

UDC 808.5:327.5

DOI <https://doi.org/10.28925/2412-2491.2026.264>

STRUCTURE OF DIPLOMATIC SPEECHES: ANALYSIS OF THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL MEETINGS ON UKRAINE IN 2024

Mariia Holtseva

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1124-5957>

Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University

m.holtseva@kubg.edu.ua

The diplomatic discourse at the UN Security Council regarding the Russian invasion of Ukraine presents a unique context to analyse the structure of diplomatic speeches while events are still unfolding.

This article considers diplomatic speech, the main genre of diplomatic discourse in meetings of the UN Security Council. The primary objective of the analysis is to reconstruct the neutral diplomatic speeches and the defensive reactions of diplomats and various invited representatives during the discussion, based on the current situation between Ukraine and Russia. The mentioned speeches were examined in light of the theory of semantic primitives and A. Wierzbicka's classification of action frames. The conducted analysis highlights the language as a powerful tool to reflect dynamics, intentions, reactions, and strategic positioning in diplomatic interactions.

Additionally, the article explores how representatives from different countries use language to shape their narratives, protect international interests, and influence the international community. Special attention is given to distinguishing the difference between neutral and subjectively coloured statements, which provides deeper insight into the mechanisms of covert manipulation and diplomatic strategies. Through an interdisciplinary approach that integrates linguistics, communication theory, and political analysis, the article offers a comprehensive look at contemporary trends in diplomatic discourse during the armed conflict. The role of action frames in building arguments and defining the positions of parties in the international arena is examined in detail. This approach opens new perspectives for studying diplomatic discourse and developing effective strategies for international communication in crisis situations.

Keywords: *diplomatic speech, lie/deception, diplomatic discourse, action frame, theory of semantic primitives*

Гольцева М.І. Структура дипломатичних промов: аналіз зустрічей РБ ООН з приводу України у 2024 році

Дипломатичний дискурс Ради Безпеки ООН з приводу російського вторгнення на територію України створює унікальний контекст для аналізу структури дипломатичних промов у реальному часі, коли події ще тривають. У цій розвідці дипломатична промова розглядається як основний жанр дипломатичного дискурсу у стінах РБ ООН. Основна мета дослідження полягає у реконструкції нейтральних дипломатичних промов, а також промов, насичених захисними реакціями дипломатів і різних запрошених представників, що беруть участь у дискусії з огляду на поточну ситуацію між Україною та Росією. Аналіз здійснювався на основі теорії семантичних примітивів та класифікації фреймів дії за А.Вежбицькою. Проведене дослідження

підкреслює мову як потужний інструмент для відображення динаміки, намірів, реакцій та стратегічного позиціонування у дипломатичних взаємодіях.

Стаття також приділяє увагу тому, як представники різних країн використовують мову для формування власних наративів, захисту національних інтересів та впливу на міжнародну спільноту. Особливий акцент робиться на розмежуванні нейтральних та суб'єктивно забарвлених висловлювань, що дозволяє глибше зрозуміти механізми прихованої маніпуляції й дипломатичних стратегій. Завдяки міждисциплінарному підходу, що поєднує лінгвістику, теорію комунікації та політичний аналіз, стаття пропонує комплексний огляд сучасних тенденцій дипломатичного мовлення в умовах збройного конфлікту. Окрему увагу приділено ролі фреймів у побудові аргументації та визначенні позицій сторін конфлікту на міжнародній арені. Такий підхід відкриває нові перспективи для вивчення дипломатичного дискурсу та формування ефективних стратегій міжнародної комунікації у кризових ситуаціях.

Ключові слова: дипломатична промова, брехня/омана, дипломатичний дискурс, фрейми, теорія семантичних примітивів

Introduction

Diplomatic speeches at the UN Security Council serve as an international platform for countries to express their attitude on global issues. A genre of a diplomatic speech is considered in terms of conversation during the meetings, scripts that are found in the archive to conduct an analysis, diplomatic representatives and their narratives, explanation of the actual situation.

A considerable amount of research has been dedicated to the question of diplomatic speech (Germana D'Acquisto (D'Acquisto, 2017); Nargiza Umarovna Kha (Kha, 2020); Yapparova Venera (Yapparova, 2019); Surendra Pokhrel (Pokhrel, 2020), etc.). Their works explore the features, functions, and effectiveness of diplomatic communication in international cooperation. For example, D'Acquisto(Ibid), and Kha(Ibig) concentrate on the syntagmatic and lexical combinations in diplomatic speech, showing how language carefully balances between assertiveness and politeness. Or Holtseva&Kolesnyk examine how deception is employed in diplomatic language (Holtseva, Kolesnyk, 2023). Even Pokhrel focuses on formal openings, emphasizing their role in setting tone and respect (Ibid).

However, when it comes to the ongoing conflict in Ukraine, there has been comparatively little attention paid to the unique characteristics and challenges in diplomatic speeches related to this situation. Researchers like Larysa Pavlichenko (Pavlichenko, 2022) and Olena Medvid (Medvid, 2024) addressed this gap by examining how the language of diplomacy adapts to the intense pressures and changing circumstances of the Ukraine-Russia war. Their works highlight the nuanced ways in which diplomats construct narratives, balance neutrality, and

employ rhetorical and semantic strategies to advance national interest or build some sort of international consensus.

Despite these contributions, there remains a significant need for further deep analysis focusing on the structure, emotional tone, and strategic positioning in the diplomatic speeches delivered in the walls of the UN Security Council during the Ukrainian crisis.

The ongoing conflict in Ukraine has been the main topic in the UN Security Council meetings since 2014, but the Russian invasion has increased the preoccupation of the international community. The following article is grounded in semantic primitives and A.Wierzbicka's classification of action frames, where

(1) these concepts help to use a universal tool of semantic primitives to show the difference between neutral speech and speech with elements of lying and deception;

(2) action frames help to conceptualize different types of actions;

(3) with the help of action frames, we can understand how different countries construct their narratives;

(4) unlike traditional discourse analysis, Wierzbicka's framework allows a deeper understanding of how participants of the UN Security Council meetings structure their arguments.

Therefore, this article provides multispectral analysis of the UN Security Council's speeches in a neutral perspective from countries that remain observers and in a subjective perspective of countries that are directly interested in achieving something from the current situation in Ukraine.

Thus, the *primary purpose* of this article is to provide a comprehensive linguistic analysis of diplomatic speeches delivered at the UN Security Council during the Ukrainian crisis, with a particular focus on the year 2024. The *aim* of the study is to explore how semantic primitives and action frames, based on the classification of A.Wierzbicka, can reveal the difference between neutral discourse and speeches with elements of strategic positioning. The article seeks to deepen understanding of how narratives are constructed and influence international decision-making within diplomatic communication.

Thus, the objectives of this article are the following:

- Conduct a comprehensive linguistic analysis of diplomatic speeches delivered at the UN Security Council during the Ukrainian situation, with a focus on the year 2024;

- Explore how semantic primitives and Anna Wierzbicka's classification of action frames can be used to distinguish the difference between neutral discourse and speeches containing elements of strategic positioning or deception;

- Examine the construction and narrative strategies of both neutral and directly interested parties within the UN Security Council, identifying how each group structures arguments and advances their interests;
- Provide deeper insight into the influence of diplomatic communication on international decision-making by analysing the structure, emotional tone, and strategic positioning.

The choice of material

We have analysed diplomatic discourse speeches retrieved from archive documents from the UN Security Council meetings in 2024 (304), including 20 closed meetings.

Notes on Methodology

Since the following discussion is based on diplomatic speeches, it is important to clarify the key characteristics of a diplomatic speech. Thus, any diplomatic speech is: 1) formal; 2) flexible; 3) neutral with moderate emotionality; 4) its objective is about finding compromise solutions; 5) any diplomatic speech is a social phenomenon that shows/follows/considers the knowledge and behavior models of the concrete social group; 6) any diplomatic speech reflects not only current social events but also the conceptual sphere of communicants; 7) the structure of a diplomatic speech guides communicants in the development of actions according to the discussed issue (Collin, 2012).

Based on this understanding of diplomatic speech, the article employs a qualitative approach, adding semantic primitives' theory and Anna Wierzbicka's (Zhabotyńska, 2006) classification of action frames to examine the structure of diplomatic speeches at the UN Security Council meetings on Ukraine in 2024. This framework is used to systematically examine the structure of diplomatic speeches, providing a deeper understanding of how these speeches are constructed and the intentions behind them.

That is why, used methodology consists of several steps:

(1) Data collection. The study analyzes official transcripts of the UN Security Council meetings in 2024, focusing on the speeches of Ukraine, Russia, Western countries (America, EU members, The UK), and neutral countries (like non-permanent countries).

(2) Action frame analysis helps to categorize gathered speeches on type of implied action, if it is a diplomatically peaceful positioning, judgement, legal

arguments or even moral judgement. Action frames give a structural way to analyze the situations being described in a diplomatic speech by answering the questions – who, what, how, why.

To consider the conceptual structure of a diplomatic speech we may add an action frame and it will be presented like this:

{[SOMEONE] [is guided by SOMETHING] [uses SOMETHING] [influences/acts in a SUCH WAY] [on SOMEONE] [HERE / NOW]}, where :

[SOMEONE] is an agen, a speaker, an addresser of the speech;

[is guided by SOMETHING] is a set of pragmatic intentions,

[uses SOMETHING] is a tool, a modeled discursive construct, the speech itself;

[on SOMEONE] is a collective addressee, other members of the UN Security Council;

[HERE/ NOW] is a typical context of a UN Security Coucil meeting.

(3) Comparative discourse analysis helps in correlating the difference between neutral diplomatic speeches and those with elements of lying/deception in terms of action frame analysis at first, then applying semantic primitives;

(4) Semantic primitives allow to break down complex diplomatic speeches into their core components. By doing this we can: reveal hidden meanings, collate and contrast different speeches, analyze the shift in a speech in a case of additional details added to the speech during a discussion.

In terms of semantic primitives, the general structure of any diplomatic speech at the UN Security Council is slightly different and looks like this:

X:1) is in a shared institutional space together with Y1,Y2,Y3....Yn due to existing conflict (Z) that threatens international security;

2) believes that Y1,Y2,Y3....Yn understand the nature of situation Z;

3) believes that Y1,Y2,Y3...Yn realise that X has some important information about situation Z;

4) believes that Y1,Y2,Y3...Yn are eager to listen to the information from X about situation Z;

5) hopes that after providing information and proposals, Y1,Y2,Y3...Yn will participate in discussions and model ways to overcome the dangers of situation Z;

6) gives a speech, presents information either objectively or with some subjective changes, appeals to Y1,Y2,Y3...Yn, and anounces possible sotutions or a resolution option;

7) concludes the speech and joins the discussion (Ivaschenko, 2006).

The war in Ukraine is a good example of competing narratives, attempts to shape international opinion such as: analysis of Russian justification for the invasions and the reaction of the society (so called *"liberation, denazification, Kyiv regime"* reveal the underlying ideology and justification for Russian actions); analysis of Ukraine and its allies while framing the conflict to gather international sympathy and support (Ukraine is using the opposite lexemes – *"aggression, genocide, capture, violation"*); comparison and contrast of different speeches can show not only different perspectives on the conflict, but also a variety of desirable outcomes; propaganda and disinformation identification in order to reveal attempts to manipulate public opinion.

Discussion. Basic notions and definitions

Lying and deception in a diplomatic speech

Quite often the United Nations Security Council becomes an international battleground. In theory it is a place of democracy, freedom, truth, and compassion, but it also can be a place, where lies/deception, manipulation, and misdirection are carefully added to the narratives.

As it was mentioned in the article *"Lies and Deception in Modern English Diplomatic Discourse: Pragmatics in Interdisciplinary Focus"* lying is considered as *"deliberately telling someone something that is not true and deception is the act of hiding the truth, to achieve an advantage"* (Ibid, p.154, 2023). And deception is *"the act of causing someone to accept as true or valid what is false or invalid"* (Ibid, 2023). Hence, we combine both terms in this article due to the presence of both lying and deception.

After having analysed 284 meetings in 2024, we have made a conclusion that it is common to use the following structural lying/deceptive strategies in either a theory of semantic primitives or in action frame theory. It has been revealed that from 284 speeches, 91(40%) speeches used distraction or false dichotomy. This may have been done to change the opinion of participants, convince them of the alternative chain of events in Ukraine and Russia in 2024. For example:

1) Framing the narrative as self-defense (A vivid example is the 9544th meeting and speech of Mr Nebenzia, where he is denying all crimes committed by Russia and uses crimes as a defense of their actions – *"Today we heard cynical statements that we would not be sitting here if Russia had not started this war. No, if we had not started our special military operation, tragedies such as the one in Lysychansk would continue to happen every day, and that is exactly what was*

happening practically every day for eight years until 2022” (Threats to international peace and security, 2024)). In the given passage, *“special military operation”* instead of *“war”* or *“invasion”* downplays aggression and suggests a controlled, justified response rather than an act of unprovoked violence. Overall, the vocabulary and phrasing serve both to justify Russia’s actions as self-defense and to frame the broader narrative in a way that seeks to legitimize those actions.

2) Burying the key information with long meaningless speeches (Quite often it is done with a help of historical references that actually do not have any direct purpose to solve the conflict and find some common grounds, but pulling the wool over the eyes – the 9601st meeting, the speech of Ms.Kwiatkowski contains the following non related accusations – *“Nazism is publicly rare and always condemned, but in Ukraine it unified the kind of people who would do what the United States and NATO desired. History was therefore forgotten, truth was ignored, and Ukrainian culture was denigrated – because a proxy war to weaken Russia politically and economically was desired by some in the West”* (Threats to international peace and security, 2024)). The selected passage provides an example where instead of addressing the immediate conflict or proposing actionable solutions, she introduces unrelated emotional accusations about Nazism in Ukraine, suggesting that it was unified to serve the interests of the United States and NATO.

3) Distracting present participants of a meeting (Counter accusations serve to distract attention from the main issue, an example is the 9562nd meeting with unrelated regional conflicts in Ukraine instead of concentrating on the main agenda, where Mr.Polyanskiy claimed to be surrounded by anti-Russian opposition that has subjective reasons that are not connected to the main agenda – *“We will not be surprised if, in order to keep this soap opera on the air, today we will also hear more anti-Russian tales and absurd accusations. That is part and parcel of the genre thought up and advanced by Washington and its satellites”* (The situation in the Middle East, 2024)). By introducing counter accusations (*will also hear more anti-Russian tales and absurd accusations*) and referencing unrelated regional conflict, the speaker shifts the focus from the main agenda toward the opposition with the West (*Washington and its satellites*).

4) Creating a false dichotomy between aggressors and victims (mainly that is about two or more opposing solutions that depict an alternative vision of the discussed situation, an example is the 9625th meeting, where Mr.Nebenzia concludes his narrative with the statement that *“The only way to stop it is to consign Zelenskyy and his clique and the entire Maidan Government to the dustbin of history, where*

they deserve to be. That is precisely what we are seeking to achieve right now" (Maintenance of peace and security of Ukraine, 2024)). The used lexemes (*the only way, consign Zelenskyy and his clique, the entire Maidan Government, dustbin of history*) provide an example of creating a binary opposition. Also, it frames the situation as the one, where you support the speaker's solution or you are in opposition.

5) End of a speech with a call to action (mostly in order to find allies and/or show that the speaker has supporters, like Mr. Polyanskiy does at the 9562nd meeting – *"We trust that the delegations that took over the watch in 2024 on the Security Council will also draw the necessary conclusions on this matter after the meeting. We do have work that we need to do together instead of holding pointless meetings to work through the playbook of a small group of countries"* (Threats to international peace and security, 2024)). The used lexemes (*draw the necessary conclusions, instead of holding pointless meetings*) are suitable in case there is a need to end a speech and call to act. These lexemes function to foster a sense of shared purpose, and subtly align the audience against an opposition (*a small group of countries*).

Thus, the use of lying/deception significantly impacts the structure of diplomatic speeches at the UN Security Council meetings on Ukraine in 2024. Instead of presenting factual and solution-oriented approaches, speeches often follow a simulacra shaping pattern (91 speeches out of 284), which is designed to manipulate perception, shift blame, and control the narrative. In this case the modified structure of a speech will look like this – (1) framing the narrative; (2) burying the key information, usually with long meaningless speeches; (3) distracting present participants of a meeting; (4) creating a false dichotomy between aggressors and victims; (5) end of a speech with a call to action. Both the theory of primitives and action frame theory will have elements of the mentioned structural lying/deceptional strategies.

Speaking about the used lexemes, the common situation is the substitution one term with another, like *special military operation* instead of *war/invasion*. It is done to soften and legitimise aggressive actions, while lexemes like *the only way consign the dustbin of history*, create binary oppositions, show support, and some agreement.

Structure of diplomatic meetings

Present-day realia increases public interest regarding principles of democracy, maintaining peaceful relations and/or finding peaceful conflict resolutions, and generally that is all about how nations interact with each other.

Thus, the theoretical frameworks and the universal analysis of the structure of a diplomatic speech via the theory of primitives and frame analysis can be applied in terms of the Ukrainian situation.

Let us see it in practice:

{[SOMEONE – *China*] [is guided by SOMETHING – China wants to remain impartial and neutral when it comes to the discussion of the situation between Ukraine and Russia – *China has always maintained that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries should be respected* (Threats to international peace and security, 2024)] [uses SOMETHING – *a diplomatic speech*] [influences/acts in a SUCH WAY – the speaker is states that *the legitimate security concerns of all countries should be taken into account. Countries' security interests are equal*(Ibid, 2024)] [on SOMEONE – Chinese representative is mainly blaming Western countries for escalating the conflict by *adding fuel to the fire*] [HERE / NOW –12.02.2024]}.

Zhang Jun's speech reflects China's position on the war – neutral in theory, but subtly sympathetic to Russia. The representative is not supporting Russia openly, but he is shifting focus to the role of the West and the general need of negotiations. Thus, China's interests are based on maintaining ties with Russia while showing its neutral attitude in the international conflict.

In case of deliberate lying/deception, the mentioned conceptual structure will look like this:

{[SOMEONE – *Russia*] [is guided by SOMETHING – Russia wants to shift the blame, rather than find the solution – "*It is now blindingly clear to an overwhelming majority of unbiased experts that the key factor hindering the quest for a peaceful settlement of the Ukrainian crisis is the West's continued support for the Kyiv regime , despite the fact that it is obviously in its death throes and unable to achieve the goal dictated to it, which is inflicting a strategic defeat on Russia or, as we have been hearing lately, at least weakening my country*"(Ibid, 2024)] [uses SOMETHING – *a diplomatic speech*] [influences/acts in a SUCH WAY – the speaker tries to show their alternative point of view on the situation – "*The reality is that despite the complete failure of the Armed Forces of Ukraine on the battlefield, the Kyiv regime's Western patrons are still pushing them with maniacal persistence to continue their senseless military confrontation, using lying slogans alleging that the collapse of the Zelenskyy regime is an existential threat to Ukrainians and that Russia wants to enslave them*" (Ibid, 2024)] [on SOMEONE – Russian representative is mainly blaming Ukraine and Western countries for everything that is happening by mentioning the hidden

interests of Ukraine and the West – *at least weakening my country*] [HERE / NOW – 22.02.2024]}.

Russian's representative statements are full of controversial information: 1) Ukraine was both weak to ask for Western help and strong enough to be prepared for the war; 2) Russia ignores their own violations of the Minsk agreements; 3) No proof was provided for a secret military buildup near Minsk; 4) The attempt to blame someone else for the conflict contradicts Russia's actual actions in Ukraine.

In case if there is no lying/deception, the speech will look like this:

X : 1) **Mr. Kyslytsya** (Ukraine) is in the same institutional space together with Mrs. Rodrigues-Birkett/Ms. Persaud (Guyana), Mr.Koudri (Algeria), Mr. Zhang Jun (China), Mr. De La Gasca (Ecuador), Mrs. Broadhurst Estival (France), Mrs. Shino (Japan), Mr. Camilleri (Malta), Mr. Kumanga (Mozambique), Mr. June Byoung Park (Republic of Korea), Mr. Nebenzia (Russian Federation), Mr. Kanu (Sierra Leone), Mrs. Blokar Drobič (Slovenia), Mr. Hauri (Switzerland), Mr. Kariuki (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Mr. Wood (United States of America), because there is still danger for Ukraine and Russia is not calling back its military forces;

2) believes that Mrs. Rodrigues-Birkett/Ms. Persaud (Guyana), Mr.Koudri (Algeria), Mr. Zhang Jun (China), Mr. De La Gasca (Ecuador), Mrs. Broadhurst Estival (France), Mrs. Shino (Japan), Mr. Camilleri (Malta), Mr. Kumanga (Mozambique), Mr. June Byoung Park(Republic of Korea), Mr. Nebenzia (Russian Federation), Mr. Kanu (Sierra Leone), Mrs. Blokar Drobič (Slovenia), Mr. Hauri (Switzerland), Mr. Kariuki (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Mr. Wood (United States of America) clearly undertands the current situation in Ukraine and what has been happening;

3) believes that Mrs. Rodrigues-Birkett/Ms. Persaud (Guyana), Mr.Koudri (Algeria), Mr. Zhang Jun (China), Mr. De La Gasca (Ecuador), Mrs. Broadhurst Estival (France), Mrs. Shino (Japan), Mr. Camilleri (Malta), Mr. Kumanga (Mozambique), Mr. June Byoung Park(Republic of Korea), Mr. Nebenzia (Russian Federation), Mr. Kanu (Sierra Leone), Mrs. Blokar Drobič (Slovenia), Mr. Hauri (Switzerland), Mr. Kariuki (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Mr. Wood (United States of America) understand why X (Mr. Kyslytsya (Ukraine)) is invited to the meeting and what kind of information he is sharing;

4) believes that Mrs. Rodrigues-Birkett/Ms. Persaud (Guyana), Mr.Koudri (Algeria), Mr. Zhang Jun (China), Mr. De La Gasca (Ecuador), Mrs. Broadhurst Estival (France), Mrs. Shino (Japan), Mr. Camilleri (Malta), Mr. Kumanga

(Mozambique), Mr. June Byoung Park (Republic of Korea), Mr. Nebenzia (Russian Federation), Mr. Kanu (Sierra Leone), Mrs. Blokar Drobič (Slovenia), Mr. Hauri (Switzerland), Mr. Kariuki (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Mr. Wood (United States of America) are ready to listen to X (Mr. Kyslytsya (Ukraine)) and participate in a discussion with him;

5) hopes that Mrs. Rodrigues-Birkett/Ms. Persaud (Guyana), Mr. Koudri (Algeria), Mr. Zhang Jun (China), Mr. De La Gasca (Ecuador), Mrs. Broadhurst Estival (France), Mrs. Shino (Japan), Mr. Camilleri (Malta), Mr. Kumanga (Mozambique), Mr. June Byoung Park (Republic of Korea), Mr. Nebenzia (Russian Federation), Mr. Kanu (Sierra Leone), Mrs. Blokar Drobič (Slovenia), Mr. Hauri (Switzerland), Mr. Kariuki (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Mr. Wood (United States of America) will take active part in a discussion of situation in Ukraine, hopefully with a set of possible solutions;

6) X is giving a speech, and Mrs. Rodrigues-Birkett/Ms. Persaud (Guyana), Mr. Koudri (Algeria), Mr. Zhang Jun (China), Mr. De La Gasca (Ecuador), Mrs. Broadhurst Estival (France), Mrs. Shino (Japan), Mr. Camilleri (Malta), Mr. Kumanga (Mozambique), Mr. June Byoung Park (Republic of Korea), Mr. Nebenzia (Russian Federation), Mr. Kanu (Sierra Leone), Mrs. Blokar Drobič (Slovenia), Mr. Hauri (Switzerland), Mr. Kariuki (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Mr. Wood (United States of America) are listening to him, especially when X (Mr. Kyslytsya (Ukraine)) is promoting Ukraine's solution *"We urge Russia to stop falsifying reality and lecturing us about international law, which Russia itself continues to violate frequently. Russia must start implementing the Court's orders on provisional measures, which are Russia's obligations under international law"* (Ibid, 2024).

It becomes apparent that strategic positioning is a key element of the Ukrainian representative's speech. Ukraine's diplomatic efforts focus on exposing Russian violations and gaining international support in this issue.

In case of some hidden motivation, the speech might look like this:

X: 1) **Mr. Polyanskiy** (Russia) is in a shared institutional space together with Mr. Yamazaki (Japan), Mr. Koudri (Algeria), Mr. Geng Shuang (China), Mr. De La Gasca (Ecuador), Mr. De Rivière (France), Mrs. Rodrigues-Birkett (Guyana), Ms. Gatt (Malta), Mr. Irachande Gouveia (Mozambique), Mr. Sangjin Kim (Republic of Korea), Mr. Kanu (Sierra Leone), Mr. Žbogar (Slovenia), Mrs. Baeriswyl (Switzerland), Mr. Kariuki (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland),

Mrs. Thomas-Greenfield (United States of America) due to maintenance of peace and security of Ukraine;

2) does not believe that Mr. Yamazaki (Japan), Mr. Koudri (Algeria), Mr. Geng Shuang (China), Mr. De La Gasca (Ecuador), Mr. De Rivière (France), Mrs. Rodrigues-Birkett (Guyana), Ms. Gatt (Malta), Mr. Irachande Gouveia (Mozambique), Mr. Sangjin Kim (Republic of Korea), Mr. Kanu (Sierra Leone), Mr. Žbogar (Slovenia), Mrs. Baeriswyl (Switzerland), Mr. Kariuki (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Mrs. Thomas-Greenfield (United States of America) fully understand the current situation in Ukraine from the perspective of Russia;

3) believes that Mr. Yamazaki (Japan), Mr. Koudri (Algeria), Mr. Geng Shuang (China), Mr. De La Gasca (Ecuador), Mr. De Rivière (France), Mrs. Rodrigues-Birkett (Guyana), Ms. Gatt (Malta), Mr. Irachande Gouveia (Mozambique), Mr. Sangjin Kim (Republic of Korea), Mr. Kanu (Sierra Leone), Mr. Žbogar (Slovenia), Mrs. Baeriswyl (Switzerland), Mr. Kariuki (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Mrs. Thomas-Greenfield (United States of America) do not take into account some important details, so that that X (Mr. Polyanskiy (Russia)) are eager to give these details to representatives – *“Today we heard, and will probably continue to hear more anti-Russian philippics in connection with the developments in Ukraine. Clearly, our Western colleagues convene these meetings in order to let off steam and show to the public that the Security Council remains focused on the question of Ukraine”* (Yapparova, 2019, pp.57-61). The used lexemes (*anti-Russian philippics, let off steam, show to the public*) have strong connotations and have rhetorical effects. The speaker frames the discourse as aggressive and unfairly critical, positioning Russia as a victim. Overall, the used lexemes work together to undermine the legitimacy of the Council’s actions, portraying them as full of no real impact.

4) believes that Mr. Yamazaki (Japan), Mr. Koudri (Algeria), Mr. Geng Shuang (China), Mr. De La Gasca (Ecuador), Mr. De Rivière (France), Mrs. Rodrigues-Birkett (Guyana), Ms. Gatt (Malta), Mr. Irachande Gouveia (Mozambique), Mr. Sangjin Kim (Republic of Korea), Mr. Kanu (Sierra Leone), Mr. Žbogar (Slovenia), Mrs. Baeriswyl (Switzerland), Mr. Kariuki (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Mrs. Thomas-Greenfield (United States of America) need to know X’s version of the truth – *“Since air defence is deployed in residential neighbourhoods, in violation of the basic norms of international humanitarian law, which our Western colleagues persistently ignore in the best ostrich tradition.... One of the most popular Ukrainian Telegram channels, which are today the source of information for most Ukrainians ever since the Kyiv dictator destroyed the last*

remnants of independent media outlets and is force-feeding the people exclusively with a "news telemarathon" (Ibid, 2024), describes it as follows: "The Office of the President has launched allegations that Russian X-series missiles hit residential buildings". In this passage phrases such as *"deployed in residential neighbourhoods, in violation of the basic norms of international law"* frame Ukraine's actions as not only military questionable, but also as violations of international law, casting blame directly on Ukraine and the West. The expression *"our Western colleagues persistently ignore in the best ostrich tradition"* is a part of the idiom *"burying one's head in the sand"* (Ibid, 2024), showing deliberate ignorance or avoidance of uncomfortable situations. Emotional language (dictator, destroyed, force-feeding) shows the Ukrainian leader as authoritarian and manipulative, suggesting a lack of freedom and transparency. Overall, this choice of language is about delegitimising Ukraine's actions and leadership, portraying the West not in the best light, and shifting blame from the speaker.

5) X hopes that Mr. Yamazaki (Japan), Mr. Koudri (Algeria), Mr. Geng Shuang (China), Mr. De La Gasca (Ecuador), Mr. De Rivière (France), Mrs. Rodrigues-Birkett (Guyana), Ms. Gatt (Malta), Mr. Irachande Gouveia (Mozambique), Mr. Sangjin Kim (Republic of Korea), Mr. Kanu (Sierra Leone), Mr. Žbogar (Slovenia), Mrs. Baeriswyl (Switzerland), Mr. Kariuki (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Mrs. Thomas-Greenfield (United States of America) will participate in discussions and support X's version of situation Z;

6) X ((Mr. Polyanskiy (Russia)) gives a speech, presents information with some subjective changes, appeals to Ukraine in order to divert attention from X's actions on the alleged actions of Ukraine and its allies – *"The consequences of shoddy Ukrainian air defense systems are presented as the results of our high-precision strikes; Ukraine is deliberately shelling peaceful cities like Belgorod; The referendums in occupied regions were a free expression of popular will; Zelensky is illegitimate because he canceled elections"* (Ibid, 2024). In the given passage the choice of words shifts blame for civilian casualties or damage from Russian military actions to Ukrainian defenses, attempting to remove responsibility from Russia. For example, the lexeme *shoddy* is a strongly negative descriptor, suggesting poor quality and incompetence. The expression *high-precision strikes* is used to frame Russian military operation as technically advanced, legitimized, and minimizing the perception of harm. Hence, the passage shows manipulative discourse in diplomatic rhetoric, using the language to reframe events, shift responsibility, and influence international participants of the meeting.

7) concludes the speech, that is mainly focused on rhetoric rather than resolution and some actions, portrays Russia more as an observer of situation Z – *“I especially want to congratulate the residents of Crimea – who 10 years ago almost to the day voted for reunification with Russia – as this is the second time that they have participated in presidential elections”* (Ibid, 2024). The used lexemes (*congratulate, residents of Crimea, voted for reunification with Russia, second time*) show Russia as a neutral observer and Crimea as an autonomus part of Russian political life. The Russian representative presented misleading narratives, omitted crucial context, modified facts. Mr. Polyanskiy’s speech is an example of a structured pattern to lie/deceive and switch the responsibility. His rhetorical approach includes falsification, omission of key information, victim-blaming, and blame shifting.

The shown examples illustrate how diplomatic discourse at the UN Security Council can be a complex unit of rhetorical strategies and lying/deception. With the help of theories of semantic primitives and action frames, we gain a deeper understanding of not only the content but also underlying manipulative intentions. This approach allows us to reveal the hidden motives behind diplomatic rethoric and show a comprehension of international relations and conflict resolution. Thus, any diplomatic speech is possible to consider in particular layers, where each layer describes the speaker’s intentions whether they are neutral or have some deceptive background.

In addition, a closer examination of the speeches reveals the use of certain common lexemes that serve specific rhetorical purposes. Such lexemes as violation, legitimacy, aggression, and victim frequently appear to frame the narrative in favor of the speaker’s objectives.

Conclusions

The structure of diplomatic speeches at the United Nations Security Council is influenced by rhetorical and lying/deceptive strategies, which are often used to achieve subjective goals (91 speeches out of 284 had these subjective elements). These strategies not only impact diplomatic discourse but also interrupt problem-solving resolutions. By analysing the speeches through the theory of primitives and action frame theory, we can more widely see the whole perspective of the speech, not only who, what, where something is said, but also why, and what was the reaction of the present participants.

The conducted analysis involves breaking down the diplomatic speech into its core components using semantic primitives and action frames. By identifying the most fundamental words and meanings, we can trace how messages are constructed

and highlight where manipulative or deceptive language may be used. This approach allows to show not only what is being said, but how even subtle changings in the choice of language units can shape the meaning of the speech;

Action frame analysis categorizes diplomatic speeches based on the type of implied action, such as peaceful observation, judgment, legal arguments or others. This approach involves mapping each segment of the speech to a specific intention or action. By doing this, we can have a better understanding of strategic purposes behind diplomatic rhetoric.

Meanwhile, semantic primitives help to reveal hidden meanings and contrast different speeches. This allows us to have a deeper analysis of the subtle ways in which language can be manipulated to serve specific purposes;

Comparative discourse analysis help to correlate the differences between neutral diplomatic speeches, and those with elements of lying/deception. This method involves comparing speeches to see patterns, repeated tactics or any kind of discrepancies.

In summary, the study demonstrates that diplomatic speeches are not only about the information exchange, but they are complex constructions shaped by rhetorical strategies, deception, and layered intentions. By implying the semantic primitives, action frames and comparative analysis, we can more effectively uncover the hidden motives within diplomatic discourse.

Furthermore, the analysis shows that specific lexemes are strategically employed to frame the discourse and influence the perception of the heard information. These words are not randomly chosen; they serve to reinforce the speaker's narrative and align listeners with particular viewpoints.

REFERENCES

1. Collin, R. (2012). Genre in Discourse, Discourse in Genre. *A New Approach to the Study of Literate Practice*. Vol. 44. 85 p.
2. D'Acquisto, G.(2017). A linguistic Analysis of Diplomatic Discourse. *Cambridge Scholars Publishing*, 1-30. Retrieved from <https://www.cambridgescholars.com/resources/pdfs/978-1-4438-5072-8-sample.pdf>
3. Holtseva, M. & Kolesnyk, O.(2022). Lies and deception in modern English diplomatic discourse: pragmatics in interdisciplinary focus. *Cogito*. Vol. XIV, no. 1p.154-173. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361670143_LIES_AND_DECEPTION_IN_MODERN_ENGLISH_DIPLOMATIC_DISCOURSE_PRAGMATICS_IN_INTERDISCIPLINARY_FOCUS
4. Ivaschenko, V.(2006). Kontseptualna reprezentatsiia frahmentiv znannia v naukovo-mystetskii kartyni svitu (na materialy ukrainskoi mystetstvoznavchoi terminolohii): Monohrafiia. Vydavnychi Dim Dmytra Buraho [Conceptual representation of fragments of knowledge in the scientific and artistic picture of the world(based on the material of Ukrainian art history terminology): monograph]. *Vydavnychi Dim Dmytra Buraho* [Dmytro Bugaro Publishing House]. 329 p.[in Ukranian]

5. Kha, N.(2020). The types of diplomatic speech and syntagmatic relations of their lexis. *An international Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference*. 75-76.
6. Lynn, S.(2006). Comparison of Discourse Genres: Clinical Implications. *Contemporary Issues in Communication Science and Disorders*. Vol. 33, 126-137. Retrieved from https://pubs.asha.org/doi/pdf/10.1044/cicsd_33_F_126
7. Maintenance of peace and security of Ukraine, (2024, March 15). *The Security Council Meetings*. Retrieved January 21, 2025, from <https://docs.un.org/en/S/PV.9578>
8. Maintenance of peace and security of Ukraine, (2024, May 14). *The Security Council Meetings*. Retrieved January 17, 2025, from <https://docs.un.org/en/S/PV.9625>
9. Medvid, O. & Podolkova, S. & Vashyst, K.(2024). Linguo-axiological Characteristics of Politico-diplomatic speeches. *Philological Treatises*, 16(1), 156-167. Retrieved from <https://tractatus.sumdu.edu.ua/index.php/journal/article/view/1129>
10. Merriam-Webster.(2025). Deception. In *Merriam-Webster online dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://www.merriamwebster.com/dictionary/deception#:~:text=%3A%20the%20act%20of%20causing%20someone,or%20condition%20of%20being%20deceived>
11. Pavlichenko, L.(2022). Diplomacy: Linguistic Tendencies During the War in Ukraine. *Current Issues in the Humanities*. Vol. 1, 155-163. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/99797385/Diplomacy_Linguistic_Tendencies_During_the_War_in_Ukraine
12. Pokhrel, S.(2020). Diplomatic Language : An Analysis of Salutations from Speeches used in International Diplomacy. *Journal of International Affairs*, 180-193. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/76418881/Diplomatic_Language_An_Analysis_of_Salutations_from_Speeches_used_in_International_Diplomacy
13. The situation in the Middle East, (2024, March 4). *The Security Council Meetings*. Retrieved January 17, 2025, from <https://docs.un.org/en/S/PV.9562>
14. Threats to international peace and security, (2024, April 12). *The Security Council Meetings*. Retrieved January 14, 2025, from <https://docs.un.org/en/S/PV.9601>
15. Threats to international peace and security, (2024, February 12). *The Security Council Meetings*. Retrieved January 20, 2025, from <https://docs.un.org/en/S/PV.9546>
16. Threats to international peace and security, (2024, February 6). *The Security Council Meetings*. Retrieved January 14, 2025, from <https://docs.un.org/en/S/PV.9544>
17. Threats to international peace and security, (2024, January 22). *The Security Council Meetings*. Retrieved January 21, 2025, from <https://docs.un.org/en/S/PV.9533>
18. Yapparova, V.(2019). Verbal Politeness as an Important Tool of Diplomacy. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, p.57-61. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/76702265/Politeness_Politics_and_Diplomacy
19. Zhabotyńska, S.(2006) Posesyvna konstruktsiia i kontseptualni transform. [Possessive construction and conceptual transforms]. *Mova. Liudyna. Svit: do 70-ty richchia prof. M.P. Kocherhana. Zbirnyk naukovykh statei* [Language. Man. World: To the 70th anniversary of prof. M.P. Kocherhan: collection of scientific articles]. 178–192.[in Ukrainian]
20. Zhabotyńska, S.(2011) Leksychni polia y neliniina dynamika kohnityvnykh struktur [Lexical fields and nonlinear dynamics of cognitive structures]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu.Seriia filolohichna*[Bulletin of Lviv University. Philological Series]. Vypusk 52 [Issue 52]. 3–11.[in Ukrainian]

The author declares no competing interests.

* This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)

© The Author 2026

Publisher: Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University, Kyiv, Ukraine

Publishing history: Received 29.03.2026 ; Accepted 26.04.2026; Published 30.05.2026