

Political Stance Using Deixis in Annalena Baerbock's United Nations Speech

 <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v11i4.2947>

*Muhammad Zulfan Adi Putra, Ruminda, Toneng Listiani^{abc} 

¹²³English Literature Department, Faculty of Adab and Humanities, UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: zlfnadptra@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Deictic expressions constitute a fundamental pragmatic mechanism in political communication, yet their role in constructing diplomatic stances within multilateral forums remains underexplored. This study aims to examine how deictic expressions are employed to construct political stance in the closing remarks delivered by Annalena Baerbock, President of the 80th session of the United Nations General Assembly, at the Closing of the General Debate on 29 September 2025 in New York. Employing a descriptive qualitative approach, the data were collected through purposive sampling across three discursive domains: global geopolitical crises, the climate change crisis, and women's rights and gender equality. The data were analyzed using Levinson's (1983) five-type deixis framework and mapped onto Du Bois's (2007) Stance Triangle. The findings reveal that person deixis is the most dominant category, functioning as the primary resource for evaluation, positioning, and alignment. Collectively, deictic expressions serve as a unified rhetorical instrument that transforms bureaucratic discourse into a morally binding call for global action.

Keywords: *Deixis, Political Stance, Pragmatics, Diplomatic Discourse, United Nations Speech*

Article History:

Received 02nd July 2026

Accepted 19th July 2026

Published 31st July 2026



INTRODUCTION

Language functions as a medium for communication and mutual understanding among individuals. Additionally, it signifies social status and acts as a means to reflect social relationships within a community. Without language, people would be unable to communicate or convey messages to others. Analyzing the structural, contextual, and social dimensions of language is essential to understanding its role in communication. Such knowledge aids in overcoming linguistic barriers across various fields, enhances communication strategies, and fosters intercultural comprehension s (Fauzan et al., 2025).

Defined pragmatics as the study of communication meaning and interpretation in a certain situation. It focuses on how context affects the interpretation of meaning in communication. Levinson (1983) underlined that pragmatics is concerned with how the meaning of an utterance is perceived in relation to its context and background. Levinson (1983) also claimed that pragmatics is an inferential process in which speakers and listeners make a conclusion based on what is said and what has been agreed upon previously. Levinson (1983) explained that there are several concepts that help understand how language is used in daily interactions to achieve the speakers intended meaning such as implicature, presupposition, speech acts, and deixis.

Deixis is the most important pragmatic study to facilitate communication. In the study of pragmatics, it certainly involves the interpretation of what people mean in a certain context and how that context is said. In deixis, it can make language have well-organized and effective meaning so that it does not cause different perceptions to the recipient. Deixis can clarify the meaning of a utterance, so that the utterance has a clear meaning for the reader (Rizqi & Sabat, 2022).

However, Levinson (1983) states that deixis concerns the relationship between linguistic forms and their situational contexts. He divides deixis into five main types: person deixis, spatial deixis, temporal deixis, social deixis, and discourse deixis. Person deixis concerns the encoding of the role of participants in the speech event in which the utterance in question is delivered, fundamentally operating through grammatical categories such as first-person pronouns (*I, we*) to index the speaker, second-person pronouns (*you*) to index the addressee, and third-person pronouns (*he, she, they*) to index significant entities that are neither speaker nor addressee (Yule, 1996).

Spatial deixis, or place deixis, concerns the specification of relative locations anchored to the place of utterance, typically manifesting through demonstrative pronouns (*this, that*) and place adverbs (*here, there*) to dynamically differentiate between proximal areas close to the speaker and distal locations situated farther away. Temporal deixis, or time deixis, concerns the encoding of temporal points and spans relative to the precise moment at which an utterance is spoken, structured through pure time adverbs (*now, then*) and calendar-based descriptive expressions (*yesterday, today, tomorrow, by 2030*) to pin down the chronological frame of the discourse.

Social deixis concerns the encoding of social distinctions, power hierarchies, and relative status between participants or social actors mentioned in the speech event, which are linguistically realized through honorifics, titles, and formal institutional forms of address (*Federal Minister, Minister for Foreign Affairs, President*) to signal appropriate social distance or respect. Discourse deixis, or text deixis, concerns the use of linguistic expressions within an utterance to refer to specific, overlapping portions of the unfolding discourse itself, utilizing markers such as *the former, the latter, this sentence, or the opposite* to establish cohesive textual connections and track the progression of arguments.

Understanding these five types of deixis is therefore essential in pragmatic analysis, as it reveals how speakers orient themselves and their listeners in communicative situations. In spoken communication, deixis is one of the most powerful linguistic tools. It not only anchors the speaker and listener within the same contextual frame but also helps manage perspective and reference throughout an interaction. Deictic expressions function as linguistic signposts that guide the audience toward understanding who is being referred to, where the event is taking place, and when the event occurs. In political communication, deixis often carries deeper rhetorical and persuasive functions. Through deictic choices, a political leader can project authority, build solidarity, or create distance between groups. For instance, the pronoun “we” may be used to promote unity and inclusivity, while “they” may serve to highlight division or difference. The strategic use of deixis in speeches allows politicians to influence how the audience perceives both the speaker and the issues being discussed. In this way, deixis becomes a central pragmatic mechanism for constructing meaning, expressing ideology, and shaping social relations.

While deixis provides the linguistic coordinates for a speaker's position, these markers serve a much broader purpose in social interaction, especially in political discourse is take a stance. According to du bois, Stance has the power to assign value to objects of interest, to position social actors with respect to those objects, to calibrate alignment between stancetakers, and to invoke presupposed systems of sociocultural value. This multidimensional power of stance is operationalized through what Du Bois terms the Stance Triangle. This model provides a structural map of the interactional process involving three interconnected components. It begins with evaluation, the act of characterizing an object with a specific quality. This is simultaneously linked to positioning, where the speaker takes a personal stand and claims a social identity based on that evaluation. These two acts culminate in alignment, the crucial dimension where the speaker manages their relationship with the listener, determining whether they are in agreement or opposition within the shared communicative frame.

In the global political arena, language is no longer a mere tool for exchanging information; rather, it functions as an active medium for diplomatic negotiation, power projection, and ideological negotiation. With the increasing complexity of international

relations, national leaders and diplomats have become more active in utilizing public speeches as highly strategic platforms to assert their nation's positions and values. Within a multilateral forum such as the United Nations (UN), speech-making turns into a "highly institutionalized speaking scene" (ZHENG Si-fen & CHEN Yu-lian, 2019). In this specific context, stance-taking becomes exceptionally complex and multidimensional. A speaker does not merely speak on behalf of themselves, but they must simultaneously evaluate global issues, position their state's political identity, and align or disalign with various social actors, ranging from domestic constituents and international allies to geopolitical rivals. Consequently, every linguistic choice carries significant rhetorical weight and real diplomatic consequences.

In navigating this highly institutionalized space, deictic markers serve as a primary pragmatic mechanism through which political actors dynamically calculate sociopolitical distance and proximity. Political speeches and statements are often carefully crafted to convey specific messages, shape public perception, and project a particular image of the speaker or the nation they represent (Rizqi & Sabat, 2022). While Du Bois's Stance Triangle provides the structural map of evaluation, positioning, and alignment, deixis operationalizes these acts by anchoring the speaker within the shared sociocultural and physical context of the discourse. The choice of personal pronouns, for instance, can signify inclusivity or exclusivity, solidarity or distance, thereby constructing a sense of collective identity or defining boundaries between "us" and "them" in global diplomacy (Rizqi & Sabat, 2022). Therefore, examining the interplay between deictic choices and stance-taking in international forums provides a profound insight into how political meaning and diplomatic relations are linguistically constructed.

This research focuses on deixis as it appears in the closing remarks delivered by Annalena Baerbock as President of the 80th session of the United Nations General Assembly. This speech is a particularly compelling object of pragmatic investigation for three interrelated reasons. First, Baerbock's institutional position is unique: unlike foreign ministers or heads of state who speak as representatives of a single nation, the President of the General Assembly speaks in a supranational, institutional capacity on behalf of the entire Assembly, which creates a distinctive pragmatic tension between personal conviction, national background, and institutional neutrality. Second, the speech was delivered at a historically significant juncture, the closing of the General Debate marking the UN's 80th anniversary, amid overlapping global crises (the wars in Gaza, Ukraine, and Sudan, the climate emergency, and setbacks in gender equality), making the stakes of her stance-taking exceptionally high. Third, Baerbock is the first woman from the Western European and Others Group to hold the GA presidency and only the fifth woman to lead the Assembly in its history, a milestone that invites inquiry into how gendered political identity intersects with institutional stance-taking on a global stage. Her speeches often address critical international concerns such as climate change, peacebuilding, and global cooperation. As a prominent female political figure, Baerbock's language choices carry both institutional representation and personal stance. The United Nations, as the setting of her speech, provides an ideal platform for examining the interplay between personal, institutional, and global identities through the lens of deixis. Therefore, investigating her use of deictic expressions allows for a deeper understanding of how she constructs meaning, establishes relationships with her audience, and conveys diplomatic messages in a formal global context.

Several scholarly studies have extensively explored the mechanism of stance-taking within various dimensions of political and public discourse. Methodologically, the operationalization of Du Bois (2007) Stance Triangle framework has been validated in recent literature as a robust tool to decode socio-cognitive and interactive alignments in spoken texts. For instance, Shi et al. (2022) successfully demonstrated the efficacy of integrating the Stance Triangle with conversation analysis to map out how speakers evaluate topics and position themselves dynamically within media interactions. Their study confirms that the three nodes of the stance triangle—evaluation, positioning, and alignment—provide precise systematic parameters for tracking how linguistic markers translate into social actions. However, while their research underscores the methodological strength of Du Bois's framework in collaborative, two-way media setups, its application within the rigid, monologic, and highly

institutionalized arena of international diplomacy still requires further empirical investigation.

In the realm of high-level diplomacy, recent studies have also begun to scrutinize the rhetoric of foreign policy officials. A notable benchmark is the work of Pavlichenko (2024), who conducted a critical discourse analysis on the political speech of Antony Blinken, the United States Secretary of State, during his diplomatic visit to Ukraine. Pavlichenko's study offers crucial insights into how a foreign minister utilizes communicative strategies and polarization discourse markers to take critical stances and calculate geopolitical boundaries. Nevertheless, while Pavlichenko (2024) research provides a vital comparative lens regarding how a state's chief diplomat constructs institutional stances during global crises, it predominantly focuses on a male diplomat utilizing a conventional, power-projection rhetorical framework. It leaves an empirical void concerning how these pragmatic strategies manifest when delivered by a female diplomat who operates under a fundamentally different, value-driven foreign policy paradigm.

This omission becomes even more significant when considering that linguistic choices and stance-taking strategies are inherently intertwined with gender identity and representation. As argued by Rovent a-Frumu şani (2022), women politicians inherently employ distinct grammatical tools, modalities, and speech acts to negotiate their political stances and construct their identities within patriarchal electoral landscapes. Rovent a-Frumu şani's findings emphasize that the intersection of gender identity and stance-taking alters the traditional dynamics of political communication. However, her study focuses on female politicians within the context of domestic presidential electoral campaigns, leaving a gap in understanding how female political actors construct stances when projecting power on a global multilateral stage.

To fully understand how these political stances are operationalized in language, it is essential to examine the pragmatic anchor of discourse, namely deixis. Recent studies have explored the crucial role of deictic markers in mapping social and political relations. For instance, Fauzan et al. (2025) demonstrated how social deixis serves as a powerful linguistic tool to establish authority, reinforce hierarchical structures, and convey respect or familiarity. Yet, their analysis was confined to cinematic dialogue within a fictional narrative (*The Godfather* movie), which differs significantly from the spontaneous yet calculated nature of real-world political rhetoric. On the other hand, the deployment of deixis within actual international forums has been investigated by Rizqi & Sabat (2022), who analyzed how President Joko Widodo strategically utilized deictic expressions during Indonesia's G20 Presidency to shape public perception and define political boundaries. Although Rizqi & Sabat (2022) successfully validated the role of deixis in navigating multilateral diplomacy, their study primarily relied on Yule (1996) framework and stopped at the level of classifying types and calculating statistical frequencies. They did not integrate these deictic choices into a broader system of interactive stance-taking.

In addition, several very recent studies continue to affirm the centrality of person deixis in political speech while remaining confined to national, state-level rhetoric. Abdurrahman & Abdurrahman (2023) examined deixis in Donald Trump's address to the UN General Assembly and found that person deixis constituted 81% of all deictic expressions, functioning to construct unity and assert national interest. A comparable pattern was reported in a 2025 study of Trump's subsequent UNGA address, which found that deictic choices were strategically deployed to personalize achievements and reinforce national and institutional hierarchies. Similarly, a 2025 analysis of Joe Biden's post-election remarks demonstrated how deixis shaped the pragmatic framing of a politically consequential moment. Outside the American context, Safi'i (2025) investigated deixis in the religious-themed speeches of Indonesian President Prabowo Subianto, showing that inclusive person deixis and socially calibrated deictic markers were used to foster solidarity and assert leadership within a culturally specific rhetorical tradition. While these studies confirm that person deixis remains the dominant pragmatic resource in political speech across different national contexts, they consistently analyse male, state-level political actors speaking on behalf of a single nation.

None examine deixis produced by a speaker occupying a supranational institutional role, nor do they connect deictic patterning to the Stance Triangle framework to explain how institutional and gendered stances are jointly constructed. This further substantiates the empirical gap this study seeks to address.

By synthesizing these current state-of-the-art literatures, a distinct and prominent research gap emerges. Prior research either focuses on the methodology of stance-taking in media discourse (Shi et al., 2022), evaluates male foreign ministers under traditional frameworks (Pavlichenko, 2024), examines female politicians only in domestic campaigns (Rovența-Frumușani, 2022), applies social deixis to fictional texts (Fauzan et al., 2025), or limits political deixis analysis to basic frequency classifications (Rizqi & Sabat, 2022). To date, there is a total lack of empirical research that integrates Levinson (1983) comprehensive deixis framework and Du Bois (2007) Stance Triangle to analyze how a female foreign minister – specifically Annalena Baerbock – navigates, calculates, and projects critical political stances at a multilateral international forum like the United Nations. This present study directly addresses this empirical, methodological, and theoretical gap.

METHOD

This research is a qualitative study utilizing a pragmatic approach to investigate political discourse. Following the framework proposed by Creswell & Creswell (2018), a descriptive qualitative approach is adopted because this study focuses on exploring and understanding the complex meanings, social actions, and ideological stances that a group or individual ascribes to a social or political problem. In this context, the approach allows for a deep, contextual interpretation of how language is structurally and pragmatically manipulated to project political ideologies, rather than measuring variables through statistical data. The data for this study consist of linguistic units, specifically utterances containing deictic markers, extracted from the official English speech video recording of the closing remarks delivered by Annalena Baerbock, President of the 80th session of the United Nations General Assembly, at the Closing of the General Debate on 29 September 2025. The recording was obtained from the official United Nations YouTube channel, titled “President of the General Assembly Closes United Nations General Debate, 80th Session”, and was independently transcribed by the researcher. To ensure the accuracy of the transcription, the resulting written text was verified by repeatedly replaying the video and cross-checking each utterance against the speaker's actual spoken delivery, so that the transcript faithfully captured impromptu remarks, emphasis, and any minor departures from a prepared script.

The research instrument utilized in this study is the researcher themselves as the primary human instrument, supported by data sheets and coding protocols to maintain analytical consistency. In collecting the data, an observational and non-participatory technique was applied through several systematic steps: repeated reading of the transcripts, cross-checking the written text with the video recordings of the speeches to ensure contextual accuracy, and identifying, highlighting, and documenting all utterances that contained deictic features.

For data analysis, this study adopted the qualitative interactive model proposed by Miles et al. (2014), which consists of three concurrent flows of activity: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing or verification. In the data reduction phase, the collected deictic expressions were selected, focused, and classified into five major types (person, spatial, temporal, social, and discourse deixis) based on Levinson (1983) framework. Next, in the data display phase, the categorized deictic data were contextualized and mapped into Du Bois (2007) Stance Triangle framework to examine how these pragmatic coordinates dynamically realize the acts of evaluation (characterizing the diplomatic object), positioning (claiming a political identity), and alignment (calibrating the relationship with global actors). Finally, conclusions were drawn by synthesizing the patterns of deictic choices to explain the underlying value-driven or feminist foreign policy stances projected by Baerbock on the multilateral stage.

The data in this study were selected using a purposive sampling technique. This non-random sampling method was strategically employed because the investigation strictly focuses on critical global issues within the international political landscape rather than analyzing the entire transcript indiscriminately. The selection criterion was thematic: an utterance was included in the corpus if it fell within one of the three major issues that Baerbock herself explicitly raised and addressed in the body of her speech, namely global geopolitical crises, the climate change crisis, and women's rights and gender equality. Utterances devoted to matters outside these three thematic areas, such as opening greetings, procedural remarks, or expressions of institutional gratitude, were excluded from the corpus, since they fell outside the specific issues the speech itself foregrounded. Consequently, three distinct, high-stakes discursive domains were isolated for pragmatic analysis: (1) Global Geopolitical Crises, (2) The Climate Change Crisis, and (3) Women's Rights and Gender Equality. By utilizing purposive sampling, the dataset ensures that the selected deictic expressions are richly embedded within contexts where the speaker dynamically executes evaluation, positioning, and alignment on behalf of national and global interests.

After isolating the three discursive domains through purposive sampling, the data were analyzed using a qualitative-pragmatic approach. First, deictic expressions were classified based on Levinson (1983) five-type framework. Second, these coded expressions were mapped onto Du Bois (2007) Stance Triangle to interpret how evaluation, positioning, and alignment are discursively achieved.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The pragmatic landscape of Annalena Baerbock's United Nations address is structurally anchored by an interconnected network of deictic expressions. Rather than treating these expressions as isolated grammatical markers, this analysis approaches them as dynamic rhetorical resources that enable the speaker to negotiate diplomatic distance and proximity. Within the discourse, person deixis and social deixis function as the primary pragmatic resources used to actively shift political identity, establish collective responsibility, and cross-align global actors within the multilateral forum. These subjective pointers are systematically reinforced by spatial and temporal coordinates that ground the geopolitical urgency of the message.

To demonstrate the intricate interplay between pragmatic coordinates and political rhetoric, this section analyzes critical discursive units extracted from the UNGA 80th session closing address. For each of the three discursive domains, the analysis proceeds in two systematic stages. First, all five categories of deixis proposed by Levinson (1983), person, spatial, temporal, social, and discourse deixis, are identified and classified in full, using multiple representative instances drawn directly from the speech, so that the complete deictic architecture of each excerpt is established before any interpretive claim is made. Second, once this classification is complete, the five categories are jointly mapped onto Du Bois (2007) Stance Triangle to explain how they combine, not in isolation, but as a coordinated system, to accomplish evaluation, positioning, and alignment. Theoretically, the Stance Triangle framework demonstrates that stance-taking does not occur in a vacuum; rather, it is a public social act achieved dialogically through clear communicative means (Du Bois, 2007; Zheng & Chen, 2019). This structure involves three primary entities, the first subject, the second subject, and a shared object of stance, as well as three complementary actions: evaluation, positioning, and alignment. Through this interactive process, speakers not only express personal opinions but also actively construct, maintain, and negotiate social relationships and sociocultural values with their audience (Niemelä, 2014; Zheng & Chen, 2019).

Global Geopolitical Crises

"Across the week, certain themes resonated above all others. Chief among them, peace and security. Gaza, Ukraine, Sudan, and the many forgotten ones. The clear message was member states must do more to protect and feed starving civilians in

Gaza, to return peace to Ukraine, to protect women and girls in Sudan. This organization is only as strong as our collective will to uphold the principles of our charter and international law. And when we do, progress follows. Monday's high-level international conference on the peaceful settlement of the question of Palestine demonstrated clearly that what happens in this hall matters. The conference, coupled with the New York declaration, showed diplomatic movement on an issue long considered immovable. But while we are gaining traction politically on the ground, the situation remains catastrophic and unacceptable. The real test now is whether the momentum generated here can be translated into tangible measures in and for Gaza – an immediate ceasefire, humanitarian aid for civilians, and the realization of the two-state solution for both Israelis and Palestinians."

Systematic Classification of Deictic Categories

Person Deixis: This category is realized through two complementary forms. The inclusive first-person plural *"we"* and *"our"* in *"our collective will"*, *"when we do"*, and *"we are gaining traction"* bind the speaker together with the member states into a single institutional agent held jointly responsible for progress. Conversely, the third-person plural *"them"* and the indefinite expression *"the many forgotten ones"* index the anonymous civilian victims of the crises named, without assigning them individual voice.

Spatial Deixis: A proximal-distal contrast structures this excerpt. The proximal markers *"in this hall"* and *"here"* (in *"the momentum generated here"*) anchor diplomatic progress to the immediate physical location of the General Assembly, while the distal marker *"in and for Gaza"* points to the remote site where the actual humanitarian consequences unfold.

Temporal Deixis: Time is anchored through *"Across the week"* and *"Monday's"*, which bound the series of high-level summits within a specific, immediate historical timeframe, sharpened by the proximal temporal adverb *"now"* in *"The real test now"*, which collapses that timeframe into an urgent present demand.

Social Deixis: The formal institutional address *"member states"* marks the audience's legal and diplomatic status within the international hierarchy, while the paired national identities *"Israelis and Palestinians"* index the two collectivities directly implicated in the peace settlement being called for.

Discourse Deixis: Two cohesive markers structure the excerpt. *"This organization"* refers back anaphorically to the United Nations introduced earlier in the address, while *"The conference"* in the later sentence refers back to *"Monday's high-level international conference"* mentioned immediately before it, tying the two sentences into a single evaluative argument.

Stance-Taking Interpretation

Having established the complete deictic inventory above, these five categories can now be seen to operate jointly, rather than in isolation, to construct Baerbock's institutional stance toward the geopolitical crises. On the axis of Evaluation, person deixis (*"the many forgotten ones"*) combines with the proximal-distal spatial contrast between *"in this hall"/"here"* and *"in and for Gaza"*, and with the temporal shift from *"Across the week"* to the urgent *"now"*, to assign a starkly negative moral value to the gap between diplomatic comfort and catastrophic reality on the ground. On the axis of Positioning, discourse deixis (*"This organization"*, *"The conference"*) ties institutional continuity directly to tangible diplomatic outcomes, positioning the speaker as an authoritative, objective synthesizer of global diplomatic progress. On the axis of Alignment, social deixis (*"member states"*, *"Israelis and Palestinians"*) fuses with inclusive person deixis (*"we"*, *"our"*) to bind the audience into shared responsibility for translating momentum into concrete relief, thereby eliminating the possibility of passive neutrality.

The Climate Change Crisis

"Dozens of delegations spoke on the impacts of climate change and the ticking clock we face in delivering on the sustainable development goals by 2030. That clock does not stop while we are here in this room. I don't know if you were in the hall, but as the prime minister of the Bahamas was delivering his remarks here, his country back home was bracing for the landfall of the cyclone. It's happening now. Climate

Political Stance Using Deixis in Annalena Baerbock's United Nations Speech

crisis won't stop if you deny it. The climate crisis is the biggest security threat in this century. We face it together, or we suffer alone... Last year alone, investment in renewable energy amounted to two trillion US dollars... I commend member states who joined the UN climate summit and pledged stronger, more ambitious climate targets in the light of COP30... Investing in green technologies and fighting the climate crisis is our best security protection."

Systematic Classification of Deictic Categories

Person Deixis: Multiple person markers structure this excerpt. The inclusive first-person plural *"we"* in *"we face it together"* binds speaker and audience into a shared in-group confronting a common threat, while the second-person pronoun *"you"* appears twice, first rhetorically (*"I don't know if you were in the hall"*) and then accusingly (*"if you deny it"*), directly implicating individual delegates. The first-person singular *"I"* in *"I commend member states"* additionally marks the speaker's personal, evaluative authority.

Spatial Deixis: A sustained proximal-distal opposition is constructed through *"here in this room"* and *"in the hall"* on one side, versus the distal expression *"back home"* (referring to the Bahamas) on the other, spatially juxtaposing the safety of the UN chamber against the vulnerability of a distant nation.

Temporal Deixis: Several temporal anchors are layered: the future calendar target *"by 2030"* (the SDG deadline), the proximal adverb *"now"* (*"It's happening now"*), and the retrospective marker *"Last year alone"*, which together compress a decade-long policy horizon into a single, urgent present moment.

Social Deixis: The formal title *"the prime minister of the Bahamas"* signals high political status and diplomatic standing, while *"member states"* again marks the collective institutional audience being called to account.

Discourse Deixis: The demonstrative phrase *"That clock"* anaphorically tracks back to *"the ticking clock"* introduced in the previous sentence, and the pronoun *"It"* in *"It's happening now"* refers back to the unfolding cyclone disaster just narrated, tightly binding the two sentences into a single dramatic sequence.

Stance-Taking Interpretation

With the full set of deictic categories established, their combined function in constructing stance becomes clear. On the axis of **Evaluation**, the spatial contrast between *"here in this room"* and *"back home"*, reinforced by the temporal collapse of *"by 2030"* into *"now"*, casts a severe negative value on the detached bureaucratic safety of the UN headquarters set against the immediate ecological devastation faced by vulnerable island nations. On the axis of **Positioning**, social deixis (*"the prime minister of the Bahamas"*) combines with discourse deixis (*"That clock"*, *"It"*) to position the speaker as an objective observer who exposes global vulnerability, demonstrating, through tight textual cohesion, that even elite world leaders are not exempt from climate disaster. On the axis of **Alignment**, the inclusive pronoun *"we"* and the confrontational *"you"* work as complementary tools: *"we"* fosters institutional solidarity around a shared threat, while *"you"* narrows the distance to the individual conscience of each delegate, together closing off any comfortable, non-committal stance toward the climate crisis.

Women's Rights and Gender Equality

"Age-old biases are being perpetuated by algorithms, as you can see, for example, when 99% of sexual related deepfakes are targeting women... Yet, as we also heard and saw on Monday, celebration of 30 years since Beijing, when female leaders spoke, one after the other, there's power in joining forces, in taking the right course at the crossroads and doing the right thing. So many strong female presidents, many the first of their country, all reminded us that women's rights are the yardstick of freedom of a society. If women are not free, eventually no one will be free. But the opposite is also true. If women are free, finally everyone will be free."

Systematic Classification of Deictic Categories

Person Deixis: The inclusive pronoun *"us"* in *"reminded us"* indexes the entire General Assembly as a single collective witness, while the universal indefinite pronouns *"no one"* and

"everyone" extend this personal reference beyond the room to encompass all of humanity. The inclusive "we" in "we also heard and saw" further marks the speaker and delegates as shared perceivers of the same historical moment.

Spatial Deixis: Territorial reference is constructed indirectly through the possessive phrase "their country", marking the sovereign, geographically dispersed origins of the female leaders referenced, in contrast to the shared physical space of the Assembly.

Temporal Deixis: Time is indexed through the anniversary marker "30 years since Beijing", anchoring the moment historically, and the paired conditional adverbs "eventually" and "finally", which project cause-and-effect consequences forward in time.

Social Deixis: The identity markers "female leaders" and "female presidents" index high political status specifically inflected by gender, marking a deliberate departure from gender-neutral institutional titles used elsewhere in the speech.

Discourse Deixis: The cohesive phrase "the opposite" refers back to the entire preceding conditional premise ("If women are not free..."), restructuring it into its logical inverse within a single textual move.

Stance-Taking Interpretation

Read together, these five categories reveal how the gender equality discourse achieves a distinctive, universalizing stance. On the axis of Evaluation, the shift from the collective "us" to the universal indefinite pronouns "no one" and "everyone", reinforced by the conditional temporal pair "eventually"/ "finally", asserts that women's liberation carries an absolute value determining the freedom of all humanity, not merely a sectional interest. On the axis of Positioning, social deixis ("female presidents", "female leaders") combines with the historical temporal anchor ("30 years since Beijing") to position the speaker as a progressive ally explicitly voicing a feminist foreign policy stance within a traditionally male-dominated diplomatic space. On the axis of Alignment, discourse deixis ("the opposite") mirrors the conditional structure to construct an airtight logical argument, while spatial deixis ("their country") universalizes the claim across national boundaries, together forcing the audience to align with women's rights as a precondition for, rather than a subset of, global freedom.

Having analyzed the three distinct discursive units, this section synthesizes how the strategic deployment of deictic expressions structurally enables the speaker to execute a unified, overarching political stance across different global issues. The qualitative data demonstrate that the choice of deictic coordinates is not accidental, but rather a deliberate rhetorical strategy. Across all three areas, namely Geopolitics (Data 1), Climate (Data 2), and Women's Rights (Data 3), the speaker consistently creates a linguistic tension between proximal coordinates ("here", "in this room", "today") and distal coordinates ("Gaza", "back home in the Bahamas", "their country"). In the geopolitical and climate discourses, this juxtaposition forces the audience to bring distant suffering into the immediate physical space of institutional accountability. Conversely, the empirical data reveal that spatial and temporal deixis appear with significantly lower frequency, typically confined to narrative framing or specific illustrative examples. In these instances, the physical space of the hall is successfully transformed from a neutral, administrative room into a collective moral mirror. When mapped comprehensively onto Du Bois (2007) framework, the three domains converge into a single, cohesive institutional stance. The speaker's evaluation consistently upgrades existential threats such as war, climate disaster, and systemic subjugation into immediate moral tests for the international community. This evaluative act is structurally supported by the speaker's positioning as an objective, authoritative synthesizer who sits at the center of global diplomacy. Consequently, the final act of alignment operates through a cascading effect: by addressing the audience through social deixis ("member states") and inclusive person deixis ("we" or "us"), the speaker eliminates the possibility of diplomatic neutrality. This comprehensive integration underscores how stance alignment functions as a dynamic ideological mechanism, allowing the speaker to strategically build a unified institutional identity that bridges disparate geopolitical crises into a coherent, values-driven diplomatic agenda (Shi et al., 2022).

This overarching alignment is dynamically manifested across the three discursive domains through distinct pragmatic configurations that merge language with international responsibility. In the domain of global crises, the speaker utilizes social and spatial deixis to demand collective state accountability, forcing national leaders to confront international humanitarian law within the immediate physical space of the United Nations. This structural approach is seamlessly maintained in the climate change discourse, where the strategic deployment of temporal and spatial coordinates disrupts traditional bureaucratic detachment, compelling the assembly to face the immediate ecological devastation of vulnerable nations. Finally, this values-driven framework culminates in the discourse on gender equality, where person and social deixis are combined to elevate women's rights from a localized policy debate into a universal metric of global freedom. Consequently, this comprehensive integration underscores how stance alignment functions as a dynamic ideological mechanism, allowing the speaker to strategically build a unified institutional identity that bridges disparate geopolitical crises into a coherent, values-driven diplomatic agenda (Shi et al., 2022).

In conclusion, the pragmatic architecture of the UNGA 80th session closing address relies on deictic markers to strip away the geographical and bureaucratic distance that often paralyzes international diplomacy. By shifting identities, anchoring spaces, and accelerating time, the speaker successfully operationalizes the Stance Triangle to transform a standard administrative closing speech into a powerful, legally and morally binding call for unified global action.

CONCLUSIONS

This study concludes that deictic expressions in the closing address of the 80th United Nations General Assembly function as a central pragmatic mechanism for constructing institutional stance and promoting collective responsibility on global issues. Person and social deixis establish a shared institutional identity, while spatial and temporal deixis connect the assembly to distant conflicts, environmental crises, and human rights concerns, transforming an administrative address into an urgent moral appeal. Integrating Levinson's (1983) deixis framework with Du Bois's (2007) Stance Triangle demonstrates that deictic categories work as an interconnected system of evaluation, positioning, and alignment, extending the Stance Triangle from dialogic interaction to formal diplomatic monologue. The study also addresses an empirical gap by examining how a female foreign minister constructs diplomatic authority within a multilateral setting. Practically, the findings provide diplomats, speechwriters, and discourse analysts with a replicable framework for understanding how strategic deictic choices strengthen authority, solidarity, and accountability in political communication. Overall, the research highlights that deictic expressions function not merely as grammatical devices but as persuasive tools that shape political responsibility and reinforce international commitments to human security.

REFERENCES

- Abdurrahman, I. B., & Abdurrahman, R. B. (2023). A pragmatic analysis of deixis in political speeches: Donald Trump UN General Assembly speech: A case study. *Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities*, 30(5(2)), 39–58. <https://doi.org/10.25130/jtuh.30.5.2.2023.20>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Du Bois, J. W. (2007). The Stance Triangle. In R. Englebreton (Ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction* (pp. 139–182). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.164.07du>
- Fauzan, M., Ruminda, R., & Listiani, T. (2025). Social Deixis in The Godfather Movie. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 10(2), 253–261. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v10i2.738>
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatic*.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data analysis A methods Sourcebook* (3th editio). Sage Publications.

- Niemelä, M. (2014). *Interpersonal Interaction in Multimodal Settings*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Pavlichenko, L. (2024). "We're far from your only friend": Stance taking in political speech. *Bulletin of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv: Literary Studies, Linguistics, Folklore Studies*, 2(36), 76–79. <https://doi.org/10.17721/1728-2659.2024.36.1>
- Rizqi, M., & Sabat, Y. (2022). a Deixis Analysis in Joko Widodo'S Statement on Indonesia'S G20 Presidency. *Journal of English Language and Culture*, 13(1), 24–33. <https://doi.org/10.30813/jelc.v13i1.3569>
- Roventă-Frumușani, D. (2022). Stance taking, gender identity, and Romanian women politicians in presidential electoral campaigns. *Anthropological Researches and Studies*, 12(1), 212–224. <https://doi.org/10.26758/12.1.15>
- Safi'i, M. (2025). Deixis in Prabowo's religious-themed speeches: A pragmatic analysis. *International Journal of English and Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 42–49. <https://doi.org/10.47709/ijeal.v5i1.5780>
- Shi, X., Wu, J., & Wei, L. (2022). Stance taking in news interviews: An application of stance triangle and conversation analysis. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 12(2), 188–206. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2022.122015>
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*.
- Zheng, S., & Chen, Y. (2019). The projection of China's national image in President Xi Jinping's speeches. *Journal of Literature and Art Studies*, 9(3), 354–361. <https://doi.org/10.17265/2159-5836/2019.03.011>
- ZHENG Si-fen, & CHEN Yu-lian. (2019). The Projection of China's National Image in President Xi Jinping's Speeches. *Journal of Literature and Art Studies*, 9(3), 354–361. <https://doi.org/10.17265/2159-5836/2019.03.011>