ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL

Vol.9. No.1.2026

Constructing Humanitarian Crises: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Selected Muslim Leaders' Speeches at the 2025 UN General Assembly

AUTHOR

Muhammad Waqas
MPhil Scholar
Department of English Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan
Mwaqasjarh@gmail.com

Corresponding Author

Dr.Hafiz Abdul Haseeb Hakimi
Assistant professor
Department of English Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan
abdulhaseebazmi@bzu.edu.pk

Abstract

This study uses Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) methodology to analyze selected Muslim leaders' speeches at the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) 2025, to study the representation of humanitarian crisis in their speeches. The study employs a qualitative research design, which adheres to Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model and van Dijk's Socio-Cognitive Approach to understand the linguistic, discursive, and ideological aspects of humanitarian discourse.

The results offer an emotional lens of civilians, children, refugees, and displaced populations, as well as moral appeals to justice, human dignity, compassion, and collective responsibility. The speeches also create victims and aggressors in three ways: positive self-representation, negative other-representation, and attribution of responsibility. The le[1]aders' challenge of perceived inequalities in global governance, selective international response and dominant narratives in the form of diplomatic resistance is a significant strategy. The concept of a "humanitarian crisis" is further constructed as a global issue that needs to be addressed collectively, as a matter of accountability and human rights, and with humanitarian assistance, as shown in the appeal to the international community.

In conclusion, it is clear that humanitarian discourse is a political, ideological and diplomatic practice, by which Muslim leaders build moral legitimacy, map identity and power, contest dominant narratives and call for specific types of international action.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis, humanitarian crises, Muslim leaders, United Nations General Assembly, political discourse, ideology, power, humanitarian discourse

Introduction

Humanitarian crises, including armed conflicts, forced displacement, human rights violations, economic instability, and climate-related challenges, remain major concerns in contemporary international politics. While these crises have significant material, social, and geopolitical consequences, they are also constructed, interpreted, and communicated through political discourse. The language employed by political leaders plays a crucial role in shaping how crises, victims, perpetrators, responsibilities, and possible solutions are represented. Through particular lexical choices, rhetorical strategies, and patterns of emphasis, political discourse

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

can influence how audiences understand the causes and consequences of humanitarian suffering. Consequently, political speeches provide an important site for examining how humanitarian issues are framed and how ideological positions and power relations are expressed and negotiated through language.

The United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) represents a significant international forum in which heads of state and government articulate their positions on major global political, humanitarian, and security issues. UNGA speeches are not merely informational statements; rather, they constitute carefully constructed forms of political and diplomatic communication through which leaders seek to influence international opinion, establish national and collective identities, justify political positions, and build diplomatic support. When addressing humanitarian crises, political leaders may draw upon concepts such as justice, human rights, international responsibility, sovereignty, resistance, solidarity, and collective action. The selection and combination of such themes are significant because they can reveal the ideological assumptions, political priorities, and broader interests underlying political discourse. Thus, analyzing UNGA speeches offers an opportunity to explore not only what political leaders say about humanitarian crises, but also how and why particular representations are constructed.

This issue is particularly relevant to speeches delivered by leaders of Muslim-majority countries, many of which are directly or indirectly connected to major humanitarian and geopolitical crises. Issues such as Palestine, Kashmir, Syria, Yemen, displacement, and human rights frequently appear within the international discourse of these states. However, Muslim leaders do not necessarily frame such crises in identical ways. Their discourse may bring together humanitarian concerns with moral appeals, national interests, religious and cultural values, diplomatic considerations, and critiques of existing international power structures. Such discursive choices can contribute to the construction of particular understandings of victims and aggressors, responsibility and accountability, justice and injustice, and national and collective identity. Examining these representations can therefore provide valuable insight into how Muslim leaders seek to establish moral legitimacy, articulate political positions, and position their states within the broader international political order.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) provides an appropriate framework for examining these processes because it conceptualizes language as a form of social practice that is closely connected to ideology, power, and social relations. Rather than treating political language as neutral or purely communicative, CDA investigates how discourse contributes to the construction of social realities and the reproduction or contestation of existing power relations. Previous research has extensively applied CDA to political speeches, particularly those of Western political leaders, demonstrating how linguistic and rhetorical strategies can construct national identities, legitimize political positions, and represent social and political actors in particular ways. Comparatively less attention, however, has been given to the systematic analysis of Muslim leaders' discourse in international institutional settings. Existing studies of Muslim political rhetoric have identified themes such as peace, justice, human rights, religious identity, and national interest, but there remains limited research examining how humanitarian crises are discursively constructed by Muslim leaders within the contemporary UNGA context. The present study addresses this gap by focusing specifically on selected speeches delivered during the 2025 UNGA.

The study therefore examines the language and discourse used by selected Muslim leaders when addressing humanitarian crises, with particular attention to the construction of power, ideology, and identity. It also considers how linguistic and rhetorical strategies contribute to broader political positioning within international diplomacy. By applying Critical Discourse Analysis, the study seeks to demonstrate that humanitarian crises are not simply described in

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

UNGA speeches but are strategically framed through particular representations of suffering, responsibility, justice, legitimacy, and political action. In doing so, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of how humanitarian discourse operates within contemporary international political communication and how Muslim leaders use language to negotiate humanitarian concerns, ideological positions, and their place within the global political order.

In this context, the present study analyzes humanitarian discourse in the addresses of select Muslim leaders at the 2025 UNGA. The study does not view these speeches as descriptions of humanitarian crises, but rather as political and ideological practices that shape and manage concepts of suffering, responsibility, justice, identity and international action. The study is aimed to answer the following research questions:

1. How do selected Muslim leaders represent and construct humanitarian crises in their speeches at the 2025 UNGA, particularly through their representation of victims, aggressors, humanitarian suffering, and responsibility?
2. How are humanitarian suffering, justice, responsibility, and collective action constructed through linguistic and discursive strategies, including modality, evaluation, transitivity, lexical choices, pronoun use, repetition, metaphor, and rhetorical appeals?
3. How are power, political identity, and international legitimacy constructed in the speeches through discursive strategies such as modality, positive self-representation, negative other-representation, polarization, presupposition, and the attribution of responsibility?

Literature Review

Critical Discourse Analysis and Political Discourse

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) examines language as a form of social practice through which ideology, power, and social relations are constructed, maintained, and reproduced. Rather than treating political language as neutral communication, CDA investigates how linguistic choices contribute to the representation of social reality, the legitimization of authority, and the reproduction or contestation of power relations (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 1997). From this perspective, discourse is not simply a means of communicating ideas; it also plays an active role in shaping how social and political realities are understood. Fairclough emphasizes the interconnected relationship between text, discursive practice, and wider social practice, while van Dijk highlights the role of cognition, social knowledge, and mental models in the production and interpretation of discourse. Together, these perspectives make CDA particularly relevant to the analysis of political speeches, where language is often strategically employed to communicate political positions, construct identities, legitimize particular viewpoints, and influence audiences.

Previous CDA research on political speeches has demonstrated that political leaders make strategic use of lexical choices, metaphors, framing, repetition, pronouns, and other rhetorical devices to promote particular ideological positions and legitimize political actions. Such linguistic strategies can influence how political actors, events, and social groups are represented and understood. Studies of Western political leaders, for example, have shown how political speeches can construct national identity, establish distinctions between “self” and “other,” and present political policies and actions as legitimate or morally justified (Charteris-Black, 2005; Phillips & Hardy, 2002; Musolff, 2006). These studies commonly identify patterns of ideological promotion, strategic persuasion, representation of power asymmetries, and the framing of national interests as legitimate political objectives.

This body of research demonstrates that political speeches provide an important discursive space in which power and ideology are negotiated through language. However, the emphasis of much existing CDA research on Western political discourse leaves comparatively less

attention to the ways in which Muslim political leaders construct humanitarian and geopolitical issues within international diplomatic settings. Examining such discourse is particularly important because political leaders may draw upon humanitarian, moral, national, religious, and diplomatic narratives simultaneously. Therefore, CDA provides a useful foundation for investigating not only the linguistic features of political speeches but also the broader ideological and power relations embedded within their representations of humanitarian crises.

Political Discourse of Muslim Leaders

Political speeches delivered by Muslim leaders represent an important but comparatively less explored area of discourse research. Existing studies suggest that Muslim leaders frequently negotiate between national interests, international diplomatic expectations, and ethical or religious values. Their speeches commonly emphasize themes of peace, human rights, social justice, international responsibility, solidarity, and cooperation, while religious and cultural references may be incorporated strategically to reinforce moral authority, construct collective identity, and establish connections with particular audiences. These discursive choices demonstrate that political communication among Muslim leaders may operate across multiple dimensions, combining political objectives with moral, cultural, and humanitarian concerns.

Research examining Pakistani, Turkish, and Indonesian political discourse indicates that Muslim leaders often combine national and ethical narratives in their political communication. They may present their states as responsible and constructive members of the international community while simultaneously drawing attention to humanitarian concerns, political injustice, and global inequalities. Their speeches may employ ethos, pathos, and logos to establish credibility, generate emotional engagement, and provide rational justification for particular political positions. Diplomatic framing, moral appeals, and subtle religious or cultural references can further strengthen these representations and enable leaders to address both domestic and international audiences.

An important feature of this discourse is the interaction between humanitarian concerns and political positioning. References to human suffering, justice, dignity, and international responsibility may function not only as expressions of humanitarian concern but also as ways of establishing moral legitimacy and positioning a state within wider geopolitical debates. Similarly, references to national identity, religious values, or shared cultural experiences can contribute to the construction of collective "self" while distinguishing it from perceived political or ideological "others." Such patterns make Muslim political discourse particularly relevant to CDA because they demonstrate how language can simultaneously communicate humanitarian concerns, construct identity, and negotiate relations of power.

Despite these contributions, the existing literature remains limited in scope. Much of the research focuses on earlier political periods, individual leaders, national contexts, or descriptive interpretations rather than providing a systematic CDA of contemporary speeches delivered within international institutional settings. In particular, limited attention has been given to how Muslim leaders collectively construct humanitarian crises in the contemporary United Nations General Assembly context. This gap highlights the need for further research examining how humanitarian suffering, responsibility, justice, identity, and political legitimacy are constructed through the discourse of Muslim leaders in contemporary international diplomacy.

Humanitarian Framing, Ideology, and Power

Humanitarian crises are not represented neutrally in political discourse. Framing involves selecting and emphasizing particular aspects of an event while giving less attention to others, thereby influencing how audiences understand causes, victims, perpetrators, responsibility, and possible solutions. Humanitarian discourse may use emotional and moral vocabulary to represent suffering populations, construct sympathy, and create a sense of urgency for

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
Vol.9. No.1.2026

international action. It can also categorize actors through oppositions such as victim/aggressor, justice/injustice, and oppression/resistance.

Research on humanitarian discourse further demonstrates that humanitarian language can serve political and ideological purposes. Leaders may use references to justice, dignity, humanity, international law, and responsibility to construct moral legitimacy and strengthen diplomatic positions. Similarly, the representation of refugees and other affected populations can vary according to political and ideological contexts, demonstrating the influence of lexical choices on perceptions of humanitarian crises. In the context of Muslim political discourse, humanitarian issues have frequently been connected with themes such as occupation, oppression, displacement, Islamophobia, global inequality, justice, and international responsibility.

UNGA Discourse and Political Representation

The United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) provides a particularly important setting for examining political discourse because leaders address a highly visible international audience while simultaneously representing their states and articulating their positions on global affairs. UNGA speeches function not only as statements of national policy but also as forms of diplomatic communication, rhetorical performance, and instruments for constructing international legitimacy. Through these speeches, leaders seek to communicate national priorities, influence international opinion, establish political identities, and generate support for particular positions. Global issues may therefore be framed in moral, legal, political, or humanitarian terms depending on the objectives and perspectives of individual leaders.

Studies of UNGA discourse indicate that political leaders employ strategies such as framing, legitimization, metaphorical language, repetition, and symbolic references to construct particular representations of themselves, their countries, and opposing actors. References to international law, human rights, historical experiences, shared moral values, and collective responsibility can strengthen the legitimacy of political claims and present particular positions as reasonable or morally justified. Such strategies are especially significant when leaders address humanitarian crises, as they can shape how suffering, responsibility, justice, and appropriate political action are understood by international audiences.

From a socio-cognitive perspective, these discursive strategies also contribute to the construction of mental models through which political events, social groups, and political actors are interpreted. The distinction between “self” and “other” can be particularly important, as leaders may emphasize positive characteristics associated with themselves or their communities while attributing negative characteristics to opposing actors. In this way, UNGA speeches can contribute to ideological polarization and influence the way audiences understand international conflicts and humanitarian crises.

The UNGA context is therefore particularly valuable for Critical Discourse Analysis because it brings together language, diplomacy, ideology, identity, and power within a highly visible international setting. Examining how selected Muslim leaders use this platform can reveal how humanitarian concerns are connected to broader political narratives and how discourse is used to establish legitimacy, assign responsibility, challenge dominant representations, and position states within the international political order.

Research Gap

The reviewed literature establishes the value of CDA for examining political discourse and demonstrates that political speeches are closely connected with ideology, power, persuasion, and legitimacy. It also indicates that Muslim leaders frequently combine national interests with ethical, humanitarian, diplomatic, and, at times, religious narratives. However, the literature reveals several gaps. First, comparatively little research has systematically examined Muslim leaders' speeches in international institutional settings through CDA. Second, much of the

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

existing research focuses on earlier periods, with limited attention to the contemporary UNGA context of 2025. Third, previous studies often emphasize either linguistic, rhetorical, or ideological dimensions without integrating textual, discursive, and socio-cognitive perspectives.

Therefore, there is a need for a contemporary and integrated analysis of how Muslim leaders frame humanitarian crises at the UNGA. The present study addresses this gap by applying Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model and van Dijk's Socio-Cognitive Approach to selected speeches delivered by Muslim leaders during the 2025 UNGA. It focuses on linguistic and rhetorical strategies, ideological construction, power relations, identity, and the broader political positioning expressed through humanitarian discourse.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research design based on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to examine how selected Muslim leaders represented humanitarian crises in their speeches at the 2025 United Nations General Assembly (UNGA). A qualitative approach was considered appropriate because the study focuses on meanings, linguistic choices, rhetorical strategies, ideological positions, and power relations embedded in political discourse rather than numerical measurement.

Data Collection and Selection

The data consist of selected speeches delivered by Muslim leaders during the 2025 UNGA session. The speeches were selected purposively on the basis of their relevance to humanitarian issues and their potential to provide substantial discourse for analysis. Official UNGA records and other authoritative sources were used to obtain the speeches. The analysis focused on portions addressing humanitarian crises, including conflict, displacement, human rights, justice, and international responsibility.

Analytical Framework

The selected speeches were analyzed using two complementary CDA perspectives: Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model and van Dijk's Socio-Cognitive Approach. Fairclough's model examines discourse at three interconnected levels: textual analysis, discursive practice, and social practice. At the textual level, attention was given to vocabulary, grammatical choices, modality, repetition, metaphor, and other rhetorical features. The analysis of discursive practice considered how the speeches were produced and used within the diplomatic context of the UNGA, while the social-practice level examined their relationship with wider ideological, political, and power structures.

Van Dijk's Socio-Cognitive Approach was used to examine how discourse constructs social representations, particularly through positive and negative portrayals of social and political actors. Particular attention was given to the construction of victims and aggressors, representations of "self" and "other," attribution of responsibility, ideological positioning, and moral evaluations.

Data Analysis Procedure

The analysis was conducted systematically by first identifying statements and passages related to humanitarian crises in the selected speeches. These passages were then coded according to recurring linguistic, rhetorical, ideological, and thematic patterns. The coded data were interpreted through the two CDA frameworks to identify how humanitarian issues were framed, how responsibility and legitimacy were constructed, and how power and identity were represented. Finally, patterns across the selected speeches were compared to identify similarities and differences in the humanitarian discourse of Muslim leaders.

Findings and Discussion

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
Vol.9. No.1.2026

The analysis of the selected UNGA speeches reveals that Muslim leaders do not present humanitarian crises as neutral descriptions of suffering. Instead, humanitarian issues are constructed through linguistic, rhetorical, ideological, and diplomatic strategies. Across the speeches, recurring patterns were identified in the representation of victims, attribution of responsibility, moral positioning, polarization, and appeals for international action. These findings demonstrate how political discourse functions simultaneously as a means of humanitarian advocacy and as a strategy for negotiating power and legitimacy in international diplomacy.

Representation of Victims and Humanitarian Suffering

One of the most prominent findings is the emotional representation of civilians, children, refugees, and displaced populations. These groups are frequently portrayed through terms associated with innocence, vulnerability, suffering, and human dignity. Such representations transform humanitarian crises from abstract political problems into issues requiring moral and international attention. The emotional framing of victims also strengthens the speaker's position as an advocate for vulnerable populations and gives humanitarian concerns greater rhetorical force.

From Fairclough's perspective, these linguistic choices demonstrate how textual features contribute to wider social and ideological meanings. The repeated emphasis on suffering and dignity constructs a particular interpretation of the crisis and encourages audiences to view humanitarian action as a moral obligation. Thus, language does not merely describe victims; it contributes to the social construction of humanitarian reality.

Moral and Ethical Appeals

A second major finding of the study is the prominent use of **moral and ethical appeals** in the selected speeches. Concepts such as *justice, dignity, humanity, compassion, human rights,* and *responsibility* are repeatedly invoked to frame humanitarian crises not merely as political or geopolitical concerns but also as matters of moral and ethical significance. Through this discursive strategy, the speakers move beyond conventional diplomatic formulations and construct their political positions as grounded in broader principles of universal humanity and shared moral values. The use of such language enables humanitarian concerns to be presented as issues that transcend national interests and therefore require attention from the wider international community.

The findings further indicate that **humanitarian responsibility is predominantly constructed as a collective obligation** rather than a responsibility belonging solely to the states directly involved in a conflict. References to the *"international community"* and the frequent use of modal expressions conveying obligation, necessity, and duty contribute to the construction of humanitarian crises as shared global concerns. Such linguistic choices position states and international institutions as morally responsible actors and establish an expectation that they should respond to suffering irrespective of geographical or political boundaries.

This framing strengthens the speakers' appeals for **international cooperation, humanitarian assistance, accountability, and appropriate forms of international intervention**. By representing humanitarian responsibility as collective, the discourse broadens the scope of accountability beyond individual states and emphasizes the role of international institutions and the global community in addressing human suffering. Consequently, moral and ethical discourse functions not only to express solidarity with affected populations but also to legitimize demands for concrete international action.

From a Critical Discourse Analysis perspective, these findings demonstrate how moral language can contribute to the **legitimation of political positions and the construction of collective responsibility**. The repeated invocation of universal humanitarian values allows the speakers to establish their arguments within an ethical framework while simultaneously

challenging perceptions of political indifference, inconsistency, or selective international engagement. Humanitarian discourse therefore operates as both a moral appeal and a strategic diplomatic resource through which political claims are presented as ethically justified and internationally relevant.

Polarization, Blame, and the Construction of "Self" and "Other"

The speeches also demonstrate clear patterns of ideological polarization. Humanitarian crises are frequently organized through binary oppositions such as victims and aggressors, justice and injustice, morality and aggression, and responsibility and silence. Specific states, occupying powers, political actors, or international systems are presented as responsible for suffering, while opposing actors are associated with concepts such as occupation, aggression, violence, oppression, and double standards.

These findings correspond closely with van Dijk's concept of positive self-representation and negative other-representation. The speakers tend to construct their own states and broader humanitarian communities as advocates of peace, justice, human rights, and humanitarian responsibility, while opposing actors are represented negatively. This polarization simplifies complex geopolitical conflicts into morally recognizable positions and strengthens the speaker's legitimacy before an international audience.

Diplomatic Resistance and the Contestation of Power

Another significant finding of the study is the presence of **diplomatic resistance** within the selected UNGA speeches. Although the speeches largely adhere to the formal conventions and diplomatic norms of the United Nations General Assembly, they simultaneously function as sites of resistance to perceived inequalities in global governance, selective international responses, and dominant interpretations of international crises. Rather than merely reproducing established diplomatic narratives, the speakers strategically employ humanitarian discourse to introduce alternative perspectives on injustice, inequality, resistance, and international responsibility. In this sense, humanitarian language becomes not only a means of expressing concern over human suffering but also a discursive resource for questioning existing political and geopolitical arrangements.

This finding is particularly significant from a Critical Discourse Analysis perspective because it illustrates the complex relationship between **discourse, ideology, and power**. The selected leaders utilize the UNGA as an international platform through which they articulate their national positions while simultaneously contesting dominant geopolitical narratives and challenging perceived asymmetries in the international system. Their discourse seeks to influence how particular crises are understood, whose suffering is recognized, who is held responsible, and what forms of international action are considered legitimate or necessary.

From Fairclough's perspective, this demonstrates that discourse cannot be separated from the wider social, political, and institutional practices within which it is produced and interpreted. The speeches are shaped by existing structures of international diplomacy and power, yet they also have the potential to reproduce, negotiate, or challenge those structures. Similarly, from van Dijk's socio-cognitive perspective, ideological discourse plays an important role in shaping shared knowledge, attitudes, and interpretations of social and political events. By challenging dominant representations and introducing alternative narratives, the leaders attempt to contest established forms of knowledge and legitimacy and to reshape the way particular humanitarian crises are cognitively and politically understood.

Thus, diplomatic resistance emerges as an important dimension of humanitarian discourse at the UNGA. The speeches demonstrate that diplomatic communication can simultaneously operate within established institutional conventions and challenge the power relations underlying them. Humanitarian discourse consequently becomes a strategic form of political expression through which marginalized perspectives are foregrounded, dominant narratives are

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

questioned, and demands for greater international justice, accountability, and equality are articulated.

Discussion and Conclusion

Taken together, the findings indicate that humanitarian discourse in the selected speeches operates across several interconnected levels rather than functioning simply as a description of humanitarian suffering. At the **textual level**, vocabulary, pronouns, modality, repetition, and rhetorical expressions contribute to particular representations of humanitarian crises, social actors, and political responsibilities. These linguistic choices help foreground certain aspects of a crisis while giving less emphasis to others, thereby shaping how suffering, victimhood, responsibility, and justice are presented to the audience. The repeated use of humanitarian and moral vocabulary further strengthens the emotional and ethical dimensions of the speeches.

At the **discursive level**, the speeches function as carefully constructed diplomatic texts designed to communicate political positions and influence international audiences. The leaders employ humanitarian concerns alongside diplomatic, moral, and political appeals to establish credibility, justify their positions, and seek international recognition and support. The discourse therefore reflects the strategic nature of UNGA communication, where leaders simultaneously address humanitarian concerns and represent the interests and identities of their states. The findings also demonstrate that rhetorical strategies such as moral appeals, ideological polarization, and the construction of "self" and "other" contribute to the broader persuasive function of the speeches.

At the **social and ideological level**, the speeches reproduce particular understandings of justice, responsibility, identity, and global power. The representation of victims and aggressors, together with the attribution of responsibility for humanitarian suffering, reflects broader ideological positions concerning political legitimacy and international relations. The construction of positive self-representation and negative other-representation further demonstrates how discourse can reinforce particular identities and political boundaries. At the same time, appeals to collective responsibility and diplomatic resistance indicate that discourse can also be used to question existing power structures and challenge dominant interpretations of humanitarian crises.

The findings therefore support the central assumption of Critical Discourse Analysis that political language is not neutral. The selected Muslim leaders use humanitarian discourse to represent suffering, assign responsibility, establish moral legitimacy, and negotiate their positions within the international political order. Their speeches demonstrate that humanitarian concerns are closely connected with wider questions of ideology, identity, power, and political interest. Language consequently becomes an important means through which leaders construct particular interpretations of events and seek to influence how those events are understood by an international audience.

The combination of **humanitarian appeals, ideological polarization, collective responsibility, and diplomatic resistance** demonstrates that the representation of humanitarian crises is simultaneously humanitarian, political, and ideological. Rather than simply reporting global suffering, the speeches construct particular interpretations of who is responsible, who is vulnerable, what constitutes justice, and what actions the international community should take. In this sense, humanitarian discourse serves not only to draw attention to suffering but also to establish moral positions, legitimize political claims, challenge perceived inequalities, and negotiate the place of states within the broader international political order. The findings consequently highlight the importance of examining humanitarian discourse through CDA as a form of political communication in which language, ideology, power, and identity are closely interconnected.

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

This study examined how selected Muslim leaders represented humanitarian crises in their speeches at the 2025 United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) through the lens of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Drawing on Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model and van Dijk's Socio-Cognitive Approach, the study identified recurring linguistic and discursive strategies through which humanitarian suffering, responsibility, justice, legitimacy, and international accountability were constructed and communicated. The analysis focused on how language was employed not merely to describe humanitarian crises but also to frame their causes, attribute responsibility, construct identities, and advocate particular forms of political and international action.

The findings demonstrate that the selected speeches represented humanitarian crises through emotional portrayals of vulnerable populations, strong moral and ethical appeals, ideological polarization, explicit attribution of responsibility, and calls for collective international action. Victimized populations were frequently constructed as innocent, vulnerable, and deserving of protection, while opposing actors were represented through discursive associations with aggression, oppression, occupation, violence, or injustice. Concurrently, the speakers positioned themselves and their respective states as advocates of peace, justice, human rights, humanitarian responsibility, and international solidarity. These discursive patterns reflect van Dijk's concepts of positive self-representation and negative other-representation, illustrating how political actors construct in-groups and out-groups within the broader discourse of international diplomacy.

The study further concludes that humanitarian discourse at the UNGA extends beyond the communication of humanitarian concerns and operates as a significant form of diplomatic and political positioning. Through carefully constructed narratives, the selected leaders challenged perceived inequalities within the international system, questioned selective or inconsistent international responses to humanitarian crises, and advanced alternative interpretations of global conflicts and suffering. The deployment of moral language, ethical appeals, and references to collective responsibility enabled the speakers to reinforce the legitimacy of their positions while urging the international community to pursue greater cooperation, accountability, and justice.

Overall, the study demonstrates that language plays a central role in the discursive construction of humanitarian reality within international diplomacy. The selected speeches reveal that humanitarian crises are simultaneously framed as moral, political, and ideological issues. Through discourse, Muslim leaders seek not only to represent and draw attention to human suffering but also to shape international perceptions, attribute responsibility, negotiate political identity and power relations, challenge dominant narratives, and advocate specific forms of international response. The findings therefore highlight the broader significance of CDA in examining how political discourse constructs meanings of humanitarianism, legitimizes particular positions, and influences the interpretation of global crises within institutional diplomatic settings.

References

Beard, A. (2000). *The language of politics*. Routledge.

Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230000612

Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.

Chilton, P., & Schäffner, C. (2002). Themes and principles in the analysis of political discourse: The case of the European Union. In P. Chilton & C. Schäffner (Eds.), *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse* (pp. 1–41). John Benjamins.

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh University Press.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse & Society, 4*(2), 133–168.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2000). *New labour, new language?* Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2006). *Language and globalization*. Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2009). A dialectical-relational approach to critical discourse analysis in social research. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 162–186). SAGE Publications.

Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction: Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (Vol. 2, pp. 258–284). SAGE Publications. Wiley Online Library

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977* (C. Gordon, Ed.). Pantheon Books.

Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs "identity"? In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 1–17). SAGE Publications.

Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse-historical approach (DHA). In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 87–121). SAGE Publications.

van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis? In J. Blommaert & C. Bulcaen (Eds.), *Political linguistics* (pp. 11–52). John Benjamins. John Benjamins Publishing Catalog

van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. SAGE Publications.

van Dijk, T. A. (2002). Political discourse and political cognition. In P. Chilton & C. Schäffner (Eds.), *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse* (pp. 203–237). John Benjamins. Cambridge University Press

van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society, 17*(3), 359–383. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250 DOI

van Dijk, T. A. (2008a). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge University Press.

van Dijk, T. A. (2008b). *Discourse and power*. Palgrave Macmillan.

van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford University Press.

Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about: A summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1–13). SAGE Publications.

Wodak, R. (2006). Mediation between discourse and society: Assessing cognitive approaches in CDA. *Discourse Studies, 8*(1), 179–190.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.