LiNGUA Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa dan Sastra

LiNGUA Vol. 21, No. 1, June 2026 • ISSN 1693-4725 • e-ISSN 2442-3823

Ideological Framings and Linguistic Representations of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict in UNGA 2025 Speeches

Mahardhika Zifana [1], **Adi Hidayat** [2], **Hanifah Oktarina** [3]

[1] dhika.zifana@upi.edu
[1], [2], [3] Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

First Received: 14/12/2025; Final Proof Received: 15/05/2026; Accepted: 04/06/2026

Abstract

The Palestinian-Israeli conflict remains one of the most contested issues in international diplomacy, with discourse surrounding the conflict functioning as a crucial arena in which geopolitical power relations are constructed, negotiated, and contested. This study investigates how Global North countries, Muslim-majority states, and Global South countries articulate their ideological positions and linguistic representations of the conflict through speeches delivered at the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) in 2025. Unlike the United Nations Security Council, whose structure privileges major powers through veto authority, the UNGA allows broader participation from both dominant and marginalized states, thereby making it an important arena for examining competing geopolitical narratives. The urgency of this investigation is further intensified by growing international polarization following the escalation of violence in Gaza and the increasing use of genocide accusations within diplomatic discourse. Employing Fairclough's three-dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), this study aims to reveal the relationship between micro-level grammatical choices and macro-level geopolitical orientations. The findings reveal systematic disparities among the state groups analyzed. The United States tends to background Israeli military actions while foregrounding Hamas, using the events of October 7, 2023, as the principal framework for its security-oriented interpretation.
In contrast, Pakistan, South Africa, and Brazil explicitly use the term "genocide," while Indonesia foregrounds humanitarian suffering without explicitly employing the term. Pakistan's discourse incorporates personalized narratives of victimization, whereas South Africa adopts a predominantly legal-institutional framing grounded in international law. The United Kingdom, meanwhile, manifests hegemonic positioning through a discourse of shared responsibility that enables simultaneous condemnation of humanitarian violations and preservation of strategic alliances. Consequently, this study demonstrates that contestation over the Palestinian-Israeli conflict is not merely a disagreement over political events, but also a broader struggle for dominance over international discourse itself. The relationship between 142 countries supporting genocide-related accusations and a single veto-holding power further illustrates the widening gap between international normative consensus and the realities of geopolitical power during a period of hegemonic crisis. Methodologically, this research demonstrates how systematic linguistic analysis can ground ideological interpretation in observable grammatical patterns, while theoretically positioning Palestinian-Israeli discourse as a metonym for wider contestation over whether international order should be governed by legal universalism, moral-religious principles, or security pragmatism aligned with hegemonic interests.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis; ideological framing; linguistic representation; Palestinian Israeli conflict; UNGA speeches

INTRODUCTION

The Palestinian-Israeli conflict, which persists through time as a highly disputed matter, continues to receive international attention at the United Nations General Assembly (hereafter referred to as UNGA) sessions and other multilateral assemblies. The conflict extends beyond its direct regional effects because it encompasses international law disputes, state sovereignty conflicts, challenges to humanitarian intervention, and questions about the legitimacy of world governance systems. Diplomatic speeches at the UNGA represent more than ceremonial performances; they constitute consequential acts of political communication through which state leaders strategically frame complex geopolitical realities, mobilize international solidarity, and contest dominant narratives (Hu & Wang, 2025). Recent scholarship has demonstrated that discourse around the Palestinian-Israeli conflict operates as a site where competing ideologies and geopolitical interests intersect, with language functioning as an instrument of power that shapes public perception, constructs collective identities, and legitimizes particular political positions (Abbas et al., 2025; Cap, 2023).

The significance of examining such discourse across geopolitically distinct clusters becomes evident when considering the fundamentally different historical trajectories, economic positions, and ideological orientations that shape states' engagement with international conflicts. The Palestinian-Israeli conflict has evolved into something more than a local disagreement, encompassing issues of international law and state sovereignty, debates over humanitarian intervention, and questions concerning the legitimacy of global governance (Iriqat, 2024). The extended duration of this situation has produced major economic effects that extend beyond its direct stakeholders, destabilizing regional areas and international markets, whose changes in remittance patterns, investment trends, and economic development paths create different effects on countries throughout the worldwide economic system (Ibrahim, 2025; Yudaruddin et al., 2024). The UNGA 2025 session is the most relevant moment for comparison, as international observers paid close attention to the Palestinian territories during those speeches. The specific period enables researchers to examine how contemporary international relations shape diplomatic communication.

Researchers studying the Palestinian-Israeli conflict have produced extensive academic work across various fields, but still need to examine how countries communicate their diplomatic positions at multilateral international meetings. The research studies examine resistance narratives in Palestinian literature (Abdullah & Hassan, 2025), media legitimation approaches used to cover pro-Palestinian activism (Abbas et al., 2025), and victimhood presentation methods in online political discussions (Altahmazi & Abid, 2025). AlAfnan (2025) used Critical Discourse Analysis to examine King Abdullah II's 2024 UNGA address, demonstrating how a Middle Eastern leader draws on humanitarian, legal, and geopolitical knowledge to establish political power and present Jordan's role as a defender of Palestinian rights. The researchers Hu and Wang (2025) studied how the Russian and Ukrainian Foreign Affairs Ministry websites reported on the Bucha Incident, showing how national entities craft different narratives through communication methods. Alharbi and Rucker (2023) established a performative theory of solidarity discourse that demonstrates five ways speakers use discursive practices to build shared identities and political partnerships.

Existing research identifies three major shortcomings that limit its usefulness despite its useful research findings. The first problem arises because researchers have not established a systematic method for examining countries across various geopolitical groups within identical institutional and temporal frameworks. The research on the conflict's diplomatic speeches failed to combine micro-level linguistic analyses of transitivity, modality, and vocabulary with macro-level ideological interpretation of the speeches. The 2025 UNGA speeches, delivered during a period of intensified global conflict, offer a unique analytical opportunity that research to date has not explored.

This study uses systematic comparative Critical Discourse Analysis to examine six UNGA 2025 speeches, which represent three geopolitical groups: the Global North (USA and UK), Muslim-majority countries (Indonesia and Pakistan), and the Global South (South Africa and Brazil). The study's analytical categories divide political entities into two groups that stem from historical colonial patterns, existing global economic ties, and political-ideological systems. The Global North–Global South division particularly shows how former colonial powers maintained economic control, while countries that followed colonial pathways still face the enduring effects of colonialism and

worldwide economic disparities (Kamal & Courtheyn, 2024; Kowalski, 2020). Modern geopolitical studies show that countries and their people operate in systems that have grown more complex due to technological development, driven by new dynamics that require strategic players to understand their geopolitical power and how their political choices will affect the world (Soepandji, 2020). Muslim-majority countries constitute an independent group that combines shared religious customs with distinct geographic characteristics, shaping their diplomatic interactions with Western nations and neighboring countries (Qolbi et al., 2024). Recent studies on religious geopolitics show how communities use everyday counter-geopolitical methods to resist state control over cross-border areas, and how geopolitical groups actively participate in state power struggles rather than merely receiving external influence (Öcal & Gökarıksel, 2022).

The latest academic research on geopolitical discourse shows that different state positions shape how countries construct their narratives of international conflict. Cap (2023) studied the Russia–Ukraine war discourse to show how different geopolitical actors use opposing spatial representations and global versus local conflict narratives to support their specific interpretations and policy approaches. Pace (2023) investigated US space policy discourse to show how geopolitical factors shape diplomats' use of international relations frameworks in their official communications, aligned with their national interests. This study examines three state representative groups because their members create distinct linguistic patterns to portray stakeholders in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, their activities, and their national duties, in line with their geopolitical identity systems.

The study combines Fairclough's (1992, 2013) three-dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis framework with Halliday and Matthiessen's (2014) Systemic Functional Linguistics to examine how micro-level grammatical choices systematically connect to macro-level ideological positioning. Fairclough's framework conceptualizes discourse through three interconnected dimensions: (1) the textual dimension, which analyzes linguistic features within the text itself; (2) the discursive practice dimension, which examines processes of production, distribution, and interpretation through intertextuality and interdiscursivity; and the social practice dimension, which situates discourse within broader structures of power, ideology, and sociopolitical relations. Complementing this approach, Halliday's SFL views language as a social semiotic system and provides analytical tools for examining how meaning is constructed through grammatical choices. This study particularly employs the ideational metafunction through transitivity analysis to investigate representations of agency and responsibility, and the interpersonal metafunction through modality and pronominalization to examine evaluation, authority, solidarity, and ideological alignment.

The integrated approach enables researchers to address established CDA methodological issues by providing a basis for understanding ideological interpretation through observable linguistic patterns, according to Barreda (2025), while maintaining a focus on how discourse sustains or disrupts global power distributions. The analysis examines transitivity patterns alongside modality choices, vocabulary, naming strategies, and pronominalization patterns. The study analyzes intertextuality and interdiscursivity at the meso-level, while its macro-level analysis shows how textual elements connect with power, hegemonic power, and ideological patterns. The researchers selected specific segments of the UNGA 2025 speeches delivered on September 23-26 through purposive sampling to achieve representativeness and maintain control over both institutional and temporal aspects.

The two research questions of the analytical framework create its research structure. First, how do state representatives from Global North, Global South, and Muslim-majority countries construct ideological framings of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict in their UNGA 2025 speeches? This research examines content dimensions that reveal how different geopolitical actors shape their main characters as they assess others' ethical standing and their national position in conflict stories. Second, how do the state representatives linguistically represent actors, actions, and responsibilities within the conflict? This research examines formal elements, including specific grammatical and lexical devices people use to express their ideological beliefs. The research methodologically advances CDA scholarship by demonstrating how systematic linguistic analysis grounds ideological interpretation in observable grammatical patterns, addresses long-standing critiques of interpretive rigor, and, empirically, identifies specific linguistic strategies through which power, legitimacy, and solidarity are negotiated in multilateral forums during moments of geopolitical realignment.

METHOD

The research uses qualitative comparative analysis through Critical Discourse Analysis, which applies Fairclough's three-dimensional framework (1992, 2013) alongside Halliday and Matthiessen's Systemic Functional Linguistics (2014). The selection of this integrated analytical framework is grounded in its demonstrated capacity to reveal complex relationships between micro-level linguistic choices, meso-level discursive practices, and macro-level ideological formations in international political discourse. The approach has established itself as a theoretical framework that yields successful empirical outcomes when applied to state representatives who construct conflict representations in their work, as recent studies investigating geopolitical discourse during the Russia-Ukraine war have shown (Cap, 2023).

The researchers conducted their study through comparative research because it helped them discover how different countries, which belong to the Global North, Global South, and Muslim-majority nations, present their views about people and their activities in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. The design supports Kamal and Courtheyn's (2024) proposal, which requires researchers to separate geopolitical categories into three different parts, which include geographical location, social standing, and institutional role, to understand how "Northness" and "Southness" operate as relationship-based elements that express themselves through language. The combination of SFL's transitivity and modality analysis with Fairclough's macro-level critique satisfies the requirements of CDA research, which demands a systematic linguistic examination that connects ideological understanding to visible grammatical features (Barreda, 2025). This approach establishes scientific standards that help researchers control their studies without resorting to subjective methods lacking scientific backing. The research design establishes a legitimate basis for research that enables researchers to investigate how people use language at the clause level, through agency attribution and modality, to display their international-system base, situated between hegemony and counter-hegemony.

The research data include official state speeches delivered at the UNGA 2025 that specifically address the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. The sample selection process used purposive sampling based on two established criteria that guided the research team's sampling approach. First, countries were selected based on three main geopolitical clusters: the Global North represented by the United States (delivered September 23, 2025, morning session, position 2) and United Kingdom (September 26, 2025, morning session, position 5); Muslim-majority countries represented by Indonesia (September 23, 2025, morning session, position 3) and Pakistan (September 26, 2025, morning session, position 15); and the Global South represented by South Africa (September 23, 2025, morning session, position 16) and Brazil (September 23, 2025, morning session, position 1).

The cluster division uses World Population Review categories, which scholars in Global South and Global North research have established as their standard (World Population Review, 2025a) that combine economic factors with colonial history and ideological beliefs and international relations (Kamal & Courtheyn, 2024; Kowalski, 2020), and two countries were selected based on having the largest Muslim-majority populations (World Population Review, 2025b). The selection of two countries from each cluster was intended to ensure representativeness and to avoid regional or idiosyncratic bias from any single nation, following established practices in comparative political discourse analysis that balance depth of analysis with cluster representation. Second, speeches were selected based on explicit references to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict throughout their duration. The conflict-specific segments showed time variations ranging from 2.5 minutes in the UK to 14 minutes in Indonesia. However, the presence of substantial issue engagement met the inclusion standards because the research focused on the linguistic constructions of actors' responsibilities and actions rather than measuring topic attention through quantitative methods.

It aligns with the study by Alshurafa and Kamla (2024), which demonstrates a method for uncovering hidden ideological beliefs through brief discourse, thereby revealing deep patterns of identity construction. The researchers maintain uniformity throughout their study by using speeches from the UNGA session 2025, which enabled them to control temporal factors while observing speakers discussing identical geopolitical situations. The researchers needed consistent time periods for their comparison because Guerra et al. (2025) found that Israeli-Palestinian conflict discussions

shifted in response to actual events worldwide. The researchers used a specific sampling method to create a small research database containing information about one specific type of content within one academic field and institutional setting, which they used for detailed critical discourse analysis to investigate how people displayed their ideological positioning and linguistic representation strategies.

Researchers collected data from official United Nations sources to produce authentic, reliable research materials. The 80th Session of the UNGA began on September 9, 2025, and its high-level General Debate took place from September 23 to September 29, 2025. The UN YouTube channel served as the official platform for collecting all speeches because it offers complete video recordings with timestamped access to specific speeches. The data collection procedure comprised five structured stages that adhered to established best practices for digital discourse analysis.

First, the official UNGA 2025 schedule published by the UN was used to identify official speeches delivered by state representatives from six selected countries, which were then verified by checking the availability of videos on the UN YouTube channel. Then, the YouTube transcript function automatically generated speech transcripts. Next, transcription was manually verified against audio recordings to ensure accuracy, with special focus on technical terminology and proper names, as well as on moments when automatic transcription fails to convey the actual meaning. The verification process becomes critical because automated transcription systems have known limitations when handling political speech, including technical vocabulary and accents of non-native English speakers.

The researchers identified and extracted specific segments containing explicit references to the following terms: "Palestine," "Palestinian," "Israel," "Israeli," "Gaza," "October 7," "ceasefire," "hostages," and their associated terms. The researchers recorded timestamps for these segments, which enabled them to locate the start and end points of the spoken material and study the full context of their speech. The extracted segments underwent analysis preparation through text normalization procedures, including removing transcription artifacts (e.g., "[Applause]" timestamps), standardizing spelling variations, and preserving original sentence structure and word order to support the study of transitivity and modality. The researchers organized all information into a system that used geopolitical clusters (Global North, Muslim-majority, and Global South) to create country-specific folders containing complete transcripts, conflict materials, metadata (duration, position, and date), and initial coding observations. The systematic collection and organization procedure ensures complete data traceability for researchers, enabling them to verify their analysis results and allowing other researchers to replicate their work or build upon it.

The analysis used a systematic, repeated method grounded in Fairclough's three-dimensional CDA framework (1992, 2013) and Halliday and Matthiessen's SFL framework (2014). The analysis examined four fundamental SFL systems at the micro-level of text analysis. The transitivity analysis first studied process types (including material, mental, relational, verbal, and behavioral) and existential processes, to show how different discursive methods develop agency and responsibility (Alshurafa et al., 2023). The study compared material processes containing human agents through their direct participation in operations to existential constructions that hide their identity. The second modality analysis focused on two elements: modal verbs and modal adjuncts, and mood structures, to evaluate epistemic certainty and deontic obligation (Cap, 2023). The third analysis of vocabulary and naming strategies showed how evaluative lexical choices and euphemisms, as well as strategic omissions, such as *genocide versus conflict* and *terrorists versus resistance*, created distinct interpretive frameworks. Lastly, the research examined pronominalization patterns to show how pronouns like *we* and *they* establish in-group and out-group connections between people and their relationships.

The analysis of intertextuality and interdiscursivity used Fairclough's framework to study discursive practice at the meso-level. The intertextual analysis showed how speeches drew on other texts and events, including the October 7 attacks, UN Charter principles, ICJ rulings, the recent recognition of Palestinian statehood, and historical precedents, to establish authority and frame their interpretations through genocide-naming practices in Mara's (2022) study. The research examined how security, humanitarian, legal, religious, and anti-colonial discourses were used to support or undermine different positions, according to Abbas et al.'s (2025) framework. The research examined

how power structures, ideological systems, and dominant societal norms operate through textual and discursive patterns, revealing how the USA security discourse maintains power over USA security interests. In contrast, the UK maintains its commonwealth status through contested power distribution, and South Africa and Brazil use their institutional systems and systemic critique to advance their own anti-hegemonic objectives.

The research used a multi-stage, cross-cluster procedure to operationalize its comparative dimension, which included three steps: a micro–meso–macro framework analysis of independent countries; within-cluster comparisons to identify internal differences; and cross-cluster comparisons of agency attribution, modality, and genocide terminology. The process of moving between different levels helps researchers identify which discourse elements are linked to geopolitical status and which result from national historical background and diplomatic tendencies. Therefore, the research addresses methodological critiques of CDA while maintaining its critical examination of how discourse creates or disrupts international power structures.

ANALYSIS

Textual Patterns

The micro-level analysis shows how speakers use transitivity and modality, vocabulary, and pronoun usage to construct different versions of actors, actions, and their responsibilities in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. The linguistic choices reveal their ideological beliefs, which connect to their geopolitical cluster identities and result in the different ways they attribute agency, frame victims, and use evaluative language.

Global North Cluster: Security vs. Humanitarian Law Framing

Despite shared foundational positions, the United States and the United Kingdom demonstrate contrasting approaches within the Global North cluster. The USA presents the conflict through material processes, which show Hamas as the main actor who performs harmful actions, such as “Hamas has repeatedly rejected…,” “…Hamas terrorists,” “…ransom demands”, while Israeli actions become hidden using nominalization and passive voice. The discourse is dominated by high-obligation modality, as in ”have to get that done," which is repeated four times, creating urgency around hostage release rather than broader humanitarian concerns. The date of October 7 serves as a recurring time reference point because it appears three times, which enables the conflict to be seen through the hostage crisis perspective, while Palestinian death tolls go unmentioned. Pronominalization patterns create two groups: an inclusive "we" representing US and international hostage advocates, and a delegitimized "they" standing for Hamas, with the speaker acting as a security mediator.

In contrast, the UK systematizes its accountability process through a dual evaluative structure, which assesses both Hamas and Israel, because the charges against Hamas display "vile, pitiless" behavior. At the same time, the Israeli government shows "indefensible", "inhumane", and "utterly unjustifiable" actions. The speech explicitly names Israel as an agent in material processes, "Israel escalates military operations," "Israel's denial of lifesaving humanitarian aid", which represents a substantial shift from the USA's previous method of omitting important information. The UK's discourse uses UN Charter intertextuality, describing it as "charter as our compass," to present Britain as a moral authority that operates under international humanitarian law, rather than military security protocols. The UK's complete victim representation, showing that both Palestinians and Israelis "deserve better", together with its declaration of "catastrophic famine", shows how Global North countries start to break their common understanding about proportionality and humanitarian responsibilities.

Muslim-Majority Cluster: Humanitarian Suffering and Solidarity Discourse

The two countries, Indonesia and Pakistan, choose to avoid criticizing Hamas while making statements about Palestinian suffering. The two countries use different communication styles, reflecting their different diplomatic approaches. The Indonesian speech describes ongoing humanitarian emergencies through its use of existential processes, “…catastrophic situation in Gaza is unfolding…”, “…the innocent are crying for help…”. The text uses the passive voice and

nominalization through the term "situation in Gaza" to show how Indonesia maintains diplomatic neutrality in line with its non-aligned stance. The speech uses philosophical intertextuality with Thucydides' maxim about the strong and the weak to create a universal moral framework that combines interfaith pluralism through the two descendants of Abraham and the Om hanti interfaith concept. The international community must meet high deontic-modality requirements by fulfilling its collective obligation to take immediate action and refrain from silence. The Indonesian government establishes itself as a positive international force by making specific security commitments, including sending 20,000 peacekeepers and providing rice aid to support its soft-power diplomatic mission through humanitarian efforts.

Pakistan, conversely, directs its operational activities against Israel through material processes, "…Israel's genocidal onslaught has unleashed…", "Israeli leadership has unleashed shameful campaign." The discourse demonstrates total knowledge of the subject matter through a complete absence of protective language, stating "genocide" as a fact rather than an allegation, and human suffering through an extended narrative about Hind Rajab, a named child victim whose story is narrated with emotional modality and rhetorical questions, "Can you imagine not having compassion to spare her life?" This individualization strategy contrasts sharply with Indonesia's collectivized framing of "the innocent" and "millions facing danger." Pakistan's pronominalization invokes Islamic solidarity—"… agony of the entire Muslim Ummah", creates an in-group identity through religious identifiers to replace global humanitarian. The lexical intensity is extremely powerful through "nefarious goals", "darkest chapter", "rogue behavior", positioning Pakistan within a confrontational anti-colonial struggle, while presenting its testimony of carrying a child's coffin in Kashmir to establish moral authority grounded in shared suffering.

Global South Cluster: Legal Accountability and Systemic Critique

South Africa and Brazil use genocide terminology and critique of Western complicity, yet diverge in their primary discursive strategies for challenging Northern hegemony. South Africa constructs the conflict predominantly through legal discourse, centering relational processes that establish Israel as a legal subject: "Israel is committing genocide," "Israel is responsible for the commission of genocide." The speech deploys evidential modality by invoking institutional authority, " United Nations Independent International Commission of Inquiry found," "International Court of Justice", transforming moral claims into legally substantiated facts. The speech constructs democratic legitimacy through quantitative references, stating "…142 and more countries", "global majority", positioning South Africa as spokesperson for a counter-hegemonic coalition that operates within, rather than against, international legal frameworks. The discourse maintains a professional register and measured tone, with deontic modality, such as "we have a duty to act" and "it must stop", grounded in procedural justice rather than emotional appeal. South Africa uses its ICJ case as a self-referential example to demonstrate both its credibility and its ability to illustrate how weaker nations use organizational systems to control dominant countries.

Brazil, while also employing genocide terminology, centers moral critique of systemic hypocrisy through emphatic relational processes, like "nothing, absolutely nothing, justifies the ongoing genocide." The discourse identifies Western powers as an active agent, like "… massacre would not have happened without complicity of those who could have prevented it…", extending responsibility beyond Israel to enabling powers. Brazil's lexical choices target structural dimensions, such as the "myth of ethical exceptionalism of the West," signaling that the issue concerns not only Israeli actions but also the double standards embedded in the international order. The speech briefly acknowledges Hamas attacks as "indefensible from any angle" before immediately pivoting to disproportionate response, which uses adversative construction "but" to maintain proportionality critique while avoiding charges of one-sidedness. The presidential voice functions through personal expression when he states that, "I express my admiration to the Jews who... oppose" and his symbolic protest through Mahmud Abbas' visa denial serves as a performative act which challenges US hegemonic control over diplomatic space. Brazil pursues a different discursive strategy: while South Africa seeks institutional legitimacy, Brazil works to establish moral grounds for delegitimizing Northern power.

Table 1. Micro-Level Linguistic Patterns by Country

Feature	Global North		Muslim-Majority		Global South	
	USA	**UK**	**Indonesia**	**Pakistan**	**South Africa**	**Brazil**
Dominant Process Type	Material (action-oriented)	Relational (moral evaluation)	Existential (humanitarian crisis)	Material (violent actions)	Relational (legal attribution)	Relational (systemic critique)
Israel as Agent	Absent/ elided	Explicit (humanitarian violations)	Unnamed (passivization)	Explicit (genocidal aggressor)	Explicit (legal defendant)	Implicit and complicit Western powers
Hamas as Agent	Hyper-visible (terrorist threat)	Explicit (terrorist organization)	Absent	Absent/minimized	Absent	Brief acknowledgment
Victim Framing	Israeli hostages (individualized)	Dual (both people)	Generic innocent (collectivized)	Named Palestinian child (personalized)	Palestinians (legal subjects)	Palestinians (existential threat)
Modality Type	High obligation (must/have to)	High certainty (moral imperatives)	High moral obligation (collective)	Extreme certainty (no hedging)	Evidential (legal authority)	Emphatic certainty (absolute)
Lexical Intensity	Moderate (focused vocabulary)	High (balanced condemnation)	Moderate (diplomatic register)	Very high (charged language)	Moderate (legal terminology)	High (systemic critique vocabulary)
October 7 Reference	Central (repeated 3x)	Acknowledged	Not mentioned	Not mentioned	Not mentioned	Brief mention
Genocide Term Use	Avoided entirely	Avoided (violations described)	Not used	Used assertively	Used assertively (legal frame)	Used assertively (moral frame)
Pronominalization Pattern	We (US and allies) vs They (Hamas)	We (moral arbiter)	We (humanity/Indonesia)	We (Muslim *Ummah*)	We (Global South leaders)	I (personal voice)

The micro-level analysis indicates three distinct patterns that extend beyond differences across individual countries. The linguistic treatment of "genocide" operates as a geopolitical marker that shows different countries' political positions through its active use by Pakistan, South Africa, and Brazil; Indonesia's emphasis on humanitarian suffering without employing the term itself; and its complete absence by the USA and UK. The UK's approach to describing violations in general terms rather than in specific ones shows that diplomatic ties with other countries have become more important than new humanitarian standards. The geography of international relations establishes two distinct paths that determine how people allocate responsibility for their actions during warfare. The UK maintains dual agency through balanced operations, positioning itself as the ethical midpoint between two opposing sides. The use of individual stories versus group identities creates different argumentative effects, because personal accounts (USA's hostage families, Pakistan's Hind Rajab) create strong emotional ties and moral obligation. In contrast, group identities (Indonesia's "millions," Brazil's "tens of thousands") show the extent and fundamental character of their suffering. The speakers of these patterns strategically deploy linguistic resources to create conflict representations that align with their geopolitical positions.

Discursive Practice Analysis

The meso-level studies show how speeches use and merge different discourse types through interdiscursivity, while it investigates how speakers reference outside texts and actual events through intertextuality. The analysis reveals that geopolitical clusters select specific discourse types to establish legitimacy through different authoritative sources, reflecting international conflicts over acceptable interpretive methods.

Global North: Security and Humanitarian Law Discourses

The United States operates primarily within a security discourse that treats October 7 as a foundational date without further explanation. The speech contains no references to the UN Charter, international law, or institutional authorities, instead deploying personal narrative as a legitimizing frame—mentioning Steve Witkoff, Marco Rubio, and meetings with hostage families. The intertextual approach establishes legitimacy through direct American participation in successful transactions through "We got most of them back", which resulted in the American military recovery of most hostages. The interdiscursive blend shows a singular security focus that excludes humanitarian or legal discourse, creating difficulties for the hostage-focused approach.

The United Kingdom demonstrates more complex interdiscursivity by explicitly foregrounding the UN Charter, "charter as our compass," invoking "equal rights, self-determination, and dignity", as an authoritative framework. The intertextual reference to Palestinian statehood, "…state we proudly recognized this week," shows that the policy has changed while engaging with international legal developments. The speech combines security discourse, which describes Hamas as a "vile, pitiless terrorist organization", with humanitarian law discourse describing Israel's "denial of lifesaving humanitarian aid" and "catastrophic famine", and diplomatic discourse, including "concerted diplomatic action" and "durable plan for peace." The United Kingdom demonstrates its interdiscursive complexity through its dual role as a Western ally that maintains its position against Hamas while also functioning as a defender of humanitarian law, which criticizes Israeli behavior to achieve reformed hegemonic status amid a changing global consensus.

Muslim-Majority: Moral Philosophy and Religious Solidarity Discourses

Indonesia uses philosophical intertextuality to its fullest extent by referencing Thucydides' assertion that the strong exercise their power, while the weak endure unavoidable suffering. The speech rejects the UN, presenting it as an institutional tool that enables countries to change the power-based international system. The intertextuality of religious pluralism extends through "two descendants of Abraham" and "…all religions, we must live as one human family," as well as a list of world religions. Indonesia's historical development path, together with United Nations institutional support, constitutes an intertextual reference that establishes a duty to "never stay silent when Palestinians face injustice." The interdiscursive blend prioritizes humanitarian discussions of suffering, starvation, and trauma; moral-philosophical discussions of justice, humanity, and moral superiority; and dialogues about establishing peacekeeping missions and rice relief. Legal discourse is absent because Indonesia approaches matters through ethical and aspirational means, aligning with its non-aligned diplomatic approach.

Pakistan employs distinctly religious intertextuality, "Muslim *Ummah* (community)," "world hereafter", to create an Islamic solidarity that functions as the primary religious community and main ethical authority. The extended narrative about Hind Rajab references a widely circulated recording in Muslim media, which serves as a common cultural document that needs no explanation for *Ummah* discourse, but teaches non-Muslim viewers. Personal testimony about Gaza and Kashmir connections, including the statement "I too carried the tiny coffin of Abbas", creates an intertextual connection that enables Pakistan to show its right to support Kashmir. The reference to "President Trump's timely initiative… three days ago here…" shows how he engaged with power centers while he maintained an Israel-facing adversarial position. The interdiscursive blend combines humanitarian, religious, moral, and anti-colonial liberation discourse. At the same time, Pakistan specifically avoids legal discourse because it prefers to ground its moral standards in spiritual and postcolonial values.

Global South: Legal Institutions and Anti-Hegemonic Critique

The discursive practice of South Africa shows legal-institutional intertextuality as its main element, because all its references to "the case that South Africa brought before the International Court of Justice" serve both as proof and as a display of its legal process. The genocide claim gains external authority from the "United Nations Independent International Commission of Inquiry" finding, which transforms it from a personal view into a demonstrated fact. The global support measurements, such as "142 or more countries", "increasing number of countries", and "global majority", establish links between the speech and actual UN voting patterns and recognition

activities. The interdiscursive combination prioritizes legal discourse on genocide and responsibility, and ruling and self-determination as legal rights, alongside human rights and diplomatic dialogue. South Africa maintains a professional approach by avoiding emotional and religious expressions, presenting international law as an unbiased legal system that limits dominant power.

Brazil employs both moral evaluation and structural analysis to achieve its anti-hegemonic interdiscursive demonstration. The speech establishes temporal links through intertextual references to recent high-level discussions about the two-state solution, which faced a veto. The statement "solution defended by more than 150 UN members... barred by a single veto" demonstrates temporal immediacy through its dramatic irony. Western ethical exceptionalism is an intellectual postcolonial tradition, as the phrase "myth of ethical exceptionalism of the West" suggests through its reference to Northern double standards. The speech uses the intertextual reference "President Mahmud Abbas was prevented by the host country" to show how the visa denial incident created a diplomatic conflict through the speaker's actions. Brazil's interdiscursive blend unites three distinct types of discourse through the integration of humanitarian, moral-indictment, and systemic-critique discourses. The speech uses legal terms, such as "genocide" and "forced displacement", to make moral-political accusations instead of following legal definitions. The speech introduces Hamas attacks as an initial point to establish fairness before showing disproportionality, maintaining focus on Western involvement in the conflict.

Table 2. Discursive Practice Patterns by Cluster

Cluster	Primary Intertextuality	Secondary Intertextuality	Dominant Interdiscursivity	Absent Discourse Types
Global North (USA)	October 7, personal narratives (hostage families)	US mediation efforts (Witkoff, Rubio)	Security discourse	Legal discourse, structural critique
Global North (UK)	UN Charter, Palestinian statehood recognition	October 7th, international law	Humanitarian law and security discourse	Anti-hegemonic critique
Muslim- majority (Indonesia)	Classical philosophy (Thucydides), religious pluralism	UN support for Indonesia's development	Moral-philosophical and humanitarian discourse	Legal discourse
Muslim- majority (Pakistan)	Hind Rajab narrative, Muslim *Ummah*	Kashmir parallel, Trump initiative	Religious, moral, and anti-colonial discourse	Legal-institutional discourse
Global South (South Africa)	ICJ case, UN Commission findings, 142 countries	Two-state solution	Legal-institutional discourse	Emotional/religious discourse
Global South (Brazil)	"Yesterday's" UN meeting veto, Abbas' visa denial	Western ethical exceptionalism critique	Moral critique and systemic analysis	Security discourse

The meso-level analysis identifies three points of dispute over which types of discourse should define the conflict. First, the legal-versus-moral framing divide: South Africa and, to a lesser extent, Brazil deploy legal discourse to constrain power through procedural mechanisms (ICJ rulings, Commission findings), while Indonesia and Pakistan prioritize moral-religious discourse that appeals to universal human values or religious obligations outside juridical frameworks. The USA's rejection of both approaches in favor of a pragmatic security discourse reflects the ability of hegemonic power to operate outside constraining frameworks. The USA's October 7 intertextuality establishes a fixed point of origin for conflict. In contrast, Muslim-majority and Global South speeches either omit this reference entirely or mention it briefly before historicizing the conflict within a longer occupation narrative. The UK occupies a middle position that acknowledges October 7 while expanding the temporal scope to encompass the ongoing humanitarian crisis. Third, the authority source competition: Global North speeches invoke recent events and immediate crisis (hostages, current negotiations) as legitimizing urgency, while Global South speeches invoke institutional

authorities (ICJ, UN votes, Commission reports) and Muslim-majority speeches invoke philosophical-religious principles, each cluster privileging different types of evidence to support truth claims. The discursive struggles show that the battle for control of representation coexists with the battle over which interpretive groups and authoritative sources should determine the international response.

Social Practice Analysis

The macro-level analysis examines how the identified linguistic and discursive patterns operate to maintain or disrupt existing power structures and dominant ideological systems within the international system. The analysis shows that geopolitical clusters use distinct methods to either uphold or dispute the security framework that has traditionally guided international responses to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

Global North: Hegemonic Reproduction and Emerging Fissures

The United States establishes its global dominance through its security-focused portrayal of the conflict, which prioritizes Israeli security needs while hiding Palestinian suffering from view. The ideological work occurs through what is systematically absent: no mention of Palestinian casualties, no engagement with occupation discourse, no reference to international humanitarian law violations. The date of October 7 acts as an ideological break, which removes historical background from all discussions about peace treatment that depend on Hamas removal and hostage recovery, instead of examining the causes of the occupation system. The USA's positioning as an indispensable mediator, “I have been deeply engaged”, “we got most of them back”, reproduces American exceptionalism and reinforces the geopolitical order in which the US alone possesses the authority to broker peace. The dominant narrative supports powerful interests by maintaining Israel's status as an essential regional partner while showing concern for humanitarian issues through its focus on individual hostages, protecting its policy framework from critical assessment. The repeated use of transactional language, including the phrase "got to get it done", demonstrates how hegemonic pragmatism uses instrumental rationality to approach political conflicts as situations that need administrative solutions instead of permanent system changes.

The United Kingdom shows ideological uncertainty, suggesting the Global North alliance could fracture into factions. The United Kingdom upholds its partnership through Hamas condemnation and security discourse while recognizing Palestinian statehood and criticizing Israel's humanitarian law violations and applying UN Charter principles to pursue reformed hegemony through which it attempts to maintain power through moral authority instead of direct power use. The Western alliance uses this discursive strategy to create material contradictions, showing that most UN members now consider traditional security methods invalid. However, the alliance still requires its members to fulfill their domestic political duties. The UK presents itself as a neutral mediator with moral superiority, as evidenced by its dual accountability system and balanced victim narrative. However, this stance hides the unbalanced power dynamics between Israel and the Palestinian population. The speech attempts to merge security and humanitarian issues through its analysis, yet the occupation system reveals its limits in addressing colonial problems.

Muslim-Majority: Counter-Hegemonic Solidarity through Alternative Universalisms

Indonesia and Pakistan develop anti-hegemonic methods by creating new universal standards that contest the Northern powers' control over the establishment of international norms. The ideological foundation of Indonesia originates in the non-aligned universalism that the Bandung Conference established as its basic principle. The speech establishes an inclusive moral community through its philosophical references and interfaith pluralism, emphasizing the concept of "one human family" that unites people from different cultures while rejecting the power-based reasoning of realists. The critique of Thucydides' maxim directly challenges hegemonic ideology that naturalizes power asymmetry, positioning the UN as an institutional mechanism through which "the weak do not suffer what they must." Indonesia demonstrates its counter-hegemonic leadership by committing 20,000 soldiers as peacekeepers, showing how Global South countries can act as security providers rather than merely relying on security resources, thereby challenging Northern countries'

control over peacekeeping operations. Indonesia's diplomatic strategy, which avoids direct mention of Israel, demonstrates its non-aligned stance through calculated moves that allow it to maintain ties with all parties while upholding its ethical standards. Indonesia uses this discursive tactic to achieve its foreign policy goal of establishing itself as a moderate force connecting Islamic nations with Western powers through diplomatic ties.

Pakistan uses Islamic unity-based confrontation to create counter-hegemony, which identifies Israeli actions as genocidal, while declaring the Muslim *Ummah* to be its main source of authority. The extended Hind Rajab narrative operates as an ideological tool that presents Palestinian suffering through humanization. At the same time, it challenges the Western media's portrayal of Israeli victims, thus producing an alternative historical record of the October 7 event. Pakistan links Palestine to Kashmir to create an anti-colonial solidarity framework, which demonstrates that both territories need liberation from their ongoing occupations, thus rejecting Western definitions that consider Kashmir a bilateral issue and Palestine a mere geopolitical conflict. The religious requirement and eschatological belief in the "world hereafter" create a moral power that transcends the boundaries of secular liberalism, thereby demonstrating that Northern nations need to express their fundamental values through secular language. Pakistan uses this discursive strategy to achieve its domestic political objectives, including establishing an Islamic identity and securing its position as a regional power leading the Muslim world. At the same time, it undermines dominant control over how conflict is understood. The decision to exclude Hamas criticism demonstrates a belief system that views anti-colonial resistance as a separate moral category from colonial occupation, which stands in direct opposition to Northern security discourse.

Global South: Institutional and Systemic Counter-Hegemony

South Africa uses international law to establish institutional counter-hegemony, preventing powerful nations from operating without accountability. In contrast, they use the same legal rules that Western nations created to restrict their own actions. South Africa uses international law to create institutional counter-hegemony, preventing powerful nations from operating without accountability. In contrast, the country uses the legal frameworks created by Western countries to limit its own activities.

The ICJ case serves as both a juridical action and a discursive performance, demonstrating that weaker states can use international institutions to hold powerful actors accountable. South Africa's invocation of the "global majority" (142 countries) performs an ideological inversion of the term "international community," which has historically referred to Western powers, thereby reclaiming numerical democracy as a source of legitimacy against a hegemonic minority. The use of genocide terminology, which establishes legal claims that exceed moral authority, creates procedural engagement requirements that are more difficult to dismiss than emotional or religious appeals. South Africa uses this strategy because its historical background demands this approach. The country used international solidarity and legal mechanisms to fight against apartheid, which gave it both moral authority and institutional knowledge to guide another similar movement. The South African speaker presents an unspoken reference to apartheid through his remarks, which create an ideological framework that connects the Palestinian situation to established historical patterns of racist colonialism. The discursive strategy enables South Africa to operate as a moral leader for the Global South, while establishing coalitions through procedural means that avoid political conflict.

The Brazilian approach to counter-hegemonic efforts demonstrates institutionalized international hypocrisy by exposing the system's hypocrisy. The critique of "myth of ethical exceptionalism of the west" names the ideological mechanism through which hegemonic powers maintain double standards, applying humanitarian law to adversaries while exempting allies. Brazil holds Western nations responsible for their crimes against Israel through "…could have prevented it in Gaza", the genocide, challenging the discourse of neutrality that powerful states claim, while enabling violence through military aid and diplomatic protection. The brief acknowledgment of Hamas attacks before immediately pivoting to disproportionality demonstrates understanding of Northern framing while refusing to accept its logic. Brazil maintains that no amount of terrorism justifies genocide. The United States government uses its power to control diplomatic spaces by preventing international assembly members from accessing information about Mahmud Abbas's

visa denial. The Brazilian Lula administration uses this discursive strategy to establish its foreign policy framework, which supports multipolar world systems and South-South solidarity. Brazil serves as the primary representative of developing nations that oppose Northern control in global diplomacy. The personal presidential voice "I express" rather than bureaucratic language signals an authentic moral stance rather than diplomatic calculation.

Table 3. Ideological Positioning and Hegemonic Strategies by Cluster

Cluster	Ideological Framing	Hegemonic Strategy	Power Relations	Discursive Function
Global North (USA)	Security paradigm, terrorism threat	Hegemonic reproduction	Maintains Israeli alliance, US indispensability	Erases Palestinian suffering, legitimizes status quo
Global North (UK)	Humanitarian law and security	Reformed hegemony (ambivalent)	Signals distance from the US while maintaining alliance	Attempts moral authority through balanced critique
Muslim-majority (Indonesia)	Universal humanism, moral philosophy	Soft counter-hegemony	Non-aligned bridge-builder	Challenges power logic through inclusive principles
Muslim-majority (Pakistan)	Islamic solidarity, anti-colonial liberation	Hard counter-hegemony (confrontational)	Muslim *Ummah* leadership	Delegitimizes Israeli actions, rejects Western framing
Global South (South Africa)	Legal accountability, global majority	Institutional counter-hegemony	Uses law to constrain power	Inverts the legitimacy hierarchy through procedures
Global South (Brazil)	Systemic critique, Western complicity	Radical counter-hegemony	Exposes structural hypocrisy	Challenges the international order's legitimacy

The macro-analysis shows that the international system faces a hegemonic crisis, because the Northern countries, which historically controlled legitimate discourse about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, now encounter an unprecedented challenge. The four countries, including Muslim-majority countries and Global South nations, demonstrate their power as they use genocide terminology to center Palestinian suffering while exposing Northern double standards. The UK maintains its alliance with the USA while creating a discursive gap, suggesting that Northern countries now consider their previous framing methods untrustworthy. The USA maintains its security system to protect its interests because international isolation has not diminished its material power, allowing it to maintain hegemonic control through military strength. The Palestinian-Israeli conflict has become a discursive battle representing the entire international system, because Global South countries want to establish order through legal methods and democratic majorities. In contrast, Muslim-majority countries want to establish order through moral-religious values, and the USA wants to establish order through its power-based approaches. The analyzed speeches demonstrate that conflicts between two parties exist worldwide, reflecting opposing beliefs about how power relates to justice and international recognition in today's global power structure.

How State Representatives Construct Ideological Framings

The study shows that state representatives from various geopolitical regions develop fundamentally different ideological perspectives on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict by using temporal framing as a vital tool to dispute historical events and their corresponding causal explanations. The USA's repeated invocation of October 7 as a temporal anchor (mentioned three times) serves to establish what Cap (2023) terms an “episodic framing” that severs the conflict from its historical continuum, transforming a decades-long occupation into a discrete security crisis requiring an immediate response. This finding is consistent with Alazzeh and Uddin’s (2025) research that demonstrates how settler-colonial environments systematically remove indigenous historical accounts to justify current violent actions. The countries of Indonesia, Pakistan, and South Africa, along with Brazil, choose to either overlook or diminish the significance of October 7 because they prefer to depict Palestinian suffering as part of ongoing processes of occupation and dispossession, which Abdullah and Hassan (2025) describe as a counter-memory that Palestinian resistance literature uses to confront systems of colonial oppression through temporal continuity rather than

rupture. The debate over conflict initiation concerns more than determining the conflict's starting point, as it involves deciding which historical account should govern understanding of moral obligations and acceptable actions. The capital-colonial world orientation, which Kamal and Courtheyn (2024) identified, determines how people perceive Palestinian resistance as either terrorist activities or anti-colonial struggles.

The United Kingdom demonstrates its duality by recognizing October 7 and by deciding to evaluate the current humanitarian situation. The study of Reddit discourse during the 2023 conflict shows that Guerra et al. (2025) found people who engage in extreme behavior during critical moments of actual events. The UK discourse employs both event-based and structural framing, including references to occupation and famine. The two frameworks highlight problems that show that Global North countries experience conflicts over their security systems. The term 'genocide' shows active use in the speeches of Pakistan, South Africa, and Brazil, while Indonesia foregrounds humanitarian suffering without explicitly employing the term.

In contrast, the USA maintains complete silence on the term, and the UK avoids using it despite expressing concerns about humanitarian violations. According to Mara's (2022) analysis of how naming practices construct identity, the term 'genocide' establishes a speaker's position of global power. The use of the term indicates that the speaker supports anti-hegemonic groups, whereas its absence suggests that the speaker seeks to maintain the Northern alliance structure. The term functions as a "legitimation and de-legitimation" strategy, which Abbas et al. (2025) define through their description of geopolitical positioning that goes beyond basic explanation.

The discursive strategies people use to define genocide reveal the different ways they seek to establish authority. South Africa's legal system uses the term genocide after the United Nations Independent International Commission of Inquiry found that Israel is responsible for transforming the term from a moral charge into legal proof. It is consistent with what Alshurafa and Kamla (2024) demonstrate through their analysis of how Palestinian activists create objective accounts that meet postcolonial identity and professional credibility requirements. Pakistan's unhedged assertion of Israel's genocidal onslaught refers to Israel's acts through documents that establish facts, not through unproven accusations, showing what Cap (2023) calls coercive rhetoric, preventing any scientific agreement between parties. The statement shows how Brazilian people need to recognize two separate facts, since they claim that Hamas attacks become unjustifiable from all perspectives. However, according to their statement, they declare that the ongoing genocide needs no justification, because they follow proportionality rules that safeguard their moral viewpoint. The genocide discourse serves as an international order legitimacy testing method, permitting speakers to use the term because they believe the current legal standards apply to all cases, regardless of who commits the crime. Brazil used to contest the Western belief that certain nations should have special moral rights. Hasan and Bleibleh (2023) describe the phenomenon of resistance landscapes, which show how people use their language to resist those who control them by deciding how violence should be defined.

Overall, the present findings largely support previous Critical Discourse Analysis studies, which show that discourse on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict is deeply shaped by ideological alignment, geopolitical interests, and unequal power relations (Heni & Chandra, 2022). The findings particularly support earlier studies demonstrating that Western and pro-Israeli discourse tends to foreground security narratives and representations of terrorism. In contrast, Global South and Muslim-majority discourse more frequently emphasize occupation, colonialism, and victimization. However, this study also extends previous studies by shifting the analytical focus from media discourse and digital platforms to formal interstate diplomacy within the United Nations General Assembly. Unlike earlier studies that primarily examined newspapers, television, or social media discourse (Guerra et al., 2025), the present study demonstrates that the same ideological polarization is institutionally reproduced in official diplomatic speech. The findings additionally differ from several previous media-oriented studies, because the UNGA setting encourages more strategic and legally calibrated forms of discourse, particularly in the cases of the United Kingdom and South Africa. Therefore, the study offers new evidence that diplomatic language within international institutions functions not merely as political communication but also as a mechanism for negotiating legitimacy, authority, and competing visions of international order.

How State Representatives Linguistically Represent Actors, Actions, and Responsibilities

The patterns of agency attribution demonstrate how people use their grammatical choices to express their particular moral beliefs when assessing their accountability for specific actions, and how these linguistic structures reveal their political affiliations. The USA's rendering of the Israeli agency invisible through nominalization, such as “war in Gaza” and “conflict”, while hyper-focusing on Hamas as an active agent, “Hamas has repeatedly rejected” and “Hamas terrorists”, exemplifies what Barreda (2025) terms "erasure," the linguistic removal of variation that carries social and political information. The political message behind this grammatical erasure maintains that Palestinian suffering results only from Hamas actions, which permits Israeli military response to be viewed as defensive instead of invasive. Pakistan and Brazil perform the inverse operation, with Pakistan explicitly naming "Israel's brutal occupation," "Israeli leadership has unleashed," and Brazil stating "massacre would not have happened without the complicity of those who could have prevented it," extending agency beyond Israel to Western enablers. Indonesia's strategy of avoiding explicit naming through passive constructions and existential processes, "a catastrophic situation is unfolding" and "innocent are crying," represents what Alshurafa and Kamla (2024) identify as navigating “conflicts between postcolonial identity and professional/humanitarian missions”, because it hides the identity of the perpetrator to protect diplomatic ties, while showing Palestinian suffering as a central issue for the non-aligned position.

The UK only attempts dual agency attribution, which directly identifies both Hamas and Israel as its target entities. The UK assessment of both Hamas and Israel presents a balanced evaluation, yet it still treats terrorism as an absolute evil that exceeds all other humanitarian law violations. Such a differential framing reflects ongoing tension within Western discourse between maintaining alliance commitments and responding to humanitarian imperatives, creating what Hamamra et al. (2025) term "discursive scenarios" that attempt to "undermine established roles" without fully abandoning traditional frameworks. The victim representation strategies employed across speeches further illuminate how actors and responsibilities are constructed through linguistic choices. The USA's extended personalization of hostage families, including details about their parents and children, with the identification of intermediary Steve Witkoff, creates a complete void in its discussion about Palestinian deaths. Pakistan performs counter-individualization through the extended Hind Rajab narrative, stating "We have all heard her trembling voice on that phone call," and employing rhetorical questions, "Can you imagine that little girl Hind Rajab as if she was our daughter?", to generate identificatory empathy. It aligns with findings from Hosny et al. (2023) on trauma expression in the Greater MENA region, where "local narratives" and "sociocultural norms guide symptom expressions," suggesting that personalized victim narratives translate structural violence into affective registers that mobilize international solidarity.

The victim framing of Brazil and South Africa through collectivized methods shows "tens of thousands of innocent women and children" and "Palestinians facing genocide and famine," which demonstrates both extensive human suffering and organized systematized violence that occurs throughout the conflict. This quantification strategy, while risking what Elkahlout et al. (2022) identify in Yemen humanitarian discourse as the “localization” challenge, where aggregated data obscures individual agency, serves to establish genocide claims through demonstrating pattern and scale rather than isolated incidents. Indonesia's rhetorical questions, “Who will save them? Who will save the innocent? Who will save the old and women?” construct universal moral obligation without requiring specific victim identification, creating what Hasan and Bleibleh (2023) term "urban dialogues around trauma sites" that invoke collective responsibility for unnamed victims. These divergent victim representation strategies reflect deeper patterns in how responsibility is distributed: individualized victims demand immediate response to specific suffering (the USA's hostage focus). In contrast, collectivized victims establish systematic patterns requiring structural intervention (Global South's genocide framing). The linguistic representation of actors, actions, and responsibilities thus operates as more than a descriptive choice; it constructs the interpretive framework through which international audiences understand who bears moral and legal accountability for ongoing violence.

The convergence of findings across both research questions reveals an international system in a hegemonic crisis, where the traditional Northern monopoly on defining legitimate discourse

around the Palestinian-Israeli conflict faces unprecedented challenge. The convergence of Muslim-majority and Global South positions around Palestinian suffering, critiques of Western complicity, and demands for accountability, together with the explicit use of genocide terminology by Pakistan, South Africa, and Brazil, signals the formation of what Salter and Damianova (2025) term "counter-hegemonic trajectories" that challenge this monopoly through different strategies. South Africa's ICJ approach exemplifies institutional counter-hegemony, using international law mechanisms to constrain hegemonic impunity through what the speech terms "global majority" (142 countries) versus a single veto power, aligning with Kamal and Courtheyn's (2024) argument for "southern ruptures" that challenge Northern epistemic dominance not through rejection of institutions, but through their strategic deployment against hegemonic actors. Brazil's systemic critique extends beyond Israel to "complicity of those who could have prevented it," naming Western structural hypocrisy itself as the problem, reflecting what Campos et al. (2025) identify in Brazilian judicial contexts as a "counter-hegemonic role" that challenges "discretionary practices characterized by punitiveness and inequality." The UK's departure from a USA-aligned stance, recognizing Palestinian statehood and criticizing Israeli humanitarian violations while maintaining condemnation of Hamas, reflects increasing tensions within dominant geopolitical narratives, illustrating how competing security and humanitarian discourses coexist within the Global North, as observed by Cap (2023) in the construction of conflicting geopolitical representations. The Palestinian-Israeli discourse reveals this transition between two power structures, representing a geopolitical shift that Moyer (2024) describes as involving multiple changes in regional and global power, creating instability for sustainable development pathways. The situation demonstrates how 142 countries made genocide allegations while a single veto power country retained its capacity to prevent any actions, thereby highlighting the gap between what dominates international discussions and the actual strengths of power that emerge during a hegemonic crisis that shapes international relationships.

CONCLUSION

The UNGA 2025 discussions about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict serve as a battlefield for geopolitical power struggles, as the selection of words used in these discussions creates international power conflicts rather than reflecting existing power dynamics. The analysis shows that the fight between the two parties over how to understand the conflict stems from both sides seeking to establish their right to define legitimate international dialogue. The Muslim-majority countries of the Global South show emerging political power because they reject Northern security definitions while supporting genocide terminology and Palestinian suffering narratives, which 142 countries use to block a single veto power from pushing their claims. The process of language choice allows people to show who holds power through their use of agency words, their presentation of time, and their depiction of victims. The UK's partial departure from the USA's dual-accountability model, which maintains alliance commitments, reveals a contested restructuring process underway within the Global North. The Palestinian-Israeli discourse functions as a metonym for broader contestation over international order, whether it will be governed by legal universalism and democratic majorities, by moral-religious principles grounded in postcolonial solidarity, or by security pragmatism serving hegemonic interests, a question that linguistic analysis reveals remains profoundly unresolved and increasingly contested in contemporary global politics.

REFERENCES

Abbas, A. H., Atatfa, O. A. W., Mohammed, S. H., & Kadim, E. N. (2025). Legitimation and de-legitimation of American pro-Gaza student protests: A critical discourse analysis. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *12*, 102076. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.102076

Abdullah, A. A., & Hassan, M. F. (2025). Emerging voices of resistance: A postcolonial perspective on noncanonical selected Palestinian poems after the October 7, 2023, attacks. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *12*, 101925. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101925

AlAfnan, M. A. (2025). Language, Diplomacy and Global Governance: Discourse Strategies in a Middle Eastern UN Address. *World Journal of English Language*, *16*(1), 33. https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v16n1p33

Alazzeh, D., & Uddin, S. (2025). Accountability and sovereignty: Financial controls in the Palestine-Israel Indigenous-settler relationship. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, *101*, 102784. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2024.102784

Alharbi, A., & Rucker, M. (2023). Discursive practices of the performative theory of solidarity discourse. Language Sciences, 95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2022.101515

Alshurafa, M., Aboramadan, M., & Haniffa, R. (2023). Digital postcolonialism and NGO accountability during COVID-19: Evidence from the Gaza Strip. *The British Accounting Review*, *55*(5), 101203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2023.101203

Alshurafa, M., & Kamla, R. (2024). Accountability and the postcolonial identity of Palestinian human rights NGO activists. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, *112*, 101546. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2024.101546

Altahmazi, T. H., & Abid, R. Z. (2025). Superman or Homelander? The pragmatic features and argumentative potential of online victimhood narratives of Israeli-Palestinian conflict. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *235*, 206–219. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2024.11.013

Barreda, S. (2025). Normalization, essentialization, and the erasure of social and linguistic variation. *Journal of Phonetics*, *110*, 101409. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2025.101409

Campos, G. S. de Q., Bedê, A., Bussinguer, E. C. de A., & Silva, H. B. da. (2025). Uncovering judges' gender effects in Brazilian sentencing: A counter-hegemonic role of women in the criminal justice system? *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, *83*, 100789. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlcj.2025.100789

Cap, P. (2023). Narratives of geopolitical representation in the discourse of the Russia–Ukraine war. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *218*, 133–143. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2023.10.008

Elkahlout, G., Milton, S., Yaseen, T., & Raweh, E. (2022). Localisation of humanitarian action in War-torn Countries: The experience of local NGOs in Yemen. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, *75*, 102921. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2022.102921

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

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Guerra, A., Lepre, M., & Karakuş, O. (2025). Quantifying extreme opinions on Reddit amidst the 2023 Israeli–Palestinian conflict. *Natural Language Processing Journal*, *11*, 100156. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nlp.2025.100156

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Hamamra, B., Mayaleh, A., & Pappé, I. (2025). New frontiers of parenthood: Sperm smuggling, IVF, and gender roles in Palestine. *Women's Studies International Forum*, *110*, 103089. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2025.103089

Heni, A. N., & Chandra, O. H. (2022). The representation of Palestinian-Israeli conflict in online news articles: A critical discourse analysis. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, dan Budaya*, *12*(1), 134-147.

Hasan, D., & Bleibleh, S. (2023). The everyday art of resistance: Interpreting "resistancescapes" against urban violence in Palestine. *Political Geography*, *101*, 102833. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2023.102833

Hosny, N., Bovey, M., Dutray, F., & Heim, E. (2023). How is trauma-related distress experienced and expressed in populations from the Greater Middle East and North Africa? A systematic review of qualitative literature. *SSM - Mental Health*, *4*, 100258. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmmh.2023.100258

Hu, D., & Wang, C. (2025). Hybrid media warfare: Discourse analysis of Russian and Ukrainian MFA websites on the Bucha Incident. *Telematics and Informatics Reports*, *20*, 100256. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teler.2025.100256

Ibrahim, M. A. (2025). Remittance flow determinants and the role of government policy in conflict-affected Palestinian territories. *Journal of Government and Economics*, *18*, 100143. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jge.2025.100143

Iriqat, D. (2024). International law: Israel's fig leaf or a route to Palestinian statehood? *Political Geography*, *115*, 103208. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2024.103208

Kamal, A., & Courtheyn, C. (2024). Where is the North? Southern ruptures in decolonizing theory. *Political Geography*, *108*, 103029. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2023.103029

Kowalski, A. M. (2020). Global South-global North differences. *Springer Nature Switzerland AG*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-69625-6_68-1

Mara, K. (2022). Jenoside, génocide, genocide: Diasporic assimilation into naming the 1994 genocide in Rwanda. *Language & Communication*, *84*, 76–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2022.03.002

Moyer, J. D. (2024). A double-edged sword into a plowshare: Analyzing geopolitical implications of alternative socioeconomic development pathways. *One Earth*, *7*(2), 336–347. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2024.01.002

Öcal, D. K., & Gökarıksel, B. (2022). Grounding religious geopolitics: The everyday counter-geopolitical practices of Turkish mosque communities in Germany. *Geoforum*, *129*, 151–160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2022.01.011

Pace, S. (2023). A US perspective on deterrence and geopolitics in space. *Space Policy*, *66*, 101565. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spacepol.2023.101565

Qolbi, Y., Ashari, M. I., Diana, & Sidqi, I. (2024). Geopolitics and Muslim Countries: Navigating Challenges and Opportunities in Contemporary International Political Dynamics. *MILRev: Metro Islamic Law Review*, *3*(2), 217–235. https://doi.org/10.32332/milrev.v3i2.9910

Salter, B., & Damianova, K. K. (2025). Reordering the European energy hegemony: War, markets and ideology. *Energy Research & Social Science*, *130*, 104454. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2025.104454

Soepandji, K. W. (2020). Geopolitik, negara, dan bangsa masa kini. *Jurnal Lemhannas RI*, *7*(1), 41–58. https://doi.org/10.55960/jlri.v7i1.50

World Population Review. (2025a). *Global South Countries 2025*. https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/global-south-countries

World Population Review. (2025b). *Muslim Population by Country 2025*. https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/muslim-population-by-country

Yudaruddin, R., Lesmana, D., Ekşi, İ. H., & Ginn, W. (2024). Market reactions to the Israel-Hamas conflict: A comparative event study of the US and Chinese markets. *Borsa Istanbul Review*, *24*(6), 1345–1357. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bir.2024.10.005