palestinians and 1,000 Israelis over five years.

Palestinians say that Jewish settlers have encroached on East Jerusalem, and that Israel has compounded the problem by revoking residency permits. Even so, the ethnic composition of Jerusalem’s population has remained about 30 percent to 40 percent Arab. “The entire international community has been in accord that Israeli annexation and settlement of East Jerusalem since 1967 is illegal, and refuses to recognize Jerusalem as Israel’s capital,” Professor Khalidi said. “If Trump changes this position, given the importance of Jerusalem to Arabs and Muslims, it is hard to see how a sustainable Palestinian-Israeli agreement or lasting Arab-Israeli normalization is possible.”

Professor Ben-Arieh says the conflict over the city is likely to endure. “The Arab-Jewish conflict escalated into a nationalistic conflict, with Jerusalem at its center,” he said. “Jerusalem was a city holy to three religions, but the moment that, in the land of Israel, two nations grew — the Jewish people and the local Arab people — both embraced Jerusalem. More than Jerusalem needed them, they needed Jerusalem.”

A version of this article appears in print on December 6, 2017, on Page A8 of the New York edition with the headline: The Current Conflict in Jerusalem Is Distinctly Modern. Order Reprints| Today's Paper|Subscribe

D. The Jerusalem Issue, Explained
The Interpreter
By MAX FISHER DEC. 9, 2017

Why is President Trump’s announcement that the United States now considers Jerusalem to be Israel’s capital such a big deal? Why are some experts warning of violence or an end to the peace process? What’s the dispute over Jerusalem all about, anyway? Let’s review.

What Are the Basics?
Both Israelis and Palestinians claim the city as their political capital and as a sacred religious site. Israel controls the entirety of the city. Any peace deal would need to resolve that.

The city’s status has been disputed, at least officially, since the 1948 Arab-Israeli War. Before that, the United Nations had designated Jerusalem as a special international zone. During the war, Israel seized the city’s western half. It seized the eastern half during the next Arab-Israeli war, in 1967.

Most foresee a peace deal that gives western Jerusalem to Israel and eastern Jerusalem to a future Palestinian state.
The United States, in order to present itself as a dispassionate broker, long considered Jerusalem’s status to be a conflict issue that was up to Israelis and Palestinians to decide. Mr. Trump is breaking with that traditional neutrality.

**Maybe more important**, Israeli’s position on Jerusalem **isn’t just that** its capital should be somewhere in the city. A **1980 law declared** Jerusalem to be Israel’s “undivided” capital, which was widely understood as a de facto annexation of the city’s eastern half. Mr. Trump, in endorsing Jerusalem as Israel’s capital, did not explicitly endorse this idea. But he didn’t reject it, either. Nor did he say that Jerusalem should also become the Palestinian capital.

**This implies** that the United States is increasingly supportive of Israel’s position — full annexation — though this would almost certainly kill any viable peace deal.

**Why Does It Matter if the U.S. Takes Sides?**

The United States has, for decades, positioned itself as the primary mediator between Israelis and Palestinians. Neutrality ostensibly allows the United States to remain a credible arbiter and keeps both sides at the negotiating table. American diplomats tend to consider neutrality a bedrock principle and essential for peace, and see Mr. Trump’s announcement as an alarming break. But the policy of neutrality has grown contentious in American politics since the 1980s and the rise of the evangelical Christian right as a political force.

The movement’s pro-Israel positions — strongly in favor of Israeli control of Jerusalem — have roots in millenarian theology as well as more straightforward identity politics. (Still, a number of Palestinians are themselves Christian, and Jerusalem’s Christian leaders objected to Mr. Trump’s move.)

Evangelical Christians have been joined by a subset of American Jews and others on the political right in arguing that the United States should overtly back Israel in the conflict. This position hardened during the second intifada, a period of vicious Israeli-Palestinian conflict in the early 2000s.

This debate has often played out over Jerusalem. Presidential candidates will promise to move the American Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, thereby recognizing the city as Israel’s capital. But once in office, the new president will forestall the move, explaining that peace should be given a chance.

Mr. Trump actually went ahead (though only partly, because he will not move the embassy right away), implicitly endorsing an American shift from neutral arbiter to overtly siding with Israel.

**Has the U.S. Really Been Neutral?**

That is not really the perception outside of the United States, particularly in Europe and the rest of the Middle East. Much of the world already considered the United States a biased and unhelpful actor, promoting Israeli interests in a way that perpetuated the conflict.

Partly this is because of the power imbalance between Israelis and Palestinians. Because the far stronger Israelis are the occupiers, and the United States is seen as a steward for the conflict, the Americans are sometimes blamed, rightly or wrongly, for that imbalance.

Partly it is because of domestic politics that led American leaders to pronounce themselves as pro-Israel while pursuing policies intended as neutral. But it is also because of a decades-old American negotiating tactic. The last three administrations — led by Bill Clinton, George W. Bush and Barack Obama — all believed that they needed to grant Israel concessions to make Israeli leaders feel secure and comfortable enough to make their own concessions for peace.
So Mr. Trump’s move, though he does not describe it this way, is arguably in line with past American strategy. And it is seen abroad as confirming long-held doubts about American leadership, rather than as drastically new.

What Happens Now?
Protests, which sometimes grow violent, have been a common Palestinian answer to perceived provocations, particularly on issues related to Jerusalem. The Palestinian view is that Israel’s occupation should be made costly and uncomfortable if it is to ever end.

As for the wider Arab response, the United States is just not very popular or trusted in the region. That tends to happen when you invade an Arab-majority country, Iraq, on what most Arabs consider false pretenses, starting a war that kills hundreds of thousands. This move is going to be unpopular, but it’s sort of a drop in the bucket.

Still, it could complicate regional politics. Marc Lynch, a political scientist at George Washington University, wrote in The Washington Post, “The visible pursuit of peace, if not its achievement, has long been the mechanism by which the United States reconciles its alliances with Israel and with ostensibly anti-Israel Arab states.”

This could make it harder for Arab governments to justify their cooperation with what is perceived to be an American-Israeli plot against Palestinians. Even if Arab governments do not themselves care much about Palestinians, they worry about domestic unrest. That doesn’t mean Arab states will break with Washington, but they might need to be a little quieter and more careful about cooperating.

What Does This Change Long Term?
Warnings of a long-term shift tend to hinge on the idea that losing American neutrality means losing American leverage over Israelis and Palestinians to achieve peace.

But the simple fact of American power makes the country an important broker, neutral or not. American leverage with Israel also comes from implicitly guaranteeing Israel’s security and providing it with lots of military hardware. Still, because Israel got something for nothing from Mr. Trump’s announcement, it has little reason to make difficult concessions.

American leverage over Palestinian leaders is also significant, since those leaders rely on American support to keep their administration funded and stable. But those leaders are deeply unpopular with their own people. A real risk here is that they one day grow so unpopular that their administration collapses. This would risk chaos and violence in the short term and, long term, a likely takeover by the militant Palestinian group Hamas.

All of that points toward a future in which peace is less likely, a Palestinian state is less likely and Israel is one day forced to choose between the two core components of its national identity: Jewish and democratic. Either it asserts permanent control over Palestinians without granting them full rights — a sort of state that critics sometimes compare to apartheid South Africa — or it grants Palestinians full rights, establishing a pluralistic democracy that is no longer officially Jewish.

Mr. Trump’s move likely edges Israelis and Palestinians closer to that future. But things were probably moving in that direction already.

The Interpreter is a column by Max Fisher and Amanda Taub exploring the ideas and context behind major world events. Follow them on Twitter: @Max_Fisher and @amandataub.

A version of this article appears in print on December 10, 2017, on Page A16 of the New York edition with the headline: Jerusalem, Explained: Why Trump’s Decision Matters and What’s Next. Order Reprints| Today's Paper|Subscribe
E. Did Trump Kill Off a Two-State Solution? He Says No, Palestinians Say Yes

By MARK LANDLER, DAVID M. HALBFINGER and ISABEL KERSHNER DEC. 7, 2017

WASHINGTON — President Trump, in formally recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel on Wednesday, declared that the United States still supported a two-state solution to settle the conflict between the Israelis and Palestinians, provided it was “agreed to by both sides.”

For the first time in his 26 years as a peacemaker, the chief negotiator for the Palestinians did not agree.

Saeb Erekat, the secretary general of the Palestine Liberation Organization and a steadfast advocate for a Palestinian state, said in an interview on Thursday that Mr. Trump and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel “have managed to destroy that hope.” He embraced a radical shift in the P.L.O.’s goals — to a single state, but with Palestinians enjoying the same civil rights as Israelis, including the vote.

“They’ve left us with no option,” he said. “This is the reality. We live here. Our struggle should focus on one thing: equal rights.”

Mr. Erekat’s change of heart is unlikely to change Palestinian policy. The dream of a Palestinian state is too deeply ingrained in a generation of its leaders for the Palestinian Authority to abandon it now. Israel would be unlikely to accede to equal rights, because granting a vote to millions of Palestinians would eventually lead to the end of Israel as a Jewish state.

But the fact that Mr. Erekat is speaking openly about it attests to the turmoil caused in the Middle East by Mr. Trump’s recognition of Jerusalem. More so than the protests that erupted in the West Bank, which injured dozens of people but were less intense than expected, the comments of senior Palestinians like Mr. Erekat captured the profound sense of despair.

Administration officials strenuously reject the argument that Mr. Trump has foreclosed a two-state solution. He recommitted himself to brokering what he has called the “ultimate deal” between the two sides, they said. He studiously avoided taking a position on the eventual borders or sovereignty of Jerusalem. And he called for status quo in the administration of the Jewish and Muslim holy sites in the Old City of Jerusalem.

“We want an agreement that is a great deal for the Israelis and a great deal for the Palestinians,” Mr. Trump said.

Beyond the president’s words, there were other signs he is serious about his intentions. On the same day that he signed his name with a John Hancock-like flourish to a proclamation recognizing Jerusalem as the capital, he quietly signed another document that will delay the move of the American Embassy to the city for at least six months — and quite probably much longer.

White House officials insist that Mr. Trump’s decision was driven by practical and logistical, not political, considerations. The State Department, they said, cannot open a functioning embassy in Jerusalem on the timetable stipulated under a 1995 law that requires the president to sign a national-security waiver every six months to keep the embassy in Tel Aviv.

But putting off the move avoids a tangible symbol of America’s new policy and spares the White House a series of decisions — like where in the city to place the embassy — that would begin to define the geography of Mr. Trump’s deliberately general statement about Jerusalem.
“Avoiding a move of the embassy is a way of avoiding geographic definition,” said Martin S. Indyk, a former American ambassador to Israel. “Avoiding any geographic definition of their recognition of Jerusalem looks like their effort to keep the peace process alive.”

Legal experts said there was nothing in the 1995 law that would prevent the Trump administration from simply hanging a sign outside the existing American consulate in Jerusalem and calling it the embassy. After the fall of the Soviet Union, the United States hastily set up embassies in temporary quarters in the capitals of newly independent republics.

F. U.N., European Union and Pope Criticize Trump’s Jerusalem Announcement

By JASON HOROWITZ DEC. 6, 2017

What World Leaders Think of Jerusalem as Israel's Capital

Global and regional leaders warned of the dangers of declaring Jerusalem as Israel’s capital. President Trump announced the change on Wednesday.

ROME — Pope Francis said, “I cannot remain silent.” The United Nations secretary general spoke of his “great anxiety.” The European Union expressed “serious concern.” American allies like Britain, France, Germany and Italy all declared it a mistake.

A chorus of international leaders criticized the Trump administration’s decision on Wednesday to officially recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, calling it a dangerous disruption that contravenes United Nations resolutions and could inflame one of the world’s thorniest conflicts.

Secretary General António Guterres and Pope Francis both expressed alarm that the announcement would provoke new tensions in the Holy City, which is revered by Jews, Christians and Muslims.

Within minutes of Mr. Trump’s speech, in which he said the American Embassy would be moved from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, Mr. Guterres delivered what amounted to a diplomatic rebuke.

Reading a statement outside the Security Council chambers at United Nations headquarters in New York, Mr. Guterres criticized “any unilateral measures that would jeopardize the prospect of peace for Israelis and Palestinians,” underscoring the administration’s departure from decades of American policy.

“Jerusalem is a final-status issue that must be resolved through direct negotiations between the two parties on the basis of the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, taking into account the legitimate concerns of both the Palestinian and the Israeli sides,” Mr. Guterres said.

“In this moment of great anxiety, I want to make it clear: There is no alternative to the two-state solution,” he said. “There is no Plan B.”

In Rome, Pope Francis prayed that Jerusalem’s status be preserved and needless conflict avoided.

“I cannot remain silent about my deep concern for the situation that has developed in recent days,” Francis said at his weekly general audience at the Vatican. “And at the same time, I wish to make a heartfelt appeal to ensure that everyone is committed to respecting
the status quo of the city, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.”

“Jerusalem is a unique city,” he said, “sacred to Jews, Christians and Muslims, where the Holy Places for the respective religions are venerated, and it has a special vocation to peace.”

In especially strong language, the pope added, “I pray to the Lord that such identity be preserved and strengthened for the benefit of the Holy Land, the Middle East and the entire world, and that wisdom and prudence prevail, to avoid adding new elements of tension in a world already shaken and scarred by many cruel conflicts.”

The European Union’s top diplomat, Federica Mogherini, expressed concern about “the repercussions this may have on the prospect of peace.”

In a statement, she reiterated the bloc’s position that Jerusalem should be a future capital of two states, Israeli and Palestinian, and that embassies should not be moved there until the city’s final status was resolved. She cited a 1980 United Nations Security Council resolution that condemned Israel’s attempted annexation of East Jerusalem as a violation of international law.

She called on actors in the region “to show calm and restraint in order to prevent any escalation.”

Within a few hours of Mr. Trump’s speech, eight countries on the 15-member Security Council — including some of America’s closest allies — requested an emergency meeting to be held before the end of the week. Diplomats said it would most likely be scheduled for Friday.

Joakim Vaverka, political coordinator of Sweden’s United Nations mission, said in a statement that the delegations of Bolivia, Britain, Egypt, France, Italy, Senegal, Sweden and Uruguay had sought the meeting, including a briefing by Mr. Guterres, “in light of the statement today by the president of the United States regarding the status of Jerusalem.”

The warnings by the pope, the United Nations and the European Union spoke to a broad fear that Mr. Trump’s announcement would be the death knell for an already moribund peace process and that it would pull the plug on a two-state solution.

Critics of the announcement said the change in policy removed any pretense that the United States is a neutral broker for peace. Palestinians and other Arabs in the region already view the Trump administration as leaning toward Israel’s right-wing government. The change in American policy “destroys the peace process,” said the Palestinian prime minister, Rami Hamdallah.

Prime Minister Theresa May of Britain called Mr. Trump’s decision “unhelpful in terms of prospects for peace in the region.” President Emmanuel Macron of France, who was in Algeria on Wednesday meeting with the country’s president and other figures, said in a news conference that the decision by Mr. Trump was “regrettable” and that “France and Europe are committed to a two-state solution.” He called on all parties to refrain from violence.

Germany’s chancellor, Angela Merkel, said through a spokesman that her government “does not support this position, because the status of Jerusalem is to be resolved in the framework of a two-state solution.”

Prime Minister Paolo Gentiloni of Italy wrote on Twitter: “Jerusalem holy city, unique on earth. Its future will be defined within the framework of the peace process based on the two states, Israel and Palestine.”

In China, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs spokesman, Geng Shuang, expressed support for a Palestinian state with East Jerusalem as its capital and urged all parties to the
conflict to proceed cautiously. “What we worry about is any potential flare-up of regional tensions,” he said. “The status of Jerusalem is a complicated and sensitive issue.”

Britain’s foreign minister, Boris Johnson, told reporters in Brussels, “Clearly this is a decision that makes it more important than ever that the long-awaited American proposals on the Middle East peace process are now brought forward.”

That process, led by Mr. Trump’s son-in-law, Jared Kushner, has seemingly failed to get off the ground.

Leaders in the region had already warned against the move. A statement from the royal palace of King Abdullah II of Jordan, whose kingdom is the custodian of Al Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem, emphasized that the city was critical to “achieving peace and stability in the region and the world.”

In Turkey, President Recep Tayyip Erdogan was convening a summit meeting of the main Pan-Islamic body next week in Istanbul to discuss the American move and to show, as his spokesman Ibrahim Kalin told reporters in Ankara, “joint action among Islamic countries.”

Mr. Kalin called the expected change a “grave mistake,” adding that “Jerusalem is our honor, Jerusalem is our common cause, Jerusalem is our red line.”

Iran, unsurprisingly, condemned the change. Its supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, said at a conference in Tehran on Wednesday that it reflected the “incompetence and failure” of the American government.

Like much of Europe, the Vatican has long been sympathetic to the plight of Palestinians. The Vatican established full diplomatic relations with Israel in 1994, and Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI visited Israel and the Palestinian territories.

In 2012, the Vatican called for “an internationally guaranteed special statute” for Jerusalem, with the goal of “safeguarding the freedom of religion and of conscience, the identity and sacred character of Jerusalem as a Holy City, (and) respect for, and freedom of, access to its holy places.”

Francis visited the Holy Land in 2014, but he upset some Israelis by flying by helicopter directly from Jordan to the “State of Palestine,” as the Vatican schedule at the time referred to the territories. He visited Israel afterward.

In 2015, the Vatican entered into a treaty with the “State of Palestine.”

On Tuesday, Francis spoke by telephone to the Palestinian Authority president, Mahmoud Abbas, about the unfolding crisis. Before the pope’s public remarks to the faithful at the Vatican on Wednesday, he met privately with a group of Palestinians participating in interfaith dialogue with officials at the Vatican.

“The Holy Land is for us Christians the land par excellence of dialogue between God and mankind,” he said. “The primary condition of that dialogue is reciprocal respect and a commitment to strengthening that respect, for the sake of recognizing the rights of all people, wherever they happen to be.”
G. U.S. to Recognize Jerusalem as Israel’s Capital, Trump Says, Alarming Middle East Leaders

By MARK LANDLER and DAVID M. HALBFINGER DEC. 5, 2017

Why Jerusalem Is So Contested

President Trump declared recognition of Jerusalem as Israel’s capital. Here’s why that’s so fraught.

By CAMILLA SCHICK on Publish Date December 5, 2017.

WASHINGTON — President Trump plans to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and move the American Embassy there, upending nearly seven decades of American foreign policy and potentially destroying his efforts to broker peace between Israel and the Palestinians.

BOR Mr. Trump’s decision, a high-risk foray into the thicket of the Middle East, was driven not by diplomatic calculations but by a campaign promise. He appealed to evangelicals and ardently pro-Israel American Jews in 2016 by vowing to move the embassy, and advisers said on Tuesday he was determined to make good on his word.

But the president, faced with a deadline of this past Monday to make that decision, still plans to sign a national security waiver to keep the embassy in Tel Aviv for an additional six months, even as he set in motion a plan to move it to Jerusalem. Officials said the process would take several years.

More significantly, Mr. Trump is set to announce his formal recognition of Jerusalem as the Israeli capital in a formal speech at the White House on Wednesday, when he will become the first American president to take that step since the founding of Israel in 1948.

The Times will have live coverage of the address, which is scheduled to take place at 1 p.m. Eastern time in the Diplomatic Reception Room of the White House.

Mr. Trump spent Tuesday morning explaining the policy change in telephone calls with Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel; Mahmoud Abbas, the Palestinian Authority president; and to Arab leaders who warned him that it would disrupt the peace process, perhaps fatally, and could unleash a new wave of violence across the region.

“Moving the U.S. embassy is a dangerous step that provokes the feelings of Muslims around the world,” King Salman of Saudi Arabia told Mr. Trump in their call, according to Saudi state television.

Late on Tuesday, Palestinian national and Islamic groups issued a joint statement calling for three days of “popular anger” to protest Mr. Trump’s move, beginning on Wednesday throughout the Palestinian territories and in demonstrations at United States embassies and consulates around the world.

Fearing attacks, the American consulate in Jerusalem barred employees and family members from going to the Old City or the West Bank, while the State Department urged embassies around the world to tighten their security.

Jerusalem is one of the world’s most fiercely contested swaths of real estate, with both sides disputing each other’s claims. West Jerusalem is the seat of Israel’s government, but the Palestinians view East Jerusalem as the capital of a future Palestinian state, and most of the world considers it occupied territory. Jerusalem’s Old City has the third-holiest mosque in Islam and the holiest site in Judaism, making the city’s status a sensitive issue for Muslims and Jews worldwide alike.

Mr. Trump’s decision drew applause from some in Israel and the United States, even if Mr. Netanyahu and the Israeli government were studiously silent in advance of the president’s speech.

“The U.S. recognizing Jerusalem as Israel’s capital is a positive and important step, particularly amid Palestinian efforts to undermine the historic ties between the Jewish
nation and the City of David,” said Amos Yadlin, executive director of Tel Aviv University’s Institute for National Security Studies.

Morton Klein, president of the Zionist Organization of America, said, “It is high time to move the embassy to Jerusalem.” He added, “Not moving it to Jerusalem for 22 years has not brought us closer to peace.”

White House officials said Mr. Trump remained committed to what he has called the “ultimate deal” between Israel and the Palestinians. The decision, they said, was “recognition of current and historic reality.” They said it could hasten, rather than impede, peace negotiations by removing a source of ambiguity from the American position.

Mr. Trump, officials said, would make clear that the United States is not taking a position on whether, or how, Jerusalem is divided between Israel and the Palestinians. He will also not take a position on a disputed area of the Old City, known as the Temple Mount to Jews and the Haram al-Sharif to Muslims, which has been a flash point for tensions.

But even with those caveats, Mr. Trump’s decision seems likely to disrupt, if not dissolve, the peace effort. Administration officials said they expected the Palestinians to walk away from the process, at least for now. The White House is girding itself for an eruption of violence, coordinating plans with several agencies to protect American citizens abroad.

“You can finesse this all you want, but Jerusalem doesn’t allow for any finesse,” said Martin S. Indyk, a former American ambassador to Israel. “They can try to limit the damage all they want, but they won’t be able to, because Jerusalem is such a hot-button issue.”

To some extent, Mr. Trump’s willingness to take such a risk underscores how little progress his peace negotiators — led by his son-in-law, Jared Kushner — have made. Six months ago, when the president last had to decide whether to sign a waiver to keep the embassy in Tel Aviv, Mr. Kushner prevailed on Mr. Trump to do so, in the interest of the peace process.

Since then, however, the administration’s efforts have shown little evidence of narrowing the differences between Israelis and Palestinians. Mr. Kushner and Jason D. Greenblatt, the president’s special envoy, supported Mr. Trump’s decision, officials said.

Mr. Trump’s pledge was extremely popular with evangelicals and pro-Israel backers, including the casino magnate Sheldon Adelson, who donated $25 million to a political action committee supporting Mr. Trump during the presidential campaign. Mr. Adelson expressed anger when Mr. Trump signed the waiver in June to keep the embassy in Tel Aviv.

The White House, which has done little to lay the groundwork for the move, on Tuesday contacted pro-Israel leaders from the Jewish and Christian communities to invite them to a conference call set for Wednesday afternoon, according to an invitee who spoke about it on condition of anonymity because he did not want to jeopardize his relationship with Mr. Trump’s team.

Mr. Klein was among several supporters who questioned why the embassy move would take several years. Former diplomats have said that the United States could relocate the embassy simply by hanging a new sign outside the American consulate in Jerusalem.

White House officials, however, said the administration’s lawyers concluded that would not be in compliance with a 1995 law, under which Congress instructed the president to move the embassy and required him to sign a waiver every six months to delay it. Legally, the officials said, the United States would have to move embassy staff into the building as well.
Reaction to Mr. Trump’s move in the Arab world was swift and negative, even from normally friendly leaders.

King Abdullah II of Jordan strongly cautioned against the move, “stressing that Jerusalem is the key to achieving peace and stability in the region and the world,” according to a statement from the royal palace in Amman. The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is the custodian of Al Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem.

“King Abdullah stressed that the adoption of this resolution will have serious implications for security and stability in the Middle East, and will undermine the efforts of the American administration to resume the peace process and fuel the feelings of Muslims and Christians,” the statement said.

Few details of the conversation between Mr. Trump and Mr. Abbas were released, but a spokesman for the Palestine Liberation Organization said the call had given shape to the worst fears of Palestinians.

“It’s very serious,” said the P.L.O. spokesman, Xavier Abu Eid. “Things look very bad.” The Palestinian news agency, WAFA, quoted Mr. Abbas’s spokesman, Nabil Abu Rudeineh, as saying that Mr. Abbas will continue his contacts with world leaders to prevent such “unacceptable action.”

King Abdullah also spoke with Mr. Abbas, assuring him of Jordan’s support for the Palestinians “in preserving their historic rights in Jerusalem and the need to work together to confront the consequences of this decision,” it said.

Mr. Trump, officials said, assured Mr. Abbas that the administration would protect Palestinian interests in any peace negotiation with Israel. He also invited the Palestinian leader to visit him in Washington for further consultations. Mr. Abbas said he could not come for a while.

Mark Landler reported from Washington, and David M. Halbfinger from Jerusalem. Julie Hirschfeld Davis contributed reporting from Washington.

A version of this article appears in print on December 6, 2017, on Page A1 of the New York edition with the headline: Trump’s Pledge Over Jerusalem Rattles Mideast.

H. Nearly Every Former U.S. Ambassador to Israel Disagrees With Trump’s Jerusalem Decision

By SEWELL CHAN DEC. 7, 2017

All but two of 11 former United States ambassadors to Israel contacted by The New York Times after President Trump’s decision to recognize Jerusalem as Israel’s capital thought the plan was wrongheaded, dangerous or deeply flawed.

The 11 ex-envoys all closely followed Mr. Trump’s announcement on Wednesday, in which he also set in motion a plan to move the American Embassy to Jerusalem from Tel Aviv. Even those who agreed that Mr. Trump was recognizing the reality on the ground disagreed with his approach — making a major diplomatic concession without any evident gain in return.

One of the exceptions was Ogden R. Reid, a former congressman who was the ambassador from 1959 to 1961, at the end of the Eisenhower administration. “I think it's the right decision,” he said. “Not a lot more to say.”
The other exception was Edward S. Walker Jr., who was ambassador from 1997 to 1999, under President Bill Clinton. “I think it’s about time,” he said. “We’ve been remiss in not recognizing realities as they are. We all know Israel has a capital, it’s called Jerusalem, and over my 35 years of service in the Middle East no one ever questioned that.”

What about the departure from United States policy since 1948 — that the final status of Jerusalem is a matter for negotiation between the Israelis and Palestinians — and the condemnation from the international community?

“It’s really a question of what are the lines, the borders, to be drawn around the state of Israel and the ultimate state of Palestine,” Mr. Walker said. “Nothing in what the president has said precludes the negotiation of a settlement of this issue.”

That was not the prevailing view. More typical was the perspective of Daniel C. Kurtzer, who was the ambassador from 2001 to 2005, under President George W. Bush.

“There are many downsides, both diplomatically and in terms of the Middle East peace process, and no upside,” Mr. Kurtzer said. “We are isolated internationally once again — except for the Israeli government, which supports this — and we are taking ourselves out of the role the president says he wants to play as a peace broker.”

What of the argument that the peace process, with the goal of a two-state political solution, was dormant, and needed to be shaken up?

“The fact that the process is moribund calls for a much more dramatic role,” he said. “It doesn’t call for the U.S. to lean over and adopt the position of one party and offer nothing to the other party.”

Richard H. Jones, who was ambassador from 2005 to 2009, also under Mr. Bush, warned that groups like Hamas and the Islamic State would exploit the issue to incite violence, and predicted that the Palestinian Authority would step up international efforts to boycott and condemn Israel.

“This is a risky move, which no doubt will cost lives in Israel and the region, particularly as Israeli settlers use it to justify accelerating their activity further,” he said in an email.

Several of the ambassadors were open to recognizing West Jerusalem as Israel’s capital. But they said that should happen as part of a broader strategy that would also require the Israelis to halt or slow settlement construction and that would recognize East Jerusalem as the capital of a future Palestinian state.

Martin S. Indyk, who served as ambassador twice, both times during Bill Clinton’s presidency, proposed just such a deal in an Op-Ed essay in The New York Times this year, weeks before Mr. Trump was sworn in.

“Not surprisingly, President Trump didn’t follow my advice to couple his move on Jerusalem with a diplomatic initiative,” Mr. Indyk said on Thursday. “Instead, he tried to limit the damage by avoiding any geographic definition of the capital that he is officially recognizing. Unfortunately, that nuance will be lost on all sides.”

William Andreas Brown, who was the ambassador from 1988 to 1992, and returned to the United States Embassy in Israel as chief of mission early in the Clinton administration, recalled that he once wrote a memo to the first President George Bush urging that the embassy be moved to Jerusalem.

“My motivation was to incentivize Israel’s participation in the Madrid peace talks,” he said, referring to negotiations in 1991 that helped give momentum to what later became the Oslo process. He recalled that there was significant resistance to the proposal in the Bush administration, and that the idea was dropped.

“If he was going to make this announcement, it ought to be very, very carefully crafted so as to minimize a blowup,” he said, making clear he did not think Mr. Trump had succeeded.
William Caldwell Harrop, who was the ambassador from 1992 to 1993, called Mr. Trump’s decision “slightly reckless” and even “kind of a masochistic move” that might “undermine his own, repeatedly discussed, ‘great deal’ of bringing peace to the Israelis and Palestinians.”

Having decided to make his announcement, Mr. Trump could have been explicit that he would place the embassy in West Jerusalem, Mr. Harrop said.

“One has to be pessimistic,” he said after listening to Mr. Trump’s speech. “We’ll get, before long, more efforts by Palestinians to build up international recognition of the state of Palestine. Some form of intifada is very likely, and there will be more bloodshed.”

Edward P. Djerejian, who was the ambassador from 1993 to 1994, in the optimistic aftermath of the Oslo peace accords, also found Mr. Trump’s effort to thread the needle unsatisfying.

Mr. Trump portrayed his decision more as a recognition of on-the-ground reality than as a sharp change in policy, insisting that “the specific boundaries” of Israeli sovereignty in Jerusalem had

But Mr. Djerejian, who was a White House spokesman during the Reagan presidency, said there was “an inherent contradiction” in recognizing Jerusalem without saying what, exactly, comprises Jerusalem. “The timing and substance of this new position serves to confuse rather than clarify,” he said.

James B. Cunningham, who was ambassador under President George W. Bush and President Barack Obama, called Mr. Trump’s decision “a pretty serious mistake,” and said that moving the embassy would have made sense only as “part of a strategy, not simply to demonstrate that you’re trying to do something different.”

He added, “It doesn’t make Israel safer, the United States safer, or the region more stable.”

The most recent former ambassador, Daniel B. Shapiro, who served under Mr. Obama, was sympathetic to Mr. Trump’s goal, if not the execution.

“Jerusalem is Israel’s capital, and it’s appropriate that we recognize it as such,” he said in a phone interview. “In that sense, the president’s recognition of reality is fine.”

He continued: “The missed opportunity here, though, is the failure to frame this decision in the context of achieving our broader strategic objective, which is a two-state solution. That would have required better prior consultation with Arab states. That would have required more clarity for what the Palestinians could expect as part of their aspirations for Jerusalem.”

He said the decision might undermine the peace process that Mr. Trump’s son-in-law, Jared Kushner, and special representative, Jason Greenblatt, have been working on.

Most of the former ambassadors were reluctant to ascribe motivations to Mr. Trump, though several said the move would bolster his support among hard-line supporters of Israel in the United States and among some evangelical Christians.

However, Thomas R. Pickering, who was ambassador to Israel during the Reagan administration, called it “a serious foreign policy mistake” and an attempt either at “ego satisfaction” or an effort to divert attention from a special counsel’s investigation into the Trump campaign’s ties with Russia.

In an interview, Mr. Pickering compared Mr. Trump’s move to the film “Wag the Dog,” in which a president fabricates a war to distract attention from a sex scandal.

Follow Sewell Chan on Twitter: @sewellchan.

A version of this article appears in print on December 8, 2017, on Page A8 of the New York edition with the headline: Former Ambassadors To Israel Disagree With Trump’s Decision. Order Reprints| Today's Paper|Subscribe
2. Al Jazeera

A. What a US embassy in Jerusalem means to Palestinians

Analysts warn Trump's US embassy move to Jerusalem will 'nullify plans for future peace negotiations'.

by Farah Najjar

7 Dec 2017

'If US President Donald Trump carries out his decision, he will inflame the entire region and threaten the US' interests there' [Reuters]

US President Donald Trump called Jerusalem the capital of Israel on Wednesday and launched the process to transfer his country's embassy to the city.
The Arab League and other groups earlier urged the US president to reconsider, saying there will be "repercussions".

In a telephone call on Monday, Hamas leader Ismail Haniya and Palestinian Authority (PA) leader Mahmoud Abbas called for a mass protest on Wednesday, and discussed how to unify the Palestinian people's efforts to confront the threats facing Jerusalem.

The PA has also called on the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation and the Gulf Cooperation Council to hold meetings on this subject.

"If US President Donald Trump carries out his decision, he will inflame the entire region and threaten the US' interests there," Nabil Shaath, an adviser to Abbas, said to Palestine TV.

Last week, Palestinians said comments by US officials reiterating the pledge by Trump to move the embassy reflected the futility of peace negotiations.

'Very dangerous step'

During his election campaign last year, Trump repeatedly promised to move the embassy and recognise Jerusalem as the Israeli capital.

In June, however, like his predecessors, Trump signed a six-month waiver to delay the relocation, which would have complicated US efforts to resume the long-stalled Israeli-Palestinian peace talks.

The White House said at the time that the question is "not if that move happens, but only when".

The waiver expired on December 1.

Senior Trump administration said Trump will continue to sign the waiver until the process of moving the embassy, which could "take years", is completed.

The controversial move, if implemented, would make the US the first country to have its embassy in Jerusalem - currently, all such diplomatic missions are located in Tel Aviv.

It would also overturn decades of international consensus on Jerusalem, a highly-contested city, half of which was occupied and annexed by Israel following the 1967 War.

"If the relocation happens, it would be the first of its kind and would reaffirm to Israel that Jerusalem is one and unified," Zakaria Odeh, director of the Civic Coalition for Palestinian Rights in Jerusalem, told Al Jazeera.

"It is a very dangerous step," he added. "It would nullify any plans for future negotiations [on the conflict]."

Israel claims all of Jerusalem as its "united" capital, and its annexation of East Jerusalem effectively put the entire city under de-facto Israeli control. The Palestinians, however, see East Jerusalem as the capital of their future state.
The international community, including the US, does not recognise Israel's jurisdiction and ownership of the city. **Palestinians say** that moving the embassy would prejudge one of the most sensitive issues in the conflict - the status of Jerusalem - and undermine the US' status as an honest mediator.

Earlier this year, Abbas warned against the embassy's move in an official letter addressed to Trump. It would have a "disastrous impact on the peace process, on the two-state solution and on the stability and security of the entire region", the letter read.

**Under the proposed 1947 UN Partition Plan**, the city was meant to be internationally administered, due to its importance to the three Abrahamic religions. But, in 1948, Zionist forces seized the western half of the city and declared the area as part of what became Israel.

"Blackmail campaign"

Khalil Shaheen, a Ramallah-based analyst, described remarks made by Vice President Mike Pence last week on Trump's embassy plan as part of a "blackmail campaign". He argued that the US is using the embassy as a tool to pressure the Palestinians.

"If the US relocates the embassy to Jerusalem, it will determine the city's fate by recognising it as the capital of the occupying state, before even embarking on the peace negotiations it's trying to achieve," Shaheen told Al Jazeera.

"This will destroy any potential of establishing an independent Palestinian state through US negotiations - which is very dangerous," he added.

Shaheen also argued that the US government is trying to draw out a path for the region at the expense of Palestinians, while attempting to force new conditions on their leadership before announcing its own plan for the peace process.

"We are witnessing the articulation of Israeli positions, but through American mouths," said Shaheen, referencing the "Zionist" views of US ambassador to Israel, David Friedman, and Trump's son-in-law, Jared Kushner.

"They belong to the most right-wing orientation in Israel," he added.

Amani Khalifa, a Jerusalem-based activist, argued that the relocation might be a crucial political move for the diplomats of the PA, but not for ordinary Palestinians in Jerusalem.

"To regular people, it doesn't really matter if the embassy stays in Tel Aviv or is relocated to Jerusalem," she told Al Jazeera.

"But this move would make it clear to the rest of the world that there is no real sovereignty, and that the PA has no say over anything that happens in Jerusalem," Khalifa added. "This has been the situation since 1967 - so this may be a good thing for Palestinians, to leverage on the fact that the occupation is real, and the move would act as proof."

**Referencing the expansion of Israel's illegal settlement project and its house demolition policies in East Jerusalem**, Khalifa described the move merely as an additional "step" that Israel would be taking to fulfill its objective of making Jerusalem its "undivided" capital.

"So, it's really part of the wider context that started with the annexation," she said.

SOURCE: Al Jazeera News
B. How will US Jerusalem move affect Israel's far right?

Analysts fear Trump's rubber-stamping of the right's political goals will further radicalise both sides of the divide.
by Jonathan Cook
10 Dec 2017

Jerusalem - Trump's recognition this week of Jerusalem as Israel's capital, overturning seven decades of US policy in the region and effectively ending hopes of a two-state solution, has provoked dire warnings.

But the focus by commentators on Palestinian reactions, rather than the effect on the Israeli public and leadership, might have underestimated the longer-term fallout from Trump's move, analysts say.

Predictions have included the threat of renewed violence - even an uprising - from Palestinians; the possible collapse of the Palestinian Authority, the Palestinians' government-in-waiting, and its diplomatic strategy for two states; and the demise of Washington's claim to be serving as a credible peacemaker.

But according to analysts, more far-reaching - and disruptive - undercurrents will likely be set in motion by Trump's decision.

Few have factored in the likely effect of Trump's new Jerusalem policy on the Israeli public, which has been shifting steadily to the right for most of the past two decades. The city and its contested holy sites have gained an increasingly powerful religious and national symbolism for many Israeli Jews.

The fear is that Trump's effective rubber-stamping of the right's political goals in Jerusalem will further radicalise both sides of the divide - and accelerate processes that have been turning a long-standing national conflict into a more openly religious one.

'Tipping point'

"We may remember this date as the tipping point, as the moment when a new consensus emerged in Israel behind the idea of total Jewish supremacy," journalist David Sheen, an expert on Israel's far-right movements, told Al Jazeera.

Similar concerns were expressed by Yousef Jabareen, a Palestinian member of Israel's parliament.

"We can expect to see a move rightwards across Israeli society," he told Al Jazeera. "The centre-left parties were already tacking much closer to the right. They will now want to align themselves with Trump's position. Meanwhile, the right will be encouraged to move to the extreme right."

Both noted that Avi Gabbay - the recently elected leader of the Zionist Union, the official opposition and the party that was once the backbone of the Israeli peace camp - had begun espousing positions little different from those of right-wing Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.

Last week, Gabbay backed Trump's announcement, saying that recognition of Jerusalem was more important than a peace deal with the Palestinians.

Sheen said that traditionally, the centre-left had been restrained in its political positions by concerns about alienating the United States: "Netanyahu has shown that he can bring the US round to his way of thinking by staying the course. In many Israelis' eyes, he has now been proved right. The centrists may decide it is time to come onboard. Allying with the Republican right and the Christian evangelicals in the US may now look like a much safer bet."
The possible effects of Trump's announcement on Israelis have been largely overlooked, even though previous turning points in the conflict have consistently resulted in dramatic lurches rightwards by the Israeli public.

Given Israel's power over the Palestinians, these changes have played a decisive role in leading to the current impasse between Israel and the Palestinians, analysts note. Most obviously, Israel's seemingly "miraculous" victory in the 1967 war, defeating the armies of neighbouring Arab states in six days, unleashed a wave of Messianic Judaism that spawned the settler movement. A new religious nationalism swept parts of the Israeli public, driving them into the occupied Palestinian territories to claim a supposed Biblical birthright.

Other major events have had a decisive effect too. Unexpectedly, the Oslo peace process, launched in the mid-1990s, persuaded many non-religious Israeli Jews to move into settlements in the West Bank and occupied East Jerusalem, doubling the numbers there in a few years.

Into the arms of the far right

Alan Baker, a legal adviser to the Israeli foreign ministry in that period, explained Israelis' peculiar reading of the Oslo Accords. In their view, Oslo meant Israel was "present in the territories with their [the Palestinians'] consent and subject to the outcome of negotiations".

In other words, many Israelis believed that the Oslo process had conferred an international legitimacy on the settlements. Later, in 2000, after the Camp David summit collapsed without the sides agreeing to a two-state solution, Ehud Barak, Israel's then-prime minister, blamed Yasser Arafat and the Palestinians. He said they were "no partner" for peace.

As a result, Israelis deserted the peace camp and drifted into the arms of the right and far-right. Netanyahu has reaped the benefits, leading a series of ultra-nationalist governments since 2009.

Now Trump's decision on Jerusalem effectively gives Washington's blessing to Israel's illegal annexation of East Jerusalem and five decades of creating facts on the ground there, said Jabareen. "Trump has legitimised the far-right's argument that Israel can control all of Jerusalem by sheer force, by denying Palestinians their rights and by creating facts on the ground," he said.

With their policy of aggressive unilateralism now paying dividends in the US, the settlers and the ultra-nationalists were unlikely to be satisfied with that success alone, he added. "The danger is that the religious right's narrative will now seem persuasive at other sites in the occupied territories they demand, such as Hebron and Nablus."

Since Trump's election a year ago, Naftali Bennett, the Israeli education minister and the leader of the main settler party, has begun calling for Israel to seize the opportunity to annex West Bank settlements.

Pressure is likely now to mount rapidly on Netanyahu to shift even further to the right. On the 972 website, Noam Sheizaf, an Israeli analyst, observed that Trump's declaration had boosted the settlers' position that "in the long run 'facts on the ground' are more important than diplomacy and politics, and that Israel will eventually win legitimacy for its actions".

Effects in Jerusalem

The most immediate effects, according to Ir Amim, an Israeli human rights organisation, will be felt in Jerusalem itself. Government ministers have already drafted
legislation to bring large West Bank settlements under Jerusalem's municipal authority, as a way covertly to annex them.

There are also plans to strip large numbers of Palestinians of their Israeli-issued Jerusalem residency papers because they live outside the separation wall Israel built through the city more than a decade ago. That would cement a new, unassailable right-wing Jewish majority in Jerusalem.

Last week, Ir Amim warned in a statement that Trump's move would be certain to "embolden" such actions by the Israeli right and provide a "tailwind" to those determined to pre-empt a two-state solution.

Assad Ghanem, a politics professor at Haifa University, told Al Jazeera: "Trump has given a legitimacy to the right's Messianic agenda. He has adopted the language of the extreme right on Jerusalem - that it is Israel's eternal, united capital. The far-right will declare this a victory."

In parallel, Trump's seal of approval for Israel's takeover of Jerusalem is likely to intensify the city's religious symbolism for Jews - and the importance of Israeli sovereignty over al-Aqsa Mosque compound, Ghanem noted.

In recent years, a growing number of rabbis have been overturning a centuries-old consensus that al-Aqsa compound is off-limits to Jews because it was not known where the ruins of an earlier Jewish temple lay. In Jewish tradition, it is forbidden to walk over an inner sanctum, known as the Holy of Holies.

Today, Jews regularly enter the compound and some even pray there. Settler rabbis and far-right government ministers have called for dividing the compound between Israelis and Palestinians, creating huge tensions with Palestinians.

**Temple movements**

Meanwhile, a once-fringe movement of Jewish supporters who wish to destroy the mosque to rebuild the ancient Jewish temple in its place, are gradually moving into the mainstream. Trump's move will be a shot in the arm to their ambitions and their credibility, said Sheen, who has studied the temple movements.

He pointed out that immediately after Trump's declaration, these groups had uploaded a cartoon of Trump standing in al-Aqsa compound, in front of the golden-topped Dome of the Rock, imagining the Jewish temple in its place. Trump is shown saying in Hebrew: "This is the perfect spot!"

Sheen said: "This will be treated as a call to arms by these groups."

**Will the US recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's capital have similarly dramatic long-term effect on Palestinians' public opinion? Analysts believe it will. The lack of an outpouring of significant anger - even after Palestinian leaders called for three days of rage last week - could be deceptive.**

**Israeli analysts** have suggested that there is often what they term an "incubation period" - a delay between a major change in Israel's favour and a popular reaction from Palestinians. That was true of the second Intifada, which came months after the collapse of the Camp David summit.

An expectation of knee-jerk anger to Trump's decision may be misplaced, say analysts. The decision may result in a slower and much deeper process of adjustment to the new reality.

"Palestinians will now have to abandon the old tools of national struggle, because they have been shown to be ineffective. We need new tools of resistance, and that will require a grassroots struggle. We need a return to mass protests," Jabareen said.

Ghanem noted the danger that, with the likely growth of a Jewish religious extremism in Israel and among the settlers, some Palestinians might drift towards violence.
But he expected that a more significant trend would be Palestinians reassessing the end goal of their struggle and opting for mass civil disobedience. "The two-state solution is obviously now finished, and that is likely to mobilise a new generation to struggle for a single state," he said. "Activists and the leadership will need to rebuild Palestinian nationalism."

SOURCE: Al Jazeera News

C. Trump's Jerusalem move: 'A blunder with consequences'

**Analysts say** Trump's decision to recognise Jerusalem as Israel's capital is a mistake with international consequences.

by William Roberts

13 Dec 2017

**Washington, DC** - President Donald Trump's decision to move the US embassy in Israel to Jerusalem is a blunder driven by domestic US politics, but with international strategic consequences, Middle East analysts and former US diplomats say. The US president, shortly after coming into office nearly a year ago, had raised some hopes of a renewed Middle East peace process by holding a series of meetings with Palestinian leader Mahmoud Abbas in Washington, Bethlehem and New York. But last week, Trump announced that the US is formally recognising Jerusalem as Israel's capital and will begin the process of moving the US embassy to the city from Tel Aviv, raising doubts from the Palestinians, as well as Middle East analysts about the US' role as a broker of a potential peace deal.

"It has injected anxiety, pressure, anger, resentment all over because not only is this a legal or political matter, this is the politics of identity," Husam S Zomlot, head of the PLO General Delegation to the US, said in a call with reporters in Washington on Monday. "This has touched on a nerve," Zomlot added.

**Any US peace plan sidelined**

Trump's ability to introduce a comprehensive peace plan, if not foreclosed, is likely sidelined for the foreseeable future, experts and diplomats say. The key question, analysts say, is how Palestinian leaders will react. Early indications are that they will press their case with the international community. Palestinian leader Mahmoud Abbas, speaking at the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) summit on Wednesday, said the US had "disqualified" itself from any future peace talks.

"We shall not accept any role for the United States in the peace process, they have proven their full bias in favour of Israel," Abbas said.

Yousef al-Othaimeen, OIC secretary-general, said the group "rejects and condemns the American decision". Aaron David Miller, a former US negotiator and now a Middle East expert at the Wilson Center in Washington, DC, said that "this is about as a grim a situation from the Palestinian perspective as I have seen in a long time in terms of what their options are". Even though Trump, in his statement, did not rule out a future resolution of Jerusalem's status, the problem is that Israel asserts sovereignty over both East and West Jerusalem.
and continues to create realities on the ground intended to deny the Palestinians a capital, Miller told Al Jazeera. "All of that combines to create an imbalance of power which I would argue strongly predisposes this issue in favour of the Israelis," Miller added.

Trump has, in effect, "decided it's more important to expand, enhance, deepen and strengthen the US relationship with Israel than it is to advance the very peace process that he has raised expectations about," said Daniel C Kurtzer, a former US ambassador to Egypt and Israel, now a professor of Middle East policy studies at Princeton University.

'Major earthquake'
The diplomatic reaction worldwide has been largely, though not universally, negative. A meeting of the Arab League in Cairo condemned Trump's move. EU foreign ministers meeting with Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu in Brussels reaffirmed European support for a two-state solution with Jerusalem seen as the eventual capital of both Israel and Palestine.

"If you look at experts, they are all debating the impact of, is this going to be a disaster, or is this going to be tolerable," Shibley Telhami, a pollster and professor at the University of Maryland, told Al Jazeera. "No one is saying this is really going to advance peace."

Trump's advisers on the Middle East are "inexperienced," "living in a bubble" and "have no independent way of making an assessment about consequences", Telhami said.

The Trump administration appears to have bought Netanyahu's argument that the Arabs no longer care about Jerusalem and will only pay lip service to the issue, the anger will die down, and Arab governments will go along because they want to do business with Trump, Telhami adds.

"If in fact another Intifada is unleashed, then all bets are off because then you have another round of violence that disrupts priorities and forces Arab rulers to take positions and maybe distance themselves from Trump. If it doesn't happen, or it happens on a smaller scale, the thing to watch for would be whether or not Abbas would find a way to get back to the negotiating table."

Hady Amr, former special envoy of Trump's predecessor Barack Obama to the Israel-Palestinian negotiations, said that Trump's decision is "a major earthquake in the Palestinian public". "People are mad as hell, deeply insulted," Amr, who is now a senior fellow for Middle East policy at Brookings, told Al Jazeera. Trump's move has triggered widespread protests across the occupied West Bank, East Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip.

At least two Palestinians have been killed and hundreds more injured by Israeli forces during the protests. Demonstrations took place in major cities throughout Asia, the Middle East and North Africa as well. Security forces fired tear gas at protesters outside the US embassy in Beirut, and hundreds of Jordanians demonstrated in front of the US embassy in Amman. Hamas and Hezbollah, with Iranian support, are calling for resistance and confrontation.

'Strategic moment'
Trump has provided "a convenient excuse" for the PLO to declare the US is not an honest broker, renege on its commitments and to take their fight to the UN and the International Criminal Court, Amr said.

Asked by Al Jazeera, what the PLO leadership may do, Zomlot said Palestinians would reevaluate the US role as a mediator and seek forums at the UN and elsewhere.
"This is a strategic moment," he said. Abbas will meet European Union foreign affairs ministers in Brussels in January. EU Foreign Affairs Representative Federica Mogherini said in a press statement after meeting with Netanyahu that the EU would seek to restart the Middle East peace talks through a convening of the "quartet" including the UN, Russia and the US, perhaps expanded to include Egypt and Jordan.

SOURCE: Al Jazeera News

D. How Israel occupies education in East Jerusalem

Raids on schools are part of Israel's strategy to control what Palestinian children are learning, observers say.

by Jaclynn Ashly
8 Dec 2017

They can't shut us down legally, so they put pressure on us socially in order to force us to close' [Jaclynn Ashly/Al Jazeera]

Occupied East Jerusalem - The Zahwat al-Quds kindergarten and primary school's walls are decorated with colourful cartoons, while its students are dressed in grey-and-red striped uniforms, The children's wide smiles and laughter echo through the hallways, belying their lingering anxiety after a recent Israeli raid on the school. At the start of the school year, Israel began targeting Zahwat al-Quds - which serves some 90 students between the ages of three and nine in the neighbourhood of Beit Hanina - because staff refused to teach the Israeli curriculum, according to parents and school staff. "Israel wants everything under their control," school cofounder Muna Ateeq told Al Jazeera, speaking under a pseudonym for fear of repercussions. "They really want to influence education so that they can more easily control the next generation of Palestinians."

Permit revoked

There are three types of schools in occupied East Jerusalem: public, private and Palestinian government schools. All have different experiences and relationships with the Israeli state. Zahwat al-Quds is a private school that had an Israeli permit and funding from the Jerusalem municipality up until July, when Israel abruptly revoked its permit. The school has since obtained a permit from the Islamic Waqf, which is connected to the Palestinian government. The Israeli permit was revoked as part of Israel's goal to shut down private Palestinian schools in occupied East Jerusalem that teach the Palestinian curriculum, and to force students to attend the public schools that are directly controlled by Israel, Ateeq said. In September, three Israeli officials entered Zahwat al-Quds to notify staff that it was being shut down. They returned last month, searching classrooms, detaining three
teachers and the deputy principal, and photographing some of the children. One child urinated on herself and another fainted during the incident, Ateeq said.

Zahwat al-Quds school was reportedly targeted because the staff refused to teach the Israeli curriculum [Jaclynn Ashly/Al Jazeera]

Ziad al-Shamali, who heads an East Jerusalem parents' committee, told Al Jazeera that some children began experiencing nightmares and bed-wetting after the raid, citing "lasting psychological impacts". Parents are getting scared to send their children to school, he added.

"They can't shut us down legally, so they put pressure on us socially in order to force us to close," Ateeq said.

According to some Palestinians in East Jerusalem, the raids on Zahwat al-Quds come in the context of Israel's goal to systematically depoliticise young Palestinians by pushing them into public schools, where Israel can more easily control what they are learning.

"Israel doesn't want the children to learn about what has happened here," Ateeq said.

"They hope that in the future, everyone will eventually forget about it."

Blank pages

Israel did not decide to impose its education curriculum on Palestinian schools overnight. According to Samira Alayan, a researcher and lecturer at Hebrew University who has been studying this issue for a decade, Israel has tried to control Palestinian education in East Jerusalem since 1967, when Israel occupied and subsequently annexed the territory.

In East Jerusalem's public schools, a censored version of the Palestinian curriculum is taught. "When the books arrive in Jerusalem, Israeli authorities peruse them and delete sentences and paragraphs that are against Israeli ideologies," Alayan told Al Jazeera.

She noted that Israel is "looking for any content offensive to Israel, including anti-Israeli expressions and any mention of [the] Palestinian Authority". The result is textbooks missing paragraphs and sentences, and sometimes entire pages are blank. Israel perceives this censorship as a preventive tool against Palestinian "incitement", Alayan noted in a 2017 article exploring the issue.

Sawsan Safadi says that Israel wants 'to create a new generation of Palestinians who feel like the occupation is normal' [Jaclynn Ashly/Al Jazeera]

However, "another purpose could be to prevent the students from developing a positive sense of identity based on the Palestinian narrative", Alayan wrote.

"This implicit aim of censorship is yet another example of a wish to erase or eliminate the Palestinian narrative by the settler colonialist regime."

This censorship was a compromise for the Israeli state, after Palestinians in Jerusalem flat-out rejected the Israeli curriculum during the early years of occupation. Israel's goal is to teach Palestinians that the land of historic Palestine was in fact empty of
people when the state of Israel was founded in 1948, and that Arthur Balfour gave this uninhabited land to the Jews.

"It doesn't teach you anything about being Palestinian," Alayan said.

Sawsan Safadi, the head of public and international relations at the Waqf's education department, told Al Jazeera that Israel aims "to create a new generation of Palestinians who feel like the occupation is normal, which will lead to them recognising themselves as Israelis, not Palestinians".

**Imposition of curriculum**

Israel is attempting to further its claims that Jerusalem is a part of Israel, rather than an integral part of a future Palestinian state, by changing facts on the ground, Shamali noted. "They want to show the world that this is an Israeli city with Israeli schools that even play the Israeli national anthem," Shamali said, adding that Israel has even changed street names and locations to Israeli ones on GPS and on Facebook, knowing that younger generations rely heavily on such technology.

Israel's efforts have been meeting with success, as more than 20 Palestinian schools in occupied East Jerusalem have introduced an option to study an Arabic version of the Israeli curriculum. The identities of East Jerusalem Palestinians have been eroded due to their statelessness and their physical separation from the rest of the occupied territory by Israel's separation wall, Alayan said.

The funding and management of schools are completely controlled by Israel, which provides an increased budget for those willing to accept the Israeli curriculum, Alayan noted.

"The control Israel has on schools has created a culture of silence, whereby people are accepting things even though they don't agree with it," she said.

**Routine raids**

From the second level of the Dar al-Aytam boys secondary school in the Old City, the golden Dome of the Rock can be seen clearly, but Israeli raids routinely interrupt this serene landscape.

Israeli police, soldiers and special forces regularly raid the school, allegedly searching for students who have thrown stones at Israeli officials near the school. Safadi says such allegations are often false, pointing to several locations from where boys were alleged to have thrown stones; tall metal barriers and fencing would make this impossible.

**According to the school's principal**, Fadi Khalil, Dar al-Aytam was raided more than 10 times last year. During one such raid, the former principal was detained and expelled from the Old City for 45 days.

"This school is the second-largest compound in the Old City after al-Aqsa," Khalil said. "The Israelis have had their eyes on it for a long time. They are working very hard to uproot the school from the city."

A staff member at Dar al-Aytam shows a picture of a recent Israeli raid on the school [Jaclynn Ashly/Al Jazeera]

An Israeli police spokesperson did not respond to Al Jazeera's request for comment on the matter.

As at Zahwat al-Quds, the raids have had an effect: Of the 250 students who attended Dar al-Aytam last year, 58 have dropped out.
Mumen al-Taweel, 18, was just 14 when he was sent to Israel's HaSharon prison for allegedly throwing stones. He spent a year and a half there. "We all want to study, but Israel doesn't want us to continue our education," he said.

Another student, 16-year-old Amir al-Rishid, was first detained when he was 10 for possessing nail cutters after a search by Israeli forces. Rishid says he has lost count of the number of times he has been arrested by Israel.

"Israel wants us to have police records at a young age, so in the future it will be difficult for us to continue our education or get good jobs. This is an intentional policy," Rishid said.

Tahseen Elayyan, head of the monitoring and documentation department at the Palestinian human rights NGO al-Haq, told Al Jazeera that the raids and the attempts to push the Israeli curriculum on Palestinian schools are related to Israel's ultimate goal of expelling Palestinians from the land.

"Israel wants the land, but not the people," Elayyan said. "Palestinians who remain in Jerusalem - if the plan to push Palestinians out of the city succeeds - have to accept Israel's narrative."

SOURCE: Al Jazeera News

E. Arab League condemns US Jerusalem move

Arab states hold emergency meeting in Cairo to discuss Trump's recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.
10 Dec 2017

The head of the Arab League has called US President Donald Trump's decision to recognise Jerusalem as Israel's capital "dangerous and unacceptable" and a "flagrant attack on a political solution" to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The statement by Ahmed Aboul-Gheit, the regional bloc's secretary-general, came after an emergency meeting of foreign ministers from 22 Arab states in Egypt's capital, Cairo, on Saturday.

Aboul-Gheit said Trump's decision was "against international law and raises questions over American efforts to support peace" between Palestine and Israel.

The shift in US policy "undermines Arab confidence" in the Trump administration and "amounts to the legalisation" of the Israeli occupation of Palestine, he added.

Leaders from across the globe made similar remarks in the days before and after Trump's announcement on Wednesday. The US president also ordered the US embassy be moved from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

World leaders said the move could derail peace efforts.

During an emergency meeting, UN Security Council members on Friday widely condemned Trump's decision, which sparked deadly protests in the Gaza Strip and the occupied West Bank.

Demonstrations denouncing the US move were held in a number of other Muslim countries too.

'US an aggressor against Palestinians'
Palestinian Foreign Minister Riyad al-Maliki, speaking to reporters ahead of the meeting in Cairo, said Palestinians can no longer accept the US as a broker in the peace
process because it has now "positioned itself as a party in a dispute and not as a mediator". Calling for a UN Security Council action against Trump's decision, al-Maliki added, "America is being an aggressor against the Palestinian people and against international law."

US officials, however, have defended the move, saying Trump remains committed to reviving long-stalled talks between the Palestinians and Israelis.

The status of Jerusalem, home to sites holy to Muslims, Jews and Christians, is one of the core issues in the perennial Israeli-Palestinian conflict. After occupying the city's eastern part in the 1967 War, Israel annexed the territory, and proclaimed it as its "eternal, undivided capital."

The Palestinians, however, see East Jerusalem as the capital of their future state, a position Aboul-Gheit backed in his opening statement on Saturday.

"We call upon all countries that support peace to refuse the decision of the US president. We consider the decision unfair and unjust. We call upon everyone to recognize Palestine as a state and East Jerusalem as its capital," he said.

Speaking at the meeting, Egyptian Foreign Minister Sameh Shoukry said Trump's policy change put the "region on the verge of explosion".

Mohammed Bin Abdulrahman Al Thani, Qatar's foreign minister, called for "all possible measures under international law", while his Lebanese counterpart called for the League to consider imposing sanctions on the US.

"Pre-emptive measures must be taken against the decision ... beginning with diplomatic measures, then political, then economic and financial sanctions," said Gebran Bassil.

**Statements made for 'public consumption'**

But despite the rhetoric in the Cairo meeting, Marwan Bishara, Al Jazeera's senior political analyst, said Arab states, in practice, differed in their reaction to Trump's decision.

"I doubt that all this will come together and culminate in any serious decision or action plan," he said.

"We will probably be left once again for the Arab street, rather than the Arab League, to do something moving forward."

Ali Abunimah co-founder of Electronic Intifada, an independent online news publication focusing on Palestine, concurred.

"The Arab League meeting and the Arab League summit will amount to nothing, as it has amounted to nothing for decades," he told Al Jazeera from the US city of Chicago.

"All the statements being made by the Arab regimes are strictly for public consumption because the Arab public is clearly outraged as the massive demonstrations in cities across the world showed.

"But in reality, most of these regimes - Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Egypt and Jordan - are very close to Israel. They either have formal or tacit ties and so they will do nothing in practice other than issue statements."

Meanwhile, the leader of Egypt's Coptic Church on Saturday cancelled an upcoming visit with US President Mike Pence in protest of the shift in US policy. Pope Tawadros II said Trump's move "did not take into account the feelings of millions of Arab people".

The grand imam of Cairo's Al Azhar Mosque said he would not meet Pence either, while Palestinian leaders stated that Trump's deputy was not welcome in the occupied territories.

**SOURCE:** Al Jazeera News
F. Trump's Jerusalem move: Key questions answered

A look at some of the key questions surrounding Trump's announcement to recognise Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.
7 Dec 2017

President Donald Trump has recognised Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and announced plans to relocate the US embassy, currently based in Tel Aviv, to the city. Wednesday's announcement, long-sought by Israel, breaks with decades of US policy as well as the international consensus. World leaders have urged Trump to reconsider, warning it could derail peace efforts and stir unrest in the region and beyond.

The status of Jerusalem - home to sites holy to Muslims, Jews and Christians - is one of the core issues in the perennial Israeli-Palestinian conflict. After occupying the city's eastern part in the 1967 War, Israel annexed the territory, and proclaimed it as its "eternal, undivided capital." The Palestinians, however, see East Jerusalem as the capital of their future state.

Here is a look at some of the key questions surrounding Trump's expected decision.

Why is Trump doing this?
Moving the US embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, and recognising the holy city as Israel's capital, was a promise Trump made during his election campaign last year. Wednesday's announcement will thrill key financial donors like Las Vegas casino magnate Sheldon Adelson, who reportedly gave $25m to groups backing Trump ahead of the 2016 election. In April, the Politico news website reported that Adelson had expressed anger at Trump over his failure to fulfil the Jerusalem pledge.

The shift is likely to boost Trump's popularity with his core, right-wing evangelical base. The measure has broad support among American legislators too. The Jerusalem Embassy Act, passed by the US Congress in 1995, calls for the US embassy to be moved to Jerusalem. Trump's predecessors, however, have repeatedly invoked an inbuilt waiver every six months, citing security concerns.

In June, Trump also delayed the relocation while instructing his son-in-law Jared Kushner to launch an effort to restart long-stalled peace talks between the Palestinians and Israelis. This week, the six-month deadline passed without Trump renewing the waiver.

Meanwhile, The New York Times on Sunday reported that the US and Saudi Arabia are backing a peace plan that gives Israel full control over Jerusalem. Citing unnamed Palestinian, Arab and European sources, the newspaper said Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman, who is very close to Kushner, presented the plan to Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas in November.

Both the US and Saudi-Arabia denied the report.

When will the US embassy move take place?
The relocation of the embassy will not happen immediately and is expected to take several years.

In Britain, the US announced plans to relocate its embassy from north to south London in 2008. Nine years later, the embassy has not yet opened, something that is expected to happen in 2018.

The length of the relocation time has raised questions whether Trump's decision could be reversed if he fails to win a second term in 2020. Al Jazeera's Shihab Rattansi said...
officials in Washington, DC, claim the process of planning a new embassy, once it begins, would reach its conclusion. The US already has a 99-year lease on a plot of land in Jerusalem; it was granted by Israel in 1989 at the cost of $1 per year but remains undeveloped. No other country keeps an embassy in Jerusalem; most of those that did had relocated to Tel Aviv after the UN Security Council in 1980 condemned Israel's annexation of East Jerusalem as a violation of international law. That came in response to Israel declaring Jerusalem as its capital.

What effect will Trump's declaration have? Jerusalem's status is central to the Palestinian-Israeli peace talks, and the change in US policy carries deep symbolic meaning as it will be seen as backing Israeli sovereignty over the city, something the international community does not recognise. Palestinian leaders have warned that any change to the status quo would mean the end of the peace process.

US officials, however, insist that Trump "remains committed to achieving a lasting peace agreement between the Israelis and Palestinians and is optimistic that peace can be achieved". One official said that Trump's decision "doesn't change the status quo with respect to the holy sites and other sensitive issues". Protests have meanwhile erupted in the Gaza Strip, while Palestinian leaders have called for three "days of rage" against the move. Over the past 20 years, the Jerusalem issue has been at the heart of much of the violence between Palestinians and Israelis, including the 2000 Intifada, or uprising. Most recently, Israeli plans to install security cameras at the al-Aqsa Mosque, Islam's third holiest site located in Jerusalem's Old City, triggered weeks of unrest.

How has the world reacted? Leaders in the Middle East and elsewhere have warned of "disastrous consequences" should the US change its stance on Jerusalem. Saudi King Salman told Trump in a phone call that the step could "inflame the passions of Muslims around the world", while Iran's Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei condemned the planned move as US "incompetence and failure". Turkey's President Recep Tayyip Erdogan had earlier threatened to cut ties with Israel, while Federica Mogherini, the European Union's top diplomat, said that "any action that would undermine" peace efforts to create two separate states for the Israelis and the Palestinians "must absolutely be avoided." Pope Francis said in his weekly address that the status quo that governs the al-Aqsa Mosque compound should be respected. Jordan has been the custodian of all Muslim and Christian sites in Jerusalem since 1994.

SOURCE: Al Jazeera News
G. Israel-Palestine peace process rendered irrelevant

Palestinians say that long-standing US bias towards Israel has pushed the peace process towards irrelevance.
by Linah Alsaafin
8 Dec 2017

The city of Jerusalem, with its historical, religious and political significance, has always been a prominent symbol for the Palestinian cause, or what is left of its tattered remains.

With a stroke of a pen, the United States, which has undertaken the role of peace broker between the Israelis and Palestinians for over two decades, has become the first country in the world to recognise the whole Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.

But to the majority of Palestinians, who say their interests were never pursued by their leaders, the unprecedented move came as no surprise, and the peace process will have little meaning.

Abdelsattar Qassem, a professor of political science at the an-Najah University in Nablus, told Al Jazeera that the Palestinian leadership will not bring about any seismic changes to the peace process.

"Nothing will happen," he said. "[Palestinian Authority President] Mahmoud Abbas is not a man who takes decisive decisions, and he is not in a position where he has any choices."

"He will go to the negotiating table if called on because he thinks it is a privilege to meet President [Donald] Trump," Qassem continued.

"He is not going to sacrifice any chances to meet with the Americans."

The PA, whose economy is propped up by international conditional donor aid, relies on an annual budget of $300m from the US.

The 1993 Oslo Accords was based on the UN resolution 242, which called for a two-state solution with occupied East Jerusalem as the capital of a future Palestine state.

Yet Israel showed no signs of cooperating to move in this direction, and did not rescind its 1980 law which stated Jerusalem as its "undivided capital".

On the opposite spectrum, the Palestinian leaders made one concession after the other, turning the entire peace process into a farce.

In exchange, these leaders got what they craved for: recognition at the international level and a system of pseudo governance and control over a few ever-shrinking territories in the face of continued Israeli occupation and land expropriation.

Talal Awkal, a Gaza-based political analyst, told Al Jazeera that in light of Trump's decision, the expected course of action - if the Palestinian officials had political leverage - would be for the US to stop its mediating role.

"Abbas did say that if this decision took place then the US can no longer be a mediator," Awkal said.

However, "the US will continue to practice this role whether we like it or not, although this time its position will be unequivocal to the Arabs especially with regards to the 'deal of the century'".

Echoing Qassem's view that nothing will change, Awkal said that the US administration will attempt to "soften their decision through empty verbal bribes to the Palestinians".

On their part, "the Palestinians might choose to hasten their way to the ICC," he said, "or speed up the process of reconciliation talks. But the peace process will remain."

Pro-Israel bias
On this day in 1988, the Palestinian Liberation Organisation (PLO) recognised Israel on 78 percent of the country, including West Jerusalem, which Israel occupied and illegally annexed in the aftermath of the 1967 war.

Yet the initial reaction from the US was frosty, and considered the PLO's recognition of Israel as falling short of long-standing American requests. **The US had long said it would not deal** with the PLO until it stated unambiguously that it recognised Israel's "right to exist" in addition to UN resolution 242 and 338, **the New York Times reported at the time.**

Hanan Ashrawi, a senior member of the PLO, told Al Jazeera Trump's decision on Jerusalem "ends the charade that the US can be an even-handed peace broker" between Israelis and Palestinians.

"He has just given Israel permission and support to annex Jerusalem, to transform its character, to kick out the Palestinians, and to Judaize it without any kind of accountability," she said.

Ashrawi said PLO leaders must begin looking for a new strategy to hold Israel accountable. 

"We have to redefine everything: our relationship to Israel, our relationship to the United States and also our relationship to the rest of the world that pays lip service to a two-state solution and allows Israel to destroy it."

Previous statements by US officials regarding Jerusalem has also made their bias towards Israel clear. Furthermore, the US gives Israel an annual military aid of $3bn.

For Qassem, it is these enduring US positions that have made the peace process useless, and the Palestinians unsurprised at Trump's decision. In his words, "there is no popular anger" on the streets.

"The Palestinian cause has been on a steady decline and it is primarily the fault of the PLO and Palestinian leaders," he said. "Signing the Oslo Accords and defending Israel's security sends a message to the world to recognise Israel and its rights, leaving the Arabs racing each other to normalise relations with it."
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H. US vetoes resolution on Trump's Jerusalem decision

Palestinian envoy says US move 'encourages Israeli crimes' as 14 other Security Council members back proposed measure.

19 Dec 2017

The US has vetoed, as expected, a UN Security Council draft resolution rejecting President Donald Trump's recent recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's capital, and his plans to move the American embassy in Israel to the city.

However, the proposed measure **was backed** on Monday by the 14 other Security Council members, including many US allies, highlighting Washington's increasing isolation over an issue that has triggered mass rallies in support of the Palestinians in major international cities.
"What is troublesome to some people [...] is that the United States had the courage and honesty to recognise a fundamental reality," Nikki Haley, the US ambassador to the UN, said.

"Jerusalem has been the political, cultural, and spiritual homeland of the Jewish people for thousands of years - they have had no other capital city," she continued. "The United States has the sovereignty to determine where and whether we establish an embassy," said Haley, describing the vote as an "insult" that "won't be forgotten".

Along with the UK, France, Russia, and China, the US is a permanent member of the UN Security Council, with the power to block any resolution from passing with the use of a veto.

Riyad Mansour, the Palestinian ambassador to the UN, said: "It is paradoxical that while we were waiting for a peace plan from the US, the administration instead decided to further obstruct peace and delay its realisation.

"The US decision encourages Israel to persist in its crimes against the Palestinian people and to continue its occupation of our territory. No rhetoric will hide this complacency in prolonging the occupation," he added.

**Draft resolution**
The Egyptian-drafted text reiterated the UN position on Jerusalem, affirming "that any decisions and actions which purport to have altered, the character, status or demographic composition of the Holy City of Jerusalem have no legal effect, are null and void and must be rescinded in compliance with relevant resolutions of the Security Council".

In an effort to keep Washington from exercising its veto power, the text did not mention the US by name, saying instead it "deeply regrets recent decisions regarding the status of Jerusalem".

Francois De lattre, France's ambassador to the UN, said his country regretted the US decision over Jerusalem.

"This draft resolution confirms an international consensus on Jerusalem that has been built over decades," said Delattre.

The vote came less than two weeks after Trump's controversial speech, which reversed decades of US policy on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The US and the international community have long maintained that the solution to the Middle East conflict **would be the formation** of a Palestinian state - alongside the Israeli one - with East Jerusalem as its capital.

Trump's declaration unleashed widespread anger and rallies within Palestine and in major cities across the world.

Since the decision, at least nine Palestinians have been killed and more than 1,900 injured in protests in the occupied territories of the West Bank, East Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip.

**General Assembly**
Anticipating the US veto, the Palestinian leadership in the West Bank promised to take the issue to the UN General Assembly to seek the passing of a resolution there.

Riyad al-Maliki, foreign minister of the Palestinian Authority (PA), said in a statement on Monday: "The member states of the General Assembly will be asked to vote on the same draft resolution that we presented to the Security Council, which the US has blocked with the veto.

"In the General Assembly, the US will not be able to use this privilege," he added.

Since the 1970s, when it first began exercising its veto power, the US has shot down some 42 Security Council resolutions relating to Israel and its actions in the occupied Palestinian territories.
Turkey, a long-time ally of Palestine, is also leading efforts to pass a resolution through the UN's General Assembly. A vote in favour of the resolution in the 193-member UN General Assembly, however, is not legally binding. This means it would only serve as a recommendation and would act as an expression of the international community's stance on Jerusalem. Al Jazeera's Mike Hanna, reporting from the UN headquarters in New York, said although the vote would not be binding, it would "highlight what the Palestinians insist is the increasing isolation of the US on the status and issue of Jerusalem".

PLO meeting
Also on Monday, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), an umbrella of Palestinian political parties, announced it would no longer accept the US as a partner in the peace process. "We will not allow the US to be a mediator or a partner in the peace process," said Mahmoud Abbas, the president of the PA, which is the Ramallah-based semi-governmental body that administers parts of the occupied West Bank. Abbas also promised to seek full membership for Palestine at the UN, despite a previous push failed to do so in 2011. Currently, Palestine is a "non-member observer state", meaning that it has the right to speak but not vote on resolutions. "We will take political, diplomatic, and legal actions against Trump's declaration regarding Jerusalem," said Abbas. SOURCE: Al Jazeera News