

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18806266

# THE USE OF DIPLOMATIC LANGUAGE IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE: AN ANALYSIS OF PALESTINIAN PRESIDENT MAHMOUD ABBAS'S SPEECH IN LIGHT OF POLITENESS THEORY

Mais khalil Odeh<sup>1\*</sup> and Nadia Abu-Zaher<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Al-Istiqlal University, Jericho, Palestine*  
Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1276-3468>  
Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2476-5943>

Received: 11/12/2025  
Accepted: 02/02/2026

Corresponding Author: Mais khalil Odeh  
[maisoduh@pass.ps](mailto:maisoduh@pass.ps)

## ABSTRACT

*In this study which aims to reveal how the Diplomatic Languages were used in the Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas in his speech to the 80th session of the United Nations General Assembly to achieve his political aims. In order to do so, the study employs discourse analysis and benefits from the politeness theory as an analytical tool. The results show that in political discourse Face-Threatening Acts do not necessarily serve an escalatory strategy. Rather, they may be functions within diplomatic discourse so they convey political messages even without breaching the international law. Additionally, the study reveals that positive politeness strategy was employed more repeatedly than negative politeness strategy to reduce the severity of Face-Threatening Acts and to correspond with the character of the discourse presented before a global organization. This study shed the light on the apparent contradiction between sharp censure and Diplomatic Language which enables Mahmoud Abbas in his speech to fuse political confrontation with a balanced Diplomatic Language. By broaden the use of politeness theory to international political discourse, rather than restricting its uses to interactive discourse or everyday media, it reassessing the relationship between diplomacy and intimidation.*

---

**KEYWORDS:** United Nations General Assembly, Diplomatic Language, Political Discourse, Politeness Theory. Negative Politeness Strategy, Positive Politeness Strategy, Face-Threatening Acts (Ftas).

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A recent concept that gained literatures attention is Diplomatic Language. This concept is used in the field of international relations to describe a special language adopted to mellow the message. It is usually a moderate language that relies on politeness, and thus it has specific characteristics related to the formal linguistic style (Bartman, 2023). As for Bobeică (2021) argues that Diplomatic Language is the language used in negotiations to reduce conflict. Bandov (2023) argues that Diplomatic Language is the language used between states to communicate. According to De Carvalho (2010), Diplomatic Language is considered part of official diplomatic discourse.

In this context, Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas's speech (Abu Mazen) before the United Nations General Assembly the 80<sup>th</sup> session on September 25, 2025, stands as a diplomatic model rich in diplomatic linguistic nuances worthy of study. This study aims to reveal how Diplomatic Language was used in President Abbas's speech to the 80<sup>th</sup> session of the UN General Assembly. To achieve this objective, the study will employ discourse analysis, specifically using 'Politeness Theory' as an analytical tool. 'Politeness Theory' was developed by Brown and Levinson in 1978 (Alabdali, 2019).

The research problem addressed in this study is defined in its main question: How did Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas employ Diplomatic Language in his speech before the United Nations General Assembly the 80<sup>th</sup> session to achieve political aim, from politeness theory's perspective? The study is significant because it examines how Diplomatic Language is employed in political discourse before international organizations to achieve diplomatic and political aims. Besides, it provides understanding into how to balance conveying political messages while simultaneously maintaining a respectable diplomatic image before the international community, thus contributing to the understanding of the relationship between Diplomatic Language and political discourse within global organizations. In spite of numerous studies on political discourse, analyses of Diplomatic Language used within the United Nations are relatively rare. This study focusing on this gap by analyzes political discourse based on politeness theory, there for helping to understand how political confrontation (between the Israeli and Palestinian sides) is managed through the use of Diplomatic Language within the global institution.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Our review of the literature addressing the analysis of Diplomatic Language in political discourse, particularly in Arabic, revealed a scarcity of such studies. The reviewed studies also revealed that the concept of Diplomatic Language has emerged prominently in the field of international relations. For example, Cornut (2015) argues that international relations are constructed through political practices, the most important of which are determined by political discourse. He identifies diplomatic discourse as the most important form of political discourse through which international relations are built (Cornut, 2015).

Bobeică (2021) considers Diplomatic Language to be a synthesis of linguistics and political science. This is because political science, as the study of relations between states, transnational relations, and international relations, combines with linguistics, specifically semiotics, at the level of discourse structures and functions (Bobeică, 2021). Nick's (2001) study discusses the language that should be used when speaking to diplomats, and the language that diplomats should use. Rattananukool's (2016) doctoral dissertation presents a compelling argument that speakers in the diplomatic field employ both traditional and non-traditional courtesy. It also attempts to identify linguistic strategies for tact based on evidence from diplomatic conversations, where linguistic courtesy is considered a characteristic or tool of Diplomatic Language.

Bobeică's (2021) study defines Diplomatic Language as referring to the words and phrases that, over the centuries, have become part of the general diplomatic vocabulary. She argues that diplomatic discourse can be considered a special form of communicative activity, its main difference from other types of communication being its multidirectional nature, due to the different aims and objectives achieved in various contexts—both public and private (Bobeică, 2021). So, we can say that the discourse of diplomatic is relied mainly on Diplomatic Language.

Studies like Rattananukool, (2016) suggests that Diplomatic Language should be distinguished by its stable characteristics, and identified by its from other languages used in political discourse, some examples were given about Diplomatic Language characteristics are: Politeness, indirectness, modality, and Face-Threatening Acts -saving.

Politeness refers to the use of language that demonstrates respect for the audience, particularly in formal contexts such as the United Nations, and

bypass direct confrontational language. Politeness includes formal forms such as 'Your Highnesses', 'Your Excellencies', it includes also words such as praise, thanks, greetings etc. (Boiko, 2025). Indirectness, on the other hand, involves expressing political demands or positions without using imperative forms, such as 'We call for, 'We hope that', 'We emphasize the importance of' etc. (Salya, 2025). Modality, or use of language that expresses possibility, or the use of conditional language. It refers to hope rather than certainty, such as 'important', 'necessary', 'could', 'might', 'should'. etc. (Declerck, 2011). The term 'Face-Threatening Acts -saving' refers to using a linguistic formula that keeps mutual respect in the discourse (Aporbo, 2022).

Our review to the literatures about defining Diplomatic Language reveals that these literatures are almost divided into two points of view. The first one argues that Diplomatic Language owns fixed forms and specific characteristics (Bandov, 2023). This point of view depends on the assumption that Diplomatic Language is segment of diplomatic discourse, which has its systematic expressions over time (De Carvalho, 2010). The second one, claims that Diplomatic Language does not own fixed characteristics but rather variable ones. Fetzer (2023) argues when analyzing political discourse, surrounding context must be considered. He believes that discourse is closely connected to context; discourse invokes context and context frame discourse, and. This is crucial for analyzing political discourse, which is heavily dependent on its context. Fetzer's study (2023) argues that while the surrounding linguistic context is one of the contexts that constitutes part of political discourse analysis, other variable contexts must also be considered, including the social, cultural, and political contexts, among others. So, the study will employ Diplomatic Language analysis based on its forms. Diplomatic Language can change with the changing cultural and political context. Combining these two approaches will yield better results when analyzing Abu Mazen's discourse.

While various literatures have attempted to define Diplomatic Language and its characteristics, they have also sought to identify its functions. These functions, as observed through a review of the literature, can be summarized as follows: maintaining international communication to facilitate dialogue with major powers and international organizations without severing relations; promoting the speaker's political position by building international legitimacy for their

demands; preserving the image of the speaker or interlocutor in a way that avoids misunderstandings or confrontational rhetoric; mitigating the intensity of conflicts; and garnering sympathy for the speaker (Bobeică, 2021; Biletska, 2012; Baartman, 2023; Sokol & Sokol, 2025).

Although there are many studies that have examined political discourse from several perspectives, the present study differs from them in that it does not analyze political discourse in general, as many studies have done (Chilton, 2004; Van Dijk, 2015; Catalano & Waugh, 2020; McKenna, 2004), nor does it focus on Diplomatic Language in general, as some studies have done (Mullett, 2023; Gul, 2011), or on the coherence of textual or purely linguistic discourse, as most studies have done (Kehler, 2006; Adesanmi, 2010; Klebanov et al., 2008; Kehler, 2022; Chilton & Schäffner, 2008).

### 3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework of this study is defined by Politeness Theory, which has become one of the most important theories for analyzing diplomatic discourse. This theory is attributed to Brown and Levinson. The foundations of the theory were laid in two stages. The first stage, in 1978, is considered the foundational stage of the theory. A study by Brown and Levinson (1978) introduced concepts that have become fundamental in the field of diplomacy, such as Face-Threatening Acts, and Politeness Strategies (Brown & Levinson, 1978). In the second stage, Brown developed a more refined formulation, which became the standard for academic citation in the analysis of diplomatic discourse. This is because he provided a tool for analyzing Diplomatic Language strategies based on practical examples (Brown, 1987).

language to maintain "Face-Threatening Acts" for themselves and their audience. Based on this, Brown and Liveston's theory of linguistic courtesy begins with a key concept: the "Face-Threatening Acts" This concept refers to the social image that a speaker in political discourse seeks to maintain during communication. The Face-Threatening Acts is divided into a positive Face-Threatening Acts and a negative Face-Threatening Acts. A positive Face-Threatening Acts means when a speaker's have a desire to be appreciation from others and to have acceptance in a way that keep their social reputation. On the other hand, a negative Face-Threatening Acts indicates a speaker's will to avoid coercion and to keep personal freedom. While Face-Threatening Acts is determined as speech acts that endanger one's social reputation, meaning they

oppose the speaker's desire to keep that reputation, such as making direct requests or demanding.

In addition to Face-Threatening Acts, strategies are used to alleviate actions that endanger one's reputation, such as 'Politeness Strategies' employed to mitigate the danger these actions threaten relationships and social image (Brown, 1987). Politeness Strategies are segmented into negative politeness, which refers to approaches used to reduce coercion, or to lessen interference with the listener's freedom, positive politeness, which refers to approaches aimed at promoting acceptance and rapport between the listener and speaker (Schubert, 2025). Negative politeness can be noted through linguistic signals such as the use of hedges, like using phrases such as 'it is possible' or 'perhaps'. It may also be observed through indirect hints when submitting a request or through apologies. Or by Lessening the strength of obligation (Chilton, 2004). 'Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs)' is used to present actions that danger the social reputation of the person being addressed, for instant uses condemnation, which embarrass person. Politeness theory is suitable for analyzing Diplomatic Language, as illustrated by Palestinian president Mahmoud Abbas's address to the 80th session of the United Nations General Assembly.

#### 4. METHODOLOGY

This qualitative study attempts to interpret the functional meanings behind the linguistic choices used, rather than quantitatively identifying linguistic features. It adopts a discourse analysis approach, and the text to be analyzed consists of the official speech delivered by Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas before the 80th session of the United Nations General Assembly on September 25, 2025, available through the archives of the UN Television website (Abbas, 2025). His speech function as the fundamental data used for the analysis. It is treated as a political address to a global audience within a formal Diplomatic Language – the United Nations General Assembly. The analysis relies on the principles of critical discourse analysis, which view political texts as sites of linguistic political roles (Chilton & Schäffner, 2008; Catalano & Waugh, 2020; Chilton, 2004; Van-Dijk, 2015).

Brown and Levinson's previously discussed courtesy theory was used as an analytical tool to examine how politically damaging actions are mitigated through linguistic strategies in Diplomatic Language within an international context (Brown & Levinson, 1978; Brown, 1987).

To facilitate the application of discourse analysis to the Diplomatic Language used in Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas's speeches, the researchers identified the direct political actions employed. Existing studies have suggested examples of actions that may be damaging to one's reputation (Goldsmith, 2000; Gil, 2012), and these studies are used to identify actions that, according to the theory, could be damaging to the reputation of Israel and the international community. These actions include calls for international action, etc.

To mitigate the impact of these damaging actions, the theory of linguistic courtesy proposes strategies for softening their effect (Brown & Levinson, 1978; Brown, 1987).

Therefore, it was necessary to identify the strategies of positive linguistic courtesy used in Diplomatic Language, such as expressions of appreciation and alignment with shared international values, etc. It was also necessary to identify the strategies of negative courtesy through which Diplomatic Language was employed, such as indirect demands based on international law and non-binding formulations used to convey Diplomatic language.

To connect the linguistic strategies employed in the theory with Diplomatic language, each linguistic strategy within the theory was interpreted in light of the Diplomatic language used within the United Nations framework, such as international legitimacy and garnering international support without violating the rules of Diplomatic Language. Thus, the theory of courtesy was activated as an analytical tool to interpret how Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas achieves a balance in his political discourse between linguistic restraint based on Diplomatic language and political assertiveness in expressing Palestinian positions. By employing discourse analysis through the lens of the theory of courtesy and defining the function of Diplomatic Language, we were able to achieve the study's objective of analyzing President Abbas's speech before the 80th session of the United Nations General Assembly, answering a functional explanatory question about Diplomatic Language. By analyzing linguistic courtesy strategies as components and spectra of Diplomatic Language discourse, we can deduce the Diplomatic Language objectives underlying the linguistic choices in the political discourse.

The nature of Diplomatic Language is defined not only by its vocabulary but also by its function that is, to achieve political objectives without conflict (Bobeică, 2021).

## 5. ANALYSIS OF THE PALESTINIAN PRESIDENT'S POLITICAL SPEECH AT THE 80TH SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

This section will analyze the political speech delivered by Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas at the 80th session of the United Nations General Assembly. The speech was delivered on an international stage, targeting major powers, countries allied with the Palestinian cause, and adversaries of the Palestinian side primarily Israel and its allies – as well as global public opinion. This speech can be presented as blaming Israel and holding accountable for its actions in Gaza war, but presented in Diplomatic Language. It seems that The Palestinian president had his own objectives behind using Diplomatic Language. In this section several aspects of Mahmoud Abbas's speech will be analyzed, based on 'Politeness Theory'.

### 5.1. Analysis Of the Politically Damaging Actions of Israel and the International

### *Community in the Palestinian President's Speech*

When he presented his speech, Palestinian president Mahmoud Abbas's was addressing the 80<sup>th</sup> session of the United Nations General Assembly. His speech was full with actions that danger the 'Face-Threatening Acts' of Israel and many international actors. These actions can be noted through direct assigning blame, accusations and statements of condemnation. These actions can be understood as starting point for comprehension how Diplomatic Language was applied to moderate their impact, in line with Brown and Levinson's theory (1978) it can be concluded how Mahmoud Abbas tries to reach his aims through employing Diplomatic Language. These actions were based on 'Face-Threatening Acts and 'Politeness Theory' that can be serves as analytical tool for analyzing political discourse. Below Table (1) explains more about the actions that Face-Threatening Acts Israel image in Mahmoud Abbas's speech.

**Table 1: Analysis Actions That Face -Threatening Acts Israel in Palestinian President Speech.**

Number	Rhetorical text	Political action	The party targeted by the threat	Diplomatic language used	Diplomatic Language objective
1-	"What Israel is doing is not just aggression."	Condemnation	Israel	Reliance on international law	Delegitimizing Israeli policies without escalation
2-	"More than a thousand decisions have not been implemented."	Taking responsibility	International community	Reliance on international resolutions	Exerting collective political pressure
3-	"A war of genocide, suffering, and displacement."	Destroying Israel's moral image by portraying it as a criminal	Israel	Avoiding insults or complete delegitimization	Exerting strong pressure on Israel

Source of Table (1): Compiled by Authors

Table (1) above demonstrates that President Mahmoud Abbas employs Diplomatic Language while using threatening actions to achieve specific aims. Mahmoud Abbas as table (1) illustrate balanced between keeping channels of international community and political accountability. It can be proven from the paragraph (1) when he condemned Israel actions in Gaza war, using Diplomatic Language and depending on international law. It seems that his aim to undermine the legitimacy Israeli actions without the intensification of tensions. It can be noted from paragraph (2) that Abu Mazen holds the international community accountable for not implementing pressure on Israel to commit the international resolutions. Besides, from paragraph (2) it can be noted that Abu Mazen uses Diplomatic Language through depending in

his speech on international resolutions. By reliance on UN resolutions, he seeks to obtain the international reinforce without jeopardizing respect for the sovereignty of any international party. From paragraph (3) it can be noted that he wanted to practice pressure on Israel by devastating its image as a criminal, but he avoiding insults by employing Diplomatic Language.

### 5.2. Diplomatic Language Strategies in the Palestinian President's Speech

Having analyzed the politically charged actions directed at the Face-Threatening Acts in Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas's speech, this section of the speech analysis moves to examining how President Abbas addressed these actions according to Brown and Levinson's theory of diplomacy.

Diplomatic Language can be considered tools for conveying specific messages within his speech. These strategies are used to communicate particular demands and positions of the speaker to the audience within an internationally accepted Diplomatic Language framework (Brown & Levinson, 1978). Therefore, this section analyzes the strategies of courtesy in Mahmoud Abbas's speech and links them to the goals he sought to achieve through his use of Diplomatic Language.

### 5.2.1. Analysis Of Positive Politeness Strategies in President Mahmoud Abbas's Speech

According to courtesy theory, positive courtesy strategies aim to enhance social acceptance from the

recipient. This is achieved by demonstrating respect and appreciation in the speech (Brown & Levinson, 1978). In the speech of Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas (Abu Mazen), the strategy of positive courtesy was not used for the sake of linguistic and Diplomatic Language courtesy itself, but rather to achieve other political goals that President Abbas sought to attain through his use of Diplomatic Language. Diplomatic language was expressed in this section through the use of expressions of thanks, gratitude, and appreciation, encouraging international recognition, and phrases that reflect the speaker's image as civilized and committed to peace. Table (2) below further clarifies the analysis of positive linguistic courtesy strategies in the Palestinian president's speech.

**Table 2: Analysis Of Positive Diplomatic Language Courtesy Politeness Strategies in the Speech of the Palestinian President.**

Number	Rhetorical text	The concerned party in the speech	Positive compliment strategy	Diplomatic Language objective
1-	"We express our deepest appreciation to the countries that have recognized the State of Palestine".	Countries that recognize the State of Palestine	Showing gratitude and appreciation to countries	Strengthening international legitimacy to build a coalition to support the Palestinian state
2-	"We want to live in freedom, security, and peace like all other peoples of the world".	International community	Affirming shared values regarding peace to link the Palestinian experience to a general experience	Showing the Palestinian leadership as rational and peace-seeking, and presenting the Palestinian cause as a global humanitarian issue
3-	"We thank the brotherly and friendly countries that send aid".	"We thank the brotherly and friendly countries that are sending aid.	Building a shared identity based on friendship	Encouraging continued support without political pressure and consolidating existing alliances

Source Of Table (2): Complied by Authors

As it noted from table (2), Mahmoud Abbas uses Diplomatic Language in his speech, through employing positive strategy politeness, by employing this strategy he seeks to obtain several aims.

He aimed through paragraph (1) to build a supportive alliance for the Palestinian state. Employing positive politeness can be observed when he uses expression of appreciation to the states, they recognized the Palestinian State. From paragraph (2) it can be noticed his aim to show the Palestinian leadership as peacemaking, rational. From paragraph (3) it is observed Mahmoud Abbas employed positive politeness to and to solidify existing alliances and to encourage support for Palestine without political pressure.

### 5.2.1. Analysis Of Negative Politeness Strategies in President Mahmoud Abbas's Speech

Negative Politeness according to Brown and Levinson's theory (1978) depends on minimizing animosity and respecting the recipient when offering criticism, making demands, or addressing issues (Brown & Levinson, 1987). As the analyzing of the negative politeness strategy in Mahmoud Abbas speech, it is noticeable that Abu Mazen systematically employed a softened and non-committal Diplomatic Language that helped him achieving his aims when addressing the international community. Below table (3) illustrate more about negative politeness strategy that used in Mahmoud Abbas speech.

**Table 3: Negative Politeness Strategy in Mahmoud Abbass Speech.**

Number	Rhetorical text	The concerned party in the speech	Negative compliment strategy	Diplomatic Language objective
1-	"We urge all countries that have not yet recognized..."	United Nations member states that have not recognized the State of Palestine	Using the verb "to urge" instead of "to command" or "to compel" softens the force of the demand and is an indication of respect for the political decision-making freedom of states	Enhancing the chances of an international response to the Palestinian demand
2-	"We declare our readiness to work with US President Donald Trump, Saudi Arabia, France, and the United Nations."	International actors and expected mediators in the peace process	Avoid imposing the Palestinian agenda and emphasize respect for the roles of others	An attempt to revive the peace process within the framework of international negotiations and to avoid isolating the Palestinian leadership

Source Of Table (3): Compiled by Authors

As it shown in table (3) above, Mahmoud Abbas employed Diplomatic Language through negative Diplomatic Language, he aimed through using this strategy to achieve several aims. It can be noted from paragraph (1) that Mahmoud Abbas seeks to achieve is to enhance the chances the opportunity for an international response to the Palestinian demand. In paragraph (2) it shows that Mahmoud Abbas's aim is to send message to potential mediators in peace process and to the international powers, revealing his ambition to revive the peace process within international negotiation. Besides, he wanted t send message to avoid excluding the Palestinian leadership.

It is significant the Mahmoud Abbas's speech involved only a few sentences that could be indicate as examples of negative politeness strategy, this means that Mahmoud Abbas chose to build his speech on positive politeness strategy rather than negative politeness strategy, or employing hedging language. This means that Mahmoud Abbas choice indicating he is employing Diplomatic Language to achieve specific aims.

It can be inferred that Mahmoud Abbas used negative politeness strategy when uses the verb

'urge' in paragraph (1), this verb indicates the lack of a direct political obligation. Besides, we can note negative politeness strategy in paragraph (2) when Mahoud Abbas offered his ready to collaborate to get the negation process on track without setting conditions or practicing pressure.

**5.3. Analysis Of Pragmatic Contradiction and Diplomatic Language Balance in the Speech of Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas**

Considering 'Politeness Theory' using of threatening verbs directed at the Face-Threatening Acts should not be understood as conflicting Diplomatic Language used in Mahmoud Abbas speech. Instead, it can be interpreted as a management language of perceived threat. Mahmoud Abbas speech combined Diplomatic Language with legal condemnation. It is understood by that Mahmoud Abbass in his speech didn't weaken Palestinian relations with the community. This balance lies in the mixture of Diplomatic Language and strongly critical language that perceived threat. Below, table (4) explain more about this contradiction.

Table 4: Diplomatic Language Balance and Contradiction in Mahmoud Abbas Speech.

Number	The rhetorical text on pragmatic contradiction	Pragmatic contradiction	The concerned party in the letter	The mechanism of Diplomatic Language balance	Diplomatic Language objective
1-	"A war of genocide... We reject the targeting of civilians by both sides."	Strong condemnation of Israel's acts of genocide is countered by an affirmation of shared humanitarian standards, rejecting Hamas's targeting of civilians	International public opinion and human rights organization	The accusation was framed within an ethical context	Maintaining the moral credibility of the Palestinian cause

2-	"We reject the conflation of solidarity with the Palestinian cause with the issue of anti-Semitism... knowing that we have already recognized Israel's right to exist."	The speech combines a rejection of the accusation of anti-Semitism with an explicit affirmation of recognition of Israel	Western countries	Adopting a global discourse in exchange for consolidating the Palestinian political position and mutual recognition	Separating the legal political conflict from the charge of religious or ethnic hatred
----	---	--	-------------------	---	---

Source of Table (4): Complied by Authors

Table (4) above shows that President Mahmoud Abbas used Diplomatic Language in his political discourse, balancing between using sharp, potentially damaging language and Diplomatic Language that softened its impact. His desire to obtain the credibility of the Palestinian cause it appears clearly in paragraph (2). While his attempt to isolate legal and political conflict from allegation of ethnic hatred.

From what can be observed in table (4) it becomes obvious that the Palestinian president uses Diplomatic Language that softened the tune Infront of UN General Assembly combined with sharp actions that condemned Israeli policies.

## 6. DISCUSSION

Mahmoud Abbas employed in his speech before General Assembly the Diplomatic Language to manage political confrontation while keeping international legitimacy. Based on Brown and Levinsons politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1978). The findings show a deliberate dependence on positive Politeness Strategies besides a limited usage of Face-Threatening Acts supported with moral and legal terms. his finding goes with previous studies on diplomatic language especially with (Bandov, 2023) when he argues that Diplomatic language is defined by its function.

The significance of positive Politeness Strategies such as words alignment with shared, international values, and expressions like gratitude or like collective responsibility implies a deliberate effort to build solidarity with the internation community. Besides the finding goes with the previous studies which emphasize the role of language in coalition building (e.g. Chilton, 2004)

The negative Politeness Strategies are used in Mahmoud Abbas less than positive Politeness Strategies, which means that Mahmoud Abbas didn't give priority to keeping the force of his demands. Rather, he preferred direct accusation with legal nature. The selective use of negative politeness can be interpreted as a strategic use in diplomatic language rather than a pragmatic lack, this finding, goes with what Schubert (2025) argued when he indicates that negative politeness used to reduce the listener's coercion.

Besides, the analysis showed the presence of threatening language directed at Israel, specifically its practices described as aggression, genocide, and war crimes. The Palestinian president sought to undermine Israel's moral and legal image before the international community, but within a diplomatic framework. The threatening language was not used as an unrestrained, escalating linguistic tool, but rather was employed to achieve the Palestinian president's objectives within a calculated diplomatic context. This finding goes whit what Bobeică, (2021), argues when he indicates that the nature of Diplomatic Language is defined not only by its vocabulary but also by its function that is, to achieve political objectives without conflict.

The analysis shows that threats were not employed in separation from the positive politeness strategy employed by Mahmoud Abbas to show his image as committed peace. Mahmoud Abbas utilized positive politeness and negative politeness in his speeches. The analysis reveal that the negative politeness strategy was not intensively employed in Mahmoud Abbas speech. and was limited to topics concerning offering political cooperation and international recognition. This indicates an awareness on the part of the Palestinian president of the need to minimize conciliatory demands and focus on positive courtesy and the legal framework in order to achieve his diplomatic objectives. His avoidance of negative Politeness Strategies Spring from a will to avoid imposing terms, in addition, to reduce interference with the recipients.

The findings revealed an apparent contradiction in the discourse. This apparent contradiction manifested itself in the simultaneous condemnation of Israel as committing war crimes and the rejection of antisemitism while simultaneously acknowledging Israel's right to exist. This contradiction can be interpreted as a mechanism of diplomatic balancing, combining strongly worded condemnation that escalates the perceived threat with diplomatic language that softens the threat and brings it back within the accepted norms of international discourse. Based on the analysis, it appears that diplomatic language in the discourse can be employed to achieve political objectives by using it as a strategic tool for conflict management,

combining escalation and de-escalation. This finding goes with Bobeică (2021) when he argues the diplomatic language is used to reduce the likelihood of conflict.

Moreover, when the Face-Threatening Acts integrate within a diplomatic language, this kind of finding suggests that Face-Threatening Acts may function in international political contexts as tools of agenda setting

## 7. CONCLUSION

This study analyzed Mahmoud Abbas speech before the 80<sup>th</sup> session of General Assembly. It depended on discourse analysis methodology, benefiting from Brown and Livingstons theory (1978) as an analytical tool. The finding of applying 'Politeness Theory' shows that Face-Threatening Acts was appeared as significant component of Abbas's speech.

Thus, this study expanding using of the Brown and Levinson's theory, by transferring it from the everyday interaction, media discourse or institutional contexts, to the contexts of political discourse in the international organizations. The study concludes that 'Politeness Theory' can interpret political discourse. Besides, the study concluded that threatening actions not only serve a negative function, but can also be used as a tool of

## REFERENCES

- Abbas, M. (29 September, 2025). Address to the United Nations General Assembly at the 80th Session (Speech). United Nations, New York. Available at <https://webtv.un.org/en/asset/k1j/k1j1ywu82l>
- Adesanmi, T. (2010). Cohesion in political discourse. *Journal of the Linguistic Association of Nigeria*, 13(1), 210–219.
- Alabdali, T. S. (2019). Revisiting Brown and Levinson's politeness theory: A Middle Eastern perspective. *Bulletin of Advanced English Studies*, 2(2), 73–78.
- Aporbo, R. (2022). Saving face-wants in casual talks: A discourse analysis. *International Journal of Research Publications (IJRP.ORG)*, 111(1), 17–40.
- Baartman, H. (2023). The impact of diplomatic language on international negotiations. *Global Journal of International Relations*, 1(1), 36–48.
- Bandov, G. (2023). Diplomatic language – a unique language of international communication. *Language(s) and Law*, 13, 154.
- Biletska, O. (2018). Language culture as a component of the international relations specialists training: Origins and present. *Питання культурології*, (34), 170–179.
- Bobeică, G. (2021). Diplomatic language as part of the language for specific purposes. *Études Interdisciplinaires en Sciences Humaines (EISH)*, (8), 600–610.
- Boiko, Y. V. (2025). Ethics & etiquette of diplomatic discourse as a problem of translation studies. *Вчені записки ТНУ імені В. І. Вернадського. Серія: Філологія. Журналістика*, 36(75), 290–296. <https://doi.org/10.32782/2710-4656/2025.1.1/47>
- Brown, P. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56–310). Cambridge University Press.
- Catalano, T., & Waugh, L. R. (2020). *Critical discourse analysis, critical discourse studies and beyond* (Vol. 11). Springer.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.
- diplomatic and legal pressure. Additionally, this study contributes an analytical aspect to the theory by revealing that contradiction in speech can serve as a balanced strategy between mitigation and threat. and keep international legitimacy.
- In spite of findings importance, still the study is limited to a single political discourse, this limits the possibility of generalizing its results to all political leaders in other countries. Besides, it depends on the analytical too of Brown and Levinson theory without taking into a count other theory to examine how diplomatic language was employed. This may limit the possibility for uncovering other dimensions of how diplomatic language used in the political discourse. Future studies are suggested in order to achieve more interpretation results, to include various political speeches, in different time period. In addition, future studies are suggested to use comparative strategies in politeness theory. It would be suggested to use different theories when analyzing diplomatic language during political discourse such as critical discourse theory and political pragmatic theories, because that would deepen better understanding for diplomatic language in political discourse in the conflict's context.

- Chilton, P., & Schäffner, C. (2008). Introduction: Themes and principles in the analysis of political discourse. In P. Chilton & C. Schäffner (Eds.), *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse* (pp. 1–41). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cornut, J. (2017, November 30). The practice turn in international relations theory. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies*. Retrieved 17 December 2025, from <https://oxfordre.com/internationalstudies/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.001.0001/acrefore-9780190846626-e-113>
- De Carvalho, E. M. (2010). *Semiotics of international law: Trade and translation* (Vol. 91). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Declerck, R. (2011). The definition of modality. In A. Patard & F. Brisard (Eds.), *Cognitive approaches to tense, aspect, and epistemic modality* (pp. 21–44). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fetzer, A. (2023). Context: Theoretical analysis and its implications for political discourse analysis. In P. Cap (Ed.), *Handbook of political discourse* (pp. 164–179). Edward Elgar.
- Goldsmith, D. J. (2000). Soliciting advice: The role of sequential placement in mitigating Face-Threatening Acts. *Communication Monographs*, 67(1), 1–19.
- Gul, A. (2011). The language of diplomacy. *New Perspectives Quarterly*, 28(1), 18–21.
- Kehler, A. (2006). Discourse coherence. In L. R. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), *The handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 241–265). Wiley.
- Kehler, A. (2022). Coherence establishment as a source of explanation in linguistic theory. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 8(1), 123–142.
- Klebanov, B. B., Diermeier, D., & Beigman, E. (2008). Lexical cohesion analysis of political speech. *Political Analysis*, 16(4), 447–463.
- McKenna, B. (2004). Critical discourse studies: Where to from here? *Critical Discourse Studies*, 1(1), 9–39.
- Mullett, M. (2023). The language of diplomacy. In *Letters, literacy and literature in Byzantium* (pp. 203–216). Routledge.
- Nick, S. (2001). Use of language in diplomacy (pp. 39–48). In *Language and diplomacy*. Malta: Diplo Projects.
- Rattananukool, P. (2016). *Politeness in diplomatic talk: A Thai case study* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Huddersfield).
- Salya, H. S. D. (2025). *Diplomatic politeness and power dynamics in Retno Marsudi's speeches at the United Nations on Palestine* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim).
- Schubert, C. (2025). Performing positive politeness: Political rhetoric in state dinner speeches by US-American presidents. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 21(2), 343–368. <https://doi.org/10.1515/pr-2024-0011>
- Sokol, Y., & Sokol, M. (2025). The language of diplomacy: How strategic communication shapes international relations. *Universum*, (21), 104–112.
- Van Dijk, T. (2015). Critical discourse studies: A socio-cognitive approach. *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies*, 3(1), 63–74.