

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN THE DISCOURSE OF PAKISTAN'S UNGA REPRESENTATIVE ON ISRAEL-PALESTINE CONFLICT

Shiza Minahal^{*1}, Zehra Batool²

^{*1}MPhil Linguistics and TESOL, Beaconhouse National University, Lahore, Pakistan

²Senior Lecturer, Riphah Institute of Language and Literature, Riphah International University, Lahore, Pakistan

^{*1}shizas1920@gmail.com, ²syedazehra.batool@riphah.edu.pk

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15796566>

Keywords

Political Discourse, Politeness Strategies, Discursive Strategies, Pakistan's Stance, Israel-Palestine Conflict

Article History

Received on 26 May 2025

Accepted on 26 June 2025

Published on 02 July 2025

Copyright @Author

Corresponding Author: *

Shiza Minahal

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the politeness and discursive strategies in Munir Akram's discourse, the Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations, to portray Pakistan's position in the ongoing Israel-Palestine conflict. Political discourse plays an important role in shaping the history of the world, especially in the context of conflict and diplomacy. Through the use of qualitative research methods, this study examines the strategies he used diplomatically in the discourse analysis of his speech to the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) and an interview with Dawn News, which was directed at global and national audiences. The findings show that Munir Akram very carefully balanced positive and negative politeness strategies to maintain diplomatic decorum while asserting Pakistan's leadership on the issue. His speech to the UN General Assembly shows a strategic use of positive politeness to promote solidarity with the international community and counterbalance negative politeness that reduces the risk of being seen as a threat when addressing dominant states. On the other hand, in his interview with Dawn News, he has used direct criticism and emotionally charged speeches and appeals to the nationalism of the audience. The analysis also revealed that Akram has used a positive self-representation discourse to construct the image of Pakistan as a defender of Palestinian rights and a negative other-representation discourse to question the actions of international powers. This study offers an analysis of the language systems that construct international diplomacy and the rhetoric of conflict by employing politeness and discourse strategies. It complements the existing literature on political discourse and shows how language functions as a diplomatic tool and political propaganda.

INTRODUCTION

The ongoing Israel-Palestine conflict has been one of the most enduring and disputed issues in modern geo-politics. The crisis has worsened in the last one year after the beginning of violence in Gaza, disciplinary responses from Israel and human rights violations (Eurasia Review, 2024). Against this backdrop, Pakistan's diplomatic stance has

turned out to be an important pillar of international advocacy for Palestinian rights. Pakistan being a staunch supporter of Palestine, has consistently opposed the Israeli aggression on international platforms such as the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) and the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) (Paradigm Shift,

2024).

Historically, Pakistan's foreign policy has equated the Palestinian struggle with its own history of colonization and its current demands for the right to self-determination for the Kashmiri people (Eurasia Review, 2024). This historical alignment formulized Pakistan's firm opposition to Israeli policies and a proactive involvement in building international consensus on the Palestinian right to self-determination. The recent statements of Pakistan's Ambassador in United State Munir Akram bear evidence that Pakistan will always promote the Palestinian cause, despite some big powers moving under geopolitical pressures (Dawn News, 2024).

Rationale of the Study

The remarks made by Mr. Munir Akram, in the interview with Dawn News, are helpful in providing context in terms of the position of Pakistani political and foreign affairs, regarding the Israel-Palestinian conflict. There are many reasons that understanding the intricacies of Pakistan's diplomacy on Israel-Palestine conflict is crucial that it emphasizes the dilemmas encountered by smaller nations in comprehending the power dynamics that exist in the world politics, especially how strong countries like

the United States influence the workings of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) (Paradigm Shift, 2024). Therefore, this research proposes to examine how Pakistan's stance on Israel-Palestine conflict reflects its broader principles of advocating for oppressed communities and opposing the strategies of global domination in international relations.

This study aims to explain how Munir Akram (the Pakistan's permanent representative to the United Nations) manifests Pakistan's official political discourse with respect to Israel-Palestine through his speeches and interviews. Moreover, the study intends to demonstrate how Pakistan's approaches were articulated to the global community and how this articulation shaped Pakistan's relations with its allies and enemies. This research will provide deeper insights into how Pakistan balances manipulative geo-political situations while adhering

to its belief and formulating its diplomatic expressions on world issues.

Significance of the Study

This research has shear importance in the field of Linguistics, both academic and practical. From an academic angle, it enhances discussions of middle power advocacy on behalf of silenced constituencies and the development of international standards. Practically, the research provides assistance to foreign policymakers and Pakistan's decision makers to redefine their foreign policy and specifically readdress the Kashmir issue in the context of international law.

Furthermore, by analyzing Pakistan's stance and its consistency, the research raises the issue of whether the efficacy of diplomatic channels such as the UNGA have the desired impact of changing world opinion and action towards the Israel-Palestine issue. The findings might also be useful in formulating suggestions to strengthen Pakistan's diplomatic strategies in the context of resolving more general problems of the international order, global justice, and human rights.

Research Questions

The study seeks to answer the following overarching questions:

- How does Munir Akram's discourse in UN differ from his discourse at Pakistani news media channel, in terms of politeness strategies, reflecting Pakistan's position on the Israel-Palestine conflict?
- How did Munir Akram use the positive self representation and negative other representation strategy in his two different discourses?

By addressing this question, the research aims to explore the broader implications of Pakistan's foreign policy narratives in focusing international attention on Israel-Palestine issues. It also aims to identify gaps between diplomatic discourse and actionable outcomes in the context of diplomacy as implemented in such international governance agencies as the UNGA.

Literature Review

The Israel-Palestine conflict is a major geopolitical issue with deep-rooted historical, political, and

cultural complexities. Pakistan being the support for Palestine has raised its voice against the powers that are directly involve in it and even who are not calling for any action while being in power. The Political discourses that address this issue are very important in provoking actions to resolve the conflict at international level.

As proposed in their theory of polite communication, Brown and Levinson (1987) elaborated on the importance of social interactions management including face-threatening acts. The theory is based on the notion of 'face' that corresponds to a person's social worth and the capacity to protect and market 'self' in the course of an interaction. According to the theory, the positive face about wants to be liked and praised; negative face is the one that is about wishing to be left alone and not intruded on. These aspects are often invoked in the interpretation of the tactics used by speakers in the interaction of likely conflict conditions (Mills, 2003).

As van Dijk (1998) pointed out, political language (political discourse) cannot be analyzed without reference to discursive strategies. Such tools of language are also used to create a positive image of self and negative image of others. Positive self-representation consists of stressing the adverse as well as the positive constructive aspects of the speaker as a person. Negative other-representation concentrates on the opponents and sees them as the aggressor or devoid of ethics. These strategies are just a few of many others that are found in political and media discourse, where they mostly influence the perception of the society and define the frames of conflicts (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001).

In the sphere of political discourse, a lot of attempts have been made to explain how the acts of politeness and the discursive strategies are employed in order to accomplish a particular diplomatic assignment. For instance, in their work Kádár and Haugh (2013) recommend politer integrative framework, focuses on the strategic planning of diverse forms of actions polite communicative acts for effective diplomacy within the policy of peace and humanism, where politeness is naturally understood. Similarly, Eelen (2001) notices that politeness is always ideological and

ideology is embedded in culture and discourse practices of a particular community. In the framework of international relations, it is not only an ethical responsibility but also practical responsibility of the internal facet as they are interdependent within two antagonistic systems of relations.

On the flip side, the van Dijk's theory of discursive strategies has found numerous practical applications in the analyzing critical discourse for the reasons of examining power and ideology as manifested through language use. According to Wodak and Meyer (2009) political figures have a tendency of adopting strategies to build stories that same any of their wrongdoing and vilify the other side. As an illustration, van Dijk (2006) shows how methodologies of elite discourse on immigration deploy these strategies to perpetuate negative stereotyping towards minorities and thus demonstrating their relevance to wider socio-political contexts.

With regard to conflict discourse analysis, some of the works done in the past showed the relationship between politeness and some discursive strategies in the narration. Haugh (2010) demonstrates that particularly in contentious contexts, face threatening utterances are modified with some politeness strategies in order to create a joined discussion. In the same trend, Al-Momani and Badarneh (2010) examine political oratory in the Middle East observing that there are some political leaders who use face work as well as other discursive means to address local and foreign audiences. These studies illustrate that these theories are flexible for application in different geographical and cultural contexts.

For all the contributions noted, politeness socio norms and communication strategies within the context of discourse strategies in the analysis of diplomatic discourse still remains a tangential area. Many literatures have studied these frameworks in isolation but there is a noticeable lack in the integration of these frameworks and their application in the real world that had political personalities. As an example, the works of Holmes (1995) and Watts (2003) as such provide an extensive amount about Chinese strategies in

communication without attempting to relate it to other wider strategies. As an example again, critical discussion of the works of Fairclough, 1992 and van Dijk, 1998 shows that concerns about politeness at the micro level are not articulated at all in the macro level concerns about an ideological framework. These undercurrents highlight the fact that political discourse is devoid of neutral frameworks hence underscore the need for such studies that seek to reconcile, in this case, the centers and peripheries of discourse.

This is how the work to which Polish Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Munir Akram's speech and interview is analyzed in the particular settings which may include cultures or social order and communicative frameworks. There has been a lot of research interest in Munir Akram's discourse as it provides an interesting case to study the interface of different settings within international relations policy-making that involves representation of dispossessed communities and dominant strategies at different times. As stated by this research, the role of language is one of both confrontation, when he articulates his displeasure with others and conciliation, when in the accompanying interview he is able to express understanding and cooperation with his opponents and critics. The study then classifies the way language is used within the specific context. In particular, this study investigates the linguistic strategies employed by the representatives to manage or challenge face in the interpretation of the response from Pakistan's diplomacy. In the context of social interaction, a positive narrative can enhance the status of the 'self', while negative externalization of 'others' aims to enhance their own narrative. One such person is the former Pakistani ambassador to the United Nations, Munir Akram. This study focuses on the strategies employed by Pakistan's Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Permanent Delegation to the United Nations in interactions with other international stakeholders, especially during the UN General Assembly.

The research also discusses the situational elements that shape Munir Akram's discourses such as the geopolitics behind Israel-Palestine conflict or the

institutional setting of the UN. Such factors bring the need to contextualize discourse analysis approaches, which has been well documented by authors such as Chilton (2004) and Blommaert (2005). Thus, the goal of this research is to provide an in-depth understanding of the narrative of Munir Akram who is Pakistan's permanent representative to the United Nations.

The researches in the area of politeness acts and discursive strategies have an impressive potential in the analysis of political discourse, yet there is a serious possibility of their joint applicability to particular cases. Researcher found this gap by looking at Munir Akram's discourse through the same approaches in order to elucidate some of the rhetorical devices used in the context of international diplomacy. This research reported the specific case of the Israel-Palestine conflict and in this sense has implications for both the theory and practice of political communication, where humanitarian advocacy and conflict understanding and resolution are concerned.

Research Methodology

This research uses a qualitative approach as it seeks to investigate complex social and linguistic phenomena through the nuances of the case study. Qualitative research enables the analysis of discourse, revealing background codes, means of implementation and ideological bases of textual fragments both oral and written (Creswell, 2014). In particular, this research implements a discourse analysis approach by combining speech act (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969) and politeness theories (Brown & Levinson, 1987) to study linguistic and rhetorical means of Munir Akram's discourses regarding the Israel-Palestine conflict. Discourse analysis can help in most instances of language used in the investigation of language as discursive practices especially when relating to international relations (Gee, 2014).

The selection of the texts for the study is done using purposive sampling since it is directly relevant to the research objectives. Purposive sampling is appropriate in qualitative research with particular concentration on the detailed examination of several cases which sheds more light on broader

context (Patton, 2015). The sample drawn includes an interview of Munir Akram with Dawn News English captures his views and also Pakistan's position over the Israel-Palestine issue in detail and Munir Akram's Address to the UNGA, this speech is Pakistan's official statement and also places the country's point of view on the global conflict.

The official website of Dawn News was utilized to collect data for this study. The Speech-to-Text software was employed as a tool to transcribe oral speech into a written script and analysis of both interview and speech was done manually by the researcher. These texts were transcribed to draft designs in order to prepare for data analysis while offering order and ease of understanding.

The analysis was systematic and articulated the research problem and its link to the theoretical framework. The discourses were read several times in order to get the core understanding of theme, structure, central ideas and the key issues. Then the texts were divided into smaller chunks like sentences and paragraphs in order to examine the politeness strategies (positive face, negative face, face-saving acts and face-threatening acts) and the selected discursive strategies (positive self representation and negative other representation). In the latter part, some patterns and themes emerged on justice issues, mobilization, and fairness and equity in power relations. These patterns were scrutinized deeply for precision and reliability. The analysis also included the socio-political situation of Pakistan, in which there is endless support for Palestine and the obstacles that exist in diplomatic talk. To confirm their findings as consistent with earlier research and highlight how it made a novel contribution to the literature, the study was compared with earlier works to further enhance the findings. As far as the relations between politeness strategies and methods used in the analysis are concerned this research explains why the speeches of Munir Akram correspond with and change the standpoint of Pakistan concerning the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. It also shows how language potentially influences the issue of power, diplomacy and equity in the international arena.

Data Analysis and Findings

The analysis focuses on Munir Akram's speech at the United Nation General Assembly and his interview with Dawn News English. Both discourses utilize politeness strategies, in particular positive and negative face as well as some discursive strategies such as positive self representation and negative other representation. These rhetorical tools reveal how language can be a tool for changing perceptions and attitudes in diplomatic and media relations.

Politeness Strategies in the Speech

In his speech at UNGA, Munir Akram maintains a **positive face** of humanitarian harmony by asserting Pakistan's stance. He terms the draft resolution as "humanitarian text" to stress the requirements of the document which were to keep peace; allow relief work and prevent refugees. Indeed, Akram goes out of his way to explain why the document did not mention Jews or Israel directly,

"The document has not condemned Israel by name"

He admits that this should have been the case but seeks national sentiment and understanding to be reasonable instead. Also he appeals the world to build solidarity for the oppressed people by saying "Are they people of a lesser God?" that seems like a voice to challenge human rights, morality and equality.

A similar case can be argued for **negative face** whenever he addresses sensitive topics, in this case, he chooses words that avoid placing a direct accusation, it is his strategy. For example, he maintains balance by stating fairness requires blame must be placed on both not on one as in Hamas case,

"Is this balance? He says what needs to be named has to be named. We believe Israel needs to be named."

It softens the attitudes of the public and encourages them to agree with part of the argument. Munir Akram also attempts to defend OIC (Organisation of Islamic Cooperation) countries by saying "It is not our purpose to name anybody..." that demonstrate neutrality.

Face-threatening acts were prominent in the speech especially with regard to saving the position of Pakistan without being overly aggressive. Munir Akram uses strategy that makes a criticism look like a demand for justice, for instance, “The Israeli occupation is the original sin in this case.”

This argument respects the historical complexity of the conflict in question and enables neutral parties to not go further in their alienation. He also makes face threats less acute. By using diplomatic words, he addresses the Canadian concerns with a sense of equity rather than of campaigns, in the following manner:

“If Canada was fair, if Canada was really equitable, it would agree either to name everybody... or it would not name either.”

On the same side it can be face-saving act to shield the image of Pakistan as a reasonable and ethical advocate of Palestinian causes.

Politeness Strategies in the Interview

In the interview, Munir Akram considers the implications of his speech to a local audience, so goes the level of politeness and the discursive strategies employed. Appearing to build **positive face** is the manner, in which he commends the leadership of Pakistan by saying,

“Islamabad has taken the lead in defending and propagating the Palestinian position.”

Such a statement bolsters the feeling of national pride. At the same time, mentioning the political restraints provides the negative politeness. Such a case of **negative face** is evident in his affirmation of global complexities by saying

“Even those countries which had not supported the resolution shared our opinion in their conscience but their political positions are constrained.”

By stating this he comprehends the limitations of others, thereby softening a direct criticism as well. Munir Akram also respects the negative face and decision making of other states by saying,

“It is a question of whether the OIC and Arab countries can agree on a set of actions.”

It also avoids forced actions or imposed decision rather shows collective effort of all Islamic countries.

In regard to the interview, **face-saving acts** are performed in such a way as to protect the reputation and vigorous image of Pakistan. Munir Akram justifies the limited role of the UN by showing deep features of the structure, “The Security Council is paralyzed due to certain powers”.

He portrays the blame on outside forces and serves to maintain Pakistan’s image as a dedicated supporter. He also, informs the audience on their continuing efforts by saying, “We will continue that effort.” This statement shows the endurance of Pakistan despite of all the challenges.

Although Munir Akram utilizes **face-threatening acts** to address the western leaders and their support for Israel to challenge international inaction, he says,

“This is genocide. And we must call it out,”

He does however soften such threats on many occasions by telling the countries to “examine their conscience”. This way he provides a middle ground between expressing Pakistan’s position and preserving the norms concerned with diplomacy.

Discursive Strategies in the Speech

The discursive strategies in Munir Akram’s speech emphasize **positive self representation** as he describes Pakistan as a fair and just nation. Munir Akram remarks Pakistan’s moderation in the resolution as “A deliberate act of moderation,” stressing moral excellence. To highlight Israel’s enormity, **negative other representation** is utilized to justify the arguments. Such as

“the enormity of the crimes...are so great and enormous” and “the Israeli occupation is the original sin.”.

These statements frame Israel as the aggressor, thereby present Pakistan’s support for the assertion of the Palestinian rights.

Discursive Strategies in the Interview

The **positive self representation** used in the interview has aimed at improving Pakistan’s image, as a moral and a diplomatic country. Munir Akram revolves the discussion around Pakistan with its courageous actions as he asserts,

“We have done so quite successfully in articulating

the position of the Palestinians.”

Negative other representation suggests that Israel's actions are violations of international law and can be labeled under genocide according to the Genocide Convention. This argument relies on anti-Israeli sentiments and build sympathy for Palestinians and augments Pakistan's credibility as an advocate for human rights.

Comparison of Both Discourses

While comparing the above two discourses the advantages and deficits of politeness and discursive strategies emerge as different factors such as audience and context. For example, the speech at the UN describes part of international relations so as achieving support from the world by its emphasis on equity, moderation, and moral policies. It uses negative politeness strategies to engage in controversy and utilizes face-saving acts to protect Pakistan's image. The interview is against the background of targeting audience within the country, and it utilizes yes political politeness strategies to enhance national emotions and discursive strategies (negative other representation) to counter Israel more effectively. In interview, more aggressive pronouncements are used as more stress is given on Pakistan's leadership role and structural obstacles in international relations.

In both the discourses, politeness acts and discursive strategies complement each other to enhance or restore the image of Pakistan as a country that is morally righteous and a good diplomat. The speech derives its success from goodwill and neutrality whereas the interview derives its success from antagonism and provocation. These results give account of how language is tailored to specific stances in order to meet certain tactical objectives and make contributions in the interplay of diplomacy, media and political discourse.

Discussion

This study highlights the use of politeness acts and discursive strategies in relations to Munir Akram's speech and interview to show how Pakistan's position was represented to the world in Israel-

Palestine conflict. The analysis reveals how Munir Akram employed positive self representation and negative other representation and also his use of systematic face saving and face threatening strategies to engage in Palestinian advocacy and challenge counter stances. These findings integrate with existing studies on politeness and discourse in politics within a complex international setting.

From Munir Akram's speech it is observed that he is mainly concerned with the use of such strategies as positive face in his assertion of Pakistan's position as a leading voice for the rights of the Palestine people. This echoes the observation of Kádár and Haugh (2013) who argue that positive face strategies are common in political speeches because the speaker is perceived as an ally for creating consensus with the audience. Munir Akram emphasizes the importance of Pakistan being the voice of Arab countries persistently to show the unity among whole Muslim nations. It aligns with the findings of Al-Momani and Badarneh (2010) who noted that the use of positive face strategies is an essential part of establishing a sense of unity and group identity in political debates.

On the other hand, Munir Akram's framing of the amendment made by Canada and the acts of Israel includes face threatening acts which focus on the integrity and ethical standing of them. This aligns with Haugh's (2010) claim that face-threatening acts in the political context lose their strength due to appeals for higher justice. Munir Akram's criticism towards the actions of Israel as criminal activities and the charge of bias against Canada challenges the negative face of the interlocutors while serving the purpose of the severity of his statements. This use of face threatening acts to deal with injustice is also found in the work of Chilton (2004) on political rhetoric where contradictive stances are taken to support the speaker's position and argument.

The research further indicates the application of negative face strategies especially in relation to Munir Akram's recognition of the concerns posed by Canada and other countries that may not wish to be brutally critical towards Israel. Munir Akram frames his argument in equity and universal justice

so as to ease the possible burden of the imposition on the autonomy of his audience, this tactic is consistent with the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987). This rather circumstantial application of politeness strategies compares with Holmes's (1995) observations that political discourse includes face-saving acts and face-threatening acts in order to navigate challenging dynamics.

Taking the cue from van Dijk (1998) as regards the theoretical framework of discursive strategies, one can notice their significance in the discourses employed by Munir Akram. Indeed, such positive self-representation finds an expression in his treating of Pakistan as a professional and fair country in terms of promoting peace and justice. This fits with van Dijk's, (2006) examination of political discourse where self-representation is said to be employed in order to boost the legitimacy and moral status of the speaker. This theme is made in particular Israel's portrayal of Pakistan as a peace loving nation during the galea's tirade against Pakistan. His followers' distribution of posters on Palestine's and Pakistan's diplomacy at the United Nations also adds to this theme. The same goes for his negative other-representation of Israel and somewhat Canada including a special attention to the alleged moral and ethical deficiencies of these countries, a view supported by Reisigl and Wodak (2001) in their study based on discriminatory rhetoric.

The analysis of previously available research literature and particularly the work of Munir Akram points to the fact that politeness acts and discursive strategies are quite adaptable to the various numbers of people addressed as well as the aims in mind. On the other hand, while Al-Momani and Badarneh (2010) tend to view it from home parliamentary perspectives, Munir Akram's discourse settings come from the global perspective and thus require a balance of polite and confident tone. This adds further to the much reason why Mills (2003) argued that the strategies for the application of politeness are not made in a vacuum but rather in context depending on culture, institutions, and geopolitical issues.

Additionally, Munir Akram's concern for humanitarian values and international legal

standards is consistent with how other actors use conflict. Political leaders, according to Blommaert (2005) and Wodak and Meyer (2009), also tend to invoke some universalist values so that they gain moral advantage in mainstream debate. Citing the Convention on Genocide and what has happened to the Palestinians appears to be a deliberate attempt by Munir Akram to ensure that his argument is presented and understood on a global scale. Such strategic appeals are often anticipated in the context of political communication, as evidenced in Fairclough's (1992) study of politics in language.

Furthermore, the analysis of the interview confirms these conclusions pointing to a systematic deployment of politeness acts and discursive strategies when dealing with delicate matters. His remarks about the geopolitical impotency of the Security Council and his wish to solicit the General Assembly for action are negative face strategies that enable him to sidestep blunt confrontation with powerful stakeholders while pushing for specific remedial action. This is in line with Eelen's (2001) point that where the boundaries of politeness are set is mostly a contentious area in international communication.

Besides, the interview demonstrates the transformations of the discursive strategies according to different formats and audiences. The speech is formal, and has a declarative tone that is appropriate for the General Assembly, whereas the interview has an informal tone which makes it possible for Munir Akram to reach out to more people. The moves from one tone and strategy to the next are in line with what Kádár and Haugh (2013) note that strategies of politeness have to be culture-specific, and may vary for each situation.

Crossing these findings with the existing body of knowledge makes it possible to trace the aspects that are the same and those that are new. There has been extensive work on face-saving acts as part of the fostering of solidarity (Holmes, 1995; Kádár & Haugh, 2013), but it is new to see Munir Akram's attempts to combine those with discursive strategies in such extreme geopolitical situations. The study also contributes to van Dijk's (1998) work by illustrating how the resolutions of positive self-

representation and negative other-representation relate to and use politeness strategies in the solution of complex international problems.

To conclude, the findings of the study put emphasis on the different ways in which politeness acts and discursive strategies can be used in political language. The examination of Munir Akram's speech and interview allows the study to shed light on how these frameworks are used together in the pursuit of political advocacy, diplomacy and accountability. These insights round off the puzzle of a more perfect view of the rhetorical strategies that form part of international diplomacy and also provide substantial guidance as far as communication in conflict situations is concerned.

Conclusion

All in all, this study has attempted to deal with the strategies of how Munir Akram used politeness acts and discursive strategies in his speech and interview to present Pakistan's position in the Israel-Palestine conflict. It emerged that he skillfully adopted the positive and negative face acts while standing out as the representative leader of Pakistan and power imbalances on global level. His positive self-representation served to promote the image of Pakistan as the defender of the Palestine while an instance of negative other-representation condemned the biases and injustices they claimed to have suffered from the opposing powers. Through the application of the theories of politeness and discursive strategies, this study highlighted the rhetorical devices which are appropriate for strategic international communication showing how politicians handle controversial matters through language. These findings enhance the existing literature on political discourse by exploring the relationships between politeness, diplomacy, and advocacy.

Future research can develop these findings further by undertaking a comparative analysis of the peace discourse of political figures from different cultures and geopolitical regions. Such studies might help understand how peace building efforts may differ in efficacy because of the different politeness and discursive strategies employed in a specific country's peace building efforts. More studies might show

how peace discourse changes over time in relation to the audience such as targeting international organization, local constituents or the global audience. Such comparative studies would add to the understanding of how language is used to create national and international narratives and enhancing relations between nations to bring people together and work towards global objectives. Hence it would contribute to the need for language that does not discriminate any group in the practice of international relations and aim at encouraging equitable and fair relations in global politics.

References

- Al-Momani, K., & Badarneh, M. A. (2010). Politeness strategies in Jordanian parliamentary discourse: A critical discourse analysis approach. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 20(1), 68–86.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.
- Eelen, G. (2001). *A critique of politeness theories*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays in face-to-face behavior*. Aldine Transaction.
- Haugh, M. (2010). Face and interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(8), 2073–2077.
- Holmes, J. (1995). Women, men and politeness. *Language in Society*, 24(1), 45–79.
- Harris, S. (2001). Being politically impolite: Extending politeness theory to adversarial political discourse. *Discourse & Society*, 12(4), 451–472. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926501012004004>
- Kádár, D. Z., & Haugh, M. (2013). *Understanding politeness*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). *The logic of politeness; or, minding your p's and q's*. Chicago Linguistics Society, 9(1), 292–305.

- Locher, M. A., & Watts, R. J. (2005). Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1(1), 9-33. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.9>
- Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and politeness*. Cambridge University Press.
- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism*. Routledge.
- Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2001). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach*. Blackwell.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2006). *Politics, ideology, and discourse*.
- Wodak, R., & Chilton, P. (Eds.), *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis* (pp. 95-119). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. Sage.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

Appendix-A

Full Speech Pakistan UN Envoy Munir Akram: "Israel Committed Original Sin" | Dawn News English

"Mr. President, the text that has been proposed by the Arab and the Islamic countries in L25 is a humanitarian text. It seeks three simple things. One, an immediate cessation of hostilities at ceasefire.

Second, the provision of urgent humanitarian relief to the besieged people of Gaza. And third, a stipulation against the further displacement of the two million people in Gaza trapped between Israel's bombs and its tanks. Mr. President, the co-sponsors of L25 have been circumspect in the language that has been used in document L25.

The document has not condemned Israel by name. And this has been a deliberate act of moderation on the part of the sponsors. Because if one were to see the situation that is on the ground with Israeli bombs and the hostilities that are there for 20 days against the helpless Palestinian people, with 7,000 men, women, and small children, half of them children, killed by Israel in the last 20 days, 17,000 injured, 1.1 million Palestinians displaced.

The enormity of the crimes that are being committed by Israel against the Palestinian people are so great and enormous that it is amazing that when my friend from Canada insists on naming the organization Hamas, that he does not feel the need for the equity and balance and fairness for which Canada is so well known. He does not feel the need to name Israel for killing 7,000 Palestinians and injuring 17,000. Only Hamas.

Is this balance? He says what needs to be named has to be named. We believe Israel needs to be named. If you are fair, if you are equitable, if you are just, you will not blame one side and not the other.

And if you were to go back to the issue of who started this, we all know who started this. It is a 50 years of Israeli occupation and the murder and killing of Palestinians with impunity that started this. When you push a people into the corner, they will respond.

This is what the Secretary General said. It did not happen in a vacuum. And look at the reaction that came from the Israeli representative insulting the Secretary General, calling for his resignation.

They can't face the truth. They can't face justice. They can't face the fact that the crime has originated with the Israelis.

The Israeli occupation is the original sin in this case. It is not what happened on the 7th of October. That is a proximate cause.

But the real cause is the occupation of Palestine. Mr. President, it was not our purpose to name anybody in this text. My colleague from Canada says, well, the hostages, we don't speak of the hostages.

The text does speak in balanced terms for the release of all who are held against their will. But not only the Israeli hostages, also the Palestinians. They have the same rights.

They are human beings too. And if you only focus on your kit and kin in Israel and forget the Palestinians, because they are different. Are they people of a lesser God? I think if Canada was fair, if Canada was really equitable, it would agree either to name everybody, both sides who are guilty of having committed crimes, or it would not name either, as we chose in L25 not to name anybody.

But if the Canadian amendment passes, Pakistan will withdraw its co-sponsorship of L25 and we will submit an amendment to the text of the resolution, which will strongly condemn all indiscriminate attacks by Israel, the occupying power against the Palestinian civilian population. That I hope we will have the opportunity at the appropriate time to do so. But my appeal to all member states here is not to support the one-sided Canadian amendment.

The unequal Canadian amendment. The unfair Canadian amendment. We urge you not to show that you are biased against the Palestinian people who have suffered 50 years of occupation.

That you are even-handed. That you will either name both or you will name neither in this draft resolution. Our purpose is to stop the fighting.

The fact that we have reports today that the Israelis have gone on the ground into Gaza, which will escalate the fighting. It is all the more reason for this General Assembly to pass a resolution which is unequivocal in calling for a halt to the fighting, to the hostilities. And that is what we must do this afternoon.

Appendix-B

Pakistan's Permanent Representative to the United Nations Munir Akram's exclusive interview to DawnNews English.

Pakistan's Permanent Representative to the United Nations Munir Akram has stated that Islamabad has "taken the lead" in "defending and propagating the Palestinian position" as Israel continues its bombardment of the Gaza Strip following the surprise attack by Hamas on October 7.

"I think we have done so quite successfully in articulating the position of the Palestinians [...] and we continue to be involved as a lead country among the Arab and Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) countries to find ways of trying to bring this unfortunate and tragic war to an end. We will continue that effort," he said in an interview with DawnNews English.

Hamas launched a surprise offensive on Israel on Oct 7, killing over 1,400 people, mostly civilians, and kidnapping more than 200, according to Israeli officials. Since then, Israel has relentlessly bombarded Gaza and sent in ground troops in an assault that has killed more than 10,000 people, mostly women and children.

Mass protests have erupted across the world against the "collective punishment" punishment unleashed on Palestinians. While Western leaders have continued to pledge support for Israel's actions, other nations have begun recalling their ambassadors and diplomats from Israel.

Asked about the UN's "limited ability" to act on the ongoing crisis and the "frustrations" within the body, Akram said, "I think the sentiment within the UN is basically, across the board, everyone is in some measure or the other condemnatory of Israeli actions and the bombardment that is continuing."

He noted that many Muslim and Arab countries had called Israel's actions in Gaza a "genocide".

“I think if one reads the Genocide Convention this would fit into a definition of genocide. So there is widespread concern about what the Israelis are doing.”

At the same time, Akram said the UN Security Council (UNSC) was “paralysed due to certain powers on the council who have prevented the call for a ceasefire”.

However, Akram said the UN General Assembly (UNGA) had acted and adopted a resolution calling for a ceasefire put forward by the Arab world and countries belonging to the OIC.

He said that the resolution had called for a humanitarian truce leading to a cessation of hostilities, called for humanitarian aid for Gaza and also opposed the Israeli effort to displace the Palestinians.

“What we are trying to do now is to press the UN secretary general and UN organisations to press for the implementation of this resolution. So, the UNGA has spoken even if the UNSC has been unable to speak.”

Akram said that even those countries which had not supported the resolution shared “our opinion in their conscience but their political positions are constrained by strategic and political relationships with Israel and its friends”.

He said that he had asked during a UN debate for countries to “examine their conscience”. “This is [a] genocide. And we must call it out and we must press Israel to stop its campaign of bombardment and military action against helpless Palestinian civilians.”

The ambassador said that if ultimately the UNSC failed to dispense its responsibility in the matter then it would have to be seen what the UNGA could do.

He said that UNGA had “residual powers in the maintenance of international peace and security, especially when the UNSC is unable to act”. He recalled the 1950 resolution called “Uniting for Peace”, saying that it had been used to establish a UN peacekeeping force.

“So the UNGA has powers. The question is how much support we can gather for a decisive enforcement action by the UNGA. We will try [...] there are major powers who will oppose it but we will try to see what we can get through the UNGA even if the UNSC is unable to.”

When asked to give an idea of what actions the UNGA could take, Akram said that these could include an oil export embargo, termination of trade relations, termination of civil aviation and several other actions to “pressurise and penalise” Israel for its actions in Gaza.

“It is a question of whether the OIC and Arab countries can agree on a set of actions and then we will bring these actions to the UNGA and see if we can get them [passed] through it. This is the diplomatic campaign that will have to be mounted in order to get some of these measures adopted by the UNGA.”

Questioned about the “lack of urgency” from the Arab world while other countries had recalled their ambassadors to Israel, Akram said, “I think some of the Arab countries have also done so [...] so I think it is going to be a kind of international move and I don’t think we should distinguish between who’s done what.”

He said the “decisive power” in the matter lay with the US, pointing out that it had eventually come around to calling for a humanitarian pause in Gaza.

He expressed the hope that this pressure would result in containing Israel and bringing the conflict to an end.

Asked about a ceasefire, Akram, “Eventually this thing has to stop, it cannot continue as such.”

The UN envoy saw pressure on Israel mounting down the line, adding that Tel Aviv would have to weigh the cost of its military campaign in Gaza.

“If there was any reasonable government in Tel Aviv, they would see a cost-benefit of this war and bring it to an end. Unfortunately, the Israeli leaders at this time, are extremists and this is the problem..

