Ambiguity and Power in Diplomatic Discourse: A Linguistic Analysis of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 2650 (2022), Lebanon

───────────────────────────────────

Ibrahim Srour[*]

Abstract

Precision of language in resolution drafting is highly required because the whole intended meaning can be changed by ambiguous referents or unclear connotations. Taking this notion as its basis, the present research article aims to examine the UN resolutions and in particular, the United Nations Security Council Resolution on Lebanon S/RES/2650 (2022) with respect to specific linguistic features and language levels. The features include the use of lexis, nouns, adjectives, at the levels of syntax, semantics, pragmatics, in addition to the utilization of language ambiguity. Hence, the goal is to expose the ambiguity that exists at these levels in order to reveal, at the level of interpretation, the power of the UN and whether it praises, breaches or works in accordance with the sovereignty of the country. The article is qualitative, descriptive in nature, and adopts Bhatia's (1993) notion of 'unfamiliar genre', Halliday and Hasan's (2013) concept of Context of Situation, Pehar's (2011) theory of power-leading ambiguity, and his classification of ambiguity (Pehar, 2001, 2005). The findings show that, despite the respect of Lebanon's sovereignty, the UN uses language in a significant way in order to either reveal or conceal information and identity through particular linguistic choices and ambiguity (in its three categories). Thus, whether through word choice or ambiguity, the UN gains dominance over any party included in its resolutions.

Keywords: United Nations, Lebanon, Ambiguity, Diplomatic Discourse, Power.

1. Introduction

Through a speech community, social members engage in interaction and communication with one another by means of a variety of genres, and the genre type is determined by the topic of

───────────────
[*] A Professor of Applied Linguistics & Literature (English Department - Faculty of Letters and Human Sciences I - Unesco)
Ibrahim.srour@ul.edu.lb

conversation among the social members. The communication purpose that a genre aims to serve defines its notion of genre, and it is this shared purpose that gives the genre its internal structure. In this respect, the reader perceives a 'different' genre depending on any significant shift in the communicative objective; for instance, drama is one genre and a diplomatic exchange is an entirely distinct genre.

Genre employs "conventionalized knowledge of linguistic and discursive resources" (Bhatia, 1993, p. 16). The knowledge that is conventionalized includes both genre-specific norms as well as linguistic and discoursal conventions. Therefore, experts in any academic or professional group need to be aware of the communication objectives. As a result, any writer or expert who writes in a genre must follow the rules established by the genre itself as well as the culture in which they live. Furthermore, the idea behind "a different genre" (Bhatia, 1993, p. 17) is that genres vary because of particular components or traits. These genres are referred to as "unfamiliar" because they are ambiguous to readers.

Bhatia (1993) referred to the idea of "a different genre" as "unfamiliar" because it is typified by certain distinguishing characteristics. That is, it has a language type that is different from the language used in daily interactions and communication, as well as in activities that social members engage in on a daily basis, like reading an email or a journal. Legal language, often known as "The Language of the Law" (Bhatia, 1993, p. 100), is one of the various genres that Bhatia provides instances of simultaneously, is incorporated into the language of diplomatic communication. One context in which this terminology is employed in is by the diplomatic members or organs of the United Nations, i.e., the experts in the field of politics and diplomacy. Thus, these members form a speech community that is referred to as "diplomatic" and share a specific set of communicative purposes. The laws or resolutions that are passed by the organs fall under the category of legal texts, whose language is referred to as "diplomatic", and which has a specific purpose: to communicate a decision made by the UN members during their assembly and following an array of negotiations.

Persuasion, deception, and determination are the three main components of diplomatic discourse, according to Pimentel and Panke (2020). One of the ideas that contributes to creating the public perceptions of countries and making their universal statuary visible on a global scale is diplomatic discourse. The establishment of diplomatic discourse can be attributed to power imbalances and ongoing battles among nations through international relations. The authors define diplomatic discourse

> …as a genre that illustrates and enables political negotiations, and that allows the identification of alliances and bargaining games…. the strategic use of discourses addresses issues of identity and public image in a complex set of meanings shared by various political subjects (p. 56).

Furthermore, Pimentel and Panke (2020) demonstrated how the construction of a political or diplomatic narrative is based on concepts of certain language features and tactics such as argumentative and persuasive styles, and rhetorical devices. The goal is to persuade a specific nation in a conflict into a political accord and philosophy, or to position it in relation to another nation or national and international political bodies. It's interesting to note that Linguistics, History, Forensic Linguistics, International Communication as well as Political Science, among other disciplines, put under their lens of research scrutiny, the diplomatic texts (Santos, 2014; Martin, 2015; Pimentel and Panke, 2020).

2. General Notions about Power and Diplomatic Language

Power has gained many definitions by various scholars such as Fairclough (2010), Van Dijk (1998), and Nye (2004). As such, there are two types of power: The hard power and the soft power. In either one, powerful people are the ones who dominate and control. According to Van Dijk (1993) the elites play a significant role in power which is attained through access to and control of many resources especially the financial ones. So, if one has the upper hand in controlling the finances, one can achieve almost any goal. Of the various goals there is the control of media. Through media, Van Dijk (1993) believed that the elites can gear how the events are reported, which in turn can shape how the audience perceives a particular event or a situation. Here, media control helps the Elite to also control the social members who reside at home because of what they are viewing and listening to.

Furthermore, the elites can utilize media (whether written or audio visual) in order to make decisions, issue statements, and literally to pump specific ideologies into society. Such a notion of being an elite is related to one's social position and role. So, elitism is not only restricted to wealthy people or politicians per se, but it is a label which is also used for diplomats. Diplomatic personnel possess power but it is one of the soft type. The diplomats' power tends to be away from the hard and the physical mode. Thus, it is a type of power that is gained through words whether in speech or writing. That is, diplomats achieve power through language which is of a particular type. This is referred to as the language of diplomacy or diplomatic language (Mehtiyev, 2010)

Diplomatic language cannot aid the diplomats if their countries are not on good terms diplomatically and the opposite is true. Good diplomacy is knitted by the international crafters who are the diplomats. Accordingly, the diplomats' knowledge and command of language are what pave the way for good or 'not good' diplomacy and diplomatic relations among the countries. Therefore, the diplomat must be skilled at speaking, reading, writing, and listening in a foreign common language such as the English language. In addition to these skills, the diplomat must possess a short interpretation ability in order to see what is and what is not in language, during a diplomatic meeting or other diplomatic encounters. Hence, a diplomat cannot effectively achieve the desired diplomatic

effect unless there is ample knowledge of the ins and outs of the designated language with respect to the diplomatic discourse. D'Acquisto (2017) posited that such a knowledge enables the drafters of diplomatic documents to navigate through the intricacies of language in order to achieve a specific political or diplomatic purpose, which is attained through manipulating language by means of ambiguous terms and expressions.

3. Language, Diplomacy, and Politics

Ismailova, et al. (2020) discussed the relation between language and diplomacy by defining the term 'diplomacy' as:

1. Science and the art of politics and negotiations on behalf of their state;

2. A complex concept, which includes the representation of a state, including the institution of foreign affairs or all foreign political agents;

3. Secret diplomacy which is the work or profession of a World War diplomat (p. 808).

The authors considered that there are two fundamental ideas in the language employed in diplomacy. Firstly, this type of language is only used in formal diplomatic documents, such as resolutions, treaties, and truces. Secondly, it has its own set of conventions, vocabulary, sentence construction, and idioms that are particular to the diplomatic domain. These then combine to form the accepted and widely used diplomatic vocabulary. The diplomat therefore possesses and is knowledgeable of diplomatic language which is an efficient symbolic weaponry. Therefore, the background, the cognitive, psychological, cultural, and personal knowledge of the diplomatic personnel must all be communicated through diplomatic language. This explanation is due to the fact that diplomatic language has its own unique set of rules, cultural significance, grammatical constructions as well as stylistic and pragmatic elements.

According to Polyakova et al. (2020), Political Linguistics is the field that studies diplomacy and language use. This indicates that since diplomatic language is political, it should be viewed and handled as such. Mehtiyev (2010) posited that language use in diplomacy is of utmost importance since language is not always an instrument for clarification. Language thus represents the fundamental nature of diplomacy as an occupation. As a result, in the event that the diplomats come from various countries and speak different mother tongues, they will need to use an officially recognized language in order to interact with one another; an example is the English language.

Arkelyan and Avetyan (2017) stated that there are three things that politics and diplomacy have in common: effective communication, conducting negotiations, and reaching an agreement. The authors considered that there is a connection between politics and diplomacy. They asserted that whereas politics deals with internal political issues and foreign policy, diplomacy is typically seen as a subset of politics that works with peace (Arkelyan and Avetyan, 2017, p. 6). As for Kenzhekanova

(2015), she presented a definition of political discourse as "a collection of all speech acts, as well as public law, tradition, and experience, which is determined and expressed in the form of verbal formations, content, subject, and the addressee of which belongs to the sphere of politics" (p. 193).

Regardless of what the listener or recipient understands of the message, Pascual (2001) contended that the unspoken is actually the most important part of a diplomatic statement. This is due to the fact that a lot of what is not spoken stays hidden until the recipient interprets the message in order to understand its intended meaning. Accordingly, comprehending the speaker's goal, the modality used, the implied meaning, the hints, the presumption, the rhetorical components, the context of communication and content, as well as the unstated, wherein all are crucial to determining the ambiguity of a diplomatic discourse. These are significant because without them, the message being conveyed is unintelligible.

As a result, these discourses of the aforementioned fields of study rely heavily on the application of language elements such as syntax, stylistics, and semantics. This can be seen in political and diplomatic documents. When dealing with diplomatic or political communication, word choice is seen as having the highest importance, regardless of the format as in diplomatic narratives, correspondence, memoranda, resolutions, truces, or negotiations. Every choice made at a specific linguistic level (rhetorical, morphological, semantic, or syntactic) influences how the reader interprets the text. Thus, in order to achieve a certain diplomatic goal, the language eclecticism can change or steer the reader's response in the speaker's preferred diplomatic direction.

The language used in international official documents and communication is one of the most important issues during diplomatic relations and negotiations. The United Nations (UN) resolution, which is a written text approved by a UN body, is one of the official documents. Resolutions may be passed by any UN body, although in reality, the Security Council and the General Assembly *are* the ones who adopt most of them (UN, 2001). In this respect, Mullany (2002) viewed that the function of diplomatic documents such as UN resolutions is to "serve as a means for interstate communication. Therefore, the language in which treaties and official diplomatic documents are written affects how widely and deeply treaty obligations are understood and, hence, followed" (Mullany, 2002, p. 3).

4. Aims of Diplomatic Discourse

Foreign affairs and international relations among states, nations, and regions are topics covered in diplomatic discourse which embodies diplomacy and diplomatic organizations. It has the following particular attributes. Legislation is drafted at the State or international level (Rana, 2000). It expresses the choices made by a nation on a certain matter through decrees or resolutions. Furthermore, it serves as the foundation for peace agreements which are enforceable international contracts under the supervision of an international body. Diplomatic discourse possesses the

legislative authority of an international organization and it makes use of oral genres including international problem analysis, negotiations, and organizational resolution. Lastly, it contains a variety of formal fixed language that is related to political or legal debate.

According to Sharp (2009), political discourse is the category under which diplomatic language falls, since it encompasses diplomatic speech. Politicians, foreign policy analysts, and diplomats all make use of the concept of historical comparison. The goal is to bolster the political or diplomatic case so that the other party or diplomat will accept the expressed viewpoints. In the diplomatic dialogue, public diplomacy plays an active role. The goal of public diplomacy is to persuade the general public to accept a particular viewpoint that a politician or diplomat has stated by influencing their behavior, opinions, and responses.

Di Carlo (2015) demonstrateed how ambiguity, expressed through the use of "weasel words," is a common feature of both legal and diplomatic discourse. Since both legal and diplomatic speech are confined to the official language and diplomacy spheres, they cannot be separated from one another. UN resolutions on specific acts pertaining to war, expose this kind of ambiguity in diplomatic discourse; the most important grammatical components that convey ambiguity are nouns and phrases. As a result, she believes that the UN uses ambiguity and weasel language as a political tool for deceit and manipulation.

According to Topala (2014), "voice" is a trait that diplomatic language uses. The intended political message must be communicated using this feature. The active voice is often preferred in diplomatic writing, yet when discussing delicate subjects, diplomats will occasionally use the passive form. The passive voice is meant to conceal the agent, a concept that occasionally causes ambiguity and makes the text difficult to understand. "Modals like 'may', or expressions like 'must be denied', and passives like 'is needed' are a few examples of words that produce vagueness" (Topala, 2014, p. 311). Therefore, the idea that the doer might be a society as a whole or a group at large is revealed by the lack of agency.

According to Kappeler (2013), persuasion is the fundamental building block of diplomatic language, whether it is used in treaties or negotiations. Persuasion is used by diplomats, whether they are representing a nation or a member of an international organization. Actually, persuasion is the foundation of negotiation, and the role of the diplomat is to convince the other side to embrace a particular viewpoint that serves the interests of the diplomat's nation (Ricento, 2018; Berridge, 2015) The goal of persuasion for a diplomat is to resolve a dispute, prevent conflict, or come to an agreement with the recipients. Therefore, the diplomat engages in bilateral discussions, acts independently, serves as a mediator, or participates in multilateral processes of negotiation in order to achieve the greatest persuasive effect (Kappeler, 2013, p. 15). Hence, we consider that the main aims of diplomatic discourse are first, to make diplomats accept other diplomats' expressed point of view.

Second, to persuade the masses into consenting to a specific standpoint, whether political or diplomatic. Third, it is a decisive tool for manipulation, deception, and concealment of agency. Accordingly, all of the mentioned aims amalgamate together in order to enable the user of diplomatic discourse to act in a designated manner and maneuver the 'listener' into behaving or thinking in a way that best suits the user's diplomatic goals.

5. Related Studies

Scherzinger (2024) examined how rhetoric can secure action by utilizing techniques from automated text analytics. Schimmelfennig's explanation of rhetorical trapping is the foundation for this work. The author utilizes two methods so as to explain how language and action in the UN Security Council are related. According to the investigation, the term "terrorism" is linked to a decline in the likelihood of involvement, whereas the usage of "human rights" continually corresponds to an increase in the likelihood of authorization of force. The finding raises the possibility that some phrases and lexical items could backfire normatively in addition to having the quality of entrapment or being empty.

Wang et al. (2023) investigated how UNFCCC Executive Secretaries subtly argue positions and express stances in speeches on climate change by utilizing concessive but-constructions and linguistic diversity. Their research shows that UNFCCC speeches to 'Parties to the Convention and Stakeholders' highlight the pressing need for coordinated efforts on climate change while subtly expressing dissatisfaction and moderate critique of multiple Parties and Stakeholders for not succeeding to do what is necessary in support of such action. This is in line with the organization's goals for equitable climate governance while complying with ethical and diplomatic principles.

The UN Security Council's reaction to the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIL) is examined critically via the lens of gendered discourse analysis by Bird (2022). The emphasis is on how personification functions to establish legal subjects in the Council's resolutions on Iraq as states (persons). Drawing on gender-specific normativities typically obscured by supposedly objective legal standards regarding state construction, the Council defines ISIL as a hypermasculine and barbarous terrorist group in contrast to Iraq. Despite being established according to the predominant framework for statehood, which is based on liberal, democratic Westphalian principles, the state of Iraq remains vulnerable to the Security Council's fatherhood.

International legal papers relevant to international courts and international law are investigated by Bekele (2021). He contends that it is challenging to define terrorism in this way. In this respect, he analyzes the Special Tribunal for Lebanon's (STL) definition of terrorism. Bekele (2021) emphasized the significance of the STL definition since it incorporates ideas of what constitutes terrorism from numerous UN resolutions and treaties. The results show that the most

recent definition is found in UN Security Council Resolution 1566 (2004), which was approved and then further altered by the STL. Because it is based on a thorough examination of state national laws, treaties, and UN resolutions, this definition of the term must be recognized as an international one.

6. Aim and Methodology

The precision of language in resolution drafting is highly demanded since the whole intended meaning can be altered by vague referents or ambiguous connotations. In this manner, the present article aims to examine the linguistic features of UN resolutions dedicated to a particular Middle East country which is Lebanon. The features include the use of lexis, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics, in addition to the utilization of ambiguity. Thus, the purpose is to expose the ambiguity that resides the United Nations Security Council Resolution on Lebanon S/RES/2650 (2022) at the afore-mentioned levels in order to reveal, at the level of interpretation, the power of the UN and whether it praises, breaches or works in accordance with the sovereignty of the country.

The present article is qualitative and descriptive in nature. It tends to describe language use in a selected UN resolution so as to reveal notions of power. Moreover, the article adopts Bhatia's (1993) notion of 'unfamiliar genre', Halliday and Hasan's (2013) concept of Context of Situation, and Pehar's (2011) theory of power-leading ambiguity as well as his classification of ambiguity (Pehar, 2001, 2005).

According to Pehar (2001), ambiguity can occur in a word, a sentence, or a collection of sentences at any discoursal level. The categories of ambiguity that he distinguishes are contingent upon their location, that is, "whether they occur in an individual word, or sentence, or a set of sentences" (Pehar, 2001, p. 3) or even throughout a text. Pehar (2001) thus differentiated among a tripartite ambiguity for the analyst to consider in examining any diplomatic document. Referential (Lexical), syntactic, and cross-textual ambiguity are the three categories of ambiguity. To Pehar (2005), not knowing the meaning of an ambiguity depends on not knowing the beliefs associated with the identified ambiguity. Lexical ambiguity pertains to vocabulary items whose position in a sentence incites a variation in meaning, whereas the syntactic ambiguity is a type of vagueness that exists in the structure of the sentence, which in turn triggers many interpretations. Specifications that are dispersed across the text under examination rather than being limited to, or contained within a single sentence are what cause cross-textual ambiguity. Concurrently, Pehar (2001) considered that this dispersion is "another source of ambiguity" (p. 5) and sentences of this kind are frequently found in diplomatic and judiciary papers.

Pehar's ambiguity-power theory centers on the manifestation and hegemony-fueled power struggle and establishment among diplomatic parties in power relations. As a clarification of the theory, Bassole (2018) posited that its fundamental tenet is that the speaker using ambiguity, is

employing language to manipulate the listeners, who in this instance become a victim, by exerting power over them. Language thus takes on the role of an embodied power. Furthermore, Pehar argued that the existence of more than two distinct meanings or readings in a diplomatic communication constitutes a fundamental component of diplomatic ambiguity. Therefore, hegemony is maintained and traversed either by both or just one of the "meanings" or "interpretations" (Pehar, 2001, p. 6).

Pehar's theory bases itself on the idea that power, ambiguity, and diplomatic language use are inextricably linked. Pehar's concept also serves two more uses. It serves as a tool for gaining strategic diplomatic leverage in the first place, and it also helps the users by influencing the power dynamics that exists among the parties in a way that is advantageous to them. Therefore, Pehar (2011) stressed the notion that "all diplomatic ambiguities serve one and only one purpose: to affect, establish, maintain, or change power relations between some parties" (p. 7).

7. Analysis of S/RES/2650 (2022): Register, Genre and Context of Situation

Resolution 2650 (2022) belongs to the genre of diplomatic discourse and its register is termed 'closed register' because its language use does not enable its drafter any margin of creativity. This is because the language of the resolution is 'fixed' where it belongs to the language of diplomacy and resolutions. Its terminology, then, is framed by the type of discourse genre that the resolution belongs to. In order to extend the mission of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) until August 31, 2023, Resolution 2650 calls for an assurance of the Interim Force's freedom of movement as well as the removal of any limitations and obstacles to that freedom. The resolution was unanimously approved by the Council, which also asked UNIFIL to provide the Lebanese Armed Forces (LAF) with the appropriate extra non-lethal supplies, including food, fuel, and medication, as well as logistical support for a period of six months while working within the constraints of available resources.

The Security Council has called on the government of Lebanon to submit a plan to strengthen its naval capabilities which will later on help in the transition of the UNIFIL's Maritime responsibilities to the LAF. In addition, the Council denounced any and all breaches of the Blue Line and demanded adherence to the ending of hostilities, prevention of future breaches, and complete collaboration with UNIFIL and the UN. The resolution further urged every State to recognize and uphold the boundaries drawn by the Blue Line and the Litani River. In particular, it recommended for more coordinated and nearby patrols between UNIFIL and the Lebanese Armed Forces.

7.1. Linguistic and Ambiguity Analysis

The UN resolution begins its preamble with cross textual ambiguity because it refers to previous statements and press statements. Lexical ambiguity is utilized in "the aftermath of the

explosions... Significant number of casualties and wounding thousands of people". Here there is no mentioning of the exact number of explosions in addition to the number of the casualties. It doesn't mention whether there were any personnel of the UNIFIL in the area of explosion and how many were wounded or whether there were any casualties from the UNIFIL. Lexical ambiguity is also revealed in the following throughout the whole resolution: Lebanese Parties, Lebanese political leaders, Lebanese leaders, and Lebanese authorities. Ambiguity results in the notion that there is no clarification with respect to the indication of the individual identity of the personnel specified. For example, are the leaders different from political leaders? Or are the leaders involved or not involved in politics? And who are the intended personnel with respect to ' authorities'? Are they political, belong to the army, or are they diplomats? This is left unclear.

The concept of three or triplet lexis is used in the resolution for the purpose of stress and magnification as in "acute social economic and humanitarian crises", "exercise maximum calm, restraint, cessation". Triplets is used in "counter terrorism, border protection, naval capacity". However, ambiguity resides in the following term " tripartite mechanism" wherein only two agents are mentioned but there is a third unknown party which is not mentioned as in "Tripartite Mechanism…The LAF, the UNIFIL". This vagueness poses a question with respect to the parties involved in discussing the arrangement of issues that facilitate the coordination between the LAF and UNIFIL, and implementing measures to reinforce this cooperation. Is this vagueness deliberate? And why the third party is not mentioned? Furthermore, the sequence of adjectives in three is revealed in "systematic, constructive, and expanded tripartite mechanism", and the final example of triplets resides in section 31 with respect to maintaining peace in "achieve a comprehensive, just, and lasting peace in the Middle East".

In addition to the use of triplets, the concept of duality in lexis is of significance in the resolution as such as "liaison and prevention", "efficiency and effectiveness" (twice), "capacities and responsibilities", "efficiencies and effectiveness". These couplets of lexis reveal the meticulousness of the language used by the resolution.

In the resolution there is the use of the expression "Lebanese people" and "Lebanese population" without clarifying the difference between the two. With respect to syntax and again lexis, there are many structures that include ambiguity.

"Expressing deep concern at the continued lack of progress made towards the establishment of a permanent ceasefire and other key provisions of resolution 1701 (2006) sixteen years after its adoption,". In these lines ambiguity resides in the notion that there is no mentioning of the reasons or by whom, or who is contributing to the lack of progress.

"all concerned parties to strengthen their efforts..., to fully implement all provisions" is a phrase that includes ambiguity with respect to adverb usage and pronoun reference where there is no mentioning of who these parties are, nor the kind of efforts put in the matter. This structure is also not without a cross-textual ambiguity because it refers to resolution 1701. As such, the reader will not know the provisions without referring back to the mentioned resolution.

"prohibition on sales and supply of arms and related materiel" is another example of ambiguity because there is no mentioning in this part of the resolution by whom, to whom, and the reason for the supply of arms, and what are the 'related' materiel?

Anagrams is used in the words "condemning" and "commending".

"encouraging the parties to resume and accelerate their efforts in coordination with UNIFIL" is an example of lexical ambiguity where there is no clarification as to who these parties are, whether military, political, local or International. It is worthy to mention that the expressions "all Lebanese parties, all parties, the parties, parties" are repeated several times in the resolution without any exact clarification of who they are. Another lexical ambiguity appears in "two serious attacks" wherein there is no indication of the identity of the perpetrators, and the use of the adjective series is not justified in the lines that follow, which raises a question as to the meaning of the adjective 'serious'.

"UNIFIL has at its disposal all necessary means and equipment to carry out its mandate" is another example of lexical ambiguity because throughout the resolution sometimes there are clarifications, but not when it comes to mentioning the means and equipment or resources.

"Determining that the situation in Lebanon continues to constitute a threat to international peace and security" is an important line in the resolution especially since it includes ambiguity with respect to "situation" and "threat". Here there is no specification of what kind of situation that threatens international peace and security, whether it is military, financial, or social situation.

Another interesting ambiguity is in the example "takes note of the impact of the Beirut explosions on the operations of the LAF" wherein the whole resolution does not even hint at the impact whether it is social, financial or psychological. This raises a question about its inclusion in the resolution.

"to exceptionally extend temporary and special measures" is ambiguous where the resolution doesn't mention what are these measures and why they are special, on what grounds and bases, and the use of the adverb "exceptionally" is left unclarified. So, are these measures ambiguous only to the reader? Or to the resolution intended parties as well?

"other United Nations personnel" includes adverb ambiguity where there is no indication of the identity of the personnel, which raises a question about why they are not mentioned in the resolution and about the purpose of hiding such information and not disclosing it. Is it for self-protection on the part of the UN?

"to deploy an international force to assist it to exercise its authority throughout the territory" is an ambiguous line with respect to the territory, whether it means border or not.

7.2. Cross-textual Ambiguity and Diplomatic Correspondence

In addition to lexical and syntactic ambiguity, the resolution includes cross-textual ambiguity and diplomatic correspondence as in the following examples:

"…established by resolution 1701 (2006), as authorized in paragraph 11 of the resolution 1701 (2006), with the provisions of resolution 1559 (2004) and resolution 1680 (2006), and of the relevant provisions of the Taif Accords,"

"Commends UNIFIL's operational changes in line with resolution 2373 (2017) and resolution 2433 (2018) and reiterates its request that the Secretary-General look at ways to enhance UNIFIL's efforts as regards paragraph 12 of resolution 1701 (2006) and paragraph 14 of this resolution…"

These quotations include cross-textual ambiguity because of the inclusion of many 'inter-texts'. This makes such lines difficult to understand and interpret without any further reference to the resolutions mentioned. Thus, a detailed knowledge of the parts (preamble) and other (content paragraphs) is a must so that the analyst or reader attains a precise understanding of their meaning. As for diplomatic correspondence, the present resolution has this characteristic trait since it belongs to the diplomatic genre. Examples are the following:

"Bearing in mind the strategic priorities and recommendations identified by the Secretary-General in his letter of 12 March 2012 (S/2012/151) as a result of the Strategic Review of UNIFIL, taking note of his letter of 8 March 2017 (S/2017/202)…"

"Further requests UNIFIL, in line with resolution 1701 and following the letter of the Government of Lebanon of 15 March 2022 addressed to the Presidency of the Security Council…"

These lines reveal that diplomatic relations do not solely rest on agreements, treaties, or diplomatic narratives. Also, diplomatic correspondence is an integral part of diplomatic communication. This is because such a type of correspondence is used to break down any diplomatic

barrier between the parties involved and paves the way for further diplomatic relations to occur smoothly; in addition to it being a formal means of communication at the diplomatic level among political and diplomatic personnel. Hence, diplomatic letters are a formal means of correspondence among parties where requests are made and are 'welcomed' (diplomatic term for 'acceptance') with respect to a particular notion or issue.

7.3. Women Empowerment

What is interesting in the present resolution is that, despite its main topic and intricate details, the resolution dedicates many of its sections to empower women as in the following examples:

Also recalling resolution 2242 (2015) and its request of the Secretary-General to initiate, in collaboration with Member States, a revised strategy, within existing resources, to double the number of women in military and police contingents of UN peacekeeping operations,
Calls upon the Lebanese Armed Forces to work towards a full deployment of model regiment troops at the earliest opportunity, including with the meaningful participation of women military personnel,
…ensure full compliance of all personnel, civilian and uniformed, in UNIFIL with the United Nations zero-tolerance policy on sexual exploitation and abuse and to keep the Security Council fully informed about the Mission's progress in this regard,
27. *Requests* UNIFIL to take fully into account gender considerations as a cross-cutting issue throughout its mandate and to assist the Lebanese authorities in ensuring the full, equal, effective and meaningful participation, involvement and representation of women at all levels of decision-making in all efforts for the maintenance and promotion of peace and security, including in the security sector, …*welcomes* the continued progress made to implement Lebanon's first National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security, commends the increase in women's participation in the LAF Military Academy…, with the support of the United Nations and women's civil society organizations, as soon as possible, including to prevent and respond to sexual and gender based violence and to increase women's representation in all levels of Lebanon's security forces and governments;
28. Requests the Secretary-General and the troop-contributing countries to seek to increase the number of women in UNIFIL, as well as to ensure the full, effective and meaningful participation of women in all aspects of operations and to implement relevant provisions of resolution 2538 (2020) in this regard;

These quotations demonstrate how dedicated the UN is to supporting women, empowering them in various fields, especially the military one, preventing any abuse they encounter, as well as taking

severe measures to punish the perpetrator. Hence, enabling women to become active participants in the army is a grand step which ensures the efficacy of women, their capability, and the deterrence of the patriarchal view towards women that, unfortunately, still exists in some places in the world.

8. Interpretation and Conclusion: Power of the United Nations through S/RES/2650 (2022)

In this resolution, the power of the UN is revealed through the use of modals and verbs as follows. S/RES/2650 (2022) includes the use of modality in section 11 of the resolution in "that should not be considered as a president in the future nor a long-term solution". The modal 'should' is interesting because it is a one sole modal in the whole resolution. This modal means an obligation towards a specific action. So, its importance exists in its function which is a condition for a particular action with respect to the support and assistance of the Lebanese Armed Forces, which is to 'exceptionally extend the temporary and special measures'. Therefore, the usage of "should" indicates the authority the UN has over the parties listed in the resolution, from an interpretive pragmatic standpoint. The parties themselves do not set the rules for the designated parties; rather, the UN does.

Moreover, S/RES/2650 (2022) contains verbs that show power, control, and dominance of the UN over the parties mentioned in the resolution. For example, "Strongly urging, stressing the urgent need, calling upon, urging all parties, commending, determining, demands the parties, requests (6 times), recalls its authorization, and decides (twice)" are strong verbs that are used in a fixed context which allows no room for leniency. The use of the verb 'urge' in its various forms whether as a noun or as an adjective is used 10 times. Thus, the number of usage of particular verbs conveys that the power of decision is in the hands of the UN.

A number of the UN Security Council's resolutions exhibits the notion that the UNSC has an implied authority. With this authority, the organization can issue directives, lay down expectations or responsibilities, or compel someone to follow a certain path of action. However, the last sentence of each resolution has a specific purpose, and this resolution is no different. For example, in "32. Decides to remain actively seized of the matter" the aim is "to clearly delineate the Security Council's jurisdiction over an issue" (Martin, 2015). A crucial aspect of this resolution is that, similar to the majority of its preceding resolutions, S/RES/2650 (2022) concludes with the word "decides" in the specific diplomatic register phrase. This statement highlights the prominence of the United Nations and its Security Council. The UNSC's authority is the reason for this domination. There is a specific context in which the verb "decides" is employed in relation to this resolution. By using a verb of this sort, the major speaker, i.e. the UN Security Council reveals an implied power. With this power, the organization can give directives, impose duties or requirements, or demand that someone commits to a course of action. Therefore, the UN purposefully uses the verb and the prepositional phrase. Hence,

this closing sequence and ending of the resolution indicates through implication that the UN is in control of whatever happens with the resolution.

Upon analyzing the selected resolution, the UN uses ambiguity to its advantage in order to avoid responsibility, make maneuvers, or show contempt. The UN adopts and promotes a wide range of views and measures. Nonetheless, because of the haze of ambiguity, nothing of the adopted or promoted is accomplished. Such ambiguity is primarily manifested in lexis and syntax. These two categories account for the majority of the investigated resolution. So, there is ambiguity in many sections of S/Res/2650 (2022) for a particular purpose, which implies that the UN deliberately employs it to covertly deliver a strong message. The UN has powerful control over the International Support Group, the Secretary-General, and the UNIFIL. They are therefore unable to carry out any decisions or take any action without first consulting the UN; a notion that proves the UN's superiority.

In conclusion, one international organization having legislative authority is the United Nations. It drafts and adopts resolutions with certain objectives in mind, like maintaining world peace in particular regions, putting an end to hostilities between opponents, or even keeping an eye on an agreement or a peace treaty. Moreover, a crucial idea is the wording employed in the resolution. In addition to being a diplomatic language, the language usage in the operational part of the resolution greatly affects its heading and internal components.

Hence, the resolution's title and content are significantly influenced by the way the operative section is worded. This in turn affects the perception of the resolution. The UN resolutions are exclusive to the discussion within a particular community, since they are specialized texts that include certain elements of legal and/or diplomatic discourse. As a result, its content cannot be understood by everyone. Because of this, the audience of the UN documents comprises specialized resolution drafters as well as experts in diplomatic communication.

The analysis of the resolution shows that, although the UN respects and works in accordance with the sovereignty of Lebanon, language is used in a significant way in order to either reveal or conceal information and identity. Such a use is materialized through particular linguistic choices in addition to ambiguity at its three levels. Thus, despite the technical and specialized jargon in the resolution and whether through word choice or ambiguity, the UN gains dominance over any party that is involved in its resolutions, including the present one. Ultimately, whatever takes place, the UN has the final word in the matter.

References

-Arkelyan, R. & Avetyan, A. (2017). The General and the Specific in Political and Diplomatic Discourses. *Yerevan State University Journal*, *1*(22), 3-10. https://journals.ysu.am/index.php/foreign

-Bekele, H. K. (2021). Problem of Defining Terrorism under International Law: Definition by the Appeal Chamber of Special Tribunal for Lebanon as a Solution to the Problem. *Beijing Law Review*, *12*, 619-630. https://doi.org/10.4236/blr.2021.122033

-Berridge, G. R. (2015). *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*. 5th ed. Palgrave.

-Bhatia, V. K. (1993). Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings. Longman.

-Bird F. (2022). ISIL in Iraq: A Critical Analysis of the UN Security Council's Gendered Personification of (Non) States. *Laws*, *11*(5). https://doi.org/10.3390/laws11010005

-D'Acquisto, G. (2017). *A linguistic analysis of diplomatic discourse: UN resolutions on the question of Palestine*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

https://www.cambridgescholars.com/resources/pdfs/978-1-4438-5072-8-sample.pdf

-Di Carlo, G. S. (2015). ''Weasel Words'' in Legal and Diplomatic Discourse: Vague Nouns and Phrases in UN Resolutions Relating to the Second Gulf War. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, *28*(3), 559-576. Springer. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/276302130

-Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language.* 2nd ed. Routledge.

-Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (2013). *Cohesion in English.* Longman.

-Ismailova, F., Rayeva, G., Koblanova, A., Yelikbayev, B. & Yessenova, K. (2020). Analysis of Political and Diplomatic Language in Linguistic, Cognitive and Pragmatic Aspects. *Opción*, *36*(91), 803-819. https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/7643168.pdf

-Kappeler, D. (2013). *Persuasion: The Essence of Diplomacy*. https://www.diplomacy.edu/

-Kenzhekanova, K. K. (2015). Linguistic Features of Political Discourse. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *6*(6), 192-199. https://www.mcser.org/journal/index.php/mjss/article/view/8084

-Mehtiyev, A. (2010). The Language of Diplomacy. *California Linguistic Notes*, *35*(2),

https://english.fullerton.edu/publications/clnArchives/pdf/MethievLgDplmcy.pdf

-Mullany, L. (2002). (Re) assessing (im) politeness, Language and Gender in Political Broadcast Interviews. *Sheffield Hallam Working Papers on the Web: Linguistic Politeness and Context.*

http://www.shu.ac.uk/wpw/politeness/mullany.html

-Nye, J. (2004). When Hard Power Undermines Soft Power. *New Perspectives Quarterly, 21*(3), 13-15.

-Pascual, E. (2001). Pragmatics in Diplomatic Exchanges. Trans. Helena Mallia. *Language and Diplomacy*, 225-232. https://www.diplomacy.edu/resource/pragmatics-in-diplomatic-exchanges/

-Pehar, D. (2001). Use of Ambiguities in Peace Agreements. *Language and Diplomacy*.

http://www.diplomacy.edu/resources/general/use-ambiguities-peace-agreements

-Pehar, D. (2005). Diplomatic Ambiguity: From the Power-centric Practice to a Reasoned Theory. *Polemos* 8, 153-182. https://hrcak.srce.hr/file/7734

-Pehar, D. (2011). Diplomatic Ambiguity: Language, Power, Law. *Lambert Academic Publishing*.

-Pimentel, P. C. & Panke, L. (2020). Diplomatic Discourses: are they an Object of Political Communication research? *Intercom*, *43*(2), 53-70. https://www.scielo.br/

-Polyakova, L.S., Yuzhakova, Y. V., Zalavina, T. Y., & Dyorina, N. V., (2020). Linguistic Manipulation Means in English Political Discourse. *AMAZONIA Investiga*, *9*(33), 27-36. https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2020.33.09.3

-Rana, K. (2000). *Inside Diplomacy*. Continuum.

-Ricento, T. (Ed.). (2018). Language Policy and Political Theory: Building Bridges, Assessing Barriers. John Benjamins.

-Scherzinger, J. (2023). 'Acting under Chapter 7': Rhetorical Entrapment, Rhetorical Hollowing, and the Authorization of Force in the UN Security Council, 1995–2017. *International Relations*, *37*(1), 3-24. https://doi.org/10.1177/00471178221082870

-Sharp, P. (2009). *Diplomatic Theory of International Relations*. Cambridge University Press.

-Topala, R. M. (2014). Morphological Characteristics of the Diplomatic Language. *Cultural Intertexts*, *1*(1), 308-319. https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=585812

-United Nations (2022). United Nations Security Council Resolution 2650. https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3 CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/s-res-2650.pdf

-Van Dijk, T. (1998). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. In: Schiffrin, D., Hamilton, H. & Tannen, D. (eds.). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*.

-Van Dijk, T.A. (1993). *Elite Discourse and Racism*. Sage.

-Wang, G., Wu, X., Xiang, Y., & Qu, Y. (2024). Linguistic Polyphony in UN Speeches on Climate Change: An Analysis of Implicit Argumentation. *Critical Discourse Studies*, *21*(2), 146-163. http://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2023.2197609